CHAPTER-1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Orientation

Language is the most important tool invented by human beings. It is a medium through which people interact and perform various speech roles. By performing speech roles, they not only affirm their status and role in family and society but also exchange whatever they want in the form of either information or goods or services. With the help of language, people express their views and understand the views of others. It is a systematic resource that always occurs in a context. Halliday also affirms the role of context by saying, “context plays a part in determining what we say; and what we say plays a part in determining the context. As we learn how to mean, we learn to predict each from other” (Halliday, 1978: 03).

Language is used differently by different people. Every individual has his/her own style of speaking; everyone uses different types of vocabulary, grammar, etc. This can be called their choice of language which is different on certain basis like age, caste, class or gender. Difference in the usage of language, on the basis of gender, has long been of great interest. This thesis, as its title suggests, is related to the study of difference in the language used by males and females only and it is not concerned with the language of gays, lesbians and transgenders.

1.2. Objectives of the Study

The objective of this thesis is to study the differences and similarities in the speech of male and female characters in the selected plays and relate these to the roles which are assigned and performed by them in culture and society. In most of the other studies available on these plays, focus has been on the basic differences in the social behaviour of these characters. But in the present study an attempt has been made to study the linguistic variations related to the gender of the speaker. The purpose of research is not to deny the basic dissimilarities but to show how they reflect themselves through language performing their day-to-day functions. Besides, this thesis tries to show how power and authority are reflected through speech.
1.3. Data and Methodology

To meet the objectives of the thesis, three plays by Henrik Ibsen have been chosen. These are: *A Doll’s House*, *Hedda Gabler* and *The Lady from the Sea*. *A Doll’s House* and *The Lady from the Sea* are male dominated plays and *Hedda Gabler* is a female dominated play. In *A Doll’s House* and *The Lady from the Sea*, there is a shift of female characters from being dominated to dominating. Female characters of all the three plays emancipate themselves from the bonding of family, or society or life and become independent to take their own decisions. Since the medium of representing this change is linguistic (verbal), the present thesis attempts to explain how language represents this experience.

The selected texts have been analysed and interpreted with the help of *Interpersonal metafunction* within *Systemic Functional Linguistics*, *Speech Acts* and *Language and Gender* theories. An attempt has been made to analyse the structure and semantic aspects of *Mood* and *Modality* in the selected dialogues from the selected plays. The speech functions in these dialogues have been classified into nine categories with the help of *Speech Act* theory (Searle, 1976) and *Language and Gender* theories (Cameron, 2006; Christie, 2000; Coates, 1986, 2013; Lakoff, 1975; Leech, 2014; Lyons, 1995; Tannen, 1990): *Representatives, Directives, Commissives, Manipulative, Dominance, Sexist Language, Swear Words, Agreeing and Tag questions*. If *Mood* choices provide the speakers linguistic choices in *declarative, imperative, interrogative* or *exclamative*, *Speech Act* theory helps in describing the function performed through this choice as each *Mood* is associated with an *illocutionary act*: a *declarative* for a statement, an *interrogative* for a question, an *imperative* for a directive and an *exclamative* for an exclamation (Downing and Locke, 2002: 164-165). And *Language and Gender* theories help in exploring the gender specific features of language.

Analysis of the selected plays has also been conducted on the basis of *Appraisal* theory, developed by Martin (Martin, 1997, 2000; Martin & Rose, 2003; Martin & White, 2005; White, 2000) within *Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Various expressions, i.e., words, phrases or sentences pertaining to *Attitude, Engagement* and *Graduation* have been analysed. This analysis helps in investigating who among male
and female characters is more expressive, judgemental and confident while performing their day to day roles in family and society.

The roles and functions performed by various characters can be better understood through a brief outline of all the selected plays:

1.3.1. *A Doll’s House*

This play is about the awakening of its heroine Nora. Having been ruled all her life either by her father or by her husband, she breaks the norms set by society and leaves her husband and children in search of herself. At the starting of the play, she seems to be happily married to Torvald Helmer who is going to be promoted as a director in the joint stock bank. They have three children. It is revealed here that Nora has a secret to keep. Once Torvald was seriously ill and she had to take a loan from her husband’s fellow lawyer, Krogstad. She had not told Torvald about this loan. She just told him that she had taken money from her father. But at that time her father was also not well and she could not tell him anything about Torvald’s health. So she took the loan from Krogstad, forging her father’s signature as a guarantee. She tries hard to save money by doing small jobs but still she is not able to return the whole amount to Krogstad. She is even unaware of the amount to be returned.

In the first act, when she is preparing for the Christmas party, Mrs. Linde, one of her childhood friends, arrives. She is a widow and needs a job. Nora helps her out by requesting Torvald to give her a job in his bank. And to give Mrs. Linde a job, he has to make space for her by dismissing Krogstad. Krogstad, in turn, requests Nora to approach Torvald for him. When she refuses, he threatens to tell everything to her husband. She somehow stops him and convinces him that if Torvald comes to know the truth, in his love for her, he can sacrifice even himself. At the same time she decides to ask Dr. Rank for help as he is their old family friend. But when Dr. Rank admits his love for her, it becomes impossible for her to ask him for money. Nora even tries to ask Torvald to help Krogstad but he refuses at once and asks her never to plead his case again. On the other hand, Krogstad decides to tell Torvald everything by writing a letter. He slips the letter in their letter-box and Nora has to try very hard to persuade Torvald not to read any letter. She even tries to take it out but all in vain as Torvald always keeps the keys of letter-box with him. She anyhow manages to
stop him from reading the letters till the tarantella night ends. But when that party is over, he at once opens the letter box and comes to know everything about the loan. Instead of understanding and taking responsibility for the forgery committed, he blames Nora for everything.

On the other hand, Mrs. Linde, who was once in love with Krogstad, makes him change his mind. Till now, Nora has understood that her marriage is not what she had thought. She is so disappointed on facing the reality that she decides to leave her husband and kids. No doubt Torvald forgives her after receiving the second envelope by Krogstad, in which he sends back all the papers of forgery and loan; she does not want to stay back at home. He tries hard to make her stay but she leaves and declares that she has to educate herself and she doesn’t care about what the world says. She has to search for her own identity.

1.3.2. Hedda Gabler

This play is about freedom of Hedda from the bonding of family and society. She is the daughter of late General Gabler, who dies leaving Hedda nothing. She is approaching thirty and after some years of active social life, she gets married to George Tesman who has a fellowship in history of art. He has been brought up by his two aunts, Julie and Rina. His aunt Julie is hoping for his new job in the university.

At the starting of the play, Hedda and George have just returned from their six-month long honeymoon. It is also revealed by Hedda to their family friend Judge Brack that during their honeymoon George had been busy with his studies and Hedda had bored herself. She also clearly shows her distaste towards her husband saying that he is ‘a specialist’. She is pregnant but she conceals this truth from everyone. After their return, George comes to know that for the post which he is expecting, he has to compete with one of Hedda’s previous admirer, Eilert Lovborg. Eilert is known to be a gifted person but he is prone to drinking. He has written two books with Mrs. Elvsted, who is deeply in love with him and has even left her husband for him. When Mrs. Elvsted comes to Hedda and George, she tells them that he has come to city with one of his manuscripts and requests them to call him at their place. She even hints to Hedda that she likes Lovborg and doesn’t care for her husband. When George comes home, he
announces that he is going for Judge Brack’s party. Eilert Lovborg soon arrives and privately confesses his love for Hedda. But when Mrs. Elvsted joins them, he admits that she is a good companion. Hedda feels jealous at this comment and manipulates Lovborg to join Judge Brack’s party. She asks Mrs. Elvsted to stay there with her and says that Lovborg will pick her up when he returns from the party. They keep on waiting but no one comes at night.

Lovborg gets drunk at the party and loses his manuscript in the process. George finds his manuscript on the way and asks Hedda to take care of that. Unfortunately, George has to leave the place to see his Aunt Rina who is sick. When Lovborg comes, he tells both Hedda and Mrs. Elvsted that he has torn his manuscript into pieces and is never going to rewrite it. He asks Mrs. Elvsted to leave him and go back to her husband but she refuses. When she leaves, Lovborg tells Hedda that he has not torn his manuscript rather he has lost it. And instead of telling him that the manuscript is lying with her, Hedda encourages Lovborg to commit suicide. She even gives him her dad’s pistol. As he leaves, she burns his manuscript. Later when she tells George that she has burnt Lovborg’s manuscript, he at first disapproves it but then feels overjoyed to know that his wife loves him so much that she can burn the manuscript of his professional rival.

At night, Mrs. Elvsted arrives and says that Lovborg has been missing. There is a rumour that he is in hospital. Judge Brack then confirms that he has died of bullet wounded in chest. George and Mrs. Elvsted, feeling quite horrible, decide to rewrite Lovborg’s book using his notes kept by Mrs. Elvsted. When they are trying to reconstruct the book of Lovborg, Judge tells Hedda secretly that Lovborg did not kill himself but he shot himself accidently. Hedda feels disappointed as it was not the death which she had imagined. Judge also reveals that he was shot by the pistol given by Hedda and says that he will not disclose this if Hedda does what he wants. And when Hedda finds that she is not able to escape Brack’s trap, she shoots herself with her father’s other pistol.

1.3.3. The Lady from the Sea

This is a five-act play about Ellida, who is the daughter of a lighthouse-keeper and has grown up where Fjord meets the open sea. She is married to Wangel, who is a
doctor in a small town on the west coast of Norway. He has two daughters by his first marriage, Bolette and Hilde. After the death of his wife, he gets married to Ellida who is much younger than him. She and Wangel had a son who died very young. This resulted in their disturbed married life and Wangel is worried about her mental health. He thus calls on Bolette’s former tutor Arnholm, who was Ellida’s friend too, to help Ellida out of the depression.

At his arrival, the girls are about to celebrate their mother’s birthday and it is clear that they do not like Ellida. Doctor Wangel leaves to see a patient and Arnholm sits inside with Ellida where she tells him that when he proposed her, she was committed to someone else. While they are talking, Lyngstrand arrives and mentions about an American whom he met on the ship. He tells them that the American was a very strange man who came to know about his wife getting married to someone else and he was to come and ‘collect’ her back. Ellida fades on hearing this as she is convinced that he is the same guy with whom she fell in love before her marriage. She tells her husband all about their relationship and also that he tied both of their rings and threw them away into the sea declaring that they are married. He was a seaman and he had to escape because he had murdered his Captain. But he asked her to wait until he comes back. She tried hard to break the engagement but all in vain as he had a compelling power over her.

On the other hand, Arnholm thinks that Wangel has called him for Bolette and she is waiting for him. In this impression, he proposes her and when she refuses saying that he is her former teacher, he manipulates her and convinces her. He says that he will help her learn everything about the world as he knows that she is very curious to explore the world. He says that he will himself be her teacher and guide. When she is convinced, she agrees to marry him.

At the same time, when Ellida has told everything to Wangel, she feels relieved and happy. She just wants to be with Wangel. But when she requests Arnholm to call Wangel, Stranger arrives. He says that he has kept his promise and has come to fetch her. Then Wangel turns up and says that he does not allow her to go. Stranger declares that it is Ellida who will decide whether to stay or leave of her own free will. This
shakes Ellida and she feels that he is the only one who has given her this choice. She asks Wangel to free her so that she can decide on her own but Wangel does not do so. He says that he will free her after Stranger’s visit but she wants to be free before his arrival. When Stranger comes to take her away with him, Doctor Wangel realises that he must give Ellida the freedom of choice between him and Stranger. And when he grants her freedom to choose, Ellida chooses to be with her husband and the play ends with the departure of Stranger and reunited husband and wife. Even the girls are happy on hearing that Ellida will stay there with them like a mother.

The following section briefly introduces the theoretical framework, i.e., *Systemic Functional Linguistics* and basic fundamentals of *Speech Act* and *Language and Gender* theories.

1.4. Theoretical Framework of the Study

Theoretical framework adopted for the study is of *Systemic Functional Linguistics* as it concentrates on the analysis of the products of social interaction (texts), considered in the social and cultural context in which they take place. Some linguistic forms have been chosen and analysed with the help of *Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)* on the basis of functions these perform in society. *SFL* framework is helpful in understanding the written text. It helps to pay attention to its context and textual organisation and enables a thorough study of the construction of meaning in a text. The analysis reveals that the verbal elements and the context of a text influence the overall experience of the text, as the context represents reality surrounding the text.

According to *Systemic Functional Linguistics* theory, conveying ideas is only one of the things people do with language. From a functional point of view, meaning and conveying ideas is something people do rather than something language has. This notion of function is not limited to the *Speech Act* theory performatives or to the *Speech Acts* but the whole language is a mode of action that functions in relation to the context.

*Systemic Functional Grammar* is more concerned with what people actually say and with what they are doing when they say it than with a speaker’s intuition concerning which sentences are grammatical and with what the speakers know about the language to enable such judgements to be made. From the beginning, systemic
theory was developed in the context of ‘applied linguistics’ concerns. Halliday himself has been engaged in the appreciation of *Systemic Functional Grammar* to the interpretation of both literary and non-literary texts. As it is a functional model, the focus of *Systemic Functional Grammar* is on meaning in context. Halliday has given three metafunctions, i.e., Ideational, Interpersonal and Textual metafunction to describe the functional aspects of language.

**1.4.1. Ideational metafunction** is language as representation. There are two subcategories of the ideational component: Experiential and Logical. Experiential is when experience is represented directly in terms of happenings, entities that participate in those happenings and circumstantial features. Logical is where experience is represented indirectly in terms of certain fundamental logical relations in natural language. These two together make up the Ideational component in the semantic system: that of meaning in the reflective mode (Halliday, 2002: 198). This *metafunction* is expressed through Transitivity or process types. Transitivity choices are related to the dimensions of Field in the context of situation. Transitivity processes are of six types. These are: Material Processes, Mental Processes, Verbal Processes, Behavioural Processes, Existential Processes and Relational Processes.

**1.4.2. Textual metafunction** is where the meanings of other two components take on their relevance in the real context. Here the semantic system enables the speaker to structure meaning as text, organising each element as a piece of information and relating it significantly to what has gone before (Halliday, 2002: 199). In the context of situation, it relates to the Mode. It serves as a point of departure of the message informing about what is given or new information. The given information is described as Theme and the new as Rheme. Theme is either the Subject or Process or Circumstance.

**1.4.3. Interpersonal metafunction** is that *metafunction* on which the methodology of the work is based and that is why it is discussed here in detail. Interpersonal *metafunction* is “concerned with the establishment of social relations and with the participation of individual of all kinds of personal interaction” (Halliday, 2005: 176). It deals with the most important function of language that is of giving and demanding
either information or goods and services. The semantic system here not only expresses the speaker’s intrusion in the speech event, i.e., his attitudes, evaluations and judgements; his expectations and demands; but also the roles which he is setting up for himself and for his hearer in the communication process. This component is therefore both speaker and hearer oriented; it is interpersonal (Halliday, 2002: 199). Following figure describes the systems of Interpersonal (Halliday, 2007:189).

![Interpersonal systems diagram]

**Fig. 1. Shows Interpersonal systems**

*Interpersonal metafunction* is associated with *Mood, Modality* and person. Since *Interpersonal* meanings are related to the interaction or exchange between people, they are more prominent in conversation or dialogue and least prominent in formal texts. But
language is a social behaviour and its nature is to exchange either information or goods and services. Information is exchanged verbally whereas goods and services can be material objects that are demanded or given in exchange and can be in addition to either verbal or non-verbal. Interpersonal meanings are realised through the grammar of Mood. According to Halliday, “Mood expresses speech function, the relations among the participants in a speech situation and the speech roles assigned by the speaker to himself and his interlocutors” (Halliday, 2005: 154). Table no. 1 shows the speech functions of a clause as described by Halliday (2002: 273).

Table 1: Showing speech functions of a clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity exchanged</th>
<th>Role of speaker in exchange</th>
<th>goods &amp; services</th>
<th>information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(all moods)</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Command</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modulated decl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mood* consists of two parts- *Subject* and *Finite*. *Subject* as defined by Halliday and Matthiessen is “something by reference to which the proposition can be affirmed or denied” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004:117). *Subject* forms the nominal group and precedes *Finite*, which serves as the verbal group, in the *Mood* element. Halliday states that *Subject* can be best understood by “starting from the concept of the clause as an exchange, a move in dialogic interaction” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004:119).

*Predicate* is the context part of a clause that specifies the process that is going on in a clause. It can also be defined as finite verb, which carries the morphological identification of *Subject* and *Mood*. A *predicate*, then, is that “fills the role of specifying the actual event, action or process being discussed” (Eggins, 2004:155).
Other participant that is less important than Subject is Complement. A Complement can be defined as a non subject participant that has the potential to become Subject of a clause with the use of passive voice (Eggins, 2004:157).

The last element in an Interpersonal clause is Adjuncts. Adjuncts can be defined as clause elements which contribute some additional (but non-essential) information to the clause. They can be identified as elements which do not have the potential to become Subject- i.e., they are not nominal elements, but are adverbial, or propositional (Eggins, 2004: 158). Different classes of Adjuncts are accorded different positions in Mood/Residue analysis of a clause. As Circumstantial Adjuncts add meanings to Ideational metafunction, Modal Adjuncts to Interpersonal, Textual Adjuncts add meanings to the Textual metafunction of a clause.

Modal Adjuncts are clause constituents which add interpersonal meanings to a clause. They add meanings which are somehow connected to the creation and maintenance of the dialogue. There are four main types of Modal Adjuncts:

1. Mood Adjunct.
2. Polarity Adjunct.
3. Comment Adjunct.
4. Vocative Adjunct.

1. **Mood Adjunct**: Based on Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:126-9), the following categories of items can be classified as Mood Adjuncts:
   
   (i) Expressions of probability: e.g., perhaps, maybe, probably
   (ii) Expressions of usuality: sometimes, usually
   (iii) Expressions of intensification of minimization: really, absolutely, just, somewhat
   (iv) Expressions of presumption: evidently, presumably, obviously
   (v) Expressions of inclination: happily, willingly.

2. **Polarity Adjunct**: Yes and no are the direct expressions of polarity in a clause.
3. **Comment Adjunct:** Functions to express an assessment about the clause as a whole. Eggins (2004:161-2) quotes Halliday who identifies the following meanings as expressed by *Comment Adjuncts:*

- admission: frankly
- assertion: honestly, really
- how desirable: luckily, hopefully
- how constant: tentatively, provisionally
- how valid: broadly speaking, generally
- how sensible: understandably, wisely
- how expected: as expected, amazingly

4. **Vocative Adjunct:** *Vocative Adjuncts* function to control the discourse by designating a likely ‘next speaker’. They are identifiable as names, where the names are not functioning as subjects or complements, but are used to directly address the person named.

   Modal Adjuncts are used by systemic linguists to represent the broader meanings of *Modality*. Propositions are used to assert what is, or, what is not. But these two extremes are not the only choices. The grammar of *Modality* enables people to assert that things are or are not with varying degrees of certainty about the probability or likelihood (possible, probably, certain) of something being, and the usuality or frequency (sometimes usually, always) of something being (Eggins, 2004: 172-3). Halliday describes *Modality* as “a form of participation by the speaker in a speech event. Through *Modality*, the speaker associates with thesis an indication of its status and validity in his own judgement; he intrudes, and takes up a position. *Modality* thus derives from what is called the *Interpersonal* function of language, language as expression of role” (Halliday, 2005: 176).

   *Appraisal* theory developed by Martin (Martin, 1997, 2000; Martin & Rose, 2003; Martin & White, 2005; White, 2000) is an extended form of *Interpersonal metafunction* which studies and evaluates emotions, attitudes and feelings. The sections below describe the concepts of *Appraisal, Speech Acts* and that of *Language and Gender* theories that state their applicability to the task of differentiating the male-female linguistic differences.
1.5. **Appraisal Theory**

*Appraisal* theory is concerned with resources through which the emotions, attitudes and feelings can be evaluated. This evaluation, which is dependent upon the source of opinions, can be of things, people’s character or their feelings. When people talk, they keep on negotiating their relationship with others. Of all the happenings in talk, consideration of speaker’s relationship with the listener is one of the most important things. This is actually negotiating the stance and *Appraisal* theory documents the elements used to negotiate the stance process, classifies them and explains how they function in language. It can also be said that *Appraisal* theory describes emotions in a text.

Martin and White (2005) have regionalised *Appraisal* as three interacting domains. These are: *Attitude, Engagement* and *Graduation*. They describe these types as “Attitude is concerned with our feelings, including emotional reactions, judgements of behaviour and evaluation of things. Engagement deals with sourcing attitudes and the play of voices around opinions in discourse. Graduation attends to grading phenomena whereby feelings are amplified and categories blurred” (Martin and White, 2005: 35).

*Appraisal* resources can be further divided as follows:

- **Attitude**: *Affect, Judgement* and *Appreciation*.
- **Engagement**: *Monogloss* and *Heterogloss*.
- **Graduation**: *Force* and *Focus*.

1.5.1. **Attitudes**

*Attitudes* can be divided into three types. These are: *Affect, Judgement* and *Appreciation*. According to Thompson, “Affect focuses on the feelings of the appraiser, whereas Judgement and Appreciation focus on the qualities of the appraised. Judgement and Appreciation are therefore less direct in that the source of the appraisal in our emotions is not made explicit” (Thompson, 2004:76).

*Affect* is the way of expressing our feelings which can be positive as well as negative. It “deals with resources for construing emotional reactions” (Martin and White, 2005: 35). *Affect* can be realised in three major sets: *In/security, dis/satisfaction* and *un/happiness*.
Judgement, as the name suggests, judges people or behaviour. According to White, “Judgement is concerned with resources for assessing behaviour according to various normative principles” (White, 2005: 35). They can also be positive or negative like Affect and can be realised through the study of: Social Esteem, which involves admiration and criticism and Social Sanction, which involves praise and condemnation (Martin and Rose, 2003: 62).

Appreciation can be thought of as the institutionalisation of feeling, in the context of propositions. White explains this issue as- “appreciation looks at resources for construing the value of things, including natural phenomena and semiosis” (Martin and White, 2005: 36). It includes three variables: Reaction, Composition and Valuation.

The three major regions of emotions can be understood with the help of following figure (Fig. 2):

![Figure 2: Systems of Attitude](image)
1.5.2. Engagement

Engagement, as is known, is the playing of voices from which the valuation and relations are judged. Whenever a speaker speaks something, he encodes his views towards it. This theory follows Stubbs (1996) and Bakhtin’s dialogism in the sense that everything spoken or written is dialogic in form (Martin and White 2005: 92). Engagement can be retrospective or prospective, i.e., the speaker can either accept or reject the views of others. Thus Engagement is ‘all utterance to some degree take into account or respond to prior utterances and to some degree anticipate or acknowledge likely responses, reactions and objections from actual or potential dialogic partners’ (White, 2002: 13). Figure 3 represents the Engagement system adopted from Martin and White (2005: 134).

![Figure 3: Systems of Engagement](image-url)
1.5.3. Graduation

*Attitudes* are gradable and *Graduation* system deals with the semantics of grading. There are two axes of gradation in the graduation system—*Force* and *Focus*. *Force* deals with the intensity or amount of an attitude which can be raised or lowered. It is of two types—*Intensification* and *Quantification*.

*Force Intensification* refers to the raising or lowering of intensity of qualities, processes or modalities of likelihood, usuality, inclination and obligation (Martin and White, 2005: 140). *Force Quantification* refers to the grading in terms of amount. It operates over entities and not over qualities and processes. It involves the imprecise measuring of number and presence or mass of entities according to such feature as their size, weight, distribution or proximity (Martin and White, 2005: 141).

*Focus*, on the other hand, is the grading of attitudes. It is applied ‘typically to categories which, when viewed from an experiential perspective are not scalable’ (Martin and White, 2005: 137). *Focus* is related to either sharpening or softening the specifications to characterise an instance. As *Focus* (*Sharpen*) up scales or sharpens the attitudes and *Focus* (*Soften*) downscales or softens the attitudes. Figure 4 shows the systems of *Graduation*.

![Figure 4: Systems of Graduation](image-url)
Speech Acts and Mood are inter-related on the basis of the basic functions performed through them. Where the basic functions of Mood are “offer, command, statement and question” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014: 135), Speech Acts are related to “statements, questions, exclamations and directives…each of these basic speech acts is associated with the grammar with a type of clause: the declarative is typically used to encode a statement, the interrogative a question, the imperative a directive, and the exclamative an exclamation” (Downing and Locke, 2006: 176).

1.6. Speech Acts

In the study of language, one of the most important questions which arises is related to the function it performs. The functions performed by language have been named by J. L. Austin (1962) as ‘Speech acts’. Austin is of the view that whenever a speaker says something, he is not only producing a statement but also performing a function by either promising to do something or asking the listener to do the same. The uttered statement is not made to be just acknowledged as something true or false rather it is uttered to perform a function. And this function of an utterance is named as Speech acts by Austin in How to Do Things with Words (1962).

Searle (1971) observes that Austin has tried to distinguish between the constatives and performatives in this book. He is of the view that, “the original distinction was supposed to be a distinction between utterances which are sayings (statements, descriptions, etc.) and utterances which are doings of some other kinds (promises, bets, warnings). It is supposed to be a distinction between utterances which are not acts (constatives), and utterances which are acts (performatives)” (Searle, 1971: 07). Searle also says that constatives turn out to be performatives sometimes as, “making a statement or giving a description is as much as performing a speech act as making a promise or an order” (Searle, 1971: 07).

Austin has focused on the motivation and force attached with an utterance which he called illocutionary force. Levinson (1973) has explained three types of acts which an illocutionary force performs. These are:

(a) A locutionary act, which simply describes the fact that the speaking of a sentence involves the creation of a specific sense and reference;
(b) An illocutionary act, which because of the force associated with performing an utterance, makes a statement, a promise, a request, or whatever;

(c) A perlocutionary act, which means that by uttering a sentence you are bringing about an effect on the audience, specific to the circumstances that they happen to be in (Forrester, 1996: 53).

But Strawson quotes Austin who describes these terms as, “A locutionary act is an act of saying something; an illocutionary act is an act we perform in saying something. It is what we do, in saying what we say. Austin does not regard this characterisation as by any means a satisfactory test for identifying kinds of illocutionary acts, since, so regarded, it would admit many kinds of acts which he wishes to exclude from the class” (Strawson, 1971: 24).

Austin (1962) has listed five types of Speech Acts, i.e., Verdictive, Expositive, Excercitive, Behabitive and Commissive. But as Searle (1969, 1971, 1976) does not agree with Austin’s theory of constatives and performatives and believes that there is an endless number of illocutionary acts which can be performed, he modifies these five types of Speech Acts given by Austin (1962) and groups them into following five basic forms:

1. **Representatives**: A representative is an utterance that describes some state of affairs (‘the sun rises in the east’) by asserting, concluding, claiming, etc. Representatives commit the speaker to the truth of the proposition expressed.

2. **Directives**: A directive is an utterance used to get the hearer to do something, by acts like, ordering, commanding, begging, requesting and asking (questions constituting a sub-class of directives). Examples include utterances such as ‘Close the door, please’ as well as ‘What time is it?’

3. **Commissives**: Commissives are utterances that commit the hearer to doing something and include acts like promising, vowing, and pledging alliance.

4. **Expressives**: Expressives include acts used to express the psychological state of the hearer, such as thanking, apologizing, congratulating and condoling.
5. Declarations: A declaration is an utterance which affects a change in some, often institutionalized, state of affairs. Paradigm examples are christening a baby, declaring peace, firing an employee, and excommunicating (the types of acts included originally in Austin’s ‘performatives’) (Dijk, 1998: 43).

Searle (1976) has based his taxonomy on “direction of fit”. Huang describes that it is found in “Searle’s speech act theory to refer to the relationship of ‘fit’ between words and world in the performance of a speech act” (Huang, 2012: 92). There are three types of ‘direction of fit’, i.e., words to world, world to words and none. In ‘A Classification of Illocutionary Acts’ Searle (1976) mentions that for Representatives, the direction of fit is ‘words to world’ and for Directives and Commissives the direction of fit is ‘world to words’. In Representatives the words are used to match the world whereas in Directives and Commissives, world is tried to match the uttered words (Mey, 2001).

Austin (1962) has laid down certain conditions for a performative or a Speech Act to be successfully performed. He calls these conditions felicity conditions. Austin’s felicity conditions are based on ‘Misinvocations’, ‘Misexecutions and ‘Abuses’ (Horn, 2006: 58). But Searle (1969) is of the view that the felicity conditions laid down by Austin are not the only ways according to which a Speech Act can be called appropriate or inappropriate. Instead, they jointly constitute the illocutionary force. In other words, “felicity conditions are the constitutive rules- rules that create the activity itself-of speech acts. On Searle’s view, to perform a speech act is to obey certain conventional rules that are constitutive of that type of act” (Keith, 2010: 708). Searle then develops and expands Austin’s original felicity conditions and classifies them into four basic categories as following:

i) Propositional Content

ii) Preparatory Conditions

iii) Sincerity Conditions

iv) Essential Conditions (Keith, 2010; Birner, 2013; Geis, 1995; Levinson, 1983)
A comparison of the list of felicity conditions for a Directive (Request) and a Commissive is illustrated with the help of Table No. 2 adapted from Cole and Morgan (1975: 71).

**Table No. 2 : Showing comparison of a Directive and a Commissive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Directive (Request)</th>
<th>Commissive (Promise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory Condition</td>
<td>H is able to perform A</td>
<td>S is able to perform A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity Condition</td>
<td>S wants H to do A</td>
<td>S intends to do A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional Content</td>
<td>S predicates a future act A of H</td>
<td>H predicates a future act A of S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Condition</td>
<td>Counts as an attempt by S to get H to do A</td>
<td>Counts as the undertaking by S of an obligation to do A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Searle (1969) states that there are two types of *Speech Acts*- direct and indirect *Speech Acts*. Indirect *Speech Acts* are mostly used to make requests. A request can be in the form of a question also, e.g.

Could you turn out the lights?

Would you mind turning out the lights? (Geis, 1995: 7)

George Yule gives reasons for indirect *Speech Acts*. He is of the view that, “perhaps the crucial distinction in the use of these two types of speech acts is based on the fact that indirect commands or requests are simply considered more gentle or more polite in our society than direct commands” (Yule, 1985: 101-102).

The following section describes the basic concepts of *Language and Gender* theories:

**1.7. Language and Gender**

Gender is the oldest and the most salient distinction among human beings. But to understand what gender is, there is a need to explore the difference between sex and gender as the term ‘gender’ is often confused with ‘sex’; moreover they are taken as synonyms sometimes. “‘Sex’ is a biological and physiological category, referring to the
anatomical differences between men and women, ‘gender’ is a social category and a social construct. This means ‘gender’ refers to the traits that men and women are assigned and how these can vary within different classes, cultures and societies” (Simpson and Mayr, 2012:15).

The early studies conducted on Language and Gender in 1970s and 1980s characterise the emergence of three schools of thought: ‘deficit’, ‘dominance’ and ‘difference’ (Simpson and Mayr, 2012:17). These take simple issues as whether the women’s speech is weak or deficit or the differences in the speech styles of males and females result from gender inequality and male dominance or these differences are the result of their being socialised into different gender roles. Deficit theory explains that woman’s language is weak which reflects and perpetuates their subordinate status in society. In other words, women’s language is considered weak in comparison to the language used by men. Robin Lakoff’s ‘Language and Woman’s Place’ (1975) and Jennifer Coates’ ‘Women, Men and Language’ (2013) concede with the same view. The other approaches ‘dominance’ and ‘difference’ seek to expose the linguistic dominance of men over women and state that the difference in their speech is based on different subcultures in which they are grown up respectively. The dominance approach looks at women as an oppressed group and interprets linguistic differences in women’s and men’s speech in terms of men’s dominance and women’s subordination. According to Coates, “The advantage of the difference model is that it allows women’s talk to be examined outside a framework of oppression and powerlessness. Instead, researchers have been able to show the strengths of linguistic strategies characteristic of women and to celebrate women’s ways of talking” (Coates, 2013:06).

Later on, a fourth approach is also introduced, that is, ‘the dynamic or social constructionist approach’. This approach views gender as a social construct rather than something given. It can also be called ‘doing gender’. This perspective treats gender as a negotiation and not something given. Simpson and Mayr (2012) support Butler, who is of the view that gender is something which men and women perform. They mention, “gender is not something that we are but what men and women perform: men and women constantly negotiate their gender roles and therefore are able to challenge them. Masculinity and femininity is a construct, an identity that has constantly to be
reaffirmed and publicly displayed by repeatedly performing acts in accordance with social norm” (Simpson and Mayr, 2012: 120).

Various studies have been conducted which state that gender is something not just learned, but something which is taught and enforced. It is something which is done and not had. As when a child takes birth, it is neither a male nor female itself. It learns the language of the mother but as it grows, it is taught to behave, to act. It has also been said and proved that girls and boys take interest in different things. For example, a girl likes to wear frill frocks mostly of pink colour whereas a boy likes to wear blue coloured clothes. Even when they play, they choose different types of toys specific to their gender. When they go to school, girls learn to speak different language than boys, they are expected to be polite, co-operative, soft spoken whereas boys are taught to be bold, to acquire leadership qualities and they learn to speak rough language there (Eckert and Ginet, 2013).

Maltz and Borker (1962) have described the features specific to male and female language as:

- Women display a greater tendency to ask questions.
- They are more likely than men to make utterances that demand or encourage responses from their fellow speakers.
- They make more use of minimal responses.
- They adopt a strategy of silent protest.
- They show a greater tendency to use the pronouns as “you” and “we”.
- Whereas men are more likely to interrupt the speech of their conversational partner.
- They challenge or dispute their partner’s utterances.
- They are more likely to ignore the comments of the other speaker.
- They use more mechanisms for controlling the topic of conversation
- They make more direct declarations of fact or opinion than women (Brenneis and Macaulay, 1996: 82-83)
Maltz and Borker (1962) are of the view that basic behaviour of males and females is due to their upbringing in different subcultures. They identify different worlds of boys and girls. They describe that:

- Girls play in small groups and not in pairs.
- Differentiation between girls is not made in terms of power but relative closeness.
- Friendship is seen by girls as involving intimacy, equality, mutual commitment and loyalty.
- Conflict must be resolved but a girl cannot assert social power or superiority as an individual to resolve it.
- Basically girls learn to do three things with words as to create and maintain relationships of closeness and equality, to criticize others in acceptable ways and to interpret accurately the speech of other girls.

Whereas, the boys’ world can be described as:

- Boys play in larger groups.
- Speech is used in three major ways as to assert one’s position of dominance, to attract and maintain an audience and to assert oneself when other speakers have the floor.
- Give verbal commands or orders.
- Name calling and other forms of verbal ridicule.
- Verbal threats or boasts of authority.
- Refusal to obey orders
- Winning a verbal argument as in the sequence.

Robin Lakoff has also given a few characteristics of women’s language. She opines that women are more polite, use empty adjectives, use tag questions, use hedges, use hypercorrect grammar, don’t tell jokes etc. (Lakoff, 1975: 52-55). Lakoff states that if a woman lacks the features specific to female language, she is treated as less feminine
and if a man lacks, he is treated as less masculine because they are not following the norms. She goes to the extent on saying that if she does not learn to speak the language of a woman in traditional society, she is considered dead and ostracized as unfeminine by both men and women (Lakoff, 1975: 61).

Coates (1986, 2013) writes that the use of taboo language was prohibited for women. Even males were to be conscious of using taboos in the presence of women. The fathers of young girls did not appoint servants using foul language. People appointed decent girls to bring up their children so that they can learn to speak a decent language. This included the thought that girls should be homely, submissive, nurturers, dependent etc. and boys should be bold and creative. Even males and females use different *Swear words* like:

(a) ‘Oh dear, you’ve put the peanut butter in the refrigerator again.’
(b) ‘Shit, you’ve put the peanut butter in the refrigerator again’

(Lakoff, 1975: 10)

It can easily be guessed that the first sentence is by a female and the second is by a male. Lakoff opines that “women don’t use off colour or indelicate expressions; women are experts at euphemism” (Lakoff, 1975:55).

Sexist language has also been part of this discussion of difference. The use of generic ‘he’ is the most discussed one. Women even challenge the use of ’man’ and ‘he’ arguing that such words exclude women (Coates, 1986: 10). For example, ‘he’ is used to refer to both males and females when used for third person.

O’Barr and Atkins (1980) present a different perspective. They do not agree with Lakoff’s theory and the features describing women’s speech. They conducted a study in courtroom testimony and focused on the features described by Lakoff (1975). After the investigation they found that both the genders had made use of the same features and “so-called women’s language is neither characteristic of all women nor limited only to women” (Bender, 2014: 405). In other words, they conclude that gender is not a determining factor for the language used by males and females; instead they state that all ten features are used by both genders that have low social status. They
suggest that, “the tendency for more women to speak powerless language and for men to speak less of it is due, at least in part, to the greater tendency of women to occupy relatively powerless social positions. What we have observed is a reflection in their speech behaviour of their social status” (Bender, 2014: 405). Thus, they suggest that “powerless language” is a better term to be used for this difference rather than “women’s language” Lakoff (1975).

Apart from this discussion, there are many more differences which have been studied in later chapters. It can also be said that the differences and similarities can be better understood in relation to each other.

1.8. Review of Literature

Since the present study has SFL, Appraisal, Speech Act and Language and Gender theories in background, this section will review briefly the literature available on the applications of these theories in literary and non-literary texts in both the spoken and written discourse.

M.A.K. Halliday in his book, Linguistic Studies of Texts and Discourse (2002) deals with the fundamental concepts of SFL for discourse analysis. The book is divided into three sections. The papers in this book focus on the application of SFL to the analysis of texts both highly valued and everyday texts in both the written and the spoken form. With the help of SFL model, Halliday explores the way grammar helps in creating meanings. This book provides the analysis of both written and spoken texts from the perspective of all the three metafunctions of language: Ideational, Interpersonal and Textual. In this way, this book provides a framework to pursue the practice of linguistic analysis of any text from the perspective of SFL.

In Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause (2003), J.R. Martin and David Rose work up with the fundamentals of SFL into a set of tools for discourse analysis. Focused on ‘discourse semantics’, this book goes beyond the clause and by bringing in its fold both the social context and lexico-grammar, analyzes ‘texts in social contexts’. The three metafunctions in ‘social activity’, the Interpersonal, the Ideational and the Textual, that the SFL model recognises are discussed in five chapters entitled Appraisal, Ideation, Conjunction, Identification, and Periodicity. Throughout the book,
these discourse systems are analysed in ‘models of the social contexts of discourse, including register and genre theory’ and their links are set up with the multi-model discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis.

M.A.K. Halliday’s Language and Society (2007) views language from a sociological perspective and describes the relationship of language and social man. It has been discussed in detail how language is socio-semiotic, how meanings change according to the situation, how the register, genre and context influence language and the aspects of sociolinguistic research. An interpretation of functional relationship between language and social structure is presented along with the discussion in anti-languages.

Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective (1989) by M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan is divided into two sections. First section is by Halliday and second section is by Hasan. In the first part, Halliday discusses about context of situation in language, functions of language, register variation and coda, text, context and learning. Hasan in the second part discusses about text, its structure, the texture of a text and identity of a text. While discussing about the context of situation, Halliday describes the importance of society and situation in a language supporting the view points of Malinowski regarding the context of situation.

In Analyzing Casual Conversation (1997), Suzane Eggins and Diana Slade present a brief study to analyse casual conversation. They draw primarily upon SFL for their theory of language and set up links between language and social life. This book develops a model for the analysis and description of casual conversation in English. First of all, it is described how meanings are made in everyday talk. After discussing various approaches, the grammar of casual conversation is discussed in detail. In the third chapter, ‘The Grammar of Casual conversation’, it is illustrated that very little gestures and minimal responses also generate meanings in casual conversation.

Fairclough in Language and Power (1989) has brought into view the use of language as a social practice. He introduces his method of language research and re-examines a set of approaches like linguistics, socio-linguistics, cognitive psychology etc. that could directly or indirectly offer language a scrutiny. Fairclough’s main
purpose in this book is to arouse a critical awareness concerning the existing social conventions of society that is the result of struggle for power, along with the concept of power behind discourse as a major characteristic of discourse analysis.

Robin Lakoff in *Language and Woman’s Place* (1975) discusses about a woman’s place in men’s world. She discusses how women, their language and their achievements are treated. Besides, she presents some features specific to ‘women’s language’. She states that women are defined in terms of the men to whom they relate. It is specified that a male name is always placed in front of a female name as is illustrated in the combinations - male-female, husband-wife, brother-sister, etc. Lakoff is of the view that social change is the basis of language change.

In *Gender and Discourse* (1994), Deborah Tannen studies gender from various aspects. She discusses the role of dominance in a cultural difference framework. She describes some fundamental principles of interactional sociolinguistics which include convictions such as roles are created in interaction and not given, context is created in talk and action, anything done in interaction is a joint production, interruption or indirectness like linguistic features cannot be described as the meaning assigned to a word in an interaction etc. She says that even the posture of males or females is different while talking to their friends. Boys sit parallel to each other while girls sit, as opposite to boys, face to face and in close proximity and talk intimately.

Jennifer Coates in *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language* (1986) studies differences between the language of males and females from a sociolinguistic perspective. She opines that social differences are the basis of linguistic differences. She is of the view that if society differentiates between women and men and treats them as unequal, the difference between their language is sure to exist. She also discusses the basic grammar differences and the use of particular language in groups.

Paul Simpson and Andrea Mayr in *Language and Power: A Resource Book for Students* (2010) at first introduce key topics in the study of Language and Power. In the development section, they describe various approaches to the study and then they try to analyse language with the help of these approaches. In the last section, they provide various readings in the field. They discuss how power is reflected through language in
different fields which include the discourse of institutions and organisations, of language and gender, of language and law, of politics, of advertising etc. All this study helps in understanding how power is reflected through language and how it can be analysed.

Deborah Tannen in *You Just Don’t Understand* (1990) states that women and men have their different worlds. What one says is not understood by the other. She is of the view that they have different words and different worlds. As the chief commodity in boys’ world is status- to achieve and maintain, the chief commodity in girls’ is intimacy. In other words the conversation between boys and girls is like cross-cultural communication. The reason which she gives is that they grow up in different world of words. Their talk is also different on the basis of rapport talk and report talk, i.e., the language used by women is rapport talk as it is a way of establishing connections and maintaining relations whereas the language used by men is report talk and this is a means to preserve independence and negotiate and maintain status in a hierarchical social order. She also states differences in lecturing and listening, and dominance and control between men and women.

Penelope Eckert and Sally McConnell Ginet discuss gender in detail in *Language and Gender* (2003). They start with what gender is and how it is formed. They say that it is a never ending process which begins even before birth. They state that the dominant ideology does not simply prescribe that males and females should be different rather it states that they are simply different. They also describe the difference and dominance theories and suggest that gender is dependent on the performance of a person. Then they discuss what linguistic resources can be taken in view to study the difference, what are the different styles of talk, what is meant by making it nice, etc., as they are of the view that women are polite as they want the listener to feel nice. They also discuss whether women should be assertive or not. Then they describe other issues like mapping the world, constructing nations, constructing boundaries and fashioning selves.

Sara Mills and Louise Mullany in *Language, Gender and Feminism: Theory, Methodology and Practice* (2011) refer to third wave research on gender, which emphasises the macro-perspective to examine social practices and gender and power.
They agree to the view that gender should be viewed as something enacted or performed rather than what is imposed upon by the society. Then they discuss various feminist linguistic approaches which include- Feminist sociolinguistics, Interactional linguistics, Multilinguism, Discourse Analysis, Feminist Discourse Analysis, etc. Apart from that, they differentiate between the language of bisexual, homosexual, gay and lesbian people.

*Dialogue and Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Modern Drama*

*Dialogue and Naturally Occurring Conversation* (1980) by Deirdre Burton witnesses a new interest among stylisticians in the role of dialogue in literature. It states that drama has been neglected by linguistic studies of literature. This book presents different moves with the help of which dramas can be studied. It provides a descriptive model for the analysis of naturally occurring language in a real social context.

**1.9. Organisation of the Thesis**

The thesis is organised into the chapter scheme as given below:

Introduction  
*Mood and Modality Analysis*  
*Appraisal Analysis*  
Results and Discussion  
Conclusion

In the first chapter, i.e., *Introduction*, objectives, data, methodology, theoretical framework and review of literature are presented. The second chapter, *Mood and Modality Analysis* analyses the linguistic resources for interpersonal meanings. Extending the discussion on interpersonal meanings, the third chapter, *Appraisal Analysis* studies how assessments and evaluations are also located in the region where we generally encode experiential meanings. This chapter has used the theoretical system developed within *Systemic Functional Linguistics* by Martin (Martin, 1997, 2000; Martin & Rose, 2003; Martin & White, 2005; White, 2000) to analyse its expression and evaluation of emotions explained as *Attitude, Engagement and Graduation* (Martin and Rose, 2003; Martin and White, 2005; Thompson, 2004). In the fourth chapter, *Results and Discussion*, there is an attempt to discuss and generalise the facts emerged from the analysis in the previous chapters. The thesis ends with Conclusion and Bibliography.