

NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE VARIATION IN ADVERBIAL AND ADJECTIVAL INTENSIFICATION: A CORPUS-BASED STUDY OF UK AND GHANAIAN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Kwabena Sarfo-Kantankah¹

Department of English
Faculty of Arts
College of Humanities and
Legal Studies
University of Cape Coast



Abstract

Studies on the use of adverbs and adjectives by non-native speakers of English have largely focused on learner corpus. Using Hansards of British and Ghanaian parliamentary debates as data, this paper attempts to partly fill this gap by comparatively examining the use of adverbs and adjectives as intensifiers by British parliamentarians as first/native speakers of English and Ghanaian parliamentarians as a second language/non-native speakers of English. Parliamentarians' use of adverbial and adjectival intensification is consequent on parliamentary debates being truth and validity judgement, which includes speaker involvement and commitment. While both groups of MPs employ intensifiers to strengthen their convictions and arguments, it leads to exaggeration. However, British parliamentarians use more complex adverbs and adjectives than their Ghanaian counterparts, who use simpler forms. The paper has implications for second language teaching and learning, the theory of nativisation and the characterisation of Ghanaian English.

Keywords: **Keywords:** Intensification, parliamentary debates, Ghanaian English, native speakers, non-native speakers

¹ Kwabena Sarfo Sarfo-Kantankah is Associate Professor of English language in the Department of English, University of Cape Coast, Ghana. He obtained his PhD from the School of English, University of Leeds, UK, where he studied on Leeds International Research Scholarship. His PhD research focused on UK and Ghanaian parliamentary discourse. His research interests include corpus linguistics, discourse analysis, political discourse, parliamentary discourse and pragmatics. He has previously published in journals such as *Language, Discourse & Society*; *African Nebula*; *Legon Journal of the Humanities*; *Corpora*; *Word*; and *Journal of Pragmatics*.

Introduction

This paper examines adverbial and adjectival intensification in British (native) and Ghanaian (non-native) varieties of English. The aim is to contribute to the ongoing debate about the extent to which the Ghanaian variety of English varies from the British variety by examining adverbial and adjectival intensification in UK and Ghanaian parliamentary debates. By comparing the two datasets, the paper attempts to throw light on whether there is some “Ghanaian-ness” (Dolphyne, 1997, p.6) in the use of adverbial and adjectival intensification in the English spoken in Ghana.

The global spread of English has led to the emergence of a diverse range of postcolonial varieties of English (Schneider, 2007), sometimes referred to as World Englishes. Kachru (1986, 1992) represents the varieties of English in three concentric circles, which “are defined with reference to the historical, sociolinguistic and literary contexts” (Kachru, 1992, p.3). The three circles are:

1. the Inner Circle, representing “the traditional bases of English, dominated by the ‘mother tongue’ varieties”, including countries such as Britain, the United States and Australia. These countries are believed to be the norm setters for education, law, administration, and media, among others.
2. the Outer Circle, representing “institutionalised” varieties of English. They somehow correspond to the traditional English as a second language (ESL) situations, for example, in Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, Singapore and Malaysia. These are countries which are former British colonies. They use English for official and national purposes, including education, the courts, the media, parliament and social discourse. English in these countries is considered as a lingua franca. The speakers of English in this circle are said to have developed some emotional attachment to the English language, creating new norms and claiming ownership of English, even though they are largely norm dependent on the inner circle speakers.
3. the Expanding Circle, which embodies countries such as China, La Cote D’Ivoire, France and Russia. Such countries use English only for international trade and communication purposes. They are traditionally referred to as English as foreign language (EFL) countries.

Schneider (2003, pp. 243-256) has examined the processes through which postcolonial Englishes develop, namely:

1. Foundation: a transplantation stage where, through colonial expansion, trade, military outposts and missionary activities, English speakers settle in the new country, where contact situations occur, local languages are predominantly used, and “toponymic borrowing” occurs and “cross-cultural communication is achieved by just a limited few” (Schneider, 2003, p. 244, 255).
2. Exonormative stabilisation: a stage whereas a “stable colonial status”, English gains some prominence through colloquialism at individual levels. British English is considered the norm but with some borrowings of local terms and vocabulary. Few bilingual elites are created through education and contact with settlers.
3. Nativisation: Schneider (2003, p. 247) considers this phase as “the most important, the most vibrant one, the central phase of both cultural and linguistic transformation”. It is the stage at which the country gains political independence from the colonial master. There are “widespread and regular contacts” leading to accommodation and stabilisation of English, characterised by “heavy lexical borrowing”, but the external norm is heavily depended on (Schneider, 2003, p. 255).
4. Endonormative stabilisation: this is a post-independence stage “marked by the gradual adoption and acceptance of an indigenous linguistic [English] norm, supported by a new, locally rooted linguistic self-confidence” (p. 249). In other words, a local variety of English is developed, accepted and used to express indigenous culture, with a strong emotional attachment to the local variety.
5. Differentiation: At this stage of development, a new nation is born, “the emergence of a new variety of English trails off”, and the country achieves political, cultural and linguistic independence, having warded off all external domination and influence and become self-reliant, where a “stable young nation” is born, “with no need to be compared to others. As a reflection of this new identity, a new language variety has emerged” (p.253, 255).

Kachru’s (1992) and Schneider’s (2003) frameworks provide a sense of the nature, state and essential properties of Ghanaian English, presenting a strong justification for comparing

features of British and Ghanaian English. There is some consensus that “English, as used in Ghana, is characterised by the persistence of peculiar forms and usage that can be found at all levels” (Gyasi, 1990, p. 27). Ghanaian English is now said to fall “between the Nativisation Phase and the Endonormative Stabilization Phase” (Huber, 2012, p. 218), where the acceptance of Ghanaian English as being distinctive is under serious consideration.

Ghanaian English

Writings from scholars such as Brown and Scragg (1948), Criper (1971), Sey (1973), Gyasi (1990) and Ahulu (1994) sparked scholarly debates about whether or not there was/is a distinctive variety of Ghanaian English. In fact, Sey (1973, p.9) spoke against discovering and popularising an all-purpose Ghanaian variety of English. Since then, attention has been devoted to trying to describe, define and accept Ghanaian English as a distinctive variety of English. Ghanaian English has gone from being described as a deviant variety with “inter-language difficulties or deviant language usage, deficiencies and fossilised errors” (Ngula & Nartey, 2014, p. 87), that is a negative attitude (see Ahulu, 1994; Gyasi, 1990; Sey, 1973; Tingley, 1981), to being considered as a nativised variety, a positive attitude (Anderson, 2009; Dako, 2001, 2002; Dolphyne, 1997; Owusu-Ansah, 1992, 1997), with distinctive features (Adika, 2012; Bobda, 2000; Huber & Dako, 2008; Koranteng, 2006). According to Koranteng (2006, p.1),

the model of English taught, learnt, and used in all teaching and learning situations in Ghana is not RP [Received Pronunciation], but a form one might readily describe as Ghanaian English, though there is yet no official recognition of any such model because it is not codified.

Whereas it is agreed that the English spoken in Ghana has some distinctiveness that characterises it and, therefore, could be called Ghanaian English (GhE), the level of acceptance and recognition of such a label has been low. As Anderson (2009, p.28) states:

[a]lthough attitudes to studies on variation in the English language spoken in Ghana are changing, we cannot say that “Ghanaian English” is a recognised

variety of English in Ghana or that it has been pushed to its rightful place among the “New Englishes” that are used all over the world.

Ngula and Nartey (2014, p. 80) reiterate this point; thus, “one of the major obstacles of GhE is its lack of proper recognition and acceptance in the country”. There is now some conscious attempt to drive home the need to recognise Ghanaian English as such, codify it and develop its standards for different functionalities in the Ghanaian socio-political space.

Thus, attempts have been made to study aspects of Ghanaian English over the years. These include pronunciation (Adjaye, 1987; Bobda, 2000; Huber, 2004; Koranteng, 2006; Ofori, Duah & Mintah, 2014); morphology and syntax, including the use of articles, prepositions, mass nouns, adjectives, relative pronouns and issues of concord (Brown & Scragg, 1948; Huber & Dako, 2008; Sey, 1973; Tingley, 1981); and vocabulary (Ngula, 2014). Criper (cited in Anderson, 2009, p.25) looked at and classified the variety of English spoken in Ghana based on “context, lexis, phonology and phonetics and comes up with four classes, namely: higher educated variety, middle educated variety, lower educated variety and a final variety she labels as ‘sub’”. In fact, today, some have called for the development of Ghanaian English corpora which can form the basis for studying the various aspects of Ghanaian English on a larger scale since “large-scale corpus projects can serve a good starting point towards enhanced linguistic descriptions into GhE for its proper recognition as a variety of English within Kachru’s (1986) *Outer Circle* of World Englishes” (Ngula & Nartey, 2014, p.80). This is necessary since, as Ngula and Nartey argue, GhE suffers from the problem of recognition because the features of GhE studied by various scholars lack sufficient representativeness because of the use of small datasets.

Perhaps, one way to look at the issue of representativeness of datasets is to consider corpora from specific domains of use, such as parliamentary discourse, which is what this paper does. Also, comparing English language use in similar domains of use within Inner Circle and Outer Circle contexts will help throw some light on the distinctiveness of GhE. This paper compares the use of adverbs and adjectives as intensifiers in about 616,000-word corpus of

Ghanaian parliamentary debates² with about one-million-word corpus of UK parliamentary debates (see section 4). It, thus, contributes to the debate about whether there is some “Ghanaian-ness” (Dolphyne, 1997, p.6) in the English spoken in Ghana and for which reason it could be recognised as Ghanaian English.

Adverbial and adjectival intensification

According to Lorenz (2002, p.144), “[i]ntensification is a lexico-grammatical category that is mainly employed to achieve expressivity”. It is a kind of grading, a cline, that indicates degrees (e.g., attenuation, medium and high intensification) of attributes or qualities of people, things or entities (Downing & Locke, 2006). It communicates speaker involvement and signals the extent to which the speaker is committed to his/her statement about people, objects and events, including the qualities attached to them (Lorenz, 1999). Intensification can be achieved through lexical items such as adverbs and adjectives, which are the focus of this study.

Intensifying adverbs

Adverbs modify verbs, adjectives, other adverbs, prepositional phrases and noun phrases, and they can function as adverbials in sentences or clauses (Downing & Locke, 2006, p. 503; Greenbaum, 1996, p. 615; Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973, pp. 125-132). Adverbs can be classified in several ways: formally/structurally, position in the clause and semantically. While such classifications appear straightforward, they can be quite complex. Depending on their interest and focus, scholars have categorised adverbs differently, including the following.

Semantically, Downing and Lock (2006, pp.505-507) categorise adverbs into stance (e.g. *certainly, definitely, actually*), degree or focus (including intensification, e.g. *quite, pretty*; attenuation, e.g. *kind of*) and focusing adverbs (e.g. *merely, just, hardly, only*), among others.

Quirk and Greenbaum (1973, p. 207; see also Greenbaum 1996, pp. 146-152) functionally/semantically classify adverbs into adjuncts (which are integral parts of clauses), disjuncts (which are usually attitudinal and “provide comments on the units in which they

² We do not review literature on parliamentary debates, because parliamentary debates are used in the study only as a source of data. Our focus is to fill a gap in Ghanaian English and adverbial and adjectival intensification, and not in parliamentary debate studies.

stand” (Greenbaum, 1996, p. 146) and conjuncts (which have connective functions). Adjuncts are further classified into viewpoint, focusing, process, subject, place, intensifiers, etc. Intensifiers indicate a place on an intensity scale which may be high or low (Greenbaum, 1996; Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973). Intensifiers are grouped into:

1. Emphasisers, which “have a general heightening effect” (e.g., *definitely, certainly, actually, clearly, indeed, plainly, really, surely, frankly, honestly*).
2. Amplifiers, which “scale upwards from an assumed norm”; they are divided into maximisers – indicate upper extreme end of the scale (e.g., *completely, absolutely, entirely, fully, quite, thoroughly, utterly*), and boosters – indicate a high point on the scale (e.g. *very much, deeply, heartily, violently, well, a great deal*).
3. Downtoners, with “a lowering effect, usually scaling downwards from an assumed norm”; and can be grouped into compromisers – with a slight lowering effect (*kind of, sort of, quite, rather, more or less*); diminishers (e.g. *partly, slightly, somewhat, to some extent, a little*); minimisers (e.g. *hardly, scarcely, a bit, barely, little, scarcely*) and approximators – express an approximation to the force of the verb (e.g. *almost, nearly, as good as, all but*) (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973, pp.214-219).

Adverbs can also be classified as adverbs of affirmation (e.g., *absolutely, certainly*), doubts (e.g., *roughly, apparently*), strong intensifying (e.g., *exceedingly, extremely*), weak intensifying (e.g., *barely, slightly*) and negation/minimisers (e.g., *hardly*) (Benamara, Cesarano, Picariello, Recupero & Subrahmanian, 2007, p. 2). The foregoing demonstrates the complexity of classifying adverbs.

The use of adverbs has been studied variously, especially among ESL learners and speakers in comparison with native speakers, including the misuse, overuse, and underuse of connective adverbs and positioning (Bolton, Nelson & Hung, 2003; Milton & Tsang, 1993; Rutledge & Fitton, 2015). Intensifiers are said to be a feature of spoken and conversational discourse, including amplifiers such as *highly* and emphatics such as *exact* and *total* (Hinkel, 2005, p. 30). Hinkel (2005, p. 34) states that intensification and amplification are a marked feature of L2 writing and that compared to L1 academic writing, for example, L2 academic essays contain “a prevalence of conversational intensifiers and overstatements that are

ubiquitous in informal speech but are rare in formal written prose” (p. 29). Lorenz (cited in Hinkel, 2005, p. 34) attributes the over-use of intensifiers by L2 writers to cross-cultural functions of hyperboles and “over-zealousness” and an attempt to emphasise the importance of their claims to impress, which can be damaging, however, as it makes them sound unnatural in their communication.

In the Ghanaian context, few studies on adverb usage can be found, two of which are Gogovi (1997) and Quansah and Tetteh (2017). The latter study the placement of adverbs and adverbial clauses in junior high school students’ writing and conclude that the students place adverbs correctly in sentences. Gogovi’s (1997) work is more relevant to the current study. He studies the knowledge levels of adverb-verb collocative restrictions among post-diploma students at the University College of Education, Winneba, Ghana. Using an elicitation method, he asked the students to complete the following four “structures adapted from GCE (Quirk et al. 1972:448)”, namely:

1. They greatly ...
2. I badly ...
3. I entirely ...
4. My friend completely ...

These are intensifying adverbs. Gogovi finds that students’ knowledge of adverb-verb restriction is far below the competence level expected of the students, as they mostly filled the slots with incorrect verbs. He concludes that “there appears enough evidence that our post-diploma students’ grasp of Intensifier + Verb collocation is weak” (p.51). Even though the study appears dated (20 years old), it gives us some knowledge about and exemplifies the use of adverbial intensifiers among students in Ghana.

Intensifying adjectives

Adjectives typically modify nouns to indicate qualities or characteristics of those nouns (Greenbaum, 1996, p.134). The majority of adjectives are gradable and can be used to compare two (using comparative forms – e.g., *larger*) or more things (using superlative forms – e.g., *largest*) (Greenbaum, 1996, p. 140). Said to be the most intensified words in language (Bäcklund, 1973), adjectives “have a heightening or lowering effect on the nouns they modify” (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973, p. 121). They act as emphasisers, which have a general heightening effect (e.g., *certain*, *outright*, *real*, *pure*), and amplifiers, which “scale upwards

from an assumed norm, denoting the upper extreme of the scale or a high point on the scale” (e.g., *complete, strong, great, entire*) (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973, p.121). Limiter adjectives also particularise the references of the nouns they modify (e.g., *only, main, precise*).

Biber, Johnsson, Leech, and Finegan (1999, pp.508-509) semantically classify adjectives into two: descriptors (denoting such features as colour, size, weight, emotions, and evaluation) and classifiers (which delimit or restrict a noun’s referent – including relational/classificational/ restrictive, affiliative, topical). The following are the relevant ones for our purpose in this paper.

Descriptors (these are usually gradable and, therefore, have intensification functions):

(i) Size/quantity/extent: denoting size, weight, extent: *big, deep, heavy, huge, long, large, little*;
(ii) Time: denoting chronology, age, frequency: *annual, daily, early, late, new, old, recent, young*;
(iii) Evaluative/emotive: denoting judgements, affect, emphasis: *bad, beautiful, best, fine, good, great, lovely, poor*;
(iv) Miscellaneous *descriptive*: *appropriate, cold, complex, dead, empty, free, hard, hot, positive, etc.*

Classifiers (which are typically non-gradable) and include relational/classificational/ restrictive adjectives, which delimit the referent of a noun, particularly in relation to other referents, for example, *additional, average, chief; complete, different, direct, entire, external, final, general, internal, left, maximum, necessary, etc.*

The use of adjective intensification between native and non-native speakers of English has been studied in diverse ways. Dunn (2009, p.1) has found that native speakers use “more precise, contextually specific evaluative adjectives such as *crappy, retarded*” than their non-native counterparts who use “more generic adjectives such as *happy, nice*”. Dunn (2009, p.1) states that:

The generalized nature of these adjectives, as well as the smaller number of lexemes at the non-native speakers’ disposal, may account for the increased rate of intensification shown by the non-native speakers. Specifically, the depth and complexity of meaning required for conversational interaction is more often handled by native speakers via a variety of specialized adjectives, while non-native speakers must rely more on adjective intensification in order to convey subtle differences in meaning.

This statement is significant since both adverbial and adjectival intensification in the current study show similar trends. Hyland and Milton (1997, p. 183) have indicated that L2 writers rely “on a more limited range of items, offering stronger commitments, and exhibiting greater problems in conveying a precise degree of certainty”.

The foregoing indicates the heterogeneity of adverbs and adjectives, making their uses and classification quite complex. Describing and comparing their uses in different contexts, especially between native and non-native speakers, can be challenging. Thus, this paper offers further evidence of the ostensible differences in the use of intensifying adverbs and adjectives between native and non-native (especially ESL) speakers of English. Most of the studies on intensification between native and non-native varieties have been based on learner corpora (e.g., Gogovi, 1997; Hinkel, 2003; Hyland & Milton, 1997; Lorenz, 1999; Milton & Tsang, 1993; Pérez-Parades & Díez-Bedmar, 2012; Rutledge & Fitton, 2015) and in academic writing (e.g., Heidler, 2011; Hinkel, 2005; Ngula, 2015). Comparative studies of adverbial and adjectival use between native and non-native speakers have hardly considered other institutional contexts, such as the court and parliamentary interactions, which makes this study significant.

Using parliamentary data to examine similarities and differences in the use of English between British and Ghanaian English is highly significant. This is because ever since the introduction of English as an official language in the law courts and parliament in the middle of the 14 Century in Britain (around 1362) (Davis, 2010, p.24-25; Fisher, 1992, p.1169), one of the bases for labelling one (variety of) English as official or standard is its use in parliamentary business, among other institutionalised settings such as schools, law courts and the church (see Greenbaum, 1996, pp.5-6, 14). Thus, if the standards of Ghanaian English have to be codified, the variety of English spoken in the Ghanaian Parliament will be one of the standard varieties. The Ghanaian parliamentary variety would be considered “an educated variety” (Kachru, 1992, p.4), even though there are some Ghanaian MPs whose English language proficiency levels have been questioned in recent times as they are unable to sufficiently express themselves in English (Gyamfi, 2014; Ibrahim, 2017). Intensification contains an “emotional involvement of the speaker” (Beltrama, 2014, p. 29), and arguably, there is no institutional interaction that involves emotions more than parliamentary debates because of the argumentation and

contestation of policy positions between government and opposition MPs. Thus, another good reason for studying intensification in parliamentary debates is their emotional nature. Yet, intensification in parliamentary debates has hardly been studied at the level of comparing native and non-native varieties of English.

Data and method

This paper is based on about one million word corpus of the UK Queen’s address debates (UK QADs – obtained from the UK Parliament website: www.parliament.uk) and about 616,000-word corpus of Ghanaian State of the Nation Address debate (GH SONADs – obtained from the Hansards department of the Ghanaian parliament). The datasets were Hansards of the debates covering different governmental administrations, as indicated in Table 1. The UK QADs are House of Commons debates on the Queen’s Speech³, which outlines the government’s legislative agenda and proposes policies for the coming parliamentary session (Priddy, 2014). The GH SONADs, on the other hand, are debates on the Ghanaian State of the Nation Address, an address delivered by the president of the Republic of Ghana in accordance with Article 67 of the Ghanaian constitution, which enjoins the president “to deliver to parliament a message on the state of the nation” at the beginning of each parliamentary session and before a dissolution of Parliament. After the president has delivered the address, Parliament debates its content in terms of whether or not the address reflects the state of the nation and to thank the president for the address. It is the Hansards of the debates of 2005, 2006, 2008 (from the J.A. Kufour administration) and 2009 to 2013 and 2015 (from the J.E.A. Mills/John Mahama administration) that form the dataset for the GH SONADs for this study (see Table 1). The Hansards were in their soft copy form. They were cleaned to remove all unwanted texts, such as headers and time. They were then processed into text documents (without grammatical tagging or annotation⁴) for the use of the *Wordsmith Tools*. Each text was identified by its date.

³ The Queen’s Speech is written by the government but delivered by the Queen to mark the formal beginning of the parliamentary year.

⁴ Tagging or annotation is the process of marking up words in a corpus and indicating their parts of speech or grammatical category.

Table 1: UK QADs and GH SONADs corpus sizes

UK QADs			
Blair 2006	Brown 2009	Cameron 2013	Total word count
347,000	338,000	327,000	1,012,000
GH SONADs			
Kufuor	Mills/Mahama		
152,000	464,000	616,000

The difference between the datasets of Kufuor’s (25%) and Mills/Mahama’s administrations (75%) arises from the fact that they were the only available data. It does not, however, affect the analysis because I do not compare and contrast the two administrations. Since the UK QADs data and the GH SONADs data are of different sizes, we normalise the frequencies of the intensifying adverbs and adjectives to a common base of 1,000 (see Tables 2, 3 and 4) to make them comparable (see McEnery, Xiao & Tono, 2006, p.52-53). Thus, the difference between the UK QADs and GH SONADs does not affect the analysis negatively.

The study employs a corpus approach in its analysis, using keyword analysis through *Wordsmith Tools* (Scott, 2012). A keyword analysis identifies words that occur with unusual frequency in a given text compared to a reference corpus (Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008; Scott, 1997). Keyword analyses are useful in identifying salient language differences and lexical differences between texts (Baker, 2006). This means that *Wordsmith* allows for comparing the frequencies of one wordlist with another. For example, assuming that we have texts (wordlists) A and B, we can use *Wordsmith* to compare text A against text B to identify which words are more statistically frequent in text A and vice-versa. *Wordsmith* can calculate the keyness value of each word in the two corpora.

The study makes use of two reference corpora – the British National Corpus (BNC) and the International Corpus of English (ICE)-Ghana (a component of ICE relating to Ghanaian English, ICE-GHA for short). These corpora serve as the standard for calculating and

measuring keywords in the study corpora – the UK QADs and the GH SONADs. The BNC is a 100-million-word corpus of written and spoken British English extracted from newspapers, academic books, popular fiction, and conversations from formal business or government meetings, informal social gatherings, and radio talk shows. Created as part of the ICE project, ICE-GHA is a corpus of written and spoken Ghanaian English of about one-million words. The study compares the UK QADs corpus with the BNC, while it compares the GH SONADs corpus with the ICE-GHA corpus to identify the keywords in each study corpus. For instance, Figure 1 below represents the first 20 keywords in the GH SONADs compared to the ICE-GHA corpus (note that I have used only the GH SONADs for illustration to save space). The first column (N) represents the keywords in order of strength, whereas the second column lists words. The third column represents the frequency of each keyword as it appeared in the GH SONADs. The fourth column indicates the percentage of each keyword over the total number of words in the GH SONADs. Columns six and seven show the frequencies and percentages of the keywords in the reference corpus (RC). The percentages give a more accurate comparison than the raw frequencies. Column eight represents the keyness value of each word in the GH SONADs: the higher the value, the stronger the keyness of the word.

N	Key word	Freq.	%	Texts	RC. Freq.	RC. %	Keyness	P Lemmas Set
1	SPEAKER	11,970	1.91	37	127		39,635.33	0.0000000000
2	THE	39,531	6.31	37	47,872	1.70	34,742.74	0.0000000000
3	MR	11,019	1.76	37	399	0.01	34,421.60	0.0000000000
4	THAT	15,886	2.54	37	11,505	0.41	21,741.85	0.0000000000
5	TO	19,372	3.09	37	22,986	0.82	17,126.46	0.0000000000
6	HON	4,616	0.74	37	22		15,493.65	0.0000000000
7	IS	13,432	2.14	37	12,333	0.44	15,221.61	0.0000000000
8	PRESIDENT	4,957	0.79	37	370	0.01	14,391.18	0.0000000000
9	OF	16,482	2.63	37	22,207	0.79	12,495.82	0.0000000000
10	MADAM	3,802	0.61	24	154		11,740.02	0.0000000000
11	THIS	6,798	1.09	37	4,840	0.17	9,358.15	0.0000000000
12	AND	14,177	2.26	37	21,464	0.76	9,155.55	0.0000000000
13	WE	7,037	1.12	37	5,498	0.20	9,053.42	0.0000000000
14	HE	6,096	0.97	37	4,348	0.15	8,377.20	0.0000000000
15	NOT	6,084	0.97	37	4,626	0.16	7,983.31	0.0000000000
16	COL	2,133	0.34	37	4		7,220.88	0.0000000000
17	IN	9,926	1.58	37	14,075	0.50	6,998.01	0.0000000000
18	MEMBER	2,291	0.37	37	138		6,812.71	0.0000000000
19	IT	7,185	1.15	37	8,623	0.31	6,208.73	0.0000000000
20	ON	5,183	0.83	37	5,076	0.18	5,507.62	0.0000000000

Figure 1: First 20 keywords in the GH SONADs

The last column gives the p-value of each keyword, which is set at 0.00000, indicating that the probability that the keyness of a word is due to chance is zero. This denotes that “the keyness value gives a more gradable account of the strength of each [given] word” (Baker, 2006, p.3). This study examines adverbs and adjectives of intensification that appeared in the first 500, that is, the first five (5) per cent, keywords in each of the UK QADs and the GH SONADs. It includes adverbs such as *particularly*, *clearly*, *simply*, *absolutely*, *extremely*, and adjectives such as *greater*, *huge*, *massive*, *good*, *clear* and *large*.

Analysis and discussion

This section analyses and discusses the use of adverbs and adjectives as intensifiers in parliamentary debates. In parliamentary debates, MPs discuss and evaluate government policies; they make truth and value judgements and express their commitments towards such judgements. They take and defend their positions against possible positions from their opponents. To strongly make their arguments and judgements sound convincing, MPs use intensification. Thus, the analysis of adverbial and adjectival intensification is based on the assumption that MPs use adverbs and adjectives to intensify their viewpoints.

Adverbial intensification

As noted earlier, adverbs perform various functions, such as modifying verbs, adjectives, and other adverbs (Downing & Locke, 2006; Greenbaum, 1996; Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973). Consider the following examples (1-3), where *extremely* modifies ‘concerned’, *absolutely* modifies ‘fair’ and *entirely* modifies ‘new’:

- (1) My constituents are *extremely* concerned about its £34 million debt.
[16/11/06:Col.223]⁵
- (2) [...] we need to be *absolutely* fair and deal with people in a proper and timely manner
[09/05/13:Col.217]
- (3) What Britain needs is an *entirely* new fiscal regime, with an independent office...
[26/11/09:Col.708]

⁵ This is the file name that identifies the date of the debate and the column at which it appears in the Hansards.

The adverb *extremely* marks and amplifies the constituents' concern while *absolutely* amplifies fairness in dealing with the people and *entirely* intensifies "new" – they indicate the certainty of the MPs' assertions (see Biber et al., 1999). The assumption is that to intensify/emphasise their views, during debates, about government policies and their effectiveness, MPs use evaluative/intensifying adverbs/adverbials. MPs use these adverbs to either positively or negatively express their personal views and to indicate that the situations in which people find themselves are beyond the ordinary. According to Lorenz (1999, p. 24), "intensification expresses an 'interpersonal' message in what might otherwise be taken to be a purely 'ideational' statement. It signals personal commitment as well as truth and value judgements". Such judgements form a continuum. For example, when David Cameron, the opposition leader, says that the Gracious Speech offers *absolutely nothing* to young people (Hansards: UK 8 May 13/col. 14) or when an MP says people are *absolutely frustrated* (see Table 2), it "denote[s] the upper extreme of the scale" of non-opportunities for young people or frustration (Pérez-Parades & Díez-Bedmar, 2012, p.106). In that way, there is an attempt by the MPs to impress, persuade and generally influence the people's reception of their arguments (Pérez-Parades & Díez-Bedmar, 2012), as it portrays them as being empathetic to the people. Showing empathy with people is important because both the UK Queen's Address debates (UK QADs) and the Ghanaian State of the Nation Address debates (GH SONADs) largely concentrate on the people's concerns. In other words, the parliamentary debates are about people (Sarfo-Kantankah, 2018, in press).

A keyword analysis of the GH SONADs and UK QADs indicates that whereas the UK MPs use a wider variety of adverbs than their Ghanaian counterparts, the Ghanaian MPs have a higher concentration of use of intensifying adverbs. While the UK MPs have an average of 0.20 adverbs per 1000 words, the Ghanaian MPs have an average of 0.92/1000 words, a phenomenon which may mean that the Ghanaian MPs compensate for their seeming lack of variety of adverbs by intensifying more frequently (see Dunn, 2009). The higher concentration of adverbs in the GH SONADs may also reflect Hyland and Milton's (1997, p. 183) view that L2 writers rely "on a more limited range of items" of intensification. There were 12 and five (5) of such adverbs among the first five per cent (that is, first 500) keywords in the UK QADs and the GH SONADs, respectively. Tables 2 and 3 represent the adverbs in order of magnitude.

Note that the adverbs considered here (including the adjectives discussed later) are those that occurred in the top five per cent (that is, the first 500 keywords).

Table 2: Intensifying and stance adverbs in the UK QADs

Adverb	/1000 (Freq.)	Frequency in			Example
		words	QADs	BNC	
Intensifiers					
<i>Particularly</i>	(421)	0.41	0.04	0.02	These subjects are <i>particularly</i> important as we approach the Copenhagen summit. [24/11/09:Col.479]
<i>Simply</i>	(358)	0.35	0.03	0.02	What the British people <i>simply</i> want is sound, competent government... [23/11/06:Col.726]
<i>Absolutely</i>	(303)	0.30	0.03	-	That is what people face, and they are <i>absolutely</i> frustrated. [24/11/09:Col.460]
<i>Certainly</i>	(290)	0.29	0.03	-	It is important to note that that almost <i>certainly</i> represents a degree of support for what I would call soft sharia. [15/11/06:Col.116]
<i>Extremely</i>	(173)	0.17	0.02	-	... <i>nearly</i> 50% of people were <i>extremely</i> concerned about their ability to make ends meet... [14/05/13:Col.577]
<i>Entirely</i>	(140)	0.14	0.01	-	That is <i>entirely</i> understandable and a civilised reflex. [23/11/09:Col.312]
<i>Surely</i>	(129)	0.13	0.01	-	<i>Surely</i> the people of this country deserve that... [23/11/09:Col.324]
<i>Nearly</i>	(121)	0.12	0.01	-	... <i>nearly</i> 50% of people were extremely concerned about their ability to make ends meet... [14/05/13:Col.577]

<i>Desperately</i>	(67)	0.07	-	-	...create apprenticeships for young people who <i>desperately</i> want a future... [15/05/13:Col.728]
<i>Hugely</i>	(44)	0.06	-	-	Interest rates are very low, and that is <i>hugely</i> important for people with mortgages and businesses borrowing. [08/05/13:Col.80] Stance
<i>Rightly</i>	(113)	0.13	0.01	-	... we have an increasingly demoralised NHS work force—people who were, <i>rightly</i> , encouraged by the Government to train for and to join the NHS. [16/11/06: Col.185]

Table 3: Intensifying adverbs in the GH SONADs

Adverb (Freq.)	/1000 words	Frequency in SONADs ICE			Example
<i>Very</i>	(1,668)	2.67	0.27	0.06	It makes things <i>very</i> expensive and people just cannot afford to purchase things from the market. [01/03/12:Col.1985]
<i>Today</i>	(487)	0.79	0.08	0.01	<i>Today</i> the people of Gusheigu are now sleeping freely... [01/03/11/Col.1774]
<i>Indeed</i>	(381)	0.61	0.06	-	Mr Speaker, <i>indeed</i> , poverty alleviation requires the infusion of resources not only to broad sectors but [...] [02/03/10:Col.1466]
<i>Clearly</i>	(173)	0.30	0.03	-	Today, we have four, <i>clearly</i> indicating that the people in this country are getting better each day... [21/02/12/Col.1154]
<i>Particularly</i>	(117)	0.23	0.02	-	that will help give access to resources to people in this sector, <i>particularly</i> of the small-scale farmers, women processors...[08/02/05:Col.362]

In the UK QADs, 10 of the adverbs (*particularly, simply, absolutely, certainly, extremely, entirely, surely, nearly, desperately, hugely*) are emphatic adverbs (see Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973, pp.214-219) and one (*rightly*) is a stance adverb, which indicates speaker attitude (Finegan, 2010, p.74; Biber & Finegan, 1988, p.1). Emphatic adverbs are “adverbs that merely add emphasis to some aspect of content but do not otherwise add content itself” (Finegan, 2010, pp.73-74). They mark definite conviction. For example, that the “people were *extremely* concerned” means the MP is clearly convinced that the people were concerned, or that “the British people *simply* want sound, competent government” indicates that the MP knows/believes beyond doubt what exactly the people want (Table 2). All the five (5) in the GH SONADs were emphatics (*very, today, indeed, clearly, particularly*). For example, *indeed* emphasises the claim that “poverty alleviation requires infusion of resources” while *clearly* emphasises the indication that people are getting better (Table 3). It must be recognised that the lack of a wide range of adverbs does not mean that the Ghanaian MPs cannot communicate well in English, for Schmitt (2010, p. 7) suggests that “second language learners do not need to achieve native-like vocabulary sizes in order to use English well”.

It must be acknowledged that the classification of adverbs can be quite problematic, as they can perform different communicative functions in different contexts. For instance, Biber and Finegan (1988, pp.33-34) categorise *simply, certainly* and *surely* as stance adverbs. Biber and Finegan (1988, p.26) state that some stance adverbs, what they call *actually*-adverbials (e.g. *actually, really*), perform “general emphatic stance”. They think that “[a]lthough at first sight *surely*-adverbials [including *surely, certainly, clearly*] appear to mark emphatic conviction, that is not their primary function” (Biber & Finegan, 1988, p.33). I think that the classification of these adverbs depends largely on the context of their use. Thus, I adopt Finegan’s (2010, pp.73-76) classification since MPs use such adverbs to either validate or deny the efficacy of government policies or the state of people’s concerns, thereby making the emphatic aspect more prominent. The emphatic aspect is more significant in the context of parliamentary debates because, as noted by Long and Christensen (cited in Finegan, 2010, p.76), the use of “intensifiers is associated with losing arguments”, and parliamentary debates are arguments about the right course of action concerning policymaking and implementation. It must be noted that I have not examined all the specific instances of the use of these adverbs in the debates,

and, therefore, the frequencies provided are only indicative. These adverbs are comparatively more frequent in the UK QADs than in the BNC. A similar trend is found between the GH SONADs and the ICE-GHA data. This points to the noteworthiness of their use in parliamentary debates.

Apart from containing a wider variety of adverbs, the UK data show higher intensification/amplification and more complex, multisyllabic adverbs than the Ghanaian ones. It indicates a greater lexical complexity and demonstrates the desire of the UK MPs to rhetorically “exploit hyperbole” or exaggeration (Partington, cited in Pérez-Parades & Díez-Bedmar, 2012, p.105) and show strong emotional attachment to their expositions: “the importance and personal involvement they assign to value judgements and their own propositions” (Lorenz, 1999, p.24). The relatively infrequent use of complex intensifying adverbs among the Ghanaian MPs could be a second language limitation, as the use of “intensifying adverbs” is said to be problematic for learners of English”: while “elementary forms such as *quite*, *very* and *really* are over-used, ... their corresponding lexical adverbs (such as *highly*, *closely* and *deeply*) are relatively rare in learner data” (Philip, 2008, p.1302). Although the GH SONADs corpus is not a learner corpus, Philip’s statement offers us relevant information about non-native varieties of English generally, making the statement significant for our discussion, especially when our findings follow a similar trend. The rate of occurrence of *quite*, *very*, *really* and *highly*, *closely*, *deeply* in the GH SONADs clearly corroborates Philip’s assertion (note that apart from *very*, these adverbs are not given in the above tables because they did not appear in the first five per cent keywords):

Elementary adverbs

quite – 72; 0.16/1000 words
really – 192; 0.31/1000 words
very – 1668; 2.67/1000 words

Lexical adverbs

highly – 38; 0.10/1000 words
closely – 07; 0.05/1000 words
deeply – 04; 0.08/1000 words

It is clear from the figures that elementary adverbs occur more frequently than lexical ones, as posited by Philip (2008). *Very* is the most frequent adverb (see Table 3) among all the intensifying adverbs in both the UK and Ghanaian datasets, registering 2.67/1000 words in the Ghanaian data. In the UK data, the frequency of *very* is 1.50/1000 words, even though it does

hyperbole for emotional effect. Exploiting hyperbole can, therefore, be said to be a parliamentary discourse feature, which allows MPs to appeal to people's emotions.

According to Long and Christensen (cited in Finegan, 2010, pp.76-77): "if isolated from other forms of powerless speech, or if used in simultaneous comparison with a phrase omitting the intensifier, [intensifiers] actually do what intensifiers seem meant to do—they intensify". What makes the intensifying adverbs significantly emphatic in their use in the Ghanaian and UK parliamentary debates is the fact that MPs almost always do compare and contrast, as they either validate or deny the efficacy of government policies in meeting people's needs. Finegan (2010, p.76) states that, in judges' judicial briefs, another adversarial setting, "decisions that were not unanimous prompted high rates of intensifiers". Similarly, as government and opposition MPs share differing views during debates, they are more likely to deploy intensifying adverbs to emphasise their views, leading to "exaggerating the actual state of affairs, reinforcing the truth value of the proposition, or emphasising a part of or the entirety of a claim" (Hinkel, 2005, p.30). On an attenuated-medium-high intensification scale (Downing & Locke, 2006, p.488), the above-mentioned adverbs are "high", occupying the upper-extreme end of the scale. Thus, we can say that the prominent use of intensifying adverbs points to the nature of parliamentary debates as one-upmanship, with high levels of adversariality, as Miliband demonstrates:

The Conservatives cannot *simply* keep going round promising things that they do not have a clue how they are going to pay for... They have *absolutely* no idea how they are going to pay for that policy [...]

(UK Hansard: 24 Nov 09/Col 414)

Miliband's assertion that the Conservatives have "absolutely no idea" indicates that he has complete conviction. The use of intensifiers is significant in the sense that "particular language choices influence a story and presumably the perception of facts behind the story" (Finegan, 2010, p.77). When MPs use emphatics, they demonstrate that their information and assessments are without dispute. Apart from adverbs, MPs deploy adjectives for intensification purposes, as discussed below.

Adjectival intensification

Adjectives are associated with subjectivity (Beltrama, 2017), and intensification involves a judgement by the speaker (Wouden & Foolen, 2017). MPs also use adjectives for judgement and emphasis (Biber et al., 1999). Adjectives that appeared in the top five percent of the keywords include UK: *great, clear, real, little, difficult* (Table 4); GH: *good, more, only, better* (Table 5). I have classified them according to complex, comparative and base forms and in order of magnitude within each category. Surprisingly, there were no superlative forms among the first five per cent of the keywords.

Table 4: Intensifying adjectives in the UK QADs

Adj.	(Freq.)	/1000 words	Frequency in QADs	BNC	Example
Complex forms					
<i>Difficult</i>	(365)	0.36	0.04	0.01	...it is <i>difficult</i> for young people to get a foot on the housing ladder. [16/11/06:Col.179]
<i>Likely</i>	(173)	0.17	0.02	-	The borrowing forecast in the previous Budget was £175 billion- 12.5 per cent of GDP. That is now <i>likely</i> to go up to £200 billion and beyond. [26/11/09:Col.740]
<i>Minimum</i>	(155)	0.17	0.02	-	... people on the <i>minimum</i> wage are paying half the income tax that they paid before... [10/05/13:Col.262]
<i>Excellent</i>	(150)	0.15	0.01	-	It has an <i>excellent</i> record of getting people off drugs and turning their lives around... [25/11/09:Col.633]
<i>Essential</i>	130)	0.13	0.01	-	For many people, it is <i>essential</i> if they are to have a full life... [13/05/13:Col.418]

Massive (127) 0.12 0.01 - There are *massive* movements of people in terms of both the qualitative make-up of...
[27/11/06:Col.875]

Considerable (89) 0.09 - - ... which could also save the *considerable* costs of people being in hospital. [13/05/13:Col.403]

Terrible (61) 0.06 - - ...I welcome that Bill, if it will give some comfort to those people who suffer from that terrible disease. [19/11/09:Col.214]

Comparative

Less (363) 0.36 0.04 0.01 ... *less* older people receiving the support they need. [13/05/13:Col.419]

Greater (308) 0.30 0.03 - This Bill aims to give people much *greater* control over the services that ... help them.
[09/05/13:Col.169]

Larger (233) 0.23 0.02 - As transport has improved, *larger* numbers people are choosing to live in my constituency but work in London. [20/11/06:Col.357]

Worse (166) 0.16 0.02 - People will be *worse* off under this Government in 2015. [14/05/13:Col.561]

Wider (120) 0.12 0.01 - The issue of housing is important ... because of its *wider* effect on people. [18/11/09:Col.92]

Base/positive forms

Great (657) 0.64 0.06 0.01 It is doing *great* things to train young people...
[10/05/13:Col.297]

Clear (572) 0.56 0.06 0.03 ... it gives people a *clear* understanding of who is responsible for what... [20/11/06:Col.277]

Real (526) 0.52 0.05 0.01 National Energy Action believes that today, 2.8 million people face *real* fuel poverty.
[27/11/06:Col.910]

<i>Little</i>	(390)	0.38	0.04	0.01	Most people have ... <i>little</i> contact with the legal profession. [15/11/06:Col.82]
<i>Small</i>	(344)	0.34	0.03	0.01	There are regulations covering vulnerable persons, but they help only a <i>small</i> number of people. [20/11/06:Col.343]
<i>Huge</i>	(287)	0.28	0.03	-	Elderly and disabled people are facing <i>huge</i> increases in home care charges... [13/05/13:Col.446]
<i>Hard</i>	(284)	0.28	0.03	-	People who work hard for a living were hit with high income taxes... [15/05/13:Col.711]
<i>Large</i>	(236)	0.23	0.02	-	The issues that unite <i>large</i> numbers of people in our society, particularly young... [23/11/09:Col.333]
<i>Extra</i>	(159)	0.16	0.02	-	... these steps will mean that ... an <i>extra</i> 100,000 young people will have benefited. [18/11/09:Col.27]

Table 5: Intensifying adjectives in the GH SONADs

Adj.	(Freq.)	/1000 words	Frequency in SONADs	ICE	Example
Complex forms					
<i>Serious</i>	(185)	0.31	0.03	-	... it is a very <i>serious</i> issue that young people between the ages of 20 and 35 form the vast majority of our people. Their biggest problem is unemployment. [07/03/12:Col.2155]
<i>Particular</i>	(184)	0.31	0.03	-	... it is a fact, because it is meant for a <i>particular</i> group of people... [04/03/10:Col.1679]

Comparative

More (639) 1.02 0.10 0.0 ... they will employ a lot *more* people and the Government would be able to get a lot *more* taxes out of them for development.

[09/02/05:Col.409]

Better (353) 0.56 0.06 - Today, we have four, clearly indicating that the people in this country are getting *better* each day...

[21/02/12:Col.1154]

Base forms

Good (687) 1.10 0.11 0.03 Mr Speaker, they have a bounding duty to the *good* people of this country and to their constituents ... to discharge their ... duties [...]

[27/02/13:Col.1143]

Only (627) 1.00 0.10 0.03 Trades, repairs of vehicles and households which absorb many of the young people also grew at *only* 2 per cent [...] [02/03/12:Col.2095]

High (224) 0.36 0.04 0.01 ... we are faced with the problem of people taking high rent advances which are alien to our law.

[26/02/13:Col.967]

Clear (197) 0.33 0.03 - It is very *clear* to our good people in the North that SADA [Savana Accelerated Development Authority] is seriously anaemic – There is no money... [25/02/11:Col.1713]

Wrong (162) 0.28 0.03 - ... to say that empirically, it was 7.7 per cent, he is totally *wrong* and misleading the good people of this country. [07/03/12:Col.2144]

Once again, the figures in the tables show that UK MPs employ more complex and varied forms of adjectives (e.g., *difficult*, *likely*, *excellent*, *essential*, *massive*, *considerable* and

terrible) than their Ghanaian counterparts, from whom only two complex forms were found (e.g. *serious*, *particular*). This could be attributed to the second language or non-native speakers' "relative lack of adjectives" (Dunn, 2009, p. 29). Dunn (2009, p.1) has said that, generally, "non-native speakers have access to a smaller set of adjectives than native speakers". It could be said, therefore, that the Ghanaian MPs' access to a smaller set of adjectives results in the overuse of such simple adjectives as *good* (occurring 1.10/1000 words), *only* (1.00/1000 words) and *more* (1.02/1000 words), compared with the most frequent adjectives in the UK data, *great*, occurring 0.64/1000 words (see Tables 4 and 5). This may imply a lack of "the subtlety and complexity that comes with a larger vocabulary" (Dunn, 2009, p. 29).

The adjective *good* requires a special mention. It is sometimes used to directly modify *people*, as in *the good people of Ghana/this country*, 41 of which were found in the Ghanaian data but none in the UK data. Government MPs used it 27 (66%) and the opposition 14 (34%) times. It constructs a direct attachment to *people*. It presents the people as virtuous and the fact that MPs hold them in high esteem, justifying the need for governments to "discharge their ... duties" to them (Table 5).

Conclusion

This paper sought to examine the use of adverbial and adjectival intensification in UK and Ghanaian parliamentary discourse to contribute to the debate about differences in features of native and non-native English varieties. The study of adverbial and adjectival intensification was based on the assumption that, in their debates, members of parliament (MPs) evaluate and judge government policies and take positions and arguments to convince their opponents and fellow MPs to accept certain positions relative to other positions. In doing so, MPs use adverbial and adjectival intensification to strengthen their convictions and arguments. MPs validate or deny the effectiveness of government policies. Intensification characterises the emotive nature of parliamentary discourse, where position and opposition MPs try to outmanoeuvre each other. The analysis appears to reiterate the fact that, in discourse, intensifiers function mainly as "exaggeratives and create hyperbole to avoid referring to the actual truth, except to highlight the fact that the described object or number is large or important in the perception of the speaker" (Hinkel, 2005, p. 31). The use of intensifiers

“foregrounds” (Lorenz, 1999, p. 26) the attention MPs attach to their statements. Perhaps, when subjectivity is high, it calls for strong(er) intensification, argument and judgement in order to sound persuasive. However, because of the subjectivity involved in intensification (Wouden & Foolen, 2017), the use of intensifiers allows MPs to be imprecise in their statements and can lead to “a distortion of the truth” (Leech, 1983, p. 148) for political purposes and may reflect the adversarial nature of parliamentary debates (Harris, 2001; Ilie, 2006). This may not be surprising, considering that parliamentary debates are highly emotional, but the significant aspect of the study rests on the variation in terms of the use of intensifying adverbs and adjectives between the UK and Ghanaian MPs. Comparatively, the UK MPs use more complex and varied forms of adverbs and adjectives than the Ghanaian MPs, which could be attributed to Ghanaian MPs’ access to limited sets of adverbs and adjectives. Due to the limited number of adverbs and adjectives available to the Ghanaian MPs, there is a higher frequency of the use of such adverbs and adjectives as *very*, *only*, *good*, *more* and *less*. It implies a high concentration or saturated use of those adverbs and adjectives among the Ghanaian MPs. This suggests that the Ghanaian MPs may lack the intricacies, subtleties and precision of descriptions required for complex interactions such as legislative constructions and discussions as compared with their UK counterparts. However, to the extent that the Ghanaian MPs can use these forms to perform very serious communicative load and functions such as legislation, the use of adverbial and adjectival intensification by the Ghanaian MPs, compared with the UK MPs, should be considered as variational rather than deficient. This has implications for English language teaching and learning in Ghana, the theory of nativisation and the description of Ghanaian English.

References

- Adika, G. S. K. (2012). English in Ghana: Growth, tensions, and trends. *International Journal of Language*, 1(1), 151-166.
- Adjaye, S. A. (1987). *Ghanaian English pronunciation* (PhD Thesis). University of London, UK.
- Adjaye, S. A. (2005). *Ghanaian English pronunciation*. London: Edwin Mellen.

- Ahulu, S. (1994). How Ghanaian is Ghanaian English? *English Today: The International Review of the English Language*, 10(2), 25-29.
- Anderson, J. A. (2009). Codifying Ghanaian English: Problems and prospects. In T. Hoffmann & L. Siebers (Eds.), *World Englishes – Problems, properties and prospects* (pp. 19-36). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Company.
- Bäcklund, U. (1973). *The collocations of adverbs of degree in English*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Uppsaliensis.
- Baker, P. (2006). The question is, how cruel is it? Keywords, foxhunting and the House of Commons. *AHRC ICT Methods Network Expert Seminar on Linguistics*. Retrieved from www.methodsnetwork.ac.uk
- Benamara, F., Cesarano, C., Picariello, A., Reforgiato, D. & Subrahmanian, V.S. (2007). Sentiment analysis: Adjectives and adverbs are better than adjectives alone. In *ICWSM. 2007 ICWSM*, Boulder, CO USA. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.465.1338&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Biber, D. & Finegan, E. (1988). Adverbial stance types in English. *Discourse Processes*, 11(1), 1-34.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (1999). *Grammar of spoken and written English*. England: Pearson Education.
- Beltrama, A. (2014). Bridging the gap: Intensification between social and semantic meaning. Retrieved from <http://home.uchicago.edu/~andremormora/proposal%20BELTRAMA.pdf>
- Beltrama, A. (2017). *Totally* between subjectivity and discourse: Exploring the pragmatic side of intensification (Accepted for publication in *Journal of Semantics*). Retrieved from https://andreabeltrama.files.wordpress.com/2014/12/jos_revised.pdf
- Bobda, S. A. (2000). The uniqueness of Ghanaian English pronunciation in West Africa. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 30(2), 185-198.
- Bolton, K., Nelson, G. & Hung, J. (2003). A corpus-based study of connectors in student writing. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 7(2), 165-182.
- Brown, P. P. & Scragg, J. (1948). *Common errors in Gold Coast English: Their cause and correction*. London: Macmillan.

- Channell, J. (1994). *Vague language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Criper, L. (1971). A classification of types of English in Ghana. *Journal of African Languages*, 10, 6-17.
- Dako, K. (2001). Ghanaianisms: Towards a semantic and formal classification. *English World Wide*, 22(2), 23-53.
- Dako, K. (2002). Code-switching and lexical borrowing: Which is what in Ghanaian English? *English Today*, 18, 48-54.
- Davis, D. R. (2010). Standardized English: The history of the earlier circles. In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 105-136). London: Routledge.
- Dolphyne, F. (1997). President's address. In K. M. E. Dakubu (Ed.), *English in Ghana* (pp. 9-22). Accra: Black Mask Publishers.
- Dunn, R.L. (2009). *Plenty too much Chinese food: Variation in adjective and intensifier choice in native and non-native speakers of English* (Master's thesis). Kansas State University, U.S.
- Finegan, E. (2010). Legal writing: Attitude and emphasis. Corpus approaches to 'legal language': Adverbial expression of attitude and emphasis in supreme court opinions. In M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics* (pp. 65-77). London: Routledge.
- Fisher, J. H. (1992). A language policy for Lancastrian England. *PMLA*, 107(5), 1168-1180. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/462872
- Gabrielatos, C. & Baker, P. (2008). Fleeing, sneaking, flooding: A corpus analysis of discursive constructions of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press 1996-2005. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 36(5), 5-38.
- Gogovi, G. A. K. (1997). Intensifier + verb collocation in English: A case study of post-diploma usage in the University College of Education, Winneba. In K. M. E. Dakubu (Ed.), *English in Ghana* (pp. 46-52). Accra: Black Mask Publishers.
- Gyamfi, A. A. (2014). MP's 'under school of trees' gaffe... should English be the only means of communication in parliament? Retrieved from <http://www.peacefonline.com/pages/politics/politics/201403/192177.php>

- Gyasi, I. K. (1990). The state of English in Ghana. *English Today: The International Review of the English Language*, 6(3), 24-26.
- Harris, S. (2001). Being politically impolite: Extending politeness theory to adversarial political discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 12(4), 451-472.
- Heidler, L. E. (2011). *NNS use of adverbs in academic writing* (Master's thesis). University of North Texas, U.S.
- Hinkel, E. (2003). Adverbial markers and tone in L1 and L2 students' writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(7), 1049-1068.
- Hinkel, E. (2005). Hedging, inflating, and persuading in L2 academic writing. *Applied Language Learning*, 15(1-2), 29-53.
- Huber, M. (2004). Ghanaian English: Phonology. In E.W. Schneider, K. Burridge, B. Kortmann, R. Mesthrie & C. Upton (Eds.), *A handbook of varieties of English: Morphology and syntax* (vol. 2, pp. 854-865). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Huber, M. (2012). Syntactic and variational complexity in British and Ghanaian English. Relative clause formation in the written parts of the International Corpus of English. In B. Kortmann & B. Szmrecsanyi (Eds.), *Linguistic complexity: Second language acquisition, indigenization, contact* (pp. 218-242). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Huber, M. & Dako, K. (2008). Ghanaian English: Morphology and syntax. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), *Varieties of English: Africa, South and Southeast Asia* (pp. 368-380). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hyland, K. & Milton, J. (1997). Qualification and certainty in L1 and L2 students' writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(2), 183-205.
- Ibrahim, A. (2017). Experts defend Ama Sey; don't ridicule English deficient MPs. Retrieved from <http://www.myjoyonline.com/politics/2017/March-13th/experts-defend-ama-sey-dont-ridicule-english-deficient-mps.php>
- Ilie, C. (2006). Parliamentary discourses. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd ed. Vol. 9, pp.188-197). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, 25, 1-14.

- Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Koranteng, L. (2006). *Ghanaian English: A description of the sound system and phonological Features* (PhD thesis). University of Ghana, Ghana.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Lorenz, G. R. (1999). *Adjective intensification: Learners vs native speakers. A corpus study of argumentative writing*. Amsterdam-Atlanta, GA: Rodopi B.V.
- Lorenz, G. (2002). Really worthwhile or not really significant? A corpus-based approach to the delexicalization and grammaticalization of intensifiers in modern English. In I. Wischer & G. Diewal (Eds.), *New reflections on grammaticalization* (pp.163-180). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- McEnery, T., Xiao, R. & Tono, Y. (2006). *Corpus-based language studies: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
- Milton, J. & Tsang, E. S-C. (1993). A corpus-based study of logical connectors in EFL students' writing: Directions for future research. In R. Pemberton & E.S-C. Tsang (Eds.), *Studies in lexis* (pp. 215-246). Hong Kong: The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Language Centre.
- Ngula, R. S. (2014). Hybridised lexical innovations in Ghanaian English. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 23(3), 180-200.
- Ngula, R. S. (2015). *Epistemic modality in social science research articles written by Ghanaian authors: A corpus-based study of disciplinary and native vs. non-native variation* (PhD thesis). Lancaster University, UK.
- Ngula, R. S. & Nartey, M. (2014). Language corpora: The case for Ghanaian English. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 20(3), 79-92.
- Ofori, S. G., Duah, I. & Mintah, M.C. (2014). Exploring the feasibility of a proposed Ghanaian English pronunciation standard. *Journal of Education and Practice* 5(22). 49-53.
- Owusu-Ansah, L. K. (1992). So what is new? An initial statement on signaling new information in non-native spoken English. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* (Univeridad de la Laguna), 25, 83-94.

- Owusu-Ansah, L. K. (1997). Nativisation and the maintenance of standards in non-native varieties of English. In K. M. E. Dakubu (Ed.), *English in Ghana* (pp. 23-33). Accra: Black Mask Publishers.
- Pérez-Parades, P. & Díez-Bedmar, M. B. (2012). The use of intensifying adverbs in learner writing. In Y. Tono, Y. Kawaguchi & M. Minegishi (Eds.), *Developmental and crosslinguistic perspectives in learner corpus research* (pp. 105-124). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Philip, G. (2008). Adverb use in EFL student writing: From learner dictionary to text production. *Proceedings of EURALEX XIII International Lexicography Congress*. Retrieved from http://www.euralex.org/elx_proceedings/Euralex2008/
- Priddy, S. (2014). Queen's speech - proposers and seconders of the Loyal Address since 1900. *Commons Library Standard Note*. Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.uk/briefingpapers/SN04064/>
- Quirk, R. & Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A university grammar of English*. England: Longman.
- Rutledge, J., & Fitton, Z. (2015). Teaching ESL students adverb position to develop rhetorical emphasis. *Linguistic Portfolios*, vol. 4, article 12. <http://repository.stcloudstate.edu/stcloudling/vol4/iss1/12/>
- Sarfo-Kantankah, K. S. (2018, in press). It's about people: Identifying the focus of parliamentary debates through a corpus driven approach. *Corpora*, 13(3).
- Satriawan, A.Y. (n.d.). A comparison between NNS and NS adverbs in their adverbial collocation. Retrieved from <http://sastra.um.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/089-Archangela-Yenny-FKIP-UAJ-EFL-Learners-.-.-.pdf>
- Schachter, P. (1962). *Teaching English pronunciation to Twi speakers*. Legon: University of Ghana Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Schneider, E.W. (2003). The dynamics of new Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language*, 79(2), 233-281.
- Scott, M. (1997). PC analysis of keywords – and key key words. *System*, 25(2), 233-245.
- Scott, M. (2012). *Wordsmith Tools version 6*. Liverpool: Lexical Analysis Software.

- Sey, K. A. (1973). *Ghanaian English: An exploratory survey*. London: Macmillan.
- The Constitution of the Republic of Ghana. 1992. Assembly Press, Ghana Publishing Corporation
- Tingley, C. (1981). Deviance in the English of Ghanaian newspapers. *English World Wide*, 2(1), 39-62.
- Torto, R. T. (2013). Nativization in the spoken mode of communication: A study of the innovations in the pronunciation of English words in Ghana. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 3(3), 171-183.
- Wouden, v. d. T. & Foolen, A. (2017). A most serious and extraordinary problem: Intensification of adjectives in Dutch, German, and English. *Leuvense Bijdragen/Leuven Contributions in Linguistics and Philology*, 101, 82-100.