CHARACTERIZATION IN TRAINING DAY

Master's thesis Teija Tatti

University of Jyväskylä

Department of Languages

English

December 2015

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty	Laitos – Department	
Humanistinen tiedekunta	Kielten laitos	
Tekijä – Author Teija Tatti		
Työn nimi – Title Characterization in Training Day		
Oppiaine – Subject	Työn laji – Level	
Englannin kieli	Pro gradu -tutkielma	
Aika – Month and year	Sivumäärä – Number of pages	
Joulukuu 2015	84 + liite	

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Elokuvatutkimuksen kasvavasta suosiosta huolimatta henkilöhahmojen tutkimus on ollut viime vuosiin asti verrattain vähäistä. Hahmot ovat kuitenkin kiistämättä elokuvien ja televisiosarjojen suola ja keskipiste, jonka ympärille tapahtumat keskittyvät. Fiktiivisten henkilöiden identiteetin muodostumisen tutkiminen onkin merkityksellistä sekä elokuvien sisällön tulkinnan kannalta, että ymmärtääksemme paremmin myös tosielämän identiteettien jäsentymistä ja vuorovaikutusta, sillä fiktiivisten hahmojen identiteettien tulkintaan käytetään samoja työkaluja kuin todellisten henkilöiden. Tämän tutkielman tarkoituksena on tarkastella fiktiivisten henkilöiden identiteettien rakentumista elokuvassa Training Day. Tutkimuksen kohteena on elokuvan kaksi päähenkilöä, ja tarkastelemalla heidän kielenkäyttöään sekä multimodaalista vuorovaikutusta voidaan tutkia hahmojen identiteettejä ja eroavaisuuksia hahmojen välillä. Lisäksi tutkitaan hahmojen identiteettien sekä heidän välisen suhteen kehitystä elokuvan aikana.

Analyysi toteutettiin tarkastelemalla elokuvan kolmea kohtausta, joista nostettiin esiin hahmoille tyypillisiä tapoja käyttää kieltä tai ilmentää multimodaalisuutta, ja näiden pohjalta rakennettiin kuvaa heidän identiteeteistään. Lisäksi huomioitiin poikkeavuudet tai muutokset heidän kielessään tai käytöksessään, jotka kuvastivat muutoksia identiteeteissä, tilanteissa tai suhteessa. Analyysin työkaluina olivat kielenkäytön suhteen keskustelun rakenteen analysointi muun muassa seuraamalla vuorojen vaihtoa ja käyttöä, sekä puhuttelusanojen ja kielen tyylin vaihtelujen tarkastelu. Multimodaalisuuden osalta tarkasteltiin hahmojen liikkeitä, eleitä, ilmeitä, äänenvoimakkuutta sekä lisäksi ulkoista olemusta. Tulosten pohjalta voidaan todeta identiteettien rakentuvan vuorovaikutuksessa toisten kanssa niin, että hahmojen identiteetti ilmenevät ja muokkautuvat tilanteiden ja keskustelukumppaneiden mukaan. Hahmojen identiteetti ilmenevät eri tavoin monipuolisen kielenkäytön ja multimodaalisen vuorovaikutuksen kautta, ja hahmoissa on selkeitä ja tunnistettavia eroavaisuuksia. Lisäksi hahmojen asenteiden muutos ja hahmojen välisen suhteen kehitys ilmenee muutoksina kielenkäytössä ja eleissä. Erityisesti kielen kautta ilmaistaan eriäviä asenteita ja tunteita, jotka kumpuavat erilaisista tarkoitusperistä. Lisäksi kielen avulla neuvotellaan vallankäyttöön liittyviä asemia ja rooleja.

Asiasanat – Keywords

characterization, film, media, identity

Säilytyspaikka – Depository

JYX

Muita tietoja – Additional information

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	7
2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	9
2.1 Sociolinguistics of performance	9
2.1.1 Styling and stylizing	10
2.2 Inferring characters	11
2.2.1 (Character) identity	13
2.3 Defining SAE and AAVE	14
2.4 Previous research on characters and their relations	16
2.5 Previous research on <i>Training Day</i>	18
3 THE PRESENT STUDY	23
3.1 Aims and research questions	24
3.2 Data	26
3.2.1 Introducing the film	26
3.2.2 Introducing the main characters	28
3.2.2.1 The greenhorn: Jake Hoyt	28
3.2.2.2 The gangster with a badge: Alonzo Harris	28
3.3 Methods of analysis	29
3.3.1 The scenes	30
3.3.2 Conversational structure	31
3.3.3 Terms of address	33
3.3.4 Style shifting	35
3.3.5 Multimodal factors	36
4 ANALYSIS	37
4.1. Coffee shop scene	38
4.1.1 Displaying power	38

4.1.2 Signs of resistance and acceptance	43
4.1.3 Signs of discomfort and annoyance	45
4.2 Discussion in the car scene	48
4.2.1 Power struggle and confrontation	49
4.2.2 Manipulation	53
4.2.3 Signs of frustration and annoyance	56
4.3 Final confrontation scene	59
4.3.1 Intimidation and attempted power	60
4.3.2 Signs of submission and pleading	65
4.3.3 Signs of determination and persistence	67
5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	72
5.1 Language as a tool of power and display of attitudes	73
5.2 Feelings and personality revealed through multimodal elements	76
5.3 The bigger picture	77
5.4 Conclusion	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
APPENDIX	85

1 INTRODUCTION

Films and popular culture in various forms have filled our everyday lives increasingly for decades much to the point of becoming rather mundane and self-evident. Although the most recent trend in spending our spare time is in front of the computer, we still consume approximately two hours of television per day (Suomen virallinen tilasto, 2009). Due to its popularity, popular culture including television shows and films has gained interest among scholars to an ever increasing extent. Indeed, television programs and films are so entwined in our lives and consumed in such great quantities that it is worth paying closer attention to what the shows we watch consist of. Studying television and film can reveal much about our society and how it works, as popular culture artifacts such as films are always both shaped by and shaping society and its consumers.

When it comes to TV-shows and films, characters are unquestionably at the center of the stage. For instance, it is apparent that what makes *The Godfather* what it is is Vito Corleone and the other famous members of the crime dynasty, and that the character of James Bond, the suave gun carrying agent, is the very essence of *Bond* films. Characters thus form the very core of films and TV-shows, therefore deserving the limelight in film and TV studies. However, as Bednarek (2010: 97-98) notes, characterization and character identity has not yet gained much focus especially in drama. Studying character identity construction is nevertheless justified in order to obtain a better understanding of how movies create meaning and give substance to characters. Furthermore, analyzing characterization is meaningful also because characters' identities and discourses have relevance to real life as well since similar methods are applied in interpreting characters from conversations in films as in interpreting real life persons (Bednarek 2010: 99). Therefore understanding character identities and relationships can give us implications and cues as to how we create meaning in everyday life and what factors influence our interpretations of real life people and their identities, especially through discourse.

Characters' identities are seen as formed in interaction with others, not unlike the identities of non-fiction persons. More specifically, character identity is regarded as a social and cultural

phenomenon that is partially intentional and partially habitual, according to views provided by Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 606-607). Viewing identity as constituted through discourse makes analyzing the characters' interaction a good starting point for studying how characters are composed and portrayed. Furthermore, in addition to character identity, through interaction it is also possible to draw conclusions about the situation they are in and the relationship between the interlocutors.

Since characters and their identities, much like real people, consist of numerous aspects from their background, language variety, hair color to favorite music, this study aims to bring about an understanding of characters and their identities. Since characters are not flat creatures encompassing merely one or two features, the present study focuses on shedding light on how to form a more comprehensive understanding of a fictional character by observing various factors of their language use, nonverbal communication as well as appearance. By analyzing these, we will study how characterization is achieved through linguistic and multimodal means, what aspects of their identities and attitudes are portrayed through these means, and how characters can be differentiated from one another. Furthermore, the development that takes place in the characters and their relationship will be mapped. The target of observation is the film *Training Day* and its two main characters, cops Jake Hoyt and Alonzo Harris.

The study is divided into five chapters and it begins with presenting some of the main themes and theories with respect to the present study. Sociolinguistics of performance will be discussed as well as notions concerning characterization, identity and the two language varieties utilized in *Training Day*. Next, some of the most relevant previous studies in character identity and relations as well as the film in question will be discussed in relation to the present one. In the second chapter the set-up of the present study will be introduced, including research questions, methods and data. In the following chapter, analysis of three scenes of the film will be presented and elaborated, leading up to a discussion and summarizing the main findings in chapter five.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section introduces some of the main themes and concepts of the present study. Starting with sociolinguistics of performance, from the vast field of film studies we will focus on exploring characterization and character identity. The two language varieties occupied in the film, Standard American English and African American Vernacular English, will also be explained. Next, some of the core research done in the fields of characterization and character relationships in relation to the present study will be presented. Moreover, previous studies on *Training Day* will be noted and observed in relation to the present one.

2.1 Sociolinguistics of performance

Performed language has been of interest to many sociolinguists recently due to the fact that it entails cultural values and intertwines with a larger set of modalities in forming social significance in our society (Bell and Gibson, 2011: 555). Moreover, performance offers multi-layered data filled with fruitful linguistic material for observing the role of language in society (ibid.). Focusing on language, Bell and Gibson (2011: 556-557) explain that performed language can be defined as language use that stands out from ordinary use and is clearly marked. In particular, staged performance includes "the overt, scheduled identification and elevation of one or more people to perform with a clearly demarcated distinction between them and the audience" (2011: 555). As a staged performance of one kind, films and other media products can be viewed as mediated performance (2011: 558). On a wider scale, sociolinguistic analysis of performance, according to Bell and Gibson (2011: 559), includes by default acknowledging all the modalities that constitute a performance. In other words, paying attention to not just language but also factors such as movement, music and appearance. In studying meaning-making of our society, sociolinguistics of performance is a fascinating field for research especially because mediated performances have sociocultural effects in our society due to their popularity. Furthermore, since media is gaining an ever-increasing role in society, our language use is being affected by the media and our everyday discourse is being filled with linguistic novelties (idib.).

Therefore Bell and Gibson (2011: 559) argue that it is safe to assume that performed language does play a role in language change, making it a relevant subject for study in both real and fictional communication.

Nevertheless, the difference between real talk and talk on films and TV is worth noting. Although fictional talk in contemporary films can be perceived, and is often meant to appear, realistic, it still lacks some of the features of real talk that might make fictional narratives difficult and unpleasant to follow. As noted by Bubel (2006: 42-44), repetitions, false starts, abrupt topic shifts and a number of other elements present in naturally occurring talk are usually missing in fictional conversations. This is due to the fact that these features of real talk can make it challenging to overhear the speech and they may hinder plot development (Bubel 2006: 43-44). Thus film and TV conversations have been molded so as to appear realistic and natural but without many of these pace and intelligibility hindering elements presented in our everyday speech. Bubel (2006: 44) sums up that film makers commonly utilize certain features such as discourse markers, hedges and pauses in order to create the illusion of real talk as well as to display certain facets of the situation. These features then help to advance from unmistakably stagey talk to creating an illusion of real talk.

2.1.1 Styling and stylizing

Related to the notion of performed language are the practices of styling and stylizing. In their article Higgins and Furukawa (2012: 2, 20) elaborate on the difference between these two terms in the following manner. Styling is taken to refer to the process of creating certain kinds of characters by assigning them specific linguistic styles and embodied features, all of which help viewers place the character in a certain social group and differentiate one character from another. Stylizing, on the other hand, is related to similar issues but in a more exaggerated manner; stylizing creates simplistic and inauthentic characters that both produce and rely on stereotypes.

As mediated performances such as films are all staged performances, they are linked to stylizing characters and taking advantage of the associations related to certain language varieties. Bell and Gibson (2011: 558) explain that staged performance is often expected to be linguistically somewhat stagey and exaggerated as well as carefully rehearsed, in other words stylized. These performances certainly rely on and are aware of the fact that certain

linguistic and stylistic variants are linked to specific social meanings (Bell and Gibson, 2011: 559). In other words, certain dialects and speech styles act as an index of specific social meanings. The performance thus always relies on the audience's knowledge of these meanings behind the indexes.

2.2 Inferring characters

Rimmon-Kenan (1989: 36) argues that a character is a construct that the reader connects from all the references and pieces scattered around the text. In other words, there are numerous aspects that come together to create an image of a character. More specifically, Rimmon-Kenan (1989: 59-70) explains that a character can be defined through either direct definition or indirect presentation in the following manner. Direct definition indicates the character being directly and bluntly described and defined by the author or another character; "she is kind hearted" or "he is a hot head". Indirect presentation, on the other hand, consists of different kinds of portrayals and implications of a character's personality, but these characteristics are not openly stated. Instead, the reader must infer these traits from for example the character's actions. More specifically, speech style, outer appearance, environment as well as actions can all convey indirect presentations of the character, all of which play a role in the reader making sense of the character (ibid.). Similarly, Culpeper (2001: 221-225) points out that visual features are an important part of a character. Kinesic features, in other words body movements and postures, together with appearance features such as clothing and stature are all a part of the complex notion of characterization. In addition, also Pearson's (2007: 43) notion of characterization is in line with the previous two. She concludes that there are six key elements that construe a character: psychological traits/ habitual behaviors, physical characteristics/appearance, speech patterns, interactions with other characters, environment and biography.

Furthermore, Culpeper (2001) elaborates on the process of inferring character from textual cues, both direct and indirect. Similarly to Rimmon-Kenan above, Culpeper (2001: 167-172) notes that character can be revealed through explicit cues, in other words through self-presentation and other-presentation. Implicit cues, then, range from language related matters to visual features and context. Culpeper's (2001: 172-229) list of these implicit cues is an extensive one, and takes into account numerous features in relation to character's language

use such as conversational structure, syntactic features, accent and dialect as well as paralinguistic features. In addition, another part of language use that shapes character impression is issues related to lexis, such as lexical richness and use of terms of address.

Rimmon-Kenan's and Culpeper's views are a very good basis for the present study, as the aim here is to observe all those factors that shape the character's identity and makes the characters who they are. Both direct and indirect aspects will be considered, but as direct presentations are not all that common and comprehensive, the main focus here will be in those indirect presentations that convey the character and indicate personality traits.

What makes studying characters more interesting is the fact that, according to Culpeper (2001: 87), in understanding characters we draw on resources that we use for understanding real life people. The same conclusion is drawn by Bennison (1998) and Bednarek (2010) as well. Furthermore, the same social categories that are used for real people are useful in character analysis as well; personal, social role and group membership (Culpeper, 2001: 87), which provides a helpful tool for character analysis as well. In addition, when it comes to characters we use the knowledge associated with dramatic role; that is, we have certain knowledge and presupposition about genres and dramatic roles attached to them, and we use this prior knowledge to perceive a character.

Although knowledge of real life people may be the main source of reference we use in interpreting fictional figures, characters' behavior cannot be analyzed in exactly the same way as real life people's behavior. Culpeper (2001: 145) points out that characters' actions are designed to be seen and heard by the audience, so they may bear more importance. We make much greater assumptions and place more significance into any behavior or action seen for example in a movie compared to real life. For example, from a near-accident on screen we will draw conclusions on the driver's characteristics (carelessness, perhaps doing it on purpose) and infer future events (an accident about to happen) much more than we would if something similar happened to our neighbor. The main reason for this is, as Culpeper (1998:87) explains, that we know the actions of a character have been determined by the writer, in other words the actions are not incidental decisions by the character but dictated beforehand by the author for a purpose. Furthermore, when it comes to fictional characters we also give more meaning to their actions and words due to the fact that what we see on screen or on the pages of a book is the complete set of behaviors that compose a character (ibid.). This of course simplifies the task of analyzing a character, although it also implies

that characters are much simpler creatures than real life people as knowing all the characteristics and details of a real life person is virtually impossible.

2.2.1 (Character) identity

In the present study identity will be viewed according to the notions provided by Bucholtz and Hall (2005). Identity is not viewed as something pre-existing but rather an emerging social and cultural phenomenon that is created through linguistic interaction with others (2005: 585-587). Characters negotiate their identities in contact with one another, and while doing so they are not only trying to find common ground but also attempting to maintain their independency. However, although negotiated in processes of interaction, identities do not exclude the resources created in past interactions, since all these processes go hand in hand in identity formation (2005: 588).

Furthermore, identity is not one sided, never altering or one levelled; instead, it is multidimensional and it entails many roles and stances. For example, cultural positions, in addition to temporary and interactionally constructed participant roles are some of the factors that comprise identity (2005: 591-592). In other words, identities consist of several micro levels that all operate at any given time. For example our participant roles may change from listener to joke teller, and we may associate ourselves more with a demographic category or an ethnographically specific position according to the situation. Indeed, as Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 606) conclude, identity is in part an outcome of different processes, ever evolving and affected by context and interaction. Similarly, Bell and Gibson (2011: 561) note that identity is both a process and a product; it is partially the result of past experiences and partially an entity under constant negotiation. Moreover, it involves both maintaining our individuality and establishing resemblance with others; i.e. it entails both similarity and difference (2011: 561).

Although fictional identities are always created by the author we can analyze them based on the notions provided above. In other words, even though characters and their multifaceted identities are all premeditated choices by the writer, they can still be viewed as shaped by their past interactions and experiences, as well as constructed in interaction with each other. Indeed, this study seeks to analyze how the identities of the main characters are portrayed in and shaped by interaction with each other.

2.3 Defining SAE and AAVE

A brief introduction of the two terms for language varieties used in this study is in order before launching further into discussion. Namely, what is meant with Standard American English, in short SAE, and African American Vernacular English, in short AAVE, will be explained. Although in the present study the main characters mainly employ one language variety that is considered to be the dialect closest to them, it should be noted that all speakers master several language varieties (Hodson 2014: 3). Although we tend to utilize one language variety more than others we still have knowledge and can use other varieties as well. Speakers' background is naturally a major factor in governing the language variety they use, and speakers often utilize the variety generally used in their social environment. However, the language variety used at any given time also depends heavily on the context and purpose of speech (Hodson 2014: 3).

Hodson (2014: 2) explains that Standard English refers to the dialect of English taught in schools and used in serious parts of the media such as the news. Furthermore, she notes that it is considered to be the language of educated people. However, different countries have differing versions of Standard English with somewhat varying pronunciation, so that the Standard English in United States is not quite the same as that in England. Standard American English then refers to the standard variety of English utilized in the United States of America. SAE includes a certain grammar, vocabulary and manner of pronunciation that differentiate it from other language varieties in the country. SAE, then, could be viewed as a clean version of English with clear pronunciation and textbook grammar with no slang expressions.

To explicate African American English, in short AAE, Mufwene (2001: 25) gives a broad definition to the intricate matter by labeling it as "English as it is spoken by or among African Americans". Green (2002: 1) goes on to explain that it is a language variety spoken by some, but not all African Americans, that has its own phonological, syntactic, semantic, lexical as well as morphological structure. It shares certain patterns with Standard English but is nevertheless not the same (ibid.). However, this by no means denotes an inferior position, it merely indicates that this variety has unique features that differentiate it from all other varieties of English. For example, some of the features that are typical for AAE but which do

not exist in SAE are double negation (*I ain't no snitch*), absence of certain verbs (*They walking too fast*), lexical items such as *steady* to mark repeating or continuing action (*She steady talking*) and changes in pronunciation such as *tes* (test) and *aks* (ask) (Green 2002). Furthermore, Green (2002: 7) points out that throughout the years several terms have been used to refer to the same matter, and at present some researchers prefer African American English, while others use African American Vernacular English or African American Language.

In the present study the term African American Vernacular English (AAVE) is adopted to refer to the language variety used in the film. Since some of the terms used to describe the same language variety are used interchangeably in literature, it could be argued that here there is no difference between using AAE or AAVE. However, AAVE is chosen for the purpose of this study since the language variety presented in *Training Day* is indeed the character's vernacular and only present in spoken form.

As Hodson (2014: 3) points out, different varieties of English are connected to speakers from specific social backgrounds and regions. Therefore it is possible to deduce information about the speaker based on the language variety they use. Furthermore, different language varieties are associated with differing values and connotations. Hodson (2014: 25) notes that the standard variety often carries more prestige than other varieties, which even leads to regarding the standard variety as proper language and all deviations from it inferior dialects. However, for example in the case of English, as further explained by Hodson (2014: 23-25), contrary to popular belief what is now considered "the language" is not the original form of the language. Instead, it is merely one of several dialects, one of which happened to become chosen as the standard (ibid.). Therefore, regarding the standard language as superior by default and other varieties as ultimately lower class has no historical backbone. Of course, this does not prevent assumptions and associations still taking place, as it is certainly the case that Standard English is generally considered more valuable than any other variety. More specifically, speakers of Standard English are most likely considered more educated and intelligent, whereas users of other varieties may be associated with less flattering descriptions. This is certainly a factor that is taken into account in film making as well, since characters can easily be associated with a certain kind of background and education level based on the language variety ascribed to them. Language is undoubtedly an important factor in creating a character as the variety that a character speaks can imply a great deal of information without having to spell out all the details.

2.4 Previous research on characters and their relations

According to Bednarek (2011: 6), characterization is a relatively rare research topic in the field of film, media and television studies. Although the topic is more common in literary studies some research does exist in the telecinematic context as well. The following is a brief look into some of the relevant studies that bear resemblance to the current one.

Bednarek (2010, 2011) studies characterization and especially language use in creating a character's identity in fictional television, with the television series Gilmore Girls as her main focus. Bednarek claims that characters are the main component in developing fictional television's plot and narrative and therefore deserve more limelight among scholars (2011: 6). She further notes that fictional characters can be used for portraying or representing certain values and attitudes, which become most salient when contrasted with one another (2011: 7). In portraying these values and attitudes as well as other aspects that make a character's identity, language plays a crucial role. However, other means in creating a character's identity are also worth noting and here Bednarek (2011: 12) presents a term called expressive character identity which refers to "those character traits that concern emotions, attitudes, values and ideologies". Character's expressive identity is construed by both verbal and nonverbal behavior and these expressive aspects are vital in shaping an impression of a character (2011: 19, 14). Furthermore, Bednarek's study shows that characters' behavior and talk is often marked with certain expressive features by which a character can be identified and also differentiated from other characters. In addition, a character's deviance from their common tendencies is clearly marked (2011: 15). Bednarek's notion of differentiating characters based on their language use is a good starting point for the present study, since the aim here is to examine the aspects in language and multimodality that make the characters different from one another.

Bubel (2006) also focuses on language use in a television series in her research about constructing character relations and in *Sex and the City*. Bubel analyzes how language is used in this series to build friendships between the main characters, an endeavor that she notes has not been given much attention in previous studies (2006: 62). Bubel's analysis focuses on the viewers', or overhearers', means for understanding the relationship on screen and this understanding is studied on the basis of two alignment patterns: familiar terms of address and

question-answer sequences. The results show how alignments can be temporarily shifted as there needs to be a balance between association and disassociation. According to Bubel (2006: 42), dialogue is used for constructing the characters' identities, providing narrative causality as well as creating humor in the series. Bubel points out that in forming both on and off screen relationships dialogue is the most important element but other factors play a role as well (2006: 59). Bubel's study provides an interesting backdrop for the present study as the goal here is also to look at language and the relationship between characters. Although not directly the main focus or direct object of analysis, the notions of associating and disassociating from one another are certainly underlying issues in many of the utterances by the characters in *Training Day*, as through language the main characters display their similarities and differences, and either strengthen or weaken the bond between them.

Also Kozloff (2000) examines dialogue and its function in films. Kozloff notes that dialogue can be used for numerous purposes; not only does it help to produce an image of the time and place but it also creates suspense, communicates causality or directs the viewer's attention. In addition, through dialogue events that took place prior to the time period of the movie can be disclosed. Furthermore, one function of dialogue is also purely just to portray ordinary conversation activities. Most importantly, however, it introduces the characters, differentiates them from one another and reveals their thoughts and inner lives. This notion fits to Bednarek's (2010: 106) deduction of characters having unique voices that are a means for differentiating them from one another, and these notions support the set-up of the present study as well.

The most recent entry on language in films comes from Hodson (2014) and her study on dialects in film and literature. She studies how different varieties of English are portrayed in these two forms of art and for what purposes. She notes that language is an important means for deducing information about a character, since different dialects of English have strong connotations about the person's background, education and social group (2014: 3). Moreover, language varieties and shifts between them can reveal much about the relationship and position of different characters in film and literature (2014: 6-7), which is of special interest regarding the present study. Hodson demonstrates these notions for example with an illustration of the film *Howards End*, and she points out how the viewer can infer much about not only the characters and their backgrounds but also the relationship of the couple from the way they speak to each other and how they adjust (or do not) to each other's speech style. The way in which the characters interact with one another thus reveals a great deal about the

characters' identities but also about their relationship, denoting that how language is used can uncover much more than what is actually being said. This certainly resonates with the present study and supports the premise of analyzing characters' language use as a means for deducing information about the identities and relationship.

Further, according to Pearson (2007: 43-49), there are six elements that construe a character; psychological traits/ habitual behaviors, physical characteristics/appearance, speech patterns, interactions with other characters, environment and biography. By studying the TV series *CSI*, Pearson notes how all these elements play a crucial role in creating a character as they all help shape an image of the character with many traits and a personality. In short, with all six combined these features create a "pseudo-human being" (2007: 48). Pearson explains that the traits and behavior of film characters can, and in some cases might even be expected to, change and develop throughout the narrative. In relation to the present study Pearson's six elements are meaningful, since all of these matters will be paid attention to. With language use and interaction centering the stage in this study, the characters' behavior, appearance and background will be analyzed as parts of constituting their identities.

Also LaGamba (2012) contributes to the topic of interactions between characters in cinema. LaGamba studies male and female characters' identities in relation to each other through an interpretive approach to three films. In particular, LaGamba notes that female characters' identities change over time and the reason for this is the contact and influence of male characters. LaGamba suggests that shaping of the identity usually serves to advance the plot, and that finally these new identities are the result of unfair stereotyping (2012: 14). Moreover, film as a product of the time reflects the contemporary ideologies and attitudes, and at the same time it has an effect t on the society and how people view themselves (2012: 9).

2.5 Previous research on *Training Day*

Some previous research on *Training day* exists, although only few studies focus on language use or other aspects of character identity in the movie. The following section will introduce relevant previous studies on the film.

The only study so far to touch on the subject of language's relation to character identity in the film Training Day is Bartley (2005). She examines language use in four interracial cop movies, focusing on how otherness is constructed by contrasting African American Vernacular English and Standard English. The study is conducted through descriptive means, in other words by merely describing the characters and situations in these films and by providing example scenes to demonstrate characters' language use. Bartley illustrates how black men in these movies are portrayed as "others" through their use of language; either they are separated from the white community by using AAVE or they alienate themselves from the black community by speaking SAE. In any case, these films always seem to portray black men as the "other", and even when speaking SAE the black main character is depicted as an exception. Furthermore, white Standard American English speakers can be seen as normal, favorable and more influential in the society, whereas AAVE users are marginalized. According to Berkley, in these films AAVE users are portrayed as others with limited positions and possibilities, whereas speakers of the dominant language are manifested as normal through their centralized characterizations (2005: 23). Furthermore, Berkley notes how language is used to create temporary bonds but ultimately also to manipulate in *Training* Day. Alonzo's abilities to switch between AAVE and SAE, although done skillfully, manifest his corruptness and breaking the codes, whereas Jake's attempts at AAVE lack not only credibility but also repercussions. Thus, the movie presents a stark division between AAVE and SAE and suggests that this line should not be crossed. Berkley concludes that the film highlights the differences between races and ideologies by contrasting AAVE and SAE (2005: 22). This study acts as a starting point for the present study, as Berkley's findings hint at the presumable outcomes of the more elaborate discussion on characters' language use conducted in the present study.

Another interesting study about *Training Day* by Baron and Carnicke (2008) analyses screen performance in the form of temporal and spatial movements of the two main characters. Baron and Carnicke (2008) base their work on Laban movement analysis as they study the actors in terms of their movements, gestures and expressions and how these are an essential part of both characters. Laban movement analysis is a framework for describing and analyzing human movements as expressions of their inner selves, and for analyzing a movie this network of concepts provides a tool for observing how an actor performs movements to portray the character's disposition and thoughts (2008: 189-191). Focusing mainly on one specific scene of the film, Baron and Carnicke elaborate on the differences between the two

main actors and their characters. They describe how Denzel Washington portrays direct physical and vocal movements together with sharp shapes, whereas Ethan Hawke's performance is marked with indirectness, unbalance and flexibility (2008: 193-194). They conclude that Washington's movements are strong, sudden and tightly bound, whereas Hawke uses more light, sustained and contemplated movements, all of which are aspects that reflect their characters' identities (2008: 193). Indeed, Laban's theory proves that characterization can be created with the design of movements and expressions, and these factors all play a part in differentiating the characters from one another. As in this case, the characters' different temperaments are manifested in their movements (2008: 197), and these traits become even more obvious as the movie progresses. Although the present study will not focus purely on movements and non-verbal communication, Baron and Carnicke's study does offer a fertile background for analyzing the two characters' identities in terms of multimodality.

In film studies the role and portrayal of black people has been studied to a great extent and there are also studies about black masculinity as well as evil cops, all of which are topics that interconnect with the current study. The general pattern of action cop films has been demonstrated by Brown (1993), who elaborates on the common rules and patterns of movies that fall in this genre. Training Day does follow some of these main patterns and obeys most of these common rules, although these are not the focus of the present study. Brown also states that the hero is often morally superior and defends traditional American values, whereas the villain's aim is to gain power and wealth by performing calculated acts of violence, thoughts that resonate with the present study as well. Brown (1993: 6) goes on to explain that the co-heroes often have visibly different ethnic backgrounds but normally in these movies problems arise due to their differing personalities. In other words, ethnicity as such is not emphasized although it is implied in their personalities, as is the case with the movie under investigation in the present study. Gates (2006), on the other hand, examines masculinity and detectives on screen and more specifically the development of the black detective over time. Gates (2006: 200) notes that in contemporary cinema it is typical to place a black star next to a white co-actor, as is the case in *Training Day*, in order to appeal to both ethnicity groups and thus attract big audiences. Moreover, the white experience is still the focal concern of mainstream cinema, in which the African-American detective is cast as the "other" in the white society (2006: 189-190). Furthermore, Gates (2006: 190-193) argues that ethnic minorities are often portrayed negatively in mainstream cinema and non-whites have

less power on screen, factors that reflect and contribute to stereotypes and racism. However, it is also suggested that black detectives must prove their worth and masculinity on screen assumingly merely due to the nature of their job, instead of any color-related issues (2006: 216). Therefore on surface level these movies seem not to focus on ethnicity issues or problems surfacing from racial differences but instead on clashes of personalities or representations of the profession or masculinity, as partially suggested also by Brown above. This is the stance that the present study takes as well: this study will not focus on ethnicity as such or as a part of causing some of the problems between the main characters. Rather, the focus will be on analyzing the personalities and identities of the characters as the main source of their differences and dilemmas.

Other interesting studies that shed light on the background and premise of *Training Day* have also been conducted in recent years. Baker (2012) draws similarities between Training Day and real-life LAPD, noting that the film bears some resemblance to actual events and figures. Firstly, Baker (2012: 56-57) notes that the movie draws on the Rampart scandal, which is probably the worst corruption scandal so far to ever hit the LAPD, and Alonzo's character in many ways resembles the main villains in the Rampart case. Secondly, Baker (2012: 56) reports that it has been suggested that the reason behind the most serious problems in LAPD in the past few years result from African American and Latino officers' criminal behavior, as is the case in the Rampart scandal, and Training Day seems to comply with this notion. In effect, the fact that the movie presents a white hero defeating the black crook cop serves to highlight the racially skewed image of LAPD corruption that the film aims at presenting (2012: 57). Moreover, the film depicts "a dysfunctional law enforcement system" where bad and illegal policing for personal gain is tolerated due to the effectiveness that such cops nevertheless provide (2012: 57-58). In addition, the movie portrays a conflicted attitude towards violence; Jake must also resort to some violence as this is necessary in order to stop the rogue cop, although violence is not the solution and not enough to put a complete end to the evilness. Similarly, Maruska (2010) discusses the development of the role of cops on screen and notes that in the 21st century corruption appears to be a major theme in police dramas. Maruska (2010: 56-57) also points out how Training Day portrays a bad cop who gains impunity from the three wise men, all adding to the impression that the cops themselves are the real problem instead of drug dealers and gangsters, an image which eloquently is portrayed in the final confrontation between Alonzo and Jake where the gang bangers and other jungle residents act as mere bystanders.

Coleman and Cobb (2007) use *Training Day* as one of their two examples of telecinematic portrayals of evil cops and the taint of blackness and they conclude that the juxtaposition between blackness and whiteness is the main theme and cause of problems in this film. They note that by depicting a social environment filled with racial signifiers these kinds of films and series justify extreme policing (2007: 101-103). Moreover, the poor and especially the colored are implied to be inferior and inherently deficient, which therefore legitimizes using excessive force (idib.). Furthermore, Coleman and Cobb note that Alonzo's evilness is caused by and symbolized in his black body, whereas Jake's whiteness represents his innocence. This stark contrast becomes evident when these two opposites are put next to each other, so that Jake's pureness highlights Alonzo's predatory-ness. Although the present study seeks to refrain from jumping into conclusions about the role of ethnicity as the source of the characters' differences and difficulties, the clear juxtaposition of the characters and their goodness is evident. However, Coleman and Cobb (2007: 117) go on to argue that race seems to be the defining factor in the characters' behavior: "(e)ach man's racialized body symbolizes his essence and that essence provides reason for his actions". In the end whiteness and pureness wins over the powers of evil and life can continue in the American suburbs and streets. Coleman and Cobb go on to explain that the black versus white -setting is a rather common one in Hollywood films where black males are often othered (2008: 119), as already noted above in other studies. Indeed, Henderson (2010: 1213) too notes that films tend to represent a rather narrow picture of black men mixed with stereotype and admiration. Training Day endorses an image of a criminal black male who is from the streets and poses a threat to the white hero (2010: 1214-1215).

Furthermore, Sexton (2009) contributes to the discourse on racialized Hollywood by discussing black actors' position in the film industry as well as touching on the role of a black director. According to Sexton, the black figure can be seen almost as a threat to the civilization and interracial friendships therefore are also set to fail. He observes Alonzo's behavior in the movie and notes how Alonzo only seems to think of himself and act out of his own accord, not giving much thought for the well-being of others. Moreover, on the relationship between Alonzo and Jake Sexton (2009: 52-53) points out that there is identification, desire as well as aggression between the two. Especially at the beginning of the film they try to form a bond and be similar but towards the end their differences create insurmountable problems and finally it is concluded that they are not, in fact, the same. In addition, Sexton (2009: 58-60) acknowledges the allegories of the slave trade and King Kong

that the movie depicts, in particular in the powerful scene at the end where the defeated Alonzo poses one last threat at the jungle inhabitants by claiming he owns the place and comparing himself to King Kong.

In conclusion, although characterization is not an overly common research topic in film studies, there are several studies that act as a backbone or support the set-up of the present study. As noted, language is a starting point for analyzing characters, but a fuller understanding of characters demands paying attention to other elements as well. Furthermore, *Training Day* has only been the focus of attention of a few studies, none of which have attempted to provide an extensive analysis of the main characters' identities. Some attention has been given to their use of language in general or their movements in one scene respectively as indicators of their differing personalities, which both certainly provide a fruitful starting point for the present study. Furthermore, some studies have been conducted about policing in films or the representation of black men on screen, both ideas of which resonate with the present study on a theoretical level but which are not of special focus here.

3 THE PRESENT STUDY

This study will have language as its starting point for characterization, since as Higgins and Furukawa (2012: 2) note, characterization is achieved mainly through linguistic means. Furthermore, Kozloff (2000: 43-44) states that revealing the character is the main function of dialogue, and dialogue is used in making characters substantial by implying on their inner life. Indeed, language acts as a major indicator of a character's identity. It can also act as a means of differentiating between characters since it is a powerful tool in creating contrasts but on the other hand, also in building bonds. In *Training Day* language serves both of these functions: linguistic means are used not only for trying to achieve a common ground and create a sense of togetherness, but also for creating divergence. Moreover, language is a window to the characters' inner lives and we infer the characters' identities mostly, although not only, through their language use.

However, language is not the only means for interpreting character. Since performance in film and television is a multimodal one also other factors help construct a character, as

pointed out by Bednarek (2010: 18-21). As Bednarek (2010: 144) sums up, emotion is conveyed through embodied performance together with language, so that a multimodal analysis is needed in order to understand the full meaning and being of a character.

Starting from these viewpoints, the present study will commence analyzing the characters. This section will outline the set-up of the present study, starting from presenting the aims and research questions of the study and discussing the relevance of such research. Next, the data will be introduced by briefly discussing the main plot of the film *Training Day* and its two main characters. Finally, the methods of analysis will be presented.

3.1 Aims and research questions

A great deal of research has been conducted in recent decades on cinema, identity and relationship construction respectively. However, as noted by Bednarek (2010: 97-98), especially in drama studies character identity and characterization have not been the center of much attention. However, studying character identity construction is meaningful for a number of reasons that have relevance to understanding both popular culture and its artifacts as well as real life. Firstly, studying fictional characters enables to obtain a better understanding of how movies create meaning and give substance to characters. Since we consume popular culture in large quantities and spend a great amount of time in front of the television each day, studying the shows we watch and what they consist of is of value. Moreover, since we apply similar methods in interpreting characters from conversations in movies as we use in interpreting real life persons (e.g. Bednarek 2010, Culpeper 2001), studying characters' identities and discourses can reveal matters related to real life as well. More specifically, understanding character identities and relationships can give us implications and cues as to how we create meaning in everyday life and what factors influence our interpretations of real life people and their identities, especially through discourse.

Conducting research on *Training Day* is particularly interesting since not many studies have been conducted about the film in question so there is plenty of interesting findings to be discovered. Studying films in general is fruitful because movies always reflect and at the same time shape our society; they cannot be seen as purely empty forms of art consumed by

viewers but forgotten as soon as they step outside of the cinema. Popular culture reflects the attitudes of our society, which makes studying a product of our culture fascinating. As LaGamba (2012: 123) points out, socio-cultural factors have an impact on the plot and character interactions in movies. Furthermore, cinema influences the ways in which societies view themselves, which then is being translated onto screens and plots which reflect these views and spirits (2012: 9). Studying films is therefore meaningful in order to create a better understanding of how societies work and how they create meaning.

Furthermore, Androutsopoulos (2012: 143-144) argues for the legitimacy of the study of cinematic discourse by stating that this area of sociolinguistic study deserves its place in its own right, and that studying films is significant for studying socio-cultural differences and language ideologies as represented in cinema. Moreover, Androutsopoulos (2012: 142-143) notes that language in film studies has not gained a great deal of close inspection as anything more than a container for the actual contents. However, language and its many dimensions in films do deserve a spotlight, an endeavor recently tackled by Hodson (2014), and cinematic discourse should be studied not only as a mere tool but as a valid platform for the performance of sociolinguistic differentiation.

The present study focuses on character identity and characterization in cinema. The aim is to analyze how the main characters construct their own identities on the one hand, and how these contrast with one another, on the other. In other words, the main focus of the present study is to describe and discuss the linguistic and multimodal means by which the two characters in the film *Training Day* construct and exhibit their own identities and how the characters contrast with one another. More precisely, the study will focus on analyzing language use and multimodal interaction as well as cinematic representations of the characters. Furthermore, with character identity as the starting point the focus will also be on how the relationship between the two characters develops during the film. More specifically, the aim is to analyze how the characters' behavior changes during the film and what these changes imply about their relationship.

To sum up, the research question to which the present study seeks answers to is the following:

How are the character identities and relationship of the two main characters in the film *Training Day* constructed linguistically and multimodally?

More specifically, these themes are analyzed with the help of the following questions:

- 1. What kind of identities do the characters have and how are they portrayed though linguistic and multimodal means?
- 2. How do the characters differ and how is this depicted? For instance, how do they use language differently and for what purposes?
- 3. How does the characters' relationship develop over time? How are changes in their relationship portrayed?

3.2 Data

3.2.1 Introducing the film

Training Day is a 2001 film directed by Antoine Fuqua focusing on two LAPD officers of the narcotics department. The film, starring Denzel Washington and Ethan Hawke, follows Jake Hoyt's (Hawke) eventful 24 hours as a training officer in Alonzo Harris's (Washington) supervision, a time period in which Jake is introduced to some of the dark sides of this line of duty. After a rocky first encounter, problems quickly start to build up due to Jake's and Alonzo's differing views on law, justice and morality. Alonzo, being a seasoned detective used to running the streets his own way, readily bends the rules and engages in illegal activities and questionable methods in order to gain evidence or personal rewards, whereas rookie Jake on his first day on the narcotics team is shocked to discover the true colors of Alonzo's antics. Willing to please his boss Jake at first seems gullible and ready to do anything it takes to get on his superior's good side but as the tension builds up Jake finally realizes that he not only has his morality and innocence to lose but also his own life.

During the training day, Jake is taken along to bust college kids buying weed, conduct an illegal house search as well as obtain information from a snitch using dubious methods. Furthermore, Alonzo takes the rookie with him to a meeting with three seasoned officers who are on top of the food chain, as well as to a rendezvous with his secret mistress —both of which are encounters benefiting only Alonzo and leaving Jake as a mere outsider. In addition, in the day they visit Alonzo's acquaintance, an important drug dealer, who later on in the film gets his house raided and his money stolen by Alonzo's team, after which he is coldly shot dead by the very same man who earlier paid him a friendly visit. Alonzo shooting who Jake

believes to be Alonzo's friend is the final straw and causes a change in Jake's attitude and willingness to follow Alonzo's lead any further. The ensuing conflict results in Alonzo paying to get Jake killed by a Mexican gangster. In the end, Jake's life is spared due to his good deed earlier the same day; Jake single handedly fought two junkies on an alley to save a high-schooler from being molested. As it turns out, the school girl is the main gangster's cousin and Jake gets off the hook as a favor in return. As the night approaches Jake searches Alonzo and they have a final, violent confrontation which leaves Alonzo injured and cashless. As the clock strikes twelve Alonzo is shot dead on the street by Russian mobsters, whereas Jake returns home to his family.

Throughout the day Alonzo rather evidently misuses his position as a superior by effectively forcing Jake to smoke drugs as well as offering him alcohol on several occasions. After busting the college kids early on in the film, Alonzo proceeds to threaten Jake to smoke the narcotics or end his training day there and then. After an initial refusal and an argument, Jake quickly assesses the situation and decides that the chance he is being given career wise outruns the risks of using the illegal substance —an act he will later realize to have cost him all credibility to file a complaint about Alonzo's code of conduct. Furthermore, what becomes evident as the movie progresses is that Alonzo is acting out of his own accord the entire time. He owes an enormous amount of money to a Russian mob and failing to provide them the cash by the end of the night leads to Alonzo paying with his life, and this is the motivator behind all his actions. In other words, all the events that he takes Jake through that day have to do with helping Alonzo out of his own difficult situation and guarantee that he gets the cash in time.

Acclaimed at the time of release, the movie also earned an Academy Award for best actor for Denzel Washington as well as a nomination for best supporting actor for Ethan Hawke.

Although ethnicity is not directly the reason behind the two officers' differences, it is clearly a visible theme in the movie, Washington being African American and Hawke Caucasian. However, this study will not focus on ethnicity or view clashes caused by differing ethical backgrounds. Rather, this study will aim at pinpointing the differences in the characters' identities and view the problems between the main pair stemming from these personality differences. Moreover, as Brown (1993: 84) notes, racial differences, which are rather common in cop films, serve to function as a symbol for personality differences in a rather visible and clear manner. Brown (1993: 84) explains that the co-heroes in police movies are

28

often from visibly different ethnic backgrounds, but the movies emphasize their personality differences instead of possible clashes caused by their ethnical backgrounds. In short, ethnicity is not the real issue but merely a symbol on the surface level representing the different personalities on the inside.

3.2.2 Introducing the main characters

3.2.2.1 The greenhorn: Jake Hoyt

Jake Hoyt is a young police officer, who takes pride in his job and likes to do things by the book. The movie starts with Jake waking up in his home with his wife and infant child, creating an image of him having a warm home with a loving family. The young cop appears to be a decent man who wants to provide for his family and advance in his career. He clearly has done well in order to have been given the chance to try out for the narcotics team, a move which would benefit not only the balance on his bank account but also his long-term plans of becoming a detective. Although wanting to advance in his career, Jake is not willing to compromise his morality since he has a clear understanding of not only his rights but also responsibilities as an officer of law. Due to his well-meaning demeanor and family centered life Jake is portrayed as a rather ordinary, almost middle-aged American male who merely wants to do well in his job and come home to his loving family.

3.2.2.2 The gangster with a badge: Alonzo Harris

Alonzo comes across as a quick, sharp man who walks his own path and is used to doing things his way and he expects his subordinates to follow his lead. Being a seasoned officer and having his own team certainly add to Alonzo's self-esteem as he appears a confident man who does not take no for an answer. We learn that the officer, probably in his forties, is married with kids but has at least one mistress and one extra-marital child on the side. Furthermore, the fact that he uses alcohol while on the job and engages in shady methods while conducting business all indicate that he does not hold what is commonly viewed as law and morality in great value. However, Alonzo does seem to be dedicated to get the job done as he takes pride in having locked away numerous dangerous drug dealers. It seems that

Alonzo paints by a bigger brush and does not care too much for the so called small fish. Moreover, he drives a lowered old-school Chevy and seems to be completely at ease on the ruthless gangster-filled areas, factors which indicate that he not only works on the streets but lives it too.

3.3 Methods of analysis

In analyzing the characters' identities and interaction the main focus will be on their language use. In addition, the study also includes analyzing the characters in terms of multimodality. Transcribed examples of scenes will be analyzed in detail to provide discussion on the aforementioned topics, all of which will be introduced and elaborated in this chapter.

The study will make use of scene-based analysis, as used by for example Bednarek (2012), so that the themes will be analyzed using certain scenes and characters' behavior and interaction in them as examples. More specifically, three example scenes from the film have been transcribed and these will then be analyzed from the point of view of conversational structure, style shifting, terms of address as well as multimodal factors. These scenes will be used as a starting point from which the discussion will be extended to reflect on the characters' language use and demeanor throughout the entire film. This method enables observing carefully and thoroughly examples from one scene at a time, from which all these different aspect can be taken into closer inspection. One scene can thus serve as the platform for analyzing several issues and it can therefore be used broadly to display speech patterns and power relations, for instance. While short examples from the scenes are provided in connection with the analysis, full transcripts of the three scenes can be found in the appendix.

Transcribing conventions in this study are based on Dressler and Kreuz's (2000) model, which is a system for discourse analytical purposes. The conventions used in the present study are the following:

We? Rising intonation

Yes. Falling intonation

five, six Continuing intonation

POCKETS Stress or saliently louder speech

°ok° Soft speech

"oh" A shift in the speaker's voice

(2.0) Pause, seconds

.. Pause, one-half second or less

... Pause, more than a half-second

>waitwait< Rapid speech

<my name> Slow speech

baa:m Lengthened syllable

wha- Word cutoff

Take [it] Overlapping speech

[No]

HH Audible breathing

(stupid) Unclear or unintelligible speech

((nervous laughter)) Paralinguistic behavior

3.3.1 The scenes

The analysis of the study will focus on three scenes of the film in which the two main characters interact in pivotal situations. There are several reasons for why these particular scenes were chosen for closer analysis. Firstly, scenes where the two cops are the main (or only) characters were chosen due to the fact that observing how they interact with each other is clearer and more fruitful in scenes where they mainly only interact with each other and there are no (or few) others interfering. Second, the scenes were chosen based on the plot and character development. Pivotal scenes can reveal common features or changes in the characters' attitudes, which can be reflected on their language use and behavior, which is why observing game changing scenes can be interesting and revealing. Therefore it is justifiable to choose scenes that bear significance to the storyline by either introducing the characters, complicating their relationship through a conflict or presenting a final confrontation that resolves the tension. Furthermore, due to the limitations of the scope of the present study only a few scenes can be analyzed in more detail, whereas others can only be referred to in a more general manner.

Due to these reasons a scene from the very beginning, from roughly the middle and from the very end of the film were chosen for closer scrutiny. In the middle scene Alonzo and Jake are the only characters present, whereas in the first and last scene there are some other characters present but out of which only one interacts shortly with the main duo. The first scene is crucial as it introduces the characters and sets the tone for the entire film; it is the scene where the two men meet for the first time in person and lay the groundwork for their relationship and interaction. The second scene takes place halfway through the film and through Jake's training day as the two officers have a serious discussion after Jake disagrees with the questionable house search and brutal murder Alonzo just involved him in. This scene and the events that led to it marks a change in both men; Jake finally starts to seriously doubt his ability to bend his sense of morality and rightness to join Alonzo's team and follow his line of policing, whereas Alonzo deduces that Jake is a liability. The last scene is the movie's final scene of the two men together, and it presents a violent encounter between the two cops. After almost being killed (on Alonzo's orders), Jake finally musters enough courage to stand up to Alonzo and put an end to his sense of immunity and superiority. This scene differs greatly from the previous one, and even more drastically from the first scene by presenting both Alonzo and Jake in a very different position than in the earlier scenes. These three scenes provide a window into the identities and relationship of the two main characters and the changes that take place in them, making these scenes a reasonable ground for research.

3.3.2 Conversational structure

In analyzing the language use of the characters, this study will draw on the framework of examining conversational structure by following Culpeper's (2001) example. Culpeper (2001: 172) explains that this framework for analysis forms the backbone of conversation analysis which is used for naturally occurring conversations, but which has also been successfully used in drama to analyze characters. Indeed, as Short (1996: 168) explains, the reason for applying linguistic theories concerning face-to-face interaction and pragmatics to studying drama is the fact that drama is comprised of interaction between characters. This is also why analyzing conversational structure can be applied to both real life as well as fictional conversations. It must be noted, however, that while the analysis method used here draws on conversation analysis and utilizes similar themes, it is not CA per se. While conversation analysis focuses on analyzing interaction and its aspect very carefully, the aim

here is to paint with a broader brush. The purpose is to draw conclusions and comparisons of interactional themes on a larger scale instead of analyzing very detailed aspects of it. Therefore the tools for analyzing interaction described below have to do with noting larger occurrences and phenomena rather than describing very carefully each detail and element.

Culpeper (2001: 172) notes how implicit information about a character can be inferred both from verbal and non-verbal cues by considering several aspects and matters, such as the structure of conversation. Culpeper (2001: 173) states that observing how people interact with each other can be revealing in terms of for example power structure, and more broadly character identity and differentiation. Analyzing conversational structure, then, includes examining how discourse is distributed between participants by focusing on such elements as turn taking and topics. To briefly explain, a turn can simply be considered "the enactment of a speaker's right to speak by taking an opportunity to speak in a speech event or situation" (Herman, 1998: 19). It is a complex matter, but this is a simple explanation that suffices here. Furthermore, turns alternate at the same time as speech alternates; since speaking equals taking a turn, alternating speech then equals alternating turns (ibid.). In addition, as Herman (1998: 26) explains, turns may be allocated by self-selection, the first speaker choosing the next one or turns may lapse. Turns can also be grabbed by a second speaker interrupting the first one, thus starting to speak while cutting off the first speaker.

Observing, for instance, who holds the floor or changes the topics can be rather revealing of the characters' relations. Similar to Culpeper, for example Herman (1998) examines how characters, situations and events appear through turn management in the play *Look Back in Anger*. Herman studies characters' turn-grabs, turn allocation, turn order and turn texture to draw conclusions about the situations and characters' relations. She (1998: 32) concludes that studying turn-management in dramatic dialogue can reveal a great deal more about the characters and situations than studying merely the meaning of what is being said. Another example of a similar method used to infer characters is Bennison's (1998) study of the play *Professional Foul*. Bennison examines how a character's personality is inferred from his language use, more specifically from his turn management tactics. Namely, turn-taking, turn-length and topic-shift are the themes under discussion in the study, providing rather revealing results about the characters.

More elaborately, describing conversational structure includes all these elements of turn management but also topics, linguistic choices and terms used. Therefore this study will take into account the characters' volume of talk including frequency and length of turns, allocation of turns and topic control. Again, analyzing these elements is conducted in a broader fashion, following Culpeper's (2001) lead. In other words, for instance turn length is not counted in seconds on screen but rather with words in order to show the difference between characters, as demonstrated by Culpeper (2001: 255-262) in his example analysis of the film *Scent of a Woman*. However, as Herman (1998: 25) notes, analyzing turn management brings about only a partial understanding of the material since there are numerous elements to study in conversations. Nevertheless, turn management and conversational structure do shed some light on characterization and are, together with other topics, a good place to start in making sense of characters and their relations.

3.3.3 Terms of address

Another factor that this study will examine concerning language use is terms of address. Terms of address and vocatives are closely related and sometimes used interchangeably (Dunkling 1990, Leech 1999), but for the sake of clarity in this study the notion terms of address will be used. Furthermore, the focus here will be given to direct address terms. This is merely due to the fact that direct addresses are a more fruitful subject for studying as indirect addresses only take place a handful of times throughout the film.

Terms of address as a part of characters' language use, as also mentioned in Culpeper's (2001) extensive list of implicit cues of characters, are an interesting subject of observation due to the fact that they can reveal social information about the speakers. As Culpeper (2001: 193) notes, through the use of terms of address characters can indicate their social relations as well as be placed in certain social groups. Furthermore, Bubel discovers in her study about the characters of *Sex and the city* that terms of address can act as an "interactional resource for establishing alignments" (2006: 139), and as a result they can also function as doing friendship. In other words, terms of address can play a role in establishing and maintaining relationships by signaling for instance togetherness or closeness. On the basis of these notions analyzing the use of these terms can be fruitful for the study of characters.

Terms of address will be divided into categories based on Leech's (1999) semantic categories. Leech introduces a set of categories for dividing terms of address, or vocatives, which can help to identify and analyze the terms. The categories are as follows.

Endearments (such as baby, sweetie); typical especially between females and family members.

Family terms (such as mommy, dad); typical especially between family members. Familiarizers (such as dude, man, bro); typical especially between males to signal solidarity. Familiarized first names (such as Paulie, Tom); typical between friends and family. First names in full (such as Jennifer, Thomas); typical between friends, family and acquaintances.

Title and surname (such as Mr. Smith, Mrs. Newton); typical in a more distant and formal relationship.

Honorifics (such as madam, sir); typical in formal situations where there is a clear asymmetrical balance between the speakers.

This list is by no means a comprehensive list and it fails to take into consideration all the nuances of usage, but it is a relatively good starting point and does give indication about the terms and social group markings (Culpeper 2001: 193-194). Furthermore, what needs to be taken into account is the context in which the term of address takes place, since it has an impact on the term and its function. As Dunkling (1990) notes, the meaning of vocative relies heavily on the context, as the vocative can turn from a rather neutral or positive one even to a hostile one depending on the situation in which it is uttered.

According to Leech (1999: 108), vocatives and terms of address can be used for three different purposes; attention seeking, addressee identification from among other possible recipients and establishing and maintaining social relationships. The term's position in a sentence also appears to indicate the purpose of the term. An initial vocative normally serves the first two purposes, whereas a final vocative serves the last two (Leech 1999: 116). However, as final vocatives or terms of address seem to occur more often in conversations, Leech (1999: 117) concludes that social role is the most significant factor in vocatives.

Leech's list will be used as a guiding line based on which the terms of address will be observed. Furthermore, the context in which they are uttered will be analyzed, from which we will draw conclusions on the function of the terms. However, from the functions introduced by Leech above it is evident that the role of establishing and maintaining social relationships is the most prominent function of the terms used in the scenes under research. This is due to the fact that in the scenes chosen for closer analysis the two police officers are either the only characters present or at least the main people who interact, which is why addressee

identification or attention seeking are of less concern to the characters. However, even within the realm of social relationship maintaining and negotiating there can be different functions for the usage of terms of address, as will become apparent in this study.

3.3.4 Style shifting

As a part of the characters' language use and idiolect, this study will also pay attention to style shifting since it takes place in notable situations and circumstances. Hodson (2014: 3-10) remarks that studying dialect in film is meaningful in that it can reveal matters not only about the characters themselves and their backgrounds, but also about character relations. Furthermore, Culpeper (2001: 206) notes the importance of dialect and accent in characterization and states that standard and non-standard language uses are commonly associated with dissimilar personality traits. Due to dialects' link to personality, it is interesting to observe language use and change from this point of view. In particular, observing cases where the characters for some reason change their normal dialect are especially interesting since they can reveal aspects about the context and the characters' hidden agendas. For these reasons this study will analyze cases of style shifting between African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Standard American English (SAE).

There seems to be some inconsistency in labeling the changing from one social dialect to another, such as AAVE to SAE (and vice versa). More precisely, there appear to be differences in whether this is defined as style shifting or code switching. For example, in his article Bartley (2005) refers to the changes between AAVE and SAE in *Training Day* as code switching, whereas in some cases similar kind of language use is referred to in such a manner as to avoid specifically labeling the change in speech (e.g. Bucholtz and Lopez 2011). However, to avoid confusion this study will adopt Ervin-Tripp's definitions of the two terms. According to Ervin-Tripp (2001: 46-49), code switching refers to switching between two languages in cases where the speakers are bilingual. On the other hand, style shifting is taken to happen in situations where monolinguals modify their style of speech for example according to the addressee or general speech conditions. This, in short, is what happens when speakers alter between dialects of ultimately one language, such as SAE and AAVE. This notion is also shared by for example Hodson (2014: 171), who states that style shifting denotes altering between speech styles of one language.

Furthermore, Ervin-Tripp (2001: 49) explains that the reasons for dialectal feature shifts are similar to reasons behind code switches, such as changes in emotion, emphasis or attitude. Hodson (2014: 174-182), then, goes on to elaborate that there are three types of style-shifting in films and literature, and she explains them in the following manner. Emotional style shifting takes place in situations where the character's emotions suddenly alter due to being shocked, surprised or distressed. Transformative style-shifts, on the other hand, refer to a character shifting to a new language variety that no one else in the situation speaks. Rather, the character aims to change their circumstance by making use of certain linguistic features of a target group they wish to be identified with. However, the type of style-shift that is of most interest in relation to the present study is interpersonal style-shifting. This occurs when characters alter their manner of speaking according to who they are interacting with. This notion is closely related to Bell's theory of audience design. Bell (1984: 159) argues that speakers alter their speech according to their audience or addressee, in other words they apply audience design. More specifically, speakers take the hearers into account and modify their speech accordingly, which is a useful theme in relation to the present study as audience design appears to be the main force behind the style shifts that take place in the film.

3.3.5 Multimodal factors

To complement the observations about language use this study will also analyze characterization from the point of view of multimodal factors. As Bell and Gibson (2011: 566) note, a performance does not consist of just language when there are other modalities present. Since film is a visual media the characters' outer appearance, for instance, pays a part in character impression formation. In addition to appearance, the characters' behavior, movements and expressions are important factors as well. As noted by Leech (1999) and Culpeper (2001), all these elements compose a character, which is why it is important to pay attention to all these factors. Again, the focus here will be on nonverbal communication and outer appearance as mediums of interaction rather than aiming to detail very carefully each part of the characters' embodied action. Elements of nonverbal communication will thus be observed in a broader light in order to observe patterns of behavior instead of narrating their embodied style and actions in very careful detail as would be customary to conversation analysis.

The importance of non-linguistic modalities in characterization and performance is pointed out by several studies, such as McIntyre (2008) Bednarek (2010) as well as Bucholtz and Lopez (2011). Furthermore, Bell and Gibson (2011: 566-567) sum up some of the main multimodal factors in performances such as music, set, characters' appearance as well as characters' movements and gestures. Similarly, in relation to implicit characterization cues, Culpeper (2001: 221-225) notes that there are two categories of visual cues that play a role in characterization. Firstly, kinesic features, which are dynamic cues related to body movements, include such matters as positioning, facial expressions, body movements, posture, eye contact, touching and so on. Secondly, appearance features consist of such more static features as physique and numerous elements of the character's outer appearance and looks, stature as well as clothing. For example, the audience can infer much about a character's background and socio-economic status based on their clothing, and certain characteristics are easily linked to specific appearance features. For example, a beautiful person is attributed with more positive features than an unattractive one, a tall man might be linked with power more so than a short man, and a person dressed up in a neat suit and carrying a briefcase is considered more educated and well-off than a weary-looking fellow in jeans and a backpack.

Given these notions, in this study the characters' appearance will be described in connection with their identities. Observations will also be made about their body movements, gestures, gaze, tone of voice and different ways to mark their speech. Attention will be paid to general patterns of behavior and attitude as well as any deviances from the norm.

4 ANALYSIS

In this section the results of the study will be presented and analyzed. Observations will be made about the characters individually and also comparatively. The analysis will be done through scene-based analysis, so that examples of all the topics under discussion will be picked up from parts of the scenes and studied. The analysis will be based on a careful investigation of three scenes; one of the first scenes of the film, one from roughly the middle, and one of the very last scenes of the film.

The identities of the characters are manifested through their use of language as well as their appearance, behavior and actions. Next, factors affecting and reflecting their identities will be introduced, and the main means for this will be through analyzing their language use in terms of conversational structure, style shifting and terms of address. Furthermore, multimodal means such as outer appearance and nonverbal communication will be observed. Comparisons between the characters will be drawn and changes taking place in the two main characters and their relationship will be touched on.

4.1 Coffee shop scene

This scene takes place at four minutes into the film and it is the first face-to-face encounter between Jake and Alonzo. Alonzo has invited Jake to meet him in a coffee shop which is where the pair will start their day, Jake's training day. Alonzo is already sitting in a booth, having finished his meal he is reading a newspaper. Jake enters and sits down opposite him and attempts to converse with his new boss. The situation gets off to a rough start and ends up with Alonzo being frustrated at Jake, after which they get up and leave.

In this scene the main arising themes are related to power and how it is displayed, resisted or accepted. Displays of power are mainly done on Alonzo's part, and Jake's role is to accept it or reject it. Furthermore, the ways in which pleasing and respect are portrayed will also be observed, as these are behavior patterns displayed by Jake towards his superior. Furthermore, signs of discomfort and annoyance can be seen on both of the characters and these will also be discussed.

4.1.1 Displaying power

From the very first moments it is clear that there is a certain tension between the two cops and that Alonzo is keen on signaling his stronger position in the equation. He displays several modes for doing so, including purposefully grabbing or ignoring turns, locking his gaze sternly either on his paper or on Jake, and stubbornly remaining on a topic and demanding more details when Jake attempts to move on.

The scene begins with a somewhat peculiar exchange of greetings, or rather lack thereof on Alonzo's part. Jake politely bids his superior good morning as he joins Alonzo on the table. Alonzo, however, chooses to remain silent, thus displaying his power by refusing to acknowledge the newcomer's presence. Jake patiently waits for some small talk to take place but Alonzo signals his unwillingness to participate by commenting on matters rather shortly and keeping his eyes on his paper. Silence and lack of eye contact are both manners for the senior cop to show his superior position and role as the dictator of communication. Furthermore, commenting on matters shortly is uncommon to Alonzo, as later on becomes evident. After a moment of silence Jake self-selects the turn and attempts to break the ice and show some power by ignoring his supervisor's cold attitude. However, Jake's attempt is once again brushed off, as can be seen in the following example. The following discussion is preceded by a short exchange on Alonzo prompting Jake to have breakfast but the newbie politely refusing the offer. Here Alonzo is focused on his paper and Jake tries to get his attention.

Example 1

(5) J: It's nice here.

((Alonzo lifts his gaze and looks at Jake for the first time since his arrival))

- (6) A: May I read my paper? ((points at his paper with index finger))
- (7) J: I'm sorry, sir. [I—
- (8) A: [Thank] you. ((resumes looking at his paper))
- (9) J: You know what, I'll get something to eat. ((opens hand to the side, starts to turn around for the waitress))
- (10) A: Nah hell no you won't, you fucked that up. ((with a strong, determined voice, locking eyes with Jake))
 I'm tryin'ta read my paper ((points at paper with index finger)), please, shut up.

In this example Jake appears the more active side by self-selecting and seeking attention. When Jake comments on the niceness of the place (turn 5) he finally succeeds in grabbing Alonzo's attention enough for him to lift his gaze to look at Jake. However, Jake's comment is met with sarcasm on Alonzo's part as he not only blatantly disregards the rookie's wish to

converse but also switches to SAE, which is in clear contrast to his usual speech style. Jake apologizes and starts to say something else but is quickly cut off with Alonzo's "Thank you" (turn 8). Grabbing the turn and sarcastically shutting off the conversation is another sign of power as Alonzo does not let his new partner finish his sentence. Next, Jake self-selects (turn 9), which again is followed by Alonzo's abrupt shutting off in a rather impolite manner (turn 10). Altogether style shifting is utilized as a tool of power and to convey differing tones of attitude.

Later on in the scene, Alonzo prompts Jake to tell him a story, during which Alonzo interferes several times although Jake is the one holding the floor, as can be noted in Example 2. Having realized that Jake, much to Alonzo's displeasure, cannot remain quiet long enough for the senior cop to finish reading the newspaper, he sternly orders the rookie to entertain him. As Jake begins replaying the events of a successful DUI stop he was involved in, Alonzo makes it clear what he thinks of the story.

Example 2

- (17) J: Well there was a DUI stop. ((now looking at Alonzo))
- (18) A: A DUI. WHOA let me load up my GUNS! ((bangs his two guns hanging on each side of his chest together while looking at Jake))
- (19) J: ((nervous laughter)) c'mon ((tossing has hand to the side and looking to the side))
- (20) A: <A DUI, [O:h shit!>] ((laughing, placing his arms on the table in a steady position))
- (21) J: [Well, I-] Listen alright, it's good. ((opens hand palm up, then presses fingers on the table))We were on mid-watch [a-
- (22) A: [We?]
- (23) J: Oh, me and Debbie. ((motions with hand))
- (24) A: Who's Debbie?
- (25) J: Oh am, I'm sorry, ((hand close to head)) Debbie Maxwell, my training officer. ((motions with hand in front of him))
- (26) A: °You had a female training officer?° ((looking at Jake somewhat surprised, almost whispering))

(27) J: Yessir.

((Alonzo starts smiling and licking his lips))

Here Alonzo is quick to address parts of the story that he either finds interesting or not fascinating at all. Firstly, he comments sarcastically on Jake's choice of story (turns 18 and 20). These exclamations function to demean Jake and his choice of story and simultaneously hint at the type of action Alonzo himself is used to. Jake then tries to take control and continue the story (turn 21), thus demonstrating a moment of power by not giving in to Alonzo's mocking. However, this is a short-lived sense of control as Alonzo quickly interrupts him (turn 22). He is curious about the we-form that Jake uses which prompts him to inquire about who else was involved. As it turns out, Jake's pair was a female officer, which immediately grabs Alonzo's attention as his next comment is uttered with a whisper-like voice and an emerging smile (turn 26). The scene continues with Alonzo interrogating Jake about the female officer.

Throughout Jake's story Alonzo blatantly interrupts him three times and grabs the turn, as for example in turn 22 in Example 2 above. It becomes evident that Alonzo cuts off Jake's turns when they do not please him or he finds them irrelevant, or when he merely wants to startle the young cop. Furthermore, Alonzo addresses parts of the story that he finds interesting and refuses to let Jake continue without having gained adequate information. More specifically, Alonzo insists on finding out whether or not the female was a lesbian, which might be an indicator that Alonzo merely wants to infer from this information whether or not Jake was sexually involved with her. At the end of the story, when Jake has not included any details other than that of a professional engagement, Alonzo still remains in the male-female theme and attempts to persuade Jake to spill the beans. However, he does not get an affirming answer or approval on Jake's part. Although the story does not quite turn out the way Alonzo hopes, he certainly tries to control the topic and steer the conversation in the direction he wishes and focus on the juicy parts. Not letting Jake tell the story his own way or disclose only the information he chooses seem to work as a means for Alonzo to show who runs the show. Moreover, it appears as though Alonzo is unwilling to let Jake take the lead even for a moment, as he repeatedly interrupts the rookie's narrative and constantly intervenes in what is being said. Indeed, Alonzo entirely dictates when a certain theme is covered adequately and when Jake is allowed to proceed with the story by verbally giving Jake the permission to continue.

Furthermore, when it comes to body language and demeanor, Alonzo's presence appears to radiate authority. He sits in a secure position in the booth, arms resting strongly on the table or on top of his seat, which makes him ooze with self-confidence. His movements are sustained and strong and he produces no flimsy hand gestures like Jake. Instead, the hand gestures that he makes are stronger and clearly representative of the object he refers to: Alonzo points at his paper with his index finger while talking about it and later he takes off his glasses and points with them at the paper and then at Jake. Moreover, Alonzo maintains his sight constantly either on his paper when he tries to read it, or after discarding it he locks eyes with Jake and never leaves them to wander around the room. In addition, his use of voice is more controlled as he delivers his lines accurately and with determination. When he gets excited about the involvement of a female in Jake's story, his voice, interestingly, gets low and soft, as if to indicate his new-found fascination towards the narration. In short, Alonzo gives the impression of being a strong, independent character who asks and needs no one's approval or advice. In addition, Alonzo's outer appearance further increases his strong being. He certainly seems to pay attention to his appearance, dressing in lean, dark clothes topped off with prominent pieces of silver jewelry. His dark clothes and tattoos together with his sharp demeanor make him appear a street-savvy chief, who works and lives the streets.

Although Jake is the one who opens the conversation and wants to talk in the beginning, it is rather clear who has the upper hand and controls the situation in this scene. Alonzo appears to take charge in many ways by deciding for example when discussion takes place and on which topic. The total volume of speech seems to be rather equally divided in the first scene since the two men alternate between turns and both characters have 25 turns each out of the total 50. However, the turns are not completely balanced due to the fact that the majority of Alonzo's turns are longer than Jake's, suggesting that he is a more powerful character. However, in the beginning Jake appears to have more command and take the initiative to talk more, a condition that turns out not to last.

4.1.2 Signs of resistance and acceptance

When it comes to power distribution there is often some negotiation and resistance involved. In the first scene Alonzo clearly is in a stronger position but at times he also resists Jake's attempts at taking the lead. For example Jake's opening of the conversation by greeting his superior and thus allocating the turn to him yields no reply. Similar instances take place several times at the beginning of the scene as Alonzo leaves Jake's small talk attempts hanging in the air invalidated. Alonzo effectively refuses to acknowledge Jake's efforts or give him the pleasure of being able to start an actual conversation.

At the same time Jake's repeated efforts to begin a conversation by taking the turn can be seen as a sign of not only persistence but also attempted power. He tries to maintain his spirits and not let Alonzo's silence discourage him even after the senior cop tells him to shut it. It is clear that the newbie feels uncertain and insecure as he squirms around in his chair but he finally musters his courage and tries to catch Alonzo's attention one more time, therefore effectively defying his superior's request of silence. Continuing blabbering is thus Jake's way of resisting Alonzo's authority. Otherwise, however, Jake becomes less powerful as the situation progresses as he submits to Alonzo's lead.

Although Jake generally takes the turns allocated to him by Alonzo, towards the end of the scene there are instances where Jake does not reply, which might be an indicator of bafflement towards his superior's questions. The following exchange takes place after Jake has finished his proud account of preventing a homicide by stopping a murderous driver.

Example 3

(46) A: You got him. ((applauding)) That's amazing.

((Jake laughs a bit))

It is. That you could be out there with a fine bitch for a year and the most ENTERTAINING story you can come up with to tell me .. is a drunk stop.

((they gaze at each other and their smiles slowly evaporate))

But I don't believe you ((smirking, turning head to one side, licking his lip)) "You tapped that ass didn't you?" ((softly))

((Jake smiles insecurely, turns his head to the side))

Didn't you? You know you tapped that ass. You put her in the backseat, BAA:M CODE X ((smirking))

- (47) J: Look man I got a wife. ((turning head to the other side, not looking at Alonzo))
- (48) A: You got a dick ((looking at Jake))

((a moment of silence, Jake turns to look at Alonzo))

You DO have a dick don't you? ((raising eyebrows))

(49) J: Yes. ((nods))

Here Alonzo teases Jake about having sex with the female officer, and subsequently questions Jake's manhood when Jake rejects the suggestions. Alonzo allocates the turn to Jake and then repeats his question as Jake provides no answer at first (turn 46). Jake's shy comment "Look man I got a wife" is not only an honest reply but also a soft manner to put down Alonzo's assumptions and reject his suggestion. Interestingly, this is not a straight answer to the question but merely an indirect notion of Jake's morality and view on his take on extra-marital affairs. In a way Jake silently accepts his superior's teasing, although his downward gaze and insecure, hunched back position reveal his uneasiness in the situation. In addition, a similar instance of not answering a question straightforward takes place earlier during the story-telling before Example 3 as Alonzo demands information about Jake's partner's sexual orientation, and Jake's seeming innocence and unwillingness to disclose any information irrelevant to their job results in merely concluding that Debbie is "pretty good". Again Jake fails to provide a clear answer and instead avoids eye contact and merely smiles weakly and insecurely. He thus seems to wish to avoid conflict by providing a seemingly soft, neutral comment that rejects Alonzo's suggestions in a gentle manner, similarly to what is observed in Example 3. Silently accepting his superior's moves not only works to keep him on Alonzo's good side but also highlights his underdog position.

In general Jake appears to accept Alonzo's authority and reign over him by going along with Alonzo's pace and rules. Alonzo is free to comment, interrupt and meddle with Jake's turns, whereas Jake does not interrupt his senior's talk or make any suggestions about his behavior. These are signs of not only submission but also of respect for his superior, as Jake probably aims to please Alonzo and make a good impression on his first day on the job. Further, the newbie's proud account of the DUI stop clearly strives to gain Alonzo's approval and acceptance. When his story does not succeed in gaining Alonzo's appreciation but instead

results in Alonzo's mocking comments (turn 46), Jake's smile evaporates and he merely looks at his superior sternly. Furthermore, a noticeable sign of respect can be observed in Jake's usage of terms of address. Jake addresses his superior as *sir* four times in the beginning of the scene, for example in "Good morning, *sir*". These are all signs of respect as Jake at their first encounter seems to react to Alonzo's presence formally and with courtesy, which most likely indicates a learned habit to address superiors with the honorific term in question. Moreover, it is an indicator of an asymmetrical relation between the two characters because as the term implies, the two men are not in a similar position. In addition, Jake's outer appearance seems to signal that he is a plain person merely leading his regular life, which seems to comply with the observations about his behavior as well. His run-of-the-mill clothes and relaxed appearance imply that he is a rather ordinary man, who does not wish to draw too much attention to himself or cause trouble.

4.1.3 Signs of discomfort and annoyance

As noted above, Alonzo seems to be rather on top of the situation, although an increasing amount of frustration is building up. Jake, on the contrary, displays feelings of uncertainty and discomfort, which are reflected somewhat on his manner of answering questions and more clearly in his nonverbal communication.

As this is the first time the main characters meet, Jake might naturally be somewhat nervous to encounter his boss for the first time and this feeling further increases at the same time as the bizarreness of the situation builds up. At the very beginning of the scene Jake is encountered with Alonzo's violation of politeness rules as Alonzo does not make eye contact when Jake enters nor does he try to make small talk as would be customary in such a situation. Not being used to an uncomfortable situation as the one at hand, Jake squirms around and his gaze wonders around the room. He seems unsure whether to stay quiet and just sit there, as requested by his new supervisor, or if he should hold on to common rules of discussion and try to make conversation and find common ground. It appears as though these contradicting thoughts in his head are reflected on his movements as he fidgets and squirms around which makes him seem nervous and insecure.

Throughout the scene Jake uses more flexible hand gestures, gazes around the place and slouches in the booth with humped shoulders. He swings his hands around several times and

especially when engaging in a narrative he moves his arms and hands constantly in an unmethodical manner. What makes his body language stand out even more of that of Alonzo's is his nervous gaze. At times Jake avoids eye contact with Alonzo as though he is either ashamed or protecting himself from him, for instance when being questioned about the female officer. Jake's body language thus reveals a great deal of his inner state and his feelings of insecurity and position as an underdog.

In addition, there are a few instances where Jake makes a minor comment accompanied with nervous laughter that uncovers his uneasiness and even annoyance. In turn 19 in Example 2, right after Alonzo has interrupted his story the first time, Jake mutters "c'mon" and laughs nervously a little bit. This reveals his discomfort and uncertainty at how to react to Alonzo's mocking. Furthermore, later on in the scene after the senior cop has interrupted the story once more with a loud noise Jake utters "Holy shit, what the fuck", again accompanied with some laughter and a puzzled look on his face. It is evident that Jake is not entirely comfortable in the situation and does not know how to react and these minor comments and laughs reveal that. However, he is unwilling to cause tension or trouble so he rather lets Alonzo's comments slide and goes on with the story as soon as he gets the permission to do so.

Alonzo, on the other hand, is somewhat more ready to let the rookie know his take on matters. Alonzo utilizes both subtle and more obvious means for displaying annoyance and displeasure in the newbie. At the beginning of the scene Alonzo is markedly frustrated by Jake disturbing his peace and he blatantly brings this forward by ordering the rookie first to be quiet and later to entertain him. Moreover, at times Alonzo comes across rather agitated due to his loud, rapid manner of speaking and the way in which he almost spits his words at Jake.

Another means for Alonzo to display his annoyance towards Jake is switching language varieties, as portrayed in Example 4 below. The difference between his usual speech variety and standard American English is noticeable and the shift certainly bears importance. In the first scene style shifting takes place in two instances, the first of which at the beginning of the scene as the two cops have a brief exchange on eating breakfast. Here Jake has just politely refused the waitress's menu and Alonzo weighs in on the matter without leaving his paper.

Example 4

- (2) A: Nah get some chow in you .. before we go to the office, my dollar. ((lifts index finger, eyes still on the newspaper))
- (3) J: Thank you sir but I, um, I ate. ((motions with hand))
- (4) A: Nah fine, don't.

((Jake looks at Alonzo, then nervously glances around the place. Clasps hands on the table.)) (5.0)

(5) J: It's nice here.

((Alonzo lifts his gaze and looks at Jake for the first time since his arrival))

- (6) A: May I read my paper? ((points at his paper with index finger))
- (7) J: I'm sorry, sir. [I—
- (8) A: [Thank] you. ((resumes looking at his paper))
- (9) J: You know what, I'll get something to eat. ((opens hand to the side, starts to turn around for the waitress))
- (10) A: Nah hell no you won't, you fucked that up. ((with a strong, determined voice, locking eyes with Jake))

 I'm tryin'ta read my paper ((points at paper with index finger)), please, shut up.

(bold added in order to highlight the main parts of style shifting)

As Jake is turning the menu down Alonzo starts with his typical vernacular and advises Jake to order something to eat. His "Get some chow in you before we go to the office, my dollar" (turn 2) is in clear AAVE. Jake politely refuses to which Alonzo replies again in clear AAVE (turn 4). This comment is delivered in a manner that implicates that the case is closed as far as Alonzo is concerned. However, when Jake goes on to comment on the niceness of the coffee shop, Alonzo chooses to reply in SAE. "May I read my paper" (turn 6) seems to display Alonzo's disapproval of the interruption in a sarcastic manner, which however does not completely register with Jake. This comment, masked as a question, is a sign of Alonzo's annoyance at the rookie's chit chat and simultaneously a request for him to be quiet. Jake's following apology is abruptly cut off with Alonzo's turn (turn 8). Next, Jake suddenly

decides to get something to eat after all and Alonzo then switches back to AAVE. "Nah hell no you won't you fucked that up. I'm tryin'ta read my paper, please shut up." marks a return to his own vernacular and clearly displays his frustration at the rookie's indecisive nature. Here it appears as though Alonzo utilizes SAE to express his displeasure and annoyance in a sarcastic manner, whereas AAVE displays reprimanding.

Yet another signal of power is Alonzo's use of terms of address. Although used scarcely in the first scene, much can be inferred from it. In the first scene Alonzo uses only one term of address for Jake and that is *Hoyt*. As the senior cop is ordering Jake to entertain him with a story he spits out "Tell me a story. *Hoyt*." Using a last name address is not a familiarizing speech event as using the person's first name would be. On the other hand, as it is their first encounter it could be assumed that the pair keep each other at a certain distance and do not address each other with familiar names. However, when considering the context in which Alonzo utters the young cop's last name it does appear that the utterance is not a pleased comment and Alonzo's attitude towards the new guys is short of warm and welcoming.

As can be noted in this scene, starting from the very first encounter between the two men there is a noticeable power imbalance between them. There are several means in which power is either taken, resisted or accepted. Alonzo signals power and its possession for example through turn management, topic control as well as body language. Jake, on the other hand, displays signs of discomfort and uncertainty through nonverbal communication and a manner of speaking in a neutral, respectful way. At times Jake attempts to take control of the situation but more often than not these efforts fall short. Instead, he surrenders to his superior's mocking and interrupting. It quickly becomes rather clear that it is Alonzo who holds the strings and plays the cards, and Jake's role is to follow his lead if he wishes not to cause conflicts.

4.2 Discussion in the car scene

The second scene under examination starts at roughly 76 minutes into the film. The scene is a discussion between Jake and Alonzo that takes place right after they have raided the home of Roger, Alonzo's ally who they first visited earlier the day. Alonzo has used a shaky excuse to obtain a search warrant, and together with Alonzo and the rest of his team Jake unwillingly

becomes a part of not only stealing some of Roger's drug money but also killing him in cold blood. Jake is a reluctant participant in all of this, as he neither accepts the reward money nor agrees to shoot Roger although Alonzo encourages him to do both. After getting what he needs from the drug lord's house Alonzo decides to destroy evidence by murdering Roger himself but teams up with his old crew to claim that Jake pulled the trigger. A row ensues first in the house after which Jake, seemingly shaken and nervous, receives some pieces of advice from his supervisor in the car.

Here the tension between the two characters has built up to a breaking point as Jake cannot digest what he has become involved in. Power is a major theme again in the scene, as it is throughout the movie, and now both cops argue to obtain a piece of it. The power struggle results in a conflict, during which both men show signs of being agitated and frustrated. Furthermore, an arising theme in this scene is manipulation as a means for Alonzo to keep the rookie in his control.

4.2.1 Power struggle and confrontation

In the second scene the atmosphere is clearly thicker than in the coffee shop scene. Here there is an evident power struggle as both men try to bring forward their opinions. A verbal confrontation takes place during which turn grabs, long turns, nonverbal communication as well as accusations and argumentation are utilized to try to obtain a more powerful position. On the other hand, remaining silent, not taking allocated turns and portraying submissive body language are signs of resignation.

In the events before this scene Jake has learned Alonzo's true colors and what it would take to be a part of the senior cop's team, and he must decide whether he can adapt to it or quit before the going gets more serious. Jake no longer hides behind an insecure smile but instead he openly confronts Alonzo and accuses him of murder, claims against which Alonzo naturally defends himself. The scene begins with Jake and Alonzo sitting in Alonzo's car outside of the now crime scene that is Roger's house, and the following example takes place right in the beginning of the scene.

Example 5

(1) A: "You aight?"

((Jake looks at Alonzo solemnly. Alonzo glances over his shoulder, then looks back at Jake))

"It behooves you not to dick around on this. Justifiable homicide in the line of duty ok? Now what happened [was]" ((with a soft, quiet voice))

- (2) J: [What] happened was murder. And armed robbery. Or wait. Wh- we had badges? So it's different? [-
- (3) A: [Oh] son can- open your eyes. Can't you see? Huh? ((raising his voice, annoyed. opens his palm))
- (4) J: That man was your friend. And you killed him. [Like a fly]
- (5) A: [laughter] C'm- my FRIEND?

 Tell me why? Because <he knows my first name?> ((points at his chest with both hands)) Son this is the game, I'm playing his ass. That's my jo:b! ((points at chest again)) That's YOUR job! ((points at Jake with index finger))

 Roger sold dope to kids. The world is a better place without him! ((beats down with index finger in rhythm of speech))

 Ey! This man was <the biggest major violator> in Los Angeles. I watch that cocksucker ((points over his shoulder with thumb)) operate with impunity for over TEN years and now I GOT him. The shit's chess it ain't checkers! ((loud agitated voice, beating down with index finger))

((Jake turns his head away, Alonzo keeps looking at him)) (5.0)

Whatcha think we were gonna do. That we gon- we gonna .. roll up in a black and white? ((points loosely over his shoulder with thumb))
Huh? Slap the cuffs on him. "You're under arrest." That's a high roller, dawg.

Example 5 begins with Alonzo asking Jake is he is ok, to which Jake provides only a nonverbal answer. Jake's look is stern and solemn and he looks Alonzo in the eye but does not utter a word. Alonzo then proceeds to replay the events as he wishes Jake to recount them, thus displaying power by signaling that he is in a position to tell the rookie what actually took place moments earlier. Furthermore, here he lowers his voice to a more quiet tone which makes his words seem softer, more empathetic and also in a way more powerful. Jake, however, refuses his superior's version of the story straight away and blatantly grabs the turn in the middle of Alonzo's sentence (turn 2). Jake's newfound confidence and shock at what he has witnessed appear to enable him to confront his superior in a way he has not done before. He puts on an accusing tone of voice and openly challenges Alonzo by claiming that they committed a murder and had no right to do so. Alonzo is quick to grab the turn and

regain control in order to steer the conversation back towards his point of view, and he starts by allocating the turn to Jake and asking a rhetorical question in a loud, agitated voice (turn 3). Jake readily takes the turn and continues his accusation (turn 4), after which Alonzo seems to lose his temper as he again grabs the turn (turn 5). Alonzo sarcastically laughs off Jake's notion of the drug dealer being his friend and continues to give the rookie a lecture about his line of business, during which Jake no longer interrupts him. Here Alonzo utilizes not only powerful words but also loud voice and aggressive, beating motions with his hands in rhythm with his words. There is a pause in his speech during which Alonzo keeps staring sternly at Jake while Jake looks away, which indicates Alonzo's unflinching demeanor while Jake portrays signs of submission. After a moment it appears as though Alonzo calms down somewhat and continues with depicting how useless merely arresting the drug lord would be, therefore indicating how street law works and that matters should be dealt with his way. Throughout the example Alonzo portrays his fearless attitude by looking Jake straight in the eye and only momentarily glancing backwards in the beginning. Furthermore, referring to Jake as son twice in this example indicates a more superior position and can thus ben seen as tool for conveying power. It also appears as though Alonzo engages in longer turns as a portrayal of power, and this is a common phenomenon especially towards the end of the scene.

The scene continues with Alonzo soon changing the topic, thus continuing to display his reign over the situation. The senior cop tries to encourage the rookie to take the money, first by advising him nicely and softly, but Jake demonstrates his unwillingness to comply by repeatedly refusing his offer in a determined manner. Next Alonzo attempts to persuade him to be a part of the money distribution in order to gain access to the team, as demonstrated in the following example:

Example 6

- (11) A: Jake, you not making them feel like you're part of the TEAM. ((softly))
- (12) J: The team? ((raises eyebrows)) You guys are fucking insane. Alright I'll go back to the valley, I'll CUT parking tickets, you know. ((turns head around, motions with hand))
 - ((Jake looks outside of the window, closes eyes, clenches teeth, beats down with fist))

I- it can't <BE> like [this].

(13) A: [It is this way man.] I'm sorry I exposed you to it but it is. It's ugly .. but it's necessary. ((softly))

In this example it appears as though Alonzo is pleading to Jake to take the pile of cash both for his own as well as the team's sake (turn 11), but Jake holds his ground and yet again refuses the offer. The newbie thus continues to defy his superior's wishes and displays a powerful mindset. He even goes on to bash the entire team, including Alonzo, which is a powerful indicator of his strong sense of morality and reluctance to cross the line. Here Jake appears to have more power over the situation as he maintains his opinion about the cash and instead gives Alonzo a piece of his mind. However, the conversation then changes course into a discussion about the general nature of the line of duty as Jake exclaims his willingness to rather take an easier policing job (turn 12). There is a pause in his turn during which Alonzo could easily self-select but chooses not to, instead patiently waiting for the newbie to continue on the subject. After a moment of consideration and looking outside of the window Jake states his disbelief at policing in his final line of turn 12 after which Alonzo readily grabs the turn to offer his opinion on the subject. Alonzo's comment is a soft apology and assurance of the necessity of their actions (turn 13). It appears as though Alonzo accepts Jake changing the topic into the general nature of narcotics policing as Alonzo's earlier attempts to turn Jake's head around did not succeed.

When it comes to displaying power this scene is in clear contrast to the first scene. As noted, Jake inner turmoil finally results in confronting his superior, which leads to a fight as Alonzo defends himself and his cause. During the heated discussion repeated interruptions and turn grabs take place, which is common to Alonzo but unlike Jake's communication style in the first scene. In addition, the difference in the characters' total volume of talk has increased as Alonzo's turns are generally longer and he uses three exceptionally long turns, while Jake often resorts to short, simple utterances. Furthermore, in this scene Alonzo portrays a much more varied use of nonverbal communication compared to the first scene. For example, he beats down strongly with his index finger in rhythm with his words when giving his speech about Roger, and although mainly locking his sight at Jake, he several times quickly glances behind his shoulder or points backwards with his thumb when mentioning issues related to Roger's house. His hand gestures and gaze are thus clearly related to his words and the matters he utters, and especially the strong hand gestures seem to increase at the same time as

his tone of voice raises as he no longer is clearly, undoubtedly in control. Such strong hand gestures thus appear to increase the effect of his words and make them more meaningful and powerful.

Similarly to the first scene, however, Jake begins to show signs of submission towards the end of the scene. After his powerful outburst at the beginning of the scene some signs of compliance emerge. Towards the end of the scene Jake's comments become shorter and at times he again avoids eye contact by gazing out of the window. It appears as though Alonzo must speak more in order to convince Jake of the rightness of their actions, whereas Jake's utterances mainly act as counterarguments in the beginning and as mere comments on Alonzo's longer turns in the end. Alonzo seems to manage to regain his powerful position and Jake submits to his will.

4.2.2 Manipulation

Related to the notion of power is manipulation, which in this movie is demonstrated on Alonzo's part. Towards the end of the movie it becomes evident that Alonzo is not only crooked in his vision of policing but also willing and able to do almost anything to achieve his goals. Alonzo manipulates Jake to gain his trust in order to be able to fulfill his plans, and he achieves this by not only distorting the truth but also adopting a softer and more paternal speech style. The tools for attaining such a style are lowering his voice, adopting a calmer style of delivering his lines, switching speech varieties and generally appearing to care about the rookie.

The following example takes place right after the previous one, where Jake has exclaimed his disbelief towards the true nature of working in Alonzo's team, to which Alonzo has offered a sympathetic reply and reassurance of its necessity. Here Jake once more voices his thoughts on the subject after which Alonzo begins his monologue about Jake's future prospects.

Example 7

(14) J: I BECAME a cop to put away drug dealers, the poisoners, the criminals. Not to BE one.

- (15) A: "Son just let it be. I know what you're going through, I know what you're feeling. You're SCARED." ((softly, almost whispering))
- (16) J: I'm not scared. ((annoyed, shakes head))
- (17) A: "Yes you are. You're terrified. Everybody goes through that the first time. I went through it. The sooner you can match what's in your head ((points temple)) with what's going on in the real world ((points over his shoulder with thumb)) the better you gonna feel. In this business you gotta have a little dirt on you for anybody to trust ya. When all this is behind you there's gonna be a whole other world that opens up for you. I walk a higher path son. I can give you the keys to ALL the doors." ((very softly and quietly))

Here Jake begins with declaring his aim to lock up criminals instead of turning into one. Alonzo then self-selects the turn to comment with a soft voice on Jake's supposed fears (turn 15), feelings which he claims to understand. Jake, however, refuses this notion (turn 16) to which Alonzo offers a long, educational turn during which he offers Jake a positive picture of his future on the job. Alonzo uses his superior position and knowledge of the line of work as a means through which he can assure the rookie of the importance and inevitability of some of the harder measures they have taken earlier. Alonzo's long monologue (turn 17) results from Jake's disbelief at Alonzo's comments earlier, and as the senior cop talks more it appears as though Jake's resistance decreases. Although looking stern, Jake listens to his superior's speech and appears to give in to the promises of a better future. In this example Alonzo appears to be something of a father figure by speaking empathetically in a very soft voice, looking Jake in the eye and delivering lines about helping Jake achieve changes. After this example Alonzo proceeds to promise the rookie his own position as the leader as he claims that Jake has the magic eye that none of the other members of his team possess. What makes Alonzo appear shameless in his actions is the fact that right before stepping into the car and beginning conversing with Jake he has in fact ordered Jake to be hit by a Mexican gangster. What is more ruthless is that Alonzo plans to pay for Jake's death with Jake's share of the drug money he refused moments earlier. Alonzo thus blatantly misuses Jake's trust and gullibility while Jake believes his superior's words. In addition, Alonzo's fancy speech about understanding Jake's fears and offering him pieces of advice are merely means for manipulating the rookie in order for him to keep quiet about the true events at Roger's house long enough for Alonzo to eliminate Jake from the game.

In addition to verbally twisting the truth and putting on a much calmer, softer voice than moments earlier, in this scene Alonzo also style shifts in order to appeal to Jake. The scene and Example 5 discussed earlier start with Alonzo speaking in AAVE in "You aight?" (turn 1). When he continues his turn not only does Alonzo adopt a calm, fatherly manner of speaking but he also uses such vocabulary as behoove, which certainly is not a part of his vernacular repertoire. After Jake does not warm to his distorted truths Alonzo becomes agitated and raises his voice as well as switches back to AAVE again to deliver his message. His speech in turn 5 includes his typical exclamation ey, vernacular ain't as well as whatcha. However, after the discussion about the money Alonzo moves closer to SAE and a softer manner of speaking again in turn 15 in Example 7 above. For the rest of the scene Alonzo maintains this soft, SAE speech style in order to appear empathetic and closer to Jake. He gives advice and appears to relate to Jake's feelings as a disguised attempt to convince Jake of his supposedly good intentions. It appears as though Alonzo speaks in AAVE when he loses his temper but when he is more composed he manages to control himself and switch to a language variety that is closer to Jake's level. This appears a cunning and corrupt means to gain Jake's trust, and style shifting works not only as a means for manipulation but also as a tool for portraying his superior role.

In this scene also terms of address are used as a means for manipulation and displaying false emotions. Alonzo refers to Jake as son five times in the scene, some of which with negative, annoyed connotations but at times with a more multilayered meaning. For example in Example 5 Alonzo utters "Son this is the game, I'm playing his ass" (turn 5), which denotes not only frustration but also a hint of senior teaching his trainee a valuable lesson, since in the given context Alonzo aims to keep Jake on his side and convince him not to speak the truth of what happened to anyone else. Furthermore, the scene's next cases where Alonzo addresses Jake as son take on a more positive connotation. In Example 7 there are two occurrences for the term and here using this word seems to act as a symbol of Alonzo's good intentions in giving advice. Utilizing this particular term of address for instance in Alonzo's empathetic speech (turn 15) appears to signal a sincere, although deep down pretended, understanding of Jake's position. In addition, Alonzo's use of other terms of address in this scene can be seen to function as deceitful means of communication. Calling Jake by his first name or referring to him as dawg appear neutral or positive on the surface but in the context turn out to be false tokens of familiarity and understanding. Yet another example is using the term man in Example 6 in "It is this way man." (turn 13). Despite its seemingly positive connotation, in

this context the term conveys fake solidarity and a false sense of understanding each other. It also appears to serve as a way to soften the impact of disagreeing with what Jake has just suggested in his previous comment.

4.2.3 Signs of frustration and annoyance

Since the scene consists of a confrontation and arguing between the two characters some noticeable signs of frustration and annoyance also take place. In addition to uttered words and the meanings they imply, also tone of voice and gestures reveal a certain mood. Furthermore, aspects of turn management indicate willingness to either quickly grab the turn and make an argument or ignore an allocated turn and remain silent as a wordless protest.

As noted in relation to the previous examples of the second scene, the conversation in the car includes a varied use of turn grabs and interruptions. In contrast to the coffee shop scene now Jake also determinedly interrupts his senior as well as somewhat raises his voice when annoyed, similar to Alonzo. The atmosphere is in general tense and rather different compared to the scene at the beginning of the day. These aspects can be observed in Example 8 below that continues from Example 5 during which Jake accuses Alonzo of murder and Alonzo defends himself by giving a speech about Roger's dangerous nature. After his monologue Alonzo then changes the topic and tries to hand the rookie his share of the drug money they stole from Roger, which is where the following example begins.

Example 8

- (5) A: Take the money.
- (6) J: I already told you I'm not gonna take [it.] ((getting annoyed, motioning away with his hand))
- (7) A: [Just take] [it.]
- (8) J: [I'm] NOT gonna [take that.] ((raising his voice, looking at the pile of money))
- (9) A: [O:k] don't.

 Just burn it. Barbecue it. Fish fry it. I don't give a fuck. But the boys'll

 ((motions over his shoulder with the cash in his hand)) feel better [about-]

(10) J: [<FU]CK> their feelings. ((determinedly, turns to look at Alonzo))

Here Alonzo attempts to pass Jake a pile of cash and requests him to take it (turn 5). Jake, however, refuses the offer as he did when they originally divided their prey at Roger's house. Here, however, Jake portrays some signs of being irritated by Alonzo bringing up the subject again as his tone of voice conveys annoyance (turn 6). Together with uttering his words Jake performs a hand gesture and motions away with his palm, thus clearly indicating that he wishes Alonzo put away the money. His hand movement here represents a sweeping motion, as if cleaning away the dirty money. Alonzo pays no attention to this but instead proceeds to casually ask the rookie to "Just take it" (turn 7), as if it was no big deal. Next, Jake portrays more frustration by raising his voice, looking at the pile of cash in an annoyed fashion and emphasizing that he will not take it. Next, Alonzo again disregards Jake's comment by advising him to destroy the money if he wishes, just as long as he accepts and takes the cash (turn 9). Alonzo plays one more card and tries to appeal to Jake's will to please the team and make his way into it by stating that the old team might accept the rookie better if he does as he is ordered, but Jake does not buy into this suggestion. Jake blatantly dismisses the idea and simultaneously displays both annoyance and indifference towards the team (turn 10). Jake's comment includes a strong swear word, which is not all that typical for him, in addition to a raised voice and determined look at his senior. Jake thus displays his negative feelings towards the discussion with his words, tone of voice, gaze and gestures. Furthermore, what this example demonstrates is the increasing amount of interruptions and turn grabs that take place as the arguments and tension increase. Starting from turn 6 some overlapping takes place and in the subsequent five turns the next character begins to speak when it is still the first one's turn. This is an indication of rapid talk and an argument in which both want to have the last word and bring forward their opinion. Jake's interruptions appear to display his irritation whereas Alonzo's comments here seem to be aimed at turning Jake's head around.

In addition, Jake's stern look and at times silence are indicators of his frustration on several occasions. At the very beginning of the scene, as noted in Example 5, when Alonzo asks if Jake is doing fine, Jake does not provide and answer but merely turns to look at his superior in a rather stern manner. Similarly, in some instances Jake chooses to remain silent although he could easily self-select when there is a pause in Alonzo's speech. It appears as though he chooses to remain silent due to his anger and frustration, and he lets these feelings transmit to

his superior through his sharp gaze. Moreover, at the very end of the scene when Alonzo has finished his devious speech about Jake's future prospects he allocates the turn to Jake by asking "Ok?", but instead of an uttered response Jake merely looks at him, as if to imply that he is not in fact "ok" but does not know how to proceed. Alonzo decides to interpret this as an agreement and approvingly ends his turn with repeating "Ok.".

Similar to Jake, Alonzo also portrays his annoyance through raised voice, interrupting and grabbing turns as well as staring sternly at his counterpart. However, this behavior is not uncommon to him as he has depicted these patterns to some extent throughout the entire film. In general Alonzo appears to lose his temper quickly and react accordingly, which in his interaction is depicted through raised voice and strong words. Example 9 below highlights Alonzo's temper and means for portraying frustration and irritation. The discussion takes place early on in the scene right after Jake has repeatedly accused him of murder.

Example 9

- (4) J: That man was your friend. And you killed him. [Like a fly]
- (5) A: [laughter] C'm- my FRIEND?

 Tell me why? Because <he knows my first name?> ((points at his chest with both hands)) Son this is the game, I'm playing his ass. That's my jo:b! ((points at chest again)) That's YOUR job! ((points at Jake with index finger))

 Roger sold dope to kids. The world is a better place without him! ((beats down with index finger in rhythm of speech))

 Ey! This man was <the biggest major violator> in Los Angeles. I watch that cocksucker ((points over his shoulder with thumb)) operate with impunity for over TEN years and now I GOT him. The shit's chess it ain't checkers! ((loud agitated voice, beating down with index finger))

((Jake turns his head away, Alonzo keeps looking at him)) (5.0)

Here Alonzo portrays his annoyance towards the rookie's accusations by speaking in a loud, agitated voice while declaring his reasons for obeying street law. Furthermore, Alonzo's speech in turn 5 includes strong hand gestures which he seems to utilize here not only to strengthen the impact of his words but also to hint at the annoyance his words convey. For example he beats down with his index finger and points over his shoulder with his thumb, and while these gestures are connected to the words he utters and thus refer to the issues mentioned, they also seem to function to indicate his irritation, which transmits to his

movements as well. In the coffee shop scene Alonzo was rather controlled and sustained in his movements, which no longer is the case in this scene. Although portraying similar drilling gaze at his interlocutor, Alonzo's hand gestures have noticeably increased. It appears that as the tension builds up and Alonzo's reign is challenged he becomes irritated and frustrated, which he brings forth not only in his words but also in his nonverbal communication.

Alonzo's annoyance is further depicted in his use of terms of address and style shifting. For instance, in Example 9 Alonzo addressing Jake as son takes place in a situation where Alonzo is angry and frustrated because of Jake's accusations. The term in "Son this is the game, I'm playing his ass" (turn 5) appears to act more as a marker of Jake's inferior position compared to the senior cop, and as a way of showing Jake his place, as the term certainly does not convey too endearing emotions in these situations. Furthermore, it appears that Alonzo speaks in AAVE as they are having an argument and Alonzo's frustration and annoyance is reflected in him speaking his vernacular in the heat of the moment.

This scene differs a great deal from the coffee shop scene, where although unbalanced, the atmosphere was nevertheless not yet threatening or accusing. As the day progresses the tension increases up to a point of confrontation as Jake can no longer tolerate the blatant misuse of power in the name of policing that Alonzo's team demonstrates. A struggle for power between the pair ensues during which for example turn grabs and strong language are utilized as a tool for obtaining more power. In addition, nonverbal communication plays a major role in giving more effect to verbal accusations, pleas and explanations. Feelings of frustration and annoyance, on the other hand, are demonstrated both verbally and nonverbally by both cops. Furthermore, Alonzo attempts to manipulate the rookie by distorting the truth and adding emphasis by verbally appealing to Jake through style shifting, terms of address and tone of voice, for instance. In the end Alonzo's tactics seem to work as Jake gives in to his senior's high-flying promises.

4.3 Final confrontation scene

This scene is one of the last scenes of the film, starting from 106 minutes into the film, and it is the final one of the two main characters together. After the conflict following the events at Roger's house, Alonzo has ordered Jake to be murdered. Jake, however, manages to escape

the gangster's house where he was left to die and has now gone to the jungle looking for Alonzo and justice. The jungle is a dangerous, gangster-filled area, where Jake finds the senior cop in his mistress's house. The surprise encounter leads to a violent fight on the roof top as well as on the street, which results in both men wounded and bleeding. The scene starts with Alonzo lying on the ground and Jake pointing a gun at him. Some residents and gangsters have gathered around them on the sideway to watch.

As the day has turned into night the inevitable has happened and a major conflict has taken place. After realizing that Alonzo has intended for him to be killed by the Mexican gangster and after surviving the ordeal, Jake finally understands that there is no reasoning with the crooked cop that is his new boss. Jake seeks revenge, but only in the sense of rightful lawabiding justice that would see Alonzo locked up and accountable for his actions. As Alonzo is more wounded and lying on the ground Jake towers above him with a gun in his hand. The composition is rather revealing from the very beginning on as it is Jake who now is in a position of power. Not only does he point a firearm at his superior but he also holds Alonzo's bag of cash that the senior cop fruitlessly attempts to negotiate back. Alonzo must thus plead not only for his money but also for his life, as he needs to hand in the cash to a certain mafia by the end of the day in order to stay alive. The situation leads to an interesting array of pleads, intimidations and resignation on Alonzo's part, and perseverance and portrayals of power on Jake's.

4.3.1 Intimidation and attempted power

The concept of power is still very much present and on display in this scene. However, in contrast to the previous scenes Alonzo is now an underdog and Jake is in a position of more power. Not only is Alonzo lying wounded on the ground and the rookie pointing a gun at him, Jake does not appear willing to cooperate and negotiate a deal. Nevertheless, the senior cop makes an effort to try and gain more power by intimidating, provoking and diminishing the rookie.

The following example (Example 10) takes place right at the beginning of the scene and it opens the conversation as the men have stopped fighting. Right before this the two cops have violently fought and are now in the middle of the street in the jungle with some residents and gangsters gathering around to see the show. Alonzo is more injured, lying on the ground as

Jake grabs the bag of cash from Alonzo's possession and tosses it to the side. Jake then takes his gun, aims it at Alonzo and opens the floor.

Example 10

- (1) J: It's no fun when the rabbit has the gun is it?
- (2) A: ((attempts a laugh)) My nigga. HH

((turns around to look at the gangsters))

HHH Ey. First dom who puts one in his head, ((motions with his hand towards Jake and then towards the gangsters)) HH ... I make you a rich man.

C'mon now. Who wanna get paid? Who wanna get paid? ((looks at the gangsters))

- (3) J: They're not like you. You know what I learned today? I'M not like you.
- (4) A: That's good Jake. I'm glad to hear that.

Good. So what now? Huh? ((turns his body around to look at Jake))

Whatcha gon' do, you gonna shoot me? You gon' bust yo cherry killin' a cop?

((takes his badge from his pocket and puts it around his neck))

There it is Jake. ((spits)) Hit me. ((taps at the badge))

You ain't never killed nobody before have you? It ain't like steppin' on ants Jake. Takes a man to kill. Are you man enough to kill Jake? ((slowly gets up on knees))

Hit me right there. ((points at his forehead with index finger))

((Jake aims at Alonzo's head. Alonzo gets up to his feet while still pointing at his forehead))

Get me Jake. Get me. Hit me. You CAN'T do it. ((drops his finger down))

Somebody drop this fool for me. ((aimed at the gangsters but looks at Jake))

Jake opens the conversation by ironically pointing out his superior position. Alonzo passes off Jake's suggestion of having the upper hand with an attempted laughter and a seemingly positive term of address "My nigga". However, instead of signaling familiarity between buddies this term here serves a different purpose. Alonzo goes on to urge the gangsters to kill

Jake (turn 2), a request that completely eradicates the seemingly positive connotation of the familiarizer. The term thus seems to function as a false token of solidarity that Alonzo wants to extend to Jake since he has, after all, managed to gain momentary control over his superior. Furthermore, asking the gangsters to shoot the rookie is an attempt at proving that the new guy is not, in fact, in charge. After the gangsters do not make a move to act on the request, Jake implicates how alone Alonzo is in the situation (turn 3). Again Alonzo quickly brushes off this comment and continues with asking Jake how he plans to proceed (turn 4), thus attempting to put him in a corner and demand answers. Alonzo's turn lasts for quite a while as Jake does not interrupt his boasting and intimidating. Alonzo intimidates Jake both with words and gestures as he goes on to try and gain a foothold in the tricky situation. First Alonzo intimidates the rookie with the thought of killing a police by for example using flamboyant AAVE in "Whatcha gon' do, you gonna shoot me? You gon' bust yo cherry killin' a cop?" (turn 4). He straightforwardly tempts Jake to shoot, even pointing at his forehead with his index finger while staring at Jake, thus displaying several intimidating signals. Furthermore, when still lying on the ground Alonzo digs his police badge which is hanging from a chain out of his pocket and places it around his neck. He then verbally challenges Jake to shoot while tapping the badge with his index finger. This gesture further emphasizes his challenge for the rookie as well as underlines his words of cop killing. After repeatedly provoking Jake to shoot and chanting lines about Jake "hitting him", he finally concludes that Jake is not man enough to do it and while doing so he lowers his index finger from his forehead (turn 4), thus suggesting to Jake that Alonzo calls his bluff and knows that Jake does not have the courage or power to defeat his superior. Consequently, in a fit of power the senior cop then asks the gangsters again to shoot the rookie (turn 4). However, while uttering this sentence he sternly looks at Jake in the eye although the request is aimed at the men standing on the sidewalk, which seems to indicate his fearless attitude and stubborn illusion of his everlasting power and command. The gangsters, however, refuse to oblige and leave Alonzo to fight his own battle.

After a brief exchange with the leader of the gangsters Alonzo turns his attention back to the rookie and continues his intimidation, as can be further observed in Example 11. Again, Jake comments on matters only shortly but maintains a stern look at Alonzo while continuing to point his gun at him. Alonzo is thus free to blabber on and intimidate the newbie, which he readily does as long as he is allowed to do so.

Example 11

(10) A: I don't believe you got it in you Jake. ((grabs a pack of cigarettes from the ground))

Shit. ((straightens up, puts a cigarette in his mouth and lights it. Looks at Jake and smiles))

I'mma get that gun, and then I'mma get that money. And you ain't gonna do a damn thing 'cause you ain't gonna shoot no cop ((points at Jake)) in the back are you. ((turns around, arms wide open, head turned to Jake))

- (11) J: ((loads his gun with a loud click)) Don't do it. ((solemnly))
- (12) A: You know what they give you for that? The GAS chamber. You know what the gas chamber smells like? Pine oil. That's where you headed boy. To <pine oil> heaven. I'mma get that gun, and then I'mma get that money. I don't believe you got it in YOU Jake. I'mma go get it right now. ((reaches for the gun))

Here again Alonzo's total volume of talk is much greater than that of Jake's as he continues to fire threats at the rookie. Alonzo's produces relatively long turns (turns 10 and 12), with Jake commenting rather shortly in between with a warning that Alonzo ignores (turn 11). Alonzo goes on intimidating and provoking Jake by repeatedly declaring that Jake does not have the guts to shoot an officer of the law. Again, Alonzo speaks in AAVE as there no longer is a need to manipulate and appeal to Jake with a more standard manner of speaking. Furthermore, Alonzo's turn includes a reference to a gas chamber and what it supposedly smells like (turn 12), which most likely is attended as a threat to make the rookie scared of the consequences of being a cop killer. Alonzo again repeats some of his utterances, as he did in the previous example, for instance by twice declaring "I'mma get that gun, and then I'mma get that money" as well as "I don't believe you got it in you Jake." It seems as though in addition to blabbering on for as long as he pleases he also repeats some of his words while trying to speak as much as possible in order to finally fire an intimidation that resolves the situation. In addition, carrying on talking may be an indicator of not only attempting to grasp more power but also of being nervous. As for turns of address, an interesting occurrence in this example takes place when Alonzo utters: "Pine oil. That's where you headed boy. To pine oil heaven." (turn 12). Here he clarifies, as if a senior explains to a novice, what follows if Jake pulls the trigger. The term seems to connote a somewhat scornful attitude towards the addressee and a stubborn belief in his own superiority. After this Alonzo continues to

intimidate the newbie with dictating his plans, carrying on with a monologue until he finally reaches for the gun on the ground and Jake fires his gun.

In the scene in general Alonzo displays a great deal of similar nonverbal communication as previously. For example, he produces similar pointing gestures and beating with fist to emphasize his words, he mainly looks firmly at Jake as they are conversing and at times he clearly raises his voice when annoyed. However, there is more movement in this scene compared to the previous two since here both men are standing up and their full bodies show on camera. At the beginning of the scene Alonzo is lying on the ground but he slowly makes his way up, by first turning to his back and then elevating himself to his knees and then upright. He thus starts as an underdog, lying wounded on the ground but slowly making his way back up and ending up standing face to face with Jake. As he makes his way up to an upright position he appears to gain more power as he simultaneously intimidates Jake, as noted in Example 10. Furthermore, Alonzo does present some novel movements in this scene as he appears to emphasize his threats by accompanying his words with certain gestures. For instance, Alonzo turns his back at Jake while his head remains tilted to still look at the rookie while boasting about Jake not being able to shoot a cop in the back (turn 10 in Example 11). He thus quite literally demonstrates his back being turned to Jake, who is still holding a gun, as though to indicate his innocence and the injustice that shooting him now would be. It appears as though Alonzo is merely testing Jake because right before this move he has intimidated Jake even more and exclaimed that Jake does not have the courage to pull the trigger. Since tables have turned and Jake now has the upper hand and is holding the gun it seems that Alonzo feels the need to intimidate and put pressure on Jake's good nature in order to get what he wants. Alonzo stubbornly appears to believe that he can talk his way out of the conflict and carry on unharmed. Moreover, Alonzo's arrogant attitude is further portrayed in his handling of cigarettes portrayed in Example 11. As he is declaring his aim to simply take the money and gun and run, he reaches for the ground and grabs his pack of cigarettes. He then casually places one in his mouth and lights it all the while looking at Jake and smiling. Alonzo is further testing Jake and challenging him to act, and since Jake does nothing Alonzo appears to continue to stall and flavor the situation while considering his next move. An act such as this underlines his seeming superiority because Alonzo gives the impression of merely enjoying his cigarette and conducting business as usual, completely ignoring the gun pointed at him.

As noted above, in this scene Alonzo is in a rather different position compared to the previous scenes. He desperately attempts to intimidate and provoke Jake in order to gain a more powerful foothold and he also fruitlessly attempts to recruit the gangsters to do his dirty work. In addition, he shrugs off some of Jake's comments and instead continues his threatening with both words and actions. Furthermore, at times terms of address are also used as a tool for intimidation. Contrary to the previous scenes, this scene is rather free from cases of style-shifting as the tension has unwound and all the cards are on the table. Both parties know that there is no turning back from the situation they are in and consequently Alonzo no longer feels the need to convince Jake and get closer to his level with the means of speaking in SAE.

4.3.2 Signs of submission and pleading

As the situation progresses Alonzo begins to understand that he cannot make a deal with Jake by merely intimidating him. After Example 11 presented above, Jake finally fires his gun in order to stop Alonzo from grabbing the gun on the ground. This finally proves to the senior cop that the rookie is, in fact, serious about stopping Alonzo's ways even to the point of firing a shot at him. He then changes his tactic and begins to plead to Jake to help him. Although still displaying signs of anger he changes his speech style to a less hostile approach and adopts a more submissive, harmless disposition.

Example 12 takes place right after Alonzo has reached for his gun on the ground and Jake has consequently shot him on the backside. Being surprised by the shot, Alonzo first shouts and calls Jake names while looking angrily at the rookie. The example begins with Jake declaring his seriousness and Alonzo continues to plead and ask for the money.

Example 12

- (13) J: The next one will kill you. ((determinedly))
- (14) A: Aah! You son of a bitch! ((through clenched teeth))
 You shot me in the ass! >Ok waitwaitwait ok ok ok.< ((small laughter))
 Aight look. C'mon Jake I need the money. Give me the money Jake, give me the money please Jake, GIVE ME THAT MONEY! ((stares at Jake))

- (15) J: It's not gonna happen. ((shakes his head))
- (16) A: Who you- what you gonna jack me now, you gonna take my own money from me [huh?]
- (17) J: [I] told you, that's my evidence. You wanna go to jail or you wanna go home?
- (18) A: ((starts to smile)) °I wanna go home, Jake.° ((puts his hands on the back of his head))

HHH °C'mon. Give me the money and lemme go home. ° ((softly))

- (19) J: Yeah?
- (20) A: Yeah.
- (21) J: You wanna go home? ((smiling a bit))
- (22) A: "Yeah. Lemme go home Jake. C'mon gimme the money and lemme go home."

 HH Gimme the money and lemme go home."

The example begins with Jake declaring his willingness to shoot again if necessary (turn 13). He has already shot Alonzo once as a means for proving his seriousness and stopping Alonzo from taking the upper hand and being able to continue his corrupt ways. Alonzo, although angry at being shot at and calling Jake names, is surprised and shocked by the turn of events. His hurried, repetitive line "Ok waitwaitwait ok ok ok." accompanied by small laughter seems to expresse his surprise and even confusion (turn 14). Whereas he generally speaks in a more controlled fashion, although rather fast at times, this line is clearly different as it has a rush of fear and indecision in it. His turn 14 brings about a complete change of direction in his tactic. Instead of scorning and threatening he appears to begin pleading with Jake as he continues his turn with an appealing "Aight look. C'mon Jake I need the money." It appears as though he attempts to make Jake understand how much he needs the cash by repeating his lines several times, even adding the word *please*, and finally raising his voice considerably and angrily shouting the words, all the while sternly staring at Jake. After Jake does not budge, Alonzo goes on to suggest that Jake is stealing his money (turn 16). The rookie then passes this off and asks Alonzo whether he wants to go to jail or home (turn 17). Ironically, this is a sentence that Alonzo has uttered a few times during the day in situations where something illegal has happened and he has decided to handle them his own way, in short not take them up in front of the court of law. Therefore in this situation Alonzo might hope that Jake uttering these words here indicates his willingness to let him go after all. In any case, Alonzo certainly does make it clear that he wishes the situation to resolve in a favorable manner, as he next begins to repeat his willingness to go home. Alonzo begins to smile and he lowers his voice and utters his line very softly (turn 18). Furthermore, he places his hands on the back of his head, as suspect do when being arrested, as though wanting to appear harmless and willing to cooperate. Next, he softly repeats this thought altogether five times (turns 18 and 22), and adds to it a plea for the money. Despite his attempts he is not able to turn Jake's head around as later on becomes clear.

As can be noted, Alonzo's behavior in Example 12 differs considerably from his behavior earlier in this final scene and also from his behavior in the film in general. Alonzo's selfconfidence and all-encompassing sense of superiority seem to have diminished after Jake shot him. Instead, he is starting to realize the reality of the troubled situation and changes his game plan. Towards the end of the scene, as noted in the previous example, he begins to bargain and plead with Jake. His turns become shorter compared to the beginning of the scene as he no longer boasts and blabbers on, and there is more dialogue. In addition, he now only uses a first name address for Jake that might serve the purpose of acting as a neutral, familiarity portraying indication that appeals to Jake more than any of Alonzo's more charged terms that carry more connotations. Furthermore, not only does he verbally repeatedly ask Jake to let him loose with the money but he also changes his nonverbal behavior. He ceases to make any sudden hand gestures and instead becomes steadier and even puts his hands on the back of his head as if displaying his supposed surrendering and appearing innocent. Moreover, Alonzo also changes his tone of voice to a soft, low voice when he aims to appeal to Jake and plead with him, similarly to the second scene described earlier. Some of his lines he almost whispers when he begs for Jake to let him loose.

4.3.3 Signs of determination and persistence

Throughout this final scene Jake displays a more powerful position and portrays signs of determination and perseverance. He has had enough of Alonzo's misconduct and has decided to finally make Alonzo pay for his blatant lies and corrupt means. Indeed, the entire scene results from Jake's persistence as he deliberately seeks Alonzo to confront him. All the anger

and disappointment at his boss that has been building up during the day now give rise to his more confident demeanor as he fearlessly resists his superior's threats and pleads. Jake displays his determination with few but strong words and resilient body language. In the end his tactics defeat his crooked boss and Alonzo finally gets a taste of his own medicine.

The next example (Example 13) serves to demonstrate Jake's few but powerful utterances. The following situation takes place right after Alonzo has for the second time prompted the gangsters to shoot the rookie, which they have declined by stating that Alonzo must put in his own work. Alonzo then turns his attention back to Jake and continues to challenge and provoke him.

Example 13

- (8) A: Playa to playa, pimp to pimp. I don't believe you gon' shoot me nigga. ((points at Jake))
- (9) J: Don't do it. ((shakes his head))

((Alonzo starts to reach for the ground))

Don't do it.

(10) A: I don't believe you got it in you Jake. ((grabs a pack of cigarettes from the ground))

Shit. ((straightens up, puts a cigarette in his mouth and lights it. Looks at Jake and smiles))

I'mma get that gun, and then I'mma get that money. And you ain't gonna do a damn thing 'cause you ain't gonna shoot no cop ((points at Jake)) in the back are you. ((turns around, arms wide open, head turned to Jake))

(11) J: ((loads his gun with a loud click)) Don't do it. ((solemnly))

Here Alonzo proceeds with his line of intimidating and provoking the rookie (turn 8). Jake, however, provides only a short but stern warning and request for Alonzo not to grab the gun lying on the ground. He then repeats the warning as Alonzo appears to reach for the ground. Next, Alonzo utters another provocative claim hinting on Jake's lack of courage, during which he casually grabs the pack of cigarettes instead of the firearm a little further away (turn 10). The senior cop then proceeds to dictate his plans and intimidate Jake to shoot him, after

which Jake solemnly warns him one more time (turn 11). He thus repeats the same utterance three times in this example, all the while looking sternly at Alonzo, standing firmly and pointing a gun at him. However, Alonzo disregards his warnings and reaches for the gun anyway, resulting in the younger police shooting him. Jake thus acts as he threatened to do, therefore implying that his words were not just empty chatter but grave warnings to be taken seriously. Only after being shot at does Alonzo begin to take the newbie seriously, as he then fathoms that when Jake speaks he tends to mean what he says.

Example 14 below depicts Jake's power and determination through using sarcasm and a strong gesture. After being shot Alonzo demands his money back, first angrily and then much more softly. In the following example the pair discusses going home, as that is what Alonzo pleads for, but Jake remains decisive and instead delivers a final blow that ends the conversation.

Example 14

- (17) J: [I] told you, that's my evidence. You wanna go to jail or you wanna go home?
- (18) A: ((starts to smile)) °I wanna go home, Jake. ° ((puts his hands on the back of his head))

HHH °C'mon. Give me the money and lemme go home. ° ((softly))

- (19) J: Yeah?
- (20) A: Yeah.
- (21) J: You wanna go home? ((smiling a bit))
- (22) A: "Yeah. Lemme go home Jake. C'mon gimme the money and lemme go home."

 HH Gimme the money and lemme go home."

((Jake lowers his gun))

°C'mon Jake. That's right. C'mon Jake.°

((Jake snatches Alonzo's badge from around his neck. Alonzo's smile evaporates))

(23) J: You don't deserve this.

The example begins with Jake determinedly declaring that the cash is his evidence. In the same turn he goes on to sarcastically ask whether Alonzo wants to go to jail or home, which is exactly the same question Alonzo has uttered several times before in the course of the day and Jake now repeats the words to Alonzo as an apparent attempt to mock the situation he is in. Jake uses this sentence ironically as he has no intention of letting Alonzo go home without some consequences. Therefore it might implicate not only a sense of a witty comeback but also a hint of Jake displaying his more powerful position by serving as a remark on the fact that Jake now is in a situation where he can utter these words as Alonzo previously has. Furthermore, although this sentence is uttered in Alonzo's AAVE style, it is rather evident that Jake does not intend this utterance to act as a tool for bringing the two cops closer or attempting to be on Alonzo's level in any other sense than portraying that he can be in a position of power too. Next, Alonzo accepts the change of direction in the atmosphere of the conversation and softly replies his wish to go home (turn 18). Jake asks for confirmation twice (turns 19 and 21), to which Alonzo replies in similar manner. Alonzo goes on about going home (turn 22) and chants the same lines until Jake lowers his gun and finally comments again. However, Alonzo's pleads have no impact on the young cop as Jake suddenly ignores Alonzo's blabbering and coldly declares Alonzo's unsuitability for policing while snatching his badge (turn 23). This effectively ends the situation as after this the gangsters step in and usher Jake out the jungle, leaving Alonzo at the mercy of the streets.

As can be noted, in this scene again Jake does not speak much and refuses to take some of the turns clearly allocated to him and he even refrains from self-selecting on easily available turns. Given that even though in this scene Jake has the upper hand, despite opening the conversation he speaks relatively little. It appears, however, that silence is a tool of power for Jake as he decides when to reply and when not to be affected by Alonzo's threats, pleads and trivial blabbering. As is strikingly evident in this scene, Jake's scarce words are rather meaningful and uttered very carefully. His turns, although short and simple, carry much meaning as for example his serious warning for Alonzo in "Don't do it", uttered altogether three times as noted in Example 13. Alonzo finally takes Jake seriously after Jake pulls the trigger, as he said he would, and when Jake then utters "The next one will kill you" (turn 13 in Example 12) Alonzo takes this threat seriously. Furthermore, as Alonzo's power diminishes and Jake's grows even stronger the difference between their total volume of talk decreases as their lines are more equal in length towards the end of the scene. Lastly, Jake's final comment of stating Alonzo's unworthiness of a police badge (turn 23 in Example 14) is

another stern comment that certainly does not conceal Jake's thoughts towards his superior. Moreover, this last comment is the final strike at Alonzo and seals his faith as the rookie then walks out of the scene with Alonzo's drug money as his evidence.

In this final scene the changes in both men's demeanor are rather striking, especially in Jake's movements. Whereas in earlier scenes Jake has appeared very flimsy and insecure, he now comes across more confident and sturdy. The scene starts with him pulling the bag of cash and the injured Alonzo out of his damaged car onto the street and then pointing a gun at him. Jake remains in this position through the entire scene, standing firmly and holding the gun with both hands with Alonzo clearly in his view. Furthermore, his gaze remains much calmer now than before. Most of the time he looks Alonzo sternly in the eye and his gaze only momentarily wanders elsewhere when some of the others are referred to or included in the conversation. Nevertheless, at times there seems to be some confusion and fear in Jake's eyes as it appears as though he is in fact unwilling to actually shoot his superior but simultaneously also not sure what else to do than aim at him to keep him under control. Indeed, Jake does not seem too keen on proceeding to a more violent direction as he does not comment on Alonzo's threats but merely waits for the situation to resolve. However, after it does not reconcile, Jake bravely threatens Alonzo with violence by shooting him and taking his badge, as well as with words by threatening to shoot again. In total Jake's demeanor is constantly much stronger in this scene, and his strength grows towards the end.

In addition, Jake's voice also gains more volume and power, as he utters his lines with confidence and determination. For instance, Jake's line "The next one will kill you." (turn 13 in Example 12), and "You don't deserve this." (turn 23 in Example 14), are delivered in such a manner that Alonzo has no reason to doubt Jake's intentions or willingness to act. Furthermore, even though Jake momentarily softens and lowers his voice when repeating Alonzo's wish to go home, this by no means marks an actual emotional softening or intention of letting Alonzo get away. Instead, the change in his voice seems to display his disbelief of Alonzo believing that he still has a chance to plead to Jake, and also Jake's willingness to prolong fooling the deceitful cop.

In this final scene the tables have turned upside down as Jake is in a position of more power and Alonzo attempts to maneuver his way out of the tricky situation unscratched. Jake has the upper hand from the beginning on as he holds Alonzo at gun point, while Alonzo must resort to merely endeavor to talk his way out and convince the rookie to let him go with his drug

money. Alonzo attempts to regain his power by not only intimidating and threatening Jake but also slightly mocking him. He executes these actions with clear, verbal utterances as well performing intimidating gestures. After grasping his losing hand, the senior changes his tactics into pleading with Jake and his demeanor changes into a less threatening one as he lowers and softens his voice, attempts to appeal to Jake with words as well as more submissive movements. However, Jake does not buy into any of this but instead holds on to his chance to make Alonzo accountable for his actions. Jake portrays decisiveness and power for example by delivering strong, well-considered comments with a stern voice. In addition, he does not budge at his superior's orders but instead the newbie snatches his senior's badge and declares him unfit for policing, thus ultimately announcing his victory in a rather direct manner.

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study focused on character identity and character relations, and the aim was to analyze how characters' identities are constructed and portrayed, and how the main characters' identities differ. Furthermore, the study aimed to map the development that takes place throughout the film in the characters and their relationship. In this study language served as the starting point for analyzing characters and their identities, since as noted by Higgins and Furukawa (2012: 2), characterization is achieved mainly through linguistic means. Furthermore, Kozloff (2000: 43-44) finds that dialogue's main function is revealing the character, and dialogue functions to make characters substantial by implying on their inner life. Indeed, as can be noted in Training Day, language certainly acts as a major indicator of a character's identity. Furthermore, it also functions as a means of differentiating between characters and it offers insight into the relationship. However, language is not the only means for interpreting character. Bednarek (2010: 18-21) notes that due to the multimodal nature of performance in film and television, also other factors compose character identities. In addition to language, character's emotions are conveyed also through multimodal interaction and embodied performance, so that a multimodal analysis is needed in order to understand the full meaning and being of a character.

Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 585-588) note that identities are shaped and constructed in interaction with others, and that identity is a multidimensional concept that is in a constant process of changing according to situations, positions and our interlocutors. Identities are thus created and negotiated in contact with others, as is the case also in this film, where the characters' identities can be seen as both portrayed and constructed in interaction with one another. Through their discussions the two men attempt to bring forward their opinions and views but at the same time negotiate a joint identity and a way of being a team by finding common ground. However, as it turns out in the end, their cooperation is prohibited due to their dissimilar identities and inability to adjust enough to each other, which we can infer from not only their language use but also through multimodal action. Identity is thus not only implied in the actual meaning of the words but also in the manner of speaking, tone of voice as well as language and word choices, for example. Furthermore, gestures and body movements, gaze as well as posture can reveal much about the situation and the person's disposition. In addition, outer appearance can give information about the person's background and identity. Next, we will sum up some of the main findings regarding the main characters' personalities and differences.

5.1 Language as a tool of power and display of attitudes

It is rather evident in the example scenes that there are major discrepancies in how the two characters use language. Alonzo appears to be a strong character in a position of more power and influence, which is manifested through several means of language use. In contrast, Jake starts off as a somewhat insecure underdog attempting to follow the lead of his boss, but who finally develops into a more courageous cop.

Starting from the amount of speech the characters produce, the difference between the men's volume of talk is rather striking. Alonzo's total volume of speech is much greater than that of Jake's as his turns are much longer and he comments on issues with a much greater number of words compared to the newbie. This indicates having power over the rookie, since as Short (1996: 206-207) suggests, having more and longer turns is usually a sign of a more powerful position. In addition, it is customary for Alonzo to blabber on as a way of arguing, boasting or intimidating. In contrast, Jake's shorter comments make him appear at a loss for words, thus coming across shy, inferior and somewhat submissive especially in the first part of the

film. However, his scarce words often carry much meaning and it appears as though towards the end of the film Jake chooses his words carefully and utters powerful, honest words that reflect his inner state of mind. His considered use of words reflects his cautious attitude as well, as he seems to take more time to assess situations instead of making hasty decisions. On the other hand, Alonzo's impulsive nature is uncovered in his flowing, swift and at times aggressive speech. His language use also implies that he is a strong, confident person who thinks and acts quickly. In addition, Alonzo also portrays his authority in controlling the topics, since he appears to grab the themes introduced by Jake only when they suit his game plan. Otherwise he appears willing to keep the strings in his own hands and reign over the interaction also topic-wise.

Turn taking tactics seem to be another means for portraying power or submitting to it. As for turn allocations and turn management, it is Alonzo who seems to take the lead most of the time and he appears to demonstrate his stronger position as Jake's superior by often deciding when and how much Jake gets to talk. Alonzo cuts Jake off when he pleases and also at times chooses not to take the turns allocated to him by Jake as a sign of power. Tactics such as these are also in line with Short's (1996: 206-207) suggestions of powerful characters so that Alonzo displays his power by managing turns in order to control the situations and steer the conversation into more suitable waters. Jake, in contrast, is not quite as influential in his turn management, although he does move a little bit forward from his insecurity displayed at the beginning of the film. After submitting to Alonzo's reign Jake finally builds up some courage and begins to grab turns and interrupt his superior when the going gets tough. In addition, Jake also verbally ignores some of the turns allocated to him by Alonzo and this takes place in all scenes. Especially in the last scene this tactic appears to denote Jake's determination and refusal to acknowledge Alonzo's intimidation and arrogant attitude as Jake only takes a few well-calculated turns. Although most turns are generally taken by the more powerful character, it seems that by not taking all the turns Jake displays power by deciding when and what he wishes to comment on. In other words, while Alonzo uses his words as a tool of power, Jake evidently uses silence. He thus proves that he does not give in to Alonzo's continuing threats but instead holds his ground, which appears an indicator of Jake having gained more confidence towards the end of the film. Thus, changes in a character's attitude are reflected on their conversational strategies, as noted by Bennison (1998: 68). As Jake evolves from a gullible rookie to a confident officer who no longer is afraid to do what is right, he also changes his tactics in their interactions.

Style shifting is another part of language use in which the main characters of Training Day differ greatly. In this film style shifting takes place as interpersonal shifts as the characters modify their speech according to the person they are interacting with. Furthermore, style shifting here is almost exclusively done by Alonzo and he rather skillfully switches from his vernacular African American English to Standard American English. Bartley (2005) notes that style shifting in Training Day is utilized for creating temporary bonds as well as manipulation. In addition to manipulating the newbie, however, these changes in Alonzo's speech variety also work to reprimand, display frustration and displeasure, as noted in the example scenes discussed above. Jake, on the other hand, mainly only speaks in Standard American English. He only momentarily moves more towards Alonzo's AAVE a few times throughout the film when repeating Alonzo's words. However, compared to Alonzo's strategic and at times calculated changes between language styles, Jake's temporary switches appear a rather innocent attempt by a rookie to be more on his superior's level and gain his approval. Moreover, the meaning of his utterances is true and his intentions are good, which makes Jake's switching more permissible. Alonzo therefore seems to have the upper hand when it comes to language use and especially in utilizing different language varieties for personal gain. As the movie progresses, the senior cop demonstrates even craftier ways of shifting as he continues his corrupt manners. His breaking of linguistic codes seems to match his breaking of the law, and faking a fatherly connection to Jake by speaking SAE is only one of the tools that he utilizes in maintaining and displaying his superior position. It seems as though Alonzo's style shifting is stained with his corruptness and is therefore objectionable. Jake, on the other hand, further demonstrates his immaculate and pure nature by not switching language varieties or using language for dishonest aims. These notions are supported by Bartley's (2005) study, as she claims that Alonzo's shifts mark his corruptness while Jake's inability to switch language varieties highlights his pureness.

Terms of address are also utilized rather differently by the two characters, which goes along with the previous notions of language use as well. Whereas Alonzo refers to Jake with a variety of terms, Jake uses terms of address rather sparingly. In his regular speech Jake addresses his superior either with an honorific term as a polite sign of respect or with a familiarizer to signal solidarity. Jake's use of terms of address seems to comply with his more hesitant and cautious character as he uses language in a rather neutral, even manner. Moreover, Jake addressing his superior as *sir* might also be an implication of Jake's underdog position since Short (1996: 206) states that powerless speakers use terms of address marked

for respect. In contrast, Alonzo seems to devise new nicknames for Jake constantly and he varies them skillfully. Not only does he utilize a variety of terms but these terms also reflect his attitude towards Jake at the time of the words being spoken. Certain terms appear to be reserved for implying frustration or anger, whereas other terms are only used in a positive light, either genuine or pretended. Moreover, Alonzo utilizes several terms of address in a variety of moods as the usage of some terms changes throughout the film according to situations. Using a vast array of terms of address is also an indication of power, since as Short (1996: 206) points out, powerful speakers use more terms of address not marked for respect, such as first names only, which certainly appears to be the case with Alonzo. In addition, Alonzo's playful use of language also in this aspect seems to reflect his vivid and quick temper and it indicates that he thinks and acts quickly. Furthermore, being able to use and vary terms of address for Jake reflects his ability to also switch between AAVE and SAE without dilemmas.

5.2 Feelings and personality revealed through multimodal elements

Personality differences are further implied in the two characters' body language and gestures, and some changes in these elements can be seen throughout the film. From Jake's behavior and gestures we can infer that he is a regular, decent, person who attempts to please his boss. He comes off as more shy and thoughtful as he appears to take time to make decisions, which is reflected also on his softer movements. Furthermore, his wandering gaze, hunched posture and flimsy gestures reveal his insecurity and at times uneasiness. However, as the movie progresses he appears to find enough courage to stand up to his superior, which is revealed through his stronger gestures, steady gaze and firm posture. His voice remains rather calm and stable throughout the film, although there is much more determination in it in the last scene. Alonzo, on the other hand, comes across as very sharp and determined from the getgo, as his voice is clear, his stride long and decisive and his gaze pierces the target. His body appears to mirror his speech as it is strong but at times still relaxed, powerful and nonapologetic. In short, Alonzo's actions and behavior all seem so suggest that he is the boss and asks permissions from no one. Alonzo's temper and attitude show especially well in his tone of voice, as he easily raises his voice when angry. Moreover, he unrelentingly believes in his own superiority and maintains his sturdy, decisive and at times harsh gestures almost until the end when he begins to show signs of surrendering and pleading. When he realizes his imminent defeat, he performs submissive gestures and reveals his emerging fear by speaking rapidly, repeating his words and quickly altering the tone of his voice. Thus, evident changes in both characters' behavior and nonverbal communication can be detected throughout the film as the tension grows.

Outer appearance can also add to our interpretation of character identity, and in relation to this factor there are notable differences between the two men. Jake's relaxed, regular clothing suggests that he is a rather ordinary person not wanting to attract attention or trouble. His style and demeanor imply that he is an easygoing, almost middle-aged family man leading a decent, if not even dull life. In contrast, Alonzo seems to pay more attention to his appearance, and his dark, lean clothing seem to increase the impression that he means business. His demeanor seems street-smart, and he appears to fit better in the streets than behind a desk in the police station.

5.3 The bigger picture

Previous studies support the findings discovered in the present study. Bartley (2005) notes that interracial cop films create disparity and otherness by contrasting AAVE and SAE, and that AAVE speakers are marginalized and often corrupt, while speakers of the standard variety are more favorable, as is the case in *Training Day*. Bartley's notions do apply to the present study, since style shifting and language use in general are certainly utilized to create contrasts and highlight the differences between the two men. In the present study the discussion on style shifting was elaborated in more detail and it was found that Alonzo switches language varieties skillfully in several situations, and these switches are accompanied by other changes in his language and demeanor as well. However, language is not the only aspect in which the two characters differ or through which their identities are manifested. Baron and Carnicke (2008) find that in Training Day the main characters' differing temperaments and attitudes are manifested through their movements and expressions, elements in which differences between the two can be noted already in the very first scene. These salient dissimilarities, then, reflect their identities. Baron and Carnicke's study hints at similar results as discovered in the present one: as noted, there are major differences in the two cops' multimodal interaction, and their nonverbal communication reveals aspects of their differing identities. However, the present study observed their multimodal interaction throughout the film and mapped the development in it, noting changes in their identities and their relationship, thus providing a more comprehensive discussion on the subject.

In general, an evident contrast between the two cops exists throughout the film, which encompasses more than their multimodal language use. Through their interactions several concepts emerge where their views collide, such as tolerance of violence, notions of power and principles of policing. More specifically, the two cops' identities and characteristics become obvious when put next to one another. Jake's willingness to obey the law is even clearer when contrasted with Alonzo's version of policing by bending the rules. In addition, Alonzo's sharpness is highlighted by emphasizing Jake's shyness, innocence and at times even apologetic demeanor. Moreover, Alonzo's competence and smoothness in seemingly all street situations accentuates his experience in the field and knowledge of the streets, whereas at the same time this emphasizes Jake's rookie-ness and incompetence of the streets. In many ways Jake's actions are in clear contrast to those of Alonzo's.

Throughout most of the film Jake is clearly inferior compared to Alonzo, which is mirrored in his use of language and his echoing of Alonzo's lead. In addition to being at a disadvantage due to his position as the trainee and newcomer, as the situation progresses Jake also seems to suffer due to his inability to adapt quickly. Furthermore, his incapability to match Alonzo's temper and suddenness furthers the gap between the two cops. Nevertheless, as identities are molded in interaction, both men alter their speech and their styles constantly while they are in contact with one another. Jake quickly learns to obey his superior's rules about the general code of conduct and for example abandons useless small talk. On the other hand, Alonzo's switches to SAE can also be regarded as adapting to Jake: the seasoned cop only changes his speech style to accommodate to the rookie's style and to get closer to him, albeit he does it for his own interests.

As noted above, the relationship between the two cops alters a great deal during the film due to changes taking place in the characters, their attitudes and situations. While in the beginning Jake seems gullible and willing to do anything to make the squat, towards the end he seems to realize how much he would need to sacrifice in order to join the team. His overly respectful and innocent, insecure behavior, portrayed though polite language and submissive behavior, gives way to a more self-assured demeanor. He musters enough courage and portrays

determination to take the situation in control and see justice served, which is reflected in his stronger gestures and even more meaningful words than before. Alonzo, on the other hand, appears a strong-minded character from the very beginning on as he appears willing to demonstrate his reign over the rookie by dominating conversations, utilizing strong words accompanied by powerful nonverbal communication. He appears confident and sure about his victorious position almost until the end, and throughout the film he portrays means for lying and manipulating the rookie to achieve his goals. Only after his deceitful antics have been revealed and he understands being in a weaker position does he lose some of his confidence and demean himself to begging and submission. In the end Jake's innocence and softness defeats Alonzo's arrogant self-assuredness and illegal antics.

5.4 Conclusion

In this study we have inspected the ways in which character identities are portrayed and how characters can be differentiated. Furthermore, this study has examined character relationship development and reasons behind changes in the relationship and the characters. We have discovered how several aspects work together to create recognizable characters that can be distinguished by not only their use of language but also by their nonverbal communication and appearance. For instance, aspects of language use reveal how power is distributed between the interlocutors, and how the characters attempt to take control or surrender to the situation. Furthermore, language seems to serve as a tool for creating bonds, manipulating and revealing outlooks. In addition, multimodal analysis provides information about the characters' differing identities, and their nonverbal communication reflects their thoughts and feelings. Moreover, it has been detected that multiple factors contribute to changes in character identities and their relationship, and these changes are portrayed through linguistic and multimodal means. As noted, changes in a character's mindset or identity result in novel communication styles and an altered structure in the characters' relationship. In short, fictional characters are complex constructions with multilayered identities, not unlike real people.

This study provides interesting results about characterization and the different means to create and portray character identity, and therefore offers a meaningful contribution to the fields of telecinematic research and characterization, both of which are growing fields.

Although interesting results were discovered, the present study is by no means a comprehensive analysis of the characters or the film in question. Due to the scope of the study we focused only on a few aspects of the main characters, so a broader, all-encompassing study of *Training Day's* main characters' nonverbal communication or language use in terms of word choices or paralinguistic features, for instance, might reveal more specific details according to which the characters can be analyzed and distinguished. Moreover, focusing on some of the main themes in regard to the characters' world views could offer different kinds of tools for analyzing identities. In addition, other important factors that comprise a film such as music, plot development or cinematography were not analyzed, so the movie still offers plenty of ground for future research.

Naturally, the results cannot be generalized and the findings presented here form only a small part of this movie. Nevertheless, they do provide a fruitful starting point for further analysis and a decent idea of the levels of characterization in the film in question, and suggestions of similar findings to be discovered in other films as well. Furthermore, the factors and subtle differences that were found here to constitute a unique character can be applied to inferring real life people as well, and give implications as to how we interpret people we encounter and the multitude of elements that comprise their identities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Androutsopoulos, J. (2012). Introduction: language and society in cinematic discourse. *Multilingua* 31 (2), 139-154.
- Baker, A. (2012). Beyond the thin line of black and blue: movies and police misconduct in Los Angeles. In M. Pomerancy (ed.), *Cultural Studies in Cinema/Video: Bad: Infamy, Darkness, Evil and Slime on Screen*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 55-63.
- Baron, C. and Carnicke, S. M. (2008). *Reframing Screen Performance*. Michigan, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Bartley, A. C. (2005). Creating difference: language use in interracial cop movies. In M. Munson and I. Serra (eds.), *Performing Culture, Florida Atlantic Comparative Studies* Volume 8. Florida: Universal Publishers, 11-26.
- Bednarek, M. (2010). *Language of Fictional Television: Drama and Identity*. London: Continuum International Publishing.
- Bednarek, M. (2011). Expressivity and televisual characterisation. *Language and Literature* 20 (1), 3-21.
- Bednarek, M. (2012). Constructing 'nerdiness': characterisation in The Big Bang Theory. *Multilingua* 31 (2), 199-229.
- Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. Language in Society 13 (2), 145-204.
- Bell, A. and Gibson, A. (2011). Staging language: an introduction to the sociolinguistics of performance. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15 (5), 555-572.
- Bennison, N. (1998). Accessing character through conversation. In J. Culpeper, M. Short and P. Verdonk (eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*. London: Routledge, 67-82.
- Brown, J. (1993). Bullets, buddies and bad guys. *Journal of Popular Film & Television* 21 (2), 79-91. http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=7&sid=f1a6f7f0-3e9c-4321-b3c5-

- <u>eb35d741b6d5%40sessionmgr4003&hid=4207&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%</u> <u>3d%3d#db=afh&AN=9401037737</u> (23 July, 2015)
- Bubel, C. (2006). *The linguistic construction of character relations in TV drama: doing* friendship in Sex and the City. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Saarland University, Faculty of Philosophy. http://scidok.sulb.uni-saarland.de/volltexte/2006/598/pdf/Diss_Bubel_publ.pdf
- Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7 (4-5), 585-614.
- Bucholtz, M. and Lopez, Q. (2011). Performing blackness, forming whiteness: linguistic minstrelsy in Hollywood film. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15 (5), 680-706.
- Coleman, R. M. and Cobb, J. N. (2007). Training Day and the Shield: evil cops and the taint of blackness. In M.F. Norden (ed.), *At the Interface/Probing the Boundaries Volume 41:*The Changing Face of Evil in Film and Television. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 101-123.
- Culpeper, J. (2001). *Language & Characterisation. People in Plays and Other Texts*. London: Longman
- Dressler, R. A. and Kreuz, R. J. (2000). Transcribing oral discourse: a survey and model system. *Discourse Processes* 29, 25-36.
- Dunkling, L. (1990). A Dictionary of Epithets and Terms of Address. London: Routledge
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (2001). Variety, style-shifting and ideology. In P. Eckert and J. R. Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 44-56.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2000). On the sociolinguistics of popular films: funny characters, funny voices. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 8, 199-133. DOI: 10.1353/mgs.2000.0006
- Green, L. J. (2002). *African American English. A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henderson, C. E. (2010). King Kong ain't got sh** on me: allegories, anxieties and the performance of race in mass media. *The Journal of Popular Culture* 43 (6), 1207-1221.

- Herman, V. (1998). Turn management in drama. In J. Culpeper, M. Short and P. Verdonk (eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*. London: Routledge, 19-33.
- Higgins, C. and Furukawa, G. (2012). Styling Hawai'i in Haolewood: white protagonist on a voyage of self discovery. *Multilingua* 31 (2), 177-198.
- Hodson, J. (2014). Dialect in Film and Literature. London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Kozloff, S. 2000. Overhearing Film Dialogue. Berkley: University of California Press.
- LaGamba, J.L. 2012. Shaping Identity: Male and Female Interactions in Cinema.

 Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of South Florida, Department of English.

 http://search.proquest.com/docview/1013834143?accountid=11774
- Leech, G. (1999). The distribution and function of vocatives in American and British English conversation. In H. Hasselgård and S. Oksefjell (eds.), *Out of Corpora: Studies in Honor of Stig Johansson*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 107-118.
- McIntyre, D. (2008). Integrating multimodal analysis and the stylistics of drama: a multimodal perspective on Ian McKellen's Richard III. *Language and Literature* 17 (4), 309-334.
- Maruska, T. (2010). How Dirty Harry was Rodney King'd: the vigilante cop in modern American cinema. *Interactions: Studies in Communication & Culture* 2 (1), 47-59. doi: 10.1386/iscc.2.1.47 1
- Mufwene, S. S. (2001). What is African American English? in S. L. Lanehart (ed.), Sociocultural and Historical Contexts of African American English. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 21-51.
- Pearson, R. (2007). Anatomising Gilbert Grissom. The structure and function of the televisual character. In M. Allen (ed.), *Reading CSI. Crime TV under the Microscope*. London: I.B. Tauris, 39–56.
- Rimmon-Kenan, S. (1989). Narrative Fiction. Contemporary Poetics. London: Routledge
- Sexton, J. (2009). The ruse of engagement: black masculinity and the cinema of policing. *American Quarterly* 61 (1), 39-63. doi: 10.1353/aq.0.0057

Short, M. 1996. Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose. London: Longman

Suomen virallinen tilasto: Ajankäyttötutkimus. (2009).

http://www.stat.fi/til/akay/2009/02/akay_2009_02_2011-02-17_kat_002_fi.html (17 November, 2015)

Training Day. 2001. Village Roadshow Pictures, Warner Bros. Pictures. Directed by Antoine Fuqua, written by David Ayer.

APPENDIX

The coffee shop scene

(1) J: Good morning, sir ((looks at Alonzo))

((A waitress comes over, gives Jake the menu))

Ah no thank you, mam. ((touches his mouth, then motions away with his hand))

- (2) A: Nah get some chow in you .. before we go to the office, my dollar. ((lifts index finger, eyes still on the newspaper))
- (3) J: Thank you sir but I, um, I ate. ((motions with hand))
- (4) A: Nah fine, don't.

((Jake looks at Alonzo, then nervously glances around the place. Clasps hands on the table.)) (5.0)

(5) J: It's nice here.

((Alonzo lifts his gaze and looks at Jake for the first time since his arrival))

- (6) A: May I read my paper? ((points at his paper with index finger))
- (7) J: I'm sorry, sir. [I—
- (8) A: [Thank] you. ((resumes looking at his paper))
- (9) J: You know what, I'll get something to eat. ((opens hand to the side, starts to turn around for the waitress))
- (10) A: Nah hell no you won't, you fucked that up. ((with a strong, determined voice, locking eyes with Jake))

 I'm tryin'ta read my paper ((points at paper with index finger)), please, shut up.

((Alonzo returns to his paper. Jake laughs nervously, squirms and looks around the place)) (17.0)

(11) J: Well I sure wouldn't mind not roasting in a hot black and white all summer.

((Alonzo lifts his gaze and laughs a bit. Then quickly becomes stern again))

(12) A: Tell me a story .. Hoyt. ((folds his paper, looking at Jake))

- (13) J: Like MY story?
- (14) A: No, not YOUR story, A story .. Since you can't keep your mouth shut long enough for me to read my paper, tell me A story. ((sternly))
- (15) J: I don't think I know any stories. ((smiling slightly))
- (16) A: You don't know any stories? Alright I'll tell you a story. This is a newspaper, right?

((takes the paper and puts it to the side, points at it))

It's 90 per cent bullshit. But it's entertaining. That's why I read it, because it entertains me.

((takes off his reading glasses and points at the paper with them. Jake looks at the paper and nods))

You won't LET me read it so YOU entertain me with your bullshit. Tell me a story right now. Go. ((points at Jake with the glasses and then puts them in his chest pocket))

((Jake laughs nervously a bit, looks to the side))

- (17) J: Well there was a DUI stop. ((now looking at Alonzo))
- (18) A: A DUI. WHOA let me load up my GUNS! ((bangs his two guns hanging on each side of his chest together while looking at Jake))
- (19) J: ((nervous laughter)) c'mon ((tossing has hand to the side and looking to the side))
- (20) A: <A DUI, [O:h shit!>] ((laughing, placing his arms on the table in a steady position))
- (21) J: [Well, I-] Listen alright, it's good. ((opens hand palm up, then presses fingers on the table))We were on mid-watch [a-
- (22) A: [We?]
- (23) J: Oh, me and Debbie. ((motions with hand))
- (24) A: Who's Debbie?
- (25) J: Oh am, I'm sorry, ((hand close to head)) Debbie Maxwell, my training officer. ((motions with hand in front of him))
- (26) A: "You had a female training officer?" ((looking at Jake somewhat surprised, almost whispering))

(27) J: Yessir.

((Alonzo starts smiling and licking his lips))

- (28) A: O:k ok alright alright hahaa. ((smirking, swaying)) So what was she, bla:ck, white?
- (29) J: She's white ((smiling, nodding, looking down to the side and then at Alonzo))
- (30) A: A:ha. Lick-her-license? ((sternly))
- (31) J: A what? ((more serious))
- (32) A: <A LICK-HER-LICENSE> was she A DYKE, A LESBIAN. ((stern and annoyed))
- (33) J: [o:h] ((smiling, attempting a laugh, looking to the side))
- (34) A: [Was she any good?] she any good?
- (35) J: Yeah she's pretty good [she's— ((nodding))
- (36) A: [Ok] pretty good Debbie, mid-watch, go.
- (37) J: Right. Alright. SO, it was a real quiet night— ((hands opened to the sides))
- (38) A: BOOM!
- (39) J: [Holy shit, what the fuck] ((nervous laughter, arms opened to the sides))
- (40) A: [Hahaaa] ((pointing index finger at Jake)) You never know, that's the point. Go.
- (41) J: Alright, well, it's- it was a quiet night. Now we're rolling on Vanowen. I'm driving. This Acura, just a: BEAUTIFUL car comes out a side street. All over the median. In excess. I light it up, hit the wailer.

((Alonzo lifts his arms to rest on the top of his seat))

Guy drives on like I'm invisible for like ten blocks before he pulls over. Plates ran clean so I field test and arrest and I'm- I'm belting him in our unit. A:nd Debbie's tossing his car. She calls me over to the vehicle and shows me a snubbed .38 and two shotguns fully loaded and locked. ((story accompanied with numerous hand movements and gestures to the sides))

- (42) A: No shit? ((no beat, inexpressive, tilts head to the side))
- (43) J: No shit. So.. she calls our supervisor and I keep searching. I find 500 grams of meth in the dash. Turns out this DUI .. is on bail for distribution and on his way to smoke his ex-partner before trial. ((beats down with index finger))

((Alonzo smiles and Jake too a bit))

- (44) A: "Boom" ((smiling, lifting eyebrows, almost whispering))
- (45) J: We prevented a murder. ((smiling proudly))
- (46) A: You got him. ((applauding)) That's amazing.

((Jake laughs a bit))

It is. That you could be out there with a fine bitch for a year and the most ENTERTAINING story you can come up with to tell me .. is a drunk stop.

((they gaze at each other and their smiles slowly evaporate))

But I don't believe you ((smirking, turning head to one side, licking his lip)) "You tapped that ass didn't you?" ((softly))

((Jake smiles insecurely, turns his head to the side))

Didn't you? You know you tapped that ass. You put her in the backseat, BAA:M CODE X ((smirking))

- (47) J: Look man I got a wife. ((turning head to the other side, not looking at Alonzo))
- (48) A: You got a dick ((looking at Jake))

((a moment of silence, Jake turns to look at Alonzo))

You DO have a dick don't you? ((raising eyebrows))

- (49) J: Yes. ((nods))
- (50) A: Ok. Dick lines up straight like that right? ((hands straight in front of him))

 To the right of it and to the left of it are POCKETS, right? ((gesturing to each side with hand)) In those pockets are money. Look in either one of em, ((slams the table with one hand)) pay the bill. ((starts to get up))

The total length of the scene is 3 minutes and 56 seconds.

Discussion in the car scene

(1) A: "You aight?"

((Jake looks at Alonzo solemnly. Alonzo glances over his shoulder, then looks back at Jake))

"It behooves you not to dick around on this. Justifiable homicide in the line of duty ok? Now what happened [was]" ((with a soft, quiet voice))

- (2) J: [What] happened was murder. And armed robbery. Or wait. Wh- we had badges? So it's different? [-
- (3) A: [Oh] son can- open your eyes. Can't you see? Huh? ((raising his voice, annoyed. opens his palm))
- (4) J: That man was your friend. And you killed him. [Like a fly]
- (5) A: [laughter] C'm- my FRIEND?

 Tell me why? Because <he knows my first name?> ((points at his chest with both hands)) Son this is the game, I'm playing his ass. That's my jo:b! ((points at chest again)) That's YOUR job! ((points at Jake with index finger))

 Roger sold dope to kids. The world is a better place without him! ((beats down with index finger in rhythm of speech))

 Ey! This man was <the biggest major violator> in Los Angeles. I watch that cocksucker ((points over his shoulder with thumb)) operate with impunity for over TEN years and now I GOT him. The shit's chess it ain't checkers! ((loud

((Jake turns his head away, Alonzo keeps looking at him)) (5.0)

agitated voice, beating down with index finger))

Whatcha think we were gonna do. That we gon- we gonna .. roll up in a black and white? ((points loosely over his shoulder with thumb))
Huh? Slap the cuffs on him. "You're under arrest." That's a high roller, dawg.

((Jake turns to look at him. Alonzo tries to pass him the cash))

Take the money.

- (6) J: I already told you I'm not gonna take [it.] ((getting annoyed, motioning away with his hand))
- (7) A: [Just take] [it.]
- (8) J: [I'm] NOT gonna [take that.] ((raising his voice, looking at the pile of money))
- (9) A: [O:k] don't.

 Just burn it. Barbecue it. Fish fry it. I don't give a fuck. But the boys'll

 ((motions over his shoulder with the cash in his hand)) feel better [about-]
- (10) J: [<FU]CK> their feelings. ((determinedly, turns to look at Alonzo))

- (11) A: Jake, you not making them feel like you're part of the TEAM. ((softly))
- (12) J: The team? ((raises eyebrows)) You guys are fucking insane. Alright I'll go back to the valley, I'll CUT parking tickets, you know. ((turns head around, motions with hand))

((Jake looks outside of the window, closes eyes, clenches teeth, beats down with fist))

I- it can't <BE> like [this].

- (13) A: [It is this way man.] I'm sorry I exposed you to it but it is. It's ugly .. but it's necessary. ((softly))
- (14) J: I BECAME a cop to put away drug dealers, the poisoners, the criminals. Not to BE one.
- (15) A: "Son just let it be. I know what you're going through, I know what you're feeling. You're SCARED." ((softly, almost whispering))
- (16) J: I'm not scared. ((annoyed, shakes head))
- (17) A: "Yes you are. You're terrified. Everybody goes through that the first time. I went through it. The sooner you can match what's in your head ((points temple)) with what's going on in the real world ((points over his shoulder with thumb)) the better you gonna feel. In this business you gotta have a little dirt on you for anybody to trust ya. When all this is behind you there's gonna be a whole other world that opens up for you. I walk a higher path son. I can give you the keys to ALL the doors." ((very softly and quietly))
- (18) J: What are you talking about? ((more softly but still annoyed))
- (19) A: "My guys ((glances over his shoulder)) are pretty good but they're not leaders, they clowns. You're a leader. You want my job? You got it. You wanna lock up poisoners, this is the best place to do it ((motions down with index finger)). But you gotta just, you know, take your time, make detective, play the game, grow wise. And then you can change things. But you gotta change them from the inside, son. Let's go downtown to the station. You talk to my guys there and they'll walk you through what you gotta say to the DA guys, ok?" ((softly, quietly))

((Jake and Alonzo look at each other for a moment)) (8.0)

°Ok.° ((softly. Pats Jake on the shoulder, turns his head forward))

Final confrontation scene

- (1) J: It's no fun when the rabbit has the gun is it?
- (2) A: ((attempts a laugh)) My nigga. HH

((turns around to look at the gangsters))

HHH Ey. First dom who puts one in his head, ((motions with his hand towards Jake and then towards the gangsters)) HH ... I make you a rich man.

C'mon now. Who wanna get paid? Who wanna get paid? ((looks at the gangsters))

- (3) J: They're not like you. You know what I learned today? I'M not like you.
- (4) A: That's good Jake. I'm glad to hear that.

Good. So what now? Huh? ((turns his body around to look at Jake))

Whatcha gon' do, you gonna shoot me? You gon' bust yo cherry killin' a cop?

((takes his badge from his pocket and puts it around his neck))

There it is Jake. ((spits)) Hit me. ((taps at the badge))

You ain't never killed nobody before have you? It ain't like steppin' on ants Jake. Takes a man to kill. Are you man enough to kill Jake? ((slowly gets up on knees))

Hit me right there. ((points at his forehead with index finger))

((Jake aims at Alonzo's head. Alonzo gets up to his feet while still pointing at his forehead))

Get me Jake. Get me. Hit me. You CAN'T do it. ((drops his finger down))

Somebody drop this fool for me. ((aimed at the gangsters but looks at Jake))

((Bone, the leader of the gang, steps up, looks at Alonzo and places his gun on the ground))

- (5) B: You got us twisted homie. You gotta put yo' own work in around here.
- (6) A: Aight. Is like that Bone?
- (7) B: Is like that.

((Bone steps back to the sidewalk, Alonzo turns back to Jake and spits))

(8) A: Playa to playa, pimp to pimp. I don't believe you gon' shoot me nigga. ((points at Jake))

(9) J: Don't do it. ((shakes his head))

((Alonzo starts to reach for the ground))

Don't do it.

(10) A: I don't believe you got it in you Jake. ((grabs a pack of cigarettes from the ground))

Shit. ((straightens up, puts a cigarette in his mouth and lights it. Looks at Jake and smiles))

I'mma get that gun, and then I'mma get that money. And you ain't gonna do a damn thing 'cause you ain't gonna shoot no cop ((points at Jake)) in the back are you. ((turns around, arms wide open, head turned to Jake))

- (11) J: ((loads his gun with a loud click)) Don't do it. ((solemnly))
- (12) A: You know what they give you for that? The GAS chamber. You know what the gas chamber smells like? Pine oil. That's where you headed boy. To <pine oil> heaven. I'mma get that gun, and then I'mma get that money. I don't believe you got it in YOU Jake. I'mma go get it right now. ((reaches for the gun))

((Jake shoots him in the backside))

OH SHIT! <AAAOOYOU MOTHERFUCKER> ((gets up, one hand on his backside, pants air with fist))

- (13) J: The next one will kill you. ((determinedly))
- (14) A: Aah! You son of a bitch! ((through clenched teeth))
 You shot me in the ass! >Ok waitwaitwait ok ok ok.< ((small laughter))
 Aight look. C'mon Jake I need the money. Give me the money Jake, give me the money please Jake, GIVE ME THAT MONEY! ((stares at Jake))
- (15) J: It's not gonna happen. ((shakes his head))
- (16) A: Who you- what you gonna jack me now, you gonna take my own money from me [huh?]
- (17) J: [I] told you, that's my evidence. You wanna go to jail or you wanna go home?
- (18) A: ((starts to smile)) °I wanna go home, Jake.° ((puts his hands on the back of his head))

HHH °C'mon. Give me the money and lemme go home. ° ((softly))

(19) J: Yeah?

- (20) A: Yeah.
- (21) J: You wanna go home? ((smiling a bit))
- (22) A: "Yeah. Lemme go home Jake. C'mon gimme the money and lemme go home."

 HH Gimme the money and lemme go home."

((Jake lowers his gun))

°C'mon Jake. That's right. C'mon Jake.°

((Jake snatches Alonzo's badge from around his neck. Alonzo's smile evaporates))

- (23) J: You don't deserve this.
- (24) A: °Ok you (motherfucker)°

((Bone and another gangster step up, Bone takes his gun from the ground and points it at Alonzo. Alonzo turns to look at him.))

- (25) B: Jake. Go 'head and bounce homie. Get up outta here. We got yo' back.
- (26) A: What?
- (27) B: Is like that. ((nodding))
- (28) A: Oh no you didn't. Wait a min-<No you did->

((Jake starts to walk away, Alonzo turns his attention back to him))

Ey ey Jake. Ey. JAKE! JAKE! JAKE! COME BACK HERE! JAKE!

((Jake continues walking away, does not look back))

((looks at Bone)) You disloyal, fool-ass bitch-made punks.

((looks at Jake's back again)) JAKE! I NEED MY MONEY! JAKE!

((Jake exits the scene))

Alonzo continues his angry monologue for a minute and a half, but the part of the scene transcribed above lasts approximately 4 minutes and 58 seconds.