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Abstract

A common assumption is that language is used for conveying factual information, but linguistic forms also serve a way to communicate pragmatic features, such as speakers’ intentions and mental state. This study describes and analyses two strategies for stance-taking in GhaPE, more specific the use of discourse particles and complement-taking predicates. Such grammatical resources have been identified in the literature to play important functions in signalling how the speaker evaluates and positions him/herself and the addressee with respect to objects of discourse. The analysis and discussion of forms is informed by Du Bois’ (2007) ‘stance triangle’, which has proved to be a useful analytical device for investigating stance from a dialogical perspective. GhaPE is at times anticipated as fairly simple both by scholars and in the community where it is spoken. This thesis is thus an attempt to display aspects of the richness of the language.
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1 Introduction

Humans in interaction take stances, defined by Du Bois as “a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means (...)” (Du Bois 2007:169). That is: they evaluate objects, respond to previous stances taken by their partner of conversation and show alignment with each other to various extents. Speech is obviously not taking place in a vacuum, and every contribution in conversation entails consequences, with direct impact on the lives of the speech participants. As an example, a person’s stance is sometimes remembered over long periods of time, and the person who took the stance is held responsible for the stance and to a fair extent its consequences (Du Bois 2007:173). The act of stance is made explicit for others to scrutinize and to respond to, unavoidably entailing cultural and moral values (Englebretson 2007).

It is well acknowledged that humans do things with words, but the use of linguistic forms is traditionally argued for conveying factual information. Within the field of descriptive linguistic fieldwork, Englebretson (2007) argues that stance has not received enough attention. As the discipline of linguistics matures, greater attention is being paid to pragmatics. Speech genre, event-type, situational specifics, interactional constraints, and diverse social considerations, all play crucial roles in the selection of linguistic elements to shape an utterance. It allows speakers to convey a form of meta-commentary about their own (wished) status and identity (Kiesling 2011:1).

A handful example of previous works has focused on grammatical strategies for stance-taking. Biber (2006:98-99) focuses on adverbials and complement clause constructions to analyse stance in American English university registers. Another example are complement-taking predicates, being grouped regarding the speakers mental state in Q’eqchi’-Maya by Kockelman (2010:54). Englebretson (2007) approaches stance in Indonesian via three grammatical strategies, among them a property of verbs. The notion of stance in this thesis is explored by focusing on two grammatical strategies: particles and complement-taking predicates. They are found to be frequently used in Q’eqchi’-Maya (Kockelman 2010), different varieties of English (Kiesling 2004), Spanish (Bucholtz 2009), in order to target aspects of the perspective of the speaker with respect to discourse objects and his/her interlocutor.

The language under study is the acrolectal variety of Ghanaian Pidgin English. Previous work on GhaPE is focused on phonology, morphology, syntax (Huber 1999; 2008), sociolinguistics (Amoako 1992; Pipkins 2004; Rupp 2013) and attitudes towards the language (Amarteifio, forthcoming), whereas the pragmatics of the language has received limited attention. To the best of my knowledge, no attention has been paid to strategies for stance-taking in GhaPE.

Furthermore, GhaPE is a contact language, sometimes regarded as fairly simple both by scholars and in the community where it is spoken. This thesis is an attempt to display aspects of the richness of GhaPE, in terms of how the speaker conceptualizes his/her evaluation and positioning with respect to the object of discourse and the speech participants (Du Bois 2007). As a fundamental aspect of human communicative behaviour, stance is expected to be an integral feature of linguistic interaction in GhaPE, as it is everywhere else.
2 Background

The background chapter offers a backdrop to the description and analysis of stance-taking, starting with an introduction to the language Ghanaian Pidgin English and its social context. The subsequent section introduces the notion of stance, and resources commonly used to signal stance. Towards the end of the chapter, the two investigated strategies for stance-taking in GhaPE, more specific particles and complement-taking predicates, are presented.

2.1 Linguistic context of Ghanaian Pidgin English

The only official and national language in Ghana is English, despite the linguistic diversity in the country. The number of individual languages is estimated from around 45 (Amoako 1992) to 81 languages (Lewis, Simons & Fennig 2016). There are few ‘native speakers’ of English, and the major lingua franca is Akan (Dakubu 1988). Akan is considered the “de facto national working language” (Lewis, Simons & Fennig 2016), spoken as a first language by 43% of the population, concentrated to the coastal area and the south of the country (Huber 2013). In the same area, a variety commonly labelled ‘pidgin’, Ghanaian Pidgin English (henceforth GhaPE) is spoken. Its structure is to a great extent loaned from Akan, whereas its lexicon is partly loaned from English and local languages. The variety is found within a continuum of West-African Pidgin Englishes, and Huber (1999) shows through structural similarities that the Pidgins in the area are derived from Krio, an English-lexified creole in Sierra Leone (Huber 1999:7).

GhaPE is found in two versions, or two extremes along a continuum. The somewhat harsh division in the middle differentiates between the basilectal and theacrolectal variety, which is a common feature of pidgins (O’Grady, Dobrovolsky & Katamba 1997:573). This division is primarily based on sociolinguistic variables, with the linguistic difference that the acrolectal to a limited extent shares a few more features with English. The basilectal variety is of focus in Huber (1999), and is spoken in multilingual contexts in Accra. The variety of interest in this study is the acrolectal variety (also called Student Pidgin by Rupp 2013; educated variety by Huber 1999). It should nevertheless be noted that the variety linguistically also has been classified as ‘pidgincreole’, or ‘extended pidgin’, due to sociolinguistic and structural reasons (Bakker 2009:148; Corum 2015:31-32). Dako (2013a) emphasizes that the variety is, in a sociolinguistic sense, not a pidgin. For example, it does not fill a void of communication (Amoako 1992:1-8).

The speakers are primarily Ghanaian males, who have attended secondary school or higher education. They have typically high knowledge in (Ghanaian) English, Akan and other local languages. An expected way to communicate would be to use one of these languages, but GhaPE is preferred (Pipkins 2004). In the next section, a few possible explanations to this found in earlier studies are provided.

2.1.2 Sociolinguistic context

As already stated, the language used in formal education is English, being the children’s second or third language (Dakubu 1988:164). The formality and explicit rules of English comprise the risk of making mistakes. This motivates the resort to GhaPE, as it lacks formal rules and is fairly open for innovations. GhaPE is in fact not acknowledged as a ‘real’ language, and has occasionally been

---

1 All listed here: https://www.ethnologue.com/country/GH/languages retrieved at 28th of April 2016
blamed for decreasing school results, ruining the English language in Ghana and causing general corruption (Rupp 2013). When students are asked (both written and orally) what language they are fluent in, very few individuals claim to have knowledge in GhaPE at all, despite its daily usage.

The use of GhaPE enables the speaker to express group belonging and solidarity, within the group of primarily male students that speak it (Lewis, Simons & Fennig 2016). The linguistic choice brings connotation of companionship if spoken in the right setting, and enables the students to mediate socially between different communities (Rupp 2013:13). Since the variety is understood by many, also illiterates, and indicates experience of attending school and/or higher education, it entails a way to display status (Rupp 2013). Further, GhaPE is described by the speakers as creative, easy to understand and speak, giving the speaker a ‘warm feeling’ of belonging and enjoyment (private interview, Ghana-Legon, 2015). Rupp (2013) finds that the linguistic choice of GhaPE is intimately tied to the students’ identities.

To show one’s identity, or more specifically to position oneself in conversation, to evaluate objects and align to various degrees with others positioning’s, though linguistic means form part of the notion of stance. Stance will be further presented in next section, as it is of main focus in this thesis.

2.2 The notion of stance

The notion of ‘stance’ has received a heterogeneous treatment in the literature. At times, it has even been neglected where it would have been appropriate, as noted by Kiesling (2011:102). Its application is broad to the extent that the number of definitions probably equals the number of scholars studying the topic (Englebretson 2007:1). Jaffe (2009:5) presents a number of terms occasionally used synonymously: e.g. (epistemic)2 stance, evaluation assessment, modality and positioning. Perhaps all these go under the notion of stance. Stance is defined and formulated by Du Bois (2007) as follows:

a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means (language, gesture, and other symbolic forms), through which social actors simultaneously evaluate objects, position subjects (themselves and others), and align with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of value in the sociocultural field (Du Bois 2007:169).

Stance is in this work approached as a merely linguistically articulated act, although the definition by Du Bois (2007) implies that it can be taken via other means (e.g. gestures). The act of stance is stressed here, enacted or ‘taken’ by a social actor, displaying e.g. dislike or preferences, which entails consequences in interaction. Importantly, stance is dialogical and intersubjective, emerging in interaction. Additionally, stance enables the speakers to continuously display and reproduce cultural and moral values (Du Bois 2007:141). For the sake of clarification, Du Bois (2007) formulates three questions that are useful for the understanding of a stance.

1. Who is the stance-taker?
2. What is the stance about?
3. What previous stance is the stance-taker responding to?

2 Epistemic origins from the field of philosophy and is associated with degree of certainty, degree of commitment, indication of the source of information or the like (Boye 2012:15).
Du Bois (2007) seeks to emphasize that stance can only be understood from a dialogical perspective, and that it consists of a complex web of processes, as he poses the theoretical model *The Stance Triangle*. The model is intended to account for the production of a stance and its interpretation (see figure 1).

![Figure 1. The Stance Triangle as presented by Du Bois (2007:163)](image)

The three nodes in the triangle stand for the subject (often oneself), the object of stance-taking (e.g. the evaluated object) and the interlocutor (or the second subject). This reflects that the two subjects in conversation alternate between the roles as speaker and hearer. Along with the sides of the triangle, three processes/functions are represented. These emerge in interaction, and are by Du Bois (2007:168-9) treated as integrated parts of a single stance. The three functions created in the act of stance (further investigated in examples of GhaPE in the current thesis) are presented below:

1. Evaluation of an object (which carries sociocultural value)
2. Positioning of a subject (often oneself)
3. Alignment (with other subjects)

The arrows along the sides of the triangle (in figure 1) indicate the direction of the processes. The animate actors invoke the processes, which are shown through arrows from the subjects, whereas the arrows from the object of evaluation, that could be inanimate, are rather a consequence of the actions by the actors. The model depicts the simultaneous processes, separable from each other but pertaining the same stance act. To shed light on stance as emerging in continuous interaction from another perspective, Du Bois (2007:176) presents the notion of *stance lead* and its consequence: *stance follow*. If a speaker has taken a stance, it will be the *stance lead*, and the answer to this constitutes the *stance follow*.

Du Bois (2007) argues that speakers use the model constantly, helping to organize evaluative actions. The model is claimed to display the underlying architecture of stance, serving partial predictability (Du Bois 2007:170). The model is however, with Du Bois’ words: “a geometric metaphor”, that unavoidably limits the description of the complex reality (Du Bois 2007:169). It is important to be aware of its vectors, with consequences affecting uncountable levels, and the three angles of the

---

1 The terminology is based on the work of Tomasello (1999:62-7; Tomasello et al. 2005) posing *gaze follow(ing)*, wherein Du Bois (2007) finds unspecified “interesting parallels”.
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triangle are not intended to limit research on stance. The dialogical and intersubjective dimensions of a stance act, and that the stance act emerges in interaction, is illustrated in the example (1) in English below (presented by Du Bois 2007:165).

(1) Speaker A: *I don’t like those*
Speaker B: *I don’t either*

Speaker A makes a proposition and an evaluation about a certain object, and positions himself/herself with respect to the same object. Speaker B answers with a seemingly similar proposition, expressing the same preference as speaker A. Nonetheless, Du Bois (2007:165) underlines a fundamental difference between the two utterances. The first stance of dislike taken by speaker A is undeniable, apparent and changes the dialogical setting, making it obligatory to relate to that stance in some way, given that the speaker wishes not to be “judged interactionally incompetent” (Du Bois 2007:161). In other words, it would be inappropriate and perceived as odd if speaker B answers identically (I don’t like those - I don’t like those). Thus, speaker B answers with the utterance ‘I don’t either’, signalling that the previous proposition is heard, as an acknowledgement of the previous stance taken by the partner of conversation. Du Bois (2007) argues that the proposition by speaker B is shaped that way due to intersubjectivity and dialogicality, and the stance taken here would not be comprehensible without the dialogical context. Either is the overt marking of an acknowledgement of previous information, in combination with the structural resemblance of the previous utterance. Especially *either* functions as an intersubjective alignment with the stance taken by speaker A, i.e. the previous stance (see Du Bois 2007 for further examples and extended discussion).

### 2.2.1 Resources to signal stance

In her work on reportive epistemological stance, Mushin (2001) investigates different constructions or resources to signal stance in Macedonian, Japanese and English respectively. The identified strategies in the languages are found in corpora of reported stories. The speakers are asked to retell a story that they have been presented to on forehand by someone else, with the intent to capture strategies to signal the adoption of another’s, i.e. the previous speaker’s, stance. Macedonian is found to make use of a grammatically coded evidential marker. That is, the choice between two different forms of past tense, (simple past vs. “L-form past”), is motivated by the epistemological state of the speaker. Simple past indicates direct experience of the event of conversation, while the “L-form past” indicates no direct experience of the event spoken about. On the other hand, Japanese displays a large set of conventionalized sentence final particle, among them the sentence final particle *tte*, occasionally translated into English as “apparently” (Mushin 2001:119). Ultimately, English is investigated and no overt grammatical coding for stance is identified. There are however other cues used to show degree of commitment to the story while retelling it, e.g. “I guess”, or “as I recall it” (Mushin 2001:131). It is argued that languages do not require grammatically coded resources for expressing stance. Rather, stance is a pragmatic phenomenon “independent of any actual linguistic realisation” (Mushin 2001:133).

Other linguistic means to signal stances is the use of complement taking predicates, studied by Kockelman (2010), focusing on complement-taking predicates in Q’eqchi’-Maya. Kockelman argues that the speakers’ mental state and intentions are shown with complement-taking predicates publicly and close to unambiguously, because the propositional mode (e.g. “I want”) and the propositional content (e.g. “to go to the beach”) are articulated explicitly (Kockelman 2010:52-4). Predicates and complements are conjoined in cross-linguistically systematic ways and the relative ‘tightness’ between the predicates and the complement clause is hypothetically related to the mental state of the speaker (Kockelman 2010). The idea is that the closer two events are semantically or logically, the closer (or tighter) they will be syntactically. Compare: ‘I remembered that he did it’ to ‘I want to do it’, the
former involving two events more distant from each other, requiring the complementizer that (see Kockelman 2010:53). Kockelman relates the grammatical properties of the predicates to a cross-linguistically applicable hierarchy: The Interclausal Relations Hierarchy (see figure 2). Obviously then, two completely unrelated events are presented in different clauses (as visible in the first line, in The Interclausal Relations Hierarchy, presented in figure 2). The claim is that there is a correlation between the demand of complementizer between clauses, and the position of the predicate in the hierarchy postulated by van Valin and LaPolla (1997:478-481). The first example in the hierarchy is the ‘loosest’ construction, whereas the last presented is the ‘tightest’.

Kockelman (2010) studies how speakers convey their mental state with complement-taking predicates, which is one of the two strategies for stance-taking investigated in the current work. The other resource of interest is the use of particles for signalling stance. In an investigation on a particle-like single term, Kiesling (2004) finds that the term dude serves as a way to take stance within the group of American English youth, especially among young white men. It is used for exclamations, to mitigate a conflict, to mark affiliation or to signal a “cool” stance (Kiesling 2004:294). It also functions as a noun and helps organizing discourse. The term became increasingly popular in 1980, and is reported to have gained its indexical load of “coolness” and “effortlessness” from its origin in surfer and/or “druggie” subcultures (Kiesling 2004:282). Example (2) below shows dude in interaction to signal affiliation and project coolness simultaneously (see appendix for transcription conventions).

(2) Speaker A:  
_ I love playin’ caps._  
That’s what did me in last- |last week |that’s- |
Speaker B: _ Everybody plays that damn game, DUDE._

(from Kiesling 2004:295, capitals in original)

The two speakers are in a bar; one of them (speaker A) is an “out-of-town friend” on visit whereas speaker B is in his hometown. Speaker B is comfortable: they are in his “hood” and he displays less excitement compared to his friend. Speaker A talks about the drinking game “caps” and how he loves it. Speaker B downplays his friend’s enthusiasm, by agreeing in a “cool” and “nonchalant” stance. The implication is that the game is popular and therefore unremarkable, and the use of dude enables speaker B to show agreement and signal a “cool” stance, without reject the proposition made by his friend. More generally, it is argued that the use of dude serves a way to show solidarity with each other and fortify the group, but also to mediate between the contradictory expectations of young men. Thus, it is a way to display heterosexuality and affiliation, meeting the (contradictory) expectations from society (Kiesling 2004:282, italics added).
In another study on a single term used among another group in the United States, namely Mexican immigrant (primarily male) teenagers, Bucholtz (2009) finds that the term güey is used to take stance and to index an urban hip style and identity. Drawing on ethnographic discourse data, Bucholtz (2009) finds that güey is an in-group colloquial phenomenon. As often is the case with colloquial terms with a high frequency of usage, güey is not prestigious outside of the context of the group of young men. Bucholtz (2009:515) reports that ‘critics’ deem it unneeded, being a ‘verbal filler’, providing evidence of the spreading of decadency among the youth. As a response to this, it is claimed that the term is multifunctional:

“However, the term is in fact highly expressive, performing a range of functions within discourse. Among other uses, it may act as an address term, as an insulting or noninsulting reference term, and as a discourse marker indicating emphasis or focus. In addition and related to these discourse functions, it also supports the performance of a stance of cool solidarity, especially during face-threatening social action such as self-aggrandizement or disappointment. Apart from referential uses of the term, in my data set güey overwhelmingly occurs at the ends of intonation units and thus also participates in the organization of discourse structure” (Bucholtz 2009:151-2)

As Bucholtz addresses, there are similarities between the term güey used by Mexican American youth, and the term dude, as described by Kiesling (2004). In their respective work on frequently used particles, sociolinguistic and pragmatic elements are found to play a crucial role in their use. The terms both function as an address and reference term, positively and negatively: thus, also for insults, indicating emphasis or focus. Nevertheless, Bucholtz (2009) states that the term güey, often being translated to dude in English, is not its equivalent, and stresses their difference in terms of type of identity and group belonging they indicate. Güey is used by an urban hip group, while dude is popular to show relaxedness or disinterest depending on whose perspective one takes. Both dude and güey are however used to take stance, as is claimed to be the case in the current work on GhaPE, regarding the term chale. Resembling the observations on respective term presented in this section (Kiesling 2004; Bucholtz 2009), the majority of the speakers of GhaPE are male. Not only the use of the term chale but the variety as a whole indirectly indexes masculinity, used primarily by and to men. The attitudes towards the “slang” terms in this section share many features with the attitudes towards GhaPE (presented in section 2.1.2). The subsequent section will present the two strategies for stance-taking in GhaPE, starting with chale, then presenting koraa and at last complement-taking predicates, the complementizer and their relation to the complement-clause.

### 2.2.2 Examples from GhaPE: chale and koraa and complement-taking predicates

The term chale is commonly explained as meaning ‘friend’, ‘buddy’ (Dako 2013a:219), or ‘dude’ (Afful 2006:83). It is a popular term in the speaker community, highly expressive, multifunctional depending on various components, e.g. context, genre, realisation such as intonation. It possesses some features of a noun, but is here discussed concerning its role as discourse marker. Adika (2012:162) describes chale as an appellation to a friend, equally as Afful (2006) considers it a widespread appellative, also used between strangers. The users are predominantly males of the same age, -5years (Afful 2006:83). Alternative spellings are charlie, charle (Kundi, Ahmad, Khan & Asghar 2014). Its origin is uncertain, some claim that it is derived from the English name Charlie (Kunadu-Suprim 2011), functioning as a term of endearment. An online resource provides examples of its use: to address a person directly, show disappointment, pity, sympathy, or signal “agreement with someone else’s statement” (Urban Dictionary 2016).
Koraa is considered a topicalization particle by Huber (2008). It fortifies positive and negative propositions, can signal superlative and does often appear postponed to a noun phrase and occasionally an adverbial phrase (Huber 1999:248-249). The particle is borrowed from one of the major substrates to GhaPE, the local language Akan (Kwa, Niger-Congo), where it is used as an emphasis, primarily in connection to positive surprises, translated to English: ‘at all’, ‘even’ or ‘entirely’ (Amfo 2010:223). It is commonly used, both in Akan and in GhaPE and also occurs when code-switching. Unlike chale, this particle brings no strong connotation of an in-group phenomenon particular for GhaPE. (For motivation to include koraa in the study, see chapter 3).

The second strategy for stance-taking in GhaPE in the study is the use of complement-taking predicates, since they serve a way to indicate the speakers’ mental state, as proposed by Kockelman (2010). In the case of GhaPE, earlier studies (Amoako 1992; Huber 1999) find that linking between complement-taking predicates and the complement clause is done optionally with the complementizer sey, prototypically with predicates within the domain of cognition, perception or saying (Huber 1999:188). Huber claims that object complements of wan, (translatable to English ‘want’, a complement-taking predicate that not pertains the domain of interest in this study), are not introduced by sey (Huber 2013). Consider the following example (3), from Huber (2013:174).

(3)  
\[
A \text{ wan } [\emptyset] \text{ go pis}
\]
\[
'\text{I want to urinate}'
\]

The example above does not conform to the claim of Huber (1999) that the complementizer is optional, since the complementizer sey not is accepted here. The predicate is however not found within the domain of cognition, perception or saying, but psych-action. Despite this, the instance of wan and its relation to the complementizer is shortly reviewed in the thesis, though the main focus is the examination of the relationship between complement-taking predicates\(^4\), the distribution of the complementizer and the complement clauses.

The current chapter has outlined some features of GhaPE and the socially conditioned context for its use, along with a presentation of the notion of stance, the Stance Triangle posed by Du Bois (2007) and some different strategies to signal stance. Having introduced two strategies for stance-taking in GhaPE, we now move on to a formulation of the aims of the study.

\(^4\) Complement-taking predicates within the domain of domain of cognition, perception or saying (Huber 1999:188).
3 Aims and research questions

The aim of this thesis is to explore strategies for stance taking in Ghanaian Pidgin English, and discuss their interactive consequences. More specific, two resources sharing the same functional domain, serving as stance markers, are examined. The two resources are:

a) Particles: chale and koraa

b) Complement-taking predicates: e.g. tink ‘think’, tok ‘say’ and their co-occurrence with the complementizer sey.

The research questions are as follows:

1. What is the frequency and distribution of the particles chale and koraa?
2. How do complement-taking predicates co-occur with the complementizer sey?
3. How are the two resources used to signal stance and what are the interactional consequences of their use?

The selection of the above research question is based on previous work on stance: complement-taking predicates following Kockelman (2010), and the immediately personally observed frequency (in the field) of the chale and to a certain extent koraa (for previous works on stance via single terms, see Kiesling 2004; Bucholtz 2009).

There are numerous particles available in GhaPE to signal emphasis, topic e.g. nɔ, die tu, nau (Huber 2008:393) and, to the study perhaps the most interesting: involvement. The particles aa, paa, waa indicate “emotional involvement of the speaker” (Huber 1999:249), suitable for investigations on stance. Waa and aa both serve as markers for emphasis, but aa is more often used for duration and intensity (Huber 1999:249). Further, this particle resembles greatly the prolonged aa, another marker for conditionalis, loaned from the substrate language Akan. These can be difficult to distinguish from each other, especially in rapid conversation. In order to explore them and with certainty differentiate them, a deeper dialogue/cooperation with the language consultants with time for thoroughly transcriptions is necessary. Unfortunately, the time was limited in the field. Thus, the motivation for choosing koraa is due to its salience and yet usefulness in discourse, despite the fact that it is not as common as chale.

---

1 The term “language consultant” is used inspired by the discussion of Bowern (2008:10)
4 Method and data

To elaborate on stance taking in GhaPE, I made use of a dynamic combination of interviewing language consultants with follow up questions and consulting my own compiled corpus. The corpus is a result of fieldwork aspiring to the empowerment framework, in which the purpose of linguistic work is to work on the variety, for the speakers, but also with the speakers (Rice 2006:132; Cameron, Frazer, Harvey, Rampton & Richardson 1992:22), aiming to share the data with the community by the summer of 2016.

4.1 Data

The data in this study consists of 3 h 20 min speech, mainly goal-oriented interactive speech. The data was gathered on linguistic fieldwork in Accra, Ghana, from November 2015-January 2016 and is compiled in a corpus. The project was partly financed by the MFS program through the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)⁶. The organization of data is to a large extent based on the recommendations of Bowern (2008). The corpus contains 20 sessions using elicitation tools, recorded with a ZOOM Handy Recorder H2 with an in built microphone. The five elicitation tasks are briefly described in the following section, presented according to relative size in the corpus.

4.1.1 Elicitation tasks

“The Family Problem Picture Task”

The task called “Family Problem Picture task” (San Roque, Gawne, Hoenigman, Colleen Miller, Rumsey, Spronck, Carroll & Evans 2012) consists of a total of 16 drawings (thus, non-linguistic) designed to collect goal-oriented speech within the domain of social cognition. The speakers are asked to create a narrative, in cooperation with each other. The task is made in three steps: interpretation and description of the pictures one by one, a sorting of them and ultimately a retelling of a story, where several scenarios are possible. The pictures, with names such as “About to hit”, “Drunken gossip”, “Taken by police”, and “Alone in the cell” (San Roque et al. 2012:169), are used to collect data on strategies for signalling aspects of the speaker’s cognitive and social awareness regarding the intentions, mental states, and actions of third parties, as portrayed in the pictures. In addition, the story can be told from ISG perspective, which provides linguistic constructions otherwise difficult to elicit due to ethical reasons. The discussions entail valuable instances of questions, agreements and disagreements, explanations and responses (San Roque et al. 2012:166).

“The Frog story”

This task is based on the storybook “Frog, where are you?” about the adventure of a boy, a dog and a frog (Mayer 1969). It was originally drawn for children, contains only pictures, which minimizes linguistic bias of translation when used for linguistic elicitation. Participants are asked to create a narrative based on the pictures, simultaneously as they look through the book for the first time. The first published volume making use of this task is Berman & Slobin (1994), initiating the cross-linguistic comparisons regarding narratives in general, motion events and manners of motion (Slobin 2004). The task has been used since 1980’s, collecting fairly broad data but has received criticism due to its cultural biased/skewed outline. Comparing to the previous presented task, this task is stricter: the

pictures are presented in a certain order and the interpretation of them results at times as slightly strained.

“My Brother task”
My Brother task is a map task (Lindmark 2015, unpublished). One single line drawing depicts objects that are pertinent in a context of the campus at the University of Ghana-Legon. The commission is to give directions to get to one’s brother (ambiguously if “the brother” refers to the brother of the speaker or the listener). There is no need for preparations and the task can be finished within a couple of minutes. One of the disadvantages with the task is that the speaker at times lacks a partner of conversation skilful in GhaPE.

“Emotional task”
Emotional task is based on the questionnaire presented in Ethnography of Emotions (Le Guen 2009). The task is designed to cover, understand and describe categories for cross-cultural emotions. The task is here performed as an oral interview, with the disadvantage that the questions are posed in English, which may cause the speaker to code-switch (to English).

“Topological relations”
Topological Relations (Bowerman & Pederson 1992) is a task with 71 line drawings depicting spatial relations between two objects. It intends to cover, among others: “horizontal support, vertical support (if hanging), adhesion, liquid adhesion, marks on surface, living creature on non-horizontal surface (...)” (Levinson & Wilkins 2006:9). It is not crucial for the purpose of examining stance, since the task is an individual interview, thus controlled and potentially artificial (primarily because the interviewer is speaking English and asks skewed questions), but it is included in the material because it provided material on a complement-taking predicate (hope).

4.1.2 Participants
The sample consists of 22 males at the age ranging from 15 to 31 years old, with a median age of 22 years. Their first languages, according to themselves filling out a metadata sheet, are Twi/Akan, Éwé and English. Altogether, they share knowledge in following languages (as L2): Twi/Akan, Ga, Éwé, English, Adangbe, Nzema, Fante, Dagbani, French and “Pidgin” (as reported by a speaker, i.e. Ghanaian Pidgin English).

All speakers who participated have attended or are attending secondary school in Accra, and the older ones have attended or are attending higher education at the University of Ghana-Legon. The metadata of the language consultants includes information on age, sex, first and second language(s), level of education, present occupation, following the suggestions from Huber (1999:4). The metadata was mostly collected after the recording session, thereby minimizing the risk of bias caused by self-reflection.

---

7 Their individual ages are: 15, 16, 16, 16, 18, 18, 19, 19, 22, 22, 22, 23, 23, 24, 24, 29, 29, 31 (The few cases where the age was not obtained, it is estimated to be 20. Thus, the age indication should preferably be viewed as an estimation)
8 With the exception of one speaker, who after graduating secondary school in Volta Region (Ghana), started working in a NGO.
4.2 Procedure of transcription

The transcriptions are made in collaboration with language consultants the following way: initially, transcriptions were made together with language consultants. As the understanding of the variety grew, raw transcriptions were made without help and later revised and translated in collaboration (ranging from one up to four language consultants at the same time), and later checked with other speakers. The recordings of sessions with several speakers are challenging to transcribe, but provide a rich material particularly on stance. Individual interviews are more controlled, thus easier to transcribe, but results in potentially artificial speech (see section 6.2 for extended discussion of the methodology).

4.2.1. Transcription convention

The language examples in the thesis are broadly transcribed. The transcription convention is the result of an intermediate representation of three components. The three main components contributing to the conventions used are the following:

- English orthography, e.g. when lexemes are loaned from English, the same spelling is applied
- Phonologic accuracy in accordance with the IPA-chart. Pronouns 1SG and 3SG are transcribed <a> and <i> respectively, following Huber (1999)
- The preferred form by speakers (which is in itself highly flexible; the same speaker can spell the same word differently within a single sentence)

This contributes to the fact that the language examples throughout the thesis are consistent in their representations, but not fully alike the conventions of previous works on GhaPE, nor wholly aligning with the speakers’ preference. This choice is made to illustrate/emphasize the actual distance between GhaPE and English, and to reduce the gap between pronunciation and spelling (which presupposes that the reader has knowledge of the IPA-chart). Since my intended audience are both linguists and speakers of the community, this is a fair decision.

Huber (1999) refers constantly to the complementizer (here spelled sey) as se. This form is phonologically more accurate. The speakers do however not prefer that form. The advantage of the version chosen in this study, apart from that it aligns with speaker preference (and partly previous works, cf. Amoako 1992:84), is that it enables easier corpus search. More specific, it is easier to differ between the complementizer sey, the verb see ‘to see’ and the verb say ‘to say’, that could be spelled identical, due to similarities in realization. Huber distinguishes them by a tonal indication on the vowel, which I did not have full access to in the field, and did not follow. Besides, language consultants perceived it odd.

Longer excerpts in the thesis are presented according to a selection of relevant features from the conversation analytic approach to transcription (Hepburn & Bolden 2013). See appendix for the features indicating conversational manners. The terms “utterances/speech turns” are used synonymously, informed by the presentation of turn-construction units by Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974:702), acknowledging that a turn can consist of a single word, which is the case with chale (see result section 5.1.1.)
4.3 Software for data analysis

The freeware corpus analysis tool AntConc\(^9\) (Anthony 2014) served as an instrument to gather the linguistic forms, in combination with manual evaluation. The method is thus both quantitatively and qualitatively constituted. Automatic quantitative analysis was not possible since the data is not annotated. Every unit required manual analysis. The complement-taking predicates were gathered informed by the list of predicates in English given by Kockelman (2010). To choose to work from English as a starting point constitutes a problem. The risk is that predicates are not identified due to the English bias, and the more thorough manual analysis resulted in the findings of the two ‘odd’ examples of what appeared to be complement-taking predicates (further presented in the result section 5.2.2). The complement-taking predicates presented in the thesis are to be viewed as a handful of examples, identified in the current material.

4.4 Analysis and interpretation

The analysis is done with the approach that linguistic choices are systematic and meaningful, and stance is a dialogic phenomenon emerging in interaction. The discussions are therefore interpreted in the light of the Stance Triangle (Du Bois 2007), with the intention to account for the realization of an utterance, its interactional consequences along with its interpretations. The three processes, initiated when a stance is taken (evaluation, positioning, alignment) are not explicitly accounted for in every instance. Rather, a sample is exposed and discussed. The theoretical model served as a conceptual tool in the systematic search for patterns of strategies signalling stance. The excerpts are primarily selected due to salience of one or both resources of stance of main interest in the study. The translations, evaluations and interpretations are based on speaker judgements.

4.5 Ethical considerations

To protect individuals participating in the project, some ethical considerations have been done. Participants were informed to the possibility of withdrawing whenever they wanted. This never happened. A contributing factor is probably that the tasks are emotive and easy to get involved in. Language consultants were also assured that their personal information would be disclosed by a coding system. Every consultant received the nickname C\(n\) where \(n\) stands for the chronological order the recordings were done. The names in the thesis are randomly picked out, on basis of commonly used names of the Akan’s (the largest group in Ghana), where a given name is dependent on what weekday the person was born (Agyekum 2006:213-218). This has nothing to do with the speakers’ identities, more than their statistical probability to pertain the Akan’s, or to have taken/been given Akan names/nicknames.

\(^9\) Available from http://www.laurenceanthony.net/
5 Results

The results are presented in the same order as the research questions. It starts with a presentation of the distribution and frequency of the particles, where short examples of their usage are provided. Then, a sample of complement-taking predicates is presented with brief examples, along with an additional discussion on two instances of what appeared to be complement-taking predicates, where the complementizer was found to be ungrammatical. The remaining part of the results is concentrating more thoroughly on how these resources are used to signal stance, providing longer excerpts of dialogues to illustrate the linguistic analysis.

5.1 Particles

This section presents the findings in the corpus of the particles *chale* and *koraa* respectively, answering the first research question.

5.1.1 Chale: frequency and distribution

When asked to do a written task, one speaker spontaneously gives examples on how to command someone to stand up in the morning: “Dude, stand up = *chale, tinup*”. Here, *chale* is translated into ‘dude’, which aligns with earlier descriptions (see background chapter 2.2.2). Other speakers’ suggestion for translation is ‘buddy’. The scope of *chale* is nevertheless restricted in the sense of meaning ‘friend’, in the following way:

(4)  *Dat bi Kofi, i ibi ma best chale*
     ‘That is Kofi, he is my best chale’

The sentence above is not acceptable. For the term ‘friend’ in this case, it would be appropriate to use the noun ‘paddie/paddy’ instead. This is an indication that the term *chale* to a large extent functions as a multifunctional particle, though still possessing some features of a noun.

In the corpus of 3h 20 min speech, the number of tokens of *chale* is 98 (98/200 min makes a token every 0.49 min, in other words: it occurs roughly once every two minutes). Its distribution and position is variable, it appears both initially, final and medial in utterances/speech turns, as shown in table 1.

*Table 1. Distribution and frequency of positions for chale (inspired by Kiesling 2004:291)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclamation with ‘oh’</td>
<td>31 (31.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>17 (17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>17 (17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>12 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an entire utterance</td>
<td>10 (10.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address term</td>
<td>9 (9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclamation with ‘ei’</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>98 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.2 Chale in usage

Chale is very common and realized in various manners regarding e.g. intonation. My investigation suggests that some of its multiple functions are:

- Serving as an address term
- Help to organize discourse, e.g. serving as a discourse marker, or marker of direct speech
- Used as an exclamation

These functions can display a range of expressions, typical of communicative nature, feelings/mental state, e.g. affiliation, agreement (or disagreement if combined with negation no or na, alternatively a dental click), compassion, desperation, disappointment, pity, relief, solidarity, sympathy. The presented functions in the list above will be exemplified in this section in chronological order (it has thought to be noted that these functions can be displayed or operate simultaneously, but the presented examples are for the sake of convenience discussed regarding one of the functions). The first example will provide the use of chale as an address term (in example 5, followed by an example from a contemporary movie), then of how it can function as a marker of direct speech (in example 6). Then, the term used as an exclamation, to take a compassionate stance is presented in example (7). Importantly, the term chale is used in various situations to take stance. Examples of this are presented in this section but more thoroughly presented in section 5.3, discussing interactional consequences (answering the third research question).

There are several instances of chale where it functions as an address term, sharing the function of dude described by Kiesling (2004) and güey as described by Bucholtz (2009). The speakers in the excerpt (5) are in the same dorm room, separated by a garment so that they cannot see each other. Ekow seeks attention from his roommate, as he is suspecting that food is being prepared, based on the slammer he hears. Ekow repeatedly tries to communicate with Kofí but does not succeed. In line 5, he addresses his friend with chale, and then adds you fo cook, which is an imperative to try to oblige him to cook for them both. The explanation follows: make we chop oo a dey hong, ‘let’s eat, I’m hungry’.

(5) Chale as an address term

1 Ekow:  
\textit{den dis bi picture 8 right? Ah you dey cook?}  
‘Then this is picture 8 right? Ah do you cook?’

2 Kofi:  
((Unintelligible mumbling))

3 Ekow:  
\textit{but wat you dey do?}  
‘But what are you doing?’

4 Kofi:  
((Unintelligible mumbling))

5 Ekow:  
\textit{Chale you fo cook (.) make we chop oo a dey hong}  
‘Chale cook ((as an imperative)) and let’s eat TOP\textsuperscript{10} I’m hungry’

\textsuperscript{10} Topicalization
In order to strengthen the analysis of the use of a popular address term, previous works turn to contemporary culture (see Kiesling 2004 referring to comics; Bucholtz 2009 referring to advertisement). In the case of GhaPE, representations of *chale* are numerous in a movie said to be “the first West Africa Pidgin hip-hop musical feature film” according to the producer Panjii Anoff (Shipley 2013:209). The very first line in the movie, which happens to be uttered an early morning, is *chale*, together with the preceding text line with the explanation: “Chale = friend, but can be used in many other ways. Just ask a Ghanaian”. Its purpose in this first occurrence is to address the friend and initiate a conversation, resulting in an immediate response from the conversational partner.

In following example (6), *chale* is used as a marker of direct speech and as an exclamation/interjection. The speaker is performing the Family Problem Picture Task, retelling the story uninterrupted. He interprets the picture as if the main character sits in front of his wife and son, sharing his experiences from jail reporting the story, as if he had no previous knowledge of it (in lines 1-3). The use of *chale* at the end of line 3 marks direct speech, representing the assumed utterance by the person in the story, enacted by the consultant. There is also a shift from 3SG to 1SG in line 4. The speaker hereby takes a stance as committed to the sequences of events as if he experienced it himself, showing a higher degree of involvement. The use of *chale* is presumably not referring to the participants of the quoted utterance, but to signal that new information is about to be presented.

(6) *Chale* as a marker of direct speech and as an exclamation

1 Kofi: *wey, (0.5)*

2 *i den dem sit*

3 *i den dem sit. (.) wey i dey tell dem about (0.2) life back in de prison you see sey in den de wife den de kiddis i dey tell dem ↑oh chale*  
   ‘And they sit. And he tells them about his life back in prison, you see, it is him and the wife and the children, he tells them oh chale’

4 *a dey de prison dere*  
   ‘I was in prison there’

5 *some chow a dey chop*  
   ‘I ate some food’

6 *a dey feel cold (0.5) wey (0.2)*  
   ‘I was freezing and’

7 *i bi like i dey tell dem wey i realize i go wrong an tins (.) wey i dey tell dem*  
   ‘it is like he tells them and he realizes that he did wrong and stuff, and he tells them’

---

11 The film is available here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R_YsQK2Yo3c (15th of April 2016), and is also found in the list of references in the current work
In the following example (7), three instances of chale in the same excerpt are shown, primarily functioning as an exclamation and to take a compassionate stance. The excerpt is from a session with the Family Problem Picture Task, though not the one presented above. Already established information is that the husband beats his wife, but at this point the child seems to be involved too, why the speakers speculate on the consequences for the child. They search for a picture providing explanations to what has happened to the child. Kodjó suspects that the child dies, probably due to the father’s abuse. The excerpt will be further commented below.

(7) Chale as an exclamation, and to take a compassionate stance

1. Kodjó: ‘The child dies’

2. Kwame: ‘Look!’

3. Atoapem: ‘Oh chale’

4. Kwame: ‘The child is hurt’

5. Atoapem: ‘and the woman’s eye chale’

Kodjó fears that the tragic story includes a murdering of the child. Kwame suddenly finds evidence for another theory in another picture and commands his partner of conversation to look at that particular picture in line 2. The child appears not to be dead, which causes Atoapem to steadily utter oh chale in a lowering pitch curve, probably indicating relief and compassion, wrapped in a fabric of solidarity. This line is analysed as an exclamation, although calmly realized. The presentation of the acknowledgement of the new information is done in a relaxed way, which resembles the description on the use of dude in American English by Kiesling (2004); there is a notion of “coolness” in this stance too. Kwame’s perspective is linked to the participants’ perspective, by mitigating the hypothesis proposed by Kodjó of the presumed death in line 1. The child is not dead, but as noted by Kwame in line 4, the child is hurt. Atoapem adopts the stance taken by Kwame in line 4, and aligns with this interpretation, omitting the predicate hurt in line 5 as he extends the observation to include the specific injury additionally imposed on the woman on that picture. Ultimately, Atoapem adds chale at the end of the utterance in line 5, in what could be interpreted as a compassionate stance.

5.1.3 Koraa: frequency and distribution

Unlike the commonly used particle chale, koraa does not appear as a single utterance/turn in my data, is used less frequently and cannot constitute a proposition in itself. Its distribution is, as seen in table 2, concentrated to the end of utterances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>24 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>10 (29.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Distribution and frequency of positions for koraa (inspired by Kiesling 2004:291)
The particle is a topicalization particle that often functions as a superlative (Huber 1999:248-249), strengthening negative and positive propositions. It is used similarly as in the substrate Akan, bearing the meaning, roughly translated to English as ‘at all’, ‘even’ or ‘entirely’ (Amfo 2010:223). It is classified as an adverb in Akan, but treated as a particle by Huber (1999; 2013). The realization of koraa is distinct, resembling a particle regarding length and intonation, although its distribution is not as absolutely free as a particle, as shown in table 2. It is in this work, accordingly, treated as a particle.

5.1.4 Koraa in usage

Koraa is distinct from chale in many ways, koraa cannot be used as an address term, cannot appear alone in a turn/as a single utterance (which is actually the case with chale, see table 1) and is not used to organize discourse. It is however used to add intensification in exclamations. The particle can also display a range of expressions, typical of communicative nature, feelings/mental state, e.g. affiliation, agreement (or disagreement), compassion, desperation, disappointment, pity, relief, solidarity, and sympathy.

A typical use of koraa is seen in example 8. The speaker is performing the Family Problem Picture Task, as the last step where he enacts as the husband, who is struggling in the relationship with his wife. He describes himself as a loving man, who would do anything for his wife and tries his best, but she does not seem to be satisfied. He does not want to loose her, and is therefore willing to give her anything she asks for.

(8) Koraa to signal intensification

1 Kofi: Anything i go tok den
      ‘Anything she asks me for’

2 A- a go give am easily ↑koraa
      ‘I’ll give it to her koraa’

Through the adverb easily, it is already stated that he would give anything to his partner, but koraa in the end functions as a booster, bearing the meaning “completely”. The proposition is that the really husband would give her anything she would ask for, and is thereby taking a stance as committed to “be a good husband”.

Example (9) shows an instance of koraa appearing in the middle of a speech turn, pertaining to its preceding constituent. It is the same speaker and occasion as in example (8), but at a later stage in the telling of his (fictive) experiences where he is confronted with consequences of his abusive behaviour. Developed comments follow below the excerpt.

(9) Koraa to indicate mental state/affective state

1 Kofi: So here you go see sey – oh – a dey jail, as a dey jail
      ‘So here you see, oh, I’m in jail, and as I’m in jail’

2 a mek- a mek mobo koraa: a mek mobo,
      ‘I am sad/pitiful koraa, I am pitiful’

The two are not juxtaposed, but included in the study as different illustrations of stance-taking.
you see sey a dey- a- now a see sey (0.5) oh (.) a f- a- a f- a=a no force,
‘you see that, I’m, now I see that... oh, I didn’t do good’

a no force koraa: a dey de prison inside wey a kai,
‘I didn’t do good at all, I’m in prison and I remember’

a kai how na mi den ma wife dey first
‘I remember how we [me and my wife] used to be’

The function of its use here is to underline the speaker’s sadness and displays a fear, assumingly to be left alone. He is “completely” pitiful; he is imprisoned and the motive for conviction is that he beat his wife. You force is a way to acknowledge someone’s effort or success; it is here used, negated, as a negative evaluation on himself in line 4, immediately followed by koraa, again. The several repetitions fortify and boosters the intended proposition of him “being bad”. It should nevertheless be noted that the speaker is prone to repeat himself because he occasionally stutters (see e.g. the end of line 3), which have an impact on the performance. Having noted features of the particles chale and koraa in my material, we are now moving on to the predicates. The subsequent section shows the two strategies in usage, to take stance.

5.2 Complement-taking predicates and complementizer

The intent of this section is to answer the second research question: to elaborate on the co-occurrence of complement-taking predicates and the complementizer. As already presented in the background section, Huber (1999; 2008) observes that the complementizer sey appears optionally in connection to predicates in the domain of saying and cognition. My material confirms the statement, which will be shown in the following section. The subsequent section (5.2.2.) is dedicated to the two cases found, where the complementizer is ungrammatical. This was already observed in the background chapter, with wan, but also found to be the case with abi, translated to English: ‘I hope’. The predicate wan is not found within the domain of focus in the thesis, whereas abi is not regarded a predicate, but rather a particle or an adverb

5.2.1 Complement-taking predicates with and without complementizer

Here follow examples with complement-taking predicates where the complementizer is at times omitted. It is argued that pragmatic variables: the mental state of the speaker, e.g. his or her intentions degree of certainty, confidence and the imagined mental state by the interlocutor, as well as the relationship between the participants (among others), may play a role in the distribution.

The following example (10) is an adjacency pair where the complement-taking predicate sure ‘to be sure’, is occurring both with and without the complementizer, when speakers are examining a picture from the Family Problem Picture Task. This illustrates the optionality in its use:
The same complement-taking predicate with and without the complementizer

1  Kwesi:  *Me a sure sey laik, i go bi den dey harvest sometin ano no*  
           ‘I am sure that, they are kind of harvesting something I  
           don’t know’

2  Ebo:  *A sure i bi watamelon*  
          ‘I am sure it is watermelon’

Kwesi uses the complementizer, while Ebo does not. Ebo makes a statement with a falling intonation curve without the complementizer. Kwesi refers to himself straightaway, that according to his personal interpretation, the persons on the pictures are harvesting, underlining that it is ‘just’ an interpretation. The choice of the complementizer here could, in the light of the discussion by Kockelman (2010) on the distribution of complementizer in these constructions in English, reflect the speaker’s degree of commitment, or perhaps degree of certainty. This could also be the case in GhaPE. Furthermore, the speaker (Kwesi) adds the hedge ‘I don’t know’ at the end, inviting others to comment, which speaks in favour of an interpretation of the speaker’s intention to indicate degree of certainty. The next example (11) also shows a distancing stance towards the narrative in the portrayed events in the pictures, taken by the speaker through hedges such as *maybe*, pauses and hesitations. Given that the suggestion by Kockelman (2010) on English is accurate, and could be transferable to GhaPE, the distancing stance is also indicated by an overt complementizer, thought to add an epistemic distance with respect to the event talked about, convergent with the pragmatic distance. These resources together would reduce the speaker’s commitment: he does not know if the girlfriend dumped the guy in the picture, and shows it grammatically.

(11) Distancing stance towards the narrative in the picture

1  Kwame:  *Wat a dey guess (.) i bi sey (.) maybe (.) in girlfriend shawn am*  
            ‘What I guess, is that, maybe, his girlfriend dumped him’

The next example (12) is a propositioned report about the main character’s mental state, and the complementizer could signal reduced commitment in line 1, together with the complement-taking predicate *figa* ‘to assume, guess’. There are contextual cues that support this observation. The excerpt is taken from a performance of the Frog Story task. The speaker has never seen the pictures before and seeks an explanation to why the boy suddenly is located on the antelope or deer’s head. The guess is that the boy thought he was climbing a tree, but instead of a tree and its branches, it appears to be the horns of an animal hiding in the woods. After a short contemplation in line 2, the speaker creates a paraphrase of his earlier proposition, and explicitly adds a higher commitment through the assertive that he is sure about his hypothesis. Nevertheless, the complementizer is current in both line 1 and 3. There are other interpretations to this distribution than that the complementizer would play a role in connection to the speaker’s commitment, e.g. the fact that the more linguistic forms being used; the more time is gained by the speaker given that he wishes to hold the speech turn.

(12) A stance of reduced speaker’s commitment

1  Ato:  *A na i figa sey i bi tri*  
          ‘He was thinking that it was a tree’

2  *(0.7)*

3  *a sure sey i figa sey bi tri*  
   ‘I’m sure that he thought that it was a tree’
A predicate of cognition together with the complementizer is also used in a context where a speaker is excited. This illustrates the use of complementizer to indicate the speaker’s degree of commitment/his or her emotional state. The question is posed based on The Emotional Task, asking for what the reaction would be if he, or someone he knew, won the lottery. The excitement of the thought of that scenario inspires the speaker to answer quickly and eagerly, demonstrating how the group of boys would scream, sing and celebrate.

(13) A stance of excitement towards the object of conversation, indicating degree of commitment

1 Kwame: *We win money chale ju know sey today chillin go pai an tyns*
   ‘We won money, then you know that we will be chilling today and stuff like that’

The following example (14) is recorded during the first step in the Family Problem Picture Task, the examination of the pictures one by one. The speaker is reminded of the story of his grandparents, when he notices that the person on the picture is stretching towards a circle in the sky, probably the sun. His only interlocutors are two persons from another continent whose knowledge in pidgin is limited.

(14) The narrative about old customs of grandparents, fairly high degree of speaker’s commitment

1 Kofi: *I check laik dis bi sun (. ) dat bi wat a dey see*
   ‘It looks like this is the sun. That is what I see.’

2 *you see sey de old times (. ) fo Africa a na watch no dey here*
   ‘You know, in Africa when there was no watch here’

3 *dat bi wat wana grandpa den wana grandmomis den dey tok*
   ‘our grandfathers and grandmothers have told us that they used the sun.’

4 *so i na den dey take sun*
   ‘It is like, they follow the sun’

5 *wey den dey (. ) laik (0.2) ebi sun wey*
   ‘and they, like look at the sun’

6 *den dey follow fo time*
   ‘to know the time.’

7 *(0.7)*

8 *so if you spy de sun a:*
   ‘So if you look at the sun’

9 *you go fi no sey i nark maybe twelve o i nark one*
   ‘you will know that it is maybe twelve o’clock or one o’clock.’
so a dey see sey dat bi wa- dat bi exactly wat de man dey do
‘So, I see that this is exactly what the man is doing [on the picture]’

i check laik i dey spy de sun wey i dey check time
‘He kind of looks at the sun to check the time’

The speaker talks uninterrupted in a fairly slow tempo about customs in Africa, more specific how the grandparents used the sun in order to keep track of the time, from line 2 to line 9. He enjoys knowledge within this domain and wishes to share the story, surely aware of the fact that his interlocutors lack extended knowledge in pidgin, a hypothesis that is compatible with them assumingly having no previous knowledge on old customs of his continent. After presenting the narrative, he goes back to refer to the man on the picture, which he is about to describe, in line 10. Now he displays more confidence, as he uses exactly in line 10. The speaker shows a fairly high degree of commitment here, as in the case with example (12), the complementizer is present. However, the logical link between the speaker’s degree of commitment and the complementizer is difficult to account for in this example. As suggested when discussing example (12), there are other interpretations to this distribution than that the complementizer would play a role in connection to the manifestation of speaker’s commitment, e.g. that the more linguistic forms are being used; the more time is gained by the speaker given that he wishes to hold the speech turn.

5.2.2 Two instances where the complementizer is ungrammatical

The complementizer sey is not optional in two instances found in the current work: with abi (loosely translated into ‘I hope’, or ‘Hopefully’) and wan (‘to want’). The complementizer is ungrammatical with abi because the construction is not a complement-taking predicate, but rather a particle or an adverb (further presented below). Wan is not found within the domain of interest in the thesis (cognition, perception or saying) but is nevertheless briefly presented in the subsequent paragraph.

(15) Abi dem no go arrest me
‘I hope not to get arrested’

Compared to the following, ungrammatical example:

(16) *Abi sey dem no go arrest me

The English predicate ‘hope’ is also acceptable in GhaPE, as hope (i.e. the same form) but the speakers do not prefer it:

(17) A dey hope sey dem no go arrest me
‘I hope that they wont arrest me’

There is only one token of spontaneously hope in the corpus of GhaPE, which could be an instance of code switching to English (which is hard to decide since the forms are the same in GhaPE and in English, and the utterance where it appears is not completed). The examples (16) and (17) are elicited on demand during elicitation sessions with speakers, when straight forwardly questioning for the distribution and possible variations to express hope. The preferred form expressing hope (also translated to “assume” and “guess”) is abi, not attested in earlier descriptions of GhaPE (Huber 1999; 2008; 2013) to the best of my knowledge. The construction is not conjugated according to numerus apart from 1SG. The form could be derived from Nigerian Pidgin English (NigPE), where abi is a
loan-morpheme from Yoruba (Niger-Congo) roughly translated to ‘isn’t it’ or ‘or’, often used in an interrogative manner (Mensah 2011:218). This does however not encompass it being a complement-taking predicate.

The other instance where the complementizer is ungrammatical is with wan. ‘To want’ is a complement-taking predicate in English (Kockelman 2010), and the corresponding predicate for want in GhaPE is wan according to Huber (2013). According to language consultants from my work, it can take an argument, as in example (18).

(18) A wan am
    ‘I want it/him/her’

However, the earlier description by Huber (1999:218-223) classifies wan as a pre-verbal mood marker, developed from a full verb. Wan could enjoy an obvious membership of the group complement-taking predicates, if only referring to the description by Huber (2013). However, wan appears in my material exclusively in the position before a non-finite predicate (example 19) or filling the first slot in a serial verb construction, working as a modal marker.

(19) Wan as a pre-verbal mood marker
1 Kwesi: A no wan drink anymore a finish
       ‘I don’t want to drink anymore I’ve had enough’

It appears that wan functions as both mood marker and predicate to some extent (see example 18). The use and distribution of wan over time could give a clue about whether it is undergoing the process of grammaticalization, but this is not elaborated further here due to few examples. Following Kockelman (2010), the predicate want (translatable according to Huber (1999) to wan) wan is, when placed in the Interclausal Relations Hierarchy, supposed to be ‘tighter’ tied to the complement clause, thereby not expected to make use of the complementizer. It also pertains the domain of psych-actions. In both cases presented, the complementizer is, as expected after consideration, not appropriate.

5.3 The two resources serving as stance markers in interaction

This section takes a look at how the introduced resources are combined to signal the speaker’s stance-taking in larger sections of discourse, elaborating on the third and last research question. The following example presents two speakers who are interpreting the Frog Story, about a boy and (at least what he considers to be) his pets: a frog and a dog. The participants comment on the behaviour of the boy, his laziness and his disordered room, repeatedly talking about him as a misbehaving child. Both chale and koraa are represented in this excerpt, with further comments below the extract.

(20) Chale and koraa in interaction to take stance

1 Ato: A dey see some shada bi fo de floor (.). ye
       ‘I can see some clothes on the floor, yeah’

2 Kwesi: De t-shirt=de kiddi bi messy boy paa:
       ‘The T-shirt, the boy is really messy’
3 Ato:  
  *his room no bi nice koraa: (. ) i no get tins sef*
  'his room is not nice at all, he does not even have anything in the room'

4 Kwesi:  
  Oh chale
  ((Turns page))

5 Kwesi:  
  *See dere wey de kiddi-
  ‘And here, the child-

6 Ato:  
  *I dey bed oo!
  ‘He is asleep FOC¹³!’

7 Kwesi:  
  Chale

Ato observes that there are clothes on the floor, with an affirmative form and invites Kwesi to participate. In this first line, Ato is the subject, constituting the upper node in the Stance Triangle (presented in figure 1 in section 2.2, p. 4). Kwesi is the second subject (and the second node in the Stance Triangle), and aligns indirectly with the previous stance taken by Ato, by specifying what kind of clothes, the T-shirt, as a hyponym to shadas. This illustrates how stance emerges in interaction and needs to be interpreted from a dialogical perspective, as the utterance in line 2 with definite article would not be appropriate without the particular context and the previous utterance. Definite article is an expected form since the speaker knows that them both see and know what is being referred to. He is eager to continue talking, as he (immediately after observing the T-shirt) goes on to evaluate the boy as messy. Also, this constitutes the third node on the Stance Triangle, namely the object of conversation, evaluated by the subjects. As a reminder: the simultaneous processes in the actions of stance, visible in the Stance Triangle (in figure 1 on p. 4), are evaluation, positioning and alignment. Ato verifies, aligning with the proposition that the boy is messy, indirect by extending the evaluation of the boy (made by Kwesi in line 2) to be an evaluation of the furnishing in the entire room, in line 3. Here, the particle koraa together with the negation no bare the negative meaning 'at all'. A further evaluation is done with the adverb sef at the end of line 3 (meaning 'even', also glossed as 'merely, only', by Huber 1999). The ultimate affirmation of the previous stances is signalled through the exclamation oh chale in line 4, indicating disappointment towards the object of conversation (the boy is more or less ‘hopeless’), in a relaxed manner showing in intonation, simultaneously indicating solidarity with the co-speaker.

When they turn the page, Kwesi is about to note that the child is perhaps lying in bed, but Ato is faster to complete the proposition: he observes that the boy is sleeping. First, the boy’s room is messy and hostile, and then it reveals that he spends his day sleeping. Moreover, the boy fails to take care of his frog. They have earlier hypothesized that he is so dirty that his mother must be so disappointed with him that she will have to punish him “very soon”. In line 7, Kwesi answers with chale in a drastically falling intonation curve. The use of chale here is typical and striking, the single word constitutes a turn take, with multiple functions: giving feedback, aligning and back channelling, expressing solidarity, disappointment and perhaps pity (since the speakers seem to value tidiness).

In the next example (21), a spontaneous dialogue is taking place in an interrupted gap during the performance of the Family Problem Picture Task. The recording is made in a dorm room at the student hall Commonwealth Hall, University of Ghana-Legon, exclusively for boys. We are in the consultant’s

¹³ Focus
part of the dorm, on his bed that is hidden behind a sort of curtains performing the task. When the consultant hears that one of the other boys (living in the same room) starts to slammer with the rice boiler on the floor, following dialogue unfolds (Previously presented in 5.1.2 but repeated here for convenience):

(21) Chale as an address term, extended excerpt

1 Ekow: *den dis bi picture 8 right? Ah you dey cook?*  
‘Then this is picture 8 right? Ah do you cook?’

2 Kofi: ((Unintelligible mumbling))

3 Ekow: *but wat you dey do?*  
‘But what are you doing?’

4 Kofi: ((Unintelligible mumbling))

5 Ekow: *Chale you fo cook (. ) make we chop oo a dey hong*  
‘Chale cook ((as an imperative)) and let’s eat TOP\(^{14}\)  
I’m hungry’

6 Ato: *Chale a dey hong pass you!*  
‘Chale I’m more hungry than you!’

7 Ekow: ((laughs))

Ekow asks for interaction, more specifically information about what Kofi is doing, if he is preparing food. When he does not receive an answer the second time he asks, he tries again by addressing Kofi directly, by the use of chale. In line 5, Ekow tries to establish a dialogue for the third time, shifting from the use of a question to formulate a demand. The speaker’s act is here related to the participant’s act, or lack of response, in the way that he strengthens the force of the utterance. At this stage, the other boy in the room, Ato, intervenes. Ato is obligatorily a speech participant, being present and able to hear the previous utterances. He intervenes by responding to the physical state of Ekow, acknowledging his hunger, by relating to his own state (as co-participant), by claiming that he is even hungrier (in line 6). He opens by the use of chale in order to take the speech turn, show affiliation (he acknowledges his sensation) and addresses Ekow directly. Ekow then laughs, accepts the lack of response from Kofi and the substitute offered from Ato, as he returns to the task.

In the study of language, awareness of the interactional context is crucial, a fact worth returning to. We have now come to the last selection of dialogical excerpts illustrative for stance taking in GhaPE. A longer excerpt of a dialogue is presented followed by a discussion to illustrate the linguistic analysis. The place of the recording is in the same male student hall, on another occasion than the previous presented. The speakers are performing the Family Problem Picture Task, four boys are participating and another three or four persons listen occasionally, as they enter and exit the room. As the pictures are observed one by one, they are spread out on the floor and consequently visible simultaneously.

\(^{14}\) Topicalization
(22) Speaker’s degree of commitment, *chale* and complement-taking predicates with and without the complementizer

1. Kwame:  
   *i beat am fini:*  
   ‘he hits her’

2. Kodjó:  
   *i beat am*  
   ‘he hits her’

3. Atoapem:  
   *na: dis [one*  
   ‘No, in this one’

4. Kwame:  
   *oh, i [go dey jail*  
   ‘oh, he has to go to jail’

5. Atoapem:  
   *i dey imagine sey chale (.) eh*  
   ‘He imagines that... eh’

6.  
   *kotì ca- go fi cam bab am*  
   ‘he is imagining/thinking that the police can come and arrest/catch him’

7. Kodjó:  
   *ye a sure [Ø] kotì go fi cam bab am o sometín*  
   ‘yeah I am sure the police they will come and take him or something’

8. Atoapem:  
   *Na dem bab am=see?*  
   ‘he has been arrested, have you seen it?’

9. Kodjó:  
   *Oh oke*  
   ‘oh okay’

10. Atoapem:  
    *Dem bab am,*  
    ‘they arrest him’

11. Kwame:  
    *Dem bab am*  
    ‘they arrest him’

12.  
    *(0.7)*

13. Atoapem:  
    *So dis be wat de execution or wat?=Aa: dem go take am go jail*  
    ‘so what should this be, the execution or what? Aah, they take him to jail’

14.  
    *see sey dem go*  
    ‘see how they go’

15. Kwame:  
    *ye*  
    ‘yeah’

16. Atoapem:  
    *chale,*
17 Kwame: ye i dey regret-
‘yeah and he is regretting-’

18 Atoapem: imprison am for life or sometin such
‘imprison him for life or something’

19 Kwame: Why i do dat.
‘why did he do that’

20 Kodjô: ye
‘yeah’

21 a see dat tin

22 a see dat tin
‘yeah, I get it/I agree’

23 ((unintelligible comment))

24 Atoapem: More times i fi regret sey i do dat tin.
‘Sometimes he regrets that he did it’

The boys observe that the man on the picture beats his wife and previous discussion has pointed towards an imprisonment of the man. Atoapem however does not agree, as he already in line 3 protests. Suddenly, Kwame refers to another picture and concludes that the man has to go to jail, in line 4. He is interrupted by Atoapem proposing what the man on the picture imagines: i dey imagine sey chale, ‘he imagines that, chale’. The complementizer is overt here, producing a grammatical distance between the complement-taking predicate imagine and the following clause. As Kockelman (2010) presents it in English, this grammatical distance could be a way to indicate pragmatic distance, such as degree of speaker commitment (for further presentation of this hypothesis, see section 2.2.1). Perhaps is the occurrence here indicating a low degree of speaker commitment to the content of the story. Atoapem does not agree with the interpretation by the others, and tries to claim his interpretation: the picture represents the guy’s imagination and how he wonders whether the police will arrest him, but it does not obligatorily entail him being imprisoned. The use of chale here could be to mark direct speech, as if he is about to report directly what the man on the picture is thinking, but this remains unknown as he starts a new proposition.

Atoapem also uses fi in line 6, a preverbal mood marker indicating ability or permission (fit, Huber 1999:223, or indicating possibility, as proposed by Nordén 2016). In this context, the interpretation of indicating possibility is applicable. This stance is followed by Kodjô’s agreement to the idea that the police will come, expressed without the complementizer, ye a sure koti go fi cam bab am or sometin (in line 7). Interestingly, the distance between the clauses is shortened, omitting the complementizer. The reason for this is not known, but following the hypothesis preliminary assumed in example (10) and relating to the discussion by Kockelman (2010) on English, this could be a way to indicate degree of commitment by the speaker and higher confidence. If this is the case, it is mitigated at the end of the utterance by the hedge ‘or something’.
Atoapem then changes his mind (in line 8) and agrees that the police indeed will arrest the guy. He points at another picture depicting the policemen dragging the man away, immediately adding ‘see’ with a raising or questioning intonation at the end of line 8, functioning as self-affirmative and questioning for agreement from his partners of conversation. Consequently, Kodjó aligns with the stance, he shows himself convinced. These stances brings the interactional consequences that another partner of conversation, Kwame, also shows alignment in line 11 by repeating the exact words from Atoapem, thereby taking the stance follow from Atoapem’s stance lead from line 10.

Moving on to another picture, Atoapem wonders if the main character is facing a sentence of execution (in line 13). He answers immediately to his own question, rushing through the answer (as indicated with = standing for latching, i.e. the absence of silence between parts of one turn, see Appendix). He concludes that the man is about to be sentenced to imprisonment. After agreement in form of a ‘yeah’ from Kwame, he uses chale (in line 16) as an entire utterance, signalling involvement, and to hold the speech turn as he previously wished, in line 8.

At this point, Kwame’s standpoint relates to the perspective of Atoapem in the way he elaborates on the interpretation of the picture, aligning with the affirmative ye, further suggesting (in line 17) that the main character is regretting something. Atoapem interrupts him. The proposition of Kwame is at this time ignored, but will soon receive a response. Atoapem positions himself as the one who knows, as he previously did in line 3. Now he claims that the guy will have to face life imprisonment. This proposition is not overtly mistrusted, as Kwame calmly utters the rhetorical question why the offender did what he did in line 19. The other speaker follows and aligns by the repetitive affirmations in lines 20-22. The last line is where Atoapem suggests that the guy in the pictures regrets “that he did it”, that he injured his family. Two aspects of this utterance (line 23) are noteworthy. These are developed in next paragraph.

Earlier in the conversation, Kwame used the complement-taking predicate regret in the conversation (see line 17). At the time of its realization, it was ignored. Here, Atoapem is the one to specify what the man is regretting. Speech is unavoidable linear in its realization, and other utterances were prioritized. However, the response comes at this point, as a form of reparation or reimbursement. This illustrates that every stance is an act, as it changes the premises for the conversation and speakers are concerned about the other speaker’s perspective. Second, the utterance in itself allows Atoapem to display his assumption about the main character’s cognitive state. The concrete cue is found in several instances. On one hand, the overt complementizer see illustrates the suggested grammatical distance iconic to the pragmatic distance. On the other hand, the modal modifier fi and the downgrading more times (indicating possibility, as formulated by Nordén 2016) provide a way to take a “cool” stance. The speaker does not show too much enthusiasm and is thereby upholding his social status.

As shown throughout the result chapter, stance taking in GhaPE is salient. The two constructions of main focus, particles and complement-taking predicates, have played the main role in the examination of examples of stance, along with additional comments on other linguistic choices to enrich the analysis.
6 Discussion

This chapter is dedicated to the discussion of the results in connection to previous research including suggestions for improvement and further elaboration, along with a critical discussion on the methodology. Further, an extended discussion on ethical aspects associated with the project follows. Ultimately, some theoretical implications are discussed.

6.1 Discussion of results in connection to previous research

The research questions are answered with qualitative examples showing speakers’ strategies to signal stance in GhaPE. In the work of Bucholtz (2009) and Kiesling (2004) with focus on particles, stance is closer tied to identity than the particles presented in this thesis on GhaPE. There is however an identity motivation for the use of the particles, which could be elaborated on in detail in future studies. Previous studies have attested sociolinguistic variables to the use of GhaPE as a whole, but not paid extensive attention to the particles discussed in the current work. The functions of the particle chale overlap to a certain extent to the categories found by Kiesling (2004) in American English, more precisely: the speaker uses the terms as a discourse marker and to indicate the own state, e.g. degree of commitment. Bucholtz (2009:150) also finds that the particle güey among Mexican American youth share features with dude, it used in exclamations, as an address term and as a discourse marker. The particle chale in GhaPE differs from them because it is not appropriate in referential use, and importantly, the three terms are used in different language paradigms. However, they all share the function of signalling identity, mental state and stance, among a group of (primarily) young men. In particular, Kiesling (2004) emphasizes the use of dude as strongly indicating a “cool” stance and solidarity.

The discussion on stance with particles and complement-taking predicates in focus provides results comparable to other studies. The relevance of a direct comparison is however not known, since stance emerges in interaction, dependent from context to context and independent of specific linguistic forms. It is however useful, but not compulsory, to approach the notion of stance through a certain linguistic form, in order to delimit the research.

Previous works on GhaPE (Huber 1999; 2008) have observed that the complementizer sey is optional together with predicates in the domain of saying and cognition. This is attested in the current work, and it is argued that pragmatic variables, e.g. the mental state of the speaker may play a role in the distribution. Given that the suggestion by Kockelman (2010) on distribution of complementizer in English is accurate, and could be transferable to GhaPE, an overt complementizer is thought to add an epistemic distance with respect to the event talked about, convergent with the pragmatic distance. That is, the distance in pragmatics, e.g. the speaker’s degree of commitment to the object of conversation is mapped onto the linguistic entities, and greater distance is displayed grammatically. This seemed to be the case to a certain extent, but is not showed to be completely clear. Contextual variables that interfere with the distribution of the complementizer could nevertheless be limitless. The mental state of the speaker cannot be viewed as the exclusive motivation for the distribution, and the hypothesis needs to be tested in further elicitation sessions, using other tasks, even larger and more refined corpora, combined with a higher per cent of spontaneous talk, e.g. daily interaction. The last suggestion could have comprised instances of greetings, sequential use of particles in leave-takings as Kiesling (2004:291) suggests regarding the study on particles.
To develop the current research, a thorough investigation on complement-taking predicates, the distribution of complementizer and the potential co-occurrence with hedges, adjectives, or adverbs (e.g. maybe) is suggested. It would hopefully provide more information to account for the possibility of the relationship between the mental state of the speaker and complement-taking predicates and the complementizer. Another speculation is that perhaps the distribution of complementizer in connection to complement-taking predicates can be related to inherent properties of the verbs. Further guesses on what these could be, are left unarticulated.

As an additional note, there are two instances where results are presented in numbers of total and in percentage, in the presentation of the particles (section 5.1). It is in order to clarify that these are only included as an illustration, of course not statistically noteworthy.

### 6.2 Extended discussion of methodology

The method in this study can be transferred to studies on other languages. The Stance Triangle carries the advantage that its applicability is independent of language variety. The dependability of the method is gained through linguistic introspection by the help of speakers, and the analysis and measurements are accurate as far as speaker judgement is accepted. Given that the studied language is not the researcher’s first language¹⁵, it is necessary to maintain a dialogue with the speakers. In cases of studies on stance in the researcher’s first language, speaker judgements both by the participants and by others are yet valuable. The research is predominantly completely dependent on speakers.

There are some limitations to the methodology of data collection in this work. Initially when collecting the data, an opportunistic approach was taken. Consequently, the sample is not fully representative. Its concentration to narratives also conveys somewhat staged speech. The goal-oriented speech should however not constitute a major problem when taken into consideration. Further notes on the collection of data of positive character, is that the tasks are primarily pictorial tasks. The choice of non-linguistic tasks reflects the attempt to avoid bias from linguistic means such as direct translations (in this case, of course, from English). The tasks encourage imagination, improvisation and may help speakers to join the conversation, which is beneficial for the outcome. Speakers are not held fully responsible for what they say, and are thus partially relieved from the demand to take precautions (and handle possible consequences).

One further methodological remark is that the setting for the sessions is crucial in order to obtain high quality data. The session is preferable recorded in a comfortable setting, and the choice in the current study was mostly the area of University of Ghana-Legon, bringing the advantage that the language (in this particular context) is not stigmatized (as it assumingly would be in many contexts outside of campus), rather expected from male students. The most common recording place in the study is more precisely the dorm room of the speakers, a familiar place for them.

A remark regarding the representativeness is that the participants are exclusively males. Some would consider this to be fully accurate, as exclusively males historically speak the variety as an in-group language. In the light of this, the problem of male dominance is partly overridden. My observation is nevertheless that female fluency in GhaPE is fairly spread, which is also attested by scholars (Dako 2013b; Rupp 2013). The use of GhaPE is still stigmatized, and despite the intentions to record females, no proper recording with interactional speech between females was obtained¹⁶. In connection to this, the problem of a small sample has to be noted. Every individual speaker may have a big impact

¹⁶ This material does however provide sociolinguistic cues on its stigmatization, as the recordings to a great extent include laughs and hesitations.
on the data, since the sample is quite small. It can result in biased results, depicting the language use of the particular group that is studied, but not the variety in general.

Therefore, the illustrations of stance in GhaPE in this study are illustrations, not intended to give an exhaustive account. Overall, it is difficult to account for the dialogical context, when the majority of the data is limited to sound recordings, failing to capture gestures, facial expressions and to whom the speaker turns at the moment of realization. A difficulty general to the field is that the activity of recording speech is never entirely spontaneous or ‘natural’. The situations are staged, as we are unable to avoid the observers’ paradox.

In research as the current, the quality of data is the decisive factor to the result. A suggested improvement to the study is to add elicitation sessions, over a longer period of time, allowing for more thorough transcriptions. Preferable, all the sessions would also be recorded on video, to enable a more reliable and richer analysis, including facial expressions and gestures. More data is however not equivalent to better data, but a thorough and observant methodology combined with a wider time scope would improve the prospects.

6.2.1 Discussion in connection to ethical considerations

The visit and travel to a secondary school, in order to broaden the sample in the study, was planned and organized by one of the language consultants, also a previous student at the particular school. It was impossible to know on beforehand which students would be available and able to speak with us at the time when we arrived. The school is a secondary school, which means that the students are underage. In this particular case, the time limitations made it difficult to completely stay within the ethical frameworks regarding the parents’ consent: it was not obtained. This constitutes a problem. However, the consent from the speakers was obtained, and the sessions made with the teenagers are exclusively performed with the Frog Story (avoiding heavy topics) and the metadata resulted somewhat incomplete, due to time limitations, as the lecture halls were booked for lectures. The highest intention is to protect and respect the participants, whose partial metadata of course is disclosed.

Responsibility and respect are two key aspects when conducting linguistic fieldwork. The presence of English in West Africa in the first place, is due to the transatlantic slave trade with devastating consequences. In this context where I am a white young female interested in Ghanaian Pidgin English, I occasionally had to clarify that the project was not about, as suspected, to observe young Ghanaians ‘spoiling’ the English language. The linguistic view of GhaPE as a stable variety, together with presentations of previous studies on GhaPE attracted language consultants’ attention and interest. The work enabled several friendly relations to be established. I could share my experiences with the changing seasons of my country and the snow, and the fact that I am young and also a student was beneficial. My nervousness of perhaps not obtaining access to GhaPE, being the in-group language among young male that it is, was completely unnecessary.

One occasion of withdrawal was close to occur in the beginning of the project. Two speakers were about to perform the Frog Story when one of the participants asked his friend in Akan (the lingua franca that they both knew I had very little knowledge in) if the task was an attempt to fool them. The book is obviously made for children and it lacks text. First after affirmation from his friend, he engaged in the task. This was revealed during transcription with another language consultant than the ones speaking. It caused much laughter. As we became better friends, I brought up the incident after a couple of weeks with the persons involved. It caused even more laughter.

17 In Ghanaian English, to spoil means ‘to ruin, destroy’.
6.3 Theoretical implications

The current work made use of the Stance Triangle, a theoretical model providing partial prediction in interaction specializing on the action of stance. The investigation demonstrates that the model can be favourably applied to instances of verbal interaction in GhaPE. It is challenging to account for the contextual factors that have impact on linguistic behaviour: previous stances (some may be remembered forever), the social relationship between speakers and how speakers express their identity through voice quality, accent, regional, ethnic and gender affiliation (Du Bois 2007:147). An exhaustive examination of stance is unimaginably not possible, as not even speakers themselves know what consequences the stances they take will have. Furthermore, different subjects can interpret the actions differently.

However, some of the main components of stance (e.g. evaluation, positioning and alignment) are salient in the stance act, and these cues are uncovered by the application of the Stance Triangle. It does not obligatorily constitute a problem that an exhaustive description of stance is not presented. Englebretson (2007) suggests from an optimistic perspective, that a research on stance, bounded with a narrow definition of stance would impede the research field, or “needlessly fragment and limit this interdisciplinary field of research at a time when it has only just begun to emerge and take shape” (Englebretson 2007:2). It is then useful to account for some aspects of the actions, and every contributing study counts in the pursuit of the description of what emerges in interaction, more specifically, stance.
7 Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to explore stance taking, more specific, how two particular resources are used for stance taking in GhaPE. The two resources were selected on basis of previous work (complement-taking predicates, Kockelman 2010), and frequency (in the field) of the particle chale (particles, Kiesling 2004; Bucholtz 2009). The data in the work consist of recordings of narratives and goal-oriented speech, collected during linguistic fieldwork in Ghana from November 2015-January 2016. The data was compiled in a corpus, which served as a provider for quantitative data, whereas the qualitative analysis of the stances and their consequences was made applying the framework posed by Du Bois (2007), the Stance Triangle, in combination with speaker judgements. The Stance Triangle is proved to be a useful conceptual tool to investigate instances of stance, aiming to include pragmatic features that have impact on the linguistic choice.

The frequency and distribution of the particles have been presented (table 1 and 2), showing their common usage, answering the first research question. Further, a number of complement-taking predicates are presented optionally occurring with a complementizer. The reason for the occurrence may depend on unlimited variables, but is possibly influenced by pragmatic variables such as the mental state of the speaker, e.g. intentions, degree of certainty, confidence or the imagined mental state by the interlocutor. The complementizer was found ungrammatical in two cases of what appeared to be complement-taking predicates, a fact that was explained by the non-membership (of the two instances) in the predicate-group. Abi is a loan morpheme from NigPE, whereas wan is not viewed as a stable predicate (see section 5.2.1 further).

The third research question was to investigate how the two constructions are used to take stance. Throughout the thesis, I have shown that the action of stance is visible in GhaPE, informed by the analytical theoretical concept of stance. Moreover, there is a suggested interaction between the speaker’s stances and the two grammatical strategies: particles (chale and koraa), and complement-taking predicates in co-occurrence of the complementizer sey. Nevertheless, the exact interaction between these is yet to be discovered.

These resources are not sufficient to account for the notion of stance, but the current study is an intention to illustrate stance taking in GhaPE, a language in which stance previously not has been studied to the best of my knowledge. Overall, it is difficult to fully account for the dialogical context, specifically when a large part of the data is limited to sound recordings, failing to capture gestures, facial expressions and to whom the speaker turns at the moment of realization.

The results in the thesis do however motivate further examination of strategies for speakers to signal their mental state. Future research can advantageously focus on stance by examining other grammatical or lexical resources, e.g. adjectives, but a deeper understanding of the pattern regarding complement-taking predicates and the complementizer is yet needed. Stance-taking through the use of particles, as in the current work, are also worthy of attention. Furthermore, as presented on page 7, there are numerous particles available in GhaPE to signal speaker involvement: aa, paa, waa (Huber 1999:249), suitable for investigations on stance, given that the linguist has enough time on the field and has had time for extensive preparation. A further fruitful focus to the investigation on stance in GhaPE is in particular the multifunctional particle chale in spontaneous data in order to capture daily interaction.
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Appendix: Conversational transcription conventions

Transcription conventions, general (Kiesling 2004; Hepburn & Bolden 2013)
One line corresponds roughly to one breath group

- indicates lengthened segment
((text)) indicates comments added by the author

Temporal and sequential relationships

[ ] indicates overlapping talk onset
A|B| indicates overlapping speech: B and C are uttered simultaneously, not A nor D.
|C|D = indicates latching, absence of silence between two turns or between part of one turn (e.g. when a speaker rushes through the proposition, often with increasing pace)
(n.n) indicates pause length
(.) indicates a micro pause

Speech delivery
↓ or ↑ indicates pitch variations, a sharp upward or downward shift

unit-final intonations
.
? indicates falling intonation
? indicates strongly rising intonation
, indicates slightly rising intonation