

ANALYSING INTERPERSONAL MEANING AND CONVERSATIONAL STYLE IN A STREET CHILDREN'S TALK FROM AMMA DARKO'S FACELESS (2003)

Ayodele Adebayo Allagbé

Department of English, Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences (FLSH), University of Zinder (UZ), Republic of Niger, Research Unit in Social, Human and Education Sciences (UR_2SHE).

Moustafa Guézohouèzon,

School of Rural Sociology and Agricultural Extension (ESRVA), National University of Agriculture (UNA), Republic of Benin

Ida Marie Josephine Tchibozo-Lainé

Department of English, Faculty of Letters, Languages, Arts and Communication (FLLAC), University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Republic of Benin.

ABSTRACT

This essay seeks to analyse interpersonal meaning and conversational style in a street children's talk from Amma Darko's Faceless (2003). Drawing its theoretical underpinnings from interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1981, 1982, 2015; Hymes, 1974; Tannen, 1979a, 1980a; 1984/2005; 1987; Coupland, 2007, etc.) and systemic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1971; 1978; Halliday and Hasan, 1985/1989; Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004; Halliday and Webster, 2009; Eggins, 1994/2004; Eggins and Slade, 1997; Fontaine, 2013, etc.) and combined with quantitative and qualitative research methods, the present study aims to examine how two street children (Fofu and Odarley) conversationally involved in the talk use language to negotiate social (group) identity and social relations. It also intends to describe the linguistic/Mood features which characterise or/and constitute the speech/conversational style or/and speech/communicative behaviour of these street children. The findings reveal that the speakers' spoken interaction is marked by such stylistic features as a predominant use of full declaratives, a considerable proportion of elliptical structures, minor clauses, inexplicitness or indirectness, lack of a general/overall theme, contextualisation cues like code-mixing, code-switching or style-shifting and such paralinguistic or/and prosodic features as reduplication and suspension marks/points. All these denote that the tenor of the talk is informal.

Key Words: Conversational style, interpersonal meaning, social relations, street children, talk.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is an irrefutable fact that the use of language plays a crucial role in the lives of human beings (Langford, 1994). As a matter of fact, they use language to interact with each other or one another, exchange ideas, goods and services, etc., with each other or one another in their everyday social life. It follows from this to note that there is no such thing called social life without the use of language. In other words, language use pervades all the strata of human social life. Now if we agree that the use of language is crucial in the lives of human beings, we implicitly want to suggest then that talk or verbal/spoken interaction occupies a priority place in their everyday social life.

Therefore, if we intend to understand the behaviour of human beings, we need to study the way(s) they use language or speak/talk in relation to their social environment. The Australian-born British linguist Michael A. K. Halliday (1973, p. 48) seems to put this assumption in a clearer

wording: “A significant fact about the behaviour of human beings in relation to their social environment is that a large part of it is linguistic behaviour. The study of social man [or social woman] presupposes the study of language and social man [or social woman].” In an earlier version of the paper from which the foregoing quote is drawn, Halliday (1971, p. 165) emphasises the need for modern linguists to study “man [or woman] in the environment of men [or/and women]” if they really intend to gain an insight into his/her social or/and linguistic behaviour.

It is obvious in the foregoing claims that Halliday (1971, 1973) views ‘language in a social perspective’, which is in fact the title of his essay. And this view, which is ultimately socially-based or sociologically-oriented, was actually a reaction to/against a more idealised view of language as code, conceptualised and put forth by the American linguist Avram Noam Chomsky as *linguistic competence*: knowledge of the grammatical rules of a language by an idealised speaker-hearer. Chomsky’s idealised view of language has been seriously criticised by many other linguists or/and sociolinguists like Dell H. Hymes, John J. Gumperz, William Labov, to name but a few. Underlying these scholars’ critiques of Chomsky’s theory of language is a general view that it deals with “language at an abstract, idealis[s]ed level and largely ignores language as interaction, as performance” (Brown, 2004, p. 395). In this perspective, Hymes (1974, p. 92) underlines the limitations of Chomsky’s definition of linguistic goals with regard to *linguistic competence* and *performance* in the following terms:

The term ‘competence’ promises more than it in fact contains. It is restricted to knowledge, and, within knowledge, to knowledge of grammar. Thus, it leaves other aspects of speakers’ tacit knowledge and ability in confusion, thrown together under a largely unexamined concept of ‘performance.’ In effect, ‘performance’ confuses two separate aims. The first is to stress that competence is something underlying behavio[u]r (‘mere performance,’ ‘actual performance’). The second is to allow for aspects of linguistic ability which are not grammatical: psychological constraints on memory, choice of alternative rules, stylistic choices and devices in word order, etc.

Earlier before the publication of his paper quoted above, in 1966, Hymes coined the term *communicative competence* to actually redress the perceived inadequacy created by Chomsky’s distinction between *linguistic competence* and *performance*. This term refers to “a language user’s grammatical knowledge of syntax, morphology, phonology and the like, as well as social knowledge about how and when to use utterances appropriately” (<https://en.m.wikipedia.org>). Drawing on the foregoing, Gumperz (1981, p. 323) posits that *communicative competence* denotes “the knowledge of linguistic and related communicative conventions that speakers must have to initiate and sustain conversational involvement.” He further argues that “Conversational involvement is clearly a necessary precondition for understanding” (ibid.) what goes on implicitly or/and explicitly in any conversational exchange. What this implies is that in every conversation, speakers need to be conversationally involved or cooperative (Gumperz, 1982) if they really intend to sustain the (flow of the) conversation at all and even make sense of it.

The notion of conversational involvement naturally presupposes intersubjective knowledge. This suggests that speakers share in common a given set of background knowledge or assumptions with regard to the context of situation or topic or ‘signalling conventions’ or/and ‘contextualisation

strategies/cues' (to borrow Gumperz's terms) which enable them to understand and interpret their everyday social interactions. In other words, in a communicative situation whereby participants speak the same language or dialect but share different signalling conventions, there is a strong tendency that different interpretations will arise from their interaction. Gumperz (in Tannen, Hamilton, and Schiffrin [2015, p. 316]) observes that people learn signalling conventions or/and contextualisation strategies/cues primarily through "direct personal contacts of the kind characteristic of family, peer-group, and close friendship relations, where background knowledge is likely to be shared and speakers can be confident that others will understand their indirect allusions". In other words, they learn how to perform socially and linguistically well via socialisation in a given speech community. According to Labov (1972/1978 in Coupland and Jaworski, 1997, p. 23), "the basis of intersubjective knowledge in linguistics must be found in speech- language as it is used in everyday life by members of the social order, that vehicle of communication in which they argue with their wives, joke with their friends, and deceive their enemies."

It is against the backdrop of the foregoing theoretical assumptions that this essay is set. It seeks to analyse interpersonal meaning and conversational style in a street children's talk from Amma Darko's *Faceless* (2003). In other words, this paper aims to examine how two street children (Fofu and Odarley) conversationally involved in the talk use language to negotiate social (group) identity and social relations. It also intends to describe the linguistic/Mood features which characterise or/and constitute the speech/conversational style or/and speech/communicative behaviour of these street children. There has been an increasing body of research work on how individuals use language in their everyday social life or on naturally-occurring conversations or on speech/conversational styles (see Tannen, 1979a, 1980a; 1984/2005; 1987; Selting, 1989; Eggins and Slade, 1997; Doi, 2012; Enyi and Chukwuokoro, 2019, etc.). But no researcher, to the best of our knowledge, has shown an interest in the way(s) street children (depicted in a fictional text) speak/talk or has attempted to describe the specific linguistic features that characterise or/and constitute their speech/conversational style or linguistic/communicative behaviour. This is the research gap this study sets out to fill in. It draws its theoretical underpinnings from interactional sociolinguistics and systemic functional linguistics.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As previously mentioned, this paper draws its theoretical underpinnings from interactional sociolinguistics (henceforth, IS) and systemic functional linguistics (henceforth, SFL). IS and SFL are *socially-based or sociologically-oriented* theoretical approaches to the study of language; i.e., they study language in context. IS was founded by the American linguistic anthropologist John Joseph Gumperz. It can be simply glossed as the linguistic study of human interaction (or verbal communication) in relation to context/culture/society. Its primary aim is to study how language users create meaning via social interaction.

Gumperz defines IS as "an approach to discourse analysis that has its origin in the search for replicable methods of qualitative analysis that account for our ability to interpret what participants intend to convey in everyday communicative practice" (Gumperz in Tannen, Hamilton, and Schiffrin [2015, p. 309]). It is also considered as "a theoretical and methodological framework within the discipline of linguistic anthropology, which combines the methodology of

linguistics with the cultural consideration of anthropology in order to understand how the use of language informs social and cultural interaction” (<https://en.m.wikipedia.org>). Underlying Gumperz’s approach to discourse analysis is the idea that language users are members of social and cultural groups, and as such, the way they use language not only reflects their group identity but also provides indices of who they are, what they want to communicate and how skilful they are in doing so. Gumperz’s approach has drawn on work by scholars like Dell H. Hymes, Erving Goffman, Harold Garfinkel, Pierre Bourdieu, etc. And a wide range of topics has thus far been studied with this approach. Some of the topics studied in IS are diversity (cross-cultural miscommunication), politeness, framing, conversational inference, conversational implicature, conversational style, etc.

This paper is mainly concerned with conversational style. The American linguist Deborah Frances Tannen has conducted an intensive research work on conversational style (see Tannen 1979a; 1984/2005; for instance). Tannen (2005, p. 4) posits that “Anything that is said must be said in some way, and that way is style.” In other words, “‘Style’ refers to a way of doing [or saying] something” (Coupland, 2007, p. 1). Related to conversation, the foregoing simply denotes that the way every single person speaks constitutes style. This is to say, every person uses words to mean something in a peculiar way in his/her interaction with others. And in order to understand (the meaning of) these spoken words, as Tannen (*ibid.*) holds, one has to know how the words are meant. For Tannen, words communicate speakers’ intentions, and the way these intentions are communicated realises the features of conversational style: tone of voice, pausing, rate of speech, relative loudness, and so on- all of the elements that make up not only what the speaker says but how s/he says it. From this, one can infer that “Conversational style is a semantic process; it is the way meaning is encoded in and derived from speech” (Tannen, 1987, p. 251). Or simply put, “conversational style refers to the basic tools with which people communicate” (Tannen, 2005, p. 4). Tannen’s notion of conversational style actually grows out of Robin Lakoff’s work on communicative style as well as John J. Gumperz’s on conversational inference: the function of paralinguistic and prosodic features, which he calls contextualisation cues, to maintain thematic cohesion and signal how conversational contributions are intended (Tannen, 1987, p. 251). According to Tannen (1979a; 1984/2005; 1987), some features of conversational style are *topic* (which includes types of topic and how transitions occur), *genre* (storytelling styles), *pace* (which includes rate of speech, avoidance of pauses and cooperative overlaps), *expressive paralinguistics* (which includes expressive phonology, pitch and amplitude shifts, voice quality and strategic pauses), *humour*, etc.

Alongside Tannen’s work on conversational style can be placed work on casual conversation by two Australian linguists Suzanne Eggins and Diana Slade (1997). This work clearly maps out the relevance of the study of spoken interaction in daily life by referring to perspectives from ethnomethodology, sociolinguistics, philosophy, structural-functional linguistics and social semiotics. Though these scholars acknowledge that perspectives from the aforementioned fields have contributed ideas about spoken interaction, they note that relatively few of them have addressed the challenge of analysing casual conversation. They then deem it useful to adopt an eclectic theoretical base, drawing on insights from all the different fields, but with particular reference to CA (Conversation Analysis), SFL, and CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis). In fact, they take perspectives on the micro-structuring of

casual conversation, including the analysis of the localistic organisation of turn-taking from CA, itemisation of linguistic features relevant to variation in conversational style from IS, the production and interpretation of speech acts from Speech Act theory and Pragmatics, and the grammatical, semantic and discourse characteristics of casual talk from SFL. All these insights are actually relevant for the present study, most especially those from SFL. SFL is a functional-semantic theory of language developed by MAK Halliday and his followers (Halliday, 1971; 1978; Halliday and Hasan, 1985/1989; Halliday and Mathiessen, 2004; Halliday and Webster, 2009; Eggins, 1994/2004; Eggins and Slade, 1997; Fontaine, 2013, etc.). This theory is functional-semantic in the sense that it models language use (written or spoken) as a purposeful behaviour (Eggins, 1994/2004). In fact, this theory views language as a social semiotic system (Halliday, 1978) or a systemic resource for making and exchanging meanings (Webster in Halliday and Webster [2009, p. 5]). From this perspective, systemic linguists, as Eggins notes, study “how people use language with each other in accomplishing everyday social life” (Eggins 1994, p. 2); i.e., they study language use in relation to its social functions/meanings.

Halliday (1971) outlines three functions/meanings that people simultaneously encode each time they use language, viz: ideational, interpersonal and textual. This study aims to analyse interpersonal function/meaning in the street children’s talk drawn from Darko’s novel. The choice of this function lies in the fact that the primary task of a talk/verbal conversation is the negotiation of social identity and social relations (Eggins and Slade, 1997). And interpersonal function is exclusively concerned with the enactment of social processes (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004); i.e., it is concerned with how people use language to build, establish and maintain personal and social relationships with others (Cunanan, 2011). In SFL, the interpersonal meaning is represented by the grammatical structure of Mood (Eggins, 2004). Halliday (cited in Eggins, 1994, p. 154) claims that Mood is “the grammar of the clause as exchange”; it generally describes the structures associated with Mood choice types drawn on to pivot social interactions. In other words, Mood describes the “variables such as the types of clause structure or mood types, modality, the use of tags, vocatives, attitudinal words which are either positively or negatively loaded, expressions of intensification, and politeness markers of various kinds” (Eggins, 1994, pp. 192-194) included in any instance of language use (say a talk/verbal conversation). The analysis of Mood involves the identification of Mood types, Modality types and Adjunct types (Koussouhonn and Allagbé, 2013).

The term “Mood type” designates the type of clause structure. Eggins (1994, p. 192) claims that Mood Types correlate with the semantic categories of speech functions of offer, command, statement and question. However, a Mood type can still perform a speech function other than the one for which it is generally known (Koussouhonn Akogbéto and Allagbé, 2015a). Modality refers to a speaker’s/writer’s/narrator’s attitudes towards and opinions about the events and situations around him/her (Simpson, 1993, p. 47). Fowler (1986, p. 131) defines modality as “the grammar of explicit comment, the means by which people express their degree of commitment to the truth of the propositions they utter, and their views on the desirability or otherwise of the states of affairs referred to”. Modality can be expressed on two main axes, viz: epistemic and deontic. Epistemic modality, called modalisation in SFL terms, indicates a kind of connotative meaning relating to the degree of certainty the speaker/writer wants to express about what s/he is saying or the estimation of probability associated to what is being said (Fontaine, 2013, p. 121). Deontic modality, called modulation in SFL terms, also indicates a kind of connotative meaning but, in

contrast to epistemic modality, it relates to obligation or permission, including willingness and ability (Fontaine, 2013, p. 121). Modality can be encoded in modal auxiliary verbs (e.g. can, could, shall, should, may, might, will, would, etc.), lexical items (usually adverbs such as probably, luckily, etc.) or groups which function as modal adjuncts (e.g. by all means, at all cost, etc.). Adjuncts can be defined as clause elements which contribute some additional (but nonessential) information to the clause (Eggins, 1994, p. 165). The subsequent section shows how the theoretical framework outlined here is relevant for the analysis of the street children's talk/verbal conversation under scrutiny. But before that, it presents the methodology the study draws on.

4. METHODOLOGY AND PRACTICAL ANALYSIS OF MOOD FEATURES IN THE STREET CHILDREN'S TALK FROM THE NOVEL

This essay seeks to analyse interpersonal meaning and conversational style in a street children's talk from Amma Darko's *Faceless* (2003). To reach this goal, it draws its theoretical underpinnings from interactional sociolinguistics and systemic functional linguistics; it specifically draws *conversational style* and the *grammar of interpersonal meaning* (otherwise known as *Mood*) from the aforementioned two linguistic traditions in that order. It also combines these theoretical underpinnings with quantitative and qualitative research methods. The study first sets out to describe, identify and quantify the linguistic/Mood features the speakers in the talk employ. These features are presumed here to characterise or/and constitute the speakers' speech/conversational style or/and speech/communicative behaviour. Next, the described/identified linguistic/Mood features are presented in Tables 1 (for Mood types), 2 (for Modality types) and 3 (for Adjunct types). Finally, the meaning of these quantified linguistic/Mood features is discussed qualitatively. The analysis of Mood is carried out here following the key below:

Key:

S = Subject, F = Finite, Fn = negative, Fms = modalised, Fml = modulated, P = Predicator, Pml = modulated Predicator, Pms = modalised Predicator, F/P = fused Finite and Predicator, C = Complement Ca = attributive Complement, A = Adjunct, Ac = circumstantial, Am = mood, Ao = comment, Ap = polarity, Av = vocative, Aj = conjunctive, At = continuity, WH = WH element, WH/S, WH/C, WHAc = fused WH element, mn = minor clause, MOOD element of ranking (non-embedded) clauses is shown in bold.

Talk (Darko, 2003, pp. 5-9)

1. "Fofo (Av), **is (F) that you (S)?** 2. What (WH/C) **are (F) you (S)**. . .?" 3. "Shshshshshsh . . ." (mn) 4. **Fofo (S) placed (F/P)** a finger (C) to her own lips (Ac). 5i. **Odarley (S) shot up (F/P)** from the cardboard (Ac) 5ii. and (Aj) **rubbed (F/P)** her eyes (C). 6. **A car horn (S) sounded afar (F/P)** like a clarion call to duty (Ac). 7. **She (S) rose (F/P)**. 8. **Fofo (S) trod (F/P)** her way (C) carefully (Ac) out of the shack (Ac). 9i. **Odarley (S) followed (F/P)**, 9ii. pausing (P) briefly (Ac) by the door to fish out her *Charlie wotee* from a bunch (Ac). 10i. **She (S) slipped in (F/P)** her feet (C) 10ii. and (Aj) **stepped out (F/P)** with Fofo (Ac). 11. On second thoughts (Ac), **she (S) got back (F/P)** inside the shack (Ac). 12. **A big plastic water bottle (S) stood (F/P)** by the pile of slippers (Ac). 13i. **She (S) picked up (F/P)** an old plastic cup (C) beside it (Ac) 13ii. and (Aj) **filled (F/P)** it (C) with some of the water (Ac). 14i. **She (S) walked out (F/P)** to the crudely dug gutter in front of the shack (Ac), 14ii. **washed (F/P)** her face (C) 14iii. and (Aj) **rinsed (F/P)** her

mouth (C). 15i. “**Have (F) you (S)?**” 15ii. **she (S) asked (F/P)** Fofu (C). 16. **Fofu (S) shook (F/P)** her head (C). 17i. **Odarley (S) handed (F/P)** her (C) the half-cup of water (C) 17ii. and **went back (F/P)** into the shack (Ac). 18i. By the time (Ac) **Fofu (S) returned (F/P)** the cup (C), 18ii. **Odarley (S) had (F)** fished out (P) some chewing sticks (C). 19i. **She (S) placed (F/P)** one (C) between her teeth (Ac); 19ii. **gave (F/P)** the other (C) to Fofu (Ac); 19iii. **chewed (F/P)** briefly (Ac) on hers (Ac); 19iv. **removed (F/P)** it (C), 19v. **spat (F/P)** into the gutter (Ac) 19vi. and (Aj) **whispered (F/P)**, 19vii. “‘Trouble?’” (mn) 20. “‘Big one.’” (mn) 21. **Odarley’s mind (S) went (F/P)** ablaze (Ca) [[with what (WH/C) **Fofu’s big trouble (S) most likely was (F)**]] (Ac). 22i. **Maybe (Am) the vegetables woman [[who (S) employed (F/P) her (C)]] (S) found out (F/P)** 22ii. **Fofu (S) sometimes (Am) picked (F/P)** pockets (C). 23i. Or (Aj) **had (F) Fofu (S) tried (P)** a fast one (C) on somebody (Ac) 23ii. and (Aj) failed (P)? 24i. “‘What big trouble?’” (mn) 24ii. **she (S) asked (F/P)**. 25. “‘And (Aj) **what trouble (WH/S)** here at Sodom and Gomorrah (Ac) **isn’t (Fn) big (Ca)?** 26i. **I (S) tell (F/P)** you (C), 26ii. how (WHAc) **we (S) boozed (F/P)** yesterday (Ac)! 27. **That one (S) was (F) big trouble (C)**. 28. **Nature (S) is (F) even (Am) calling (P).**” 29. **She (S) held (F/P)** her stomach (C). 30. “‘**Let’s (S) go (P)** to the dump (Ac).” 31. And (Aj) **she (S) went ahead (F/P)**. 32i. **A handful of children and a few adults (S) were (F)** already there (Ac) 32ii. and (Aj) doing (P) their own thing (C) under the scrutinizing eyes of some early rising pigs and vultures (Ac). 33. **They (S) found (F/P)** a free spot (C). 34i. **Odarley (S) raised (F/P)** her dress (C) 34ii. and (Aj) **pulled down (F/P)** her pants (C) 34iii. and (Aj) **got (F/P)** straight to business (Ac). 35i. **Fofu (S) also lifted (F/P)** her dress (C) 35ii. and (Aj) **squatted (F/P)**. 36i. **Odarley [[who (S) was (F) observing (P) her (C)]] (S), shot out (F/P)**, 36ii. “‘**You (S) are (F) wearing (P) no underpants (C)?**” 37i. “‘**You (S) let (F) us (C) finish (P) fast (Ac) 37ii. and (Aj) get out of (P) here (Ac) 37iii. before (Aj) Macho (S) comes (F/P)**. 38i. **You (S) know (F/P) 38ii. how (WHAc) he (S) has (F) been harassing (P) people (C) nowadays (Ac), 38iii. don’t (Fn) you (S)?**” 39. **Fofu (S) responded (F/P)**. 40. **They (S) were (F) facing (P) each other (C) like two alternate angels (Ac)**. 41. **It (S) enabled (F/P)** them (C) [[to watch (P) each other’s back (C)]] (C). 42i. “‘Honestly (Ao),” (mn) 42ii. **Odarley (S) snorted (F/P)**, 42iii. “‘Macho (Av) himself, where (WH/Ac) **does (F) he (S) do (P) it (C)? 43. He (S) is (F) a foolish man (C)**. 44i. “‘Where (WH/Ac) **does (F) he (S) want (P) us (C) 44ii. to do (P) it (C)?**” 45i. “‘**He (S) wants (F/P) us (C) 45ii. to go (P) to the public toilet up there (Ac)**. 46. Where else (WH/Ac)?” (mn) 47. “‘Nonsense. (mn) 48. Then (Aj) why (WH/Ac) **doesn’t (Fn) he and his gang (S) also go (P) there (Ac)? 49i. Who (WH/S) can (Fms) walk (P) that long distance to up there (Ac) 49ii. when (Aj) the thing (S) is (F) coming (P) with force (Ac)?**” 50. “‘Ask (P) again (Ac). 51. And (Aj) look at (P) the long line of people (C) too **always (Am) there (Ac)**. 52. Ah! (At/mn) 53i. Even if (Aj) **you (S) go (F/P) there (Ac) at twelve midnight (Ac), 53ii. you (S) would (Fms) find (P) a queue (C).**” 54i. “‘That is why (Aj) **people (S) sometimes (Am) do (F/P) it (C) on themselves (Ac) 54ii. while (Aj) waiting (P) for their turn (Ac)**. 55i. **This (S) is not (Fn) like hunger (Ac) 55ii. where (Aj) you (S) can (Fms) force (P) small (Ac) 55iii. and (Aj) say (P) like: 55iv. Oh (At), let (F) me (C) hold on (P) a little (Ac)**. 56. **This one, [[when (Aj) it (S) says (F/P) // it (S) is (F) coming (P)]] (S), zoom (F/P)! 57. It (S) comes (F/P)**. 58. Bum! (mn) 59. Like that (mn)! 60. What (WH/C) **does (F) it (S) understand (P) about holding on a little (Ac)?**” 61i. “‘And (Aj) see (P) how ((WH/Ac) **sometimes (Am) too 61ii. when (Aj) you (S) are (F) in there (Ac) 61iii. doing (P) it (C) 61iv. and (Aj) haven’t (Fn) finished (P) at all (Ac), 61v. those guard people (S) too will (Fms) come (P) on you (Ac) 61vi. telling (P) you (C) 61vii. to hurry up (P) 61viii. because (Aj) you (S) have (F) been (P) there (Ac) for too long (Ac) 61ix. and (Aj) others (S) are (F) waiting (P)**. 62i. **Is (F) this (S) something**

(C) 62ii. that (Aj) **you (S) can (Fms)** start doing (P) 62iii. and (Aj) stop (P) midway (Ac) 62iv. just because (Aj) **you (S) have (F)** been (P) there (Ac) for long (Ac) 62v. and (Aj) **others too (S) are (F)** waiting (P)?” 63. “Hm.” (mn) 64. **Odarley (S) seemed (F)** to be (P) concentrating (Ca). 65. **She (S) groaned (F/P)** a little (Ac). 66. **Fofo (S) was (F)** obviously (Ao) having (P) a problem (C). 67i. “Odarley (Av), **do (F) you (S)** think (P) 67ii. **God (S) is (F)** watching (P) us (C) 67iii. do (P) it (C)?” 68i. “Ah (At), **don’t (Fn) they (S)** say (P) 68ii. **He (S) sees (F/P)** everything (C)? 69. But (Aj) why this question (WH/Ac)? (mn) 70i. **You (S) squat (F/P)** there (Ac) 70ii. and (Aj) **ask (F/P)** foolish questions (C). 71. Me, **I (S) am about to (F)** finish (P).” 72. “What? (mn) 73. Just now?” (mn) 74. “**You (S) call (F/P)** all the time [[**we (S) have (F)** been (P) here (Ac)]] (C), just now (C)? 75i. **Do (F) you (S)** want (P) Macho (C) 75ii. to come (P) after you (Ac) with those thick round arms of his like Mami Adzorkor’s kenkey balls (Ac)?” 76. **Fofo (S) didn’t (F)** reply (P). 77. “Fofo (Av),” **Odarley (S) called (F/P)**. 78. “Hm.” (At/mn) 79. “**I (S) am about to (F)** finish (P) oh (At).” 80. **Fofo (S) didn’t (F)** respond (P). 81. “**Are (F) you (S)** also about to finish (P)?” 82. “No.” (Ap) 83. “No? (mn) 84. Why?” (mn) 85. “Ah (At), me **do (F) I (S)** know (P) why (C)? 86. **It (S)’s (F)** refusing to come (P).” 87. “Oho! (At/mn) 88. What (WH/C) **did (F) you (S)** eat (P) yesterday (Ac)?” 89. “Yesterday (Ac), what time (WH/Ac)? (mn)” 90. “Yesterday morning (Ac/mn). 91. What (WH/C) **did (F) you (S)** eat (P)?” 92. “Bread (mn). 93. Tea bread (mn).” 94. “And (Aj) in the afternoon (Ac)?” (mn) 95. “Bread (mn). 96. Sugar bread (mn).” 97. “*Ebei!* (mn) 98. And (Aj) in the evening (Ac)? (mn) 99. **Don’t (F) even (Am)** answer (P). 100i. **I (S) am (F)** sure (Ca) 100ii. **it (S) was (F)** some of Kwansima Fante’s butter bread (C). 101. No?” (mn) 102. “Yes.” (Ap) 103. “Hm (mn). 104. **You (S) ate (F/P)** bread (C), bread like that (Ac)? 105. With what?” (mn) 106. “Water (mn). 107. **Yesterday (S) was (F)** a bad day (C).” 108i. “Then (Aj) give up (P) 108ii. and **let’s (S)** go (P). 109i. **Don’t (Fn) you (S)** know (P) 109ii. **you (S)** end up (F) cheating (P) your own self (C) 109iii. when (Aj) **you (S) try (F)** to cheat (P) the spider (C)? 110. By now (Ac) **the plenty bread (S) has (F)** turned to (P) concrete (Ca) inside your stomach (Ac). 111. **Let’s (S)** go (P)!” 112. **She (S) rustled (F/P)** her piece of old newspaper (C). 113i. **Fofo (S) panicked (F/P)** 113ii. and (Aj) **groaned (F/P)** aloud (Ac). 114. “Eh (At), **are (F) you (S)** forcing (P)?” 115. “But (Aj) what (WH/C) **should (Fml) I (S)** do (P)?” 116. “**You (S) will (Fms)** get (P) piles (C) oh (At)!” 117. **She (S) rose (F/P)**. 118i. “**Don’t (F)** go (P) 118ii. and (Aj) leave (P) me (C), please!” 119i. “**I (S) am (F)** waiting (P); 119ii. but (Aj) **you (S) are (F)** taking (P) too much time (C). 120i. **Do (F) you (S)** hear (P) 120ii. **the lorry engines (S)** revving (P)? 121. **Macho (S) would (Fms)** be (P) here (Ac) any . . .” 122. “**Everybody (S) s-c-a-t-t-e-r-r-r- (F/P)**. . . oh (At)! 123. **He (S) is (F)** coming (P) oh (At)!” 124. **Someone (S) yelled (F/P)**. 125. **Everything and everything within sight (S) went (F/P)** hey-y; even the pigs and vultures. 126i. **Odarley (S) was (F)** yards away (Ac) 126ii. before (Aj) **Fofo (S) could (Fms) even (Am)** make it (P) to her feet (Ac). 127. By which time (Ac) **Macho’s bald head (S) was (F)** already within sight (Ac). 128. **Fofo (S) bolted (F/P)**. 129. “**You (S) ’ve (F)** left (P) your plastic bag (C)!” 130i. **Odarley (S) screamed (F/P)**, 130ii. “Look! (P) 130iii. **He (S) has (F)** taken (P) it (C)!” 131. **Fofo (S) turned (F/P)**. 132. **She (S) had (F)** completely (Ao) forgotten (P) the bag (C). 133i. **Macho (S) looked (F/P)** inside it (Ac) 133ii. and (Aj) **grinned (F/P)**. 134. “**He (S) ’s (F)** got (P) all my money (C) from last week (Ac).” 135. **Fofo (S) whined (F/P)**. 136. “All of it?” (mn) 137. “All of it.” (mn) 138. And (Aj) **broke down (F/P)** in tears (Ac). 139. “So (Aj) what (WH/C) **are (F) you (S)** going to do (P) now (Ac)?” 140. **Fofo (S) didn’t (Fn)** hesitate (P). 141. “**I (S) am (F)** going to see (P) my mother (C).” 142. “For money?” (mn) 143. “**Am (F) I (S)** a dreamer (C)? 144. **She and me who (S)** needs (F/P) money more (C)?” 145. “Then (Aj) what (WH/C) **are (F)**

you (S) going to see (P) her (C) about (Ac)?” 146. “The big trouble (C) **I (S) told (F/P)** you (C) about.” 147. “The big trouble?” (mn) 148. “Yes. (Ap) 149. Poison (Av/mn).” 150. “Poison? (mn) 151. The Poison? (mn) 152. The street lord?” (mn) 153. **Fofo (S) nodded (F/P)**. 154. **Odarley (S) grew (F/P)** scared (Ca). 155. “Why on earth (WH/Ac) **should (Fml) you (S)** become involved with (P) him (C)?” 156. “**I (S) didn’t (Fn)**. 157i. **The Poison [[I (S) said (F/P)] (S) tried (F) to rape (P) me (C), 157ii. that (S) was (F) him (C).**”158. **Odarley (S) laughed (F/P)**. 159. **Her initial scare (S) turned to (F/P)** bemusement (C). 160. “Oh (At) Fofo (Av)! (mn) 161. **Who (WH/S) would (Fms)** believe (P) you (C)? 162. **Poison (S) doesn’t (Fn)** rape (P) girls (C) like us (Ac). 163. **He (S) doesn’t (Fn)** need to (P). 164i. When (WH/Ac) **he (S) wants (F/P)** it (C), 164ii. **he (S) beckons (F/P)**, 164iii. and (Aj) **the hi-life girls (S) flood (F/P)** to him (Ac) in their numbers (Ac). 165. **Are (F) you (S)** sure of (Ca) [[what (WH/C) **you (S) are (F)** saying (P)]?” 166. “Yes. (Ap) 167i. But (At) **I (S) don’t (Fn)** know (P) why (C), 167ii. **I (S) don’t (Fn)** understand (P) it (C) either. 168i. That is why (Aj) **I (S) want (F/P)** 168ii. to see (P) my mother (C). 169. **She (S) has (F)** some connection (C) with him (Ac). 170. **I (S) don’t (Fn)** know (P) exactly (Ao) what (C). 171i. But (Aj) **I (S) know (F/P)** 171ii. **she (S) knows (F/P)** him (C).” 172. “**Who (WH/S) doesn’t (Fn)?**” 173i. “**I (S) mean (F/P)** . . . 173ii. **she (S) knows (F/P)** him (C) more.” 174. “How? (mn) 175. How (WH/Ac) **do (F) you (S)** know (P)?” 176i. “**I (S) heard (F/P)** her and my stepfather (C) 176ii. talk (P) once (Ac). 177i. **That (S) was (F)** 177ii. before (Aj) **I (S) quit (F/P)** home (Ac). 178. And (Aj) **they (S) mentioned (F/P)** Poison (C) more than once (Ac). 179. “**Were (F) they (S)** fighting (P)?” 180. “No. (Ap) 182. **It (S) was (F)** a conversation (C). 182. A conversation and an argument in one.” (mn) 183. “And (Aj) **you (S)** never (Ao) **told (F/P)** me (C)?” 184. “**I (S)** never (Ao) **thought (F/P)** much of it (C). 185. But (Aj) now (Ac) that **Poison (S) tried (F)** to . . .” 186i. “Fofo (Av), **are (F) you (S)** sure (Ca) 186ii. **it (S) was (F)** him (C)?” 187. “**It (S) was (F)** he (C).”

Table 1: Distribution of Mood types per speaker in the talk.

Mood (ranking clauses only)				
Speaker	Narrator	Fofo	Odarley	Someone
Mood type				
Full declarative	4; 5i; 6; 7; 8; 9i; 10i; 11; 12; 13i; 14i; 15ii; 16; 17i; 18i; 18ii; 19i; 21; 24ii; 28; 29; 31; 32i; 33; 34i; 35i; 36i; 39; 40; 41; 42ii; 64; 65; 66; 76; 77; 80; 112; 113i; 117; 124; 125; 126i; 126ii; 127; 128; 130i; 131; 132; 133i;	37iii; 38i; 38ii; 67ii; 86; 107; 134; 141; 146; 157i; 157ii; 167i; 168ii; 169; 170; 171i; 171ii; 171iii; 176i; 177ii; 178; 181; 184; 187.	22i; 22ii; 26i; 26ii; 27; 43; 45i; 49ii; 53i; 54i; 55i; 55ii; 55iv; 56; 57; 61ii; 61v; 61viii; 61ix; 62ii; 62iv; 62v; 68ii; 70i; 71; 79; 100i; 100ii; 109ii; 109iii; 110; 116; 119i; 119ii; 129; 130iii; 162; 163; 164i; 164ii; 164iii; 186ii.	123.

	135; 140; 153; 154; 158; 159.			
Elliptical declarative	5ii; 9ii; 10ii; 13ii; 14ii; 14iii; 17ii; 19ii; 19iii; 19iv; 19v; 19vi; 32ii; 34ii; 34iii; 35ii; 113ii; 133ii; 138.	67iii; 82; 102; 148; 156; 166; 168ii; 173i; 176ii; 177i; 180; 185.	44ii; 45ii; 54ii; 55iii; 61iii; 61iv; 61vi; 61vii; 62iii; 70ii; 75ii; 120ii; 121.	122.
Full polar interrogative		67i; 85; 143.	1; 36ii; 62i; 75i; 74; 81; 104; 109i; 114; 120i; 165; 179; 186i.	
Elliptical polar interrogative		38iii.	15i; 68i.	
Full WH-interrogative		115; 144.	23i; 25; 42iii; 44i; 48; 49i; 60; 88; 91; 139; 145; 155; 161; 175.	
Elliptical WH-interrogative			2; 23ii; 172; 183.	
Full imperative		37i; 50; 118i.	30; 51; 61i; 99; 108ii; 111; 130ii.	
Elliptical imperative		37ii; 118ii.		
Minor		3; 19vii; 20; 52; 72; 73; 78; 89; 92; 93; 95; 96; 137; 149; 182.	24i; 42i; 46; 47; 58; 59; 63; 69; 83; 84; 87; 90; 94; 97; 98; 101; 103; 105; 106; 136; 142; 147; 150; 151; 152; 160; 174.	
Total selections of Mood & percentage	75 (28.73%)	62 (23.75%)	122 (46.74%)	02 (00.76%)
Total ranking clauses	261			

Table 2: Distribution of Modality types per speaker in the talk.

Modality (verbal and Adjunctive realisations)				
Speaker	Narrator	Fofo	Odarley	Someone
Modality type				
Modalisation	126ii.		49i; 53ii; 55ii; 61viii; 62ii; 116; 121; 161.	

Modulation		115.	155.	
Mood Adjunct: usuality		184.	22ii; 51; 54i; 61i; 183.	
Mood Adjunct: probability			22i.	
Mood Adjunct: intensification	28; 126ii.		99.	
Total & percentage	03 (14.28%)	02 (09.52%)	16 (76.19%)	00 (00%)
Total selections of Modality	21			
Total ranking clauses	261			

Table 3: Distribution of Modality types per speaker in the talk.

Speaker	Adjuncts			
	Narrator	Fofo	Odarley	Someone
Adjunct type				
Circumstantial	4; 5i; 6; 8 (×2); 9ii (×2); 10ii; 11 (×2); 12; 13i; 13ii; 14i; 18i; 19i; 19ii; 19iii (×2); 19v; 21; 32i; 32ii; 34iii; 39; 65; 113ii; 126i; 126ii; 127 (×2); 133i.	37i; 37ii; 38ii; 50; 89; 90; 134; 169; 176ii; 177ii; 178; 185.	23i; 25; 26ii; 45ii; 48; 49i; 49ii; 51; 53i (×2); 54i; 55i; 55ii; 55iv; 60; 61ii; 61iv; 61v; 61viii (×2); 62iii; 62iv (×2); 70i; 74; 75ii (×2); 88; 94; 98; 104; 110 (×2); 121; 139; 145; 162; 164iii (×2).	
Mood	28; 126ii.	184.	22i; 22ii; 51; 54i; 61i; 99; 183.	
Comment	66; 132.	170.	42i.	
Polarity		82; 102; 148; 166; 180.		
Vocative			1; 42iii; 77; 149; 160; 186i.	
Conjunctive	10ii; 13ii; 14iii; 17ii; 19vi; 31; 32ii; 34ii; 34iii; 35ii; 113ii; 126ii; 133ii; 138.	37ii; 37iii; 118ii; 167i; 168i; 171i; 177ii; 178; 185.	23i; 23ii; 25; 48; 49ii; 51; 53i; 54i; 54ii; 55ii; 55iii; 56; 61i; 61ii; 61iv; 61viii; 62iv; 62v; 69; 70ii; 94; 98; 108i; 108ii; 109iii;	

			115; 119ii; 139; 145; 164iii; 183.	
Continuity		52; 78; 85.	55iv; 68i; 79; 87; 114; 116; 160.	122; 123.
Total & percentage	50 (28.73%)	31 (17.81%)	91 (52.29%)	02 (01.14%)
Total selections of Adjunct	174			
Total ranking clauses	261			

Table 1 reveals the Mood types selected by the speakers (Narrator, Fofo, Odarley and Someone) in the talk in general. Though the narrator is not conversationally involved in the verbal exchange in the talk, the role she plays here is not negligible. She is the one who depicts the event narrated in the fiction in general and in the talk under study in particular. By so doing, she takes on the role of a speaker *per excellence* in that she is conveying or communicating a given message to the reader. As the analysis of Mood shows, in her attempt to portray the social situation of street children in 'Agbogloshie' or 'Sodom and Gomorrah', a fictionalised market name in Accra city, Ghana (Allagbé, 2016, p. 25), the narrator uses **75/261 (i.e., 28.73%)** clauses of the Mood structure of declarative. Quite surprisingly, **56 (i.e., 74.66%)** of these clauses are full declaratives and **19 (i.e., 25.33%)** elliptical declaratives. The narrator's exclusively preponderant use of declaratives shows that she is ultimately concerned with representing or giving information about something-people (street children), their social action/behaviour/attitude/perception, their social living conditions, etc. This also denotes the written mode where feedback between the writer and the reader is not possible (Eggs, 1994, p. 313). It is important to add that the narrator encodes her attitudes towards and opinions about the social situation of the street children she represents. The narrator draws on Modality for this purpose.

In Table 2, the narrator employs **03//21 (i.e., 14.28%)** Modality features. One striking feature here is that two (28 and 126ii.) (**i.e., 66.66%**) of the Modality types are realised by the mood adjunct 'even', and this adjunct indicates intensity, as in: '28. Nature (S) is (F) **even (Am)** calling (P).' The remainder (126ii) (**i.e., 33.33%**); we mean the remaining Modal feature used by the narrator is encoded in the modal operator 'could'. This modal auxiliary verb is a modaliser and it indicates probability or likelihood, as in: '126ii. before (Aj) Fofo (S) **could (Fms)** even (Am) make it (P) to her feet (Ac).' Another striking feature in the narrator's speech is noted in her selection of adjuncts. Table 3 exudes that the narrator uses **50/174 (i.e., 28.73%)**. These adjuncts are selected from four adjunct classes, namely: circumstantial (**32; i.e., 64%**), mood (**02; i.e., 04%**), comment (**02; i.e., 04%**) and conjunctive (**14; i.e., 28%**). As it appears in the foregoing, circumstantial adjuncts are predominantly selected by the narrator. The narrator uses these circumstantial adjuncts to enhance the experiential density in the text or encode a given spatio-temporal point of view (Allagbé and Allagbé, 2017) therein (e.g. 'Odarley (S) followed (F/P), 9ii. pausing (P) **briefly (Ac)** by the door to fish out her *Charlie wotee* from a bunch (Ac)'). Circumstantial adjuncts are followed by conjunctive adjuncts. The narrator's use of conjunctive adjuncts denotes that she has planned the rhetorical organisation of her talk (e.g. '10i. She (S) slipped in (F/P) her feet (C) 10ii. **and (Aj)** stepped out (F/P) with Fofo (Ac).').

As the analysis of Mood also displays, apart from the narrator, the speakers who are interactionally involved in the talk under study are three in number (Fofu, Odarley and Someone). However, Fofu and Odarley markedly stand out here given the number of ranking clauses they use. Table 1 clearly unveils that Fofu employs **62/261 (i.e., 23.75%)**, Odarley **122/261 (i.e., 46.74%)** clauses. Out of the 62 clauses Fofu uses, **24 (i.e., 38.70%)** are full declaratives and **12 (i.e., 19.35%)** elliptical declaratives. In the same token, out of the 122 clauses Odarley employs, **42 (i.e., 34.42%)** are full declaratives and **13 (i.e., 10.65%)** elliptical declaratives. The predominance of the Mood structure of declarative in this talk denotes the exchange of information between the two participants. Again, another striking feature is found in the speakers' selection of other Mood classes. Out of the 62 clauses Fofu employs, **03 (i.e., 04.83%)** are full polar interrogatives and **01 (i.e., 01.61%)** elliptical polar interrogative. Likewise, out of the 122 clauses Odarley uses, **13 (i.e., 10.65%)** are full polar interrogatives and **02 (i.e., 01.63%)** elliptical polar interrogatives. Also, **02 (i.e., 03.22%)** out of the the 62 clauses Fofu uses are full WH-interrogatives but Odarley employs **12 (i.e., 09.83%)** full WH-interrogatives and **04 (i.e., 03.27%)** elliptical WH-interrogatives.

One striking feature in Odarley's full polar interrogatives is that 03 (36ii; 74 and 104) of them are actually full statements phonologically high-pitched into questions (e.g. '36ii. **You (S) are (F) wearing (P) no underpants (C)?'**'). In other words, they are declarative clauses phonologically realised as interrogatives. Such speech acts are what Adejare (2013) terms 'echo questions'. Again, Fofu employs **03/62 (i.e., 04.83%)** full imperatives and **02/62 (i.e., 03.22%)** elliptical imperatives. But Odarley uses **07/122 (i.e., 05.73%)** full imperatives. One striking feature in Fofu's full imperatives is that 01 ('50. "Ask (P) again (Ac).') of them is not meant to order her addressee to do something for her; it is rather meant to summon or encourage her to continue with her (contribution to the) talk. Likewise, 01 ('51. And (Aj) **look at (P) the long line of people (C) too always (Am) there (Ac)'**) of Odarley's full imperatives is meant to summon or persuade her respondent to follow her argument/point all through.

As seen above, the use of polar interrogatives, WH-interrogatives and imperatives naturally shows the presence of a dialogic mode in the talk. While the use of polar interrogatives and WH-interrogatives indicates that the interlocutors in the talk are conversationally involved (this gives one the impression that the speakers have a sense of solidarity or cooperation); i.e., both participants alternate between Speaker and Listener roles, jointly making their contributions to the conversation, that of imperatives points to the speakers' social identity/status and relations of power; the speakers are street children- close friends, and as such, power is equal between them. The dialogic mode in the talk is further exuded by the number of minor clauses (**42/261 [i.e., 16.09%]**): **15 (i.e., 05.74%)** selections for Fofu and **27 (i.e., 10.34%)** for Odarley. The relatively high proportion of elliptical structures and minor clauses (most of which represent frequent back-channel responses or cooperative overlaps or/and summons [e.g. "Shshshshshsh . . ." (3); "Trouble?" (19vii); "Big one" (20); "What big trouble?" (24i); "Honestly" (42i); "Where else?" (46); "Ebei" (97); "Hm" (103); "All of it?" (136); "All of it" (137); "For money?" (142); "The big trouble?" (147); "Poison?" (148), etc.]) identified in this talk actually indicates that the tenor therein is an informal one.

The speakers in this talk also use Modality types to encode their views and opinions about the subject-matters in/of their talk; the subject-matters range from Fofu's big trouble with Poison,

the street lord, to her decision to pay her mother an impromptu visit, and how they are able to cope with this multitude of subject-matters suggests that they truly know each other very well and share in common some background knowledge; an indicator of intersubjective knowledge which facilitates their interpretation of what is communicated but unsaid in their conversation (for instance, when Fofu loses her plastic bag to the street lord and decides to pay her mother an impromptu visit, this naturally surprises her friend, Odarley, who immediately asks her this question: 142. “For money?”. Fofu’s reply to her question is: 143. “**Am (F) I (S) a dreamer (C)?** 144. **She and me who (S) needs (F/P) money more (C)?**”. Fofu’s reply presupposes that her mother is so poor and wretched that she cannot rely on her for any financial assistance. Though Fofu does not mention this straightaway in her utterances or this cannot be logically inferred from her utterances, Odarley actually gets the message right) and makes them not consider any uncouched speech act or a face-threatening act (FTA) as a threat to their face (for example, when Odarley notices on their arrival at the dump that her friend, Fofu is not wearing her underpants, she asks her this question: ‘36ii. “**You (S) are (F) wearing (P) no underpants (C)?**’”. This question normally requires a clear-cut answer like ‘Yes, I am not wearing my underpants because ...’ or something else close to that. But consider how Fofu replies in what follows suit: ‘37i. “**You (S) let (F) us (C) finish (P) fast (Ac) 37ii. and (Aj) get out of (P) here (Ac) 37iii. before (Aj) Macho (S) comes (F/P)**’. This response placed in another context might be interpreted as an insult in that the speaker here deliberately chooses not to satisfy the hearer’s face want).

As Table 2 clearly indicates, Fofu uses **02/21 (i.e., 09.52%)** Modality features: one encoded in the modulator ‘should’ (115) expressing obligation and the other realised by the modal adjunct ‘never’ (184) denoting usuality. Unlike Fofu, Odarley employs **16/21 (i.e., 76.19%)** Modality features. Surprisingly enough, **09 (i.e., 56.25%)** of these Modality items are verbal realisations: 08 (49i; 53ii; 55ii; 61viii; 62ii; 116; 121 and 161) modalisers and one (155) modulator. The modalisers are encoded in such modal verbs as ‘can’ (49i; 55ii and 62ii), ‘would’ (53ii and 121), ‘will’ (61viii and 116) and ‘could’ (126ii). They express probability, certainty and usuality. The only modulator Odarley uses is realised by the modal auxiliary verb ‘should’ (155) and it expresses obligation. In addition, the **07 (i.e., 43.75%)** other Modality features (21i; 22ii; 51; 54i; 61i; 99 and 183) Odarley employs are adjunctive realisations. These mood adjuncts are ‘Maybe’ (22i), ‘sometimes’ (22ii; 54i and 61i), ‘always’ (51), ‘even’ (99) and ‘never’ (183). As it appears in the foregoing, Odarley uses 05 mood adjuncts (22ii; 51; 54i; 61i and 183) which express usuality. She also uses 01 mood adjunct (22i) which expresses probability and another 01 (99) which expresses intensity.

Another significant stylistic feature characteristic of the speech/conversational style or linguistic/communicative behaviour of the two street children is noted in their selection of adjuncts. Table 3 discloses that Fofu and Odarley respectively use **31/174 (17.81%)** and **91/174 (52.29%)** adjuncts. They select these adjuncts in varying proportions from all the seven classes of adjuncts. However, it must be noted that the two interactants select and do not select adjuncts from some classes. Fofu, for example, selects adjuncts from the following classes: circumstantial (**12; i.e., 38.70%**), mood (**01; i.e., 03.22%**), comment (**01; i.e., 03.22%**), polarity (**05; i.e., 16.12%**), vocative (**00; i.e., 00%**), conjunctive (**09; i.e., 29.03%**) and continuity (**03; i.e., 09.67%**). But Odarley selects adjuncts from the following classes: circumstantial (**39; i.e., 42.85%**), mood (**07; i.e., 07.69%**), comment (**01; i.e., 01.09%**), polarity (**00; i.e., 00%**), vocative (**06; i.e., 06.59%**),

conjunctive (31; i.e., 34.06%) and continuity (07; i.e., 07.69%). As the foregoing clearly indicates, Fofu and Odarley select and use adjuncts from six out of the seven classes. Again, it is noted that they select the greatest number from the class of circumstantial adjuncts. This shows that these participants use circumstantial adjuncts to enhance the experiential density in their talk or encode a given spatio-temporal point of view (Allagbé and Allagbé, 2017) in it (e.g. ‘75i. “Do (F) you (S) want (P) Macho (C) 75ii. to come (P) after you (Ac) **with those thick round arms of his like Mami Adzorkor’s kenkey balls (Ac)?”**’). The use of the highlighted phrase in (75i) and many others in the talk is indexical of a given context and thus culture-specific in nature.

In the same way, one notices the mixture of two codes or dialects (Standard English and a native language from Ghana) or the switching or shifting from one code or dialect or style to another in (75i), this indicates linguistic and cultural hybridity or multicultural setting in the talk (Allagbé and Alou, 2020; Allagbé, Alou and Ouaronodima, 2020). There are also other cases of code-mixing, code-switching or style-shifting in the talk (see 9ii; 25; 87; 97; 100ii, for instance). According to Gumperz (Gumperz in Tannen, Hamilton and Schiffrin, 2015, p. 315), code-switching (like pronunciation along with prosody (i.e., intonation and stress), rhythm, tempo, and other such suprasegmental signs) constitutes a contextualisation cue. He defines a contextualisation cue as “any verbal sign which, when processed in co-occurrence with symbolic grammatical and lexical signs, serves to construct the contextual ground for situated interpretation and thereby affects how constituent messages are understood.” (ibid.). For Selting, (1989, p. 115), code-switching denotes ‘speech style’. She defines the term ‘speech style’ as “the use of prototypical kernel and/or co-occurring peripheral cues on different linguistic levels to signal, induce and constitute typified linguistic varieties which are paradigmatically opposed to other typified varieties in a speaker’s or a community’s repertoire of varieties” (ibid.). Another striking feature in this talk which constitutes a contextualisation cue is the speakers’ use of such paralinguistic or/and prosodic features as “**Shshshshshsh . . .**” (mn) in (3), ‘**Macho (S) would (Fms) be (P) here (Ac) any . . .**’ in (121), “**Everybody (S) s-c-a-tt-e-r-r-r-r- (F/P) . . . oh (At)!**” in (122) and “**I (S) mean (F/P) . . . she (S) knows (F/P) him (C) more.**” in (173i and 173ii) and ‘**But (Aj) now (Ac) that Poison (S) tried (F) to . . .**’ in (185) There are actually two types of paralinguistic or/and prosodic feature found here: *reduplication* (3) which encodes a signal to keep quiet or talk slowly and *suspension marks/points* indicating a transient hesitation, pause or incompleteness/omission simply (3; 121; 122; 173i; 173ii and 185).

After the class of circumstantial adjuncts comes that of conjunctive adjuncts. The speakers use them to tie bits of their discourse together so as to ensure cohesion and coherence in it (e.g. ‘37i. “You (S) let (F) us (C) finish (P) fast (Ac) 37ii. **and** (Aj) get out of (P) here (Ac) 37iii. **before** (Aj) Macho (S) comes (F/P)’). Their use of continuity adjuncts also reinforces the texture in their verbal interaction (e.g. ‘77. “Fofu (Av),” Odarley (S) called (F/P). 78. “**Hm.**” (At/mn)’). Fofu’s use of polarity further provides an evidence of back-channel responses or cooperative overlaps in the talk (e.g. ‘81. “Are (F) you (S) also about to finish (P)?” 82. “**No.**” (Ap)’). Odarley’s use of vocatives corroborates once more the inference that power is equal between her and her addressee, whom she repeatedly calls by her name ‘Fofu’ (see 1; 77; 160 and 186i). She also calls the street lord, who is actually absent from their talk, by his two terrifying names: ‘Poison’ and ‘Macho’ (see 42iii and 149). It should be noted at this stage that the names ascribed to the street lord are or suggest an in-group identity marker.

In fact, Odarley's use of the two names ascribed to the street lord does not suggest her belonging to or sharing the same social group identity with him; it rather indicates her burning anger, indignation toward and contempt for him. What really proves the foregoing apprehension in the talk is Fofu and Odarley's representation of the street lord and his gang in negative terms (see 37i-48, for example). Indeed, the street lord and his gang control the streets, and as such they abuse, oppress and maltreat other street children, mainly female street children (Allagbé, Alou and Ouarodima, 2020). In the sequences of these street children's talk in which the street lord is discussed, one notes that Fofu and Odarley discursively or/and ideologically challenge and resist his control or power over them. Fofu's comment adjunct 'exactly' in '170. I (S) don't (Fn) know (P) **exactly** (Ao) what (C).' suggests presumption. However, Odarley's comment adjunct 'Honestly' in (42i) is meant for persuasion in the talk.

4. CONCLUSION

This essay has analysed interpersonal meaning and conversational style in a street children's talk from Amma Darko's *Faceless* (2003). It has drawn its theoretical underpinnings from interactional sociolinguistics and systemic functional linguistics; it has specifically drawn *conversational style* and the *grammar of interpersonal meaning (otherwise known as Mood)* from the aforementioned two linguistic traditions in that order. It has also combined these theoretical underpinnings with quantitative and qualitative research methods. With this, this article has examined how two street children (Fofu and Odarley) conversationally involved in the talk use language to negotiate social (group) identity and social relations. In other words, it has described/identified the linguistic/Mood features the two speakers draw on in their talk. The analysis of Mood has yielded some salient findings related to the speech/conversational style or/and speech/communicative behaviour of these street children.

The findings reveal that there are three major speakers (Narrator, Fofu and Odarley) in the text. The narrator has exclusively employed the Mood structure of declarative, mainly full declaratives. This denotes that she is mostly concerned with informing the reader. This also indicates the written mode where feedback between the writer and the reader is not possible (Eggins, 1994, p. 313). Likewise, Fofu and Odarley, who are conversationally involved in the talk, have predominantly used the Mood structure of declarative, mainly full declaratives. This reveals that they exchange information with each other in the text. Again, these participants have selected choices from the other Mood classes, namely: polar interrogatives, WH-interrogatives, imperatives and minor clauses. The use of these Mood classes confirms once again the spoken mode marked by a face-to-face interaction whereby the interactants are actively engaged; they alternate roles, ask and answer each other's questions. They also give each other orders or/and summon each other to act in a given or desired way. Actually, the speakers' speech style is highly marked by a considerable number of elliptical structures and minor clauses. This exudes that the talk is a spontaneous conversation between two street children- close friends, and as such it is obvious that there is frequent contact, high affective involvement and equal power between them.

In addition, the participants' talk is highly marked by the deletion/ellipsis of some clause constituents whose interpretation strongly depends on the context of use, and it lacks a general/overall theme. All these elements put together prove that the tenor of this talk is informal. The speakers' (the narrator included) selection in Modality and Adjunct types does not alter the informality of the interaction; it rather enhances and even entrenches it in its culture-specific setting, realising thus their attitudes towards and opinions about the subject-matters being

narrated/discussed therein. Again, the speakers' (the narrator included) language is marked by code-mixing, code-switching or style-shifting. This denotes a multicultural setting in the talk (Allagbé and Alou, 2020). The interlocutors' (the narrator excluded) idiolect is also marked by inexplicitness or indirectness. This suggests thus that both interlocutors share in common some background knowledge on which they draw to interpret intended meanings encoded in their talk. Finally, the interlocutors' conversational style is marked by the use of such paralinguistic or/and prosodic features as reduplication which encodes a signal to keep quiet or talk slowly and suspension marks/points indicating a transient hesitation, pause or incompleteness/omission simply in their spoken conversation.

REFERENCES

- Adejare, R. A. (2013). "The Manifestation of Mood and Modality in Texts". In *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, Vol. 1, No. 3? PP. 24-34.
- Allagbé, A. A. (2016). "Character Naming and Authorial Attitudes in Contemporary African Literature". In *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 6, No. 4. Pp. 20-28.
- Allagbé, A. A. and Allagbé, M. A. (2017). "A Systemic-Functional Stylistic Appraisal of Chimamanda N. Adichie's *Purple Hibiscus* (2003)". In *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, Volume 5, Issue 1, pp. 69-86.
- Allagbé, A. A. & Alou, Y. (2020). "A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Stylistic Variation and Multiple Social Identities in Amma Darko's *Faceless* (2003)". In *Revue Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée, de Littérature et d'Éducation*, Volume 3, Numéro 2, pp. 1-17.
- Allagbé, A. A. Alou, Y. & Ouarodima, M. (2020). "A Textual Analysis of Street Children's Survival Strategies in Amma Darko's *Faceless*." In *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies (JHSSS)*, Volume 2, Issue 6, pp. 139-144.
- Brown, K. (2004): *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Second Edition. Volume 1, Elsevier: The Pergamon Imprint.
- Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. First Edition. New-York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunanan, B. T. (2011). "Using Transitivity as a Framework in Stylistic Analysis of Virginia Woolf's *Old Mrs. Guy*". In *Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles*. Vol. 54. Pp. 69-79.
- Darko, A. (2003). *Faceless*, First Edition. Accra, Ghana: Sub-Saharan Publishers.
- Doi, K. (2012). "An Analysis of Conversation Styles of English Learners: Backchannels as Effective Strategies in Communication." In *The Bulletin of Institute of Technologists*. No.3, pp. 38-41.
- Eggs, S. (1994/2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Eggs, S. and Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. First Edition. London: Cassell.
- Enyi, A. U. and Chukwuokoro, I. (2019). "A Stylistic Analysis Of Naturally-Occurring Conversation in Nigerian English." In *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI)*. Volume 8, Issue 12, pp. 30-35.
- Fontaine, L. (2013). *Analysing English Grammar: A Systemic Functional Introduction*. First Edition. New-York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*, First Edition. UK: University Press.

- Gumperz, J. J. (2015). "Interactional Sociolinguistics. A Personal Perspective". In Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin, *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Second Edition, Volume 1, pp. 309-323, USA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. First Edition. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1981). "The Linguistic Bases of Communicative Competence." In Deborah Tannen (ed.) *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk [Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics]*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 323-34.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1985/1989). *Language, Text and Context: Aspects of Language in a Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Webster, J. J. (2009). *Continuum Companion to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. First Edition. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Halliday, M.A. K. (1978). *Language as A Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. First Edition. London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd.
- Halliday, M.A. K. (1973). "Language in a Social Perspective." In M.A. K. Halliday (ed.) *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold, pp. 48-71.
- Halliday, M.A. K. (1971). "Language in a Social Perspective." In *Educational Review*, 23. 3, pp. 165-188.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1971). "Linguistic Function and Literary Style: An inquiry into the Language of William Golding's *The Inheritors*". In S. B. Chatman (ed) *Literary Style*. London and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hymes, H. D. (1974) *Foundations in Sociolinguistics. An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 92-209.
- Koussouhon, A. L., Akogbéto, P. and Allagbé, A. A. (2015a). "Gender Relations and Mood Choices: A Systemic Functional Analysis of Amma Darko's *The Housemaid*". In *Revue Internationale de Sciences Humaines, Sociales et Techniques*. Issue 3, pp. 148-171.
- Koussouhon, A. L. and Allagbé, A. A. (2013). "The Lexicogrammar of Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's Fiction: A Systemic Functional Contribution." In *Langage & Devenir*, N°22, Revue Semestrielle. Pp. 19-44.
- Labov, W. (1972/1978) "Linguistics and Sociolinguistics." In Nikolas Coupland and Adan Jaworski (eds.) *Sociolinguistics: A Reader*. First Edition. USA: Macmillan Education, pp. 23-24, 1997.
- Langford, D. (1994). *Analyzing Talk: Investigating Verbal Interaction in English*. First Edition. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Selting, M. (1989). "Speech style in conversation as an interactive achievement." In Leo Hickey, ed. *The Pragmatics of Style*. London: Routledge, pp. 106-132.
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of view*, First Edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tannen, D. F. (2005). *Conversational Style: Analyzing talk among Friends*. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D. F. (1987). "Conversational Style". In Hans W. Dechert & Manfred Raupach, eds. *Psycholinguistic Models of Production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 251-267.

Tannen, D. (1980a). "Toward a theory of conversational style: The machine-gun question." In *Working Papers in Sociolinguistics* 67-73 (No. 73, pp. 1-16). Austin, Tex.: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Tannen, D. (1979a). *Processes and Consequences of Conversational Style*. Ann Arbor, Mich. University Microfilms.