

The Study of Language and Sex, Part III

The Discourse Analysis of Male and Female Speech

Linguistic Forms of Affect

Kyoko Ishimaru

1. Introduction

Women have begun launching into society and working as partners of men in various work places. They have found themselves working literally everywhere in society, both manually and professionally. But they have found their discourse as different from that of men and have often run into communication breakdown between the partners at work. Such communication problems were the topic of linguistic research after the years of The Viet Nam War, when more work force was needed.

One of the major linguists who has been studying communication breakdown is Deborah Tannen. She first published *That's Not What I Meant!* in 1986, then a similar kind of popular book, *You Just Don't Understand!* in 1990. Both of those books were bestsellers, which indicated that many women shared communication problems with their partners. Then, Tannen focused on cross sex communication at work and published the book entitled, *Talking From 9 to 5, How Women's and Men's Conversational Styles Affect Who Gets Credit, and What Gets Done at Work*, in 1994. She has expounded some of the reasons why communication breakdown takes place and why we misunderstand each other. She has illustrated it with many examples in situations so that people at work can easily understand the causes of their problems which they themselves are facing daily. It may sound as if the book were a practical handbook

for problem-solving. But the study of language in society has always contributed its findings to society in solving problems which are caused by linguistic barriers, such as language planning for minority citizens. In this paper male and female speech is to be analyzed so as to find any differences or similarities in expressing affect and involvement in on-going topics.

2. Conversation Styles

When women begin to work for life in society, they usually meet someone who has been there and has a particular style to conversation at work. Female novices are trained for practical work in the beginning of their career, but they are not trained in how to converse with their colleagues. Because they have been talking at home and also in their neighborhood, it is taken for granted that they have the ability to function in their new work places.

If they go abroad and work in foreign countries, they might expect that they should function in a foreign language and that they might have difficulties in talking to others at work because of different conversational styles from what they have been accustomed to. But in their own country, men and women did not even dream of the fact that they might have different speech styles in communicating in their own language.

Tannen has exemplified women's phrases of praise as a preamble to a real remark, whereas men habitually get down to a point right away without using softening phrases or the hedges to criticisms.

2.1 Hypothesis and Present Data

The present paper hypothesizes this point on male and female speeches which were sampled from the present analysis data. Men and women tend to speak differently when they are conscious of their differ-

ences, where they have intimate relationships. Women tend to use more involved speech styles than men do; especially when they are emotional they can be very verbal and contending to their partners.

The hypothesis will be substantiated with the data of movie scripts: ones dealing with court cases and ones dealing with romances. The data is not natural language; however, it will reveal our stereotypes which are commonly accepted in society. The findings of the present analysis will be compared with those of the next project, in which natural data will be examined.

In the court case scripts men and women are presumed to speak with similar speech styles, whereas in the romantic movie scripts they are presumed to speak differently because they are conscious of their different roles in romantic situations. The court case scripts, *Verdict* and *Presumed Innocent*, and the romance scripts, *Sabrina* and *The Bridges of Madison County*, will be used in the present study.

2.2 The Foci of the Present Analysis

The speech style differences between male and female speeches will be examined with the present data focusing on the three discursal aspects. Firstly, the types of speeches: monologues, dialogues, and addresses. Secondly, the characteristics of the three types: phonetic, syntactic, and information structural. Thirdly, the changes of the speaker's consciousness of the addressee: the appealing style to the addressee: the addressee-conscious style, the style ignoring the addressee. The three aspects will be briefly exemplified in what follows.

2.2.1 The Three Types of Speeches

The speaker typically has three types of addressees. Kogami (2001: 28-37) has stated that when the speaker is talking to herself, it becomes a monologue. This is the first world in which the speaker is placed. Even in everyday speech, she (in this paper, the speaker is taken as a woman,

the addressee is taken as a man) often talks to herself to organize her thoughts. When the speaker is talking to a particular addressee who is facing herself, her speech becomes a dialogue. This becomes the second world in which she is placed. When the speaker is talking to a mass audience, her speech becomes a lecture or an address. This is the third world in which the speaker is placed. It is very often the case where an individual in a group or audience is not facing the speaker. Then, they often talk to each other and would not listen to the lecture. The individual does not feel a personal contact with the speaker.

2.2.2 Changes in the Speaker's Consciousness to the Addressee

The speaker's changing consciousness of the addressee changes her speech styles, as Maynard has studied. In formal and public situations, the speaker can be conscious of the addressee who is often unfamiliar, higher-ranked, or older. Her speech becomes formal in the standard variety of a community. In a dialogue situation, especially when the speaker is intimate with the addressee, her speech becomes appealing to the addressee. In Japanese discourse (cf. Maynard, 2001: 38-45), she often uses the particle *yo*, such as in *yoku kiite yo* (Listen to me carefully. My translation.). When the speaker is so involved in the on-going topic as to ignore her addressee, her speech becomes blunt, such as in *nanda to mooichido ittemiro* (*Ibid.*) (What did you say? Say it again! My translation.). Thus speech styles reflect the speaker's consciousness of the addressee. The following example in (1) illustrates the changing attitude of the speaker, Sabrina, from the intimate to the formal. This change is expressed linguistically by the uses of the first name of the addressee, and then his family name.

- (1) Sabrina is in Linus's office, trying to cook for him. [] indicates the stage directions.

Sabrina: There must be an egg beater somewhere.

[Sabrina looks around for an egg beater. She goes over to the desk, turns on the lights and just happens to notice two tickets for the Liberte. One of the tickets has her name on it.]

Sabrina: *Linus.*

[She holds the tickets behind her back and walks over to Linus.]

Sabrina: *Linus*, why didn't you tell me? You do want to take me with you, don't you?

[She shows Linus the tickets.]

Linus: These don't mean what you think they mean.

(Lines are skipped.)

Linus: Sabrina? I ... I wasn't going to take you to Paris. I was going to send you.

Sabrina: Alone?

Linus: Yes, all alone.

[She breaks away and stands back.]

(Lines skipped.)

Sabrina: I'll just take one of those tickets.

[Linus hands her a ticket.]

Sabrina: I was happy in Paris. I think you would've been, too.

[Sabrina begins to exit.]

Sabrina: *Good night Mr. Larrabee.* I'm sorry I can't stay to do the dishes.

[Sabrina turns and walks back.] (*Sabrina*, pp.98-100)

In (1) the truth was revealed to Sabrina who thought that she was the true love of Linus's, and that he was going to take her to Paris. When the reality was known to Sabrina, she changed her tone of voice from the involved happy tone to an aloof reserved tone, and her language became

very formal. The way she called Linus was changed from the first name to the last name, which are italicized in (1), indicating the changing consciousness of her addressee, from the intimate to the distant. Thus, the language reflects the status of the speaker's mind.

3. The Changing Roles of Women

In the present data from romance movies, *Sabrina* and *The Bridges of Madison County*, the two women, Sabrina and Francesca, are playing the traditional female roles. Young girl, Sabrina is depicted as an obedient daughter to her father. But the role is going to change as she is going to be more independent of him and is physically going away from home. This changing status of mind from dependence to the independence of the father is revealed in her language. The example (2) reveals the obedient daughter to her father.

(2) Sabrina is watching Larrabee's family ball in a tree.

Fairchild: Come on down from there, Sabrina. Come on. You better go to your room and finish your packing.

Sabrina: Who's that girl, father?

Fairchild: Which girl?

Sabrina: The one dancing with David.

Fairchild: Her name's Van Horne, Gretchen Van Horn, Chase National Bank.

Sabrina: I hate the girl that giggles all the time.

Fairchild: You hate every girl David looks at. Sabrina, you can't go on like this about David all your life. You understand that? You ... you've got to get over it.

Sabrina: *Yes, father.*

Fairchild: It's good you're going away. I only hope it's far enough.

Sabrina: *Yes, father.* (*Ibid*, p.10)

In (2) the father, Fairchild, the Larrabee's chauffeur, instructs his daughter in how to handle her affection toward David, the son of a millionaire. He is trying to send his daughter to Paris where she can take cooking lessons. To the orders of her father, the daughter, Sabrina, obediently answers 'Yes, father', as is italicized in (2). These answers reveal the traditional relationship between the father and the daughter.

After a few years' stay in Paris, Sabrina comes home and is asked to attend the family ball by David. She happily accepts the offer, which makes her father anxious about the relationship between his daughter and David. The conversation between father and daughter in (3) reveals a significant difference from what it was in (2).

(3) Sabrina is unpacking her suitcases, while her father is telling the news of David's engagement.

Fairchild: Then you didn't care?

Sabrina: *Not too much. After all, he's not married yet.*

Fairchild: I don't like that. I don't like the sound of it.

Sabrina: *But don't you see, father, everything has changed?*

Fairchild: No nothing has changed. He's still David Larrabee and you're still the chauffeur's daughter and you're still reaching for the moon.

Sabrina: *No father. The moon's reaching me.*

[Sabrina sits back in her chair and smiles]

(*Sabrina*, pp.41-42)

Now in (3) Sabrina comports herself with confidence and contradicts her father. No more 'yes, father' appears in her speech.

4. Affect

The term 'affect' has been discussed and defined by Maynard (2000). The affective meaning, has been considered to include an 'expressive meaning' and an 'emotive meaning'. This broad sense of the affective meaning includes the speaker's emotions, mood, attitude, and the attitude towards her communication situations. Ochs and Schieffelin (1989) have adopted the affect in their discourse analysis.

Ochs and Schieffelin have described research on the affect as four-streamed: the one done by the Prague School, another done by Halliday (1975) on his intonation studies, the other on drama and theatrical arts by Bakhtin (1981) and Burke (1969), and the last by the second language acquisition researchers on the acquisition of the expressions to transmit emotions.

Ochs and Schieffelin characterize 'affect' as the affective features which transmit the speakers emotions, and the addressee will construct his emotional attitudes after receiving the features from the speaker. They have taken the affect as the influence from the speaker to the addressee. The linguistic expressions which transmit the speaker's emotions will form an affective frame to the information which has been transmitted. This frame indicates the speaker's attitude toward the information that she is now transmitting to her addressee. The addressee will respond to the speaker with reference to the clue which has been given by the affective frame. The affect has both a positive and a negative frame, which will affect the following linguistic behaviors. The affect can be transmitted by linguistic devices, such as pronouns, articles, mood, tense, aspect, the active or passive forms of verbs, particles, repetitions, intonation, the quality of voice, symbolic sounds, the choice of words, and code-switching.

Ochs and Schieffelin continue that affective keys will contribute to

the construction of atmosphere in which the conversation between the speaker and the addressee is taking place. The affective keys will set the emotional meanings to the conversations whether they are upset, ironical, disappointed, sad, happy, humorous, surprised, rough, or gentle. If the speaker puts a preamble to her utterance as 'it is sad to say this,' then the preamble will work as the affective key to her utterance. In this sense, it can act as the comment on her linguistic behavior.

5. Involvement

Maynard (2000) has also discussed and defined the term 'involvement'. The term has been used to describe the different styles between the spoken and the written language. Chafe (1982) distinguishes the two as 'involvement' is the expression used in speaking, whereas 'detachment' is the expression used in writing. Emotional involvement has been said to be revealed in the frequent uses of first person pronouns, the expressions with which the speaker describes the thinking processes, the expressions with which the speaker monitors her information flows, the expression with which the speaker emphasizes her ideas, and the expressions of direct narrations.

Both Chafe and Tannen (1982) have characterized the involvement as particular to the spoken language, which shows such speaking tactics as pauses, interruptions, hedges, repetitions, and false starts. These speech tactics themselves show a high involvement in the on-going conversation.

Tannen (1989: 12) has defined 'involvement' as "an internal, even emotional connection individuals feel, which binds them to other people as well as to places, things, activities, ideas, memories, and words." Lakoff (1990) has defined it as emotional connection, interest and concern. The

concept has been used in the broader sense which includes emphatic expressions, the speaker's empathy with the on-going topic, some emotional linguistic behavior, and the perspectives of various participants. It has been used as a vague term for discourse analysis.

6. Involvement

The concept of 'affect' covers a broad range of human emotions to the speaker's concern. One way to investigate it is through the investigation into the concept of the speaker's involvement in the on-going discourse topic, which is expressed both linguistically and paralinguistically. In the present paper linguistic forms of involvement are to be discussed. The present data reveals the speaker's involvement in various speech forms, that is, in their word choices, repetition, particular sentence structures, and intonation.

6.1 Vocabulary

The speaker chooses specific types of words which express her involvement in the on-going discourse topic, as is seen in (4).

(4) Sabrina: I *hate* girls that giggle all the time. (*Sabrina*, p.10)

In (4) the heroine Sabrina is watching her crush, David, who is dancing with a pretty lady who is giggling all the time. She hates anyone to whom David pays attention. Her father Fairchild rightly mentions to her that she hates everyone that David looks at. The word 'hate' expresses Sabrina's involvement.

The following (5) also expresses a different type of involvement by the speaker.

(5) David: Linus, I want to talk to you.

Linus: Ask Miss McCardie for an appointment.

David: Don't give me *that appointment* business. I'm *mad*. I'm *really steamed*.

Linus: All right, gentlemen. I'll be ten minutes. (*Ibid.*, p.26)

In (5) there is a contrast between a cool man and a mad man. The cool man Linus uses business-like English with a cool tone, whereas the mad man David repeats the same word 'appointment' in the phrase 'that appointment business'. He also expresses his state of mind by choosing the right words, 'mad' and 'really steamed'. Both of David's lines express his involvement in the current problem which he then has in his mind.

In the next piece of dialogue in (6) the speakers are playing a game by using the same words time and again.

(6) Sabrina: *Desoris Lane*.

David: *Desoris Lane*? Say, that's where I live.

Sabrina: Really?

David: Sure. We must be *neighbors* and if there's one thing I believe in, it's "Love thy *Neighbor*."

Sabrina: So do I. Come on, *David*.

David: *David*? Is his name *David*?

Sabrina: Yes, it is.

David: That's *funny*. My name's *David*, too.

Sabrina: That is *funny*, isn't it? (*Ibid.* p. 32)

Both of the speakers in (6) are very interested in each other, and yet they are playing a game of investigation into each other. Their involved state of mind is expressed by the repetition of the same words, such as 'Desoris Lane', 'David', and 'funny'. The word play creates a scene as if two dogs

were playing with each other. In (7) the butler is repeatedly using the superlative form of adjective words for Sabrina, which is expressing his involvement in the dancer of the ball.

(7) Butler: Oh, *you should see her. You should see Sabrina!* The prettiest girl. *The prettiest* dress. *The best* dancer. The belle of the ball. And such poise as though she belonged up there.

(*Ibid.*, p. 47)

The repetitious uses of the same words and exaggeration in (7), as italicized, show the speaker's involvement into the dancing scene. The word choice and their repetition express the involvement of the speaker.

(8) Sabrina: *Suppose* you meet someone on the boat the very first day out? A perfect stranger.

Linus: I have a better *suppose*, Sabrina. *Suppose* I were ten years younger. *Suppose* you weren't in love with David. *Suppose* I asked you to ... Oh, I *suppose* I'm just talking nonsense.

Sabrina: I *suppose* so.

Linus: *Suppose* you sing that song again, slowly. (*Ibid.*, p. 81)

The word 'suppose' is repeated eight times in (8), which shows the speakers' involvement in the ideas which are in their minds. The lexical cohesion of the lines shows the mental and emotional connection between the speakers.

The terms for calling the addressee also indicate the speaker's involvement or intimacy with the addressee. The following piece of discourse, which was earlier cited in (1), between Sabrina and Linus will show the relationship shift.

(9) Sabrina: *Linus*, why didn't you tell me? You do want to take me with you, don't you?

Linus: Those don't mean what you think they mean.

...

Sabrina: But there's a ticket for you.

Linus: For an empty cabin.

Sabrina: Were you joining me in Paris, is that it?

Linus: I'm afraid not.

Sabrina: I think I understand.

Linus: I'm sorry.

Sabrina: But why? Why did you do it, *Linus*?

...

Sabrina: I was happy in Paris. I think you would've been, too.

Sabrina: Good night, *Mr. Larrabee*. I'm sorry I can't stay to do the dishes. (*Ibid.*, p.100)

The speaker, Sabrina expressed her intimacy to the addressee by using his first name. Sabrina stops using the first name, 'Linus' when she discovers the true intention behind the two tickets. Her disappointment is now expressed by the formal calling term, 'Mr. Larrabee', which indicates the social distance and emotional distance between the speaker and the addressee.

The involvement is also expressed with the choice of curse words. The following piece of discourse which is sampled from *Presumed Innocent* shows the speaker's involvement into the on-going topic.

(10) Raymond: Well, who *the hell* are you gonna assign it to? Homicide? Tommy Molto, *for Chrissake*? Wouldn't Della Guardia just love that? Molto would tip him off on everything we'd get. *Miserable guinea bastards*. They're so close you can see *Molto's*

nose sticking out of Nico's belly button. Christ! Listen to me. What a waste. Beautiful, sexy gal, hell of a lawyer. That's her ending right? That's her au revoir. And the first thing we gotta think about ... is what the public thinks in the middle of an election. (Presumed Innocent, p.11)

Raymond is so upset about the murder of his female colleague lawyer, Carolyn. The status of his mind is reflected in his language. He chooses slangy expressions which express his deep involvement into the murder. He uses 'hell' two times, the swear word 'Christ' or 'Chrissake' two times, and also a curse addressing term, 'miserable guinea bastards'. The speaker expresses his involvement into the situation by using dirty words. The following speech also expresses the speaker's involvement with dirty words.

(11) Balestrieri: (into telephone) ...what the *fuck* is happening to the fingerprints report? Don't give me that computer *crap!* You know I don't understand that *shit!* (To Rusty) They wanna know how big the field you want it run against. We could do convicted felons, anybody who's ever been fingerprinted ... county employees, *shit* like that. (*Ibid.*, p.30)

Balestrieri repeatedly uses swear words, 'fuck', 'crap' and 'shit'. The speech expresses the speaker's character and his involvement in his speech topic, the fingerprints report.

The speaker expresses her involvement in the discourse topic with word choices and their repetition in her speaking. Repetition clearly expresses the speaker's involvement in an on-going topic. The following section will illustrate this more in detail.

6.2 Repetition

The linguistic form which expresses the speaker's involvement is exemplified in her word choice in the previous section. The particular words are repeated in the discourse under discussion. Here, in this section the repetition is focused as another linguistic form of involvement. Some examples of repetition in what follows will reveal her involved attitude.

- (12) Raymond: *Wait, wait-wait-wait-wait-what-what, what's* with all this reassignment shit? *Goddamn it*, Rusty, I told you to give this investigation top priority, for Chrissake! Look, Nico is eating me alive with this thing. The election is *in ten days*. If you don't have Carolyn's killer for us *in ten days*, we are both history. *Goddamn it*, turn all of that administrative bullshit to Mac. (*Ibid.*, p.20)

Raymond in (12) is upset about Rusty's slow work and he expresses his unhappy attitude toward Rusty with repetitious use of 'wait' five times, 'what' three times, 'Goddamn it' twice, and 'in ten days' twice. The speech expresses his extreme involvement and his urgency for the investigation. His uses of curse words, 'shit' and 'bullshit' express not only his personality but also his involvement in the on-going topic. The same form of involvement can be observed in the following piece of discourse.

- (13) Guerasch: *I don't know. You know*, when I gave these files to her, they were in nice order. *You know*, now, none of 'em's complete. *You know*, all the fucking work that went into this and the bitch just trashed 'em. (*Ibid.*, p.26)

Guerasch repeatedly uses 'you know' three times. The discourse marker 'you know' has the function of highlighting the following phrases. He is

very concerned with the files that he gave to Carolyn earlier. The next speech of Mr. Polhemus centers on his exwife, the victim of the murder. The subject of each sentence that he speaks is 'she' which is his speech topic. The consistent use of the subject pronoun 'she' indicates his deep concern about his exwife and his deep involvement with her.

- (14) Mr. Polhemus: Mr. Sabich, I have no idea where *she* came from. *She* admitted to me that *she* lied her way into the university. Made up some kind of background. *She* was very good at playing roles. When *she* left me, I lost all pride. I-I begged her not to leave. The last time *she* looked at me, it was with disgust. Disgust that somebody *she'd* looked up to could be so weak. At that moment, I remember, I had the most desperate wish that *she* were dead. Maybe *she* made a man feel like that, who actually acted on his fantasy. Would you like to see what *she'd* looked like at that time? (*Ibid.*, p.29)

Mr. Polhemus's choice of the subject of a sentence reveals his empathy toward it. He is looking at the present issue from the eyes of the subject. Mr. Polhemus's repetitious use of the pronoun 'she' indicates his deep involvement with her. The following piece of conversation displays a word play with the word 'surprise'.

- (15) Barbara: I can't believe there could be any more *surprises*.

Rusty: That's when they come. That's why they're called *surprises*. (*Ibid.*, p.56)

Barbara in (15) says that she is surprised at the fact that arresting detectives came to her house all of a sudden. And Rusty responds to her surprise and explains why they are called 'surprises'.

Repetition expresses not only the speaker's involved attitude in the on-going topic but also is utilized for convincing the addressee. This use of repetition often appears in public addresses. In court also a lawyer repeats his core message to his addressee.

- (16) Sandy: How are we to answer this, Rusty Sabich and I? Mr. Della Guardia's case does not involve facts, but *supposition upon supposition*. *Guess upon guess*. When you listen to the evidence, ... (*Ibid.*, p.66)

The defendant lawyer Sandy is intentionally repeating the phrases in question so as to let his addressee realize the fact that the accusation is based on supposition and not on reality. He is stressing the point, in other words, he is involved in the issue. The other linguistic means of expressing the speaker's involvement is with the structure that he is using. In what follows the structures that show involvement in the on-going topic are exemplified.

6.3 The Structures Expressing the Speaker's Involvement

The speaker uses such structures which highlight the focus of his information. She uses the cleft sentence construction and topicalization to indicate her involvement in the focused information. The followings are some of the examples with these constructions.

- (17) Kenneally: Hey, Guerasch, you wanna bring that shit in my office?!
Hey, so, you're figuring what? *Guy she's havin' cocktails with is the one who done her?*
Kenneally: I figure *it was somebody who knew what he wanted it to look like* when he called her, Cop, a P.A., a private dick.
(*Ibid.*, p.25)

(18) Mr. Polhemus: ... *The last time she looked at me, it was with disgust
Disgust that somebody she'd looked up to could be so weak. ...*
(*Ibid.*, p.29)

In (17) Kenneally uses the two types of sentence structures which indicate his involvement in his discourse topic. First he uses topicalization, that is, 'Guy she's havin' cocktails with'. He stresses the left most item, the topic, 'Guy'. The cleft sentence is also used by the same speaker, 'it was somebody who knew what he wanted it to look like ...'. The word 'somebody' is emphasized with the particular structure, 'it was ... who ...'. In (18) the word 'disgust' is emphasized by Mr. Polhemus and he uses the structure of topicalization, which moves the highlighted noun phrase 'disgust' to the left of the sentence in question. He also uses the structure 'it was ... that ...', which highlights 'disgust' in this sentence. In the following pieces of discourse the speakers also uses the structure which highlights their topics, the left most noun phrases of these sentences in question.

(19) Guerasch: ... You know, *all the fucking work that went into this ...*
(*Ibid.*, p.26)

(20) Kenneally: ... *Five six years ago when she worked out here as a
probation officer. ...* (*Ibid.*)

(21) Kenneally: *The night you brought the Night Saints in. ...* (*Ibid.*)

In these examples of (19) to (21) the speakers used the structure, NP+ Relative Clause, which moves the phrases in question to the beginning of each utterance. The left-most phrases are highlighted as discourse topics, with the result that the speakers show their involvement in the phrases in

question. The same structure of topicalization is very often used in the current data to express the speaker's involvement.

(22) Sandy: We have no objection to the photographs. *Any testimony as to fingerprints we will object to.* (*Ibid.*, p.68)

The speaker, the lawyer, is also using the structure in question as had done by other speakers, which were already illustrated above.

(23) Rusty: Yeah. Yeah. I gotta find *this guy Leon. Leon Wells.* Ya know, *the guy who's supposed to have bribed the P.A. down at the North Branch?* (*Ibid.*)

In (23) Rusty is focusing on 'this guy', and he repeats the same phrase twice and the personal name, 'Leon' twice, and what is more, he uses the topicalized description of 'the guy' as can be seen in this example.

(24) Lipranzer: Okay, after I testify, all right? You know, *those guys, they* got their eyes on me. ... (*Ibid.*, p.69)

In (24) the speaker Lipranzer is involved with 'those guys'. He uses the structure with left-dislocation to highlight the phrase, 'those guys' in the sentence 'those guys, they got their eyes on me'.

The speaker uses discourse markers to highlight the focus of his utterance. In the present data of *Presumed Innocent*, the speakers uses 'you know' most frequently among other discourse markers, as has already appeared in (13, p.15).

7. Subjectification

Subjectification is one of the current topics of cognitive linguistics. Langacker (1990) has pointed out the shift in semantic theory from an objectivist view to an subjectivist view. He has found that a foundational claim of cognitive semantics is that an expression's meaning cannot be reduced to an objective characterization of the situation described: equally important for linguistic semantics is how the conceptualizer chooses to construe the situation and portray it for expressive purposes. An expression's semantic value is determined by numerous facets of construal, including the level of specificity at which the situation is characterized, background assumptions and expectations, the relative prominence accorded various entities, and the perspective taken on the scene (p.315).

The speaker expresses her perspective regarding the on-going discourse topic in linguistic forms of involvement, as has been observed in the previous chapter. In the present chapter, the perspective is detected in different forms of narration. The speaker expresses her perspective through which she looks at the story in question. In the following section, three types of narration is investigated from the point of perspective.

7.1 Narration

In the present data of movie scripts, three different speech styles of narration have appeared. First, the speaker's self-introduction as the main character of the prospective story to the audience who anticipates what will happen. Second, the speaker objectifies the past event and tells the truth to her husband and to the audience. Third, the speaker narrates the characters and the setting of the story which is to occur in the movie in the form of new information introduced to the audience.

In the data, *Presumed Innocent*, the hero, Rusty Sabich, introduces

himself to the audience as is italicized in (25).

(25) Rusty: (v.o.) *I* am a prosecutor. *I*'m a part of the business of accusing ... judging ... and punishing. *I* explore the evidence of a crime, and determine who is charged ... who is brought to this room to be tried before his peers. *I* present my evidence to the jury, and they deliberate upon it. They must determine what really happened. If they cannot, we will not know if the accused deserves to be freed, or should be punished. If they cannot find the truth, what is our hope of justice?

(Presumed Innocent, p.7)

In (25) the speaker, Rusty, introduces himself in the first person pronoun, as a prosecutor who engages in doing justice in society by judging who is guilty and who is innocent. In his introduction, the speaker shifts from 'I' to 'they', that is 'the jury', in the utterance, "If they cannot find the truth, what is our hope of justice?". The speaker first looks at himself within his own domain, and then he looks at the jury outside his domain. Thus he lays the ground for the story's suspense which will unfold in the movie.

The first half of the narration is the self-introduction, which demonstrates the speaker's involvement in the on-going topic, that is, Rusty looks at the story which centers around himself. Unlike this self-introduction, the second type of narration is objectified by the speaker. At the end of the same movie, although the speaker talks about herself to her husband Rusty, she reveals the truth as if it happened in a dream, as is italicized in (26).

(26) Barbara: You understand what happened had to happen. Couldn't have turned out any other way. *Woman's* depressed ... with *herself* ... with life ... with *her husband*, who had made life

possible for *her* until he was ... bewitched by another woman. A destroyer. (sobbing) Abandoned ... like someone left for dead. *She* plans *her* suicide. Until the dream begins. In the dream, the destroyer's destroyed. That's a dream worth living for. Now with such simplicity ... such clarity, everything falls into place. It must be a crime ... that *her husband* can declare unsolved and be believed by all the world. *She* must make it look like a rape. But *she* must leave *her husband* clueless. Once he discovers who it was, he'll ... put the case into the file of unsolved murders. Another break-in by some ... sex-crazed man. But all his life ... he'll know that it was *her*. *She* remembers a set of glasses *she* bought for the woman some time before, a house-warming gift from *her husband* and his office. *She* buys another set. *Her husband* has a beer one night, doesn't even comment on the glass. Now *she* has his fingerprints. Then, on a few mornings *she* saves the fluid that comes out when *she* removes *her diaphragm*. (sobs) Puts it in a plastic bag. Puts the bag in a basement freezer ... waits. *She* calls the woman and asks to see her. Stops first at the U and logs into the computer. Now *she* has *her alibi*. *She* goes to the woman. Woman lets *her* in. When her head is turned, *she* removes the instrument from *her bag* and strikes. The destroyer is destroyed. *She* takes a ... cord out that *she* brought along and ... ties her body in ... ways *her husband* described the perverts do. *She* feels power ... control ... a sense that *she's* guided by a force beyond *herself*. Takes a syringe and injects the contents of the ziplock bag, leaves the glass on the bar, unlocks the door and windows ... goes home. And life begins again. Until a trial, when *she* sees *her husband* suffer ... says she never ... intended. *She* is prepared to tell the truth right up

to the very end. But magically ... the charges were dismissed. (chuckles) The suffering was over. And *they* were saved. (*Ibid.*, pp.102-103)

This long ending narrated by Barbara is in the third person 'she' in (26). The speaker, Barbara, distances between herself and 'she', as if they were not identical. The speaker looks at the murder as though it happened outside her domain. The perspective invites her audience to the dreamy world where a woman was destroyed. The audience might imagine that the woman, 'she', lived in a distant, dreamy world and that the whole story was a dream which did not really happen. The narrator never identifies herself with the discourse topic 'she'. This narration is a significant case where the speaker denies her involvement in the on-going topic. The speaker intentionally objectifies the topic because she wants some distance between the topic 'she' and herself.

The third type of narration falls in-between the above two examples, the subjective one (25) and the objective one (26). In the romance movie, *Sabrina*, the story presents a fairy story, a Cinderella story, which happens in twentieth century America. The narrator introduces some new information to the audience who awaits the characters and settings of a story. The speaker's neutral introduction of new information to the audience is italicized in (27).

(27) Narrator: *Once upon a time, on the north shore of Long Island, some thirty miles from New York, there lived a small girl on a large estate. The estate was very large, indeed, and had many servants. There were gardeners to take care of the gardens, and a tree surgeon on a retainer. There was a boatman to take care of the boats, to put them in the water in spring and scrape their bottoms in winter. There were specialists to take care of*

the grounds. The outdoor tennis court and the indoor tennis court. The outdoor swimming pool and the indoor swimming pool and there was a man of no particular title who took care of a small pool in the garden for a goldfish named George.

Also on the estate, *there was a chauffeur* by the name of Fairchild, who had been imported from England years ago, together with a new Rolls Royce. Fairchild was a fine chauffeur of considerable polish like the eight cars in his care and he had a daughter by the name of Sabrina.

It was the eve of the annual six-meter yacht races and as had been traditional on Long Island for the past thirty years, the Larrabees were giving a party. It never rained on the night of the Larrabee party. The Larrabees wouldn't have stood for it.

There are four Larrabees in all. Father, mother and two sons. Maude and Oliver Larrabee were married in nineteen hundred and six and among their many wedding presents was a townhouse in New York and this estate for weekends.

The townhouse has since been converted into Saks Fifth Avenue. Linus Larrabee, the elder son graduated from Yale, where his classmates voted him the man most likely to leave his Alma Mater, fifty million dollars. His brother, David, went through several of the best eastern colleges for short periods of time and through several marriages for even shorter periods of time. He is now a successful six-goal polo player and is listed on Linus's tax return as a six hundred dollar deduction. Life was pleasant among the Larrabees, for this was close to heaven as one could get on Long Island. (*Sabrina*, pp.7-9)

In the long citation (27), its speaker leads the audience to a scene in

a fairy story, with the conventional introduction of new information. The speaker objectifies the story by looking at it from the uninvolved and neutral eyes. The audience anticipates a fictional tale in which the Larrabees, the rich people, and their chauffeur, Fairchild, and his daughter, Sabrina are the main characters.

In the narration (26) and (27) the speaker objectifies the on-going discourse topic so that she can cause some suspense between the story and the audience. Subjectification expounds the way how the speaker looks at the on-going discourse topic. In these examples of narration, two types of subjectification have been observed. And it may be significant to notice that a male speaker has presented the topic in the first person pronoun, in an involved manner; whereas the female speakers have presented their topics outside their domain, a less involved manner.

8. Summary and Residual Problems

The present paper has discussed how the speaker expresses her perspective toward a discourse topic. The perspective has been detected in linguistic forms with which the speaker expresses her subjectivity and affect. The subjectivity has been observed in speech forms of monologue, dialogue and address. It is most prominently expressed in monologues, which has appeared in the first person narration. It is also expressed in the forms of involvement of the speaker in the on-going discourse topic. The speaker has chosen specific words to show her involvement in the topic in question, and has also used repetition, and curse words.

The speaker's narration of a story has also expressed how she views at it. She has expressed quite straightforwardly her perspective in the use of the first person singular pronoun. On the other hand, she has used the third person pronoun so that she can distance herself from the topic in question. This technique causes some suspense in the audience.

The analysis of male and female discourse has revealed that both men and women use the same involved expressions; however, only men use curse words. Men have introduced themselves in the first person singular pronoun 'I'; whereas women have introduced themselves in the third person pronoun 'she' to the audience. The different introductions need further investigation with more data, which will reveal some significant evidence to the study of subjectification in male and female speech.

References

- Chafe, L. Wallace, 'Integration and Involvement In Speaking, Writing, and Oral Literature,' D. Tannen (ed.) *Spoken and Written Language*, Norwood: Ablex, 1982, 35-53.
- 鴻上尚史, 『あなたの魅力を演出するちょっとしたヒント』, 講談社, 2000.
- Kogami, Shooji, '*iroirona hanashi kotoba no sutairu o minitsuke yoo*, (Lets assume various speech styles!) 「いろいろな話しことばのスタイルを身につけよう」『月刊言語』 *Gengo* 6, Vol.30, No. 7, 2001, 28-37.
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko, '*nihongo rashisa no naka no "shukansei"*' (Subjectivity Expressed in the Japanese Language) 「日本語らしさの中の〈主観性〉」『月刊言語』 *Gengo* 1, Vol. 28, No. 1999, 84-94.
- Lakoff, Robin, *Talking Power: The Politics of Language in Our Lives*, New York: Basic Books.
- Langacker, Ronald W., 'Subjectification', *Concept, Image, and Symbol, The Cognitive Basis of Grammar, Cognitive Linguistics Research* 1, Mouton de Gruyter, 1990, 315-342.
- Maynard, K.Senko, '*buntai no imi*' (The Meaning of Styles), 「文体の意味」『月刊言語』 *Gengo* 2, Vol. 20, No. , 1991, 75-80.
- Maynard, K. Senko, '*patosu to shitenno gengo*', (Language as Pathos) 「パトスとしての言語」『月刊言語』 *Gengo* 6, Vol. 27, No. 6, 1998, 34-41.
- Maynard, K. Senko, *Jooi no Gengogaku*, (Language of Affect), 『情意の言語学』, Kuroshio Shuppan (くろしお出版), 2000.
- Maynard, K. Senko, '*kokoro no henka to hanashi kotoba no sutairu shifuto* (Changing Minds and the Speech Style Shift) 「心の変化と話しことばのスタイルシフト」『月刊言語』 *Gengo* 6, 2001, Vol. 30, No. 7. 38-45.

- Ochs, Ellinor and Bambi Schieffelin, 'Language has a heart,' *TEXT* 9, 1989, 7-25.
- Onoe, Keisuke, '*bun no koozoo to "shukannteki imi"*' (The Sentence Structure and the Subjective Meanings), 「文の構造と“主観的”意味」, 『月刊言語』 *Gengo* 1, Vol. 28, No. 1999, 95-105.
- Tannen, Deborah, *That's Not What I Meant!*, London: Virago Press, 1986
- Tannen, Deborah, *Talking Voices*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Tannen, Deborah, *You Just Don't Understand*, London: Virago Press, 1990.
- Tannen, Deborah, *Talking from 9 to 5, How Women's and Men's Conversational Styles Affect Who Gets Heard, Who Gets Credit, And What Gets Done At Work*, New York: William Morrow and company, INC., 1994.
- Usa, Mayumi, *taijin komyunikeeshon no shakai shinri gaku*, (Social Psychology Working in Interpersonal Communication) 「対人コミュニケーションの社会心理学, デイスクース・ポライトネスという観点から」, 『月刊言語』 *Gengo* 6, 2001, Vol.30, No. 7, 78-85.
- Yamanashi, Masaaki, '*kansei,shintaisei ni nezasu gengo*' (Language Rooted from Affect and Physique), 「感性・身体性に根ざす言語」 『月刊言語』 *Gengo* 6, Vol.27 No. 6, 1998, 26-33. (My translation)

Data

- The Bridges of Madison County*, Shohakusha, 1995. Warner Bros VTR.
- Presumed Innocent*, Screen Play Series, 1994. Warner Bros VTR.
- Sabrina*, The Screen Play Series, 1995. Paramount VTR.
- The Verdict*, The Screen Play Series, 1995. The Twentieth Century Fox VTR.