

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

GENDER-SPECIFIC FEATURES OF MALE/FEMALE
INTERACTION IN A POPULAR ROMANTIC NOVEL BY
BARBARA CARTLAND

A Pro Gradu Thesis

by

Raija Savinainen

Department of English

2001

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
ENGLANNIN KIELEN LAITOS

Raija Savinainen

GENDER-SPECIFIC FEATURES OF MALE/FEMALE INTERACTION
IN A POPULAR ROMANTIC NOVEL BY BARBARA CARTLAND

Pro gradu –työ

Englantilainen filologia

Kesäkuu 2001

110 sivua

Lähtökohtana tutkielmalle on teksteissä esiintyvä sukupuolen sisältyminen kielelliseen ilmaisuun, eli kielen sukupuolispesifisyys, ja sukupuolen tuominen esille tiettyjen tekstuaalisten keinojen avulla. Tutkielman tarkoituksena on selvittää sukupuolispesifien kielellisten piirteiden esiintymistä yhdessä populaariromanttisessa romaanissa. Materiaali koostuu romaanin mies- ja naispäähenkilön välisistä dialogeista, joiden tarkastelun tavoitteena on selvittää niissä mahdollisesti esiintyvät sukupuolispesifit vuorovaikutuksen piirteet. Tärkeä osa tarkastelua on kontekstuaalisten tekijöiden huomioiminen interaktion piirteiden muotoutumisessa. Tutkimalla dialogeja ottaen huomioon niiden konteksti voidaan paremmin arvioida, mitkä interaktion piirteet mahdollisesti pohjautuvat sukupuolirooleihin tai –odotuksiin ja mitkä esiintyvät kontekstin vaikutuksesta.

Dialogit on jaoteltu neljään kontekstuaalisiin piirteisiin pohjautuvaan kategoriaan, jotka samalla ilmentävät romaanin juonenkehityksellistä suuntaa. Jokaisen kategorian dialogeja tarkastellaan kolmen interaktion piirteen osalta, joihin kuuluvat nais- ja miespäähenkilön tekemät sanavalinnat ja heidän vuorovaikutuksessaan esiintyvät transitiviteettivalinnat. Lisäksi tarkastellaan heidän vuorovaikutuksensa rakenteellisia piirteitä eli puheenvuorojen määrää ja pituutta sekä interaktion hallintaa osoittavia vuorovaikutussekvenssejä. Tutkimuksessa sovelletaan siis puhutun kielen diskurssianalyysin keinoja kirjoitettuun vuoropuheluun.

Tutkimustulokset osoittavat tarkasteltujen interaktion piirteiden olevan tietyssä määrin sukupuolispesifejä. Miespäähenkilön osalta voidaan todeta sukupuolispesifi vuorovaikutustyyli eli hänen interaktionsa pohjaa populaariromanttisen sankarin totunnaiseen sukupuolirooliin. Tiedyt piirteet miespäähenkilön interaktiossa voitiin kuitenkin johtaa puhetilanteesta johtuviksi, joten hänen vuorovaikutuksessaan on myös vähäisempi ei-sukupuolispesifi aspekti. Naispäähenkilöllä voidaan havaita kaksi interaktiotyyliä, jotka esiintyvät eri konteksteissa. Toinen vuorovaikutustyyleistä pohjaa naispäähenkilön esiintymiseen totutusta sankarittaren roolista poikkeavalla tavalla, toisin sanoen, tämä tyyli tuo esille ei-tyypillisiä populaariromanttisen naishahmon ominaisuuksia. Interaktion piirteet, jotka pohjaavat tähän naiskuvaan ja sukupuoli-odotuksiin ovat sukupuolispesifejä tätä muuttunutta sukupuoliroolia silmälläpitäen. Toisen vuorovaikutustyylin piirteet pohjaavat perinteiseen sankarittaren rooliin, jolloin naispäähenkilön interaktio on totutulla tavalla sukupuolispesifiä. Naispäähenkilön vuorovaikutuksen osalta kontekstuaalisilla tekijöillä on suuri vaikutus hänen interaktionsa piirteitten muotoutumiseen ja niiden sukupuolispesifiin luonteeseen.

Asiasanat: popular romantic fiction. feminist stylistics. discourse analysis. interaction. gender-specific.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. CONTEXT OF THE PRESENT STUDY	8
2.1 Popular Romantic Fiction	8
2.2 Barbara Cartland	10
2.3 The Characteristics of the Novel in the Present Study	12
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	13
3.1 Feminist Literary Criticism	13
3.1.1 Ideological considerations	13
3.1.2 Feminist literary perspective on popular romantic fiction	15
3.1.2.1 Theoretical considerations	15
3.1.2.2 The structure of a popular romantic novel and its gender implications	16
3.2 Language and Style in Popular Romantic Fiction	19
3.2.1 Gynesis and Deconstruction	19
3.2.2 Feminist Stylistics	20
4. ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK	22
4.1 The Aims and Method of Analysis	22
4.2 The Analytic Principles	23
4.2.1 Context	23
4.2.2 “The mechanics of conversation”	24
4.3 The Organisation of Analysis	28
5. ANALYSIS	29
5.1 Meeting and Dating	29
5.1.1 Wordings	29
5.1.2 Transitivity choices	34
5.1.3 Turn-taking and Interactional management	40
5.1.3.1 Turn quantity and length	40
5.1.3.2 Extended turn sequences	41
5.1.4 Gender-specificity in the context of ‘Meeting and Dating’	43
5.2 Deepening the Relationship	45
5.2.1 Wordings	45
5.2.2 Transitivity choices	50
5.2.3 Turn-taking and Interactional management	57
5.2.3.1 Turn quantity and length	57
5.2.3.2 Extended turn sequences	58
5.2.4 Gender-specificity in the context of ‘Deepening the Relationship’	61
5.3 Disagreement	63
5.3.1 Wordings	63
5.3.2 Transitivity choices	67
5.3.3 Turn-taking and Interactional management	70
5.3.3.1 Turn quantity and length	70
5.3.3.2 Side-sequences of meaning negotiation	71
5.3.4 Gender-specificity in the context of ‘Disagreement’	73

5.4 Rebuilding the Relationship	76
5.4.1 Wordings	76
5.4.2 Transitivity choices	81
5.4.3 Turn-taking and Interactional management	87
5.4.3.1 Turn quantity and length	87
5.4.3.2 Extended turns	88
5.4.3.3 Side-sequences of meaning negotiation	90
5.4.4 Gender-specificity in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship'	95
6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	99
BIBLIOGRAPHY	108

1. INTRODUCTION

Popular romantic fiction has been studied widely from the point of view of feminist literary criticism. This field of study has largely concentrated on the gender implications of the structure of romantic novels, described as the 'romantic formula' which refers to, on the one hand, the typical gender roles of the hero and the heroine in romantic fiction. This takes place in the sense that the characters exhibit certain characteristic features indicative of their gender. These features contribute to an image of a strong, powerful male character and a weak, oppressed female character. On the other hand, the romantic formula refers to the development of the romantic plot from initial infatuation and the forming of the couple to a turning point of disagreement. The relationship is, nevertheless, re-established, often by the effort of the heroine, and finally the disagreement and tension resolve into love and happiness.

It appears that a great deal of study on popular romantic fiction has concentrated on the gender implications that the structure of popular romantic novels has. However, an equally important and interesting viewpoint on the study of romantic fiction is that of the language used in romantic novels. A field of feminist study called feminist stylistics has concentrated on the gender implications of the language of popular romantic texts, among other genres. The research done in this field shows that in popular romantic texts, certain textual places, through the language used in them, serve to denote the gender of the characters.

The objective of the present study is to take the above idea of gendered language one step further and to investigate the possible emergence of textual places denoting gender not only in texts in general but more specifically, in the interaction taking place in the dialogues of a popular romantic text. In other words, the objective of the present study is to investigate whether there are gender-specific features, that is, features evolving from or demonstrative of gender, in the interaction of the popular romantic hero and heroine. An important aspect of study of gender-specificity of interaction will be the investigation of what is the effect of other contextual features (setting, topic, other individual features of the characters than gender, etc.) on the communication. This way one will be able to conclude which features of interaction (if any) evolve from and/or are demonstrative of gender, and which features can be explained as the outcome of other factors influencing the interaction. The study of the possible gender-specific features will enable one to conclude whether the hero and the heroine of a popular romantic novel can be seen as having gender-specific interactional styles. Such interactional styles can be compared to the findings of the study of the structural characteristics of popular romantic fiction to see

if the two are consistent, and also to what extent gender-specific interaction possibly derives from the gender system of romantic fiction.

The objective of studying the possible gender-specific features of interaction will be attained by applying methods of discourse analysis, and more specifically, methods of the study of spoken discourse, to the dialogues in a popular romantic novel. The dialogues constituting for the data of the present study are gathered from a popular romantic novel by Barbara Cartland called 'Broken Barriers'. The reason for the fact that only one novel serves as the primary source of the study is because the novel provides a sufficient amount of material for the purposes of the study at hand. A novel by Barbara Cartland was chosen as the primary source because of the vast number of romantic stories Cartland has produced which makes her novels easily available. The dialogues gathered from the romantic novel by Cartland, taking place between the hero and the heroine of the story, will be studied as to the possible gender-specificness of three features of interaction; the number of the features of interaction to be studied has to be restricted to some central ones because of the limitations of space of the present study.

The features of interaction to be studied include the analysis of the wordings, that is, the analysis of word choices the characters make. These are informative of, firstly, the images the characters give, or, the way in which they are presented. Secondly, they are informative of the make-up of the interactional styles of the characters in the sense that the characteristics of the words and expressions they use can be indicative of their communicational starting-points, such as the influence their backgrounds, occupations, social positions, gender and the like can have on their interaction. Another feature of interaction to be studied is transitivity choices made by the characters. The study of transitivity will be useful because it is essentially informative of the aspect of "who does what to whom" in the interaction. In other words, the study of transitivity enables one to investigate the aspects of activeness and passiveness which might serve to denote control and power. The notions of power and control refer to male/female gender expectations which typically assign the high status position and the ability to control mixed sex interaction, understood as demonstrating activeness, to men. Manifested in the transitivity choices the characters make in their interaction, the aspects of control and power could be indicative of gender expectations influencing the male/female interaction and thus be informative of gender-specific styles of interaction. Thirdly, the study of the features of interaction will include the analysis of aspects of turn-taking and interactional management. Turn-taking will be studied as to the features of turn quantity and length which are informative of the amount a character speaks in a dialogue and in this sense can be seen as denoting the relative importance and centrality of different characters. Interactional management can be considered as the investigation of the actual structuring

of the dialogues. The interest concerning this feature is on the specific sequencing choices the characters possibly make, in other words, on their manipulating the usual pattern of exchange sequences, such as question – answer adjacency pairs. Again, possibly demonstrative of interactional control, the features of turn-taking and interactional management might be indicative of underlying gender assumptions. These, in turn, would count as gender-specific features of interaction and be part of a gender-specific interactional style.

The analysis of dialogues will be arranged thematically: the themes correspond to the steps of development of the popular romantic plot as evolve from the ‘romantic formula’. The analytic categories thus demonstrate the different contextual settings through which the present novel develops. The dialogues investigated in the present study fall into four analytic contexts, namely, those of ‘Meeting and Dating’, ‘Deepening the Relationship’, ‘Disagreement’ and ‘Rebuilding the Relationship’. Such an organisation of the analysis enables one also to pay attention to the aspects affecting the interaction of the hero and the heroine which might evolve from the characteristics of different contexts.

Before the actual analysis of dialogues, the study at hand includes a section on the contextual environment/background whose purpose is to account for the historical as well as contemporary aspects of popular romantic fiction which have made the genre such a wide-scale phenomenon as it presently appears. The context section also includes information of the novel serving as the primary source in the present study as well as of the author of the novel, Barbara Cartland. The following section on the theoretical framework of the present study serves the purpose of demonstrating the hypotheses and findings of previous study made in the fields of feminist literary criticism and feminist stylistics, and the concepts and ideas of these fields which relate to the study at hand. After this, chapter four on the analytic framework will clarify the methodological choices made in this study which evolve from the theoretical framework. In this chapter also the principles of analysis as to the features of interaction to be studied, and the way in which the analysis will be carried out will be explained. After the analysis, in the discussion and conclusion, the major findings will be summarised and discussed as to their implications of gender-specificness of interaction in popular romantic fiction, how the findings relate to previous research, and what they imply as to possible future study.

2. CONTEXT OF THE PRESENT STUDY

2.1 Popular Romantic Fiction

Among the phenomena of current popular culture, popular romantic fiction is certainly to be considered one of the most prominent ones. As we know it today, popular romantic fiction is produced in a highly organised way with new stories being published every week. The average shelf-life of a romantic novel is, however, rather short, since popular romantic fiction is consumed by thousands and thousands of readers all over the world who want fresh stories every week. Targeted especially at women, popular romantic fiction is a major form of female consumption. To understand the important position of popular romantic fiction today, it is necessary to turn to its roots. This way also the connections of romantic literature to the social conditions and social change can be taken into consideration. These are factors which contribute even to the current form of popular romantic novels.

The beginning of popular romantic fiction is said to be lined to the emergence of the novel as a literary form. To be more specific, it can be said that romantic fiction really began with the publishing of Samuel Richardson's 'Pamela' in 1740. In Mussell's (1981:3) words, in 'Pamela' "the operation of the fictional world" can be seen for the first time. Bridget Fowler (1991:5) thinks that 'Pamela' demonstrates "the elements of the modern domestic romance". She goes on to argue that in 'Pamela' the notions of love and wealth are combined with ethical commitment. This essentially means that the life of the wealthy was idealised, but that a better position in life was obtainable also for the less fortunate, at least women, by being virtuous and thus worthy of marrying to the gentry class. This might also be what Mussell means with her 'fictional world' since social mobility through virtue is a common mechanism of romantic fiction. Further, as Fowler observes, Richardson has created in Pamela a model for romantic heroines which still holds.

The next phase in the development of popular romantic fiction was the 1840s-1850s when the mass production of popular fiction began. This was because of the increasing literary interest and the better economical circumstances of the working classes. The romantic novel became very popular because of the "domestic ideology" of the time. Fowler (1991:17) notes that family matters grew in importance and the appliance of ethical values into family life was essential. It seems that marriage and home became important in leading a respectable life, a model for which could be found in romantic novels. Also Mussell (1981:7) puts forth that the 1840s were time when romantic novels became established in women's fiction.

Cheap magazine-fiction for working-class women in the 1930s was the next innovation in popular romantic literature. Fowler (1991:54) reports that the 'romance formula' is always used in the magazine stories. Also Mary Eagleton (1986:91) confirms the existence of a standard formula in romantic fiction. According both of them, the formula includes such factors as a life-long marriage chosen by the partners as the context of sexual activity, a Madonna-image of women as perfect wives and mothers and the presentation of the private sphere as the context for existence. Fowler (1991:54) thinks that the romance formula reflects the strict discipline of the time as well as the competitiveness of the market and the contraction of free-time activities. It is easy to imagine that the widely-read magazine-stories were an important medium in forming peoples' opinions. It is also notable that such a 'romance formula' exists in current romantic fiction, but it is now being criticised for its patriarchal, oppressive image of women. Kay Mussell (1981:17) observes that "the value system for women in modern romantic fiction is also very similar to that of earlier models. The necessity of virtuous behavior and the punishment for transgression... as well as the very definition of femininity are relative constant in such fiction".

Lastly, Bridget Fowler (1991:100) has found a new line of development in the 1980s. That is the emergence of a new social type seen as the female 'idol of production'. This female character is in charge of her life; she is capable, active and participating. In a sense the character could be seen as more women-centred, as moving away from the patriarchal ideology. The traditional gentry-bourgeois ideals of love are, nevertheless, lurking in the background. This might be a way in which romantic novel writers have begun to incorporate social change into the traditional formula.

Popular romantic fiction still observes the same principles as it did 250 years ago. As both Fowler and Mussell note, the 'formula', or the "feminine sub-culture of virginity and dependence" exist in romantic writing. At present, however, there is no longer just one kind of popular romantic writing, but there are sub-genres within the area. Basically, they all make "a love-story within a domestic drama" (Mussell 1981:xi), but the accentuations differ. Fowler differentiates between the 'Gentry-Bourgeois Romance', 'The Romance of the Modern Woman' and 'The Romance or Family Saga'. In other sources there are such concepts as 'Regency Romance', 'Medical Romance' and the like. These are more likely to be found in Harlequin or Mills&Boon mass-market romances.

Firstly, the 'Gentry-Bourgeois Romance' is usually situated in the past. It describes the environment and the life of the upper classes. The heroine is, nevertheless, a very poor, young, virtuous woman. This sub-genre is perhaps most in concord with the 'romance-formula' with its image of the female character and the presentation of courtship and marriage as the destinations of her life. The 'Romance of the Modern

Woman' is more about the independent, capable woman of the 1980s and onwards. Here the female role is almost reversed from the traditional allowing also the description of female sexuality. Nevertheless, the old ideals can still be found in these novels. Heterosexual relationships, for example, are still the norm, and love is still idealised. Lastly, the 'Romance or Family Saga' concentrates on depicting the lives of one family, usually wealthy and/or aristocratic. The family's values are as a rule quite traditional, capitalist and patriarchal. Sometimes, however, the notion of social mobility comes across. This happens most often when the novel is about the self-made man or describes a love-story between a member of the family and a person with a less elevated background.

It should be noted that the categories described above are not necessarily fixed. New ideas and ideals, which might not fit these descriptions, find their way into popular romantic fiction. Romantic novels have recently been and still are criticised for their patriarchal view of the world. Virginity is hardly a virtue anymore, nor is the woman's complete devotion to domestic matters. Most popular romantic writers have acknowledged this and taken a more realistic stance in their writing. In the present society such notions as single-parents, divorce, and female sexuality are accepted and they appear also in romantic novels. There might emerge a need of concepts to describe such writing which, more or less direct, criticises the patriarchal order in the form of a romantic novel.

2.2 Barbara Cartland

Barbara Cartland was born on July 9 1901 in Edgbaston, Birmingham, England. Her married name was Barbara McCorquodale, but she used her maiden name when she published her works. Cartland grew up in London high society and in the 1920s she became one of the 'bright young people'. During the 20s she contributed to the 'Daily Express' and in 1925 she published her first romantic novel 'The Jigsaw' which became an immediate success. In 1925 took place also the performance of her first play 'The Blood Money'. Later in her life Cartland became, in addition to her writing career, increasingly interested in the issues of national health and home politics. In the 1950s she was elected the County Councillor in Hertfordshire County which gave her the opportunity to promote matters of health. Cartland also actively participated in the work of various charitable organisations. In the 1960s Cartland campaigned for camps and education for gypsies, issues which became successively resolved. In 1991 she was made Dame Commander of the Order of the British Empire for her literary contribution and charity work. By 1999 she had more than 650 million literary works sold and had written

over 700 novels. On May 21st 2000 Barbara Cartland died at the age of 90. (Encyclopedia Britannica. Online. Internet. 11 Oct. 2000. and "BarbaraCartland.com – the official web site of Barbara Cartland." Online. Internet. 11 Oct. 2000.)

According to Rosalind Brunt (1984:127) Cartland saw herself as having "a moral and educational duty to communicate the values of romance". Cartland firmly believed in the notions she advocated in her writing and had formed an ideology on the basis of which she worked. The ideology consisted of three central elements. Firstly, as presented by Brunt (1984:131), Cartland believed in the moral values of the 1920s, the decade which she valued as the "last Romantic Age in Britain". The fact that Cartland's heroines were always virgins has its origin in the way of life of the 1920s. Secondly, Cartland thought that the society should be made equal for all, and that the upper classes should have a special concern for the lower classes because of their position which includes not only privileges but also social responsibilities. Thirdly, Cartland had her own 'Philosophy of Life' which was based on the notions of the 'Life Force' and 'Positive Thinking'. The 'Life Force' has to do with love, so that 'Life Force' transforms romantic love and brings it to contact with divine love; romantic love between people is hence 'purified' through the 'Life Force'. Through the notion of 'Positive Thinking', in turn, people have the chance to find the truth in life by striving for the good.

By applying the above mentioned principles into her writing, Cartland wanted to provide appropriate role-models for women and men (Brunt, 1984:140). For Cartland "sexual divisions [were] irreconcilable and given for all time" and she believed that "men [were] the superior sex" (Brunt, 1984:140). Education and emancipation do not change the fact that the destiny of women is to love men and for their love women should be the objects of worship and adoration. The double-standard of 'innocent' women and 'experienced' men is preserved in Cartland's novels (Brunt, 1984:140-41). Working within the feminist paradigm, Brunt (1984:147) says that Cartland's novels are inherently materialistic accounts of gender relations and circumstances. They point out how gender is connected with a variety of economic, social and cultural powers. Cartland herself saw her novels as "entertainments with a message"

Economic necessity after her divorce first compelled Cartland to write romantic novels. In the course of time Cartland managed to establish her position and to create a romantic empire of her own. Rosalind Brunt (1984:136) sees Cartland's production of herself as a public figure as the most important reason for the bloom of 'Barbara Cartland Industry' in the 1970s. What the notion of 'industry' refers to here is the enormous amount of text which Cartland was capable of producing in a short period of time. Being able to publish a novel every two weeks, she was undoubtedly one of the most productive writers in the world. Cartland attained this position by rationalized working methods:

from 1970s onwards she worked to a daily routine of dictating novels in the morning and doing background research in the afternoon. With massive production and by establishing herself as a figure larger than life, Cartland became the Queen of Romance, and for many she still remains so.

2.3 The Characteristics of the Novel in the Present Study

The popular romantic novel which serves as the source of research material in the present study is called 'Broken Barriers' and was written by Barbara Cartland in 1976. The novel is set in the late 1930's and takes place mostly in London, although there are some scenes which take place in Paris and also in the British countryside. 'Broken Barriers', as usual, tells the typical story of a love affair which after initial enchantment encounters difficulties and misunderstanding due to both the emotional insecurity of the characters and the misjudging of each others' feelings and actions. The tension, nevertheless, finally resolves into happiness and bliss once the characters have realised how wrong they have been in their negative assumptions about each other.

In the role of the heroine there is Carlotta Lenshovski who is a young, attractive, orphan actress of half-Russian origin. She has grown up and lives in London in the care of Magda Lenshovski, a Russian theatrical costumier. Carlotta, being somewhat undecided about what she wants in life, has more or less drifted into acting. She is too self-indulgent as well as insecure about her abilities to be bothered to try something else. To feel more important, she likes to imagine that her mother belonged to the Russian royal family, although she nor Magda have no clear proof of this. In spite of her lack of professional ambition, her need for indulgement and a somewhat immoral quality of character, deep down she is a kind-hearted, caring and socially active person.

The hero of the story, Sir Norman Melton, owner of the Melton Motor Company, is a self-made man who thanks to his relations through his first marriage, determination and ambition has made his way to the financial elite. This feature of depicting the life of a self-made man, his financial achievement, and relationship to a woman of a less elevated social background indicates that the novel, although it might not be the best example of it, belongs to the sub-genre of the 'Romance or Family Saga', as described in 2.1. To continue with Norman, he is not much of a socialite, however, but prefers to keep people, especially women, at a distance which is partly due to his failed first marriage. Nevertheless, he is not quite so independent and self-sufficient as he would like to think, and the life in his large country estate gets dreary at times. He has, however, a step-daughter called Skye from his first marriage to comfort him in his loneliness.

The love affair between Carlotta and Norman seems successful at first, Carlotta enjoying the flowers and presents she receives and Norman being able to forget his loneliness. Then Carlotta meets another man and falls in love with him; her feelings, however, go unanswered and thus, rejected and unhappy, she accepts Norman's proposal of marriage which will bring her at least material well-being; she also appreciates Norman's feelings for her. Norman is unaware of Carlotta's true reasons for marrying him, and when the state of affairs is revealed to him, he, too, emotionally abandons her. This, in turn, leads Carlotta to realise that she does, in fact, love Norman who has been so kind and considerate of her, and she thus tries to convince Norman of this new state of affairs so that the relationship could be saved. After many difficulties her efforts are finally rewarded at the point when she is at the verge of giving up altogether and forgetting about Norman: he, understanding that Carlotta is leaving him, finally relents and the couple can live happy ever after.

It should be noted that in the study at hand only Carlotta and Norman and their action will be taken into consideration. There are other characters as well who come to contact with the two main characters and influence the development of the plot but in the scope of this study, the action and influence of these characters cannot be accounted for. Thus, although in the dialogues between Carlotta and Norman also other characters might be mentioned, they will not be considered in terms of their influence on the main characters' interaction, but the focus of the study will be on Carlotta's and Norman's dialogues with each other.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Feminist Literary Criticism

3.1.1 Ideological considerations

The significance of feminist literary criticism for the present study originates from its agenda and can be defined as follows:

“Feminists have *politicized* existing critical methods and approaches. If feminist criticism has subverted established critical judgements it is because of its radically new emphasis on *sexual politics*. It is on the basis of its political theory that feminist criticism has grown to become a new branch of literary studies” (Moi, 1985:87).

Virginia Woolf had much earlier a similar conception as Moi of the purpose of feminist literary criticism as a political way to explore gender and social reality: as quoted by Humm (1994:3), she has said that “literature read with feminist eyes involves a double perspective”. By this Woolf refers to the fact that the social reality as people perceive it is shaped by gender, which contributes to the fact that “*the representation of women in literature is also gendered*” (in Humm, 1994:3). The above notion of gendered representation of women and men has since Woolf’s days become almost a basic assumption on the basis of which to work further in many feminist literary studies; it is the ideological kernel of research.

In her definition of the field, Maggie Humm follows the same principles: “feminist criticism addresses social ideologies and practices [and] feminist literary criticism attends to how those ideologies and practices shape literary texts”(1994:viii). This is precisely the point of the study at hand as well: to investigate literary forms, and more specifically, literary forms of popular romantic fiction, from the point of view of feminist enquiry. This is not the least because the gendered representation of women has also been demonstrated to exist in literature, such as the female stereotypes in D.H. Lawrence’s writing studied by Kate Millett. Millett, as quoted by Humm (1994:45), argues that literature shows how men are the sexual masters of women by using “symbols and patterns of dominance and subordination”. This idea of gender-specific structures in literature will be further discussed in section 3.2 below.

It should be noted here, however, that feminist literary criticism is a multifaceted area of research, and not all theories within the field apply to romantic fiction. It would be more accurate to say that the feminist study of romantic fiction, with its own area of research, is a sub-field within feminist literary criticism. When considering the study at hand, Woolf’s statement forms the basic assumption made concerning the representation of gender in literature. A notable achievement in feminist literary theory was also Kate Millett’s study on gender stereotypes in, for example, D.H. Lawrence’s writing (in Humm, 1994:8). This study, thus falls within the same framework as Woolf, Moi (quoted above) and Millett in that it investigates the underlying patriarchal, stereotypical assumptions often made in literature. What is different is the focus of the study which has shifted from the canonical works of literature to popular culture. Even within feminist literary criticism the study of popular texts does not have a long history, although today it is firmly established as one area of interest within the field.

3.1.2 Feminist literary perspective on popular romantic fiction

3.1.2.1 Theoretical considerations

Terry Lovell, as quoted by Eagleton (1986:84), argues that “certain genres have been marked off as ‘lesser’ forms, and ceded to women”. By this she means, for example, romantic fiction (as well as other popular literary forms) which for a long time has been banned by critics and been politically questionable for feminists. However, recent development of feminist literary criticism has allowed a new reading of popular literature which “questions the division between ‘literature’ and ‘writing’, ‘high’ and ‘popular’ culture, the ‘classics’ and the ‘mass market’ (Eagleton, 1986:91). The emergence of such notions as ‘playful pluralism’, a term used by Annette Kolodny, have probably facilitated the acceptance of popular genres into feminist study. Kolodny (in Eagleton, 1997:250-251) thinks that instead of being the only way to read literature correctly, a feminist reading is just one of the various possibilities to read the same text within different contexts of enquiry. Toril Moi in her ‘Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory’ (1985:74) elaborates on this and says that Kolodny sees feminist criticism as too diversified to be an internally consistent field of study, and it is thus ascribed to the position of pluralism. This leads Moi (1985:74) to criticise Kolodny: Moi states that “without common political ground, there can simply be no recognisable *feminist* criticism” and is thus opposed to the ‘playful pluralism’. It seems, nevertheless, that Kolodny was right in suggesting a pluralistic stance, since by so doing she did not abandon the feminist agenda, but made it possible for differing feminist critiques to appear. This might have helped at least in making previously unsuitable issues legitimate subjects of enquiry.

Another significant development in feminist thought in relation to popular romantic fiction was the idea of ‘gynocritics’. According to Eagleton (1986:190), the term ‘gynocritics’ means a female frame of reference for the analysis of women’s literature and the development of theories based on women’s experience. In *Feminist Literary Criticism*’ (ed. by Eagleton, 1991) she explains the term as referring to the study of the “female author and character” and the development of “theories and methodologies based on female experience”, which, for her, is “the touchstone of authenticity”. These principles should lead one to “an understanding of female character” (Eagleton, 1991:9). Elaine Showalter (in Eagleton, 1997:256) defines ‘gynocritics’ as freeing oneself from the male tradition of literary history and focusing on female culture. ‘Gynocritics’ thus study the “female subculture including...the ascribed status, the internalised constructs of femininity [and]...the occupations, interactions and consciousness of women”. It seems

that of these two categories, the one of 'gynocritics' is what has influenced most the feminist study of popular romantic fiction what comes to, for example, the women-centred principles of analysis. A lot of the current feminist research of popular romantic fiction is conducted bearing in mind the female readership of the romance and their experience of the world (e.g. Janice Radway, 'Reading the Romance', 1984; Alison Light, "Returning to Manderley" – Romance fiction, Female sexuality and Class, in Lovell, 1991).

3.1.2.2 The structure of a popular romantic novel and its gender implications

Mary Eagleton (1986:91-92) as well as Ann Barr Snitow (in Eagleton, 1997:192) refer to the 'romantic' or 'Harlequin' formula as an interesting issue for feminist researchers: The formula is exactly the point which has made popular romantic fiction politically suitable for feminist analysis. More specifically, Barr Snitow (in Eagleton, 1997:194-195) argues that the 'Harlequin' formula encapsulates the "distance between the sexes" and that in 'romanticized sexuality' distance creates pleasure through 'waiting, anticipation and anxiety': the culmination point of sexuality. She goes on to consider the world-view implicit in such formula and concludes that the formula raises the formation of the couple as the primary activity, and in so doing it suppresses the significance of society and presents the action as having no context. The formula also re-enforces the traditional female role-model in that it presents the couple-formation as the chief concern of the heroine, suggesting that "the true completion for women is nearly always ... social, domestic, sexual" (in Eagleton, 1997:195, 197).

Alison Light (in Lovell, 1991:326) and Mary M. Talbot (1995:75) share the same conception as Barr Snitow of romantic novels being based on patriarchal values. Light sees the romance as a part of 'oppressive ideology' which renders women 'socially and sexually subordinate'. Talbot says that romantic novels present 'femininity, masculinity and relations between women and men' from the point of view of the dominant, i.e. male, culture. In the light of this study, the 'romance formula' is seen as a traditional structure of power and inequality which, then, comes to be expressed through other forms in romantic fiction, and in this case, through linguistic features of interaction.

In addition to those researchers mentioned above, also Anne Cranny-Francis has suggested some characteristics which the hero and the heroine typically demonstrate in popular romantic fiction. Cranny-Francis (1990:81) says that the hero is often "an established professional man", and he thus represents the middle- or the upper classes. Further, he is a white heterosexual, ten to fifteen years older than the heroine and with

considerably more life experience. The heroine, in turn, comes from "a poorer and less socially elevated background". She is also "less established and less wealthy". These descriptions give an image of a strong, powerful male figure and a weak, powerless female figure.

As Cranny-Francis (1990:187) shows, it seems that the ways in which gender and class are described in popular romance are connected through the disposition of power. Further, she observes (1990:186) that "inequality of class is a mechanism of the romance". This means that the social implications of a romance, realised by the different backgrounds of the heroine and the hero, are an essential part of the structure of romantic novels: Without such social differences the traditional values of popular romantic fiction could not exist. With traditional values are meant basically the patriarchal notion of male and female roles. Powerful men can be active outside the home and at home they are respected as the head of the family. Powerless women are the perfect wives and mothers who abhor the idea of paid employment but remain in the domestic sphere. Being socially inferior to their husbands, the women need to be ethically and morally intact to be worthy of them. It is usually only morally that women can be the superiors of men. Power inequalities and oppression are seen as the 'natural order', the way in which the society functions.

However, the purpose of popular romantic fiction is not to criticise love, but to idealise it. What the romance is essentially about is the "characterisation of a strong, male figure, the hero, and the romance and marriage between him and the heroine" (Cranny-Francis, 1990:178). The idea which lies behind the above mentioned plot structure is, according to Kay Mussell (1980:xii), the notion that every woman should strive for a "satisfying, mature and all fulfilling" marriage, because that is what women are "preordained" for. Mussell further argues that romantic love is presented as a primary factor in defining a woman's position in society. In the light of the arguments which have been presented so far, it seems safe to say that very often in popular romantic literature women are seen as dependant of men, and having their right to exist through their relation to men: the love-bind, the romance and the marriage. The popular romantic novel always ends in a marriage because that is the point where the story ceases to be of interest. At that point the patriarchal order has been restored and all is well.

In addition to Cranny-Francis' and Mussell's conceptions of the relationship between women and men in popular romantic fiction, both Light (in Lovell, 1991:327, 341-342) and Talbot (1995:75-76) note that the romance glorifies heterosexuality: the passive heroine finds her happiness with the dominant hero. Talbot explains this as having the function of letting the readers participate in the romance "without transgression of society's expectations concerning gender identity" (Talbot, 1995:76). Barr Snitow (in

Eagleton, 1986:197-198) refers to the same issue as Talbot, when she states that romantic novels give an impression of the conventional role-models for the sexes still holding. Barr Snitow also assigns patriarchal gender constructs to the role of satisfying the readers' needs. She explains that there is a vacuum in social conditions which women perceive and which the romance fills with the help of its fantasy world.

Much like Barr Snitow and Talbot above, also Alison Light has taken an interest in the social interpretation of the romance. In her view, romantic fiction should be considered a 'restatement of a social reality' and be examined from the point of view of 'how literary texts might function in our lives as imaginative constructions and interpretations' (in Lovell, 1991:326). This is what Radway (1984) has done in her study of the readers of popular romantic fiction: she explains that at least some of the attraction of romantic novels derives from their capacity to fulfil "certain basic psychological needs" of women "that have been induced by the culture and its social structures but that often remain unmet in day-to-day existence as the result of concomitant restrictions of female activity". Romantic novels answer to these needs by providing "vicarious emotional nurturance by prompting identification between the reader and a fictional heroine whose identity as a woman is always confirmed by the romantic and sexual attentions of a male". This is a factor which serves as reconstructing and affirming the reader's sense of self vis-à-vis the society (Radway, 1984:113).

When considering the connections between the structure of the popular romantic novel and its social implications, an important issue to consider is also the fact that, as Talbot (1995:113) puts it, feminist discourse can be detected in the more recent popular romantic novels. This is in concord with the development of popular romantic fiction as discussed in 2.1., where the 1980s were considered the time of the emergence of the 'Romance of the Modern Woman', presenting a more active and assertive heroine. This clearly indicates that romance writers have taken a more realistic stance in their novels and tend to write about issues of current female interest. It might be the case that feminist discourse has led them to do this, but it is more likely that the romance continues to fulfil its role of "imaginative constructions and interpretations". As the relationship between women and men takes new forms, the romance must adapt itself to the changing needs of women, be it nostalgia or need to reinforce one's sense of self.

3.2 Language and Style in Popular Romantic Fiction

3.2.1 Gynesis and Deconstruction

Issues of language and style, or, more comprehensively, issues of *stylistics* are of central importance in this study. Through stylistic means it is possible to investigate the realisation of the stereotypical, patriarchal assumptions made in popular romantic fiction which were discussed in the section above. The goal of stylistics in general is to explain the interplay of language and the function of a literary text. This takes place through the analysis of the ways of artistic expression and of how language, used in a certain manner, comes to have different artistic effects (Leech and Short as quoted by Mills, 1995:5). The means to find these effects, and the aims of explaining them vary between different schools of stylistics. The concern here is the study of stylistic issues from the point of view of feminism. In explaining the feminist view on the language of literature two concepts are of central importance: those of ‘gynesis’ and postmodernism.

‘Gynesis’ is a term evolved from the French tradition of feminist literary criticism and is explained by Alice Jardine (in Eagleton, 1997:261) as referring to the reincorporation and reconceptualization of the “nonknowledge of the master narratives”. ‘Gynesis’ has connections to the notion of ‘gynocritics’ which, as discussed above, concentrates on the bringing of female experience into literature. The nonknowledge in ‘gynesis’ is “a [textual] space encoded as *feminine*, as *woman*”(Jardine, in Eagleton, 1997:261). The putting into discourse of that feminine space is the essence of ‘gynesis’. Rachel Bowlby (in Eagleton, 1997:272) defines this as the “exploration of textual spaces ‘gendered feminine’”. The idea of finding out what these feminine spaces consist of is what links ‘gynesis’ to deconstruction.

The notion of ‘deconstruction’, according to Mary Poovey, is a postmodernist idea referring to the “demystification of the category of ‘woman’” (in Eagleton, 1997:262). Poovey (in Eagleton, 1997:263-264) means by this the revealing of the artificial nature of the female space in literature, in other words, the understanding of gender as an artificial social construct. The abandoning of this artificial construct might lessen the “social prominence” of the “supposedly fixed opposition of masculine/feminine”. Mary Jacobus (in Eagleton, 1997:300) speaks of deconstruction as the ‘écriture féminine’ meaning the woman as “the writing-effect” instead of the origin of a narrative. Jacobus sees the “production of gender through patriarchal discourse” in literature as “the textuality of the sex”, the dominance of binary oppositions such as described by Poovey above.

What arises of the discussion above is the question of how to read texts; how to deconstruct the feminine space in literature. Luce Irigaray (in Eagleton, 1997:317)

suggests that the reader destroys the “discursive mechanism of gender” by deliberately assuming the feminine role, that is, by ‘mimicking’. This means that the reader should place herself in the role of the exploited female, and by identifying the places of female oppression, she can gain the position of resistance. Irigaray (in Eagleton, 1997:317) proposes that “to play with the mimesis is thus, for a woman, to try to recover the place of her exploitation by discourse, without allowing herself to be simply reduced by it”. This idea of finding out the textual places and features where oppressive ideology can be detected, by assuming not only a feminine, but a feminist role, is what interests us in the following section.

3.2.2 Feminist Stylistics

The term ‘feminist stylistic’, as used by Sara Mills, refers to the investigation of gender differences encoded in language (1995:11). To be more specific, Mills is, firstly, interested in finding out how readers come to certain gender-related interpretations of texts. Secondly, resembling what Irigaray said above about the destroying of “the discursive mechanism of gender”, Mills is interested in detecting those textual triggers which bring about different readings depending on the reader’s gender-identity (1995:8). In sum, Mills says that “*gender is foregrounded in texts at certain key moments and is usually dealt with in ways which can be predicted*” (1995:17; emphasis added). What is important in this statement is that it focuses the interest of literary study on textual features functioning as indicators of gender. In the light of the present study, the above statement invites one to read popular romantic literature from the point of view of making explicit the moments where gender possibly becomes foregrounded and of considering the predictability of those moments, i.e. their stereotypical characteristics evolving from gender expectations. Such a reading should enable one to conclude whether gender constructs, which have their basis on the patriarchal ideology, are to be found in romantic novels.

This kind of a reading of popular romantic texts would not, however, be sufficient if left on the general level of discovering underlying gender assumptions. As Mills (1995:149) points out, words and sentences do not ‘make sense’ when studied in isolation, but they need to be studied in “the context of larger-scale ideological frameworks and frameworks of critique”. This is where feminist ideology and issues arising from it come to play a role in the analysis of texts. Feminist stylistics, according to Mills (1995:10), is aimed at discovering the “underlying ideological messages in texts”, and this way it can be exercised also as a form of social critique targeted at

patriarchy. In this sense feminist stylistics is also an independent field of feminist criticism.

To achieve the end of pointing out the patriarchal function of a text, feminist stylistics primarily studies the encoding of gender differences, or gender systems, within texts. Hodge and Kress (as cited in Mills, 1995:11) state that

“one aspect of a gender system is a classification of reality which projects social meanings about men and women onto the non-human world, inscribing an ideology of sex roles and sex identities into the language itself. “

This seems to be also what Walter Nash (1990:55) thinks, when he states about women’s magazine fiction that the genre prescribes roles for women and men, and that it tends to present women in their role as defensive and powerless. Nash (1990:55, 78) also regards female defensiveness a stylistic feature of the genre, whereas men in general can be boisterous and macho, using e.g. a ‘macho-lexicon’ of their own.

All in all, what has been said above indicates that in studying a genre such as popular romantic fiction, which has traditionally been regarded oppressive and inherently patriarchal, the stylistic features cannot be separated from the gender ideology. Only when studied together they reveal the true implications of a text. Nevertheless, it should be also noted that considered only from the perspective of texts inherently including gender, the analysis remains incomplete: as Mills (1995:38) points out, “gender is ... outside the text and yet it is also very much part of its integral structure”. This refers to the fact that there is a “bi-directional relationship between context and text”(Mills, 1995:38), that is, the author of the text and the contemporary ‘sociohistorical context’ affect the text as much as the text itself affects the author and the context. This means that texts where gender is inherent (such as popular romantic fiction) can in themselves lead to gender-based literature by creating certain gender expectations the author needs to fulfil. On the other hand, the author of the text and the context surrounding him/her can affect the literary product so that certain gender expectations, or roles, come to be included in the text.

Thus, the aim of feminist stylistics is to tackle the question of gender in texts, be it inherent or produced by the author or context. What is important in this aspiration, considered in the light of the present study, is that the investigation of gender systems within texts takes place through the analysis of language. Feminist stylistics regards linguistic items as indicative of gender, or, as Mills argues (1995:17), linguistic items denote textual places where “gender is foregrounded”. As argued previously, linguistic items and thus also textual places do not denote on their own but need to be considered in

the larger contexts they appear (Mills, 1995:149). In this sense the inclusion of context into analysis is essential so that one could extract those linguistic items in texts which ‘foreground’ gender and those which bring forth other aspects of context.

4. ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

4.1 The Aims and Method of Analysis

The present study aims at answering the question of whether there are features in the dialogues between the male and female characters which evolve from, or are demonstrative of gender roles or expectations. The gender-specificness of such features will be defined in relation to the traditional gender roles of the hero and heroine as presented by the ‘romantic formula’. A further objective of the study at hand is the taking into consideration of what effects the context of the dialogues has on the features of interaction that take place in them. The investigation of contextual features will enable one to better determine which features of interaction in the dialogues are brought about by gender: aspects of context could also account for different features of interaction for women and men.

The method of analysis which best enables one to pinpoint the places in dialogues where gender is foregrounded and, at the same time, lets one consider the patriarchal assumptions arising from the context, is that of analysing structures of discourse, or, discourse analysis. As Sara Mills (1995:159) points out, “the content of texts” can be seen “as something which is the negotiation of textual elements and codes and forces outside the text which influence...the way that the text is constructed...”. Discourse analysis is, thus, essentially about the “larger structures and patterns [of interaction] which determine the occurrence of ...individual lexical items... (Mills, 1995:159). Further, discourse analysis is concerned with the “socially accepted associations among the ways of using language”, that is the contextual features (such as gender) which affect language use (Gee, 1999:17). Considering the study at hand, using a discourse analytic method means, thus, investigation of textual structures which together with contextual features construct the text. As the research material of this study are dialogues in popular romantic fiction, the textual structures studied are features of dialogue. This means that the study at hand will be concerned with the investigation of structures of *interaction*.

Discourse analysis has been previously applied to studying dialogue as interaction in the works of, for example, Vimala Herman (1995) as well as Joanna Thornborrow and Shân Wareing (1998). They have all studied, among other things, dramatic discourse, that

is, the written dialogue in dramatic texts. Thornborrow and Wareing (1998:212) say that when texts are studied as discourse, we are dealing with “language governed by the principles of spoken interaction”. They are interested in the idea of “how analytic techniques which linguists have applied to naturally occurring conversations can be applied to dialogue in plays...” (1998:130). Herman (1995:5) sees the connection between naturally occurring conversation and dialogue so that they “both encompass underlying *interactive* processes”. She explains: “The principles, norms and conventions of use which underlie spontaneous communication in everyday life are precisely those which are exploited and manipulated by dramatists in their construction of speech types and forms in plays” (1995:6). Herman (1995:76) calls the interactive processes operating in conversation and dialogue also “the mechanics of conversation”, a notion which refers to the fact that dialogue can be studied with the aid of discourse analytic means.

In the same vein, in the present study, dialogue in romantic fiction is seen as similarly governed by “the mechanics of conversation”, since it can be assumed that fiction writers will “exploit and manipulate” the processes of interaction when constructing dialogue in a way similar to play writes. As Herman states, also the question of gender-specific linguistic features can be tackled through the analysis of dialogue: “Female dramatic figures are constructions which are assembled via strategic linguistic use, and their representational modes of construction are open to scrutiny” (1995:282). The assumption of strategic assembling of characters can be seen as applying to male figures as well. What has been put forward so far leads one to conclude, that it is, indeed, the *interactional features of dialogue* which should be the object of analysis in this study. Further, one comes to the fact that techniques of studying conversation will best enable one to investigate also the interactional features of dialogue.

4.2 The Analytic Principles

4.2.1 Context

It is a known fact that neither conversation nor dialogue takes place in isolation, but there are always such matters as the setting, or the background of the participant, which affect the outcome of the speech situation. Vimala Herman (1995:7) states that there are various contextual features, such as “the role and status of the participants, considerations of appropriacy of speech behaviour, setting, degrees of formality or informality...” which need to be considered when communicating with others. It should, nevertheless, be noted that as the focus of the present study lies on gender, also those features of context which

evolve from gender are of prime importance in the analysis of the features of interaction. In other words, such notions as differences of status and inequality of power, which according to the feminist study of popular romantic fiction are contextual features characteristic of romantic novels, will be used to determine the possible differences in the speech of women and men.

In addition to what has been said above, one should, nevertheless, acknowledge that in search of gender-specific linguistic constructs, the possible differences in men's and women's ways to communicate do not necessarily relate to gender. Instead of this, they may be the outcome of other factors, such as the setting/situation or personal characteristics of the characters (background, occupation etc.). It is also useful to note that contextual characteristics can be studied in combination with gender in order to find out whether women and men speak differently in certain specific situations. In other words, the taking into account of contextual characteristics might enable one to find out if gender interacts with particular settings to produce gender-specific constructs.

4.2.2 "The Mechanics of Conversation"

As has been stated previously, the analysis will concern the structure of interaction in dialogues, or, "the mechanics of conversation". It would not, nevertheless, be useful to investigate all the possible features of interaction: considering the study at hand it is more worthwhile to concentrate on those structural features which are likely to inform us about the interactive styles of the characters, the linguistic characteristics of these styles and the possible differences and/or similarities of their individual styles. As Janet Maybin (in Maybin and Mercer, 1996:16) points out, "aspects of our [conversational] style can probably be traced to where we have come from, our class, our age and our gender". More specifically, this means that individual and gender characteristics are very likely to influence such features of a person's conversational style as, for example, what they consider appropriate to talk about, what the system of turn management is like, or how much directness is tolerated (Tannen in Maybin and Mercer, 1996:17).

The first feature of interaction to be considered in the dialogues of the present study comes from what the characters talk about and more importantly, from what they actually say in the dialogues: the focus is on the wordings of the dialogues. The main interest in the study of wordings lies in finding out what kind of an image, or representation, they give of a character. For example, Tannen, as quoted by Maybin (in Maybin and Mercer, 1996:17) points out, the person's ideas about "what it is appropriate to talk about", that is, the choice of an appropriate topic, contributes to his/her individual conversational style

and also to the image people have about him/her. In terms of the present study, it can be expected that what the characters say, or what kind of words and expressions they use, is similarly indicative of a character's conversational style and the way s/he is being presented. In the light of the study at hand, this means that wordings can be considered one aspect of linguistic use which reflects the make-up of the interactive styles of the characters. The analysis of the wordings in this study thus means essentially the study of the interaction between the characters as it is actualised in the word choices, investigated from the point of view of gender-specific representation possibly evolving from the wordings. It should be noted here, as Vimala Herman says, that "...dramatic figures are constructions which are assembled via strategic linguistic use..."(1995:282) which suggests that the writer of the dialogue can deliberately make certain word choices which contribute to a certain kind of representation of a character. Thus, wordings can be used, for example, to make a character fit or break the mould of formulaic literature, an aspect which might be useful in the study at hand as well.

Secondly, in the present study the interaction of the characters will be investigated from the point of view of transitivity. This is because transitivity choices of the characters can be indicative of their relative activeness and passiveness as expressed by a part of their style of interacting. Finding out the active and passive participants in a dialogue, or, distinguishing between the character who is "actively in control of the environment, making decisions and taking action" and the one who is "the passive 'victim' of circumstance" (Mills, 1995:144) is a concern of the feminist study of stylistics. It can also be regarded a concern of a feminist-oriented study of structures of interaction in the sense that 'activeness' referring to control and 'passiveness' referring to submission can be informative of essentially gender-specific features of interaction. Further, transitivity choices can be regarded also one aspect of strategic representation of the characters in a certain, possibly gendered manner because a use of transitivity which implies, for example, control of one character can be used to give a certain image of him/her.

Transitivity choices are a concept of the systemic grammar developed by M.A.K. Halliday and refers to the notion that the events of our inner and outer reality that we experience are expressed in language "through the grammar of the clause" (Halliday, 1985:101). Halliday (1985:101) explains that "transitivity specifies the different types of process that are recognised in the language, and the structures by which they are expressed". There are three kind of process: material, mental and relational. The material processes are essentially about 'doing', as in 'John reads a book', the mental processes are about 'sensing', such as 'I feel good' and the relational processes express that there is some sort of a relation of 'being', 'having' etc. between entities, as in 'John is a student'. Thus, it is the verb of the clause which expresses the nature of the process, and also in the

present study the distribution of the characters turns into different processes is based on the nature of the predicate verb of the clause in question. The more elaborate system of studying transitivity used, for example, by Mills (1995) and Wareing (in Wales, 1994) which account for also the deliberacy/unintentionality of material processes and the internal/external aspect of the action of mental processes will not be used in the study at hand. This is because these variables are not needed in the scope of this study: here transitivity will be investigated as to the distribution of process types between the characters and to the actors and affected parties of the processes. In the analysis of these features of transitivity, the aspects of deliberacy/unintentionality and internal/external action are not the most central aspects but it is more important to describe the processes to the basic distinction of material/mental/relational. Considering the needs of the present study, the distinction into the three main process types should be sufficient.

The choice of the distribution of process types between characters as one feature of transitivity to be studied is because some processes are inherently more active and dynamic and others more passive and static: the active process type can be involved with control in interaction. Also Mills (1995:149) points to the more passive quality of mental and relational processes when assessing the representation of a female character in her analysis of transitivity, and to the more intentional quality of the material processes of the male character of her analysis. Thus *what* is done in the interaction is important but of great interest is also the finding out of *who* does and to *whom*. This is why another aspect of the study of transitivity involves, in this case, the investigation of the actors and the affected parties of processes. The actors of material processes are called 'actors', those of mental processes are called 'sensors' and the actors of relational processes are called 'carriers' (Halliday, 1985:102-113). The term 'actor' will in the present study be used to refer to the actors, sensors and carriers of processes when they are discussed in the general meaning of 'doer' of a process. By identifying the actors and affected parties one can distinguish between active/controlling and passive/submissive characters with regard to the different process types. Furthermore, as Mills states, the finding out of "who does what to whom" enables one, through transitivity choices, to "compare the representations of the male and female characters" (Mills, 1995:146). In the terms of the present study this means that one can also compare the different interactional styles creating certain representations of the characters. Further, the features of interaction determined by the study of transitivity need to be considered as to the context of their emergence so that one can consider their possible gender- and/or situation-specificness.

Thirdly, on the basis of previous studies on interactional features of dialogue (Thornborrow and Wareing (1998), Herman (1995)), it appears that among such structural characteristics of interaction which could inform us about the characters'

conversation/interactive styles are features of turn-taking. Herman (1995:78) defines turn-taking to be “[a] mechanism which facilitates the orderly distribution of turns and governs the progress of talk...” Turn-taking is, thus, a system of conversational management and as such can be used differently by different participants. As management often entails the notion of control and this way also the notion of power, features of turn-taking and interactional management can be indicative of gender-specific features of interaction.

Turn quantity and length are among the features which vary between characters and probably between genders. Turn quantity and length can, according to Thornborrow and Wareing (1998:130), be “indicative of [a character’s] relative importance ... or of how important they think they are”. Further, turn-taking can be studied from the point of view turn sequencing: the interaction is studied as to what kind of, if any, exchange patterns there are. According to Herman (1995:123), the sequencing of turns “reveals how participants themselves are structuring and constructing the situation they are enacting through their talk”. Also Thornborrow and Wareing (1998:132) maintain that the “exchange structure” is indicative of “aspects of characters’ relationships with one another”. Such aspects of the characters relationship as the distribution of power and expectations brought about by gender (male control/female submissiveness) can probably affect the structuring of the interaction.

The features of interactional management which in the present study can be considered as the characters’ making specific sequencing choices are extended turns and side-sequences of meaning negotiation. Extended turns refer to places in conversation where one character holds the floor for two or more subsequent turns. Side-sequences of meaning negotiation, in turn, refer to such places in conversation where something a character has said requires clarification, elaboration, or the like. The need for repair is signalled by the other character and the issue is dealt with in a side-sequence after which the conversation can continue its former route. Extended turns and side-sequences do not appear in all the contexts; thus they cannot be studied in them all. They seem rather to be features of interaction characteristic of certain contexts. This, nevertheless, does not exclude their potential of giving information of the possible gender-specificness of interaction which is why they are included in the study. Thus, extended turns and side-sequences of meaning negotiation will be considered in those contexts where they appear relevant.

4.3 The Organisation of Analysis

The analytic categories according to which the data have been organised have been chosen on the basis of contextual features. As was pointed out in 4.2.1, the context of a conversation, and thus also of a dialogue, includes usually many factors which have an effect on interaction. In this light, considering that the study at hand concerns finding out whether or not there are gender-specific features to be found in the dialogues of popular romantic fiction, context must be taken into account when studying the interaction. This is because also other factors than gender can cause differences to the interaction of the male and female characters: these need to be accounted for in order to receive an accurate picture of what are gender-specific features of interaction, and which features evolve from other sources, such as the setting or the topic, etc. An organisation of data based on contextual features enables one also to consider the possibility of the context interacting with gender in speech situations in such a manner which creates certain gender-specific features of interaction in particular settings.

In the study at hand the context has been taken into consideration so that the analytic categories represent the four different emotional settings which can be extracted in the novel. The emotional setting refers to the speech situations which take place in a similar context of action; the action, in turn, is governed by some feature characteristic of a love affair, such as getting to know each other, or trying to make up after a disagreement. These situations taking place in a similar context of action also share the same emotion which motivates the action, such as, initial infatuation triggers the process of getting to know each other. Thus, the emotional setting of 'Rebuilding the Relationship', for example, consists of those dialogues which are aimed at re-establishing the relationship after a disruptive situation, such as disagreement. These dialogues share in common the motivation and goal of the action (not breaking up) and the emotions of remorse, forgiveness and love. The four emotional settings which with the above criteria can be extracted in the data form the contexts of 'Meeting and Dating', 'Deepening the Relationship', 'Disagreement' and 'Rebuilding the Relationship'. The dialogues falling into these categories have been chosen on the basis of their typically presenting the action and emotions characteristic of the contexts. It should be noted of the context of 'Disagreement' that there is only one instance in the novel where the characters are having a row, probably because of the necessitations of popular romantic formula. The typical development of a popular romantic novel should follow the progress of love-misunderstanding-making up as the culmination points of the story. More than one disputes would disrupt this structure: several rows would also hardly conform to the image of a couple in love.

The analysis will be carried out by studying each of the analytic categories from the points of view of the three features of interaction selected in 4.2.2 (“The Mechanics of Conversation”) as indicative of the interactional styles of the characters. Thus, the analysis in each context will begin from the level of the word in the study of word choices made by the characters. After this the representation brought about by the wordings will be further investigated at the level of phrase/sentence in the study of aspects of transitivity choices the characters make. Finally, the interaction of the characters will be considered at the level of discourse when the structuring of the dialogues is investigated with the help of features of turn-taking and interactional management. The features of interaction and the subsequent representation of the characters will be considered in terms of their evolving from gender or being representative of it. These considerations will be based on the characteristics of a hero and a heroine typical in popular romantic fiction which were in 3.2.2.2 (The structure of a popular romantic novel and its gender implications) considered as representative of their respective gender. Most prominent of these are the male supremacy demonstrated in his age, experience, background, wealth and social position in comparison with the less elevated position of the female apparent in her less important or wealthy background, inexperience, youth and social unimportance. In 3.2.2.2 these characteristics were considered to be indicative of an inequality of power between the characters which will in the analysis be one criteria according to which consider a feature’s gender-specificness. However, the features of interaction of the characters might not be brought about by their gender but evolve from the situation at hand or result from the interplay of the situation and gender. These possibilities were discussed in 4.2.1 and will be an important part of the analysis in the sense that they can be factors explanatory of the features of interaction in addition to gender.

5. ANALYSIS

5.1 Meeting and Dating

5.1.1 Wordings

The first section of the study on the context of ‘Meeting and Dating’ is aimed at the analysis of what the characters say in the dialogues, in other words, the focus of study lies on the wordings. In what follows the wordings of the dialogues will be investigated as to what kind of an image, or representation, they give of a character. In situations where the

characters are getting to know each other they need to tell each other about themselves: who they are, what they do in life, etc. Thus, this section is aimed at exploring, with the help of some examples, the expressions that Carlotta and Norman use of themselves or of each other when engaged in the process of getting acquainted. First, some of the word choices they make during their very first meeting will be given a closer look. The turns are arranged as in the original text which can be found in Cartland's (1976) '*Broken Barriers*' on pages 20-22. Of the marking conventions one should note that C refers to Carlotta and N refers to Norman; thus C1, for example, refers to Carlotta's first turn in the particular dialogue. These conventions will be used throughout the analysis section.

C1: Tell me about yourself. I expect *I ought to know all about you* but I must just plead *ignorance*

N1: What do you think I am?

C2: You might be a *politician*. You certainly aren't an actor, and I don't think you look *sophisticated enough* to be a *diplomat*. Yes, you must either be *politician* or *big business*, or perhaps both.

N2: You are either a good guesser or a flatterer.

C3: Then I am right?

N3: Not where *politics* are concerned but *business*, yes. Are you disappointed that I am not *the future Prime Minister*?

Pause in the presentation of the dialogue during which the writer generally describes the situation and the characters' impressions of each other.

C4: I have got a *rotten little part* but it is a *great thing* to be in *the West End* – the managers and agents are *impressed*, if not the general public.

[...]

N5: Is there anything else you would rather have done?

C9: Oh, *nothing particular*. I think I am just *lazy*. *I don't really want to do anything* in life except *enjoy myself*. Now you can't understand that, can you?

N6: I have been *driven by ambition all my life*. That sounds rather as though *I was giving a newspaper interview*, but strangely enough, it is true.

[...]

The above example presents Carlotta and Norman discussing each others' careers and wishes in life in a way which seems to enhance Norman's importance relative to Carlotta. This is because such expressions denoting profession as "politician" (C2), "politics" (N3), "diplomat" (C2), "big business" (C2 and "business" in N3) and "the future Prime Minister" (N3) which signal a high position in society are being used in connection to Norman. A further example of his important and active role is in N6 where he tells that he has been "driven by ambition all his life" which presents him as an achiever who probably works hard for success. Also the image of him giving a newspaper interview (N6) adds to his portrayal as an important character.

As for Carlotta, who has "a rotten little part" (C4) in some play, luckily in the West End, her role in society seems to be one of a less importance compared to Norman's.

Further, she does not “really want to do anything in life except enjoy herself” which portrays her, compared to Norman, as self-indulgent and maybe even promiscuous: considering that the novel is set in the 1930’s, in those days the term ‘actress’ often referred to a wanton woman. Carlotta is thus, by herself and probably deliberately by the writer, presented as being less important, successful and as having weaker moral standards than Norman. Further, as shows in C1 where she “ought to know” something but does not know, as being “ignorant”. All in all, in comparison with Norman, Carlotta is being presented in a rather negative way whereas Norman in his role of an ardent, hard-working business man is doing considerably better. Further points to consider here are Carlotta’s aspiration for a lazy life as well as Norman’s hint that she might be interested in men in high positions (N3: Are you disappointed that I am not the future Prime Minister?). These seem to indicate that Carlotta’s position is, indeed, one of a less moral character because they hint at the possibility that she might be interested in catching an important and rich husband: one like Norman in this dialogue. This further enhances the image of Carlotta as the social inferior of Norman and as having a social role of lesser importance and prominence.

The next extract of a dialogue (Cartland, 1976:19-20) is taken from a phone conversation between Carlotta and Norman: Norman wants to go out with Carlotta but she might not be able to make it because of a strained ankle.

[...]

N3: I might ask you to prove your belief in me. *Will you have supper with me tonight, after the show?*

C4: *I would love to, that is if I go to the theatre.*

N4: Why, what do you mean?

C5: I can’t tell you how fascinating *my young Scotch doctor* is. He has promised to *come and see me today.*

N5: *I never heard such a nonsense.* Go to sir Harry Andrews – *he’s the only man worth seeing. He’s my doctor.*

C6: *I have complete faith in my Scot.*

C7: *Don’t worry, and unless you hear that I am in hospital, be waiting for me at 11.35.*

N6: I will, and *take care of yourself, my child.*

C8: I will do my best.

First of all I want to clarify C5 which might not be too clear to someone who does not know the whole story. The reference to the “young Scotch doctor” is made because he helped Carlotta home after she had strained her ankle: they became friends and he is now seeing to Carlotta’s recovery.

Also the above dialogue seems to be demonstrative of a difference in the social standings of the characters. In this case the social difference is brought about, firstly in N3, where Norman is the one who takes initiative and proposes a night out together. It

should, nevertheless, be noted here that in the 1930's, men did generally take the initiative in situations like these because it would have been somewhat improper of a woman to ask a man out like this: nevertheless, his asking Carlotta out here reflects the notion of the 30's of male superiority and thus emphasises his more prominent standing. Further, in N5 Norman's position of being able to judge better what is the appropriate course of action for Carlotta to take than herself emphasises his superiority in the situation at hand. His criticism of Carlotta ("I never heard such a nonsense") combined with his reference to his own doctor as the one who is the best doctor of all create an image of him as the more experienced person who is able to make the right decisions whereas Carlotta cannot take care of her own affairs but needs Norman's advise. Such a presentation of Norman contributes also to the image of him having more status than Carlotta. Furthermore, a similar notion to that which was presented above of male superiority arises in N6 where Norman advises Carlotta to take care of herself and furthermore, calls her "my child" which again creates an image of Norman as the 'advisor' and Carlotta as a somewhat helpless and childlike person who cannot look after herself properly without Norman's guidance.

As for Carlotta, her role in dialogue, judged by the wordings and her subsequent representation, seems to be one of a co-operating character. This comes out, e.g. in C4 where she emphatically approves of Norman's suggestion of going out. Also in C7 Carlotta is presented as working for their plan to succeed by expressing her willingness to go out with Norman when she sets the time for their meeting. Then again, in C5 Carlotta's reference to "her young Scotch doctor" does not seem very co-operative in the sense that it implies to Norman that she might be more interested in meeting someone else but him. The reference to the Scotch doctor might not be helpful for Carlotta's and Norman's relationship also in the sense that, as was already discussed above, it enhances her presentation as a wanton woman because it implies her interest to not only one man at a time. On the other hand, Carlotta's remark about the Scot can be understood as her teasing Norman to make him even more interested in herself which, of course, indirectly suggests that she wants him to be interested in her and thus also encourages him. It could very well be the case that Carlotta is trying to make Norman jealous in order to make him pursue her even harder; such behaviour, however, strengthens the image of her as an immoral character. This is because it suggests that she is manipulative and is very much interested in attracting the male attention. The image of Carlotta manipulating and controlling the conversation and deliberately annoying Norman comes through also in C7 where the situation resolves when she reassures Norman of her willingness to co-operate with him by saying "Don't worry". This expression implies that Norman does not need to be worried about the possible rival and that Carlotta was only teasing him but is now co-

operating with him: she has thus returned to the setting where Norman with his higher status controls the dialogue and she is the co-operating character.

All in all, what can be concluded from the above dialogues is that Norman is, as a rule, being presented as the more important and powerful character: he is a successful business man, probably experienced because he can advise Carlotta, and an ambitious achiever. As pointed out previously, some of his power comes from the situation the characters are in, such as the taking of the initiative above, but as a rule, it seems to be the case that Norman's status and power come from two matters: he has a high social standing and he is male which in itself gives him a superior position. What comes to Carlotta, she is being presented in a less important social position and as having lower status than Norman. With this I refer to Carlotta's expressions which serve as presenting Norman an important person (the high-status nouns in the first dialogue: this is a means with which she can maintain Norman's interest and, more importantly, signal that she acknowledges his higher status). Nevertheless, there is also an instance in the data where she clearly controls the conversation. With this I refer to the situation where Carlotta uses the strategy of making Norman jealous to enhance his interest in her. In that situation Carlotta gives a strong, although manipulative image of herself.

In sum, in the context of 'Meeting and Dating', the status difference of the characters is established with the help of the wordings they use and the subsequent images these create of themselves and of each other. The dialogues indicate that the character with higher status is Norman, partly because of his own achievements in life, partly because the society in the 1930's emphasised the importance of men and their control in situations where women and men got to know each other. Judged by the wordings, Norman is a character who also confirms to the notion presented in the 'romantic formula' of the typical hero of a popular romantic novel: he is successful, ambitious, experienced and stands high in the society. As it seems that Norman is attributed the position of power chiefly because of the qualities essentially deriving from his being the hero, that is, the male figure, it can be concluded that the expressions found in the dialogues expressing these male qualities are thus gender-specific features of interaction, resulting in a certain portrayal of the character.

As for Carlotta, she is, for the most part, being presented in a role with lesser importance and power, that is, in this case, in a co-operating role. As with Norman, here again her weaker standing can be brought about by the general conventions of the society in 1930's: however, her presentation, at least when co-operation is concerned, also confirms to the features of a typical heroine of popular romantic fiction who is, for example, socially less elevated than the hero and less experienced, and thus not positioned in the leading role. Thus, Carlotta's co-operation could be considered an

essentially female characteristic which, as expressed in by her in the dialogues, is indicative of her gender, that is, a gender-specific feature of interaction. Then again, the wordings in the dialogues which contribute to the image of her as a promiscuous and wanton woman, are not typical of a romantic heroine, and thus do not confirm to the image of a typical female character in popular romantic fiction. These wordings, thus, can be considered a feature of interaction specific of Carlotta chiefly because of her role as an actress which in itself denotes 'immoral woman' when considered in the context of 1930's and not a feature of interaction which would arise from her gender. The conclusion to be drawn from this could be that Carlotta manipulates the dialogues: she knows how to present herself in the typical female role but she also uses expressions atypical of the heroine. Thus, instead of being a gender-specific feature, at least some of Carlotta's wordings are more of a strategic feature of interaction enabling a certain kind of presentation of her.

5.1.2 Transitivity Choices

In what follows the aim of the analysis is on the different transitivity choices made by the speakers in dialogues taking place in the setting of 'Meeting and Dating'. With the help of transitivity choices, it is possible to investigate the nature of the action between the characters. With the nature of action I refer to finding out the agent and the affected of the action, that is, the study of who does (agent), what s/he does (what kind of a process; cf. 4.2.2) and to whom (affected). As was pointed out in the previous section (5.1.1), on the basis of the wordings it seems to be the male character, Norman, who is portrayed as more important and powerful, and the female character, Carlotta, is being, at times, presented as less important and powerful. On the basis of this it could be expected that Norman would be more central/important also when considered from the point of view of agency and affectedness and be more in the role of the actor. On the other hand, one could expect that Carlotta, at least in some situations, would be more in the role of the affected. Nevertheless, it should be borne in mind that, as discussed in the previous section (5.1.1), judged by the wordings Carlotta is sometimes presented in a role deviant from that of traditionally considered feminine in romantic novels which might come through in the transitivity choices as well.

Let us take a closer look at the transitivity choices made by the characters with the help of the following example where Norman phones Carlotta in order to ask her to come over to help him with some decorations. After the full dialogue (Cartland, 1976:44), the

turns will be analysed one by one in terms of process type, actor and affected (for the full explanation of these features see 4.2.2).

N1: I want you to see you. What are you doing now?

C1: oh, I am frightfully busy, and you'll laugh when I tell what I am doing.

N2: Well, what are you?

C2: I am sticking my press cuttings into a book. I think it will be nice for my grandchildren to see how brilliant Grannie was in the early thirties.

N3: Must you worry about the grandchildren at the moment? I want you to come round here.

C3: Where's here?

N4: I am at my house at Belgrave Square. I told you I was thinking about reopening it and I want your advise about the decorations.

C4: I'd love to help you but not now. I am covered with paste and I can't be bothered to change. Come and have tea with me instead.

N5: I will come right away.

N1: I want to see you. = mental process internal, N senser, C affected

What are you doing now? = material process, C actor

C1: Oh, I'm frightfully busy, = relational process, C carrier

and you'll laugh = material process, N actor

when I tell = material process, C actor

what I am doing. = material process, C actor

N2: Well, what are you? = relational process, C carrier

C2: I am sticking my press cuttings into a book. = material process, C actor

I think it will be nice for my grandchildren to see = mental process,
C senser

how brilliant Grannie was in the early thirties. = relational process,
C carrier

N3: Must you worry about the grandchildren at the moment? = mental

process, C senser

I want you to come round here. = mental process, N senser, C affected

[...]

N4: I am at my house in Belgrave Square. = relational process, N carrier

I told you I was thinking of reopening it, = material process, N actor,
C affected

and I want your advice about the decorations. = mental process,

N senser, C affected

C4: I'd love to help you but not now. = mental process, C senser

I am covered with paste = relational process, C carrier

and I can't be bothered to change. = mental process, C senser

Come = material process, N actor

and have tea with me instead. = material processes, N actor, C affected

The above data show that of the two characters, Carlotta is the actor (actor used in the general sense 'doer' includes the terms 'actor', 'senser' and 'carrier') of more processes than Norman: Carlotta is the actor of four material, senser of four mental and carrier of four relational processes, and Norman is the actor of four material, senser of three mental

and carrier of one relational processes. Carlotta's total number of processes where she is the actor is twelve and that of Norman is eight. This seems to imply that Carlotta is in a more active, central and important role than Norman because she acts more in the conversation. Then again, considering the process types that Carlotta and Norman have in their speech, Carlotta has an even distribution between the different process types (four material, four mental, four relational) whereas in Norman's case, the material process type is, although slightly, the more frequent one (four material, three mental, one relational). As Mills (1995: 144) points out, the material process type is typical of a character who is "actively in control of the environment" and thus in Norman's case, as the material process type is typical of him, one could assume his action to be important in the situation. As shows from this discussion, considered from the point of view of the amount and type of processes between the characters, one cannot make definite conclusions about the importance of a character or his/her control in the situation. This is why the data will be, in what follows, considered from the point of view of who is the actor and who is the affected party in the processes; this point of view will be more useful in eliciting information on the relative positions of the characters.

The only instances of processes where there is an actor and an affected character can, in this case, be found in Norman's processes in N1, N3, N4 and C4. In N1 Norman is the sender of a mental process which affects Carlotta ("I want to see you"). In N3 he is also the sender of a mental process which affects Carlotta ("I want you to come round here"). In N4 Norman is the actor of a material and the sender of a mental process ("I told you I was thinking of reopening it", "...I want your advice about the decorations"), both affecting Carlotta. In C4 Norman is the actor of a material process which affects Carlotta (...have tea with me instead"). Thus, it seems to be the case that there are only such processes where Norman is the actor and Carlotta the affected party and none of such processes where Carlotta's action would affect Norman.

In this view, although the distribution of the process types between the characters indicated that Carlotta be more in control of the situation because she was the more frequent actor, Norman comes out as the character who is in control, as was already implied by the material process type being more typical of him. The image of him being in a dominating role here is further enhanced by the choice of the verb 'to want' in his three mental processes (N1, N3, N4), albeit that mental processes, describing more states of mind than action, are not so active by nature than material processes. Nevertheless, the idea of Norman 'wanting' emphasises his position of control. All in all, the fact that only he has processes which affect the other character, being 'unaffected' himself, leads one to assume also a difference in status between the characters. This is so because it can be expected that if Norman did not have high status and occupy a position of power in

relation to Carlotta, his action would probably affect Carlotta less. Also if they were equal in power, it could be expected that also Carlotta's processes would affect Norman, which they in the above dialogue do not do. Transitivity choices thus seem to indicate a clearer distinction of power than was present in the analysis of wordings.

Considering the above result of Norman having more power in relation to time when the dialogue took place (in the 1930's) one could assume that men are more in control of action in male/female interaction where the characters are getting better acquainted because women were expected to be more passive and thus chaste. Further, considering the age difference between the characters, it could be expected that in addition to being a man 1930's, his age would bring him a certain advantage over Carlotta and him being older, thus also more experienced, might hinder Carlotta from 'bossing' him about. On the other hand, considering the characteristics of a hero and a heroine of popular romantic novels, differences of age and experience are among the typical features of their relationship creating inequality of power. In this point of view, in addition to Norman's higher social standing thanks to his occupation, there seem to be features in his position of power which imply that he has it because of the characteristics he has as the male character (age, experience...). Thus, Norman presenting his position of power in the transitivity choices he uses can be seen as a feature of interaction which is brought about by his male gender. What comes to Carlotta's use of transitivity, her choices, although presenting her as the actor more than Norman but not affecting him, seem to conform to the notion of a less dominant and powerful female figure, and thus be indicative of her gender. Nevertheless, considered in the light of the interactive features she had in the previous section (5.1.1) the transitivity choices she makes in the above data could, instead of indicating her conforming to the notion of a typical heroine, be more of a strategy to make her appear in a certain way.

The next example of the characters' use of transitivity demonstrates a situation where Carlotta controls the course of action and demonstrates such characteristic of her interaction which might not be gender-specific but come from contextual factors. In the dialogue (Cartland, 1976:95-96) she and Norman are in a car coming home from a night out and Carlotta is not in the mood to be social:

C1: I'm dead. It has been a lovely evening, but now I've got a headache. Don't talk to me, let me just relax until we get home.

Pause

C2: Are we back already? I am so sleepy. Don't get out, Norman dear. I am sure you are tired, too.

C3: I will find my own way upstairs. Good night, and thank you for a lovely evening.

N: Carlotta!

C4: I must see you tomorrow. Will you telephone me in the morning?

N2: Lunch with me. I shall be in London. I can be free by half-past one, if you will meet me at the Ritz, or anywhere you like.
 C5: I should love to. The Ritz – one-thirty.

In what follows is the analysis of the turns according to the different process types, and the actors and affected parties of the processes (cf. *Mechanics of Conversation* 4.2.2). Processes where the actor is some other entity than Carlotta or Norman have been left out.

C1: I'm dead. = relational process, C carrier
 [...] but now I've got a headache. = relational process, C carrier
 Don't talk to me, = material process, negative, N actor, C affected
 Let me just relax [...] = material process, N actor, C affected

C2: [...]
 I am so sleepy. = relational process, C carrier
 Don't get out, Norman dear. = material process, negative, N actor
 I am sure = relational process, C carrier
 you are tired, too. = relational process, N carrier

C3: I will find my own way upstairs. = material process, C actor

[...]

C4: I must see you tomorrow. = mental process, C senser, N affected
 Will you telephone me in the morning? = material process, N actor, C affected

N2: Lunch with me. = material process, C actor, N affected
 I shall be in London. = relational process, N carrier
 I can be free by half-past one, = relational process, N carrier
 if you will meet me at the Ritz, = material process, C actor, N affected
 or anywhere you like. = mental process, C senser

C5: I should love to. = mental process, C senser.

The above analysis of the processes shows that in the majority of the processes, the actor is Carlotta (the term 'actor' includes the notions of actor, senser and carrier): the total number of the processes where she is the actor is ten, and that of Norman's five. Although most of Carlotta's processes are of the relational or the mental kind, that is, they do not express the same kind of action which often contributes to a change or something happening in the environment, in other words, are not so 'active' processes, the number of her being the actor against that of Norman still implies that she is in control of the action in this case. It should be further noted that in her turns (C1 and C2) she uses processes which describe Norman as the actor of two negative processes, that is, as the actor of a non-existent process ("Don't talk to me", "Don't get out"). In the conversation this negative process of course refers to an inhibition for Norman to carry out certain course of action; Carlotta thus controls Norman's behaviour. Carlotta's

controlling role comes even clearer through when one looks at the instances where one of the characters is affected by the other's action. In this dialogue the situation is different than what was above; here both characters have processes which affect the other, and furthermore, Carlotta has slightly more processes which affect Norman than vice versa.

The data show in this case two instances where Norman is the actor and Carlotta in the role of the affected character. These take place in C1 "Let me just relax [...]" and in C4 "Will you telephone me tomorrow?". It is noteworthy that both of the processes having Norman as the actor and affecting Carlotta take place in her speech: if they were uttered by Norman their force of affecting the other person would probably be greater, but as it is now, coming from Carlotta these processes are brought about by her and as such regulate the way in which Norman will affect her. In this sense, these two processes do not emphasise Norman's status nor are they indicative of his power but they rather present the action in a way Carlotta wishes it to take place. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the situation at hand in which Carlotta is somewhat irritated, tired and unwilling to socialise with him might well affect Norman's transitivity choices: first of all, he cannot speak as much as he did in the previous example and it may be that he does not dare impose himself on Carlotta but restricts the processes affecting her to a minimum. After all, they are only getting to know each other better and it is likely he wants to keep Carlotta happy.

The processes having Carlotta as the actor and affecting Norman are slightly more numerous than the instances vice versa. The instances where Carlotta's processes affect Norman take place in C4 "I must see you tomorrow", N2 "lunch with me" and again N2 "if you will meet me at the Ritz". As shows from the examples, two of them are such that affect Norman but take place in his own speech. As already stated above, these processes are probably not so affective on the party on whom the action is directed because they are very likely to be actions desirable to the affected party; otherwise s/he would probably not express them. Also the process affecting Norman in C4 is probably quite desirable for him because it indicates that Carlotta is still willing to be in contact with him; after treating him rather coldly, she relents and here turns favourable for Norman.

In the sense that Carlotta first distances herself from Norman and subsequently controls the conversation to keep her distance, she is, in this situation, holding the position of power relative to Norman: Carlotta both controls the interaction and Norman's role in it. Also the nature of the processes whereby her action affects Norman is such as to indicate Carlotta holding the position of power: they are about essentially about Carlotta re-granting her favour to Norman. This kind of use of transitivity which is indicative of the power of the female character clearly is different from the use of transitivity presented in the example above which was indicative of Carlotta weaker

standing. In this case the use of transitivity cannot be considered gender-specific because it rather emerges from the particular situation than the gender characteristics of the character: this kind of use of transitivity would not, for example, be typical of the usually submissive and weak heroine of popular romantic fiction. Then again, it might be that this kind of use of transitivity is indicative of a change in the role of the heroine which would imply that Carlotta's interaction is here gender-specific, after all. What comes to Norman, his transitivity choices are also different from what was presented previously. Nevertheless, it seems to be the case that Norman's relative submissiveness results rather from the situation and not his gender characteristics. Further, his transitivity choices cannot be said to be indicative of a change in his gender role as the hero: Norman's interaction is not gender-specific even in this sense.

5.1.3 Turn-taking and Interactional Management

In this section the interaction of the characters will be investigated as to some features of conversation which tell about how the interaction is structured and managed. On the one hand, matters of interest from this point of view are the amount of turns and speech the characters produce which are indicative of their importance and prominence in the interaction. On the other hand, the interaction is studied also as to the ordering of the turns in the dialogues which gives information on the sequencing choices made by the characters: these can be indicative of conversational control and thus also relate to the position of the character. In the light of the analysis presented so far of the dialogues taking place in the context of 'Meeting and Dating', one could expect features of turn-taking and interactional management which, on Norman's part indicate him conforming to the characteristics of the male hero. On Carlotta's part one could expect some indication of her somewhat atypical characteristics as a romantic heroine to appear also in what follows as have been demonstrated to appear in the two sections above.

5.1.3.1 Turn quantity and length

When considering the dialogues which take place in the context of 'Meeting and Dating', one finds that it is the heroine of the novel, Carlotta, who has received slightly more turns than the hero, Norman: Carlotta outweighs him by the total of eighteen turns against thirteen. What is interesting is that although C has only five more turns than N, her total amount of speech reaches 369 words against N's 154. Carlotta thus speaks more than

twice as much as Norman in these settings which is interesting, since these are situations where they do not know each other very well. Bearing in mind that the novel is set in the 1930's one could expect that men were more active in getting to know each other in mixed-sex situations but here it seems to be the reverse: the female is more active, at least she is more wordy.

On the basis of the turn quantity and length in settings where the characters are getting to know each other, it thus seems that Carlotta comes out as the more important character with more status since she has more turns and her amount of speech is greatly larger. Bearing in mind the social context of the novel, it should, however, be Norman who is socially superior because Carlotta is a not-too-famous actress (that is, a woman with a certain kind of reputation) whereas Norman is a successful businessman. As a result, it seems that the features of turn quantity and length that the characters exhibit in dialogues of the context 'Meeting and Dating' and the contextual features of the novel do not give a consistent picture of some aspects of interaction between Carlotta and Norman since they do not accord the position of power to the same character. Furthermore, in this case it seems that the interactional features of turn quantity and length are incongruent with the contextual features of the dialogue so that the character with less status comes out as the more important person on the basis of the features of interaction when one might expect the reverse: the social context cannot give a satisfactory explanation for the above mentioned features of interaction. Further, on the basis of what Maybin (in Maybin and Mercer, 1996:19) says about women usually talking less in mixed sex company, Carlotta's wordiness appears out of place. What might explain the features of turn quantity and length which indicate Carlotta's position of power is that this particular characteristic of interaction is, in fact, a gender-specific means of interactional management. It could be that Carlotta is more wordy because that is the way in which she can gain importance in the dialogues and assert herself in a manner which makes her more equal with Norman.

5.1.3.2 Extended turns

The next example (Cartland, 1976:21) is about the features of interactional management which the characters bring about by making specific sequencing choices, or, by constructing specific exchange sequences. The following extract of dialogue demonstrates topic maintenance and control which is done through the means of extended turns, that is, the same speaker holding the floor for several subsequent turns. Bruner, as quoted by Maybin (in Maybin and Mercer, 1999:21), refers to such extended turns as

“storytelling” which means that a narration of a certain situation, event, or the like functions as “the major way in which we account for our actions and the events we experience” and that “our sensitivity to narrative provides the major link between our own sense of self and our sense of others in the social world around us”.

[...]

C4: I have a rotten little part but it is a great thing to be in the West End – the managers are impressed, if not the general public.

N4: Why did you go on the stage?

C5: Not because I had a particular call but because I was brought up to it. My mother – my adopted mother – is Magda Lenshovski, the theatrical costumier.

C6: I remember the smell of grease paint far more vividly than anything else during my childhood. I met every famous character on the boards before I was five, for I used to go to rehearsals when Magda had to arrange the dresses.

C7: In fact, my first lessons were memorising the parts I heard repeated over and over again, as I sat in the empty stalls waiting for Magda to come from the dressing-rooms.

C8: I couldn't say 'no' when Christian Holden offered me a part in his company. I was just seventeen and I thought him the most attractive man I had ever seen in my life. Of course I accepted – who wouldn't have?

[...]

Here Carlotta first comments on her acting career (C4) which triggers Norman's question (N4) about why she chose to become an actress in the first place. Carlotta's answer (C5-C8) to this is rather long and she holds the floor for four turns while her answer meanders from the actual facts of her becoming an actress to her childhood memories of the theatre. Norman listens her story through after which the conversation continues with question-answer adjacency pairs. The above exchange sequence differs to an extent from the usual question-answer sequencing of turns in that Carlotta uses four turns for one answer when the normal sequence would be one turn for an answer. It can thus be concluded that in the above example, Carlotta has made a particular sequencing choice which allows for her to maintain the topic she wants to communicate. In the light of what was said above concerning conversational storytelling, the above extended turn-sequence of Carlotta can be considered an example of the character telling a story. Carlotta is communicating to Norman the experiences which lead her to take up an acting career and probably at the same time is building an image of herself.

Bearing in mind what was said above about Carlotta's tendency to be rather wordy in the dialogue, the feature of extended turns seems to support the view of her relative conversational dominance in the setting of 'Meeting and Dating' and be a part of the gender-specific linguistic construct of interactive management discussed above. Then again, conversational storytelling is a frequent feature in conversation, used by both women and men, and in this sense does not support the view that by using it, Carlotta

dominates the conversation. This is because it can be assumed that also Norman would have access to storytelling but, in this particular context, does not use it for some reason. On the other hand, as Norman does not have extended turns which could be interpreted as storytelling in the dialogues which take place in the contextual setting 'Meeting and Dating', this feature of interactional management can be seen as specific for Carlotta.

What comes to the gender-specificness of extended turns, it could be that in this setting, this feature is gender-specific in the sense that, as the general wordiness of Carlotta, it helps her gain a more dominant position in the dialogue and thus brings her a more dominant position. On the other hand, in the light of the romantic formula, one could assume that what constitutes a gender-specific feature of interaction would be the reverse. It is often the case that the female character has less power and chances to dominate the interaction than the male precisely because of her femaleness which accords her to a weaker position. Thus to be gender-specific, Carlotta's should exhibit submissiveness and not dominance in her interaction. In this sense, it must be concluded that extended turns as well as wordiness constitute for a feature of interaction specific of Carlotta as individual in this context and thus do not emerge from her gender.

5.1.4 Gender-specificity in the context of 'Meeting and Dating'

On the basis of the above analysis, one can conclude that in dialogues that appear in the context of 'Meeting and Dating', there are interactional features which emerge from the gender of the characters and are representative of it. Such gender-specific interactional features are, first of all, Norman's presentation as an important, powerful and successful character through the wordings he uses, or, which are used of him. Also the aspect of his controlling certain speech situations and Carlotta's role in them by making transitivity choices which present him as the actor and Carlotta as the affected party constitute for gender-specific interactional features. What comes to Carlotta, a gender-specific feature of interaction in her speech, in certain situations, is the presentation of her, with the help of specific word choices, as a character with lower status and a position of lesser importance than Norman. Further, the absence of transitivity choices which would indicate her action affecting Norman in some instances is a feature which emerges from her gender and is indicative of it in the interaction.

The reason why it can be concluded that the above mentioned features of interaction are gender-specific is that they conform to what could be expected to appear in the speech of the characters judged by their gender characteristics as the hero and the heroine of a popular romantic novel. Thus, Norman's presentation as having high status, a

position of power and capability to control the interaction can be seen as deriving from his wealth, high standing in the society and being experienced in life. These are characteristics typical of a popular romantic hero and can be considered as features indicative of the hero's gender as male. Similarly, Carlotta's presentation as character with little power, being submissive and co-operative, may come from her less elevated social position, less important role in the society and relative inexperience in life. Again, these being typical characteristics of a heroine in a romantic novel, they can be seen as characterising her from the point of view of gender.

On the other hand, as the analysis shows, there are also features of interaction which can be considered to be specific to certain situations taking place in the contextual setting of 'Meeting and Dating' and/or deriving from the individual characteristics of the characters acting in this contextual setting. Some features might also be brought about by the interplay of gender and contextual setting. Among such characteristics of the setting and/or the character which affect the interaction are, firstly, Carlotta's presentation as an actress, or, a somewhat immoral and wanton woman with the help of certain wordings. This characteristic enables her to appear in a stronger position and dominate some situations; she can, for example, try to make Norman jealous by socialising with other men which is something a 'decent' girl, especially in the 1930's would probably not do. This can be considered essentially as manipulating Norman and trying to control him. The same aspect of control is detectable in the situation where the transitivity choices indicate Carlotta's dominance in terms of the quantity of processes and the quality of affectedness: the action affecting herself or Norman are essentially such as indicate her being favourable towards Norman. In other words, Carlotta dominates the situation by acting in a way which emphasises her role as the more important character and granting favours to the other. These interactional features of Carlotta could also be seen as deriving from her characteristics as the heroine of a popular romantic novel. In this sense the above features of interaction would essentially derive from a gendered position of hers and would also be gender-specific. From Norman's point of view, his transitivity choices in the same situation indicate submissiveness which also can be considered as evolving from the setting where sees the need to please Carlotta: he adjusts his interactional style to fit the situation. Further, considering the features of turn-taking and interactive management, one would probably not expect Carlotta to be so wordy and dominant in a situation where the characters are just getting to know each other. Considering the status difference of the characters and the social habits of 1930's, one would expect the man to dominate the situation. Also in the light of what Maybin (in Maybin and Mercer, 1996:17) says about men generally being more talkative in mixed sex situations the male character could be expected to speak more here as well. Carlotta's

general control and talkativeness might, however, come from the fact that she is an actress and thus probably secure in expressing herself. Secondly, she is very interested in Norman who is a good catch, and maybe deliberately brings herself forward to make Norman take an interest in her. Generally, Carlotta's deviance from a typical female character of a popular romantic in the context of 'Meeting and Dating' might be a deliberate choice of the writer with which it is possible to create a certain setting of unexpectedness and tension.

5.2 Deepening the Relationship

5.2.1 Wordings

In what follows the aim of analysis is on investigating the representation of the characters brought about by certain word choices in dialogues characterised by the process of deepening the relationship. The deepening of the relationship essentially means that the relationship of Carlotta and Norman is being established on a firmer ground, that is, there is at least the aspiration of the relationship becoming permanent and the two getting married. Let us take a look at the following examples (Cartland, 1976:56-60), where Carlotta and Norman are spending the night out and talking about the future, and see what kind of images of the characters are being created by wordings. The example consists of three extracts which are taken from the same dialogue:

[...]

C2: I haven't thanked you yet for the orchids. *Do you think they look nice?*

N4: You look lovely.

C3: *What shall I eat?* I don't think I am very hungry.

N5: *Nonsense.* You have had no dinner and you have been working. *Let me order you something.*

C4: *Yes, please do.*

[...]

N9: You aren't worried about anything, are you?

C8: Yes, I am worried about myself.

N10: *But why?*

C9: I seem to be *drifting.* You are always *planning ahead, working for the future, looking forward, striving, struggling, full of ambition,* and what is more *you have the chance of satisfying it. I don't know what I want, and like a child, I shan't be happy until I get it.*

[...]

C10: [...] But, if I did give up the stage, *what else is there for me to do?*

C11: [...] No, there seems to be no niche for me. Is it, perhaps, because I am *only half English?*

N12: I think there might be another reason.

C12: What's that?

N13: That *you want a home of your own.*

All the three extracts have in common the notion of Carlotta appearing somewhat insecure because she is seeking approval and/or confirmation from Norman. When considering the first piece of dialogue from C2 to C4, such places where Carlotta seeks support from Norman can be found, firstly, in C2: here Carlotta asks a very feminine question of the flowers she has received from Norman; she wants to know if Norman thinks they look nice. In fact, as Norman's answer (N4) shows, this can be understood as Carlotta asking Norman whether he thinks that *she* looks nice, which he affirms and thus chooses probably the right answer "You look lovely" instead of referring to the flowers. Further, Carlotta's inability to decide about her affairs, such as what to have for supper (C3) and her reliance on Norman on a matter like that enhance the image of her as somewhat helpless and in need of support. Then again, one might also consider the fact that as Carlotta is an actress and interested in 'catching' Norman, she might deliberately present herself, that is, act out as insecure and in need of support. This would probably result in Norman becoming supportive and wanting to help her which would suit her ends well. What comes to Norman, he appears to be the more capable character ready to offer his assistance; this happens in N5, for example, when he says to Carlotta "Let me order you something" in order to help Carlotta decide on her meal. Before that he has dismissed Carlotta's hesitations about her dinner as "nonsense", and together these two matters make Norman come out as taking the role of the advisor bestowed with more knowledge and discretion than Carlotta. As was pointed out above about Carlotta deliberately enacting a traditional gender role, this aspect might have an effect on Norman as well. With this it is meant that if Carlotta is acting insecure, and Norman falls for this, then it seems that it is Carlotta who is in the position of power: she has been able to fool Norman and manipulate their subsequent interaction.

The second piece of dialogue from N9 to C9 demonstrates further from Carlotta's point of view the different roles that the two characters have: in C9 she describes herself as passive and undecided when she says "I seem to be drifting", "I don't know what I want" and that she is "like a child" whereas her description of Norman shows him more active, goal-oriented and achieving; Norman is "planning ahead, working for the future, looking forward, striving, struggling, full of ambition". Norman's more secure attitude to life comes out also in N9 where his question about Carlotta being worried expresses more surprise at such an idea than actual need to know what she is worried about. The same seems to hold for N10 where Norman asks "But why?" which can be interpreted as 'Why on earth should you be worried about anything?'

Furthermore, what is noteworthy in the second extract is the topic of the discussion which is the personal worries of Carlotta. On the one hand, the topic enhances Carlotta's

portrayal as undecided and not quite knowing what to do in life, on the other hand, it could indicate Carlotta's gradual moving away from her role of a wanton actress: the topic implies that she has begun to doubt her present way of life. This implication of Carlotta realising the limitations of her present position comes out also in C9 where she remarks that Norman, in his respected position, has "the chance of satisfying" his aspirations. All in all, considered from a contextual viewpoint, the topic matches with the setting where the relationship is being developed. This is because it indicates that there is enough trust and security between the characters for personal topics to be discussed.

The last extract from C10 to N13 further portrays Carlotta as not quite sure of herself. She is worried about her life and career but as she says in C10, there is not much else for her to do than acting and that is because she has very few other skills, further, her reputation might be somewhat tarnished: in C11 she concludes that there is "no niche" for her. Also her identity as half English, half Russian troubles her (C11). It might be that in addition to her being an actress, her exotic foreign origin combined with a possibly bohemian way of life truly is a burden for her, at least if she is trying to appear respectable among the conservative English upper classes. Although Carlotta is trying to communicate her awkward position to Norman, he, maybe deliberately, ignores her worries and takes an advantage of Carlotta's personal worries. He puts forth that her insecurity and not knowing what to do in life does not come from her personal characteristics but from the fact that she wants to become a wife and mother but has not realised this: in N12 and N13 Norman informs her of what he thinks is the reason for her present confusion, trying thus to make Carlotta consider the possibility of marrying him.

In sum, it can be concluded that the above extracts, when giving an insecure, undecided and unhappy image of Carlotta, imply that Carlotta is probably aspiring away from her unrespected position: it comes clear that she is not happy with the present situation. The reason for telling her worries to Norman might come from the fact that he is an older, secure, respected person who is able to give advice which would indicate that features evolving from gender might have an effect on the interaction. Then again, Carlotta's reciting her worries might, again, be a strategic means which she uses to give a certain image of herself and to achieve certain ends. It might be that by presenting herself as unhappy with her situation and wanting something else, she deliberately steers the conversation to the point where Norman can bring forth the possibility of marriage. In this case her image is strategically built and derives from the setting the characters are in. As for Norman, his presentation seems to conform to the high-status, self-assured image of the average romantic hero in that he is the person appearing as the advisor and problem-solver, acting in a secure manner. These features can be seen as deriving from his position of power as the male character and are thus essentially gender-specific.

The following example (Cartland, 1976:101-102) further demonstrates the differences (such as security and control) in the presentation of the characters which were already brought forth above. Furthermore, in what follows the analysis will, from the point of view of the depiction of their relative positions in the relationship, investigate the way in which the characters are presented vis-à-vis each other. Even more so than above, this piece of dialogue is about the characters' ideas about each other and feelings for each other: the relationship is being built on an amorous ground.

[...]

C3: You are *a funny person*, Norman. On first acquaintance you seem a *strong, silent business man*, the type one meets in books or on the stage. I felt at first as though *nothing could upset you, nothing disturb your air of calm efficiency*.

C4: If the roof fell in, or a fire broke out under the table, I believed *you would cope with it and emerge unruffled, still calm, reserved and unsurprised*. Now I still feel you could cope with anything, but I have grown to know that *you are vulnerable all the same*.

N5: Carlotta, *you could help me so tremendously in life, if you would*.

N6: *I want you to marry me*, I think you know that. I think you must have known it for a long time. I love you more than I can tell you.

N7: I am not good at expressing myself, but I love you, Carlotta. *I would make you happy – at least I would do everything in my power to see that you were*.

The above piece of dialogue demonstrates the way in which, on the one hand, Norman is being portrayed as a strong, secure centre of the dialogue, and, on the other hand, Carlotta is being portrayed in a role which is defined in relation to Norman. This difference between the manner in which the female and the male characters are being described comes out most clearly if one compares Carlotta's turns (C3 and C4) to those of Norman (N5 and N6). In C3 and C4 Carlotta is describing Norman with expressions the most of which portray him as strong and capable, such as when she tells that he seems "a strong, silent business man" whose "air of calm efficiency" cannot be disturbed, who can cope with practically anything and "emerge unruffled, still calm, reserved and unsurprised". Although the expressions "a funny person" and "vulnerable" suggest that Norman is not quite as macho as described above, they, too, can be considered as portraying his exceptional nature. This is because it appears that "funny" should be understood as referring to the different sides that Norman has; he is strong but also "vulnerable" and the capability of being both brings him out in a positive light. All in all, it is worth noting that Carlotta is quite freely describing her image of Norman and even calling him "a funny person" which suggests that their relationship is on such ground as to enable her to do so. In other words, they know each other quite well by now and are secure in each others' company.

In contrast to Carlotta's description of Norman, he refers to Carlotta quite differently in N5 and N6. First of all, her characteristics are not being spelt out in a precise manner

by Norman whereas Norman's characteristics are listed by Carlotta. Instead of this, Norman refers to Carlotta in relation to his wants, feelings and intentions. The first instance of such reference is in N5, where Norman describes Carlotta in a position of helper (...you could help me so tremendously in my life), which, of course, gives a positive image of her but, nevertheless, portrays her as existing in relation to Norman. Further, in N6 Norman refers to Carlotta as goal of his action: Norman wants Carlotta to behave in a way which fulfils his wish, in other words, Carlotta is here being told what to do from Norman's point of view. Lastly, in N7 Norman promises Carlotta that "I would make you happy – at least I would do everything in my power to see that you were" which again portrays Norman as the actor and Carlotta in a role relative to Norman's action. Carlotta's state of mind of happiness is thus brought about by Norman which means that at least one aspect of Carlotta's role is defined in relation to Norman. Also Norman's reference to his higher status in N7 (I would do everything in *my power*) reinforces the image of him defining Carlotta's role from his point of view.

In sum, it seems that in the above example, the relationship is being defined from the male point of view. For this interpretation speak both Carlotta's description of Norman which is very much like her description of him in the context of getting acquainted (cf. 5.1.1): they both depict Norman with high-status nouns. The depiction of Norman takes place, thus, from the viewpoint of his individual characteristics. The way in which Carlotta is being presented is, nevertheless, quite different. She is being defined in relation to the male character; she is, for example, presented as the object of his wishes and action. Thus, in the above example Carlotta is not being described from the point of view of her characteristics, as Norman is, but from the viewpoint of what she represents to Norman. In this sense the way in which the characters refer to each other resembles very much the power inequality which, due to their social distance, they have in their relationship. In this sense the difference in the characters way to present each other might be due to the social context which determines their unequal positions. Then again, as was pointed out above, Carlotta describes Norman quite freely and even calls him "funny" which seems to indicate that the social power distance has diminished in their relationship and they are in secure and friendly terms. Considered from this point of view, it seems that the differing ways of the characters to present each other emerge from gender. This is because it seems that in this case, it is being male and thus having power which brings about a certain kind of presentation, and being female and in a weaker position which enables another kind of presentation.

All in all, comparing the first example consisting of the three extracts and the example above to each other, one finds that the representation of Norman has stayed the same: in both examples he has in common the position of power as the basis of his presentation. In

the first example it was demonstrated in his role as the advisor and initiative-taker and in the second example his power comes out in the way in which Carlotta is being defined in relation to him. Norman thus stays in the typical male role and his wordings can be considered specific to his gender. What is different between the examples is the representation of Carlotta. Although she was in the first example presented as insecure, undecided and seeking support from Norman, this feature of interaction could be explained by her using it as a strategy of achieving certain ends and not as demonstrative of her femaleness. Thus, although there is a gender-specific aspect to her representation in the dialogues as shows in the second example in Norman's dominance, Carlotta is able to manipulate the interaction and gain control in certain situations. Then again, when Carlotta presents herself as weak and insecure, she is taking advantage of the typical gendered representation of the female character and the accommodating way in which men often react to women being helpless. Bearing this in mind, it seems that the representation of characters in settings where the relationship is being established on a firmer ground takes place, considered as a whole, from a male point of view.

5.2.2 Transitivity Choices

The above section on word choices of the characters implied that there is a male point of view defining the way in which the characters come out in the dialogues of the 'Deepening the Relationship'-context. In other words, the images of the characters in the above section were largely constructed with the help of gender-specific constructs denoting male supremacy. In terms of the present section on transitivity choices, such an assumption would imply that the male character appears more in the role of the actor than the female character, he has more material processes (processes denoting active doing) whereas the female should have more mental processes (processes denoting inactive sensing) and that his action affects her more than her action affects him. In what follows this assumption will be investigated as to find out the possible gender-specificness of the transitivity choices made by Carlotta and Norman. The first example to be investigated is an extract of a dialogue (Cartland, 1976:101-102) featuring Norman's proposal to Carlotta and their subsequent discussion on the issue:

[...]

N5: Carlotta you could help me so tremendously in my life, if you would.

N6: I want you to marry me. I think you know that. I think you must have known it for a long time. I love you more than I can tell you.

N7: I am not good at expressing myself, but I love you, Carlotta. I would make you happy – at least I would do everything in my power to see that you were.

C5: I don't know. I don't know what to say.
 C6: To be honest, I knew that you loved me. There is no reason otherwise why you should have troubled about me so much, should have taken me out, telephoned me, continually sent me flowers.
 C7: You have been very kind, Norman, and very patient, but the awful thing is that it isn't getting us very much farther. I don't know what to say to you.
 N8: Let me make up your mind for you.
 C8: How I wish I could but it isn't as easy as all that.
 [...]

In what follows the above dialogue is analysed turn by turn as to the process types which can be found in it and the actor and the affected party of those processes. Processes having other actors than Carlotta or Norman will not be analysed since those processes will not give information on the interaction of the characters.

[...]
 N5: Carlotta, you could help me so tremendously in my life, = material process, C actor, N affected
 if you would. = mental process, C senser

N6: I want you to marry me. = mental process, N senser, C affected
 I think you know that. = mental process, N senser, C affected
 I think you must have known it for a long time. = mental process, N senser, C affected
 I love you = mental process, N senser, C affected
 more than I can tell you. = material process, N actor, C affected

N7: I am not good at expressing myself, = relational process, N carrier
 but I love you, Carlotta. = mental process, N senser, C affected
 I would make you happy = material process, N actor, C affected
 at lest I would do everything in my power to see that you were = material process, N actor, C affected

C5: I don't know. = mental process, C senser
 I don't know what to say. = mental process, C senser

C6: [...] I knew = mental process, C senser
 that you loved me. = mental process, N senser, C affected
 [...] you should have troubled about me so much, = material process, N actor, C affected
 [you] should have taken me out, = material process, N actor, C affected
 [you should have] telephoned me = material process, N actor, C affected
 [you should have] continually sent me flowers. = material process, N actor, C affected

C7: You have been very kind, Norman, = relational process, N carrier
 and [you have been] very patient [...] = relational process, N carrier
 I don't know what to say to you. = mental process, C senser, N affected

N8: Let me make up your mind for you.
 = [you] let me = material process, C actor, N affected
 [I] make up your mind for you. = material process, N actor, C affected

C8: How I wish I could [...] = mental processes, C senser
 [...]

Considering the above data, the most obvious feature in it are the amounts of processes where the two characters are actors. Carlotta appears as the actor of eight processes, two of which are of the material type, the rest six processes being of the mental kind. Norman, in turn, is the actor of seventeen processes; he has seven material, seven mental and two relational processes. Judging by this information, Norman seems to be expressing most of the action in the above dialogue which contributes to an image of him as an active character. His relative activeness in the dialogue is enhanced by the fact that of Carlotta's processes, most describe mental action (sensing, thinking, knowing) which often does not require physical action and thus must be considered more static by nature. For example, Carlotta uses often the verb 'know' in the above example (C5, C6, C7) to denote a mental action of hers whereas Norman's action includes such verbs as 'tell', 'do', or 'make' which refer to some action detectable as a physical process and are as such more dynamic verbs.

The above image of Norman acting more in the dialogue comes even more strongly through when one considers the processes where his action affects Carlotta compared to those where Carlotta's action affects him. To consider first Carlotta's action affecting Norman, there are three such processes appearing in N5, C7 and N8. What happens in N5 and C7 are ordinary cases of being affected by the other characters action but what takes place in N8 is interesting. This is because the material process in N8 '[you] let me' (Carlotta lets Norman) presents Norman as asking for permission from Carlotta to do what he intends in the rest of N8 '[I] make up your mind for you'. This example shows that although Carlotta's action does not affect Norman as much his action affects her, her action can, nevertheless, be effective in the sense that it demonstrates her being able to control the situation by (not) permitting something.

What comes to Norman's processes affecting Carlotta, their number is much higher than that of Carlotta's action affecting him. There are fourteen instances where Carlotta is affected by him, seven of these are of the material process type and seven of the mental process type. Especially noteworthy of Norman's action towards Carlotta is the fact that many of his processes express action which affects Carlotta intensively. For example, in N6 his mental process is expressed by the verb 'want' which is quite a strong expression of his will. Further, in N7 his material process is about 'making Carlotta happy', a process which again changes the state that Carlotta is in a great deal. Also 'making up Carlotta's mind' in N8 expresses action which intervenes on Carlotta's affairs in a decisive manner. Thus, considered together with the larger amount of his processes affecting Carlotta, the intensive nature of his action affecting her enhances the notion of Norman being not only more active in the interaction, but also in a position where he is able to affect Carlotta more profoundly than she can affect him.

All in all, the transitivity choices investigated above seem to indicate that Norman is the more active and controlling character who can do more things to the female character than she can do to him. This feature of transitivity might, on the one hand, result from the setting of the dialogue: the more active role seems to fall naturally to Norman since he is the initiator of the discussion. More importantly, he must try and convince Carlotta of marrying him, especially as it seems that she is somewhat indecisive about the issue. Further, proposals were probably in the 1930's a business meant to be conducted by men which naturally emphasises Norman's role in the discussion. Then again, Norman does his proposing in quite an authoritative manner at times, as was already pointed out when discussing the intensity of his action. This could be indicative of his gender role as the hero of the novel: his authoritative expressions denote his higher status and power. Also the expectation of men doing the proposing can, in fact, be seen as a characteristic of the male gender role, and this further speaks for this feature of transitivity being a gender-specific feature of interaction.

As for Carlotta, her being the actor of considerably fewer processes than Norman, having more mental (inactive) processes and affecting Norman less with her action than she is being affected create an image of her as more passive in the interaction. As Norman's active role above, this kind of use of transitivity suggests that the feature derives from a difference in the position of power between the characters. This means that Carlotta is passive and uses more mental processes because she has lower status and less power. On the other hand, this particular feature could, of course, be brought about by the topic which does not leave her much room to interact; proposals often are not material for productive dialogues but the passiveness of the female character can be expected. Then again, as with Norman above, the expectation of Carlotta to interact in this way because she is a woman together with the power difference suggest that her use of transitivity derives essentially from gender. Thus both Norman's activeness and Carlotta's passiveness expressed by their transitivity choices can, in the light of this contextual setting, be considered gender-specific features of interaction.

As was concluded about the above example, the particular setting of proposal might be a factor affecting the gender-specificness of the characters' transitivity choices. In what follows will be the analysis of a dialogue (Cartland, 1976:129-130) which takes place in a more neutral setting, in other words, there are no such characteristics of the setting as above which would inherently affect the interaction. The purpose of analysing transitivity choices of the characters in this setting is to find out whether they retain their gender-specific nature also in a situation which is less laden with gender expectations. The following dialogue takes place after the wedding of Carlotta and Norman when they are spending their honeymoon in Paris. In this sense it might be questionable whether the

dialogue demonstrates the context of the deepening of the relationship as it takes place after the actual culmination point of the relationship. Then again, the dialogue features such characteristics as emotionality and closeness, which are typical to the context of bringing the relationship on a firmer ground. In this sense the dialogue can be seen as an example of the consolidating of the relationship and can be analysed as an example of this context.

In what follows is the dialogue in full and below it the turns will be again analysed one by one as to the different process types, actors and the characters in the affected roles. As previously, those processes having some other entity than Carlotta or Norman as the actor will not be analysed because they are not relevant for the analysis of the transitivity choices of the main characters.

N1: We will dine at the Maxim's. It is the fashionable place and I expect you would like to show off your new dress.

C1: I would love to.

Pause

N2: I love you.

N3: I have never seen you look more wonderful. You don't look tired, though it has been an exhausting day for the both of us.

C2: I have enjoyed myself. Fancy, if I had allowed you to have your way and we had been married in some dingy registry office, what we should have missed!

N4: You were quite right. The service was very beautiful.

C3: Oh, the service. Yes, of course, and the reception was fun, wasn't it? Did you hear how funny Magda was being with Sir John Christian? I think your sister Alice was rather shocked.

N5: Oughtn't we go home?

C4: I would rather like to go on to Montmartre.

N6: Not tonight. I have planned to take you there tomorrow.

N1: [...] I expect you would like to show off your new dress. = mental process, N senser, C affected

C1: I would love to. = mental process, C senser

N2: I love you. = mental process, N senser, C affected

N3: I have never seen you look more wonderful. = mental process, N senser, C affected

You don't look tired. = material process, C actor

C2: I have enjoyed myself. = mental process, C senser

Fancy, if I had allowed you to have your way [...] = mental process, C senser, N affected

N4: You were quite right. = relational process, C carrier

C3: [...]

Did you hear how funny (Magda was being with sir John Christian)? = mental process, N senser

I think (your sister Alice was rather shocked). = mental process, C senser

[...]

C4: I would rather like to go on to Montmartre. = mental process, C senser

N6: I have planned to take you there tomorrow.

= I have planned = mental process, N senser

[I] take you there tomorrow. = material process, N actor, C affected

In the above dialogue, Carlotta has slightly more processes than Norman; she is in the role of the actor in seven processes and Norman in six processes. This difference in the amount of the character being in the role of the actor is, nevertheless, so slight that on the basis of it, the dominance of the female character cannot be concluded. More interesting is the amount of the mental process type which is quite high among both Carlotta's and Norman's processes. They both are the sensers in five mental processes, that is, in the majority of all their processes. Such a dominating position of the mental process type probably is due to the topic of the dialogue. The discussion is mostly about the feelings and perceptions of the characters best expressed by the mental process which is essentially about 'sensing'. Thus, in this case, the use of the mental process type is probably a feature of interaction evolving from contextual factors. Further, as both characters use it almost equally much, the mental process type cannot be considered gender-specific since it in this situation does not denote any difference in the nature of the action expressed by the characters or the possible power relations behind it.

Considering the processes where one character is in the role of the actor and the other character is affected by the action of that process, Norman has more of such processes where he is the actor and his action affects Carlotta. There are altogether four instances of such processes whereas there is only one process where Carlotta is the actor and her action affects Norman. Most of Norman's processes represent the mental type (three instances) there being one material process whereby he affects Carlotta. As already stated above, the topic of the discussion is likely to have an effect on Norman describing more of his mental states of mind or matters he precepts, such as "I love you" in N2 or "I have never seen you look more wonderful" in N3, than the matters he does to Carlotta. Such processes affecting Carlotta do not express action or intentions of actions towards her and in this sense do not demonstrate Norman controlling her. Then again, the one material process in N6 which affects Carlotta presents Norman clearly in the leading role. This is because, in combination with the preceding mental process "I have planned" the material process "[I] take you there tomorrow" expresses Norman's capability to decide on affairs on *their* honeymoon and to carry out plans he alone has made concerning it. Further, taking place in a context where Carlotta has just before in C4 proposed they take the action in question (going to the Montmartre) immediately, Norman's material process of *him* taking *her* there when *he* wants is demonstrative of his power to control the action.

Also the fact that Carlotta in C4 proposes the going to the Montmartre by a mental process whereas Norman in N6 uses a material process demonstrates the difference in the decisiveness of their suggestions, Norman's process being more effective.

Thus, the majority of Norman's processes are of the mental kind and do not denote such gender characteristics of his as higher status and more power according him a leading role. However, the emergence of the one combination of a mental and a material process in N6, taking place in that particular context probably evolves from his gender role and represents his gender characteristics in the interaction. This is firstly because there are no other contextual features in the dialogue which would give him the possibility to control the interaction than the power he has as the male character. Secondly, he seems to be the only character to express control with the help of certain transitivity choices. Then again, it is true that also Carlotta has a process C2 whereby she affects Norman. It also seems that her mental process in C2 "Fancy, if I had allowed you..." is quite an intensive one, featuring the verb 'allow' which expresses action whereby the other character's action is strongly affected. Thus, Carlotta seems to also have power to control Norman's action. Nevertheless, one must conclude the opposite because the effects of Carlotta's mental process in C2 do not actually take place: her process expresses make-believe rather than reality. As her mental process does not in reality affect Norman, one can conclude that there is no controlling role for her in this dialogue. Thus it seems that by being rather the controlled than the controlling character, Carlotta also adheres to the typical weak role of a female character of popular romantic fiction in the use of transitivity.

In sum, considering the transitivity choices made by the characters in the two examples presented in this section, one can conclude that they seem consistent in the way in which the male character controls the interaction. The female character is not only affected more by the action of the male, but she is also controlled and dominated by his action. This dominating feature of the transitivity choices indicating the male being affected by the female character is missing. The female character does not control the interaction by her transitivity choices nor does she gain control by them. As was stated in the analysis of the first example featuring a proposal, the setting, the situation and the topic can also contribute to the importance and prominence of the gender role in interaction; it might be more normal for a man to control a situation where he proposes. Then again, the analysis of the second example, featuring a more neutral situation, also shows the male in a controlling role. Albeit that there is only one instance of control in the dialogue, it is all the more important in its decisiveness and evidence of male dominance.

5.2.3 Turn-taking and Interactional Management

The two previous sections on wordings and transitivity have demonstrated that there is, to a certain extent, a feature of male dominance to be detected in the interaction. Considering the features of turn-taking and interactional management which will next be in the focus of study, one could expect these to demonstrate the above feature as well. Thus, it could be expected that the male speaks more and this way comes out as the more important and controlling character. Further, he might make some specific sequencing choices indicative of his conversational control. The female, in turn, should be more submissive and appear in a less central role.

5.2.3.1 Turn quantity and length

In the dialogues taking place in the setting of 'Deepening the Relationship' it is Norman who has more turns: his total is twenty-five against Carlotta's nineteen turns. But although Norman has six turns more than Carlotta, it is Carlotta whose total amount of speech is larger with her uttering 400 words and Norman uttering 275 words. This means that Carlotta's amount of speech exceeds that of Norman by one third. As in the previous context, here again her talkativeness in a mixed sex situation is surprising (cf. Maybin, in Maybin and Mercer, 1996:19). Thus, one must conclude, judging by the amount of words, it seems to be the case that Carlotta is the more important person in this situation and is probably also the character with more conversational control.

Considering the contextual features in this case, here again, judging by the social context, it should be Norman who holds the position of power and thus to be the one who speaks more. He does actually have more turns in the dialogue which indicates that he is actively participating in the conversation and, to an extent, also controls the conversation because of his more active turn-taking. However, this characteristic of interactional management holds rather poorly in comparison to Carlotta's greatly lengthier turns which indicate that she is far more in control of the conversation.

Another contextual feature which needs to be considered here is the fact that the dialogues in the context of making the relationship more established take place in settings where the characters are not mere acquaintances any more but know each other rather well. On the basis of this it could be expected that due to the more intimate nature of their relationship, the characters would both have more or less equal chances of expressing themselves. Thus Carlotta's wordiness in this case might not be a gender-specific feature of interactional management and assertiveness which helps her to gain more power in the

relationship; it could be that the space for her to express herself is already there in the conversations and she does not need to take it as might have been the case in the dialogues of the previous context (cf. 5.1.3). Nevertheless, the fact that the quantity of Norman's turns is higher in the dialogues in question could indicate that Carlotta's lengthier turns are a means which she uses to control the conversation and to balance the distribution of power between Norman and herself. This means that turn length could be a gender-specific linguistic feature of interactive management in the sense that it is a way in which the female character can acquire power in the interaction.

5.2.3.2 Extended turns

Next, let us consider the aspect of male/female conversational control and the idea of that feature being, in one way or another, gender-specific, with the help of extended turn sequences. The dialogues of the context of 'Deepening the Relationship' exhibit the feature of extended turns also in Norman's speech, and not only in Carlotta's speech as was the case in 5.1.3.2. Further, as Carlotta's extended turn sequence in 5.1.3.2 could be considered a means by which she possibly controlled the conversation, here, too, one must consider the possibility of Norman dominating the interaction by his extended turn. Then again, on the basis of that, Carlotta could be dominating the interaction as likely as Norman because there are extended turns in her speech in this context as well. Further, as was pointed out in 5.1.3.2 about this feature of interaction actually representing 'storytelling' and not necessarily power relations and control needs to be considered here as well. In addition to this, to be able to make conclusions about the possible gender-specificness of extended turns in the sense that they demonstrate some characteristics evolving from gender one must investigate the purpose for which extended turns are possibly used. It might be the case that extended turns serve to express other characteristics of interaction than gender-specificness.

The following example (Cartland, 1976:101-102) has already been used when analysing the transitivity choices made by the characters in 5.2.2 but as it seems a good example of extended turns by both Carlotta and Norman, using it in this section is probably justified. In this case the example will be constricted as to the presentation of the relevant feature and the extended turn by Norman will be investigated first.

[...]

C3

C4

N5: Carlotta, you could help me so tremendously in my life, if you would.

N6: I want you to marry me, I think you know that. I think you must have known it for a long time. I love you more than I can tell you.

N7: I am not good at expressing myself, but I love you, Carlotta. I would make you happy – at least I would everything in my power to see that you were.

C5

C6

C7

As shows from the example, Norman's turn is preceded and followed by extended turns by Carlotta; thus the overall structure of the conversation is dominated by the both characters holding the floor for two or more subsequent turns. In this sense the idea of mutual storytelling might describe the situation well since both of the characters seem to be reciting longer stretches of speech at the time. Also when the content of the extended turns is considered, first concerning Norman's turn from N5 to N7, it seems to fit to what is usually communicated in conversational stories: Norman's extended turn is about his feelings, wants and his overall perception of the situation. It may well be that the extended turn also has the function of a story for Norman in the sense that his sense of self is somehow re-enforced through his reciting of his experience. On the other hand, Norman's story could be understood also as a means of influencing Carlotta. This is chiefly because the intensity and emotionality of Norman's turn do not seem to fit the way in which he is otherwise presented. His blurting out his feelings and intentions is very unlike the interaction of the rational, powerful hero he has been characterised so far. Thus, this unusual emotional outburst of Norman is very likely a feature of interaction used strategically to create an image of Norman being lead by his emotions, finding himself in a state where he can no longer resist Carlotta but must express himself. The misfit between this extended turn and the rest of his interactional style thus re-enforces the idea of him desperately wanting Carlotta to marry him and not being able to wait any longer. In this sense, it can be concluded about Norman's extended turn that this feature of interaction is probably specific to this particular situation: it functions to underline rather Norman's passion in this situation than his gender role. The idea of situation- or even context-specificness is further enhanced by the fact that Norman uses extended turns only in this particular context of 'Deepening the Relationship'.

In what follows the extended turns by Carlotta missing from the above example will, in turn, be presented:

[...]

C3: You are a funny person, Norman. On first acquaintance you seem a strong, silent business man, the type one meets in books or on the stage. I felt at first as though nothing could upset you, nothing disturb your air of calm efficiency.

C4: If the roof fell in, or a fire broke out under the table, I believed you

would cope with it and emerge unruffled, still calm, reserved and unsurprised. Now I still feel you could cope with anything but I have grown to know that you are vulnerable all the same.

N5

N6

N7

C5: I don't know. I don't know what to say.

C6: To be honest, I knew that you loved me. There is no reason otherwise why you should have troubled about me so much, should have taken me out, telephoned me, continually sent me flowers.

C7: You have been very kind, Norman, and very patient but the awful thing is that it isn't getting us very much farther. I don't know what to say to you.

The first extended turn of Carlotta's (C3 and C4) is clearly a story: she is telling about her conception of Norman and the way in which she sees him. This extended turn, functioning as a story, could be about Carlotta sorting out her feelings for Norman and in that sense building an image of him for herself. In other words, she is establishing the way in which she sees Norman and this in relation to herself: she is probably trying to clarify what Norman means to her. In this point of view the fact that Norman's proposal, presented in a form of an extended turn, comes after this extended exchange sequence makes sense. He is probably responding to Carlotta's narrating her experience about him by reciting his feelings for her. Although there is nothing direct about love or affection in Carlotta's extended turn which would excite Norman to such an emotional outburst as was presented above, the expressions she uses about Norman, nevertheless, show trust and admiration. These together with the fact that Carlotta is openly pondering her image of him might contribute to Norman's extended turn appearing as a response to this. The second extended turn of Carlotta from C5 to C7 appears also to be a narration of Norman's action, the reciting of which probably serves the purpose of helping Carlotta structure and understand the situation. She thus responds to Norman's story of his feelings for her (or, his proposal; see the first example above), which was initially triggered by Carlotta's first narrative sequence (C3 and C4).

What is typical of Carlotta's extended turns, compared to those of Norman, is that they are less emotional, and are more about her perception of the other character than about her feelings, intentions, wants, or the like. They resemble more thinking aloud without trying to affect the other character but probably serving the purpose of structuring her experience. In this sense Carlotta's stories appear to be quite ordinary features of interaction without any additional functions, such as influencing the other character. From this point of view, it can be concluded that extended turns for Carlotta's part, investigated in this specific context, do not seem to be specific to her gender. This is so because both the male and the female character have extended turns in the context of 'Deepening the Relationship'; they are here accessible to both genders without being

representative of their gender roles, evolving from a power inequality or being used to control the interaction. Further, there do not seem to be features in her use of extended turns which would indicate their functional specificness to the above situation as was the case with Norman. Extended turns, or storytelling, are thus a feature of interaction which the female character uses here with no relation to the situation. The idea of extended turns being specific for Carlotta in this context, as seems to be the case with Norman, must also be excluded since Carlotta's speech exhibits this feature of interaction also in the context of 'Getting Acquainted' (see 5.1.3.2 for details). Rather, it seems that possibly as a part of their conversational styles, they both exhibit "willingness to enter story rounds", as Tannen, quoted by Maybin (in Maybin and Mercer, 1996:17) points out. In this sense, extended turns, functioning as conversational stories, are a feature of interaction specific to neither gender, but can be used by them both without gender limitations.

5.2.4 Gender-specificity in the context of 'Deepening the Relationship'

In the analysis of the transitivity choices it was suggested that certain settings are more prominent from the point of view of the appearance of gendered features of interaction. This means that certain situations, such as proposals, which are structured around certain gender expectations are more likely to produce gender-specific behaviour also in the area of interaction. From this point of view, considering the contextual setting of 'Deepening the Relationship' as a whole, it could be expected that this context in itself, that is, inherently, is more prone to produce gender-specific features of interaction because it is largely made up of situations where gender roles and expectations play a greater role than possibly is the case in other contextual settings. This idea of certain contexts demonstrating more gendered characteristics is also expressed by Mills (1995: 145) as follows: "Even when gender roles are disrupted in a novel, stereotyping in romantic encounters has a strong hold in popular fiction". Also Wareing (in Wales, 1994:117) points out that "romantic norms frequently ... govern the way certain parts of novels are written – particularly romantic and sexual encounters".

Considering the analysis of the interaction taking place in the context of 'Deepening the Relationship', there seem to be some connections with the findings and the above statements. Firstly, the analysis of the word choices of the characters and their subsequent presentation indicated, more or less, a male point of view in the representation of the characters. This feature was present, e.g. in the wordings denoting Norman's position of power and his role as the advisor, helper and initiative-taker. Secondly, Carlotta was presented in a role which was defined in relation to Norman: she was presented as

existing as the object of his action, wants and needs. This male point of view of interaction was also detectable in the transitivity choices made by the characters, demonstrating again Norman's position of power and control. The female was affected more by the male's processes; she was thus dominated by him and did not in her use of transitivity exhibit features of gaining power by affecting the male in her processes. These features of interaction were considered to be brought about by the gender of the characters because of their dependency on such gender factors as male power and status vs. female oppression and submission. Considered further from the point of view the context enhancing certain gender expectations, they certainly appear to be constructions evolving from gender roles.

Then again, the data show also instances which do not necessarily conform to interaction laden with gender expectations or the gender constraints of particular situations/settings. Considering Carlotta's representation by the word choices she makes, there are instances where she manipulates the interaction by deliberately creating a certain image of her to achieve certain ends. This indicates her being in a position of power relative to Norman and being able to control the situation. Thus, not all interaction in this context follows the traditional gender rules, but the female character is able to break the mould in some situations. In other words, there are also character-specific features of interaction brought about by the situation itself, or by the characters action in that particular situation as discussed earlier, these character-specific features of interaction can also be seen as indicating Carlotta's role as the female character, and in this light demonstrating her gender characteristics. Further, the features of turn-taking, at least what comes to turn quantity, imply that Carlotta is in the role of the more important character because her amount of speech greater than that of Norman. This again is opposite to what might be expected of the typical female character in the sense that on the basis of her gender role, she should not be the more important character but it should be he.

Furthermore, what can be said about Carlotta's and Norman's interaction on the basis of the features of interactive management, gender roles do not seem to affect it. The extended turn sequences which appear to be typical exchange sequences in the context of 'Deepening the Relationship' seemed to represent conversational storytelling of the characters. As a story-telling routine, this feature was accessible to both characters, and used by both, could not in its existence be seen as a means of interactive control or indicating the speakers gender. Then again, Norman's use of extended turns appeared to be strategic way of him to influence Carlotta: this feature, nevertheless, was seen as evolving from the situation and not representing his gender.

Thus, although there are features of interaction which conform to the above notion of the interplay of context and gender, there are also instances of situations where gender role does not seem to be decisive in the interaction of the characters, but features evolving from other sources can appear. The most interesting example of interaction unaffected by gender are the features of interactive management found in the data. Extended turns, i.e. holding the floor for several turns, can be considered controlling the conversation as such; nevertheless, as they seem to be representative of storytelling, they are quite normal in their existence. When a character narrates, s/he naturally holds the floor longer than usually and in this sense extended turns are not controlling the conversation. As they are not a feature denoting control and domination or used to gain these, do not seem to evolve from other gender characteristics and are not specific either to the male or the female character, they are not gender-specific. It is true that extended turns are context-specific in Norman's use but it is doubtful whether they indicate his gender; extended turns are rather just dependent on the situation and context in his use.

5.3 Disagreement

In what follows dialogue taking place in an emotional setting where the characters are having a disagreement and facing difficulties as a couple is in the focus of analysis. As was pointed out in 4.3 (the Organisation of Analysis) this setting occurs only once in the novel (Cartland, 1976:130-132), possibly because disagreements are too disruptive settings considering the developing of the romantic plot. With this are meant the restrictions set by the romantic formula on the popular romantic narrative. These stipulate that the story should develop from gradual infatuation to misunderstandings and falling out; after this the couple restore their relationship and are rewarded by love. In this sense there can be only one instance of disruption: constant disagreement would interfere the plot. Thus, throughout the analysis of the context of 'Disagreement' the analysis will, for the above reasons, involve the investigation of only one setting and the one dialogue taking place in it.

5.3.1 Wordings

Word choices made by the male and female characters are the first point of interest concerning the study of interaction in the context of 'Disagreement'. Wordings will be

analysed with the help of the example below which features two extracts of the dialogue taking place in the setting of disagreement (Cartland, 1976:130-132).

N1: Carlotta, you know I love you.
 C1: *Don't.*
 N2: *What is the matter?*
 C2: *Nothing.*
 N3: *Tell me.*
 C3: There is nothing to tell. Why can't you *leave me alone? I won't be bullied.*
 N4: *I'm not bullying you. Something is wrong, you are trying to avoid me. You don't pretend very well, Carlotta.*
 C4: I'm not pretending, I'm tired.
 ...
 C7: I've tried to ... I've tried to.
 N7: And now that it is too late to do anything about it, *you regret the contract?*
 C8: Must you always think in *business terms?* Can't you separate your mind from business?
 N8: I think I understand. *You don't love me, you have never loved me.*
 C9: And I have married you for *your money!* Why don't you add that – you are thinking it. Why can't you say so?
 N9: And you have married me for *my money.*
 N10: ... I have been *handed a rotten deal* through my own blindness.
 C10: I am sorry you think you have got a rotten deal in me but *at least it is too late now.* I am your wife, even though I do love someone else.
 [...]

Firstly, Norman's turns will be considered in more detail. To begin with, Norman tries to find out the cause for Carlotta's behaviour in N2 as well as in N3. It is interesting that Norman should be using the above expressions "What's the matter?" and "Tell me" because one would probably associate women with the role of trying to sort things out rather than men. The first extract, nevertheless, portrays Norman in a more co-operative role trying to find out what is the matter with Carlotta, who seems to be upset about something and less willing to co-operate. Then again, presuming that all is well between them, Norman is probably in this situation surprised and wondering what has upset Carlotta. His bewilderment might be an aspect which comes out in his trying to find what has upset Carlotta rather than behaving as a typical male and retreating from the situation. Norman's caring and co-operating role comes out also in N4 where he further uses expressions aimed at resolving the situation, such as "Something is wrong, you are trying to avoid me". Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that Norman is concentrating on Carlotta's behaviour in the situation and trying to find out the cause of the dispute from her part. Although seemingly caring for Carlotta's well being, he dismisses his possible responsibility for the disagreement in N4 when he says "I'm not bullying you". Norman thus presents the situation as such where Carlotta is the cause for the disagreement and not something he might be responsible for. In this sense, the image Norman creates about Carlotta and the situation as a whole might result from him (thinking of) being more

experienced and thus better judge of the situation. Further, Norman's more elevated and esteemed position might contribute to him presenting Carlotta in a more negative role as the source of the dispute. In this light, Norman's role, instead of representing cooperation and taking an interest in Carlotta, is representative of his gender characteristics as male and brings forth his position of power. This comes out also in the fact that, although Carlotta seems reluctant to have a discussion with Norman, he pursues questioning Carlotta and thus controls the interaction.

What is noteworthy in the first extract considering Carlotta is that she resorts to one-word answers, as in C1 and C2 which clearly bring out that she is upset and does not want to communicate with Norman: this is also evident in C3 when she asks Norman "Why can't you leave me alone?". Furthermore, in C3 she expresses her conception of Norman asserting himself on her (I won't be bullied) as a reaction to his trying to find out what is wrong. Then again, it is very likely that Carlotta here is aware of Norman's aspiration to control the conversation. Her protest in C3 could be indicative of this and thus represent her resistance against Norman's position in this situation. Thus, what is interesting in Carlotta using such expressions is that, as was already pointed out in the previous sections, she is not the one who generally holds the position of power. In some situations, of course, she has been demonstrated to gain power and control but this is perhaps not the general nature of matters. However, on the basis of the expressions she uses in this example, she seems to be very sure of herself and openly confronts Norman's leading role. Especially her standing up against Norman is a feature which, in this particular situation, indicates that she has here more power than in some of the dialogues investigated so far. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that the above feature of Carlotta's behaviour is clearly situation based and thus also context-specific; it is not necessarily indicative of her gender role. Then again, it might be that in this particular piece of dialogue her gender role is actually changing and the above feature is indicative of that change. Such a conclusion of Carlotta's gender role changing seems sensible because it would still allow for Norman's more controlling role because it would not need to indicate a change in Norman's gender role to a weaker direction.

What comes to the second extract from C7 to C10, there are quite a few business terms being used as a way to refer to the characters' relationship: such terms appear in N7 "...regret the contract", C8 "business terms", N10 and C10 "a rotten deal". Moreover, it is quite ironic that Carlotta in C8 asks "Must you always think on business terms? Can't you separate your mind from business?" when it turns out that she herself has been thinking in business terms all along when she agreed to marry Norman. This, of course, could be indicative of the guilt she feels as it indicates her trying to change the focus from her behaviour to that of Norman's. Then again, this feature in Carlotta's speech

might be demonstrative of the fact that the characters represent different subcultures. As explained by Maybin (in Maybin and Mercer, 1996:19) a possible factor causing differences in male/female interaction is their identification with different subcultures: in this case, Carlotta represents the more emotional theatrical world and Norman the rational world of business. Thus, Norman's thinking in business terms might be something which genuinely puzzles or irritates Carlotta. Then again, as shows in Norman's statement in N8 ("You don't love me..."), he considers C8 as demonstrative of Carlotta's feelings of guilt: the illusion of love is broken and what is left is "a rotten deal". Carlotta was interested in money all along (C9 and N9) which material aspiration is further enhanced in C10 when she says "... at least it is too late now.." meaning that it is luckily too late for Norman to retreat now that they are married. Thus, although Norman is using business terms when describing their relationship, it is not him who comes out as cold and manipulative but Carlotta whose true intentions are revealed. This image is brought about also by the change of style in Carlotta's speech which takes place in C10: before this (C8 and C9) she has been quite emotional and accusative of Norman but in C10 her style is more formal and rational.

All in all, it can be concluded that the more direct and emotional style used by Carlotta in the both extracts could be indicative of her trying to control the situation so that her motives of marriage would not be revealed. Also Carlotta's initial unwillingness to communicate speaks for this end because the unwillingness to co-operate can, in a sense, be a form of controlling the situation. As pointed out above, such features of Carlotta's interaction could be indicative of her gaining control and power in this situation; thus there might be a change taking place in her gender role. Further, in the second piece of dialogue Carlotta comes out as a cold, manipulative and acting for the sake of her own interest. The above notion of Carlotta's gender-role changing fits these features of her representation because they contribute to an image of her which is quite different from the usual: she is not the typical considerate and kind heroine of romantic fiction. Such a representation of her and the features of interaction arising from it appear to be gender-related and context-specific in their emergence. As for Norman, he, by taking an at least seemingly co-operative role is able to continue the conversation and thus actually controls it. Norman pursues the questioning of Carlotta, ignores her unwillingness to communicate and, in the end, forces Carlotta to open up. Further, he creates an image of Carlotta as the reason for the dispute by denying his possible responsibility for the disagreement. This, along with his overall control, emphasises his position in the conversation. As was stated above, this feature of Norman's interaction seems to represent his gender role and can in this sense be considered gender-specific. Further, as similar features of interaction can be detected in his speech in other contexts as well,

Norman's control is not specific to the context of 'Disagreement'. What is context-specific in Norman's wordings is the presentation of him as disillusioned and bitter in the second piece of the dialogue; such word choices as to denote these mental features are natural in a situation where one's eyes are brutally opened. Yet it seems not to be the case that Norman would, e.g. lose his position of power because of this representation, thus his gender characteristics as the male in the dialogue do not change because of this. Further, what is gender- and situation (context)-specific in Norman's interaction is his presentation of Carlotta as the cause of the dispute, thus creating a negative image of her by presenting himself sensible and rational in the situation. This kind of deliberate presentation of Norman, or, the male character, as more worthy on the basis of his characteristics and by downgrading the female character, appears to be specific to the context of dispute.

5.3.2 Transitivity choices

In what follows the interaction taking place between Carlotta and Norman in the context of 'Disagreement' will be investigated from the point of view of transitivity. As previously, the analysis will be conducted in terms of the process types, characters in the role of actor and characters in the affected role. To avoid repetitiveness in the presentation of the limited data, only that consistent piece of the whole dialogue (Cartland, 1976:130-132) which best exemplifies the features of transitivity in the setting of disagreement will be analysed below. After the full dialogue the turns will be analysed one by one and again, such processes where the actor is some other than Carlotta or Norman will be left unanalysed.

[...]

C7: I've tried to ... I've tried to.

N7: And now that it is too late to do anything about it, you regret the contract?

C8: Must you always think in business terms? Can't you separate your mind from business?

N8: I think I understand. You don't love me, you have never loved me.

C9: And I have married you for your money! Why don't you add that – you are thinking it. Why can't you say so?

N9: And you have married me for my money.

N10: For the first time in my life I thought something except business. I see I was wrong to do so. I have been handed a rotten deal through my own blindness.

C10: I am sorry you think you have got a rotten deal in me but at least it is too late now. I am your wife, even though I do love someone else.

N11: As you say, you are my wife.

N12: Good night, Carlotta.

[...]

C7: I've tried to ... I've tried to. = material processes, C actor

N7: [...] you regret the contract. = mental process, C senser

C8: Must you always think in business terms? = mental process, N senser

Can't you separate your mind from business? = material process,
N actor

N8: I think = mental process, N senser

I understand = mental process, N senser

You don't love me = mental process, negative, C senser, N affected

You have never loved me = mental process, negative, C senser,
N affected

C9: And I have married you for your money! = material process, C actor,
N affected

Why don't you add that = material process, negative, N actor

you are thinking it. = mental process, N senser

Why can't you say so? = material process, negative, N actor

N9: And you have married me for my money. = material process, C actor,
N affected

N10: For the first time in my life I thought of something except business. =
mental process, N senser

I see = mental process, N senser

I was wrong to do so. = relational process, N carrier

C10: I am sorry = relational process, C carrier

you think = mental process, N senser

you have got a rotten deal in me = relational process, N carrier

I am your wife, = relational process, C carrier

even though I do love someone else. = mental process, C senser

N11: As you say, = material process, C actor

you are my wife. = relational process, C carrier

[...]

In the above example, both of the characters hold the role of the actor almost the same amount of times. Carlotta is the actor in the total of eleven processes when the negative processes are included. The negative processes are included for both characters because, instead of expressing inaction, they express that the action of the process does not take place but still, the action opposite of that holds. This is because, for example, not loving constitutes as a mental process as much as loving does. Thus, Carlotta is the actor in four material processes, the senser in four mental processes and the carrier in three relational processes. Norman, in turn, is in the role of actor for the total amount of twelve times, and his processes constitute of three material, seven mental and two relational processes. Especially the relatively high number of Norman's mental processes is worth noting here. Mental processes inherently express action which is not so much directed to the outside

world but takes place inside the mind of the character. Thus, in the light of the image created above by wordings of Norman as a powerful character, there seems to be a discrepancy between that image and the transitivity choices he makes. Then again, one must remember that although Norman was in a controlling position above, he was also shown as becoming disillusioned. It is likely that his disillusionment and mental confusion contribute to such transitivity choices: he probably tries to solve the situation in his mind. On the basis of the data this, indeed, seems to be the case. Norman's ponders on the situation and uses such verbs as 'think', 'understand' and 'see' as when he says in N8 "I think I understand" and in N10 "I see I was wrong".

As for Carlotta, rather than the processes in which she is the actor, one should look at the processes where she is the actor and which affect Norman. In the above piece of dialogue, only Carlotta has such processes which affect the other character. These take place in N8, C9 and N9. In N8 Carlotta is the senser in two negative mental processes which are aimed at Norman. As was stated above about negative processes, these express a lack of some specific action of Carlotta towards Norman, in this case, that of loving. On the other hand, they express that the opposite action to loving, that is, not-loving, holds. Thus, Carlotta's mental process of not-loving Norman is what affects him here. Sadly enough, this is a mental process by Carlotta that Norman would not want to be affected by but rather the opposite. Further, in C9 (I have married you for your money) and N9 (You have married me for my money) Carlotta is the actor in two identical material processes affecting Norman. What is interesting here is that the transitivity choices made in them portray Carlotta in the active role when the issue is marriage. It could be expected that in formulaic fiction, which adheres to certain traditional gender roles, women would not be presented in the active role as marrying someone but rather as being married. Here, nevertheless, is a situation where the male character is being married by the female character. This feature could be explained by the fact that Carlotta has married Norman based on reasoning; that is, she has made a conscious choice of marrying him in which sense *she* has married *him* in a very active manner. Then again, such transitivity choices indicating active doing aimed at the other character could derive from Carlotta, in this particular situation, gaining power or being the stronger character. As already stated about Carlotta's presentation in connection to wordings (5.3.1), it might be that in the context of 'Disagreement' her gender position is changing and she is gaining power. This could explain this situation where only Carlotta has processes affecting Norman, when, on the basis of the previous contexts (5.1.2 and 5.2.2) Norman has had more processes affecting Carlotta than vice versa.

All in all, the transitivity choices used by both Norman and Carlotta in this situation and thus also this context appear to be deriving from contextual factors and only to an

extent from their gender. This is so, firstly, because Norman having more mental processes can be explained by the situation and the subsequent state of mind he is in; his gender thus, does not affect the transitivity choices he makes. The same seems to hold for Carlotta, whose transitivity choices denoting an active role in the interaction are brought about by the context of 'Disagreement'. This is because situational factors, such as her need to defend herself, contribute to a certain more straightforward and aggressive manner of her to interact. Such a manner to interact, in turn, wins her more prominence and power in the discussion which also shows in transitivity. Then again, the strong image of Carlotta created here is somewhat different from her previous presentation as a not so powerful character. Thus it could be considered as a case of her presentation as the female character being different, in other words, her gender representation might be changing into a more self-assured, dominant direction. In this sense this feature would be a case of gender and context interacting to produce certain features of interaction, such as shown above in the case of transitivity. In sum, Norman's use of transitivity as a feature of interaction can in this case be considered to be evolving from the situation and is thus context-specific. What comes to Carlotta, her use of transitivity seems to be an interactional feature which comes from the interplay of the situation and gender: these factors affect each other to produce certain atypical features of interaction of a heroine.

5.3.3 Turn-taking and Interactional management

The emotional setting of 'Disagreement' occurs only once in the data probably due to limitations of the popular romantic genre as already explained above. Considering this it is probably the case that this single quarrel is all the more important from the point of view of what it can tell us about the interactional features of the characters and the way in which these features reflect and affect their relative positions. Some implications of the characters' features of interaction in the context of 'Disagreement' have been suggested above in the sections on wordings (5.3.1) and transitivity choices (5.3.2). Next the focus will be on what the analysis of aspects of turn-taking and interactional management show about interaction in the setting of dispute.

5.3.3.1 Turn quantity and length

What comes to the characters' turn quantity and length, they are roughly equal: Carlotta has ten turns and utters 104 words whereas Norman has twelve turns and utters 114

words. On the basis of this information neither character comes out as the more important or the more powerful one but they seem to share equal importance in the conversation. Then again, when one compares the distribution and length of turns here to that in the two sections above where Carlotta came out as the more dominant character (5.1.3.3.1 and 5.2.3.3.1), this context shows a more active role from the part of Norman. Such a change, especially considering the amount of speech produced, indicates that Norman might be taking the advantage of his gender role as male and asserts himself more in the conversation. What is also noteworthy is that, for the first time, Norman is exhibiting the feature of greater amount of speech usually typical of male characters.

Also considering the context of the conversation it makes sense that Norman should be more active in this case than before: Norman has been insulted by Carlotta and is thus hurt and confused. This means that, more than before, he needs to sort out his feelings and his confused state of mind by speech, thus he appears more talkative. This, in turn, results in Norman coming out as the more important and central character. Further, judging by his amount of speech, he may be holding the controlling position. It should be noted, however, that considering the relative positions of the characters in the light of turn quantity and length, the characters seem to be quite equal: the features of turn quantity and length do not in this context really assign neither character to the position of power. Then again, considered from the point of view of the characters' turn quantity and length in the previous sections, there is some change in this context which needs to be accounted for. Namely, Norman's amount of this speech is in this context larger than previously which implies him dominating especially the conversation at hand. In the previous contexts Carlotta has been the more talkative character and here as well she talks almost the same amount as Norman. Considering the relative rise in the amount of Norman's speech in this context compared to the amount of Carlotta's speech, Norman seems to be the more important and central character. Yet the fact that the characters' amounts of speech are nearly equal can be seen as indicative of the power Carlotta is gaining in the situation; was she completely dominated by Norman, her amount of speech would very likely be much smaller than his.

5.3.3.2 Side-sequences of meaning negotiation

Of the means of interactional management, the feature of side-sequencing appears prominent in this context. Thus, in what follows the focus of study will be on side-sequences, or the embedding of one exchange sequence within another (for details on side-sequences see 4.2.2 "The mechanics of conversation"). Common to the side-

sequences found in this data in general is that they involve negotiation of meaning between the characters, that is, they are initiated by one party in order to get a clarification, further information or the like from the other party about the information that has been communicated. To explain further, there is a communication break-down mostly due to insufficient information which needs to be repaired so that the conversation can continue. This repair of conversation takes place inside the dialogue and is carried out as an embedded exchange sequence. Side-sequences, thus, represent specific sequencing choices made by a character. Such choices of sequencing can be explained, as above, as request for clarification, information or the like and thus natural phenomenon in interaction. Then again, they can also be seen in a function where they are used to control the conversation. This is because the one who initiates a side-sequence is interfering in the normal course of the dialogue and breaking its construction around adjacency pairs; thus s/he is managing the interaction.

The following example demonstrates the negotiation of meaning in the context of 'Disagreement' (Cartland, 1976:130-132). In the dialogue, there are attempts at initiating side-sequences to receive further information on unclear matters but as shows below, these attempts are not successful. Thus also the structure of the side-sequence is incomplete.

C6: I can't help it.

N6: *Can't help what? Not loving me? Is that what you mean?*

C7: *I've tried to .. I've tried to.*

N7: *And now it's too late you regret the contract?*

C8: *Must you always think on business terms? Can't you separate your mind from business?*

N8: I think I understand. You don't love me, you have never loved me.

In terms of the above example, it seems that the characters are both following their own trains of thought and co-operation is minimal. Norman initiates the negotiation of meaning in N6 ("Is that what you mean?") but does not receive sufficient response from Carlotta in C7. Thus Norman initiates the negotiation of meaning again in N7 where he continues with the same issue as in N6, where he was not properly answered. However, Carlotta in C8 does not respond in a satisfactory manner but makes a counter-question. This has an effect also on the structure of the interaction which so far has demonstrated question-answer adjacency pairs: this sequencing is disrupted. To clarify, Norman's question in N7 is followed by another question in C8; the structure is thus Q-Q and not Q-A as would normally be the case. It should be noted that this piece of dialogue as a whole does not follow the typical structure of meaning negotiation which is Q-Q-A-A (for details on this see 4.2.2 "The mechanics of conversation"). Here, if any structure is detectable, it is Q-A-Q-Q. As the incomplete structure of the example as well as the

content of the dialogue show, this side-sequence of meaning negotiation fails. In the end Norman makes his own conclusion of the issue, failing thereby to answer Carlotta's last question in C8.

Such an incomplete example of meaning negotiation is probably brought about by the situation where the characters are in. As the dialogue features a disagreement, it is probably more likely to expect unstructured conversation rather than the opposite. In this case, as the dialogue represents a major dispute between the characters, it is understandable that there are emotional responses to questions which fail to give sufficient information. It is often a fact that disagreement is not about co-operation and co-operative management of interaction but disruptive features as demonstrated in the above example are likely to appear. What comes to the question of controlling the conversation by side-sequencing, it seems that Norman as the initiator of the sequence manages the interaction. Then again, it is difficult to say anything about Norman controlling the situation as he is the initiator of the possibility for meaning negotiation because there essentially is no consistent negotiation of meaning. In this sense Carlotta as well could be seen in a controlling role because she does not respond to Norman's negotiation of meaning but evades it and thus controls the interaction. On the basis of the above discussion, it seems that the emergence of the above instance of meaning negotiation having the specific characteristics described earlier, results from the context of 'Disagreement' and is probably typical of it and specific to it.

5.3.4 Gender-specificity in the context of 'Disagreement'

As was the case in the previous section about the context of 'Deepening the Relationship', here, too, it seems that quite a few of the interactional features have been brought about by the interplay of the context and gender. This means that in the context of 'Disagreement', the situation of dispute has an effect on the linguistic behaviour of the characters. This takes place in a way which can be seen as demonstrating gender-specific features of interaction made possible because of the situation of disagreement. In what follows the gender-and context-specific interactional features will be summarised and the effects of the situation to the gender-specificness of the characters' interaction will be considered.

Firstly, on the basis of the analysis of the word choices made by the characters, there seem to be both gender- and context-specific features of interaction. Especially the wordings Norman has, and the way in which he is being presented, are gender-specific to a certain extent. Such word choices and aspects of representation are him controlling the

interaction by questioning Carlotta and forcing her to interact. Also the image of him as the rational party in the quarrel, working to solve the situation where Carlotta is behaving badly, is gender-specific because it portrays him as the male character in a more positive light. Then again, Norman has also such wordings and is being presented in such a manner which evolve from the situation. Among these expressions are the wordings which denote his disillusionment and unhappiness in a situation where his love for Carlotta has proven to be one-sided. Further, the seems to be also one context- and gender-specific feature in his interaction. This feature is brought about by Norman's indication of Carlotta as the source of dispute: Norman denies his possible responsibility for the state of affairs, and by doing so, enforces the image of Carlotta being the one who has caused the quarrel. Carlotta is thus brought out in a more negative manner than Norman and his position and representation as the male character are more positive. In this sense the above feature of Norman's wordings is brought about by the interplay of gender and the particular situation.

Considering the wordings on Carlotta's part, there is more evidence of the situation as well as gender affecting her word choices. Carlotta is in a situation where her manipulative, self-interested behaviour is about to be revealed and thus needs to try and defend herself in order not to appear to too cold and scheming. She is presented as standing up against Norman and appears, in some instances, stronger and more powerful than he. Thus, instead of being apologetic and full of remorse, as might be expected of a kind, well-behaving heroine in a dispute, she appears to be holding on to her position and does not regret her behaviour. Such a portrayal of Carlotta does not abide to the accustomed female gender role but is more likely to be brought about by her personal characteristics in this situation. Thus, her wordings can be considered a situation-specific feature of interaction which might be gender-related. The relation to gender comes from the fact that Carlotta's word choices and her subsequent presentation could be indicative of a change in her gender role and in this deriving from gender. In this sense, this feature of Carlotta's wordings could well be brought about by the situation and gender affecting each other to produce certain characteristics and thus there is also a gender-specific side to this matter.

What was said above about Carlotta's wordings seems to hold also for her transitivity choices. This is because her use of transitivity, for the first time in the analysis, indicates her affecting Norman more with her action than Norman affecting her with his action. Such a feature indicating her role as an active doer thus probably evolves from the situation of dispute. Further, as above with the wordings, here as well transitivity choices can be seen as indicative of a change in her gender role and her action as the female character. In this sense, transitivity choices she makes are demonstrative of her gender

and thus also gender-specific. This gender-specificness, nevertheless, is made possible only by the situation of dispute. What comes to Norman's transitivity choices, they seem to be representative of situational factors. Thus, although the mental process type was demonstrated to be typical of him in this setting, it does not necessarily indicate a change in his gender role: there is, for example, no loss of power or status involved. Rather, it seems that the large number of Norman's mental processes is indicative of the nature of the situation, where he has been hurt. In this sense it is natural for him to express more mental action taking place because it is probable that he needs to ponder on the situation and mentally sort matters out. Considering this, Norman's mental processes probably evolve from the particular situation he is in rather than his gender representation changing.

Lastly, what comes to the features of turn-taking and interactional management of the conversation, they have some connections to the features of interaction described so far. Especially considering the side-sequence of meaning negotiation, representative of management of interaction, there are similarities to what has been discussed above. The fact that Norman initiates the negotiation of meaning speaks for his control of the interaction which is constant with the features he has demonstrated in the wordings and to some extent in the transitivity choices: the high number of Norman's mental processes does not ascribe him into a weaker role. In this light, Norman's control of the interaction constitutes for a feature specific to his gender in the sense that his better chances to dominate derive from his position of power as male. Also the fact that in this context Norman is more talkative than in previous contexts enhances the image of him dominating the conversation. This feature implies that Norman's control of the conversation has to do also with the particular situation enhancing his male gender characteristics.

Considering turn-taking and interactional management from Carlotta's point of view, it seems that the way in which the meaning negotiation failed due to the characters' following of their own trains of thought and not co-operating with each other is a feature of interaction by which especially Carlotta could be controlling the conversation. Trying to defend herself, she might be deliberately evading Norman's attempts at finding out more about the situation and thus ignoring his efforts to meaning negotiate. This kind of disrupting the side-sequence can be considered a form of conversational control as well as Norman's initiating the side-sequence. Further, it seems to gain Carlotta a stronger position as the female character in which sense the disruption of the side-sequence could be functioning as indicative of her gender as well. The strong position Carlotta has in the conversation comes out also in the fact that although the amount of Norman's speech rises, the amount of her speech does not accordingly diminish. This again is

demonstrative of the way in which the context of 'Disagreement' effects the gender-specificness of interaction in the sense that it allows a stronger role for Carlotta.

All in all, the interaction taking place in the context of 'Disagreement' shows such features of interaction which might not have been expected to appear considering the gender roles usually dominant in popular romantic fiction. In this sense the context at hand is quite remarkable, showing instances, especially from the part of the female character, where the usual gender representation has changed and the character comes out stronger and more in control than might otherwise be the case.

5.4 Rebuilding the Relationship

5.4.1 Wordings

The logical consequence of a disagreement is often the aspiration to make up, and also here those dialogues which demonstrate settings governed by the process where Carlotta and Norman are seeking for reconciliation will be the ensuing interest of study. In what follows examples of dialogues demonstrating the process of 'Rebuilding the Relationship' will be studied as to what kind of wordings the characters use of themselves and of each other, contributing perhaps to a gender-specific representation. First of all, the following extract of a dialogue taking place on Carlotta's and Norman's honeymoon and chronologically closest to the disagreement will be given a closer look (Cartland, 1976:141-142). The example does not, however result in reconciliation but rather demonstrates the process leading to it.

N1: *You would like to rest, I expect.*

C1: *Norman, I want to talk to you. Please listen to me.*

N2: *But of course, what is it you want to say?*

C2: *I have been trying to speak to you for days but we have been so surrounded with friends, at least you have, that I haven't had an opportunity.*

N3: *I am sorry, I thought you were enjoying the entertainments I arranged for you. They cost a lot of money.*

C3: *Norman, you are being horrid to me.*

N4: *Horrid! I am afraid I don't understand. I have been doing everything in my power to make our honeymoon amusing.*

[...]

C5: *It isn't that, it is us. Norman, I am sorry about the other night ... terribly sorry.*

N6: *My dear child, please don't worry about a little thing like that.*

C6: *Norman, you aren't being real, you aren't genuine with me... I was mad, overwrought, hysterical, and I said a lot of things that I didn't mean. Must you go on punishing me?*

[...]

The first piece of dialogue from N1 to N4 which is generally characterised by Carlotta's aspiration to communicate with Norman and presents her in a role of a character more interested in getting matters sorted out. Norman's somewhat reluctant attitude towards Carlotta comes out in Norman's statement in N1. There Norman, by seemingly stating what he believes Carlotta wants, is in fact indirectly suggesting that Carlotta should leave him alone by, e.g. going into her room to rest. This clearly is an indication of Norman's unwillingness to interact with Carlotta which is quite understandable this being the first instance where reconciliation is sought; before this, he has lived in the belief that Carlotta could not care less for him. However, not being discouraged by Norman's coldness, Carlotta in C1 expresses her wish to have a discussion with him and thus ignores Norman's previous signal to leave him alone. Norman complies to this and Carlotta, possibly trying to make what she has to say seem worth the while to Norman, underlines the urgency of her request in C2: she brings out the fact that she has tried to have a discussion with him for days. This, together with her request to talk with Norman create an image of her as repenting her previous behaviour and wanting sincerely to make things up. However it may be intended, her expression in C2 ("I've been trying to speak to you for days...") comes out as a reproach for Norman of him not being available for her. Norman acknowledges this and in N3 defends himself by claiming that he was only thinking of Carlotta's interest. Norman's mentioning the costliness of the entertainments he has arranged for Carlotta indicates also that he has not yet forgiven her. As came out in 5.3, Carlotta has married Norman chiefly for money; this kind of "shared past experience", as Maybin (in Maybin and Mercer, 1996:12) points out, is a contextual feature worth considering here. Thus Norman explaining in N3 that he thought Carlotta would like the expensive amusement he has arranged for her stands for scorn. In N3 Norman is also reminding Carlotta of his stronger position with the reference to him *arranging* matters and having "a lot of money" to spend on entertainments. What Carlotta says in C3 ("...you are being horrid to me) suggests that Carlotta has understood Norman's scorn and is upset for this because her aspiration for reconciliation is genuine (the dialogue does not say it directly but otherwise in the story it is made clear that Carlotta now loves Norman). At least she wants Norman to believe she is in remorse because of the way matters are: her position as Norman's dependant cannot be too pleasant in present terms. Thus, in C3 Carlotta protests against Norman's taking up the money issue but Norman will not relent. In N6 he further reminds Carlotta of the dependent position she chose for herself when she married for money when he says "I have been doing everything in my power to make our honeymoon amusing". This phrase brings out the fact that Norman is in control of what happens on their honeymoon and

with its direct reference to his power, enhances the image of Carlotta being under his rule.

The wordings in first piece of dialogue from N1 to N4 thus demonstrate Norman's position of power and control. This is evident in the way in which he can scorn Carlotta and remind her of her dependent position. It is also evident in the way in which he expresses his wish not to socialise with Carlotta (N1) and in his relentless attitude towards her. It is, of course, true that he is in the position of the hurt and mistreated party; nevertheless, his ignoring of Carlotta's effort to make up together with the features discussed above indicate that he is in a controlling position. In this light, both Norman's wordings and the representation created of him with the help of certain word choices are in this case gender-specific, i.e. representative of his gender characteristics. What comes to Carlotta, she is presented as wanting to communicate with Norman and obviously regretting the way she has treated him. However, the way in which she brings forth this wish to mediate with Norman does not come out as submissive but rather quite self-assured and spirited (e.g. "I *want* to talk to you, "...you are being *horrid* to me"). It might be, of course, that the situation is such as to call for tenacity so that she could get Norman to communicate. Then again, considering the overall setting of the dialogue, where Norman clearly tries to make Carlotta feel herself small, Carlotta resist to this and will not be downgraded. As such, this feature of interaction resembles her strong position in the previous context (disagreement) and here, too, could be indicative of her adopting a resisting and strong role as the female character. In this sense, her word choices are indicative of her gender-based characteristics and can be considered a gender-specific feature of interaction.

The second piece of dialogue from C5 to C6 continues with the setting where Norman dominates and stays distant with the help of his higher status, and Carlotta, because of her dependent position, tries to be co-operative in order to get the relationship re-established. Further, the second extract is characterised by Carlotta's genuine regret of what she previously told Norman about her feelings because she has by now realised that she does, in fact, love him and is desperate to make him believe this. Thus in C5 Carlotta apologises to Norman trying to convince him of her genuine remorse ("I am sorry ... terribly sorry"). Norman is not moved and instead of it, in N6 he resorts to his experienced position when he expresses his indifference at Carlotta's apology: when he calls Carlotta "my dear child" he might be underlining the fact that he is aware also of the nasty ways of the world and that Carlotta's behaviour has not shocked him. Carlotta suspects this to be a pretence (C6: "You aren't being real, you aren't genuine with me") and pursues convincing Norman of her true feelings by describing herself as having been irrational and out of control of herself, that is, behaving in a childlike manner when they

argued. The childish aspect of her behaviour comes out also in her question “Must you go on punishing me?” as if she was a little girl who is being disciplined by an older and wiser person. Carlotta’s effort to make herself appear in a more favourable light to Norman is, nevertheless, wasted. The couple stays in the setting where Norman appears distant and asserts his stronger position by less interest in sorting matters out, and Carlotta tries to mediate by admitting that she has been foolish and thus placing the experienced and rational Norman above herself. Thus, as above, the same gender-based representation of the characters continues here as well; the wordings of the second piece of dialogue can in this sense also be considered gender-specific.

Next the focus of study will be on a dialogue which takes place some time after the above extract and results in the reconciliation of the couple (Cartland, 1976:204-206). It is presented here because it demonstrates some features of wordings quite different from those taking place in the beginning of the process of reconciliation (see the example above). The following piece of a dialogue is situated in a setting where Carlotta, convinced that Norman will not ever forgive her, has left him. She is presently on board a ship to go to the United States to continue her acting career. Norman, realising that she is gone, repents his relentless behaviour. When he hears that Carlotta’s step-mother is seriously ill, he has got all the cause he needs to go and bring her back home: luckily, the ship has not yet departed and he finds her in the harbour. Of the marking conventions it should be noted that three dots in the middle of the turn denote hesitation.

[...]

C8: Magda ... my beloved Magda

C9: If she dies, that is *the ... end. I shall be ... left! Alone with ... nobody to ... care for me.*

N7: My dear, *that is not true.*

C10: *It is true! It is true. She loved me. She was the only person. I have been so miserable ... so un ... happy. Oh, Norman, why do you ... hate me?*

C11: *Take care of me ... Norman. I can't bear it.*

C12: *I didn't understand ... but I ... love ... you ... I do ... Only you won't ever ... believe ... me.*

C13: *I only thought ... I ... loved Hector ... because he ... didn't want me.*

C14: *And I ... thought I only ... wanted ... your money but I ... was such ... a fool ... I loathe your money ... I want you ... you ... you...*

N8: *It is all right, my darling. It is all right.*

What is noteworthy in the above piece of dialogue are the very emotional, exaggerated expressions that Carlotta uses throughout the extract. In the previous example Carlotta was more emotional than Norman but here this feature is even more obvious. This piece of dialogue presents Carlotta describing her loneliness and misery in a manner full of hesitations, repetition and other intensifying and dramatic expressions. Thornborrow and Wareing (1998:132-133) state about production errors, such as hesitations, that they are

sometimes used deliberately by a writer “to convey something about the character”. Considered from the point of view of deliberate presentation of characters, it appears that for the couple to be able to rebuild their relationship, Carlotta needs to submit completely and confess how unhappy she is if left on her own. In the previous example she did not go this far and held some of her spiritedness but now that she submits, Norman can rescue her from her misery without losing his pride or position of power: thus the relationship can be successfully re-established. This, of course, is only one interpretation of the dialogue. Another one, quite as correct, might be to consider the above example as just an example of the speech of a very unhappy woman. It is understandable that in a situation where one hears that her mother is dying and believes she has lost all possibilities for love, one can't control one's emotions and says a lot of exaggerated things. In this sense, there do not need to be such connections to gender differences and unequal positions of power as suggested above. Then again, as Carlotta has been shown to be able to stay strong in previous situations which probably affected her deeply (disagreement), her breaking here makes one suspect deliberate presentation of her in this way. There is possibly a need from the part of the writer to present Carlotta as on the verge of losing everything important to her because she needs to learn a moral lesson. As she has been a somewhat immoral character, the final repentance is necessary to show that she is, after all, worthy of love as well as to have Norman.

Let us next consider what was put forward above in the light of examples taken from the dialogue. First of all, in C9 Carlotta expresses her fear of ending up alone by using very emotional expressions which dramatise her position, such as “that is the ... end” and “I shall be ... left!” and make her appear vulnerable by emphasising her need for being cared for as in “Alone with ... nobody to ... care for me”. Norman's answer to this (N7) is very rational and serves also as a hint that he is relenting from his previous distant attitude by suggesting that there is, after all, someone to care for Carlotta. Nevertheless, she continues by first asserting, in an exaggerated manner, her opinion that there is no one else besides Magda to care for in C10 (“It is true! It is true.”); next she affirms her above opinion when she refers to herself being “so miserable ... so un ... happy” because Norman hates her. In her next turn (C11) she asks Norman to “take care” of her because she “can't bear it” which is quite irrational considering that she just expressed her conception of Norman hating her. In what follows, through C12 to C14, Carlotta confesses her love for Norman, as in “I ... love ... you ... I do...” and “I want you ... you ... you...” and that her judging has not been very good (“I ... was such ... a fool ...”): these convince Norman of her remorse and, more importantly, of her submission which gives him the opportunity to bring the episode into an happy end in N8 where he affirms that “It is all right”.

All in all, in the light of the above discussion and the examples that have been investigated, it seems that in some of the settings where the relationship is being rebuilt, female submissiveness is a typical feature of the interaction. In fact, as Carlotta has also previously in many instances, including the first example in this section, been presented as quite strong, self-assured and able of interactional and situational control, it seems that female submissiveness is actually needed for the relationship to continue successfully. Also the fact, that Norman does not need to repent his persistence, which has driven Carlotta to despair, but can continue as he has always been, speaks for the necessity of the female to submit for the couple to be able to reunite. Thus, it appears that in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship', the gender role of the female character is, again, changing; this time the change is to the direction of the typical heroine of popular romantic fiction. This means that in this context, gender and the situation affect each other to produce gender-specific features in the wordings and the representation of the female character. What comes to the male character, his gender role seems to stay constant and can also, for the reasons stated above, be considered to affect the word choices he makes and the way in which he is being presented. Nevertheless, it could be that in his case, too, the situation enhances the gender-specific quality of his wordings.

5.4.2 Transitivity choices

In this section the dialogues taking place in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship' will be considered from point of view of transitivity choices made in them. As previously, transitivity will be studied, with the help of an example illustrative of these features, from the point of view of process types, characters in the role of actor and characters in the role of the affected party. The following dialogue (Cartland, 1976:192) demonstrates a situation where Carlotta is seeking Norman's forgiveness; he, nevertheless, will not relent.

[...]

C3: Norman, must you go on like this ... this for...ever?

N4: Go on like what?

C4: Can't you forgive me? Won't you ever forget what happened the night we were married?

N5: How nice of you to ask for my forgiveness. Of course it is yours, if you want it, but I assure you there is nothing to forgive. I like hearing the truth; I prefer it to hypocrisy at any time.

C5: But it wasn't the truth. I swear to you, Norman ...

N6: My dear, you mustn't strain my credulity too far! And why agitate yourself? We have all had a long day, shall we go to the drawing room?

In what follows will be the analysis of the characters' turns one by one. Again, processes featuring some other entity than Carlotta or Norman as the actor will be left out of the analysis because those processes are unlikely to clarify the features of interaction of the two main characters.

[...]

C3: Norman, must you go on like this ... this for ... ever? = material process,
N actor

C4: Can't you forgive me? = mental process, N senser, C affected
Won't you ever forget what happened [...] = mental process, N senser

N5: How nice of you to ask for my forgiveness. = material process, C actor
[...], if you want it, = mental process, C senser
but I assure you [...] = mental process, N senser, C affected

C5: [...]

I swear to you, Norman ... = material process, C actor, N affected

N6: My dear, you mustn't strain my credulity too far! = material process,
negative, C actor

And why [you] agitate yourself? = mental process, C senser

[...]

What is noteworthy of the example above, in the light of transitivity choices made in it, are the processes having one character as the actor/senser of a process which affects the other character. Compared to some other contexts investigated so far, such processes do not appear as prominent a feature of transitivity as they have previously been demonstrated to be. Nevertheless, the processes where one character is the actor/senser and the other one affected by his/her action are points in conversation which can be indicative of, e.g. the power relations between the characters. Thus, they can be indicative of gender differences and gender-specificness in interaction, and although their number is in this case low, their appearing in the data can be significant.

The data show two such processes where Carlotta is affected by Norman's action. These take place in C4, where she is affected by Norman's mental process ("Can't you forgive me?") and in N5, where she is also affected by Norman's mental process ("I assure you ..."). Of these it should be noted that Norman's mental process in N5 expresses quite an intensive mental action of 'assuring' Carlotta of something. This gives the impression that through his action, Norman can change the state Carlotta is in: he can make Carlotta assured, that is, to appear in a state of mind of certainty. Such an ability to assure Carlotta might arise from Norman's high status and his general position of superiority. In other words, it might evolve from such characteristics of his gender as have been demonstrated to be part of the hero's intrinsic gender characteristics. In this

sense the above process of Norman where his action affects Carlotta in such a manner can be considered a feature of interaction specific to his gender.

To consider further the processes where one character is affected by the other's action, there appears in the data also one such process where Norman is being affected by Carlotta. The process is of material kind and takes place in C5 "I swear to you, Norman ...". This process by Carlotta also expresses quite an intensive action: she is not only telling Norman something about the situation, she is strongly affirming him of something. Such an intensive process concerning affirming Norman about something is probably brought about by the situation, where Carlotta is desperately trying to convince Norman of her wish to reconcile. Thus this feature of Carlotta affecting Norman by her action can, unlike to Norman's case, be considered situation-based and specific to the setting of the example.

Another interesting point to consider in the above piece of dialogue is the fact that most of the processes where Carlotta is the actor take place in Norman's speech, and most of the processes where Norman is the actor appear in Carlotta's speech. This is interesting in the sense that in this piece of dialogue the characters are telling about each others action: they are not so much concerned of the way in which they themselves act in the situation, or react to the situation or to each other. Especially Carlotta describing Norman's processes in her turns is noteworthy. This is because it might be expected, her being the female character, that she would rather recite her feelings, sensations or other mental states in the above context of making up as a way of sorting out the situation, rather than concentrating on Norman's action. Then again, by accounting her impression of what she sees Norman as doing in the situation, she can evaluate the situation and, in a way, point out to Norman what he should or should not be doing. Such an evaluative feature of her telling about Norman's action can be seen, for example, in C3 where Carlotta's utterance "Norman, must you go on like this ... this for ... ever?" can be understood as a kind of a reproach of him not relenting, albeit that it is not a very strong or intense expression. In this sense Carlotta is quite straightforward of her evaluation of the situation. She expresses the way in which she sees the action taking place with the help of certain transitivity choices concentrating on Norman rather than, for example, her own mental processes taking place in the situation.

It appears that in the above situation, this feature of Carlotta might not be what one would expect of a traditionally submissive heroine of popular romantic fiction. Thus, compared to the typical characteristics of a female figure, the above evaluative feature of Carlotta's transitivity choices is not gender-specific but is more likely to be brought about by the specific situation. In other words, she uses the above feature in the above situation because it is in that context interactionally effective. Yet it might be that in this case the

above, somewhat unexpected feature of Carlotta's transitivity choices might be brought about by a change, for example, in her position in that situation; that is, her gender role might be changing. In this point of view Carlotta's evaluative use of transitivity could be brought about by gender in the above setting.

Also considering the appearance in Norman's turns of processes having Carlotta as the actor, there is a certain evaluative feature detectable. This is so, for example, in N5 ("How nice of you to ask for my forgiveness") and N6 (Why agitate yourself?"). These expressions of Norman, describing Carlotta's action as he sees it, are clearly evaluative in the sense that they, more or less, judge or scorn Carlotta. In Norman's case such a use of transitivity can be seen as evolving from his position as the hero of a popular romantic novel, as already explained above. In this sense Norman's evaluative use of transitivity is a gender-specific feature of interaction. However, it should be noted that Carlotta's somewhat similar use of transitivity might make Norman more prone to interact in a similar manner.

For the sake of comparison, the dialogue featuring the final resolution of the situation and the relationship being re-established (Cartland, 1976:206) will be also analysed as to the transitivity choices made in it. In what follows is an extract of the dialogue which demonstrates some features of transitivity similar to the above example and some features different to what were found above. First the piece of dialogue will be given in full after which the turns will be analysed one by one as to the process types, actors and affected parties appearing in them. Again, processes where the actor is some other than Carlotta or Norman will be left unanalysed because they are not directly relevant to the interaction of the main characters.

[...]

C11: Take care of me, Norman. I can't bear it.

C12: I didn't understand ... but I ... love ... you ... I do ... only you won't ever ... believe me.

C13: I only thought ... I loved Hector ... because he didn't want me.

C14: And I ... thought I only ... wanted ... your money but I ... was such ... a fool ... I loathe your money ... I want you ... you ... you.

N8: It is all right, my darling. It is all right.

[...]

C11: Take care of me, Norman. = material process, N actor, C affected
I can't bear it. = mental process, negative, C senser

C12: I didn't understand ... = mental process, negative, C senser
but I ... love ... you ... = mental process, C senser, N affected
I do = material process, C actor

only you won't ever ... believe me. = mental process, negative, N senser,
C affected

C13: I only thought ... = mental process, C senser

I loved Hector ... = mental process, C senser, H affected
 [...]

C14: And I ... thought = mental process, C senser
 I only ... wanted ... your money = mental process, C senser
 but I ... was such ... a fool ... = relational process, C carrier
 I loathe your money ... = mental process, C senser
 I want you ... you ... you. = mental process, C senser, N affected

[...]

Considering the above extract of dialogue from the point of view of transitivity choices made in it, one area of interest appear to be the processes where one character's action affects the other character. These were discussed also in relation to the previous example on transitivity choices, where such processes were shown to be a gender-specific feature of interaction of the male character. Further, in the case of the previous example it seemed that the female character's action affecting the male character was a situation-specific choice of transitivity. In this case, as well, the processes of the male character affecting the female seem to be a gender-specific feature. This comes out especially when one considers Norman's material process affecting Carlotta in C11 ("Take care of me, Norman"). Here Carlotta's expression creates an image of Norman in a comforting, reliable role where he is being drawn on by her. Thus, the process expressing Norman 'taking care of' Carlotta can be basically considered as being brought about by the characteristics of the male and female gender roles: the male is expected to be strong and the female weak.

Considering the processes where Carlotta's action affects Norman, there, too, seem to be similarities to what was found in the previous example about her use of transitivity. As was already stated, the female character's processes affecting the male were considered to be situation-specific. In the light of the present example, this seems to hold. This is because Carlotta has nowhere previously demonstrated to have such processes as here which would involve her feelings for Norman in such an intensive manner. Thus, it seems that in this situation she is more or less forced to express her mental states of loving and wanting Norman, as shows in C12 (" but I ... love ... you ...") and C14 ("I want you ... you ... you"). It is very likely that such expressions by Carlotta are needed in this contextual setting so that the relationship could be restored.

Another matter to consider in the present example is the amount of the instances where Carlotta is in the role of senser. As was argued in relation to the previous example, one might expect the female character be more prone to exhibit processes where she feels, thinks or the like in the context of rebuilding the relationship as way to sort things out. Such feature of transitivity would in this sense derive from the female character's utterances conforming to gender expectations; that is, it would be gender-specific. In the

previous example Carlotta did not exhibit so much processes of thinking, feeling or the like but more of processes with a evaluative function on Norman's action. What seems to be the case considering this example is that here Carlotta's processes do exhibit her telling about the way she feels ("I love you", "I loathe your money"), thinks ("I only thought ..."), comprehends ("I didn't understand") and what she desires ("I want you ... you ... you"). Thus, the large amount of such mental processes of Carlotta can be explained by them being an example of a gender-specific feature of transitivity in the above context.

All in all, it seems that considering the transitivity choices the characters make in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship', there are gender-specific features, situation-specific features and features which have been brought about by the interplay of gender and context. Gender-specific features of transitivity can be detected in Norman's speech, and, more specifically, in the way the processes where he is the actor and Carlotta the affected party arise from the gender role he has as the male character. This was considered to be the case because Norman's ability to affect Carlotta in such an intensive manner as was demonstrated in the first example probably evolves from his position of power as male. Also in the second example Norman's processes affecting Carlotta could be considered a gender-specific feature for the same reasons as stated above. Further, Norman's evaluative use of transitivity when he is reciting Carlotta's action in the first example was considered a gender-specific feature also because it evolves and is indicative of Norman's superior position as the male character.

What is interesting that there are no such features of transitivity evolving purely from gender in Carlotta's speech. However, such features of transitivity which evolve from gender as it interacts with the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship' can be detected in her speech. More specifically, Carlotta's processes in the first example which have an evaluative function seem to be a feature of interaction which evolves from gender in that situation. This was considered to be possibly gender-specific in that particular contextual setting because it might be indicative of Carlotta's position or role changing to a stronger direction. Another feature which exhibits the interplay of context and gender in Carlotta's speech is the large of amount of mental processes she has in the second example: these are indicative of typically female way to solve also love worries by telling of one's feelings, thoughts and the like.

Features of transitivity which can be seen as situation- (context-)specific were found only in Carlotta's speech. Among such features were considered to be, in the first example, the process where she is the actor and whereby her action affects Norman. Rather than, for example, being indicative of her gender role changing into a stronger direction, the process appeared to be, in that situation of her needing to affirm Norman of

something, brought about by the requirements of the setting. Similarly situation- or context-specific were the features of her processes affecting Norman in the second example, were they could be seen as also evolving from the setting of her needing to ensure Norman of her love and the requirements that this task brought about.

5.4.3 Turn-taking and Interactional Management

The last features of interaction to be considered in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship' involve those of turn-taking and interactional management. In what follows these will be analysed, firstly, as to the possible gender-specific characteristics of turn quantity and length. After this the features of interactional management, such as extended turns and side-sequences of meaning negotiation will be considered as to what they reveal about gender-specificness of interaction in this context. In the light of what has been said above in 5.5.1 and 5.5.2 about Carlotta's gender role changing whereas Norman's gendered representation stays relatively constant, it is interesting to see whether these features will be detectable in the structure and the structuring choices of the dialogues as well.

5.4.3.1 Turn quantity and length

In the dialogues taking place in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship', the quantity of turns between the characters is nearly the same. Carlotta has altogether forty turns, and Norman's total amount of turns is thirty-five. Judging by this information, neither character appears more important or dominating in that they would have more turns than the other. There are more notable differences considering the amount of speech the characters produce in the dialogues. Carlotta's total amount of speech is 485 words whereas that of Norman reaches 803 words. Such a difference in the amount of speech produced indicates that Norman is the more central and important character because he has more room to express himself in the dialogues. Norman's considerably larger amount of speech also contributes to an image of him as the controlling character in the interaction. This image comes even clearer especially in the two dialogues which show Norman speaking half as much as Carlotta. In one instance Carlotta's amount of speech is ninety, and that of Norman is 196. Further, another dialogue shows Carlotta uttering 181 words against Norman's 402 words which, judging by the amount of words, makes Norman's control quite obvious. In this sense the features of turn length which Carlotta

and Norman exhibit seem to conform what can be considered to be gender-specific in interaction: the dialogues are largely controlled by an active male character which is very likely to be an indication of his position of power as male. Furthermore, the fact that there are production errors, namely hesitations, in thirteen of Carlotta's fourteen turns during one dialogue speaks for Norman's more steady role of male self-confidence.

Thus, here when the relationship needs to be re-established it turns out that Norman is the more active character, although the contextual features of the dialogues could lead one to expect the reverse: sorting out relationships tends to be more feminine business. Then again, contextual features might help to explain Norman's more powerful role because a situation where the relationship is negotiated is a perfect place to exercise one's power over the other character; Norman's wordiness could be a reflection of this. Also what Maybin (in Maybin and Mercer, 1996: 19) says about men being usually the more active party in mixed sex conversations could explain Norman's wordiness. Nevertheless, one could also argue that Norman does not, in fact, gain his position of power by himself in the conversation: it might be that the feminine strategy here is to let him speak more so that he would feel himself important and the relationship could be successfully restored.

In this case it could thus be argued on the one hand that Norman's wordiness is a gender-specific construct of interactive management which helps him to assert his position in a context where women tend to be in the lead. On the other hand it could be claimed that Carlotta deliberately reduces her amount of speech in order to give Norman more space to express himself and thus an opportunity to enhance his position. Such a strategy of withdrawal could also be seen as a gender-specific construct of Carlotta since there are no situations in the dialogues where Norman could be said to do the same: he does not at any point reduce the amount of his speech from what it has been whereas Carlotta has up till now been the more wordy character. In this case the context would, of course, have a decisive role in the gender-specificness of this particular feature of Carlotta.

5.4.3.2 Extended turns

Next the focus of study will be on the cases where the characters make some specific sequencing choices, such as the appearance of extended turns, which might function as a means of interactional management. The first example illustrating such a feature of interaction presents Carlotta holding the floor for several turns (Cartland, 1976:205-206). The turns are presented as arranged by the author of the original text.

[...]

N7: My dear, that is not true.

C10: It is true! It is true. She loved me. She was the only person. I have been so miserable ... so un ... happy. Oh, Norman, why do you hate me?

C11: Take care of me, Norman. I can't bear it.

C12: I didn't ... understand ... but I ... love ... you ... I do ... only you won't ever ... believe ... me.

C13: I only thought ... I loved Hector ... because he didn't want me.

C14: And I ... thought I only ... wanted your money but I ... was such ... a fool ... I loathe your money ... I want you ... you ... you.

[...]

Previously such extended turn sequences have been considered examples of a character telling a conversational story. This seems to be the case here as well, although in this piece of dialogue, there are certain characteristics different from those appearing in the previous cases of conversational narration. Such features different to those examined before can be found in C10 and C11. In C10 there is Carlotta's question "Oh, Norman, why do you hate me?" which implies her addressing Norman with her question. In this sense the following turn should be Norman's answer because questions and answers tend to form adjacency pairs Q-A. Carlotta's question can, in this sense, be seen as a feature indicating a transition point of turns; this transition does not, nevertheless, take place but Carlotta continues herself. Thus, Carlotta's question in C10 must be considered rhetorical, in which case it does not necessitate an answer. In other words, answering that question is not even expected in which sense it does not form the question part of a Q-A adjacency pair. Similarly, the request Carlotta makes in C11 ("Take care of me, Norman") can be understood as a rhetorical means of conversation which does not necessitate or even expect verbal responding from the other character. Considered from such a point of view, the above extended turn sequence of Carlotta is, after all, an instance of conversational storytelling. In this sense, it does not demonstrate interactional control but is a normal pattern of exchange sequences which often takes place in conversations. Thus, there is nothing gender- or context-specific in this feature, as it has been demonstrated to appear in the speech of both of the characters and in other contexts as well.

The following example (Cartland, 1976:191-192) demonstrates further the above argument of there being nothing gender- or context-specific in conversational stories. This is because the example to follow presents Norman in a similar activity of conversational storytelling than Carlotta above. However, it must be admitted that the following piece of dialogue takes place in a situation where the characters are not engaged in a very emotional discussion, trying to work out their problems. The dialogue takes place in a setting where the characters are quite civil with each other but the subject

still reveals the ongoing need for reconciliation: the issue is Norman's adopting a local boy because he does not think Carlotta and he are ever having children of their own.

C1: Did you see Dr. Matthews today? What did he say about Billy?

N1: I have decided to adopt the child. He will have to have a governess here in the house until he is old enough to go to school. He's a fine little boy and I believe that with a decent education and a chance in life, he might develop into a worthwhile man. Anyhow, there's always work for him in the factory.

N2: I shall settle a small amount of money for him to start with, and may increase it further in the years to come.

[...]

The above piece of dialogue features essentially an extended answer to Carlotta's question in C1. This does not, however, mean that the exchange sequence would not function as a story in the above situation because it supplies Carlotta with an answer. Norman answering Carlotta just takes place in the form of a conversational narration. Thus, the above piece of dialogue does indicate that telling stories is a gender-and context-neutral feature of interaction, as already explained above. In the light of the above discussion, it can also be concluded that extended turns functioning as conversational stories are not indicative of interactional management in the meaning of control from the part of either character.

5.4.3.3 Side-sequences of meaning negotiation

In what follows, the interaction of Carlotta and Norman is considered from the point of view of side-sequencing for the purposes of meaning negotiation. The examples illustrating side-sequences in this contextual setting will be studied as to how successful the meaning negotiation is, who initiates it and how the side-sequence is structured. These all can be informative of, for example, gender-based control of the conversation on the basis of power relations. The first example to be investigated (Cartland, 1976:103-104) takes place in a situation where the characters are trying to reinstate friendly terms after a situation which was essentially disruptive in terms of their relationship. This means that the dialogue at hand does not take place after the one instance of disagreement/falling out (context 5.4) which was considered the only instance of dialogue fully exhibiting an emotional setting of disagreement. The present example aims at the solving of a less radical disruption, which was essentially due to partial inability of the characters to agree on a certain matter. Thus, although the situation which caused the present dialogue was not characteristically a total disagreement as in the situation of falling out, there was some disruption taking place, and in this sense the dialogue below

exemplifies re-establishing of friendly terms. Next the dialogue where the characters are trying to show renewed intimacy by the disclosure of delicate information.

[...]

N16: I had a very difficult interview with my stepdaughter and I am afraid that I lost my temper. It isn't a thing I often do, especially with Skye.

C15: *What has she done to annoy you?*

N17: *I don't know whether I ought to tell you, but I know that you will respect my confidence. Perhaps one day we shall have no secrets from each other.*

C16: *Tell me. You know I'd never say a word to anyone.*

N18: Well, Skye has fallen in love and unfortunately she has chosen for the object of her affections the son of her grandfather's keeper.

[...]

The point which seems to cause the need for negotiation in the above extract of dialogue is whether or not Carlotta can be trusted with some personal information. In other words, the negotiation is about ensuring that both parties understand the delicate nature of matters involved and that there is, in this sense, mutual will to co-operate in the conversation. This is the point of view in which the side-sequence at hand concerns negotiation of meaning: it is about making sure that both characters share the same view of matters.

In the above example, the negotiation of meaning is triggered by Carlotta's question C15 about the action of Norman's step-daughter. The negotiation is initiated by Norman in N17 where he ponders whether or not he should give Carlotta the information she has asked for in C15. Although structurally different, Norman's statement in N17 can be considered as having the same function as a counter-question usually has in meaning negotiation. Namely, the structure of side-sequences of meaning negotiation usually follow the pattern of Q1-Q2 (counter-question) -A2 (answer to question 2) -A1 (answer to question 1). Thus, there is Q1 made by Carlotta in C15. Norman's turn in N17 functions as Q2. This function of N17 as the second question is affirmed by what Carlotta says in C16; she replies to Norman as if he had asked her directly 'Can I trust you on this?'. Carlotta's turn in C16 then constitutes for A2 and Norman's turn in N18 finally answers what Carlotta asked in C15; that is, N18 constitutes for A1. In sum, this discussion on the structuring of the above side-sequence shows that in this case, the negotiation of meaning essentially follows the usual pattern, albeit that there is one exception to the form in N17. The functional qualities of all the turns constituting for the side-sequence are, nevertheless, the same as usually found in side-sequences of meaning negotiation. The present example of meaning negotiation seems to follow the usual pattern also in the sense that it has a successful outcome; something (a mutual understanding) has been achieved with it. Comparing this to the meaning negotiation taking place in the context of 'Disagreement' where side-sequencing was somewhat

chaotic and unsuccessful, the present example shows much more structural consistency as well as presents the characters as working for a mutual goal, or, co-operating.

What comes to interactional management taking place in side-sequencing, it seems that in this case there is evidence of conversational control being undertaken by the negotiation of meaning. This comes out, firstly, in the issue which is being negotiated; that is, whether or not Norman can trust Carlotta. In N17 Norman is presented as holding a position where he can judge Carlotta. This speaks for his position of power in the dialogue: were Norman not in a position superior to Carlotta, he would probably not need to or he could not estimate Carlotta's character before revealing the asked information. Further, Norman's pondering on whether or not to tell Carlotta the required information is in itself an act of interactional control because it indicates that it is up to him to tell or to refuse to tell what she wants to know. Also the fact that Norman initiates the side-sequence, that is, makes a specific sequencing choice, enhances the image of his control.

As was stated earlier, such a position of control could be brought about by Norman being more powerful or important character than Carlotta on the basis of certain gender differences (social position, class, age, experience: status and power) which typically favour heroes. Then again, it could be that the contextual setting of the dialogue is such as to position Norman in a role of interactional control. This is because the dialogue takes place in a situation where the couple has had a disagreement earlier and the characters are now reinstating friendly terms. Further, Carlotta has been the party to cause the disagreement which, in the present example, might have an effect on Norman's stronger position and enable him, for example, to judge Carlotta. Also the way in which Carlotta in C16 shows willingness to co-operate in the side-sequence is a factor which supports the view of the above contextual explanation. Then again, Carlotta's urging Norman to reveal the information in C16 could be brought about by sheer curiosity. Nevertheless, the dialogue taking place in a setting with an evident asymmetry of power due to previous situations seems to rule out this possibility. Thus it appears that the side-sequence of meaning negotiation is, in the present case, demonstrative of Norman's position of power and control which are intrinsically male characteristics. In this sense the above side-sequence can be considered a feature of interaction specific to the male gender.

To get a better view on the present issue, in what follows another piece of dialogue constituting for negotiation of meaning will be investigated. This side-sequence takes place in a situation where Norman has said something indicative of the tension between the two. This triggers Carlotta to try and talk the matter through with Norman. Again, the side-sequence will be studied as to its initiator, structure and outcome which can all be

indicative of the use or purpose of the side-sequence as a means of interactional management.

[...]

N3: I am fond of children and as it seems unlikely that I shall have any of my own, I shall have Billy to take their place.

C3: *Norman, must you go on like this ... this for ... ever?*

N4: *Go on like what?*

C4: *Can't you forgive me? Won't you ever forget what happened the night we were married?*

N5: How nice of you to ask for my forgiveness. Of course it is yours, if you want it, but I assure you there is nothing to forgive. I like hearing the truth; I prefer it to hypocrisy at any time.

[...]

The above example of side-sequencing in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship' is triggered by Norman's turn N3 where he expresses his disbelief of ever having children with Carlotta. This statement of Norman makes Carlotta ask her question in C3 about Norman keeping up his distant and cold stance towards Carlotta. Her question in C3 thus is the point whereby the negotiation of meaning is initiated. This is because the following turn by Norman (N4) shows that he has not understood what Carlotta asks in C3 but needs to have further clarification on the issue. This is provided by Carlotta in C4 where she elaborates on her first question and makes it more specific. After this Norman understands her point and is able to give her an answer on the matter. Thus, considering the functional qualities of the turns in the present side-sequence, they seem to conform to the usual pattern. This is because, as often is the case, here as well the negotiation of meaning is first triggered and then initiated. After this there is a sufficient clarification to the initiation which enables the final response to the issue which triggered the meaning negotiation.

Considering the above example of meaning negotiation from a strictly structural point of view, it does not, nevertheless, fully conform to the usual pattern of Q1-Q2-A2-A1. In this case, the structure of the side-sequence appears to be Q1-Q2-Q3-A1 which seems somewhat atypical. There are three questions in a row and only the first of them is answered; such a structure hardly seems fruitful in terms of the negotiation of meaning. However, it seems that, at least in this case, structure is not so decisive a feature of meaning negotiation as to alone be indicative of the suitability of a side-sequence as an example of meaning negotiation. This is because, as discussed above, the functional qualities of the turns fit the pattern of meaning negotiation and are constitutive of a successful side-sequence. Thus, what is seemingly constitutive of a structural misfit (Q3) in Carlotta's turn C4 fits the pattern when considered from a functional point of view. The questions made by Carlotta in C4 are, in fact, answers to Norman's question in N4

because they clarify and elaborate on the issue Norman wanted to know. In this sense, Q3 can be considered to be, in fact, A2 which conforms to the usual pattern of meaning negotiation.

What comes to interactional management in the sense of conversational control in the above side-sequence, it could be that Carlotta is here making some specific sequencing choices or specific choices concerning the topic. This is because Carlotta's turn in C3 shows her introducing a new topic to the conversation which in itself constitutes for action aimed at interactional management. In this sense Carlotta appears in a controlling role vis-à-vis Norman which might also be indicative of a change in her gender role: she could be, in this situation, acquiring more power. Such a feature of interaction would then be indicative of her gender affecting the interaction; conversational control achieved through topic introduction could be a gender-specific feature of interaction appearing in the above situation. Then again, this new topic needs to be negotiated with Norman, as shows by the emergence of the side-sequence, in order to be accepted by him. This feature is indicative of Norman controlling the situation by wanting to negotiate the topic before giving information on it. On the other hand, it seems more likely that in the above situation, the negotiation of meaning is not a means of conversational or topic control for Norman. It is more likely that he genuinely does not understand what Carlotta wants to know and thus needs to initiate meaning negotiation. In this sense the above side-sequence cannot be considered gender-specific because it could essentially appear in the speech of either character as a case of non-understanding; further, in Norman's case the side-sequence, evolving from non-understanding, is not indicative of his typical gender characteristics as male. Thus, of the two, Carlotta is more likely to be controlling the conversation, as explained above.

Then again, considering the setting of the side-sequence, the notion of Carlotta's controlling position thanks to her gender role changing appears in a different light. This is because there is an ongoing discrepancy in the relationship of Carlotta and Norman which needs to be mended. The distant terms the characters are in come out in Norman's turn N3: this turn of Norman forces Carlotta, as responsible for their problems, to try and communicate with Norman on the issue so that they could sort out their disagreement. Thus, instead of demonstrating interactional management by her topic switch in C3, Carlotta is rather interacting in a way necessitated by previous and present characteristics of their relationship. In this sense it is rather context than gender which has an effect on Carlotta appearing in a controlling role; this particular feature of interaction can thus be considered context- or situation-specific.

All in all, considering the discussion on side-sequences taking place in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship' as a whole, it seems that Norman is the character who on

the basis of gender characteristics can achieve conversational control by side-sequences of meaning negotiation. This was demonstrated to take place in the first example of side-sequencing where the issue being negotiated, and Norman's appearing in a stronger position thanks to the nature of the issue (judging Carlotta's ability not to gossip on his affairs) clearly evolved from expectations of male superiority. In the case of the first example there were, of course, contextual features which probably had an effect on Norman's controlling position. The most prominent of these was probably the fact that the couple had previously fallen out because of Carlotta, which might weaken her position and strengthen Norman's role in situations to come, including the one above. Then again, the asymmetry of power favouring the male character can be seen as indicative of his male superiority which works to enhance the notion of male conversational control being a gender-specific feature of interaction.

Similarly, the asymmetry of power brought about by an earlier conflict situation can, in the second example, be considered a fact which speaks against female conversational control. Thus, although Carlotta could in one sense be seen as controlling the conversation with the help of the topic switch and the subsequent side-sequence in a gender-specific way, this conversational control was more likely to evolve from other factors. It was concluded that in the second example, Carlotta's seemingly controlling role was, in fact, brought about by the situation and the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship'. This was because her being responsible for the earlier conflict, the interactional feature of topic control could be seen as resulting from her responsibility in the sense that she needs to try and sort the problems out and show effort in the process of reconciliation. Thus, Carlotta's case of interactional management does not evolve from her gender characteristics but rather from the requirements of the situation. In this sense, the interactional management taking place in Carlotta's topic switch cannot be seen as an example of conversational control due to her gender because it is essentially brought about by the situation at hand. Further, Carlotta's topic switch, at least what she means by it, is not automatically accepted by Norman but needs to be negotiated in the side-sequence which also indicates that although managing the interaction, Carlotta is not necessarily controlling it.

5.4.4 Gender-specificity in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship'

What comes to gender-specificity of the male and female characters' interaction in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship', it appears that some interactional features are, indeed, generated by the gender characteristics of the characters and/or are demonstrative

of it. Then again, there are also such features of interaction which are brought about by the situation or the context of the dialogue: these features are then considered to be, more or less, context-specific. Further, the third type of interactional features to be found in the dialogues of the present context are the features which evolve from the interplay of the gender of the character and the context of the speech situation: these features can be termed gender-specific features of interaction in a certain context.

Let us first summarise those features of interaction which were considered to be gender-specific in the dialogues. What comes to wordings, it appears that the word choices Norman makes and the subsequent image they create of him conform to the typical presentation of the male hero as presented in the section 3.2.2.2. With the help of certain wordings, Norman was presented as holding a stronger position in the relationship of the characters with references to him having money and power to make things happen. He was thus presented in a role where he was able to control Carlotta who was dependent on him financially. Norman was also presented more rational and in control of himself and his feelings in comparison to Carlotta who was more emotional. Further, Norman was generally staying distant and his stance towards Carlotta appeared somewhat reluctant at times. All of these characteristics indicate that Norman is in a stronger position than Carlotta, able to outweigh her, be it wealth and status or self-discipline and manners. Such a presentation of male supremacy can be seen as largely deriving from the characteristics expected of a male hero, such as good social position, status, experience and rationality. Thus, Norman's presentation in the wordings can be seen as conforming to gender expectations which enables one to conclude that Norman's wordings are a gender-specific feature of interaction.

The same feature of Norman holding a stronger position in the relationship is apparent also in the transitivity choices he makes. The transitivity choices Norman made in the dialogues of the present context indicated, first of all, action from his part which affected Carlotta, and secondly, action which affected Carlotta in an intense manner, such as assuring her of something (*making her* being certain of something). As the above presentation of him holding the position where Carlotta is dependant on him, such feature of transitivity indicating Norman's ability to affect Carlotta in a profound manner speak for Norman's position of power and control. Since this position of power seems to be accorded to him because of his characteristics as male, also the above affective feature of transitivity can be considered as indicating male gender in the couple's interaction. Similarly specific to Norman and also the male gender is his evaluative use of transitivity. He clearly presents himself in a role which indicates him being the better judge of affairs or holding a position where he can evaluate Carlotta. An example of such

use of transitivity can be found in Norman's utterance "How nice of you to ask for my forgiveness" which indicates his scorn towards Carlotta.

An evaluative feature similar to that above could be found also in one of the side-sequences of meaning negotiation where Norman again used the process of meaning negotiation to indicate his controlling position. This was because the negotiation of meaning concentrated on making sure whether Carlotta can be trusted with some personal information; whether she is worthy to hear something like that. This evaluation took place by Norman from his point of view, thus again, the male character was demonstrating his stronger position in the relationship by his evaluation being somehow the norm in the interaction.

Further, in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship', it seems that Norman, for the first time, exceeds Carlotta's amount of speech and utters clearly a larger total amount of words than she does. This contributes to an overall image of him as interactionally demonstrating the typical features of the male hero of popular romantic fiction and as conforming to the stereotypical representation of the male character. When one compares such a gendered representation of Norman to the features of interaction Carlotta has demonstrated, one finds more variation on her part. What is most noteworthy in her case is the fact that in the present context, there are no features of interaction which could be considered as evolving from gender. Instead of this, her interactional features seem to evolve either from the conversational situation or the interplay of the situation/context and gender. As Norman's gender-specific features of interaction contributed to a gendered image of him, it might be expected that Carlotta's features of interaction would indicate a more unconventional role of a heroine.

Considering the dialogues, there seem to be such features in her interaction which are indicative of her gender role possibly changing in this particular context because of the characteristics of the situation affecting her gender. In other words, due to the interplay of the situation and Carlotta's characteristics, there are instances where she comes out in an unexpected way considering the typical presentation of the female heroine. One of these is her position becoming stronger in the relationship which shows in her evaluative use of transitivity. As pointed out above, the ability and position to judge the other person can be seen as involving power which is typically a male characteristic. In this sense also Carlotta being able to evaluate Norman indicates that she must have some status and power; without these it would be difficult for her to, for example, use such transitivity choices which evaluate, from her point of view, the other person's action. Another feature which is possibly indicative of Carlotta's gender role changing due to the situation can be found in the word choices she makes. Some of Carlotta's wordings indicate her adopting a persisting and resisting stance vis-à-vis Norman in a situation where one could expect

submissiveness from her. To clarify, Carlotta is presented as persisting on communicating with Norman in a situation where he has indicated his unwillingness to do so because of Carlotta's previous bad behaviour towards him. Through her perseverance she is able to get the conversation going which gives an image of her as having a leading role in the interaction. Further, she is presented as resisting to Norman's attempt at trying to downgrade her by expressing her reproach at Norman's insinuations. This feature enhances the image of her as having a stronger position in the interaction and the relationship as might be expected of a female heroine of popular romantic fiction. Then again, on the basis of one of the side-sequences of meaning negotiation, Carlotta's conversational control could also be considered a situation-specific feature of interaction. There Carlotta's introduction of a new topic, which serves to trigger the negotiation of meaning, was seen rather a feature of interaction necessitated by the situation and not indicative of her gender role or a change in it. In this sense Carlotta demonstrating conversational control and a leading position does not necessarily evolve from gender but can be brought about by the situation/context, and be considered a feature typical of that speech situation.

Then again, there are also such interactional features brought about by the situation/context or the situation/context and gender together which indicate Carlotta conforming to the typical role of a female character in romantic fiction. The most notable of these is the way in which her word choices present her as insecure, emotional, irrational and finally admitting her foolishness as a sign of her submitting to a position of an obedient, orderly, moral, essentially weak female. Her presentation as such is probably brought about by her gender characteristics changing because of the particular situation: she needs to submit to win Norman back. Considered from the point of view of transitivity, there seems to be more evidence of Carlotta occupying a typically female role. This is because of the large number of mental processes expressing the way she feels, what she thinks, how she comprehends and what she desires. These are representative of the mental process type which is probably more likely to appear in the speech of the female character: women are expected to talk of their feelings, what they think and the like. It seems that this feature of transitivity is also brought about by the interplay of the situation/context and Carlotta's gender role. A similar feature of interaction on which both gender expectations and the context have an effect is the diminishing of Carlotta's amount of words; it might very well be that she speaks less as a sign of her conforming to the traditional gender role of a heroine.

All in all, as was pointed out above, it seems that in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship', Carlotta needs to come out in a way conforming to the expectations of female gender so that the relationship can be re-established. Thus, the altering of

Carlotta's gender role followed by a change in the way she is presented could actually denote Carlotta being manipulative and deliberately giving a certain image of herself. Nevertheless, it seems more likely that the change in her gender characteristics to the direction of a typical female character is genuine: in the end she needs to become the typical heroine so that she and the hero can be reunited.

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

To give a more coherent picture of what the different features of interaction demonstrated to appear in the dialogues actually denote, they will be summarised in what follows. The summing up will concentrate on the features of interaction from the point of view of what they indicate of the interactional styles of the characters. This way the individual, situational/contextual and/or gender-specific make-up of the characters' interactional styles can be demonstrated and their respective styles can be compared to each other. The features of interaction emerging from the analysis of extended turn sequences will be left out from the conclusion. This is done because extended turn sequences functioning as conversational stories were in 5.1.3 and 5.2.3 demonstrated not to exhibit conversational control and thus cannot be considered as instances of a character making specific sequencing choices, which were hoped for to appear in the analysis of interactional management. Such specific sequencing choices of a character would have indicated differences in the interactive styles of the characters, which could have been further considered from the point of view of their possible gender- and/or context/situation-specificity. Now that conversational stories have been demonstrated to be features of interaction which do not give information on the differences of the interactional styles of the characters and the causes of these differences, they are considered best to be left out of the following discussion on the part of contexts of 'Meeting and Dating' and 'Deepening the Relationship' where extended turns appeared in the analysis.

In the context of 'Meeting and Dating' Norman was presented by the wordings to be a powerful and important character with a high position in society. Norman's transitivity choices demonstrated his activity and control in the sense that Carlotta was frequently affected by his processes. Only features of turn length assigned him to a less important or central role than Carlotta. Nevertheless, most of Norman's interactional features point to a self-confident interactional style indicative of social prominence. Such a style can be seen as deriving from his gender characteristics as the male hero of the novel (such as wealth, age, experience, social position, status and power) and in this sense Norman's style to interact is gender-specific.

Carlotta, in turn, was presented as occupying, on the one hand, a role of less social esteem and being a less important character. This was essentially brought about by her presentation as a lazy, fun-loving, self-indulgent actress which in the context of 1930s can be interpreted as referring to an immoral woman. Then again, Carlotta was, at times, presented as straightforward and taking the lead which made her appear more controlling than Norman. This could be seen as deriving from her role as a somewhat unconventional heroine in the sense that being an actress interested in comfortable living, Carlotta might see her opportunity in Norman and bring herself forward in order to keep his interest. Carlotta's relative talkativeness demonstrated by her larger amount of speech uttered also speaks for a somewhat controlling and active image of her which might not be expected in the context where the characters are getting to know each other. It might be more appropriate for the man to take the lead and the woman to be more subtle, at least in the 1930s this probably was expected. Carlotta's interactional style is thus indicative of her occupation and life-style affecting the way she interacts in the context of 'Meeting and Dating'. However, comparing Carlotta's position of low status and esteem with her ability to control the conversation, it seems that in the present context, Carlotta is coming out as more important and powerful as she should be. In this sense one might argue that Carlotta's personal characteristics interact with the female gender expectations (submissive, weak and essentially moral) in a manner which contributes to her appearing in an unexpected position as the female character; she gains more power. In this light Carlotta's interactional style could be termed demonstrative of the gender characteristics of the heroine changing in this context, in other words, her interactional style is gender-specific in the context of 'Meeting and Dating'.

The context of 'Deepening the Relationship' was seen as involving situations, such as proposal, which are about traditional gender expectations and often call for traditional gender roles. Such inherent characteristics of the contextual setting were also demonstrated to have an effect on the interaction. What comes to Norman, the features of interaction evolving in the context of 'Deepening the Relationship' pointed to presentation which brought out his importance and high social position in the wordings he used or which were used of him. His prominence in the relationship was especially evident in the way in which Carlotta was presented in a role defined in relation to Norman; she relied on the older and experienced Norman to advise and support her. Norman's stronger position came out also in transitivity choices; he was able to affect Carlotta in an intense manner through his processes which action was not possible for Carlotta vis-à-vis Norman. Thus, Norman's conversational style is, in the present contextual setting, generally indicative of his prominence, strong position in the relationship and chances to control the (inter)action. However, it should be noted that

features of turn-taking (turn length) indicated to a different, less important position for Norman. Nevertheless, most of Norman's features of interaction pointed to his position of power as the male character; thus, his interactional style is essentially gender-specific also in the context of 'Deepening the Relationship'.

What comes to Carlotta, she was considered to be able to manipulate the wordings and the subsequent image of herself into a direction of a more traditionally 'feminine' character in the sense that in the present context, she came out as indecisive, insecure and in need of male attention and support. This is clearly different from the manner in which she was presented in the first context (Meeting and Dating) where she was self-confident and decisive. It might very well be that here again her conversational style is affected by her occupation and characteristics as an actress (immoral woman). This is because Carlotta might be manipulating her image in order to make Norman believe that she is a frail woman in need of protection which would enhance Norman's role of importance, experience and reliability and bolster his male ego. As such, Carlotta's wordings would indicate manipulation and subsequent control of the situation which imply to her strong position in the present context. Carlotta's active role in the sense of control is, nevertheless, not confirmed by transitivity: she was rather the affected party in the processes found in the dialogues. On the other hand this would fit the idea of her *letting* Norman control herself. However, Carlotta's controlling style in the context of 'Deepening the Relationship' was obvious considering her wordiness indicated by her greater total amount of speech uttered. Considering Carlotta's interactional style from the point of view of gender, it seems that her seemingly adopting a more traditional gender role to that previously demonstrated could be brought about by the demands of the context; Carlotta needs to conform to the notion of the typical heroine so that the ideal of romantic love can be fulfilled. In other words, her letting Norman believe she is frail and weak demonstrates a deliberate exploitation of the traditional gender role. Further, even though Carlotta might be only acting out the traditional gender role, the characteristics she presents in her interaction evolve from those gender expectations, which thus makes her style to interact gender-specific. On the other hand, the aspect of manipulative control she gains through her enacting the traditional gender role and her wordiness imply that she is actually gaining power in the present context. As was the case with the previous context, Carlotta's personal characteristics and ways of handling matters interact with the context in a way which contributes to a change in her position as the female character: she seems to hold considerably more power and initiative than the traditional heroine. In this light, this aspect of her interactional style is also gender-specific but demonstrates quite different, atypical gender characteristics compared to those above.

On the basis of the dialogues taking place in the context of 'Disagreement' it appears that Norman continues with the gender-specific interactional style he has been demonstrated to use in the two contexts above. In the wordings, Norman comes out as rational and calm in the situation of dispute; he is in control of himself and knows how to behave in a decent manner. He also gives the image that he is in control of the speech situation and works to the direction of sorting matters out. Further, Norman gives the impression that he is not responsible for the disagreement, but it has been brought about by Carlotta: she alone is to blame for their falling out. This contributes to a more positive image of Norman. Features of interaction indicative of Norman's more controlling interactional style include also the fact that Norman speaks more in the dialogues of the present context. Further, Norman initiates a side-sequence of meaning negotiation which can be interpreted as an act of control in the sense that it involves the making of a specific sequencing choice. On the other hand, in the context of 'Disagreement' Norman exhibits also such wordings which contribute not to his presentation as a powerful figure in control of matters but to the presentation of him as affected by the dispute: he is disillusioned and unhappy because his love for Carlotta has proven one-sided. Norman's interactional style indicates his hurt feelings also from the part of transitivity: Norman has quite a few mental processes which essentially express the actor's mental state of mind and/or mental action, and are often considered to be typical of female characters. Then again, these features of his interactional style do not in themselves exclude his stronger position. The above wordings and transitivity choices are essentially situation-specific exhibiting Norman's mental state in a particular setting. They do not involve him losing his gender characteristics as the male character, nor can they be seen as indicative of his gender role or position of power changing. Still, they should be included to Norman's interactional style as an example of his way to interact in a specific situation.

The features of interaction which Carlotta exhibits in the context of 'Disagreement' speak for her remaining in a relatively strong position vis-à-vis Norman. Carlotta is, by the word choices she makes, presented in a position of resistance vis-à-vis Norman. One might expect the opposite in a situation where Carlotta is to blame for the dispute and for hurting Norman. Carlotta's wordings show her standing up before Norman and not regretting her behaviour which give an image of her as almost equally strong and powerful character as Norman. It is as if in the situation of dispute where Carlotta's true nature is about to reveal, she affirms the image of her as cold and manipulative also through her resistance and lack of remorse. It might also be that she is defending herself by interactionally attacking Norman, as shows in transitivity choices which demonstrated her processes affecting Norman more than vice versa. Also her evasiveness in the situation of meaning negotiation, which can be seen as leading to the disruption of the

side-sequence, could be a form of her resisting Norman by her interactional style. Thus, it seems that the context of 'Disagreement' and the situation in itself affect Carlotta's way to interact and contribute to her appearing strong and powerful. Yet there could be a gender-specific side to this matter, as has been demonstrated in the two previous contexts. It seems quite possible that Carlotta is in the situation of dispute demonstrating *her* way to interact as a popular romantic heroine, as she has been demonstrating her way to interact, evolving from her characteristics as the heroine, in previous contexts, and most notably in the context of 'Meeting and Dating'. In this sense Carlotta's interactional style is in the present context, as it was previously, a feature evolving from and indicative of her gender characteristics; it is also gender-specific in the sense that her interactional style is indicative of an alteration in the traditional gender role of a popular romantic heroine.

What comes to the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship', on Norman's part it seems that he further continues with his gender-specific interactional style. As previously, the wordings demonstrate his rationality, wealth, prominence and power: he comes out as a typical romantic hero. His gender-specific way of interacting shows also in transitivity choices: his action affects Carlotta more than vice versa; he also uses transitivity to evaluate her. The side-sequence of meaning negotiation further demonstrates Norman's ability to evaluate Carlotta, and his evaluation is the norm in their interaction.

When contemplating Carlotta's features of interaction in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship', it appears that her style is characterised by interactional features evolving from the interplay of context and gender. On the one hand, there are instances which imply that Carlotta's is holding a position of power and control in the dialogues. Such places of Carlotta's interactional control can be found in wordings (she is presented as persisting and resisting Norman), and in transitivity (she uses processes evaluative of Norman). The more important way in which context and gender are interacting in the present setting is Carlotta's conforming to the typical heroine of romantic fiction. The context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship' reaches its climax in Carlotta's adopting the traditional gender role. Her interactional style changes and she becomes irrational, emotional and dependent of the male. She uses mostly the mental process type typical of female interaction concentrating on thoughts, feelings and the like. It is evident that she needs to submit and has to admit her previous foolishness in order to prove her worthiness as heroine; she becomes thus worthy of Norman's love and shows she has learned an essentially moral lesson. This lesson is a moral judgement which renders her manipulative, controlling, immoral behaviour as disfavoured. It forces her to the role of

a 'pure' woman in a heterosexual relationship which comes out as the only position for women to experience happiness.

All in all, what can be concluded of the interactional styles of the characters' is that Norman's style to interact stays more or less constant throughout the analysis whereas Carlotta's interactional style shows ambivalence. To be more specific, in all of the four contexts, Norman's interaction can be seen as evolving from his gender characteristics and being demonstrative of these characteristics he has as the hero of a popular romantic novel. Further, these gender characteristics stay constant in all of the contexts and thus Norman's gender-specific style of interacting also stays invariable.

This is not the case with Carlotta who appears to shift from one role of a popular romantic heroine to another in different contexts. In the contexts of 'Meeting and Dating' Carlotta's interactional style indicates her holding a position of control and power which has been brought about by her personal characteristics interacting with those of contextual settings. This interplay contributes to *a change in the gender role* of the heroine of a romantic novel: in this sense interactional features demonstrative of this alteration can be called gender-specific. This meaning of the term 'gender-specific' is obviously different from that which it had when used to refer to the gender-specificness of Norman's interaction above. Nevertheless, as both cases of the term's use evolve from gender and are demonstrative of gender characteristics, the use is justified in both instances. However, also Carlotta's interactional style can be termed gender-specific in the same sense as Norman's interactional style was. This is because also Carlotta demonstrates features of interaction evolving from *the typical role* of a popular romantic heroine. Such gender-specific features of her interactional style, demonstrative of the traditional female gender expectations, appear in the contexts of 'Deepening the Relationship' and 'Rebuilding the Relationship'. In the context of 'Deepening of Relationship' her conforming to the traditional gender role was probably brought about by her enacting the role because of the pressure laid on her by the gender expectations inherent to the context of romantic encounters. Nevertheless, Carlotta's interactional style could be seen as evolving from traditional gender expectations of a heroine and being demonstrative of these. Her interactional style, thus, is here gender-specific in the same sense as Norman's interactional style above. A more convincing instance of Carlotta's interaction evolving from the typical female gender role takes place in the context of 'Rebuilding the Relationship' where she embraces the traditional role of a popular romantic heroine.

When comparing the interactional styles of Carlotta and Norman and the gender roles and/or expectations they emerge from, there is some congruence between these and the way in which heroes and heroines of romantic fiction are presented by the 'romantic

formula', as studied by feminist literary critics of popular romantic fiction. The hero is typically a wealthy, sophisticated member of the upper (middle) classes; he is older, wiser and more experienced than the heroine. His status compared to the heroine is considerably higher which together with the above mentioned characteristics assigns him to a position of power in the relationship. This kind of description holds for Norman as well who is a wealthy self-made man, ambitious, socialises with the elite and is older than Carlotta. These characteristics he has as the hero of a romantic novel come evident also in his interactional style.

As for the popular romantic heroine, she is young, attractive, virtuous, often does not have a very elevated background nor much wealth and her social standing is low. Once united with the hero, she usually comes emotionally and financially dependent of him. Such a description of a heroine partly fits the characteristics of Carlotta, partly she exhibits quite different features. Carlotta is young and attractive, is not very rich and as an actress (considering the connotations in the 1930s) does not belong to the brightest elite, thus her status is quite low. Further, her origin as an orphan half Russian denotes low social standing and in the context of 1930s, connotes alienness to the British society and possibly a threat to the social order. Thus, Carlotta is not exactly virtuous; she is rather wanton and immoral. These connotations of an immoral, alien, threatening character could very well result in an interactional style which exhibits her as manipulative and controlling and essentially changing the traditional image of a popular romantic heroine. However, the interactional style which essentially evolves from her conforming to the traditional, virtuous image of a heroine cancels the above connotations and establishes her in the social order as well as in the traditional value system of a romantic novel; Carlotta thus ceases to be a threatening alien.

Faced with such images of the hero and heroine, one cannot help but wonder whether the writer has not deliberately created such representations as demonstrated above. This is because firstly, such a presentation of especially the heroine creates tension which serves to hold the interest of the reader: she is faced with a discrepancy between Carlotta's character and that of a typical heroine. This tension forces her to read the novel through because it is not resolved until in the end of the story. Secondly, such a discrepancy and especially the solving of it in a traditional way probably give pleasure to the reader in that the tension becomes successfully solved; the reader of formulaic fiction gets satisfaction when her expectations are met. Thirdly, the moral lesson implicit in Carlotta's conversion to a virtuous, orderly heroine probably corresponds to Cartland's ideas of love and relationships in that it brings forth the transformation of material love into something near divine.

All in all, one can conclude that the interactional styles of the characters', based on the analysis of the three different aspects of interactions, bear generally resemblance to the male/female gender roles/expectations found in popular romantic literature, and in this sense, these different interactional styles of the female and male characters' can be termed gender-specific. As the analysis showed, there are also such features of interaction which cannot be said to demonstrate anything about male/female interactional differences, such as extended turns functioning as conversational stories. Further, there are such features of interaction which evolve from contextual aspects, such as the situation, the character's occupation or the like. Thus, it must be remembered that not all features of interaction in the present study were gender-specific. However, the amount and prominence of the features of interaction evolving purely from gender roles/expectations, or the interplay of gender and context which in their emergence were demonstrative of gender, were such as to enable one to conclude the existence of gender-specific styles of male/female interaction.

In the light of what was said above, the present study is successful because it demonstrates the existence of certain gender-specific features of interaction and enables one to delineate certain gender-specific interactional styles for the male and female characters. Further, the study shows an interesting feature in the interactional styles of the characters. This is the fact that the hero's style to interact derives from his traditional gender role, whereas the interactional style of the heroine has more to do with individual and contextual factors affecting her gender role, albeit that she also interacts in a manner deriving from the typical gender expectations. In this sense the present study shows that adopting a discourse analytic point of view for the study of the dialogues and the interaction taking place in them is sensible and yields valuable information on the issue of possible gender-specificness of interactional features. The study at hand also demonstrates that the "foregrounding of gender" argued in feminist stylistics to appear in certain textual places applies also to the language of dialogues and is present in certain features of interaction. Further, considered from the point of view of feminist literary study of popular romantic fiction, the findings of the present study indicate that 'the romantic formula' of romantic novels functions also in the present case. This is most notable in the way the hero's interactional style conforms to the traditional image of the male character. The female character seemed, in certain contexts, to appear in a quite an atypical way in comparison to that of the traditional heroine but she, too, had to convert in the end to meet the typical gender expectations so that the value system of romantic fiction could be reinstated.

In the sense that the findings of the present study clarify the construction and functioning of gender expectations in popular romantic fiction, they could be useful, for

example, in a study of gender and reading, or, the ways in which the gender of the reader as well as the genderdness of the text predispose certain readings. With this is meant that the features of interaction could be part of the consideration, firstly, of the gender expectations the text includes and secondly, of the consideration of how readers construct the possible genderdness of a text from their own gender positions. Especially the following viewpoint could be useful in this, bearing in mind that through the features of interaction, a character can be made to conform to a certain gender role or made to break the mould of gender expectations, as was demonstrated above in the case of Carlotta. This could be a useful point of view in the study of construction of gender in texts and by readers of texts.

Another interest of study where the present findings could be of use is the point of view of how the author possibly deliberately creates certain presentations of characters and certain gender roles for the characters. Considering this viewpoint in relation to the present study, the strategies of character presentation of the author could be determined by examining a greater amount of Barbara Cartland's romantic novels and thereby trying to find out possible similarities in her ways to create certain images of characters. To get a fuller view of the strategies of character presentation in popular romantic literature it might also be useful to compare to each other novels and the presentation of characters they include by different writers of romantic fiction.

THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary source:

Cartland, Barbara 1976. *Broken Barriers*. London: Arrow Books Ltd.

Secondary sources:

BarbaraCartland.com Ltd. "BarbaraCartland.com – the official web site of Barbara Cartland." Online. Internet. 11 Oct. 2000. Available HTTP: www.bluemelon.co.uk/bc/

Barr Snitow, Ann 1986. Mass Market Romance: Pornography for Women is Different, in Eagleton (ed.) 1986, 134-140.

Barr Snitow, Ann 1997. Mass Market Romance: Pornography for Women is Different, in Eagleton (ed.) 1997, 192-198.

Bowlby, Rachel 1996. Flight Reservations: The Anglo-American/French Divide in Feminist Criticism, in Eagleton (ed.) 1997, 271-274.

Brunt, Rosalind 1984. The Romantic World of Barbara Cartland, in Christopher Pawling (ed.), *Popular Fiction and Social Change*, London: MacMillan Press, 127- 156.

"Cartland, Dame Barbara." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Online. Internet. 11 Oct. 2000. Available HTTP: www.britannica.com

"Cartland, Dame (Mary) Barbara Hamilton." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Online. Internet. 11 Oct. 2000. Available HTTP: www.britannica.com

Cranny-Francis, Anne 1990. *Feminist Fiction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Eagleton, Mary 1991. *Feminist Literary Criticism*. London: Longman.

Eagleton, Mary (ed.) 1986. *Feminist Literary Theory: A Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Eagleton, Mary (ed.) 1997. *Feminist Literary Theory: A Reader*. Repr. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Fowler, Bridget 1991. *The Alienated Reader: Women and Popular Romantic Literature in the Twentieth Century*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Gee, James Paul 1999. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Humm, Maggie (ed.) 1994. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Feminist Literary Criticism*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Herman, Vimala 1995. *Dramatic Discourse: Dialogue as Interaction in Plays*. London: Routledge.
- Irigaray, Luce 1997. The Powers of Discourse and the Subordination of the Feminine, in Eagleton (ed.) 1997, 316-320.
- Jacobus, Mary 1997. Reading Woman: Essays in Feminist Criticism, in Eagleton (ed.) 1997, 299-301.
- Jardine, Alice A. 1997. Gynesis: Configurations of Woman and Modernity, in Eagleton (ed.) 1997, 260-262.
- Kolodny, Annette 1997. Dancing through the Minefield: Some Observations on the Theory, Practice and Politics of a Feminist Literary Criticism, in Eagleton (ed.) 1997, 250-254.
- Light, Alison 1990. "Returning to Manderley" – Romance Fiction, Female Sexuality and Class, in Terry Lovell (ed.), *British Feminist Thought: A Reader*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 325-343.
- Maybin, J. and N. Mercer 1996. *Using English: From Conversation to Canon*. London

and New York: Routledge.

Mills, Sara 1995. *Feminist Stylistics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Moi, Toril 1985. *Sexual/Textual Politics*. London: Methuen.

Mussell, Kay 1981. *Women's Gothic and Romantic Fiction – A Reference Guide*.
Westport: Greenwood Press.

Nash, Walter 1990. *Language in Popular Fiction*. London: Routledge.

“Obituary: Barbara Cartland.” *Economist* 27 May 2000. Online. Internet. 11 Oct. 2000.
Available HTTP: www.britannica.com

Poovey, Mary 1997. Feminism and Deconstruction, in Eagleton (ed.) 1997, 262-267.

Radway, Janice 1984. *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy and Popular Literature*. Chapel Hill, N.C: University of North Carolina Press.

Showalter, Elaine 1997. Toward a Feminist Poetics, in Eagleton (ed.) 1997, 250-254.

Talbot, Mary M. 1995. *Fictions at work: language and social practice in fiction*. New York: Longman.

Thornborrow, J. and S. Wareing 1998. *Patterns in Language: An Introduction to Language and Literary Style*. London: Routledge.

Wareing, Shan 1994. And Then He Kissed Her: The Reclamation of Female Characters to Submissive Roles in Contemporary Fiction, in Katie Wales (ed.), *Feminist Linguistics in Literary Criticism*, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 117-136.