

The Ideational Hegemonic Gendered Transactional Ideology across 'Long day's Journey into Night': A Socio-semiotic Analysis

Sara Samir ElDaly

Faculty of Arts, English Language & Literature Department, Menofia University, Egypt.

E-Mails: Sara.eldaly@art.menofia.edu.eg

Received on: 22 December 2024

Accepted on: 19 January 2025

Published on: 15 February 2025

ABSTRACT

This study addresses the triangulation of language, power, and gender since it aims at examining the ideational function of language realized through the interpersonal profile. The interpersonal profile is investigated through the family relations and the literary discourse markers. The ideational meta-function is construed through the ideology-based value conducted through the experiential construal of the interpersonal relations between the characters of the play 'Long Day's Journey into Night' and the interpersonal metadiscourse devices of the authorship. This study employed both the quantitative and qualitative approaches. The corpus of the study was composed of the archived txt. files of the play and the qualitative interpretation of the conducted results. Analytically, the play corpus is the 43,209 thousand words. An integrated approach to investigate the ideational function is followed; it belongs to both the interpersonal metafunction (Halliday 2014) and the discourse marker (Hyland 2005). The results of the study classify the interpersonal profile into; firstly, the interpersonal identity-based practices realized and conducted through: the interactional meta-discourse devices' use, the propositional recurrences event model, the modalities dramatic ception, the co-joint masculine-based hegemony over the female-oriented activities, and the factive/fictive preceptory-oriented ideology. Secondly, the literary-style interpersonal realization is conducted through the characters'-cognitive complexity portrayal and the multiple ideological implications; the double-voice of the feminine discourse orients the 'herself's' interest and mitigates the interactions; the masculine's single voice discourse pattern is conducted for one-basic communicative end.

Keywords: Genderlect, Ideology, Interpersonal profile, Modality, Meta-discourse markers, Negation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Dialectically, narrative dramatization mirrors the interpersonal life scenery. It is examined through the integration of Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS) and socio-semiotics. Analytically, the conceptualized gendered behaviors serve a world-construal experienced through the play as a literary style. The following section refers to the ideational meaning of hegemony through identity-based practices.

The nature of spotting the light on the human experience of gender-based identity practices and of a preference of the writer to represent the interpersonal meta-discourse markers paves the way to activate

the ideational function of language (Halliday, 2014). The play script presents the dialogism interactive exchanges between numbers of participants, i.e. the family members. Sociolinguistically, they produce a gender-based pattern of behavior that goes hand in hand with the inherited gender stereotypes. Given the variety of the family members, it seems that there is a cross- as well as same-gender exchanges across the family members.

The nature of cross-gender dialogism stems from the punch line of each conversational turn across the participants. Dialogism across the dramatic spurt of events sets the stylistic attractiveness. The pattern noticed through the dialogical exchanges renders a

double-edged stylistics weapon; homogeneous-female based conversational stereotype vs. heterogeneous-male conversational stereotypes and rhetorical imprisoned prototype of ideologies. The discursal fields across the dramatic moves are seen across the generic moves designed by the author (Swales, 1990). The frequent discursal fields wear the aesthetic form and function to serve the dramatic end, i.e. stylistic beauty. Micro-analytically, the single unit is interwoven with textual layers within the living context so as to set the dialogized image (Bakhtin, 277-278). Macro-analytically, sequences of participant/s reflect/s the ideological determination (e.g., deficit or differentiation) (Lakoff, 1975; Tannen, 1993), bearing in mind the dramatic sequences of sequences provided by one participant or multiple-speakers formulate the intentionality-based dynamicity, i.e. force, the commonly semantic networks, the gendered frame, and the transactional socio-cultural communication relevance (e.g., dialectical and/or discursive).

At the micro-level, genre colonies are provided for definite communicative ends across the textual layers (Bhatia, 2014). The identifiable sub-/genre provides some about the preferable grammatical tense pattern that formulates a lexico-grammatical map, i.e. textual structure. Accordingly, the micro-level of analysis reflects the socio-constructed identities across the family members (Paltridge, 2012, 7-8). These identities are constructed by the social practices that shape and are shaped by the preferable linguistic tools producing the genderlect (10). The genderlect, across the dramatic scenes, may be explicitly and/or implicitly intertextualized through the sense and/or force of the word, the phrase, the clause, the pragmatic markers, or the acts of similar kinds (10-11). The fine-tuned consequentials of hierarchical patterns of gender stereotypical values are experienced through the grammaticalized-texture of the scenes. As a matter of fact, the narrative dramatization mirrors the interpersonal life scenery. Narrative dramatization is examined through the integration of Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS) and socio-semiotics. The conceptualized gendered behaviors serve a world construal constructed through the play.

Based on the previously mentioned aspect of gendered discourse, this study aims at proving the validity of these hypothetical questions of the transactional-based masculine ideology of the three family-members, as follows:

1. Is the masculine ideology rendered discursively through the interpersonal function-based profile? If not, what is the dominant gendered ideology?

2. Is the gendered ideology struggle rendered across dramatic scenes? If not, to what extent has a new ideology been elaborated?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section addresses gender as a social factor that affects language performance (Holmes 2013). The gendered discourse is reviewed through the interpersonal profile that is composed of the meta-interpersonal function of language and the meta-discourse markers (Halliday 2014; Hyland 2005).

Gendered discourse dates back to gender differences and/or similarities determined by Lakoff (1975). Her claims are based on two main notions of differentiation and determination. The two claims are stereotypically inherited over ages locating/positing males and females in definite positions performing definite social roles that match their social identities (Paltridge 2012; Holmes 2013). Studies in gendered literary discourse focus on: a) the role of gender as a reflection of modern society changes (Khachmafova, Karabulatova, Lyausheva, Luchinskaya, and Osipov 2015) and b) gender roles and equality through the dramatic series in both a critical analytic manner and a fruitful tool to affect culture values (Ng and Cheung 2022). The present study attempts to reflect gender performances across the family exchanges as well as the preferences of the authorship to achieve an interactional effect through the meta-discourse markers. Analytically, the meta-functions of Halliday deploy the human experience in the eco-world, i.e. fictive or factive (2014, 30). The fictive world is represented throughout the play as a situated drama and the factive world is already inherited and frames the speech communities.

2.1 Gendered Interpersonal Profile

Generally speaking, the gendered interpersonal statement provides a prototypical image that costs cognitive efforts through the old perceived world structure with a hypothetical recall, i.e. a resemblance of two items with slight differences (Saeed 2009). The characteristic features are employed through the literary genre, i.e. play (37). The interpersonal statement under examination is experienced and is acculturated; it is identified as a frame or an Idealized Cognitive Model (ICM) for conducting both the literal meaning as well as the encyclopedic meaning (38). Accordingly, it turns to be an ideational language function (Halliday 2014). Narrowly, dramatic gendered dialogism is conducted explicitly/implicitly from the punch line of homogeneous-/heterogeneous imprisoned ideologies. Imprisoned ideologies are experienced either across the micro-/macro level of communicative genderlect patterns across the family members, i.e. the genderlect of identities (Paltridge 2012, 7-10). The fine-tuned gendered

hierarchical patterns are experienced through the scenes' grammaticalized texture conducting the local as well as the global coherence realized through the macro-frame of accumulative historical stereotypes and the conventional linguistic features (Paltridge 2012, 114-115). The logical sequentials of the family relations prove the text coherence and the literary style of the author (Biber and Conrad 2009 1-5). The shift realized within and across the dramatic scenery proves the sub/registered communicative purposes, i.e. general persuasion vs. specific purposes of sub-registered instances of the family members (e.g., past memories, self-blaming, drug addiction, diseases, and painful sufferings) (45).

Along with dialogism, the text texture is activated through the transitivity system of the dramatized meaning potentialities (Halliday 2014, 120). It is operated upon the texture polarity (e.g., the hierarchical arrangement as constituency and components) (Langacker 2008, 60). The discursivity of the texture is represented through the relations conducted across the actually past genderlect patterns, the future-based genderlect patterns, and the presupposed-based genderlect patterns experienced in context. Context is described by lexical entries and their grammatical functions employed for semantic interpretation, i.e. grammaticalization (Kroeger 2018, 229).

The gender world is constructed through the cognitive configurational structure identified, stimulated, and re-experienced as the ception of domains, i.e. the un/conscious cognitive processing (Talmy 2000, 140-149). Discursively, it serves the Ideological-Discursive Formations (IDF, henceforth) (Fairclough 2010). IDF uncovers; a) the concept represented discursively and 2) the value-/attribute-based experiences encountered across situational dots (Talmy 2000, 150-153). The IDF deploys the episodic knowledge (e.g., the practical, the procedural, and the cognitive circuits) (McIntyre 2006, 113-114). Dialectically oriented, these circuits elaborate the sense of distance vs. proximity and inclusion vs. exclusion of "Us" and "Them"; such are to be enacted so as to design the self-image, value-based representations, contextual legitimate "us-good actors" vs. delegitimate "them-bad actors" (Wieczorek 2013, 1).

Accordingly, the feminist resistance claim is conducted through gender social activities, positions, distance, super-/subordination (Lazar's 2005, 5-7). Discursively, the pre-assumed family relations are naturally affected by the dominant IDF_s (e.g., femininity and masculinity) (Coats 1996). Accordingly, gender-based relations are elaborated through the

intertextual cross-event relations (e.g., Figure and Ground) (Talmy 2000, 345-346). In this study, the IDFs are represented through the sequential dialogical Turn Constructional Units/TCUs (Schegloff 2007, 2-3). Dramatically, the ongoing dramatic sequences negotiate, clarify, extend, shape, and frame the social identities for interpersonal relations' unlocking (Paltridge 2012, 26). For that reason, literary genres value-evaluate the interpersonal-based relations in light of in/out-group proximization (Wieczorek 2013, 10). Given the literary appraisal sense conveyed thoroughly, implicit/explicit grammaticalization licenses multiple thoughts (Halliday 2014, 68). Discursively, the global coherent-based sense links the expected propositions, the syntagmatic patterns, the symbolic assemblies, and the speech communities' pragmatic acts (Austin 1962). In this sense, the world engendered ideological implications are analogically constructed and construed, i.e. gender-based experiential construal (Langacker 2008, 49; Saeed 2009, 358). Intertextually, the gender construal results in the ongoing production and consumption, i.e. interdiscursive performativity (Bhatia 2014, 140).

Moreover, interdiscursive performativity depicts the masculine hegemony through the co-social dimensions (e.g., social distance, status relations, formality, and topical-based realized purpose) (Holmes 2013, 9). Accordingly, the feminist-based inferences depend mainly on activating the genderlect determination; the constant identification of females as victims is, to put it mildly, depressing (Talbot 2007, 167). Genderlect is characterized with some linguistic features (Lakoff, 1975; Holmes, 2013). Societally, gender is claimed to show particular social practices and constitute the social hierarchy (Lazar 2005, 5-6). With that, the knowledge-built transparent medium is mutually conducted (Mills 1995, 20). Stylistically, the apparent mind style of the character-to-character discourse structure is elaborated through the polarity system (Halliday 2014; McIntyre 2006). Accordingly, the ideological-based fragmented propositions are constructed through the clause positions and the roles constituting textual pragmatic markers (e.g., references, inferences, and presuppositions) (van Dijk 1998, 203). The aforementioned section presents some gendered practices experienced in relation to language, cognition, and society.

2.2 Ideational Hegemony: Interactions and Discursivity

Language is ideationally oriented through the discursive and dialectical interactive circuits (Halliday 2014; Omoniyi 2011, 260). Both pave the way for: identity-based practices, ideology indications,

genres' integration, dramatic scenes, syntagmatic and paradigmatic constructions (e.g., structures and entailments, and semiotic interpretations). Dramatic experiences signify the interpersonal statement when closely crafted. The interpersonal statement derived from the motivated situational dots and experienced by various social agents and thematic roles (Saeed 2009); it represents the worldview gendered-conceptualizations re/contextualized through symbolic conventionalized stereotypical patterns of behaviors. Transactionally, the relations between the signified and the signifier uncover the ideological indications implicitly/explicitly performed thoroughly. The interpersonal function is elaborated through the 'Day' vs. the 'Night' since the past memories are evoked and re-lived by through the journey of day. Transactional ideologies are raised through the 'memetic code' representing a cultural progress as a partial cultural pattern schematized in the 'mental model' cognitive paths (Saeed 2009, 37). The 'memetic code' is constructed through the syntagmatic and paradigmatically. The 'memetic code' is discursively intertextualized through the integrated genres. Literary genres introduce informational packages through factive and fictive dyads (e.g., competitiveness vs. cooperation, space vs. solidarity, negotiating vs. conflict, past memories vs. future plans, and bargaining vs. break). Those are determined through the syntagmatic constructions, grammar and lexicon (Gumpres 2011, 215). Syntagmatic units go hand in hand with paradigmatic units to build meaning potentialities and go further for accessible interpretations given the context-based transfer (Widdowson 2004).

Furthermore, meaning potentialities are constructed and construed through implicational hierarchy (Saeed 2009, 159). Implicational hierarchy licenses multiple constructions (Evans 2009, 111-112); a multiplicity of informational chains is licensed by language 'Parameterization' (112). Within the dramatic scenes, parameterization is experienced through conversational interactionism where socialized behaviors are thoroughly constructed and construed to identify the cognitive and social properties of the polarity-based propositional dots evoked and elaborated so as to reach the local/global coherence reflecting degrees of relevance between dynamic cognition and activated schematization (Halliday and Hasan 1989); thus, more interpersonal stances are enacted, more stabilized mental maps are designed, more implicature is conducted, and more identity-based practices are displayed (Givon 2005). Given the hierarchical implications and stabilized behavioral patterns, a coherent-dramatization sense of intertextuality underpins the interpersonal involvement

of the ongoing discursivity of actions within and across syntagmatic and paradigmatic constructions (Tannen 2007, 61-62).

The superficial level of social agents within another content/deep structure with symmetric thematic progression and socio-hierarchical organization is co-/eco-schematized through the) primitive role of subjectivity-qualification realized across the being, the good, and the potential (Therbon 1980, 18-19). These three dimensions carry the ideological cycle of the family behaviors conducted across speech communities, networks, and small groups reaching mindsets' 'value-change' (Therbon 1980; van Dijk 1998). They act side by side through the cycle of "mental model" and 'role theory". Socio-cultural schematized practices are inherited over time by groups' categorization (van Dijk 1998, 70). How the gendered ideology is experienced represents an enquiry about language habits prototypically performed in the family (Saeed 2009, 153-158). 'Language habits' are constructed and construed beyond the ability to value-appraise the oneself and the oneself's traditions (Edberg 2018, 22-23).

3. METHDOLOGY

3.1 Data Base

The data of this study is the *Long Day's Journey into Night* original text written by Eugene O'Neill in 1987. The text, with its scenes/chapters, is about 144132 K. Word span for the collocation task is conducted. The word span is determined due to the syntactic significance of the examined interpersonal profile across the semantic relations.

3.2 Framework of Analysis

This study adopts the quantitative and the qualitative approaches.

3.3 Procedure of Analysis

To answer the research questions, two analytic phases are proposed; the first depicts the interpersonal function in light of gender dynamic circuits and the second phase is concerned with the discursal interpersonal function. The analysis depends mainly on the Antconc 3.5.8 corpus soft programming for documenting the concordances as well as the collocates of the linguistic devices (e.g., the interpersonal devices of the metafunction and the interpersonal metadiscourse markers under investigation) (Anthony 2019).

3.4 Method of Analysis

Given the literary-style, this study adopts an integrated approach to examine the interpersonal profile. The

interpersonal function is derived from Halliday (2014); the interpersonal metadiscourse markers are derived from Hyland (2005). The meaning of the interpersonal profile is negotiated so as to fulfill the communicative purposes through socio-semiotic references and inferences of the family situations (Halliday and Hasan 1989, 4-5). Meaning making can be conducted through textual polarity and interactional discourse processing (e.g., metadiscourse markers) (Halliday 2014; Hyland 2005). Textual polarity is approached through negation and modality; discourse processing is elaborated through metadiscourse markers, i.e. interactional one. Table 1 presents negation constructions:

Table 1. Negation Structure Through Morpho-Syntactic/-Semantic Constructions

Article	Use	Example
Not/any	Local negation	
Nobody, nothing, no or never	Using a non-verbal 'nu-clear' negative word	
Value degrees of uncertainty, e.g. adverbs of	The non-assertive words	
Morphological affixes	Negate the positive morphemes	un-, il-, dis-, -in, -im, irr-, a-, mis- and -less
Comparative conjunction, e.g. textual markers	Logical shift across propositions	But, however, otherwise
Antonyms	Lexico-semantic feature	Happy vs. sad; tall vs. short
Polar quantifiers	Render partial relation to the whole	Few, some, little.

As for modalities, deontic and epistemics can be realized across four types: probability, obligation, and inclination with three identified values of being high, low, or median (Halliday 2014, 691-695). Moreover, modality markers can be stated through the construction, epistemic/deontic modality (Berk 1999, 150-151). Moreover, the social frames within the speech community are experienced through the textual layers interpersonal devices, i.e. the interactional dimension of metadiscourse (Hyland 2005). Cognitively, the linguistic devices display the fictive personae designed by the author across the transactional utterances of the personae are provided through a compatible profile for interpersonal meaning-making potentialities. Table 2 presents modalities and interactional metadiscourse markers.

Table 2. Modality Markers and Interactional/Interpersonal Devices of Metadiscourse

Construction	Epistemic modality	Deontic modality
Lexical verb	I <i>think</i> that... I know I imagine	I <i>wish</i> to...
Modal auxiliary	Sue <i>might</i> be....	He <i>should</i> fix...
Semi-auxiliary	The baby <i>is going to</i> ...	You <i>have to</i> ...
Category of meta-discourse markers	Function	Examples
Interactional	Involve the reader in the text	Resources
Hedges	withhold commitment and open dialogue	might; perhaps; possible; about
Boosters	emphasize certainty or close dialogue	in fact; definitely; it is clear that
Attitude Markers	express writer's attitude to proposition	unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly
Self-Mentions	explicit reference to author(s)	I; we; my; me; our
Engagement Markers	explicitly build relationship with reader	consider; note; you can see that

4. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Deeply rooted in meaning potentialities, the dramatic proposition can be derived from the paradoxical iconicity that stems from the two worlds the factive and the fictive where the 'day' and 'night' are represented. To address the hypothetical questions, the discursively sequential hierarchy of gender performances, i.e. sequentials of Turn Construction Units/TCUs are analyzed (Schegloff 2007). The sequentials of TCUs serve the implementation of actions through modalities, polar networks, and discourse markers (9). Furthermore, the ongoing processing upon the accessible transactions re-evokes the symbolic meaning of 'time' construction and the cognitive dynamicity experienced through language, socio-cultural stereotypes, and the audience autonomous plane (Hyland 2005, 4-16). The triangulation of language, socialized performances, and cognition constructs the 'mental images' employed to substitute the real world and expects the sequentials of future peripherals of situations, events, and acts (Kress 2010, 10-33; Danesi 2004, 66).

The polarity system in the text under investigation is employed significantly with negation and morphological demarcation. Analytically, negatives set the monotonicity hierarchies of upward/downward

Table 3. Negatives, Modality, and Metadiscourse Concordances Hits

Inter-personal devices	Concordances	Concordance Hits										Total Hits	
Negatives	Not/n't	44/20.7%										212	
	Any	10/4.7%											
	No	36/16.9%											
	Nothing	3/1.4%											
	Any	10/4.7%											
	Less	2/0.9											
	But	66/31.13											
	On the other hand	-											
	Never	28/13.2											
	Few	3/1.4%											
	Can't	8/3.7%											
	Dis	1/0.4											
	Un-	1/0.4											
Modality	Lexical	Think 18/ 33.33			Imagine 1 / 1.85%			Know 32/ 59.2%			Wish 3/ 5.5		54
	Modal	Can 38/33%	Could 6/5.2% ¹	should 6/5.2	May 3/ 2.6%	Must 13/11.3%	Ought 10/8.6%	Shall 2/1.7%	Will 14/12.17%	Might 4/3.4%	Would 19/16.5	115	
	Semi-	Is going to (1)					Was going to 2					3	
Metadis-course devices	Interpersonal metadiscourse markers	Really 22/11.45	I 50/ 26.04			We 14/ 7.2		Me 18/9.3		Our 89/ 46.35%		192	

# antconc.can collocates results - Notepad					# antconc.jb collocates results - Notepad					
File	Edit	Format	View	Help	File	Edit	Format	View	Help	
#Total No. of Collocates Tokens: 199										
#Total No. of Collocates Tokens: 380										
1	1	1	0	11.88910	yawn	7	5	1	4	8.97716 right
2	1	1	0	11.88910	wondering	8	3	0	1	8.92271 has
3	1	1	0	11.88910	vulgar	9	6	1	5	8.82968 too
4	1	0	1	11.88910	trouble	10	3	0	3	8.63131 not
5	1	1	0	11.88910	terribly	11	7	1	6	8.56877 we
6	1	1	0	11.88910	tant	12	4	2	2	8.28528 never
7	1	0	1	11.88910	suit	13	5	1	1	8.18177 do
8	1	1	0	11.88910	standing	14	5	2	3	8.20511 ve
9	2	1	1	11.88910	sink	15	5	2	3	8.16664 re
10	1	1	0	11.88910	secret	16	5	2	3	8.16664 can
11	1	0	1	11.88910	secrets	17	1	0	1	8.92271 then
12	1	1	0	11.88910	resentful	18	5	2	3	8.92271 all
13	1	0	1	11.88910	quiet	19	4	2	2	8.88318 if
14	1	0	1	11.88910	promise	20	3	1	2	8.78924 this
15	2	1	1	11.88910	none	21	3	2	2	8.69244 kid
16	1	1	0	11.88910	nods	22	9	4	5	8.83638 with
17	1	1	0	11.88910	lonely	23	3	1	2	8.18262 one
18	1	1	0	11.88910	junk	24	3	1	2	8.18262 marry
19	1	0	1	11.88910	itrover	25	6	4	2	8.62962 by
20	1	1	0	11.88910	impose	26	10	6	4	8.59439 her
21	1	1	0	11.88910	herd	27	15	5	10	8.54010 the
22	1	0	1	11.88910	helped	28	21	18	11	8.59369 to
23	1	0	1	11.88910	hating	29	1	3	5	8.52798 that
24	1	0	1	11.88910	fussed	30	7	4	3	8.50677 on
25	1	1	0	11.88910	flutters	31	13	5	8	8.74155 it
26	1	1	0	11.88910	dog	32	3	0	7	8.12005 you
27	1	1	0	11.88910	damedest	33	18	7	11	8.06364 you
28	1	1	0	11.88910	broke	34	6	3	3	7.20187 let
29	1	0	1	11.88910	belong	35	9	2	7	7.09264 she
30	1	0	1	11.88910	beat	36	4	3	1	6.90201 in
31	1	1	0	11.88910	babes	37	6	3	3	6.75690 in
32	1	1	0	11.88910	anywhere	38	6	3	3	6.67760 his

[illegible]

Analytically, Table 3 shows a semi-balanced use of the interpersonal-based linguistic devices. Thematically, negatives provide the perceptual typological appraisal towards interactions (White 2011). Typological appraisal uncovers the *polyphony* along with the multiple voices of the family articulated through the interactional scenes, i.e. the discursual dialogism

In terms of discourse, meaning potentialities can be found through the patternized dialogical interactions. Paradigmatic structures are available through communicative goals with accessible iconic propositional interpretations creating a semantic entailment for an inclusive and/or exclusive interpersonal statement constructed and construed through the use of the first voice interpersonal pronoun (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015, 98–99; Saeed, 2009; Wieczorek

ILCC

2013, 19–22). The exclusionary as well as inclusionary statement depicts the commonly dramatized literary style, so as to reach the narrative generic function that is realized through the discourse processing (Paltridge 2012); the narrative generic unlocks various language functions (e.g., poetic, referential, informational, and appraisal) construed through the value-readability of the interpersonal discursive contextualized scenes (Hyland 2005, 195–196).

[illegible]

Figure 2 'can' concordance

More accurately, 'can' concordance is employed frequently across the dramatized scenes. It provides, regarding the polarity-sense, a thematic progression through ability, probability, necessity, incomplete progression, desire, and/or propositional containment. Transitivity across meaning making potentialities conceptualizes the socialized patterns across the social dimensions (e.g., space, power, age, gender, and activity-based practices) as in the quotation below that show the use of 'can or can + negative article'.

Example 1

DMUND Derisively. <u>Can</u> it! You'll be crying in a minute. JAMIE Starts a 164.txt
Because I'll do my damndest to make you fail. <u>Can't</u> help it. I hate myself. Got to take revenge. On 169.txt
I <u>can't</u> stay up all night like [used to. Getting old 173.txt

Modalities' concordances serve partially the role of interpersonal value-appraisal function contextualized as an internal/external discursive context (Halliday 2014, 432); thus, polar propositions are processed upon and intertextualized with multiple social agents (Saeed 2009). As yet, texture is schematized through the cognitive frames of speech communities (Goldberg 1995). Cognitive frames elaborate the socio-cognitive requirements employed for action control (e.g., desires, obligation and duty, plausibility, reliability, credibility, truth, accuracy, or facticity

and epistemic knowledge as interpersonal function attributes) (Black 2006, 55; Chandler 2017, 79-80). On this base, interpersonal dramatization serves the audience design through modalities and the narrative is discursively justified, revealed, and linked to the eco-/co-socio-stereotypical frames (Cheshire and Ziebland 2005, 21). The efficacy of authorship is validated/proved through accessing the cognitive paths of the audience. The matter that does not only reflect the social patterns but also the author's value-evaluation of the raised claims, i.e. claim proponent or opponent (van Dijk 1998, 249). The narrative dramatization presents a communicative determinism (van Dijk 1997, 115-117). Communicative determinism shows the hegemonic struggle polar proposition through production/consumption (Fairclough 1992, 95-96). The hegemony struggle is conducted across the "pushed-away" mechanism resides in the female's mentality or the "pushed around" mechanism desired by males' intentions (Kendall and Tannen 2001, 553-554).

Furthermore, the employed “pushed away” and “pushed around” frame the gendered patterns implicitly or explicitly constructing definite spaces in light of associating/dissociating participants from groups in/directly. Accordingly, a mutualized discursive ception is conducted on the behalf of both authorship and readership (Adams 1999, 233-235). Gendered patterns are delivered deliberately and/or implicitly across same-/cross-gender interactional instances activating the identity-based practices. The counter/through arguments are considered as negated stances of textuality or as interactional exchanges, e.g.

1 found his throat. His face is stern and disgusted
 2 his glass and his sons follow suit mechanically,
 3 Can't, that's trouble. Had enough to sink a ship,
 4 have either lost his mind or he's a damned fool.
 5 isten, Kid. You know me. I've never lectured you,
 6 the damned marlaca come back on me. JAMIE Haybe,
 7 Jamie come back. I've never lectured you, but I
 8 no sign of having heard. Tyrone adds pityingly,
 9 he, James? It's getting dark. I know you hate to,
 10 anger ebbing. I know you'd never say that unless
 11 you were sure it was true. JAMIE comes back.
 12 JAMIE Haybe not, but he can't prove it. Putting
 13 n away, I do feel sorry for him about one thing.
 14 He's got a good deal of sense. He's got a brain.
 15 and then Bridget crosses so as if it was a blame,
 16 nk of me as dead - tell people, I "had a brother,
 17 he was killed in the war." I don't know if you
 18 can really mean this. Edmund does not notice.
 19 risk you'll hate me-and you're all I've got left.
 20 I know you'll hate me. I know you'll hate me.
 21 forget 'dore? MARY hits detached pity. No dead,
 22 id of course, I would do anything she suggested,
 23 fectionate trust. She's old and a little cranky,
 24 id. I love her dearly. It may be sinful of me
 25 gets up and turns on the reading lamp roughly.
 26 and behind his and he cannot look into her eyes.
 27 He changes to a detached, impersonal tone.
 28 thought resentment. All right, Kid. Had it coming.
 29 als to pay any attention. It's the damned poison.
 30 I'm not a school teacher. I'm not a school teacher.
 31 oughing and gives her a quick apprehensive glance,
 32 slip a piece of change to the Judge and be saved,
 33 stench she is far away again. Sir Edmund gives
 34 the Judge a look. Not a word. Not a word.
 35 But at the same time pitying. Edmund does not notice
 36 but before they can drink MARY speaks and they slowly
 37 can't sink. Well, here's hoping. He drinks. EDM
 38 But I don't seem to be getting any more than I
 39 but Doctor HARRY was right when he told you to cut
 40 out but don't be too sure. 57-57
 41 But I don't seem to be getting any more than I
 42 But don't take it too much to heart, lad. He loves to
 43 but Edmund has proved to you that one bulb burning
 44 But God, Jamie, no matter how drunk you are, it's no
 45 But I don't seem to be getting any more than I
 46 on his collar and tie. 57-57
 47 But he has even that coming to him. He's to blame.
 48 But I don't seem to be getting any more than I
 49 But he's a grand handsome man, if he is old. You'll n
 50 but he's dead." And when you come back, look out for
 51 But I don't seem to be getting any more than I
 52 but his mother does. MARY in a forced teasing tone.
 53 But I didn't mean to tell you that last stuff-go that
 54 But I didn't mean to tell you that last stuff-go that
 55 But I forgive. I always forgive. I always forgive.
 56 But I knew it was simply a waste of time. After I ef
 57 But I love her just the same, and she has things in h
 58 But I love her better than my own mother. I love
 59 But I'm a fool to talk reason to you. To Edmund. I'll
 60 But I seem to be always picking on you, telling you h
 61 But I suppose life has made him like that, and he can
 62 But I told you how much I'd hoped - He puts his hand
 63 But I've never known to draw herself in it as de
 64 But I don't seem to be getting any more than I
 65 But if his suspicions are aroused her tenderness mak
 66 But if you're angry you can go to hell. He grin
 67 But I don't seem to be getting any more than I
 68 "Can vino verbe" stuff. You better take it seri
 69 But I don't seem to be getting any more than I

Figure 3 'but' concordance

Example 2

Deliberate gendered discourse with opposing claims, i.e. counter-stance

Mary: I heard you say something about a doctor and your father accuse you of being evil-minded.
(act N, and Scene N. pp. 38-40), Long day's journey into Night:

Inferred gendered discourse with negotiative claims, i.e. through-stance

Jamie: *Don't start jumping down my throat! God, Papa. This ought to be one thing we talk over frankly without a battle.*
Tyrone: *I'm sorry, Jamie. (Tensely) But go on and tell me.*
Jamie: *there's nothing to tell. I was all wrong. It's just that last night—well you know how it is. I can't forget the past. I can't help being suspicious. Any more than you can. (Bitterly) That's the hell of it. And it makes it hell for Mama! She watches us watching her Tyrone (sadly) I know.*

The above gendered cross-/same-based discourse evoke the truth-based appraisal value through the propositional value of counter-/through-stances (Halliday 2014; van Eemeren 2010, 2). Discursively, the two gendered patterns agents evoke a doubtless sense towards reality, reasonableness, and fiction. The socialized meaning potentialities are evoked through negotiative socialization of polar-based/modal-based various socio-semiotic interactional congruencies (27-28); it is elaborated across the discursal contextual configuration (Halliday and Hasan 1989). Discoursly, the underlined contextualized situational units approach the patterns of Contextual Configuration depending on lexico-syntactic-/semantic relations Lexical Concepts and Cognitive Models/ LCCM (Evans 2009, 46). The LCCM is highly represented through lexical representation, encyclopedic semantics, symbolic grammar, and situated language use (28). Modalities mediate the intensity of meaning; negations validate the truth value of meaning potentialities. Both elaborate discourse accessibility through frequent internal/external eco-/co-cognitive coherence (Lambrecht 1994, 100-101). As yet, discourse accessibility shapes and is shaped through the performative actions (160), e.g.

Example 3

Deliberate gendered discourse performativity, e.g. performative acts

Mary: *Now James, don't lose your temper (pp. 24-25).*

Implied gendered discourse, e.g. performative acts

Tyrone: *And you are worse than he is, encouraging him. I suppose you're regretting you weren't there to prompt Shaughnessy with a few nastier insults. You 've a fine talent for that, if for nothing else. (pp. 2.)*

Dialectically, dialogical statements depict performances through the TCUs. Propositional layers are built (e.g., damaging face with family tension and disrupting the social harmony with intense sufferings along the scenes). Speech acts determine the nature of actions performed; thus, the polarity base of each textual layer is perceived and the truth beyond the verbs is identified through truth-based conditions. As yet, the textual layers' meaning builds a semantic entailment with frequently syntagmatic networks.

Both along with interactional discourse markers build the audience design that overgeneralizes the texture of texts and constructs a worldwide consensus.

Given the conventionalities produced and consumed as well, textual layers' syntagmatic constructions construct the semantic roles' interplay through the surface structure and the polarity system. Additionally, semiotic-based accessible interpretations stabilize the dynamicity of the social distance scale, the status scale, the formality scale, and the referential and affective function scales (Holmes and Wilson 2017, 8-10). The function served by each scale shapes and is shaped by a joint two-way processing upon language and identity practices (Paltridge 2012). The integrated functions construe sub/genre integrity. With that, gender ception is co-constructed and construed by polarity-based minimal interactional instances between the family members. These minimal interactional instances support the action-roles carried out by various identities; accordingly, social-based hierarchical structure is designed and accessed thoroughly showing deference, superiority, inferiority, and determination. As yet, minimal interactions establish more propositional paths that require double-cognitive efforts to manipulate them and co-operate upon. This in turn expects, within and across propositions, the hegemonic ideology siege. Furthermore, the frequent minimal discursive units cost less cognitive efforts.

To conclude, the co-joint interpersonal statements unlock the context of situation as well as the context of culture where frames of content and structure draw a fixed multi-cognitive personae of the female-based patterns of behavior (e.g., a mother's role, a wife role, old beloved, a drug addicted patient, a biased-family member, and struggle-moderator). Interactions conducted with these multi-cognitive circuits are determined by the 'pushed away' and/or the 'pushed around' mechanisms (Saeed 2009; Halliday 2014; Dowing 2015). They serve propositional thematic progression since the situational dots are quoted and reported by dynamicity of the verb groups (e.g., mental or action creating a cognitive path) for the schematic structures, i.e. ception (Talmy 2000). These schematic structures depict the triad of author, audience/readership, and the inner self, i.e. the interpersonal interactional cycle (Hoey 2001, 14-15).

5. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Since the results of the study prove the interrelations between the fictive and factive worlds embodied through the ideational meta-function, i.e. the interpersonal profile, this section elaborates the

discussion of the interpersonal architecture of language. The hypothetical aims at investigating the interpersonal interactional cycle conducted through the coherent dramatized narration experienced daily and literally. The interpersonal interactional statement is presented through the experienced construal constructed and construed within and across the conversational scripts narrated in the scenery drama, i.e. the male-based / masculine-based identity practices conceptualized through the small community and the broader one (e.g., family membership and speech communities as well). Gendered self-representation is embodied thoroughly across the past/present based cognitive dynamicity circuits of memories. Accordingly, a socio-cognitive prototype prevails with the definite linguistic system; 1) being linked by social forms; 2) talk to each other; and 3) homogenous-based speech (Halliday 1978, 154-155). The social construct reflects the well-acquaintances of the communicative end-goal, i.e. performance and competence with conventionalities (Bara 2010, 133-205). Accordingly, homogeneity, as referred to by van Dijk, is experienced through routinely-based situational dots within and across the micro-/macro-context; the matter that discursively legitimizes the ideological implications (1998, 51-52). Legitimization of ideological indications licenses the value of each ideology; (e.g., positive ideology such as feminism) (8). Ideology emerges from the 'struggle' against power abuse through ideological practices.

Concerning the male-based identity practices, the male-based family practices ascertain the male-based ideology across discursual fields as well as topical progression, trivialization as well as seriousness; evidentialities for rationalization as well as epithets for attitude-based; contextual propositional layers as well as textual rhetoric (Leech 1983, 69). The cross-gendered practices display the degree the End-Focus maxim realization where being accessible in ongoing time, being clear, quick, easy, and expressive is un/experienced in the ongoing situations given the available references as well as inferences (64). In this sense, levels of references and/or inferences are conducted through the syntagmatic as well as paradigmatic networks that carry heavy content-based propositions through the factive or the fictive world (65). Accordingly, end-weight and end-scope Maxims refer to the syntactic-/semantic-based formulations where thematic progression is discursively organized (given the thematic patterns) (Paltridge 2012; Leech 1983). In this regard, discourse thematization is realized through characterization, the topmost level of the addresser, i.e. the playwright and the second level the embedded one of the characters addressing each other in the fictional world (McIntyre

2006, 5-6).

To continue, the validity of the hypothetical statement is realized. It is proved on the behalf of interactive utterances (e.g., conversational utterances and indexicalities) depicted through the traditional, transitional, and egalitarian references (Lazar 2005). Firstly, the traditional dominance interactive cycle is proved to determine the dramatic scenery. Secondly, the transitional reference is conducted through transactional statements conducted through metadiscourse devices. Transitions are practically realized through the discursive interactions of family members who enact, interact, and stereotypically construe the mother role/Mary Tyrone as the family guard (Holmes 2013). The lack of confidence, weakness, and passivity paved the way for the continuity of unconscious gendered behavior; the lack of logical reasoning and over-sensitivity on her behalf licensed the implicit /the explicit and/or the positive/negative appraisal value of commentaries and her painful and drugged memories rendered the family a grieve look (Magalhães 2005, 186). Such a look is invited through the topics' production and consumption where a reflection of the hierarchical canonical trajectory is dialectically dealt with resulting in less propositional expansion (Schegloff 2007, 192-193). The detachment of Mary from the floor management results in 'dramatic hegemony' that mentally conceptualized through the management of mind constructing a consensus about the social order (van Dijk 1998, 2-3). It is realized through ideas' production, reproduction, comprehensibility, texture, consumption, and discursivity. Intertextually, the more simplified dramatic hegemony is, the more simplified syntagmatic constructions and paradigmatic networks are; the more extended thematized propositions are; the more expected semantic frames are conducted (Coupland and Jaworski 1997; Paltridge 2012). Extended chains of expected meanings show up how meaning making is construed coherently given the hierarchical organization of the critically socialized patterns of patriarchal versus feminist discourses of sexuality (Fairclough 2010, 93). Meaning making, pragmatically, requires motivated context, i.e. social roles, tools, causes, evidences, and (Thomas 1995, 183; Saeed 2009). Furthermore, extended semantic chains reflect presuppositional behavior of source-triggered networks (Saeed 2009, 108). Given the traditional, egalitarian, and transitional considerations of dealing with the gendered discourse, the interactions conducted across the dramatic scenes highlight the notion of defeasibility, i.e. cancelling of a presupposition (108). Presuppositional behavior and/or defeasibility uncovers/sheds light on the readership, the dramatic agents and prevailed cognitive ception.

Accordingly, the propositional statement depicts an expected gender stereotype that is value-evaluated on the behalf of the speaker and/or the point of view of the addressee (Cumming and Ono 1997, 115-117). From the point of view of the speaker, the nature of thematization is value-evaluated through the focus of consciousness represented partially by Mary; it is controlled by the eco-context from the point of view of the addressee (116). Therefore, the authorial accommodated audience design is typically presented through the dramatized based narrativity-craft (116-117).

As yet, the interpersonal profile is textually-oriented through constructing coherent propositional layers with limited indexicalities through interactional metadiscourse devices. They create an integrated world of intense- and empty-based content that formulates the co-/eco-knowledge of the ongoing situations (Hyland 2005). These reside in a negotiative appeal operated upon the stereotypical factive socio-cultural frame and the fictive authorial text and/or the old conceptualized stereotypes and the newly represented dramatization (13). Accordingly, the generic literary style is conventionalized, enacted and employed to monitor non-/natives' writing skills of production and consumption (Johnstone 2008, 124-125). Discursively, negotiative meaning making elaborates outbox expectations, i.e. conducting epistemic subjective-objective ontology (Searle 2006, 11); negotiative meaning making extends the polarity language. The memorials of Mary elaborate the experiential circuits of behaviors and conceptualized value-beliefs. Since, the formal structure of narratives may reside in a clause, a phrase, or a word (Thornborrow and Coates, 2005, 3-4), hierarchical dramatic texture is constructed and is construed through the memorial narrative (e.g., Mary's discursive phenomenal discourse processing) (Cheshire and Ziebland 2005; Johansen and Larsen 2005, 58). Accordingly, the Communication Dynamism/CD of Mary creates a living-contextual structure that embodies her story and schematizes suffering-based phenomena; the authorial craft appears lies in situated cognition (Alves 2015, 20). Textually, the situated cognition signifies the interpersonal function (Johansen and Larsen 2002, 63).

Meaning making potentialities through polarity system is conducted through transitivity of meaning and cognitive paths (e.g., locative path and mental path) constructing image scenes for the dramatic topic's aboutness, scene setting, thematization, semantic expectancy coherence, pragmatic relevance, and transitive- based polarity way round (Lambrecht 1994, 117-124). As a result, dramatized texture

conducts the interpersonal texture raising the nature of the permanent medium that proves the relation between knowledge and text-producers/consumers affecting the interpersonal profile (Johnstone 2012). Accordingly, meaning is mapped through circles of 'statements, questions, and responses', 'affirmation and denials', 'possibility and certainty' are manipulated with definite discursal markers (Leech and Svartvik 1975). Given the spontaneous dialogism between family members, the phatic function may be the end-goal of the daily situational dots, i.e. an affective or a social relation reference (Holmes and Wilson 2017, 294). It is realized syntactically through the semantically-based carriers of meaning or the pragmatically-based connotative indicators, and the empty constructions of modals, i.e. moot (Berk 1999, 152).

Furthermore, modalities create a space between certainty and possibility; it serves the role of a path that directs or redirects the situational dots for new dramatized/fictive event model. The covert multifaceted relations shed the light on the notions of '*deference and respect*' across family members' interactive circuits (Haugh 2010, 272-273). The notions of '*deference and respect*' show the politeness strategies followed to value-estimate the social ranks within the family members given the gendered behaviors, i.e. politeness rites (273). Within and across the dramatic scenes, the sense of asymmetrical use of deference rendering asymmetrical social ranking is noted; James Tyrone vs. Jamie Tyrone, James vs. Edmund, James vs. Mary, Jamie vs. Mary, Edmund vs. Mary, Mary's transactional behavior towards the male-based circuit of behaviors, and James' and Jamie's dramatic commentaries on Mary's long night's painful history gave rise to irritation. The conventionalities of gendered behaviors guarantee language performativity with mutual ception stability. Generally speaking, ception stability is legitimized explicitly or implicitly (van Leeuwen 2008, 125-126). With legitimatization, the dramatic scenes proximize family relations in light of the masculine-/feminine-patterns of behavior, e.g. de/associations with family ties, past memories, drug addictions, physical appearance, bitter commentaries, reluctant passions, hesitant reactions, and firm-fake siege. Playing with and across family relations depict the socio-cognitive interplay of valenced experiences in light of mood states and emotions (Greifeneder and Bless 2018, 126-127). These features reflect the extent the social stereotypes affect the ongoing behaviors of the interactants. Furthermore, the dramatic interplay depends on the cognitive system of any individual or reasoning bearing two discrepant but compatible sub-systems of cognition; in this sense, event model

is constructed and construed in light of not only conducting active experiences but also by evoking alternative ones (Talmy 2000, 100). Alternativity licenses intertextuality within and across social layers, event models, and social domains paving the way to 'encyclopedic knowledge of redundant situational background' (Gasparov 2010, 2). In this sense, intertextuality is involved in constructing gendered cognition-based circuits derived from the global coherent performative speech act through intentions, knowledge, and social positions of the social roles within and across dialogism (van Dijk 2009, 6-14).

The wordings of the text are designed in a classical manner that licenses the dramatic heroes to serve the role of homo/heterodiegetic 'narrator' (238). Text wordings represent fictional discourse, seemingly mimetic of ordinary language, where processes operate upon speech and thoughts for more narrational involvement (Black 2006, 54- 64). The multiplicity forms of discourse are attached to either the text or the character through the Narrator's report of Speech/Thought Act (NRSA/NRTA) (64). The involved forms include Free Direct Discourse/FDD; Free Discourse Thought/FDT; Direct Discourse/DD; Free Indirect Discourse/FID; or Indirect Discourse/ID (65-70). Across these forms of discourse, a sense of artistry is raised given the individuals' enormous stylistic variations.

Stylistically, the interpersonal function conducted across narrative discourse creates a sense of emotional involvement and promote the bafflement statement across the characters (Black 2006, 62). The interpersonal profile discussed differentiates the 'interpersonal' as a function of language and as a context of situation, culture, and cognition, i.e. back ground information chains and prototypical patterns (van Dijk 2009). The interpersonal function is realized throughout the sentential exchanges of interactive information (e.g., theme-rheme, co-speech acts performativity given the dialogic adjuncts pairs, textual interactional markers, and discursivity) (Halliday 2014, 134-135). Both the two roles served by the 'interpersonal' prove the validity of 'language' as a double-edged indicator of end-goal means and exchanging language itself (138). For that, the interpersonal function renders the textual layers exchange potentialities and argumentation status (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999, 9).

6. CONCLUSION

The previously mentioned results prove the interpersonal gendered identity activities. Interpersonal communication shapes the 'social

reality' through dual processing, elaborative vs. simple cognitive dynamicity (Greifeneder, Bless, and Fiedler 2018, 6). The dual processes stem from the background activity consciousness (Chafe 1994, 140). The social roles recontextualize the habitual topic acceptance across the topic referents, integrated generic texts, social roles, codes, and mediated-channels. With frequently repeated propositions, low cognitive efforts are operated upon since a degree of general correlation is constructed between the cognitive 'activation' and 'identifiability' (Lambrecht 1994, 165-166). Both require topic foci and motivated semantic expectations of the proposition 'content' (Saeed 2009) and dialectical pragmatic relevance (Wilson and Sperber 2012). Given its low cognitive processing, no increment of the information intensity is conducted; experiences are constructed and construed within and across the social order behavioral patterns displaying the 'interpersonal function' (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999, 511). Moreover, the logical sequence of experiential processes constructs and construes the experiential "construal" (508). The experiential construal evokes the conceptual substrate for the background knowledge and apprehension of physical, social, and linguistic context in multifaceted schematic interpretations and compositional paths (Langacker 2008, 4). Alongside, integrated genres deploy and construe the content-based "construal" through multi-faceted structural networks and information-like spurt intensity exchanging the roles of the focus and the foci and the multiple stylo-voices represented and re-contextualized across eco-asymmetric/symmetric stories lived by for more contextualized hegemonic ideologies (Wodak 2007, 208-209). The exercise of power is realized through the hierarchical organizational formations of built-in socio-discursive relations, i.e. IDFs (Fairclough 2010, 26).

Up to the community of practices, a value-based interaction relevance-based statement is dramatically co-/eco-constructed and elaborated dialectically and hierarchically since they design the cognitive paths for the 'image schemata' (Langacker 2013; Fairclough 2010). Image schemata are schematized as conceptual archetype-stances that smoothly motivate the action and the reaction towards social practices, arise the habitual daily interaction, and stabilize the authorial-based ideological hegemony (Langacker 2013, 33; van Dijk 1998). All the ideological hegemony practices are transitively experienced through the lexico-grammatical constructions providing a complementarity view of the daily scenes encountered through the family members' transactions (Halliday 2014; Halliday 1989). Family-based transactions, the focus in this study, dressed syntagmatic as well as paradigmatic patterns of genderlect polarity

(Halliday 2014, 63). Semantically-based, genderlect polarity actualizes coherence through the Context Configuration/CC identified and performed by the social agents-based ideology (Halliday and Hasan, 1989). Syntagmatically and paradigmatically-oriented, morpho-based strata constructions reflect social properties represented by social roles formulated through group-self schema with in-/out-group homogeneity/heterogeneity legitimized within the public sphere and/or in circumscribed social community of practices (Therborn 1980, 80; van Dijk 2000, 33-34); discursively-token, the community of practices is elaborated through feminism struggle among groups and attitudes towards the other, social

struggle, resistance and oppression (van Dijk 1998, 65-76). The adopted claim of Them vs. Us in light of being the bad vs. the good; the social group mirror requires equal-status representations rather than the value-based positive self-representation vs. negative other-representation (76-77). Accordingly, the practical and the procedural practices alongside with individual cognition constitute the socially shared cognition experienced thoroughly (van Dijk 2014, 91-97). To conclude, the present study does not only echo the genderlect practices in literary works but also stresses the conceptualized discursivity of masculine hegemony.

REFERENCES

Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. Bloomsbury Academic, 2019.

Adams, Karen L. "Deliberate Dispute and the Construction of Oppositional Stance." *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPRA)*, July 6, 2022, 231-48. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.9.2.02ada>.

Alves, Fabio, and Aline Schwieter John W Ferreira. "Translation Process Research at the Interface: Paradigmatic, Theoretical, and Methodological Issues in Dialogue with Cognitive Science, Expertise Studies, and Psycholinguistics." *Psycholinguistic and Cognitive Inquiries into Translation and Interpreting.*, 2015.

Austin, John. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press, 1969.

Bara, Bruno G. *Cognitive Pragmatics*. The MIT Press, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262014113.001.0001>.

Berk, Lynn. *English Syntax: From Word to Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Bhatia, Vijay. "Worlds of Written Discourse," 2014. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=184599108&h=962a424d504049c5e00fcf0214dc2326&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Biber, Douglas, and Susan Conard. "This Page Intentionally Left Blank," 2009. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=161109362&h=c340d9339c2c6d8833666c5b7b4a40a0&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Black, Elizabeth. *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

Chafe, Wallace. "DISCOURSE, CONSCIOUSNESS, AND TIME The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing," 1994. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=160958281&h=dc03e3ce0832b8c-206b26e3c7c827d83&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Chandler, Daniel. "Semiotics the Basics, Second Edition : The Basics. Routledge: Taylor and Francis. London and New York," 2017. <https://analepsis.files.wordpress.com/2011/08/69249454-chandler-semiotics.pdf>.

Cheshire, Jenny, and Sue Ziebland. "Narrative as a Resource in Accounts of the Experience of Illness," 17-40, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sin.6.02che>.

Coats, Jennifer. *Women Talk : Conversation between Women Friends*. Blackwell Publishers, 1996.

Coupland, Nikolas, and Adam Jaworski. "SOCIO-LINGUISTICS : A Reader. Macmillan Education," 1996. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=175349602&h=7af90a157e221cba007d107d326b4741&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Cumming, Susanna, and Tsuyoshi Ono. "Discourse and Grammar. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction." *Sage Publications*, 1997.

Danesi, Marcel. "Messages, Signs, and Meanings: A Basic Textbook in Semiotics and Communication Theory. 3rd Ed. Canadian Scholars' Press Inc. Toronto," 2004. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=185495885&h=ea32a543e579c2bf00830e5495ee323c&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Dijk, Teun van. *Discourse and Knowledge. A Sociocog-*

- native Approach. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- . *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. SAGE Publications, 1998.
- . "Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction," 2000.
- Dijk, van. *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Vol. 1. London : SAGE, 1997.
- Downing, Angela. *English Grammar: A University Course: Third Edition. English Grammar: A University Course: Third Edition*, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315750040>.
- Edberg, Hélène. *Creative Writing for Critical Thinking: Creating a Discoursal Identity. Creative Writing for Critical Thinking: Creating a Discoursal Identity*, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65491-1>.
- Eemeren, Frans van. "Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse. Extending the Pragma-Dialectical Theory of Argumentation. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam / Philadelphia," 2010. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=161885725&h=098c0ac8c9cdae098d-9dad59ffa53c06&u=cache&ext=pdf>.
- Evans, Vyvyan. *How Words Mean: Lexical Concepts, Cognitive Models, and Meaning Construction. How Words Mean: Lexical Concepts, Cognitive Models, and Meaning Construction*, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199234660.001.0001>.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis : The Critical Study of Language (2nd Ed)*. Routledge, 2010.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Norman Fairclough, Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press: Norman Fairclough, 1992. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=187141718&h=15f20350b39e135e-74252365a837b2a3&u=cache&ext=pdf>.
- Gasparov, Boris. *Speech, Memory, and Meaning: Intertextuality in Everyday Language. Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs*, 2010.
- Givón, T. *Context as Other Minds: The Pragmatics of Sociality, Cognition and Communication. Context as Other Minds: The Pragmatics of Sociality, Cognition and Communication*, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.130>.
- Goldberg, Adele. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. The University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Greifeneder, Rainer, Herbert Bless, and Klaus Fiedler. *Social Cognition*. Second Edition. | New York : Routledge, [2018] | Revised edition of Social cognition, 2004.: Psychology Press, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315648156>.
- . *Social Cognition: How Individuals Construct Social Reality, Second Edition. Social Cognition: How Individuals Construct Social Reality, Second Edition*, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315648156>.
- Gumpres, John. *Interactional Sociolinguistics: A Personal Perspective*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, , 2001.
- Haegeman, Liliane. *The Syntax of Negation*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Halliday, M. A.K., and Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar: Fourth Edition. Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar: Fourth Edition*, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203431269>.
- Halliday, Michael. . *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford University Press, 1989.
- . "Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning." Edward Arnold: M.A.K Halliday, 1978.
- Halliday, Michael, and Christian Matthiessen. "Constructing Experience through Meaning. A Language-Based Approach to Cognition. Continuum. London. New York," 1999. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=157128483&h=6ef40bbf54c178dd2042c-c79fad9ca8a&u=cache&ext=pdf>.
- Haugh, Michael. " Respect and Deference." In *Interpersonal Pragmatics*, 271–88. DE GRUYTER MOUTON, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214338.2.271>.
- Hoey, Michael. *Textual Interaction: An Introduction to Written Discourse Analysis*. Routledge, 2001.
- Holmes, Janet. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833057>.
- Holmes, Janet, and Nick Wilson. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315728438>.

Hyland, Ken. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing, 2005.

Johansen, Jørgen Dines, and Svend Erik Larsen. *Signs in Use*. Routledge, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203994146>.

Johnstone, Barbra. *Discourse Analysis*. 2nd Ed. Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

Kendall, Shari, and Deborah Tannen. "Discourse and Gender." In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 639–60. Wiley, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584194.ch30>.

Khachmafova, Zayneta R., Irina S. Karabulatova, Svetlana A. Lyausheva, Elena N. Luchinskaya, and Gennady V. Osipov. "Gender Features of Discourse in Women's Literature as a Reflection of Changes in the Modern Society." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, May 1, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n3s2p476>.

Kress, Gunther. *Multimodality*. Routledge, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203970034>.

Kroeger, Paul R. *Analyzing Meaning: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Second Corrected and Slightly Revised Edition. *Analyzing Meaning: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Second Corrected and Slightly Revised Edition, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2538330>.

Lakoff, Robin. *Language and Women's Place*. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Lambrecht, Knud. *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge University Press, 1994. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620607>.

Langacker, Ronald. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*, 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331967.001.0001>.

———. *Essentials of Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford University Press, 2013.

"Laurence Anthony's Software," 2019. <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>.

Lazar, Michelle. "Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power, and Ideology in Discourse." *Palgrave Macmillan: Michelle M. Lazar*, 2005.

Leech, Geoffrey. *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman:

London and New York, 1983.

Leech, Geoffrey, and Jan Svartvik. "A Communicative Grammar of English." *London: Longman*, 1975.

Leeuwen, Theo Van. "Discourse and Practice. New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis," 2008. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=185042586&h=f68e282c-12051c5aaf38b44129ff70a1&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Magalhães, Izabel. "Interdiscursivity, Gender Identity, and the Politics of Literacy in Brazil. In M. Lazar (Ed.), *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power, and Ideology in Discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan: Michelle M. Lazar," 2005. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=157958767&h=25d2695c-36c3874edd4f370552ace4e3&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

McIntyre, Dan. *Point of View in Plays*. Vol. 3. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lal.3>.

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

Ng, Chiew Hong, and Yin Ling Cheung. "Gender Roles and Equality through Popular Asian Drama Series: Critical Interpretations and Pedagogical Implications." *Journal of Pedagogy* 13, no. 1 (June 1, 2022): 31–47. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jped-2022-0002>.

Omoniyi, Tope. "Discourse and Identity." K. Hyland & K. Paltridge, *The Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis*, 2011.

O'Neill, Eugene. "Long Day's Journey into Night." *New York: Chelsea House*, 1987.

Paltridge, Brain. "Discourse Analysis An Introduction 2nd Edition," 2012. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=187410133&h=d9cd638810974ae-8c66a865c63bd38c1&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Saeed, John. *Semantics*. 3rd ed. Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Schegloff, Emanuel. "Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis I. Cambridge University Press," 2007. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=185113825&h=3a599955c0e0323f2f09d81ee1a385fa&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Searle, John. *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York : Free Press, 2006.

Talbot, Mary. *Media Discourse: Representation and*

Interaction. Media Discourse: Representation and Interaction, 2007. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=184222536&h=62a3eb6bb1a9e8b-4647c282795b9102b&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Talmy, Leonard. "TOWARD A COGNITIVE SEMANTICS," 2000. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=175926304&h=8c25a00e814afb74e-7ceef6496269c46&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Tannen, Deborah. "Gender and Family Interaction." In *The Handbook of Language and Gender*, 179–201. Wiley, 2003. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756942.ch8>.

———. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511618987>.

Therborn, Goran. . "The Ideology of Power and The Power of Ideology. Verso Editions and NLP," 1980. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=187886196&h=b3e95dd87a28824a937b5ecd19ed2ce6&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Thomas, Jenny. "Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics." *Journal of Petrology*, 1995.

Thornborrow, Joanna, and Jennifer Coates. "The Sociolinguistics of Narrative: Identity, Performance, Culture." In *The Sociolinguistics of Narrative*, 2005.

Wardhaugh, Ronald, and Janet Fuller. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Wiley Blackwell. John Wiley and Sons, 2005.

White, Peter. "Discursive Pragmatics," 2011. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=188303858&h=fb830c0798fc1186b4e0d-235d0c08945&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Widdowson, Henry. *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Wieczorek, Anna. "Clusivity: A New Approach to Association and Dissociation in Political Discourse. Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Anna Ewa Wieczorek," 2013. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/download.pdf?id=189394843&h=4a393d881bae0c742d951f-04bc9fb5f7&u=cache&ext=pdf>.

Wilson, Deirdre, and Dan Sperber. "Truthfulness and Relevance." In *Meaning and Relevance*, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139028370.005>.

Wodak, Ruth. "Pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis: A Cross-Disciplinary Inquiry." *Pragmatics & Cognition* 15, no. 1 (2007).

Zienkowski, Jan. "Discursive Pragmatics," 1–13, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hoph.8.01zie>.