

Interpersonal Metafunctional Analysis of Marital Conflictual Discourse in Sofola's the Sweet Trap and Soyinka's Trials of Brother Jero

Lucy Chinwe Nweke (Ph.D)

Department of English,

Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/ejells.2013/vol12n14051>

Published February 7, 2024

Citation: Nweke L.C. (2024) Interpersonal Metafunctional Analysis of Marital Conflictual Discourse in Sofola's the Sweet Trap and Soyinka's Trials of Brother Jero, *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, Vol.12, No.1, pp.40-51

ABSTRACT: *This research examines language choices employed by the spouses during their conflictual interactivity as depicted in the select Nigerian plays. The analysis is anchored on Modality aspect of Interpersonal Metafunction theoretical Framework of Michael Halliday, 1960. Its modality specificity is because it is a grammatical resource for making interpersonal meaning. The analysis focuses on the provocative language usages of the spouses during their dialogical interactivity in the plays. The analysis is of qualitative research design, and the sampling technique for data collection is purposive. Twenty-five (25) data excerpts are used for the analysis. The result shows dominance of Modulation Obligation modals, followed by Modulation Inclination, and a minor detect of high Probability Modalization. The prevalence of the Modulation modality is as a result that the spouses' relations revolves around proposal, a form of speech function that expresses either offer or command. Command aspects of it is found prevalent within the conflictual discourse of the male spouse, who expects obeisance of the commands from his female counterpart. The research reveals to the reader the use of variants modals and gives clue to understanding the negative implication of inappropriate application of high sounding types in cordial relationship like marriage.*

KEYWORDS: Interpersonal Metafunction, Marital Discourse, Modulation Obligation, Modulation Inclination, Modalization Probability

INTRODUCTION

In marital discourse, it is either that the husband speaks and or the wife listens, or vice versa. This entails the term "participant" which is an aspect of physical context in the discourse as the person who performs the act of speaking. The relation between the participants involved in the act, however, determines the designs of language that would be used. Of course, the language of husband and wife ought to be that of intimacy. On the contrary, it becomes abnormal which might

ensue conflict if the language deviates with a slightest cue of less intimacy. An instance is when a husband talks to his wife as if she were a ‘house help’ or ‘a foreigner’. Perhaps, this is why Gee (2014) argues that I cannot really tell what one is trying to do or intending to say or implies unless I know who you are and who you think I am or want to be. In a similar view, when choosing an appropriate utterance for a situation, we usually consider the following factors in order to convey the message effectively to other participants – how do they know each other, social; the setting-status, relationship between participants, aim and purpose of the conversation, and topic (Cyndi cited in Opara, 2009). The argument is that our relationship with whom we know and what we know about a participant will command the kind of language to be employed in interactions.

The recognition of a relationship between language and society has existed from the very beginning. It is a social medium or one’s primary socialisation agent for family which is the microcosm of every society, and a place for peaceful co-existence between husband and wife. Based on the ordinances of marriage as an institution established by God, it is presumed that spousal relationship should be a very intimate one that every right thinking adult would want to go into. That is, it is expected that their relationship would be overwhelmed with the highest degree of love expressions with most appropriate language in each other’s company. A kind of relationship that is among the most important, most intimate, and most enduring interpersonal relationships that couples have in their lives. It is worthy to note that these expectations are most often vulnerable to jeopardy in the sense that this relationship is controlled by this communicative medium called language. A tool which can make or mar family, that is, with language, relationship can be broken, reconciled or built. By the time of such, a union which started existing in a lovely and friendly manner will begin to experience misunderstanding which is manifested in their language usage. This misunderstanding, if not properly managed, could lead to mismatch, and it is this mismatch that this work refers to as marital conflictual situation. The study, however, was inspired by the increase in profile of broken homes caused by negative application of modals during marital conflicting times in our society.

Interpersonal Meaning/Metafunction

The interpersonal metafunction is about the social world, especially the relationship between speaker and hearer, and between the speaker and his message. As defined by Leech and Short (1985) quoted in Opara (2015), it expresses the relationship between languages, communicates the speaker’s attitudes and influences the behaviour and attitude of the hearer. The interpersonal function refers to the grammatical choices that enable speakers to enact their complex and diverse interpersonal relations (<http://www.ling.helsinki.fi>). This means that by the concept interpersonal metafunction, it means that users of language establish, negotiate and assume their position in social relationships.

This tenet of systemic functional linguistics in its interpersonal perspectives is based on the claim that a speaker not only talks about something, but is always talking to and with others. Language not only construes experience, but simultaneously acts out the interpersonal encounters that are essential to our survival (Halliday, 2003). It is concerned with clauses as *exchanges*. Ezeifeke points out that clause is the highest content-carrying unit of analysis, and therefore, the basic unit of analysis (2018). The grammatical systems that relate to the interpersonal function include mood, modality, and polarity. This research, however, is majorly on modality.

Modality as a Concept and Theoretical Framework

Apart from Mood, Modality is another system of grammar that has to do with the interpersonal meaning. Modality supposes that there are intermediate degrees in between the positive pole (it is, do it) and negative pole (it is not, don't do it) with reference to the opinion and judgments of the speaker (Ezeifeke 2018).). She points out also that the features of modalities construe areas of doubt, tentativeness and subjectivity in discourse. Modality analysis can be employed to determine the speaker's interpersonal meaning reflected in the speaker's speech. This shows that the Interpersonal Metafunction of Language is not limited to the process of exchanging utterances between the speaker and listener only, rather it can also contribute to instantiate a meaning through expressions of speaker's judgements and opinions in the clause towards the topics. Through the analysis, either the speaker's position, emotion, affirmation, attitude towards his will or the speaker's estimation and uncertainty to the recognition of things can be revealed. Modalities are realized in the grammar of clause by finite modal operators including may, must, will, can, shouldn't, won't, needn't'. They can also be expressed by whole clauses such as I think.... It seems..., I feel..., it is certain...., and by a modal /comment adjunct, expressed by adverbial group or prepositional phrases as: surely, perhaps, certainly, probably et cetera (Halliday & Mathiessen 2004).

Halliday (2002) states that modality also plays an important role in carrying out the interpersonal metafunction of clauses showing to what degree the proposition is valid. In his view, modality refers to the space between 'yes' and 'no', indicating the speaker's judgements of the probabilities or the obligations involved in what she or he is saying. It refers also to the validity of what is being predicated, stated, questioned, commanded or offered within the clause. It can also be used to show social role relationship (Halliday & Mathiessen, 2014).

There are two types of Modality, they are Modalisation (epistemic modality) and Modulation (deontic modality). When a modal verbal reflects the speaker's opinion about a statement, then this is *epistemic modality* (<http://www.usingenglish.com>). Epistemic modality on the hand, is defined as a modality that connotes how much certainty or evidence a speaker has for the proposition expressed by his or her utterance (<http://www.sil.org>). Halliday and Mathiessen (2014) identify Modalization and Modulation types as the sorts of subcategories and variant values to

express what is between yes and no. The need for the sorting arose as a result of the type of clause whether propositional or proposal. Halliday and Matthiessen argue that if the utterance is proposition, the modality construes how valid the information presented in the clause becomes. They state also that the information is usually expressed in Probability and Usuality forms, and if the clause is proposal, the Modality concerns the degrees of Obligation or Inclination to carry out the command.

Modalization

People are interacting in order to exchange information by statements or questions, and the semantic form of the clauses when doing that is what Halliday and Matthiessen regard as proposition. In their further explication, they see the term, proposition as the thing which can be argued about, affirmed or denied. It is recorded that proposition has two types of intermediate possibilities used in propositions, and they are:

- degrees of probability, related to “judgements of likelihood”, Fontaine’s examples include:
 - he might arrive today; Perhaps, I will go, He could take my car et cetera.
- degrees of Usuality, related to “judgements of oftenness”, that is frequencies of what happens, happened and will happen)

Examples of Modalization (Usuality) (Obligations) by Halliday & Matthiessen (2014) include: He usually sits there all day; Usually, they don’t open; It seldom works that day.

Modulation

Proposal is the form of the clause when it functions to exchange goods and services. In proposals, therefore, Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) recorded two types of intermediate degrees of possibility ‘‘depending on the speech function whether to offer or command’’. According to them, in commands, the intermediate values are used to express Obligation like ‘you must go’ whereas in offers, the intermediate degrees are used to express Inclination as in ‘you would like to go’. It is these scale of Obligation and Inclination that are known as Modulation. In Fontaine’s (2013) view, modulation is viewed as a kind of connotative meaning relates to Obligation or permission, including willingness and abilities. Examples of Modulation Obligation include: You should know that; You ought to be going; Mary will help et cetera. Examples of Modulation (Inclination) by Eggins (2004) are: I want to lend you the Bostonians; I’m willing to lend you the Bostonians, I’m determined to lend you the Bostonians et cetera. In essence, Modalization refers to the speaker’s attitudes and judgements propositions and Modulation indicates the speaker’s attitudes in proposals. Below are degrees of Modulation and Modalisation, stated by Halliday and Matthiessen (2014).

Degrees of Modalization and Modulation

Halliday and Matthiessen postulate that there are three degrees via which Modality choices can be expressed and this can reflect how much the speaker is uncertain about what is he saying or suggesting whether in propositions or proposals. This distribution of Modalization and Modulation is shown in tables, below:

Degrees of Modalization

Realization	Probability	Usuality
High	must, certainly, sure, believe, of course Definitely, can't, couldn't, bet,	always
Median	should, will be, won't, think Probable, probably	usually, often, frequently
Low	may be, may, perhaps, possibly, can	sometimes, occasionally, ever Ever, never, once, seldom, rarely

Degrees of Modulation

Realization	Obligation	Inclination
High	must, have to, ought to need, is to	determine to, need to
Median	should, shall, will, would	want to, keen, will, would Won't, wouldn't,
Low	may, might, can, could, allowed	willing, can

Tables above show the degrees of Modality which are high, median and low, and the expressions of each degree. Table 1 shows that modalization is expressed in both modal verbs and adjuncts of probability and usuality, whereas, in table 2, modulation is described in terms of its representation in modal verbs only, this reflects the use of modulation within the mood part of the clause. Below are examples of both Modalization and Modulation listed by Thompson (2014:72).

Degree	Examples of Modalization	Examples of Modulation
High	I shall never be happy again	you must ask someone
Median	They should be back by now	You ought to invite her
Low	I may be quite wrong	You can help yourself to a drink

Owing to this view, Modality is a rich resource for speakers to intrude their own views into the discourse, their assessments of what is likely or typical their judgement of the rights and wrongs of the situation and of where other people stand in this regard (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999). The current study analysed the mood and Modality patterns in spousal conflictual language in order to contribute to understanding their language choice roles and the position of either of the spouses in

their interactivity, and by Modality studies, it reveals either of the spouses' views and judgements regarding their context of the conflictual situation.

METHODOLOGY

The research design for this investigation is descriptive qualitative design. The population selected was all the clauses that depict spousal conflictual language in the two select Nigerian plays including Sofola's *The Sweet Trap* (Text 1) and Soyinka's *The Trials of Brother Jero*(Text 2). The technique adopted in this study is purposive sampling concentrating on the utterances that best depict spousal conflict.

Analysis of Modality Features within the Conflictual Discourse in Text 1 and 2

In the analysis, how interpersonal meaning is realized through modality features within the spousal conflictual language in the select Nigerian plays is looked upon. The realization of modality as a function of the interpersonal meaning is achieved through application of modal auxiliary verbs. Modality, thus, involves degrees and scales about the validity of a proposition, which coins the term "Modal Commitment" with the three basic value, including high, median and low on the scale. The different scales of this modal commitment, however, leads to different meanings. Halliday and Mathiessen, (2014), regard modality as a speaker's comment and perception of states encoded in clauses exposing the speaker's uncertainty of things, offers and request of people, and enable understanding the interpersonal meaning and social roles between the speaker and the listeners.

Here, the analysis of marital conflictual discourse in Text 1 is made with these modalities:

1. Will – Median Modulation obligation
2. Must – High Modulation obligation
3. Cannot – High Modalised probability
4. Should – Median Modulation Obligation
5. Would – Median Modulation Obligation
6. Could –Low Modulation Obligation

From the data collected, the median "will" appeared 4times, "must" 4times, "cannot" 4times, "should", "would", and "could appeared once. The median obligator modal 'will' is not used as a marker of future tense, rather it is used as a modal verbal operator to show "strong wish and determination" of the spouses in attending to their conflicting issues. Examples are seen in the following clauses:

- 1 Dr. Sotubo: if that *will* put some sense into you (P.10)
- 2 Dr. Sotubo: You *willnot have* it now (P.10).

- 3 Dr. Sotubo: and you *will not have* it hereafter until I instruct you to the contrary (P.10)
- 4 Mrs. Sotubo: You *will* find your instructions still standing (P.10)
- 5 If they *cannot* withstand the test of critical analysis, rational diagnosis, and intelligent scrutiny (P.10).

From the excerpt above, the modal auxiliary “will” is combined with the personal pronoun ‘you’ employed by Sotubo, the male spouse to address his spouse, Clara. From the context of the discourse, the modal ‘will’ expresses a median degree of Obligation. It is clear from the interactivity that Dr. Sotubo used the ‘will’ in the first clause to express his strong desire in order to illicit a change of habit of his wife, and modals ‘will not have’ occurred two times and are applied to express his firm resolution on seeing she does not go on with the party activity. On the other hand, Clara’s own “will” usage reveals her defiant refusal in carrying out her husband’s instruction, and with the use of high probability modalisation “cannot” to express her reasons behind her refusal to follow his instruction.

The modal auxiliary “must” is a high Obligation of Modulation modality, representing the highest scale of modal commitment signaling the highest degree of pressure on another to carry out a command. Thus “must” is most often used in a marital discourse while attending to controversial issues, in that the addresser often the husband needs, to show his firm determination, to compel his spouse to obey his command. The application of “must” in the data is shown in the following clauses:

- 6 Dr, Sotubo: You *must* never forget that I am the man here (P.9).
- 7 Dr. Sotubo: ...every instruction I give here, *must* be contemptuously thrown through the window? (P.9)
- 8 Dr. Sotubo: You are a woman and *must* be treated as a subordinate (P.10)
- 9 Dr. Sotubo: Now, that dammed party of yours *must* be cancelled forthwith (P.10)

Here, Sotubo employs the modal “must” to firmly inform his spouse that it is an obligation for a woman to be loyal to her husband. He uses the modal also to firmly tell her that the party will not hold again. On the other hand, the clauses below depict the application of high Probability Modalisation:

10. Dr. Sotubo: Femi Sotubo cannot give an instruction in his own house and be assured (P.8).
11. Clara: I cannot be pushed around by the inflated ego of an undisciplined male partner (P.10).
12. Clara: I cannot be forced into any action that is against good reasoning (P.10).
13. Clara: You should have known that with my degree.... (P.10)

The application is used to reflect what the spouses are very much concerned about within the context of the issues of dialogue. In the first clause, the interlocutor and female spouse, Clara expresses the impossibility of her abiding by her husband's instructions against her wish of holding the party. Dr. Sotubo on the other hand, expresses disappointment he is greeted with by the wife's disloyalty.

“Should” in the clause is a marker of median Obligation found in the data and it is used to reflect Clara's expectations of her spouse agreeing with her, based on her status as a university graduate. From the clause context, it is shown that her perception of her acclaimed academic status quo, thus, gives her the impetus to carry out the act of disobedience. Sotubo in his regrets, hence laments:

14. Sotubo: I said that if Femi Sotubo *could* burst those cursed elephant ears of yours with the noise of my chewing (P.9).
15. Sotubo: I *would* congratulate myself (P.9).

“Could” is a marker of low obligation and is used here by Sotubo to reveal a seemingly possibility in carrying out such action he proclaimed. Semantically, the playwright meant to let the reader understand more the level of the addressee's stubborn attitude, a very strong minded type. The application of ‘could’ modality, therefore, enables Dr. Sotubo to communicate his grievances to his wife. The use of the median Obligation “would” thus shows the aversion he has developed towards his spouse's mischiefs.

In Text 2, 12 modal verbal operators, and 3 lexical verbs are selected of which, the most frequently used ones are the following: “will” turned up 3 times, “would” 3 times, know, 3, and the less frequent ones include: “must” turned up once, including ‘should’, ‘cannot’, ‘may’, ‘needn't’, and ‘supposed’. In this study, ‘will’ which is traditionally known as a marker of future tense, goes beyond that to mean otherwise, the following examples explain thus:

1. Amope: Not with you. I'll find my own way home (P.35)
2. Amope: You'll have to kill me (P.36)
3. Amope: Prophet Jeroboam, I hope you will pray for my soul in heaven (P.36)

The application of modals “will” in the clauses represented above, construes a combination of median Obligation and Inclination devices of modulation modality type. The first ‘will’ is an example of median Obligation modal whereas, the subsequent ‘will’ applications are examples of median Inclination modals. The median Obligation operator ‘will’ in clause 1 is used to show Amope's strong mind and keen refusal to go home with her spouse, Chume. It indicates an angrily expression of her determination to go her way. The use of ‘will’ in the rest of the two clauses

denotes the meaning of mild Inclination, that is, the median Inclination ‘I’ll have to kill’ in “you’ll have to kill me” shows that Amope seems to have given up and offered the spouse, Chume, to take away her life. This communicates to the readers the level of bitterness in her heart. By Inclination also, she requested Prophet Jeroboam to pray for her soul in heaven. The use of ‘will’ in ‘...will pray for my soul...’, indicates futuristic tense and from the context, Amope predicts that this conflict ensued between him and her spouse might kill her, and she has taken to prayer as the last resort. Other modalities usage are however seen utilized in the following to reflect different meanings:

4. Chume: Anybody who didn’t see what happened *would* think you were the one who broke an ankle (12).
5. Amope: You *must* admit it’s a tough life for a woman (P.12)
6. Amope: If you *should* take me home (P.14)
7. Amope: I *would* have said that you did it on purpose (P.14)
8. You don’t drink only because you *cannot* afford to (P,33)
9. Chume: You *may* think what suits you (P.33)
10. You know I *never* touch any liquor (P.33)

As stated above, different scales of modal commitment lead to different meanings. Typically, in the data collected, the use of “should, would, may, must” represent different modulations which construe different interpersonal meanings, and “cannot” of Probability Modalisation. “Would” is a median obligation and here suggests that different interpretations can be given about what transpired between the spouses by the people not present at the scene of the event; Amope also used median obligation ‘should’ to express her fear about her spouse taking her home. On the hand, with a very low obligation degree ‘may’ Chume shows displeasure to his spouse, and considers it unimportant arguing on with her since there is no commonness of her opinion with his. It expresses the spouse’s view that there is no need preventing her from thinking however she feels like, hence he knows he is not a drunkard. However, the application of high probability operators ‘cannot’, as occurred in the clause “you are not drinking because you cannot afford to” is used to reflect Amope’s judgement on her husband’s not taking to drinking alcohol. In her view, he is not drinking because he has no money, thus the reason for the use of ‘cannot’, a probability modal. The modal element “must”, represents a highest value obligation modulation. Here, the use of ‘must’ expresses Amope’s certainty about the impression she has been left with, about lots of challenges facing a woman. She equally calls on her man to have the same understanding with her.

Through Modality analysis, the researcher found modal operators that are ascribed to Obligation and Inclination Modulation, and probability Modalisation, as most dominant in the field of the discourse. The study also showed that these modal auxiliary operators expressed different situation and construed different meanings. Examples of such include: the median “will” function in three

ways depending on the context of situation. Here “will” as a modal of Inclination revealed Dr. Sotubo’s intention for dealing with his spouse in the way he did which is simply to call her senses to order by giving him his due respect. “Will” as a modal of median Obligation is used by Dr. Sotubo twice to impose his order against Clara’s carrying out her birthday party. The other ‘will’ as a modal of Probability is used by Clara to inform her spouse, Sotubo that she will not abide by his instruction, and in the expression of defiant refusal to agreeing with Sotubo’s order, Clara used high probability “cannot” to express her reasons behind her non-submission.

In like manner with Text1, ‘will’ in text 2 has triple roles in the data provided for the study. Amope used ‘will’ as a modal of median Obligation to inform her husband that she does not want to go home with him. She used the other ‘will’ as a modal of Inclination to let her know she is no more comfortable with him as her spouse because she is afraid that he might kill her. The last ‘will’ as a modal of Inclination, functions to express Amope’s expectations of Prophet Jeroboan’s praying for her soul after death.

The expression of high modality obligation depicts Sotubo’s firm determination on terminating his spouse’s plans about the party, and call on her to adhere to his instruction, to remember that he is the head of the family, and to remember that she is a woman and must be submissive. In essence, the presence of Modality plays an important role in carrying out the interpersonal meaning of clauses showing to what degree the proposition is valid.

The analysis revealed that spouses used the different degrees of obligation to impose orders on each on the other. The usage of high obligation serves to express assertions when the situation requires urgent commitments such as the issue about carrying out with the birthday party or not, and joining the husband in going home or not. Through the median obligation, the spouses maintained their stands on the issue of controversy. The low obligations ‘may’, ‘could’ and ‘would’ were used to express a less serious issue for example when Amope accused Chume of drinking to stupor. Chume doesn’t drink, therefore the low Obligation ‘may’ is imposed to assign the judgement to the Wife. The study showed that Obligation and Inclination as aspect of Modulation are used more frequently than Probability as type of Modalization. The implication is that spouses use proposal more than proposition in the clauses of modality within the spouses’ conflictual language. The study therefore suggests that for couples to prevent or manage crisis, depend largely on the mutual understanding of couples involved while dispensing goods and services.

As for modality, the analysis contributed to the understanding of the judgements and ideas regarding the issues with a reflection of the male spouses’ interactivity with their wives. Through the investigation of modality degrees, the analysis shows what orders/instructions requires attention more than the other. The modulation type of modality is found to be prevalence. “Will” is not used as a maker of future tense, rather it is used as a modal verbal operator to show “strong

wish and determination” of the spouses in attending to their conflicting issues, and thus “must” is used to compel the spouse in question to obey a command. There is application of high probability operators ‘cannot’, and it used to reflect what the spouses are very concerned about within the context of the issues of dialogue. Instance of that is the interlocutor and female spouse, Clara seen expressing the impossibility of her abiding by her husband’s instructions against her wish of holding the party.

Should” in the clause is a marker of median Obligation found in the data and it is used to reflect Clara’s expectations of her spouse agreeing with her based on her status as a university graduate. “Could” is a marker of low obligation and is used here by Sotubo to reveal a seemingly probability in carrying out such action. The median Obligation operator ‘will’ used by Amope shows her strong mind and keen refusal to go home with her spouse. The application of high probability operators ‘cannot’, as occurred in the clause “you are not drinking because you cannot afford to” is used to reflect Amope’s judgement on her husband’s not taking to drinking alcohol.

Conclusion:The study considered a dialogue between a male spouse and his female counterpart, and data were drawn considering the issues that formed the conflictual discourse. Data exploration was limited to Modality features. The use of modal variant operators revealed how the different scales of commitment lead to different meanings. Modality features found in the spousal clauses were Obligation and Inclination part of Modulation and Probabaility part of Modalization. That of frequency of Modalities are revealed in this order: ‘will’ as median modulation obligations were found predominant, followed by ‘cannot’ as high Probability Modalisation, and ‘must’ as highest Obligation modulation. The less frequent operators were: should, would (median): ‘will’ (Inclination), ‘will’ (Future tense), ‘could’ and ‘may’ (Low Obligation modulation), and lexical verbs ‘needn’t and ‘suppose’. The availability of these features reflects more of modalities that lengthen the distance between the spouses involved in the marital conflict.

REFERENCES

- Eggs, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.), Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Ezeifeke, C. (2018). *Discourse analysis: Concepts and approaches*. Patrobas Nigeria Limited.
- Fontaine, L. Bartlett, T., O’Grady, G. (2013). *Systemic functional linguistics: exploring choice*. (eds). Cambridge University Press.
- Gee, J.P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method*. Routledge.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (2002). *Spoken and written modes of meaning* in M.A.K. Halliday *on grammar*. 323-351. Continuum.
- ... (2003). *On language and linguistics (collected works of M.A.K. Halliday)*. Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. (3rd ed.) Edward Arnold.

... (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar*. (4th ed.). Edward Arnold.

Opara, S.C. (2009). *Aspects of functional grammar: A systemic approach*. Gabtony Prints Ltd.

. . . (2015). *Topics in discourse analysis: The concepts, the approaches, the analysis*. Gabtony Prints Ltd.

Soyinka, W. (1964). *The jero plays: The trials of brother jero*. Spectrum Books Limited.

Zuru, S. (1979). *The sweet trap*. Oxford University Press Limited.