

Gendered emotive displays in complaint discourse

Virginia Acuña-Ferreira
Universidade de Vigo

Departamento de Traducción e Lingüística
Facultade de Filoloxía e Traducción
Universidade de Vigo
As Lagoas-Marcosende, s/n
E-36200-Vigo, Spain
virginia@uvigo.es

Abstract

Analyses of complaint discourse examine the procedures involved in the interactional management of this communicative activity and the conversational devices employed to invite an affiliative display. In this article, we centre particularly on emotions display in complaint discourse and discuss the gender meaning of certain affective intensification devices. After reviewing previous studies on complaint discourse, we apply methods of conversation analysis and interpretative sociolinguistics to the analysis of conversational extracts, in which female and male speakers complain about the negative behaviour of a third party displaying a high degree of emotive involvement. Our analysis emphasizes the construction of female and male styles, in the display of indignation, through complaint activities in these interactions, and the key role played by prosody in this respect.

Key words: complaint discourse, emotions display, gender, conversation analysis, interpretative sociolinguistics.

Resumo

As análises do discurso de queixa examinan os procedementos implicados no manexo interaccional desta actividade comunicativa e os recursos conversacionais empregados para invitar a un despregamento afiliativo. Neste artigo centrámonos particularmente no despregamento de emocións nas actividades de queixa e argumentamos sobre o significado de xénero de certos recursos de intensificación afectiva. Tras unha revisión dos estudos previos sobre o discurso de queixa, aplicamos os métodos da análise da conversa e da sociolingüística interpretativa á análise de fragmentos conversacionais nos que mulleres e homes se queixan con respecto ó mal comportamento dunha terceira persoa despregando un grao alto de implicación emotiva. A nosa análise destaca a construción de estilos femininos e masculinos no despregamento de indignación a través das actividades de queixa nestas interaccións, e o papel fundamental que desempeña a prosodia a este respecto.

Palabras clave: discurso de queixa, despregamento de emocións, xénero, análise da conversa, sociolingüística interpretativa.

1. Introduction: Complaint discourse

Complaint discourse, over the last few years, has drawn the attention of numerous researchers, particularly of those working from the viewpoint of conversation analysis. Some of the studies conducted within this analytical framework examine the procedures involved in the handling of this communicative activity, highlighting its indirect insertion in the interaction. Mandelbaum's analysis (1991/1992), for example, focuses on the methods adopted by speakers to formulate a complaint merely apparent, and in the strategies used by interlocutors subtly to overlook this action. In the two complaint sequences analyzed by this author, speakers negatively frame the events that they reconstruct to express their complaints, only in an implicit manner, leaving it to the interlocutors to deal with them, explicitly, as complaints. Disattention towards this type of complaint precisely involves overlooking how this is implicitly carried out, dealing with the reconstructed events as neutral and responding, in a coherent manner, in terms of this erroneous interpretation. Among the possible motivations for these lacks of conversational co-operation, Mandelbaum notes that complaint formulating, in certain cases, puts the speakers in a compromising position, as for example, when they have a close friendship or are related to the person about whom the interlocutor is complaining. Roulston's analysis (2000), on the other hand, focuses on interview situations where both the interviewer and the interviewee belong to the "music teachers" collective. In this type of situation, in a similar manner to that noted by Mandelbaum, the interviewees' complaints in terms of the poor situation of this collective were initially formulated in a fairly indirect manner. However, in view of the interviewer's indirect affiliation, the interviewees subsequently reformulated their complaints in a more direct and authoritarian style. As far as Roulston is concerned (2000: 335-36), these procedures echo the fact that complaints are a "risky business" in situations where participants belong to a given collective, because the co-participant "knows too much" and may easily refute an "unsafe" complaint.

Complaint activities are then, in some cases, preceded by sequences in which speakers sound out the interlocutor's availability to become involved in a co-operative manner, in carrying out the activity and possibilities of affiliation, with his/her own critical angle on events. This is a feature which complaint activities share with troubles-talk (Jefferson, 1988), and with gossip (Bergmann & Luckmann, 1995). The manner in which speakers proceed to formulate a complaint (or narrate a problem or gossip) largely depends on its content and on the type of relationship between the participants. As Drew (1998: 323) notes:

we do not complain to just anyone: we choose who to complain to and what kinds of complaints might appropriately be made to which kinds of recipients. The matter of choosing to tell a recipient about something that happened, and

the manner in which that is told (i.e., complained about) involves some degree of complicity between the speaker and the recipient.

In situations where there is a high degree of complicity between the participants, complaint activities take up long, clearly demarcated sequences, because the speakers usually start up and end what they have to say in a fairly abrupt manner (Drew, 1998). Studies examining complaint activities in these situations highlight their important social functions, to the extent that they re-affirm links of solidarity between the participants, through the construction of a “common identity” (Günthner, 1997a: 213). A fair number of these studies centres on analyzing the conversational resources used to invite the affiliative display of the interlocutors in complaints sequences about transgressions and misconduct of a third party. In these sequences, narratives are basic means for providing evidence of the negative nature of conducts that are being rejected and moving the audience, by means of a “staging” of events (Günthner, 1997a, 1997b). Reported speech in these narratives is marked by “parodic stylization” (Bakhtin, 1981: 364): the narrators employ certain prosodic devices to construct a caricaturized portrayal of the quoted voices. Reported speech, both in indirect and direct style (cf. Günthner, 1997a, 1997b) is then, a powerful mechanism of implicit discrediting in sequences where the speakers complain about what somebody had said in a previous interaction:

although appearing to reproduce previous locutions in an objective manner, it is clear that factors such as a the design of the telling and the prosody of the reported utterance can implicate the speaker’s attitude toward the reported utterance, thus inviting a particular kind of response from the recipient.
(Holt, 2000: 438)

But speakers not only implicitly discredit the “bad speech” (Briggs, 1996: 25) of a third party through reported speech or his/her misconduct in general by means of a dramatic staging of the events, but also by negatively evaluating the reported events in an explicit manner. Whereas in communicative activities focusing on one’s own misconduct, such as excuses or justifications, the moral meaning of the discourse usually remains implicit, in complaint activities regarding the conduct of another party, the discourse in this case lies in the interactional surface of the talk because the speakers frequently resort to explicit formulations of the transgressions (Drew, 1998: 306-9). Anticipating a possible sceptical response from the audience to any strong accusations made determines the display of various types of argumentative tools. These tools include circumstantial accounts of the transgression and reasoning practices about events and behaviour (Drew, 1998: 312-15), the frequent use of extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1986) and of idiomatic expressions (Drew & Holt, 1988), list construction (Jefferson, 1990; Roulston, 2000) and of contrasts between the appropriate conducts of the complainants and the unfair

or inappropriate conducts of those being complained about (Günthner, 1997a; Drew, 1998).

Narratives and reported speech also play an important role in this respect. In complaint activities regarding misconduct, it is common for the speakers to add on other narratives to the “original piece” (Bergmann & Luckmann, 1995: 300) that contextualize the main transgressions. Inclusion of these exemplary stories (Günthner, 1995) serves to highlight the fact that the negative evaluation of the person being complained about is not based on one isolated case, but rather on the recurring nature of his/her bad actions. Inclusion of exemplary stories is, therefore, a way of lending more weight to the censorship of the “antagonists” (Günthner, 1997a, 1997b), i.e., of the people whose conduct has affected the speaker. On the other hand, reported speech is, moreover, a powerful way of conveying objectivity (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Just as a third person’s criticisms may easily determine a non-affiliative response from the audience by, for instance, considering that the speaker has taken a dislike to a given person, or that he/she is exaggerating, the speakers often include what others said of the antagonists, that is in keeping with their own critical perspective, in order to convey objectivity.

Emotions display is the most powerful strategy to win over the empathy of the interlocutors in complaint activities. Günthner’s analyses (1997a, 1997b) of “complaint stories” among women friends draw special attention to the prosodic and verbal techniques used by female speakers to contextualize their negative affective stances towards the events. Our aim in this article is to discuss the gender meaning of certain affective intensification devices¹ from the analysis of conversational extracts corresponding to interactions that took place between Galician speakers in socially intimate scenarios. In these interactions, the participants complain about a third party’s conduct, displaying a high degree of emotive involvement, in a very similar manner to what occurs in the complaint stories analyzed by Günthner (1997a, 1997b). Taking as our starting point the methods of conversation analysis and of interpretative sociolinguistics, we show that, in these interactions, male and female speakers employ devices to contextualize their negative affective stances that are gender-related. In line with the latest trends in gender and discourse research (see Kendall & Tannen, 2001), we take a constructivist view whereby gender is considered dynamically as the achievement of socio-cultural expectations, in terms of the verbal and non-verbal conduct of men and women. From this viewpoint, the so-called “gender differences” arise from the exhibition of verbal and non-verbal behaviour patterns that all societies link to sexual class (Goffman, 1977), and the

¹ We consider the notion of “affect” in its broadest sense, as the conventionalised and socio-culturally learnt display of feelings, attitudes, emotions, humour and dispositions of the speakers towards the propositional content of the utterances (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989; Caffi & Janney, 1994; Selting, 1994; Günthner, 1997b).

study of gender, therefore, becomes a part of the more general study of the social meaning of linguistic practices (Ochs, 1992). It is important to emphasize, therefore, that our intention is not to establish generalisations of the type “men do this, women do that” (Cameron, 1995), but rather to show how “femininity” and “masculinity” can be evoked through language use, specifically, which are the linguistic mechanisms involved in the construction of gendered discourse through emotions display in complaint activities.

2. Female affective intensification devices

Examples 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, analyzed in this section, correlate to these female interactions:

- a) The interaction in an urban bus, between two women friends, who we shall call Lola and Mari. Lola presents a complaint story regarding the uncooperative conduct and poor work performance of a work colleague.
- b) The interaction in a school yard, between three women friends, who we shall call Bea, Car and Sus. Bea complains about the misconduct of her son, who was not only playing truant throughout almost the entire academic year, but also hid a letter from the teacher advising the mother of this conduct.
- c) The interaction in the kitchen of a private house, between a mother and her daughter, who we shall call Isa and Ana respectively. Isa presents a complaint story regarding the conduct of an old female friend. The illustration of this character focuses on various aspects: she is typified as having a nerve, as bad-mannered and as an indiscrete gossip.

Interactions (a) and (b) are taken from the *Corpus of Bilingual Galician/Spanish Speech*²; interaction (c) was recorded in audio, with a hidden microphone, through observant participation.

2.1. High rising intonation phrase finals and elliptical syntactic constructions

One of the affective intensification devices frequently used by female participants in the interactions of this corpus entails the combining high rising intonation phrase-finals with so-called *suspended utterances*: comparative or consecutive type syntactic structures, where the second term is suppressed to intensify the quantification or the consideration expressed (Herrero, 1997: 121; Briz, 1998). These devices are used to contextualize the negative descriptions of the antagonists as extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1986). Example 1 is Isa’s complaint story on her friend’s misconduct. Ana

² Project set up at the University of Vigo which has been financed by the Xunta de Galicia (XUGA 30202A98) and the University of Vigo (Vice-Rectorate for Research, University of Vigo, 1998–2001). See Rodríguez-Yáñez & Casares-Berg in this issue.

strategically signals co-indignation at this explanation of the antagonist's misconduct, by resorting to extreme case formulations:

Example 1

- | | | |
|---|-----|--|
| 1 | ISA | {[dc] y le dije yo} →
<i>and I said to her</i> |
| 2 | | {xx} |
| 3 | | terminaron el año ↓ =
<i>they finished the year</i> |
| 4 | ANA | = ah {[a] es que tiene una cara} ↑ ↑ =
<i>ah, just that she's got a nerve</i> |
| 5 | ISA | = y le dije yo =
<i>and I told her</i> |
| 6 | ANA | = es que tiene [un moRRO:] →
<i>just that she's got a cheek</i> |
| 7 | ISA | [y le dije yo] tienes {[xx]}
<i>just that I told her you've got</i> |

With the reconstruction of a dialogue between the two antagonistic protagonists of the story world, i.e., Isa and her friend (lines 1-3, 5, 7), Ana replies affiliatively, inserting negative evaluations of the antagonist (lines 4, 6). These utterances are equivalents, from a lexical-syntactic stance, to the extent that both use syntactic ellipses to intensify a very similar negative description of the antagonist, although they differ at prosodic level, as there is a high rising intonation phrase-final, combined with the use of a global high pitch in the first case, = ah {[a] es que tiene una cara} ↑ ↑ (“ah, just that she’s got a nerve”) (line 4), and a sustained intonation phrase-final combined with phonetic lengthening in the second: = es que tiene [un moRRO:] → (“just that she’s got a cheek”) (line 6). The lexical-syntactic similarities and the prosodic differences between these utterances reflect the fact that “verbal and prosodic repetition are independent of one another” (Couper-Kuhlen, 1996: 367). Syntactic (ellipsis), lexico-semantic (negative description) and prosodic devices (high rising intonation phrase-final and global high pitch; sustained intonation phrase-final and phonetic lengthening), as commented, are used to evaluate the antagonist negatively as a person with an extreme nerve. The use of extreme case formulations in the negative description of this person functions as a strategy to point out co-indignation at Isa’s complaint story.

Other examples particularly underscore the combination of high rising intonation phrase-finals, suppressing the second terms in the consecutive syntactic structures constructed with the lexical intensifiers *so/such a/as ... as*. The typically female use of constructions of the type, “I’m so glad you came”, has been noted by authors such as Jespersen (1922: 249), who viewed this type of use negatively, echoing

the fact that women “much more often than men, break off without having thought out what they are going to say”, and Lakoff (1975: 55), who considered them as “a device you’d use if you felt it unseemly to show you had strong emotions, or to make strong assertions, but felt you had something along those lines anyway”. The syntactic ellipsis characterising this type of construction has led to the frequently held consideration that this is a matter of incomplete or deficient linguistic uses which, when associated with female speech style, have been correspondingly interpreted as markers of a supposed vagueness, impression or haste in women as speakers. Example 2 entails Lola’s complaint story about her work colleague’s uncooperative conduct. This speaker emphasises her rejection of the antagonist by constructing a list of her negative attributes:

Example 2

1	LOLA	dixéronlle → <i>they told her</i>
2		(según) ↑ <i>(according to)</i>
3		{{[f] Lola} → <i>Lola</i>
4		mire ustedé tiene ↑ <i>listen you must</i>
5		Lola tiene dos brazos y dos piernas → <i>Lola's got two arms and two legs</i>
6	MARI	{{[p] sí} → <i>yes</i>
7	LOLA	y ustedé tiene dos brazos y dos piernas ↓ <i>and you've got two arms and two legs</i>
8		y dos manos ↓ <i>and two hands</i>
9		{{[p] como ella} → <i>like her</i>
10		entonces {{[f] si lo hace ella} ↑ <i>so if she can do it</i>
11		lo hace ustedé} ↓ <i>you can too</i>
12		(a difere-) ↑ <i>(unlike)</i>
13		{{[ac] pero éche tan 'mula tan 'bestia tan 'Mala tan venenoS:A} ↑ ↑ <i>but she's as stubborn as a mule such a poisonous one</i>
14	MARI	{{[p] así por lo que hablas} ↑ = <i>going off what you say</i>

In this sequence, Lola reconstructs the manner in which the company management had called the antagonist's attention, because of her poor performance at work, to highlight the fact that these people support Lola in this conflict (lines 1-5, 7-11). So, the speaker uses reported speech as an objectivity resource (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998), quoting in direct style and changing over to Spanish in order to "stage" the conversation (Günthner, 1997a, 1997b) and to create the involvement of the woman being addressed (Tannen, 1989). The reconstruction of this dialogue between the antagonist and her bosses is interrupted by the formulation of a negative evaluation comment on the antagonist. Interspersing evaluation comments during the narrative process, is a general feature of narratives concerning an interpersonal conflict. These interspersings function as metadiscursive strategies that stress both links and gaps between narrated and narrative events, conferring a particularly "disorderly" feeling to the discourse (Briggs, 1996). In line 13, Lola interrupts herself to discredit her work colleague explicitly: {[ac] **pero éche tan 'mula tan 'bestia tan 'Mala tan venenoS:A**} ↑↑ ("but she's as stubborn as a mule such a poisonous one"). The speaker makes the antagonist out to be an extreme case of a "bad person", by combining prosodic resources, such as time acceleration and high rising intonation phrase-final, with the suspended construction of the utterance, the use of various negative evaluative vocatives, while repeating the syntactic model *so/such a + predicate*. The antagonist is made out to be an extreme case of a bad person, by listing her negative attributes. This strategy determines the audience's display of affiliation in the following turn (14).

Example 3 concerns Isa's complaint story as regards her friend's conduct. In this case, we are unable to speak of the use of suspended utterances, although very similar resources as those seen in the previous example are resorted to:

Example 3

1	ISA	= ella es:: [M::Aleducada] → <i>she is bad-mannered</i>
2	ANA	[la veo] ↓ <i>I can see</i>
3		no es que la Lola:: → = <i>no it's just that Lola</i>
4	ISA	= es [una co'Tilla] → <i>she's a gossip</i>
5	ANA	[no tiene: (xx)] <i>she's got no</i>
6	ISA	es es una es una = <i>she's she's a</i>
7	ANA	= [(xx)]
8	ISA	[es 'tan] 'SUPERMALEDU'CADA ↑↑ = <i>she's so super-bad-mannered</i>

9	ANA	= sí = yes
10	ISA	= que tan maleducada es ↑ <i>she's so bad-mannered that</i>
11		que no puede ser má::s fijate = <i>just how bad-mannered can you get</i>
12	ANA	= sí sí [sí] yes yes yes

As in the previous example, in this sequence, Isa emphasises her feelings of rejection towards the antagonist, by drawing up a list of the person's negative attributes (lines 1, 4, 6). Reiterated use of the syntactic model subject + verb + predicate, as an enumerating resource is, nonetheless, interrupted by the speaker's hesitancy (line 6). Thus, the process of intensifying the negative description of the antagonist subsequently replaces the use of this enumerative model by the consecutive structure *so + that* (lines 8, 10-11). The negative evaluation of the antagonist as an extremely bad-mannered person implies a combination of prosodic intensifier resources, such as an increase in volume when pronouncing the negative evaluation vocative of "super-bad-mannered", the high rising intonation phrase-final and emphatic accentuation, with verbal intensifier resources, such as the lexical intensifier *so/such a*, the derivation through the use of the augmentative prefix *super*, and the construction of a chiasmus (Quinn, 1982): [es 'tan] 'SUPERMALEDU'CADA ↑ ↑ = ("she's so super-bad-mannered") (line 8), = que tan maleducada es ↑ ("she's so bad-mannered that") (line 10), que no puede ser má::s fijate = ("just how bad-mannered can you get") (line 11). The audience's affiliative responses appear interspersed in this affective display (lines 2-3, 5, 7, 9, 12).

2.2. Emphatic accentuation

The belief that women's talk has a characteristic emphatic load enjoys a long tradition. Expressive intonation and emphatic accentuation are considered to be the main melodic keys of the female voice (Wu & Childers, 1991: 1829). Exploitation of emphatic accentuation is another feature to note in the emotive discourse of female participants in the interactions of this corpus. In some cases, the rhythmic organization of a considerable number of emphatic accents leads to a similar phenomenon to what Müller (1991) terms as "metrical emphasis". In example 4, relating Lola's complaint story of her work colleague, the speaker reconstructs the complaints to the managers of the company where both work, in a comical fashion:

Example 4

- 1 LOLA **un día xa lles dixen** →
one day I said to them
- 2 **ós directivos** →
to the managers
- 3 **(dixenlle) mire por favor** →
(I told him) listen please
- 4 ..
- 5 **(xx) séntanma aí nunha silla** ↑
sit yourself down on a chair
- 6 ..
- 7 **que a mi no me importa** ↓
just that I don't mind
- 8 {[ac] **que a senten nunha silla e que esté ali quietaña**} ↓
if they sit her down on a chair and that she stays there quiet
- 9 **PERO 'HA DE PO'ÑER UNHA CREMA'LLERA NA 'BOCA EH?**
but she has to put a zip on her mouth eh?
- 10 MARI he he
- 11 LOLA (e:) [laughing]
and
- 12 **a min non me importa traballar** →
I don't mind work
- 13 **pero a ela cóllena sentada a'li nunha es'quina** ↑
but they found her sat down there in a corner
- 14 **cunha crema'llera na 'boca** ↑
with a zip on her mouth
- 15 **e que non se levante da silla para nada** ↓
and she couldn't leave her chair at all
- 16 <4>

In this sequence, the speaker makes her complaints in a comical way (using irony, humorous expressions) to show that she can take the clash with her colleague in good spirits, i.e., in order to communicate “troubles resistance”, as noted by Jefferson (1984: 351) in his analysis of troubles-talk:

It appears that in troubles-talk, a laughing troubles-teller is doing a recognizable sort of job. He is exhibiting that, although there is this trouble, it is not getting the better of him; he is managing; he is in good spirits and in a position to take the trouble lightly. He is exhibiting what we might call “troubles-resistance”.

In line 9, the increase in volume and metrical emphasis combine to contextualize insistence and perseverance (Müller, 1991) in Lola’s demands: **PERO 'HA DE PO'ÑER UNHA CREMA'LLERA NA 'BOCA EH?** (“but she has to put a zip on her mouth eh?”). The interlocutor responds to this comic signalling of indignation, in line 10, in

an affiliative manner, with a laugh. Construction of the utterances in lines 14-15, on the other hand, underlines the role of prosodic repetition in the contextualization of insistence and perseverance: both present rising intonation phrase-final and shifting of the emphatic accents to the final part: **pero a ela cóllena sentada a lí nunha es'quina** ↑ (“but they found her sat down there in a corner”) (line 14), **cunha crema llera na 'boca** ↑ (“with a zip on her mouth”) (line 15).

Example 5 is Isa's complaint story of her friend's misconduct. In a similar manner to what we have seen in 2.1, the speaker signals indignation through the use of extreme case formulations in the negative description of the antagonist and of her family in general. In this case, however, this type of formulation is constructed by combining suspended constructions with metrical emphasis and accelerating of time:

Example 5

1	ISA	= y cogi ↑ <i>I grabbed hold</i>
2		y me senté → <i>and I sat down</i>
3		y me senté → <i>and I sat down</i>
4		NO:: <i>no</i>
5		{[ac] es que se ti'enen 'unos 'perga'minos} → <i>just that they've got some parchments</i>
6		como me dijo Paqui [una vez en el río dice] <i>as Paqui told me once down at the river she said</i>
7	ANA	[se ti'E:nen se ti'E:nen] unos aires ↑ ↑ = <i>they put on they put on airs</i>
8	ISA	= {[ac] esas se ti'enen 'unos 'aires} → <i>they put on airs</i>
9		ya fueron mucho para BAJO ↓ <i>they've slid down a lot</i>
10		cayeron mucho porque les dieron muchos cortes en #ciudad# <i>they've slid down a lot because they've been put down in #town#</i>
11		'PE::ro las 'tias se ti'enen un:: = <i>but those girls put on</i>
12	ANA	= SÍ SÍ se tienen por una [gran ↓ co::sa] ↑ <i>yes yes they think they're really it</i>
13	ISA	[(xx) de miedo] de miedo <i>they go too far too far</i>

As we saw in example 2, Isa interrupts the narrative process (lines 1-3) to discredit the antagonists explicitly for their excessive arrogance (lines 4-5). This discrediting is formulated as an extreme case by means of syntactic ellipsis and the

use of emphatic prosodic parameters: time is accelerated and all syllables are accentuated constituting a specific rhythmic model, {[ac] es que se ti'enen 'unos 'perga'minos} → (“just that they’ve got some parchments”) (line 5). In line 6, Isa reconstructs what other people in the world of the story world had said regarding the antagonists’ extreme arrogance in supporting the negative evaluation of these people which she has just done herself, i.e., she uses reported speech as an objectivity resource: como me dijo Paqui [una vez en el río dice] (“as Paqui told me once down at the river she said”). Ana overlaps in line 7 with a verbal imitation of Isa’s turn in line 5: the antagonist’s negative description is, once again, contextualized as an extreme case of arrogance, through syntactic ellipsis and the use of a lexical formula equivalent to that employed by Isa, “they put on airs”. The utterance, however, is different from the prosodic point of view. In this case, a high rising intonation phrase-final is resorted to, and there is no metrical emphasis, but rather a strong accentuation in the tonic syllables of the verbs which are repeated: [se ti'E:nen se ti'E:nen] unos aires ↑ ↑ = (“they put on they put on airs”).

The utterance in line 8 quotes, in direct speech, what Isa stated in line 6. The discourse of the people cited by the speaker to support their own discrediting of the antagonist is almost a word for word repetition of her previous intervention in line 5, excepting the replacement of the term “parchments” for “airs” (which also coincides, therefore, with Ana’s intervention in line 7). The prosodic parameters used are also identical (accelerating of time and rhythmic organization of a high number of emphatic accents): = {[ac] esas se ti'enen 'unos 'aires} → (“they put on airs”).

The use of “normal” prosodic parameters demarks a bracketing in lines 9-10. In line 11, Isa once again resorts to combining syntactic ellipsis with the use of emphatic prosodic parameters (marked dense accentuation, marked rhythmic organization, local increase in volume, phonetic lengthening), to formulate the arrogance of the antagonists as an extreme case: 'PE::ro las 'tías se ti'enen un:: = (“but those girls put on”).

Lastly, Ana closes the sequence with a final evaluation of the people involved. While in previous turns, the participants combine the suspended structuring of the statements with the use of emphatic prosodic parameters to construct extreme case formulations in the negative description of the antagonists, in this case the syntactic structure of the statement appears in its entirety: = SÍ SÍ se tienen por una [gran ↓ co::sa] ↑ (“yes yes they think they’re really it”) (line 12). The fall-rise pitch movement in the pronunciation of the word “cosa” is one of the melodic contours most avoided by male speakers, as noted by Brend (1975).

The joint discrediting of the antagonists through exchanges of expression of moral indignation builds up a sequence of “emotional reciprocity” (Günthner, 1997a) between the participants. This type of sequence contextualizes the “peaks of emotive involvement”, from an interactional viewpoint, in complaint activities. In this sequence, Ana almost immediately ratifies (occasionally by overlapping) the negative evaluation that Isa makes of the antagonists, through the use of statements

similar to those used by Isa at the lexical-syntactic level. This example particularly underlines the “automaticity” with which dialogical repetition often occurs in conversational interaction, and the important role played by this strategy in establishing rapport between the participants (Tannen, 1989: 87-93).

2.3. Prosodic patterns of “surprise” and response cries

According to Brend (1975: 85), one of the most characteristic features of female voices is the use of intonational models expressing “unexpectedness and surprise”. In line with Günthner (1997a) had previously noted in her analysis of complaint stories among women, the female participants in the interactions of this corpus use prosodic patterns and interjectional expressions, which indicate “surprise”, in a ritualized manner, to signal co-indignation at the types of conduct described. In example 6, Isa reconstructs a conversation where the antagonist approaches her in the street to ask her impertinent questions about her relations’ lives. The woman being addressed by the story, Ana, shows her co-indignation at this conduct with an expression of disbelief:

Example 6

1	ISA	[porque] eso de llamarme → <i>because this thing about calling me</i>
2		de decir <i>about saying</i>
3		pasar por ella y decirle adiós <i>go up to her and tell her goodbye</i>
4		y llamarme <i>and call me</i>
5		{{[a] I::sa ↑ <i>Isa [false voice]</i>
6		mi::ra → <i>listen</i>
7		qué te voy a decir → <i>what can I say?</i>
8		tu hermana:: <i>your sister</i>
9		y Carina Estévez se enfada- <i>and Carina Estévez gets cross</i>
10		están enfadados?} = <i>are they cross?</i>
11	ANA	= {[ac] [ac] [a] TE PREGUNTÓ?} <i>did she ask you? [astonished]</i>
12	ISA	sí: <i>yes</i>

13	ANA	[yo flipo] yo es que flipo ↓ = <i>that flips me out I mean that flips me out</i>
14	ISA	= AH pues si este invierno <i>ah well this winter</i>
15	ANA	{[p] este ↑ invie::mo} ↓ <i>this winter [astonished]</i>

Reconstruction of this conversation between the narrator-protagonist and the antagonist is used to make it clear that this person is an indiscrete gossip (lines 1-10). Furthermore, reported speech also acts as a resort to convey, in an implicit manner, the narrator's critical perspective towards the statements that she is reporting. By means of techniques of "prosodic stylization" (Günthner, 1997a, 1997b), such as phonetic lengthening and the use of a global high pitch (line 5), the narrator ascribes the antagonist with a false, hypocritical voice. Reconstruction of this dialogue reflects the characteristics of a certain gossip practice that Lamela Vieira (1998: 171-73) aptly terms "the interrogatory". This is a matter of scenes which normally take place on the street or in public establishments, where one person addresses another to enquire as to the private life of that person or of his or her relatives, in an apparently disinterested manner. The interrogator, although aware that his/her behaviour is incorrect, continues with the interrogatory, "generally with smiles, in an amicable fashion and in an exaggerated tone of innocent curiosity" (op. cit., p. 171). Ana's affiliative display occurs immediately after reconstructing this dialogue, in line 11, as she formulates an "astonished question" (Selting, 1996). This type of question is asked with specific prosodic parameters (to be distinguished from the "real" questions) and fulfils diverse functions, depending on the communicative context. Given the connotations of amazement, surprise or astonishment, these questions are used, for example, when the speaker considers something said by the interlocutor to be contradictory and seeks clarification. The main contextualization cues are the use of global high pitch and increased volume, although these may also be accompanied by others, such as a marked phonetic lengthening and/or acceleration/deceleration of time (Selting, 1996). In the example in point, the speaker combines the use of global high pitch, an increased volume and a marked acceleration of time in asking the question, = {[ac] [ac] [a] TE PREGUNTÓ?} ("did she ask you?") (line 11), to point out that she considers the antagonist's conduct as unbelievable. Affiliation by means of a show of this type of co-indignation strategy extends to subsequent interventions. In line 13, the reiterated use of the verb "flip out" constitutes an indignation formula: *yo flipo yo es que flipo* ↓ = ("that flips me out I mean that flips me out"). In line 15, the low volume and the rise-fall pitch movement in the pronunciation of the word "winter" indicates, once again, a ritualised shock or stupefaction to show co-indignation: {[p] este ↑ invie::mo} ↓ ("this winter").

Besides handling this type of prosodic patterns, the affiliation display through an expression of disbelief also implies the use of response cries (Goffman, 1981). Within the wide range of this type of expressions, some appear firmly associated with female discourse, due to the semantic particularities presented. Those indicating shock or surprise at a situation which, in reality, is under control, and for which there is no real cause for concern, takes on certain connotations of “frivolity” that make their merely ritual use more predictable among women (Goffman, 1981: 103). Example 7 is Bea’s complaint story over her son’s mischief. Explanation of the antagonist’s misconduct determines the insertion of shows of co-indignation by the audience, through response cries:

Example 7

1	BEA	[(xx)]
2		<1>
3		e:: empezou:: <i>he started</i>
4		{{ac} bueno} ↓ <i>well</i>
5		pero ahora → <i>but now</i>
6		cando me chamou (el lunes) la profe <i>when the teacher called me (on Monday)</i>
7		mire <i>listen</i>
8		<1>
9		e:: h el rapaz <i>the boy</i>
10		es ahí la casa de:: Carlos David (xx) <i>is that Carlos David’s house</i>
11		si <i>yes</i>
12		es usted la madre? <i>are you his mother?</i>
13		si <i>yes</i>
14		..
15		pues:: <i>well</i>
16		<1>
17		mire <i>listen</i>
18		{{ac} es que el niño está faltando mucho a clase} <i>it’s just that the boy is missing lots of classes</i>
19		{{f} le mandé una::} <i>I sent you a</i>

- 20 SUS **A:::H ↑ =**
- 21 BEA = le mandé una:: no-
I sent you a no-
- 22 una carta
a letter
- 23 {[f] no le llegó señora?}
didn't you receive it, madame?
- 24 **NO::**
no [astonished]
- 25 SUS **no::**
no
- 26 he he he
- 27 BEA [**dixen eu mira si é oies**]
I said you see what he's like
- 28 CAR [**o:i que ↑ ghambe::rro**] ↓
look what a lout he is
- 29 BEA **buE:no ↓**
well
- 30 **si me deron ghanas de esmaghalo eh?**
yes I felt like walloping him one, you know?
- 31 <|>
- 32 **dixenlle eu**
I said to her
- 33 **oie pero**
hey but
- 34 **e logo a carta que mandaron?**
what about that letter you sent?
- 35 ..
- 36 **dixo ela**
she said
- 37 **pues la mandamos por correo eh?**
well we sent it by post, you know?
- 38 **dixen eu boh**
I said uuff
-
-
-
- 39 BEA **xa nos pasaron máis casos destes**
we've had other cases like this
- 40 <|>
- 41 **que:: de mandar as cartas por correo**
all this about send letters by post
- 42 **e os pais non se enteran**
and the parents never get them
- 43 **e en canto pasan unhos cuantos días**
and after a few days have gone by

- 44 **chaman por teléfono**
they ring up
- 45 SUS (xx) =
- 46 BEA = **dixen eu mira o tío maricón por que**
I said listen little beggar why
- 47 **ademais el non ten chave do buzón**
what's more he hasn't got the key to the letter box
- 48 **pero un día díxome**
but one day he said to me
- 49 {[ac] [a] mamá déjame la llave del buzón ↑
mum will you let me have the key to the letter box?
- 50 que me parece que hay una carta::
because I think there's a letter
- 51 ..
- 52 de la caja de ahorros en el buzón para mi} ↓
from the savings bank in the letter box for me
- 53 **dixenlle eu**
I told him
- 54 **e por que vai haber unha caixa::?**
and why's there going to be a savings bank ...?
- 55 <l>
- 56 **pero eu**
but I
- 57 [**non lle dixen nada**] ↑
didn't say anything
- 58 CAR [**cla::ro**] =
course
- 59 BEA = **colleu as chaves no caixón ↑**
he got the keys to the letter box
- 60 **baixou e:: →**
he went downstairs and
- 61 CAR **A::i que ↑ ghambe::rro ↓**
look what a lout

As in examples studied above, reconstruction of the telephone conversation in which the teacher informs Bea of her son's numerous absences from class (lines 7-19, 21-24, 32-44) works as a resort to provide evidence of the antagonist's misconduct. The audience's first affiliative reaction occurs just after the teacher's explicit formulation of the antagonist's misconduct, i.e., the numerous absences from class (line 18), through a response cry (line 20). Later reference to the warning note that the teacher had sent and that Bea had not received (lines 21-24) determines the construction of a brief indignation dialogue (Günthner, 1997a) in lines 25-30. The receivers of the story strategically show their affiliation in this exchange through laughter (lines 25-26) and a response cry: [o::i que ↑ ghambe::rro] ↓ ("look what a lout he is") (line 28). Bea, for her part, uses indignation formula, [**dixen eu mira**

si é oies] (“I said you see what he’s like”) (line 27), and hyperbolic expressions: **si me deron ghanas de esmaghalo eh?** (“yes I felt like walloping him one, you know?”) (line 30). Finally, the reporting of the antagonist’s discourse asking for the keys to the letter box to get the letter sent by his teacher and, thus, avoid his parents’ seeing it (lines 49-52) once again arouses the audience’s affiliative display through a response cry: **A::i que ↑ ghambE::rro ↓** (“look what a lout”) (line 61).

3. Male affective intensification devices

Examples 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 to be analyzed in this section, are an interaction comprising an exchange of complaint stories between young members of a football supporters club of Real Madrid, whom we shall call Fran and Luis. Their complaint stories concern the poor organization, incompetence and misconduct in general of the main leaders of the supporters club. This interaction was recorded by the researcher on audio, with a hidden microphone, through observant participation, in a bar frequented by men who meet up each night to play cards. In the course of this interaction, two female participants are also present, acting as audience of this practice: a friend and the researcher. In a very similar manner to that noted by Hall (1993) in her analysis of gossip narratives among girls of the Dominican Republic, the participation structures in this interaction determine the setting up of two groups: a primary group, which is the one carrying out the conversational activity itself (comprising two members of the football supporters club), and a secondary group (comprising two female participants, detached from the conflicts between the members of the supporters club). This secondary group acts as an audience to the practice and has a more restricted access to the turn.

The communicative activity commences by Fran’s introduction of a complaint story concerning the club manager’s failure to provide him with tickets for a Real Madrid match at the Santiago Bernabéu Stadium. Fran had paid for the tickets through the club, prior to travelling to Madrid, but when he reached the stadium, he found that the ticket office refused to give them to him for not having a membership card with him. Consequently, the protagonist had to pay for the tickets again off a tout to be able to see the match. Narrating this experience opens up the way for telling other old stories related to the incompetence and poor organisation of the club managers.

3.1. Hyperbolic performance of rhetorical questions

In her analysis of complaint stories among women, Günthner (1997a) underlines the use of rhetorical questions as a resource of affective intensification. In the male interaction of this corpus, rhetorical questions are made prosodically, in an aggressive manner and are frequently accompanied by the use of stigmatized emphatic markers:

Example 8

- 1 CATI hombre yo por ejemplo
man me for instance
- 2 yo en #ciudad# nunca he oído esas movidas con las peñas
me down #town# I've never had those kinds of scenes with supporters club
- 3 porque en #ciudad# lo del tema de las peñas
because down #town# this stuff about the clubs
- 4 aunque llegues a última hora:: =
although you get there at the last minute
- 5 LUIS = todos tienen entrada no? =
they've all got tickets, right?
- 6 CATI = no se [andan (xx)]
I don't know they go
- 7 LUIS [o lo respetan más seguro] =
or they respect it most probably
- 8 CATI = no tiene no tienes [fallo o sea:]
he doesn't have you don't have any mistake or in other words
- 9 LUIS [(xx) mal organizado es] del Real Madrid =
badly organized is the Real Madrid
- 10 FRAN = {[f] [f] pero si no tengo [ni carné]}
but if I haven't got my card
- 11 LUIS [(xx)] =
- 12 FRAN = {[f] [f] de la PE::ña qué coño [voy a (acre-)]}
of the supporters club what the shit I'm going to show (proof)
- 13 LUIS [(xx)] =
- 14 FRAN = {[f] [f] qué coño voy a acreditar} → =
what the shit am I going to prove
- 15 LUIS = (xx)
- 16 después
after
- 17 y el carné no?
and the card, right?
- 18 (xx)
- 19 no hace falta
not necessary
- 20 {[a] é igual que carné?}
it's the same as the card? [false voice]
- 21 nada hombre nada ↑
nothing man nothing

In this sequence, a female participant, Cati, and one of the members of the supporters club, Luis, comment on the differences in the organization of tickets for club members, depending the teams (lines 1-9). Fran bursts into the exchange to formulate a rhetorical question (lines 10, 12, 14), whereby he sets out to highlight

the fact that it is not the fault of the Real Madrid organization or of football clubs in general, but rather of the managers of the team's local supporters club of which they are members, since they had failed to issue them with the appropriate club membership card and to acquire tickets without any setbacks. Fran's rhetorical question puts forward an argument with the approach "if ... then.", and presents a marked overall increase in volume, a strong emphasis on the word "peña" ("supporters club"), a stigmatized emphatic marker "shit", and a sustained intonation phrase-final: = {[f] [f] pero si no tengo [ni carné]} ("but if I haven't got my card") (line 10), = {[f] [f] de la PE::ña qué coño [voy a (acre-)]} ("of the supporters club what the shit I'm going to show (proof)") (line 12), = {[f] [f] qué coño voy a acreditar} → = ("what the shit am I going to prove") (line 14). The overall marked increase in volume in formulating this question hinders understanding Luis' parallel interventions (lines 11, 13). In this sequence, the hyperbolic delivery of the rhetorical interrogation acts as an affective intensification resort to call the attention of the interlocutors and to demand for an affiliative response. This occurs in lines 16-21. Immediately following Fran's rhetorical question, Luis intervenes to reconstruct a conversation between him and one of the supporters' club managers (16-21). In this conversation, the protagonist's question on the need for the membership card (line 17) meets with the antagonist's impassive response, taking away any importance from this point (lines 20-21). By pointing out that the supporters' club managers deny the importance of the membership card, Luis lends support to Fran's previous reproach of the antagonist's conduct and affiliates with him.

3.2. Fast speech and low falling intonation

Another of the more outstanding resources of affective intensification in the emotive discourse of male participants entails the abrupt introduction of such prosodic parameters as an average increase in volume and a marked accelerating time. In a similar manner to that noted by Selting (1994) regarding the sequential organization of "emphatic speech style", these prosodic parameters are used to contextualize peaks of involvement in narrative performance and to call for responses:

Example 9

1	FRAN	= el ENCARGAO de la peña madridista de llamar a: <i>the manager of the Real Madrid supporters club to call</i>
2		<1>
3		de llamar a: <i>to call</i>
4	LUIS	al Bernabéu ↓ = <i>up the Bernabéu Stadium</i>
5	FRAN	= al Bernabéu ↑ <i>the Bernabéu Stadium</i>

- 6 LUIS parecía Gila allí vestido [(xx)]
he was like Gila dressed up like that
- 7 FRAN [parecía GILA]
like GILA [LUIS laughs]
- 8 mira te lo juro mira
listen I'm telling you listen
- 9 e::h
eh
- 10 faltaba un día pal partido →
there was just one day to go for the match
- 11 y leías desde la semana anterior ↑
and you were reading since the week before
- 12 en el Marca que no había entradas →
in the Marca that there were no tickets [Marca is a football newspaper]
- 13 <1>
- 14 y a él
and they
- 15 le mandaron la dirección ↑
they told him the route
- 16 el teléfono ↑
the telephone
- 17 equivocao ↓
was wrong
- 18 {[f] bueno sigue llamando [(xx)]}
alright keep on ringing
- 19 LUIS [no llamaron al teléfono] equivocao =
they didn't ring the wrong number
- 20 FRAN = llamaron (xx) por teléfono ↑
they called on the phone
- 21 LUIS al final (dieron con el) teléfono propio =
in the end (they found the) right number
- 22 FRAN = el martes
on Tuesday
- 23 (xx) Bernabéu pero::
Bernabéu Stadium but
- 24 sabe Dios a dónde [llamaron]
God knows where they called to
- 25 CATI [sí] =
yes
- 26 LUIS = de quince llamada::s =
after fifteen calls
- 27 FRAN = y le dice::
and he says
- 28 <2>
- 29 sí?
hello?
- 30 es el (xx)
it's

- 31 es el Real Madri?
is this Real Madrid?
- 32 <|>
- 33 sí
it is
- 34 no:: mira es que yo:: ↑
no listen it's just that I [hesitant voice]
- 35 pero todo titubeando sabes?
but stammering all the time you know? [normal voice]
- 36 yo llamaba ↑
I was calling [hesitant voice]
- 37 yo llamaba por las entradas del partido →
I was calling about tickets for the match
- 38 ah ↑
ah
- 39 no hay no hay
there aren't any none
- 40 ah ↑
ah
- 41 bumba →
uuff [normal voice]
- 42 cuelga ↓
hang up
- 43 ..
- 44 qué guay
that's great
- 45 dije
I said
- 46 no ya lo sé
no I knew that
- 47 {[f] [ac] me lo llevo leyendo quince días ↑
I've been reading about it since fifteen days
- 48 joder →
fuck it
- 49 que no hay) →
there's no [audience's laughter]
- 50 ..
- 51 {[f] [ac] [pareces gilipollas]} ↑
you cretin
- 52 LUIS {[xx]} =
- 53 FRAN = {[f] [ac] es que el tío tú imagínate →
just that the guy you can imagine
- 54 que estás trabajando en la oficina del Bernabéu ↑
you're working in the office at the Bernabéu Stadium
- 55 y (xx)} =
- 56 LUIS = pringao ↓
he's a drip [laughing]
- 57 puto pringao →
bloody drip

In this sequence, Fran introduces a narrative to underline the antagonist's incompetence, particularly that of the supporters club's manager by telephoning the Bernabéu Stadium offices to ask for match tickets. During the orientation phase, (see Labov & Waletzky, 1967, on the phases of narrative production), prior to the reconstruction of the main events, Fran picks up and enjoys the comparison made by Luis between this person and Gila³ to characterise him in a mocking manner (lines 6-7), and refer to the fact that a sports newspaper had reported on the lack of tickets one week earlier (lines 11-12), adding further weight to his subsequent discrediting of the manager. In the reconstruction of the telephone call made by the antagonist, to the Bernabéu Stadium offices to ask for tickets (27-40), the speaker assigns the manager with a hesitant voice (lines 34, 36-40), by means of parodic stylization techniques such as phonetic lengthening (line 34) and false starts in the construction of the reason for the call (lines 36-37).

Following the parodied acting out of the antagonist's call to the Bernabéu Stadium offices, Fran uses constructed dialogue (Tannen, 1989) to respond hypothetically to the information given by this person in terms of the lack of match tickets (lines 44-51). In lines 47-51, the abrupt introduction of time acceleration marks out this segment as "fast speech" (Uhmann, 1992), which highlights a particularly high degree of emotive involvement, in co-occurrence with the global increase in volume: {[f] [ac] me lo llevo leyendo quince días ↑ ("I've been reading about it since fifteen days") (line 47), joder → ("fuck it") (line 48), que no hay} → ("there's no") (line 49). Discrediting this person by using explicit categories closes the intervention: {[f] [ac] [pareces gilipollas]} ↑ ("you cretin") (line 51). Luis immediately responds to this show of emphatic involvement (Selting, 1994), although his intervention is overlapped on Fran's and is unintelligible (line 52). In lines 53-55, the use in co-occurrence of the same prosodic parameters with the use of techniques of appealing to the interlocutor such as the imperative verb tense, = {[f] [ac] es que el tío tú imagínate → ("it's just that the guy you can imagine") (line 53), leads to Luis' affiliative response through a negative evaluation of the person involved, = pringao ↓ ("he's a drip") (line 56), intensified by the use of a stigmatized emphatic marker in line 57: puto pringao → ("bloody drip").

Example 10 is very similar. The increase in volume and accelerating of time are abruptly introduced at the evaluation phase of the story, to call on an affiliative response from the audience:

Example 10

1 FRAN = aún por encima llegamos a Oporto
 what's worse is that when we got to Oporto

3 Gila was a Spanish stand-up comedian. His comic performances became very popular for his completely absurd telephone conversations. In this sequence, the participants joke about the supporters club manager's telephone call to the Real Madrid club offices to ask for tickets, comparing him with Gila.

- 2 que Oporto es un CAOS ↑
and Oporto is a chaos
- 3 en hora punta →
at rush hour
- 4 ..
- 5 era la hora de salida del chollo ↑ =
when everybody's coming out of work
- 6 LUIS = las siete las;:
at seven
- 7 FRAN que no dábamos llegao tal ↑
and we weren't going to get there
- 8 y le dice uno: →
and someone says him
- 9 de cachondeo al chófer →
having a laugh with the driver
- 10 <|>
- 11 {[f] oye neno:;
hey kid
- 12 <|>
- 13 **tí sabes donde va::s?**
do you know where you're going? [containing laughter]
- 14 no: ↑
no
- 15 <|>
- 16 {[f] [ac] me cago en dio:s ↑
fuck me
- 17 **pero tú pa donde va:s**
but where are you going
- 18 **E:h?**
eh? [audience's laughter]
- 19 el tío ↑
the guy
- 20 ..
- 21 ala ↑
hey
- 22 psst
psst
- 23 {[f] [ac] no sabía ni dónde quedaba el ESTADIO me cago en dios ↓
he didn't even know where the stadium was fuck me
- 24 no me jodas} ↓ =
fuck
- 25 LUIS = el rollo fue que [había una]
the thing was that there was one

The antagonists' incompetence and poor organization are underlined, in this case, through a narrative related to the driver selected to drive the coach to the Oporto stadium, on one of the trips organized by the supporters' club managers. After constructing the scenario at the orientation phase (lines 1-3, 5, 7), the use of a saying verb in the present (line 8) announces the staging of the story in that tense: the joking comments made by one of the travellers to the coach driver for having taken the wrong road. Sustained intonation phrase-finals and phonetic lengthening contribute to building up narrative tension, to attract the attention of the interlocutors, besides the strategic positioning of pauses (8-10). Furthermore, prosodic shift (increase in volume) and code switching to Galician in the reconstruction of the traveller's comments, through the use of direct reported speech (11-13, 16-18) comprise highly used stylistic resources in general, in enjoyable stories, in order to suggest to the audience the humoristic nature of what is being told (Holt, 2000).

The reconstruction of the question, jokingly made to the driver (11-13) and the latter's negative reply (14) underline the fact that this person did not know the way and that he was driving nowhere in particular, so that their arrival at the stadium was considerably delayed and the journey was a long and weary one. The global increase in volume and accelerating of time are abruptly introduced into the negative evaluation following the reconstruction of the dialogue (23-24), and which explicitly justifies the reason for introducing this short story into the interaction. By the use of the conjunction "not ... even" (line 23), Fran explicitly deals with this anecdote at the end of the sequence as an extreme case of incompetence on the part of the supporters' club managers, in order to legitimize his critical view of these people: {[f] [ac] no sabía ni dónde quedaba el ESTADIO me cago en dios ↓ ("he didn't even know where the stadium was fuck me") (line 23), no me jodas} ↓ = ("fuck") (line 24).

Kramarae (1977) studies the supra-segmental features involved in the prosodic presentation of the gender identities. By way of an example, the use of a notable volume, of very marked intonational falls and/or of a limited intonational range, would be the prosodic keys of an "aggressive" male voice. The emotive discourse of male participants underlines the use of these parameters at key points of the interaction:

Example 11

- | | | |
|---|------|---|
| 1 | FRAN | [y le cuesta mucho]
<i>and it's difficult for him</i> |
| 2 | LUIS | [al (xx) hostias]
<i>bloody hell</i> |
| 3 | FRAN | [a las peñas madridistas]
<i>to Real Madrid supporters clubs</i> |
| 4 | | <i>coger y decir</i>
<i>get up and say</i> |

- 5 mira no vamos a éste
 look we're not going to this
- 6 y vamos al
 and we're going to
- 7 al de la semana siguiente =
 the one next week
- 8 LUIS = que es del mismo precio =
 that costs the same
- 9 FRAN = y [(xx) por España]
 and for Spain
- 10 LUIS [en el mismo sitio] =
 in the same place
- 11 FRAN = un título oficial =
 an official title
- 12 LUIS = [y fuera de (xx)]
 and outside of
- 13 FRAN [(xx)]
- 14 un partidazo de la hostia ↑
 a hell of a bloody match
- 15 no →
 no
- 16 VAMOS A VER EL PUTO INTER MADRÍ ↑
 let's go and see bloody Inter Madrid
- 17 en PLEno agosto ↑
 in the middle of August
- 18 me cago en DIO::s ↓ ↓
 fucking hell
- 19 NO [no no]
 no no no
- 20 LUIS [somos tontos] =
 we're stupid

This example highlights the distinction made by Bublitz (1988) between the primary and the secondary speaker. As a primary speaker, it is Fran's turn to formulate a rhetorical question (lines 1, 3-4), which works as a starting point for the development of a reasoning: the speaker hypothetically poses what would, from his point of view, be the right decision as regards the supporters club trips (lines 5-7, 9, 11, 14), to mark the contrast with the inappropriate decision actually taken by the managers (lines 15-19). As a secondary speaker, Luis cooperatively supports Fran by interspersing comments to reinforce the reasoning expressed (lines 2, 8, 10, 12). The statement referring to the decision taken by the antagonists (lines 16-18) contextualizes a peak of emotive involvement by means of its distribution into three intonational phrases. Rising intonation is repeated in the first two: VAMOS A VER EL PUTO INTER MADRÍ ↑ ("let's go and see bloody Inter Madrid") (line 16), en PLEno agosto ↑

(“in the middle of August”) (line 17), to stress the final low falling intonation phrase-final: *me cago en DIO::s* ↓ ↓ (“fucking hell”) (line 18). This low falling intonation also coincides with an expletive of maximum emotional intensity, to mark the end of the turn and to call for an affiliative response (Drescher, 1997). Reiteration of the adverb of negation, in line 19, highlights the use of negation as a strategy of emotive assertiveness (Caffi & Janney, 1994), which is superimposed the audience’s affiliative display (line 20).

3.3. Bad language: The use of expletives

The socio-cultural restrictions in terms of the use of “bad language” (Anderson & Trudgill, 1992), have traditionally been far greater in the case of women than in men (Lakoff, 1975). The male interaction of this corpus is marked by the exploitation of expletives as an affective intensification resource. In view of their close association with men’s speech, this type of interjectional expression plays a vital role in the construction of “simplified masculinity” (Pujolar, 1997a, 1997b) and in the managing of the impression of a greater intensity of the emotive shows of male participants, in co-occurrence with the prosodic resources commented on above. In example 12, the impression of a very marked emotive intensity arises from a brusque prosodic shift and from the accumulation of expletives at the end of the turn:

Example 12

- | | | |
|----|------|---|
| 1 | FRAN | = ojalá lo llamara en el Nou
<i>if only they'd call him up at the Nou</i> |
| 2 | | y dijera
<i>and he'd say</i> |
| 3 | | {[b] hombre ese niño
<i>man that boy [false voice]</i> |
| 4 | | ese niño que me mandaste que no:: vino o qué?
<i>that boy you sent me did he come or what?</i> |
| 5 | | sí que me dijeron
<i>yes they told me</i> |
| 6 | | oye:: Francisco tal}
<i>listen Francisco so-and-so</i> |
| 7 | | vale vale que (xx)
<i>alright alright who</i> |
| 8 | | que vamos a hacer una bulla buena =
<i>we're going to start up a real racket</i> |
| 9 | LUIS | = hostiá:: no te tires tanto =
<i>hell don't overdo it</i> |
| 10 | FRAN | = y entonces sí que le salto yo =
<i>and so then I jumped on him</i> |
| 11 | LUIS | = que no fui?
<i>I didn't go?</i> |

- 12 cómo que no fui? =
 what do you mean I didn't go?
- 13 FRAN = {[ac] [ac] fui me cago en DIO::s
 I went fucking hell
- 14 y cuatro vueltas que di al puto Bernabéu
 and went four times round the bloody Bernabéu stadium
- 15 y que le pagué a un hijo de puta en la reventa} =
 and paid some bastard on the tout
- 16 LUIS = de la cera (xx) =
 on the street
- 17 FRAN = qué coJOnes me cago en dios
 bloody hell fuck it

In this sequence, the participants cooperatively construct a “hypothetical story” (Goodwin, 1990/1991) where Fran, in his imagination, faces up to one of the supporters club’s chief managers. The antagonist’s hypothetically formulated question regarding Fran’s attending the match with tickets for which he finally had to pay a tout (lines 3-6), is first answered by Luis, who takes on Fran’s voice in this dialogue (lines 11-12) and later by Fran (lines 13-15, 17). Fran’s hypothetical reply involves a very intense emotive display. The speaker abruptly introduces a marked acceleration of time and the use of very strong language (expletives, stigmatized emphatic markers and negative evaluative vocatives) to intensify his indignation at the disastrous events surrounding that trip: = {[ac] [ac] fui me cago en DIO::s (“I went fucking hell”) (line 13), y cuatro vueltas que di al puto Bernabéu (“and went four times round the bloody Bernabéu Stadium”) (line 14), y que le pagué a un hijo de puta en la reventa} = (“and paid some bastard on the tout”) (line 15). The accumulation of expletives at the end of the turn acts as a “closing comment” (Drescher, 1997) to this particularly intense affective show: = qué coJOnes me cago en dios (“bloody hell fuck it”) (line 17).

The exchange of interjectional expressions between the participants, contextualizes peaks of emotive involvement, from an interactional point of view:

Example 13

- 1 FRAN = QUE YO TENGO UN COLEGA
 I've got a mate
- 2 QUE PAL MADRÌ BARSÀ CONSIGUE ENTRADAS ↑
 who can get hold of tickets for the Madrid Barsa
- 3 HOSTIA → =
 match fuck
- 4 LUIS = me cago en dios ↓
 fucking hell
- 5 y le dices →
 and you say to him
- 6 pues mira
 well look [bangs his fists]
- 7 aquí [(xx)]
 here

Intensification of Fran's indignation in this sequence, through the combined use of the emphatic "que", increase in volume and shifting the expletive to the final part of the turn (lines 1-3), immediately meets with Luis' affiliative response through the use of another interjectional expression of maximum emotive intensity (line 4). Through the exchange of these types of expressions, the participants construct a peak of emotive involvement in carrying out the activity.

4. Conclusion

The examples analyzed in this article emphasize the emergence of patterns of expressivity that are gender-related in emotions display through complaint activities. The female participants use affective intensification devices that are associated, in a stereotyped manner, with female discourse, such as the use in co-occurrence of high rising intonation phrase-finals with elliptical syntactic constructions, the hyperbolic use of lexical intensifiers, the emphatic accentuation, and the use of prosodic patterns and interjectional expressions to note ritualized "surprise" as attuning strategies. In male interaction, the factual-appellative function is highlighted in rhetorical questions, prosodically put forward in a hyperbolic manner and combined with the use of stigmatized emphatic markers, abrupt shifts in volume and time at the end of the turn and pronounced intonational falls, besides the utter violation of taboos regarding the use of swear words and curses.

The managing of affective intensification devices closely related to gender determines very notable stylistic differences between the emotive displays of female participants and those of male participants, in the examples under analysis: in this respect, of particular note is the role played by prosody. As noted by McConnell-Ginet (1978: 542), intonation (and, more generally, prosody) is a central resource for the construction of "femininity" and "masculinity" in certain contexts of communication (such as, in our case, in the performing of indignation):

Intonation—the tunes to which we set the text of our talk— may well prove to be the chief linguistic expression in American English of (relative) femininity and masculinity, because it serves to underscore the gender identification of the participants in certain contexts of communication. The fact that speech melodies are acquired early yet are only partly "conventionalized" is probably partly responsible for their function in linguistic stereotyping of the sexes. In addition, intonation is particularly important for understanding sex differences in speech strategies (ways of using talk to achieve one's ends) and in the expression of attitudes and emotions.

The gendered emotive displays arising in our analysis particularly underscore the close relationship between the social construction of gender and the social construction of emotions (cf. Besnier, 1990). Gender ideologies determine the fact that women are considered as the "emotional gender" and their speech styles as

“expressive” or “affective”, whereas men are considered to be the “rational gender” and their speech styles as “inexpressive” (see, for example, Johnson, 1997). In our analysis, however, particularly intense degrees of emotive involvement were noted in the male participants, the more “powerful” of their affective intensification devices. This apparent contradiction echoes the fact that the relationship between the social construction of gender and the social construction of emotions is not as simple as the emotional/rational counter-posing. Women’s negative association with emotions correspondingly determines the men’s positive association with “rationality”. But, however, in view of these known correlations between men/women, rational/emotional, few studies have taken into account a further dimension in the relationship between gender and emotions, namely where female emotive discourse is characterized as a “deficient” speech style, as opposed to the power of emotions in male discourse.

Appendix: Transcription conventions

These conventions are adapted from Álvarez Caccamo (1990).

Intonational phrase	Line of transcription
Spanish	Rounded print
Galician	Bold print
[non lle dixen nada]	Conversational overlap
[cla::ro]	No interval between turns
= y entonces si que le salto yo =	Pauses shorter than one second
= que no fui?	Pauses of indicated length (in seconds)
=	Segment affected by the phenomenon
<3>	Relatively loud volume
{ }	Very loud volume
{{f}}	Relatively low volume
{{f} [f]}	Relatively accelerated time
{{p}}	Very accelerated time
{{ac}}	Relatively decelerated time
{{ac} [ac]}	Global high pitch
{{dc}}	Global low pitch
{{a}}	Rising intonation phrase-final
{{b}}	Falling intonation phrase-final
↑	Slightly sustained intonation phrase-final
↓	Interrogative intonation
→	High rising intonation phrase-final
?	Low falling intonation phrase-final
↑↑	Rise-fall pitch movement
↓↓	Fall-rise pitch movement
↑ ghambE::ro ↓	
{gran ↓ co::sa} ↑	

es que se tí'enen 'unos 'perga'minos	Emphatic accentuation
CAPITALS	Increase in volume in a given short segment
no::	Lengthened sound
a difere-	Truncated sound
(parece)	Uncertain transcription
(xx)	Unintelligible segment
he he	Laughter
[se levanta]	Additional comments
#ciudad#	Confidential details
:	Several turns omitted

Bibliographical references

- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1990). *The Institutionalization of Galician: Linguistic Practices, Power, and Ideology in Public Discourse*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Department of Anthropology, University of California at Berkeley.
- Andersson, L. & P. Trudgill (1992). *Bad Language*. London: Penguin.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). "Discourse in the novel". In M. Holquist (ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 259-422.
- Bergmann, J. & T. Luckmann (1995). "Reconstructive genres of everyday communication". In U. Quasthoff (ed.), *Aspects of Oral Communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 289-304.
- Besnier, N. (1990). "Language and affect". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19, 419-51.
- Brend, R. (1975). "Male-female intonation patterns in American English". In B. Thorne & N. Henley (eds.), *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 84-87.
- Briggs, Ch.L. (1996). "Introduction". In Ch.L. Briggs (ed.), *Disorderly Discourse. Narrative, Conflict and Inequality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-40.
- Briz, A. (1998). *El español coloquial en la conversación. Esbozo de pragmatogramática*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Bublitz, W. (1988). *Supportive Fellow-Speakers and Cooperative Conversations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Caffi, C. & R.W. Janney (1994). "Towards a pragmatics of emotive communication". *Journal of Pragmatics* 22, 325-73.
- Cameron, D. (1995). "Rethinking language and gender studies: Some issues for the 1990s". In S. Mills (ed.), *Language and Gender. Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. London: Longman, 31-44.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1996). "The prosody of repetition: On quoting and mimicry". In E. Couper-Kuhlen & M. Selting (eds.), *Prosody in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 366-405.

- Drescher, M. (1997). "French interjections and their use in discourse". In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (eds.), *The Language of Emotions. Conceptualization, Expression, and Theoretical Foundation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 233-46.
- Drew, P. (1998). "Complaints about transgressions and misconduct". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31(3/4), 295-325.
- Drew, P. & E. Holt (1988). "Complainable matters: The use of idiomatic expressions in making complaints". *Social Problems* 35, 398-417.
- Goffman, E. (1977). "The arrangement between the sexes". *Theory and Society* 4, 301-31.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, M.H. (1990/1991). "Retellings, pretellings and hypothetical stories". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 24, 263-76.
- Günthner, S. (1995). "Exemplary stories: The cooperative construction of moral indignation". *Versus* 70/71, 147-75.
- Günthner, S. (1997a). "Complaint stories. Constructing emotional reciprocity among women". In H. Kotthoff & R. Wodak (eds.), *Communicating Gender in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 179-218.
- Günthner, S. (1997b). "The contextualization of affect in reported dialogues". In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (eds.), *The Language of Emotions. Conceptualization, Expression, and Theoretical foundation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 247-76.
- Hall, J.K. (1993). "*Tengo una bomba*: The paralinguistic and linguistic conventions of the oral practice *chismeando*". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26(1), 55-83.
- Herrero, G. (1997). "La importancia del concepto de *enunciado* en la investigación del español coloquial: a propósito de enunciados suspendidos". In A. Briz, J.R. Gómez Molina, M.J. Martínez Alcalde & Grupo Val.Es.Co. (eds.), *Pragmática y gramática del español hablado. El español coloquial*. Zaragoza: Pórtico, 109-26.
- Holt, E. (2000). "Reporting and reacting: concurrent responses to reported speech". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33(4), 425-54.
- Hutchby, I. & R. Wooffitt (1998). *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practises and Applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). "On the organization of laughter in talking about troubles". In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 346-69.
- Jefferson, G. (1988). "On the sequential organization of troubles-talk in ordinary conversation". *Social Problems* 35(4), 418-41.
- Jefferson, G. (1990). "List construction as a task and resource". En G. Psathas (ed.), *Interaction Competence*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 63-92.

- Jespersen, O. (1922). *Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Johnson, S. (1997). "Theorizing language and masculinity: A feminist perspective". In S. Johnson & U. H. Meinhof (eds.), *Language and Masculinity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 8-26.
- Kendall, S. & D. Tannen (2001). "Discourse and gender". In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H.E. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 548-67.
- Kramarae, C. (1977). "Perceptions of male and female speech". *Language and Speech* 20, 151-61.
- Labov, W. & J. Waletzky (1967). "Narrative analysis". In J. Helm (ed.), *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 12-44.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lamela Vieira, M.C. (1998). *La cultura de lo cotidiano. Estudio sociocultural de la ciudad de Lugo*. Madrid: Akal.
- Mandelbaum, J. (1991/1992). "Conversational non-cooperation: An exploration of disattended complaints". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 25, 97-138.
- McConnell-Ginet, S. (1978). "Intonation in a man's world". *Signs* 3(2), 541-59.
- Müller, F. (1991). *Metrical Emphasis: Rhythmic Scansions in Italian Conversation* (KontRI Arbeitspapier Nr. 14). Konstanz: Universität Konstanz.
- Ochs, E. (1992). "Indexing gender". In A. Duranti & Ch. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 335-58.
- Ochs, E. & B. Schieffelin (1989). "Language has a heart". *Text* 9(1), 7-25.
- Pomerantz, A. (1986). "Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims". *Human Studies* 9, 219-29.
- Pujolar, J. (1997a). *¿De què vas, tio?*. Barcelona: Empúries.
- Pujolar, J. (1997b). "Masculinities in a multilingual setting". In S. Johnson & U.H. Meinhof (eds.), *Language and Masculinity*. Oxford & Cambridge: Blackwell, 86-106.
- Quinn, A. (1982). *Figures of speech*. Salt Lake City, UT: Gibbs M. Smith.
- Roulston, K.J. (2000). "The management of 'safe' and 'unsafe' complaint sequences in research interviews". *Text* 20(3), 307-45.
- Selting, M. (1994). "Emphatic speech style-with special focus on the signalling of heightened emotive involvement in conversation". *Journal of Pragmatics* 22, 375-408.
- Selting, M. (1996). "Prosody as an activity-type distinctive cue in conversation: The case of the so-called 'astonished' questions in repair initiation". In E. Couper-Kuhlen & M. Selting (eds.), *Prosody in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 231-70.

- Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking Voices. Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Uhmann, S. (1992). "Contextualizing relevance: On some forms and functions of speech rate changes in everyday conversation". In P. Auer & A. Di Luzio (eds.), *The Contextualization of Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 297-336.
- Wu, K. & D.G. Childers (1991). "Gender recognition from speech. Part I: coarse analysis". *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 90, 1828-40.