Reconstructing Female Emotionality

Abigail Locke

Psychology Subject Group

School of Health and Social Sciences

Coventry University

Priory Street, Coventry

CV1 5FB

UK

Phone: 02476 887642

Fax: 024 76 838300

Email: A.Locke@coventry.ac.uk

Reconstructing Female Emotionality

Abstract

I examine the use of emotion discourse in the management of blame and accountability, using as an empirical case, the Panorama interview between Princess Diana and Martin Bashir. Diana's talk is examined to determine how she uses notions of emotionality attributed to her in her discourse for accounting purposes. I argue that Diana provides the background for her 'emotional' label and through doing so, allocates blame by accusing the media and royal family of fabricating that label for her. She further constructs their motive as being due to their being threatened by her *strength* of character, rather than her perceived instability. Finally Diana reconstructs her emotional nature into a positive attribute whilst marking the royal family as 'unemotional' and uncaring. This study is linked to a broader discursive psychology of emotion concepts and their uses.

Emotion discourse

This paper offers a discursive psychological study of the uses of emotion and gendered concepts in accounting for actions and relationships. Rather than studying the 'actual' role of emotional states in relationships, as it is traditionally conceived, I approach the issue as a discursive phenomenon (Edwards & Potter, 1992; Harré & Gillett, 1994), produced as part of a narrative framework and utilised for accounting purposes.

Emotion discourse is an important part of how social accountability is produced (e.g., Lutz, 1988; White, 1990). More specifically, Buttny (1993) and Edwards (1997; 1999) have looked at emotion discourse in settings such as relationship counselling and therapy and have found that emotion discourse forms an integral part of the accounting process, either to imply that circumstances are problematic or out of the ordinary, or in contrast to rational thought and in making narrative sense of people's actions.

I focus on Princess Diana and examine how she uses notions of emotionality attributed to her to manage blame and accountability. Much research attention has been paid to Diana and she has been discussed in the light of sexual politics (Campbell, 1998); commented on for her 'discourses of the heart' (Heelas, 1999); constructed as a 'media saint' (Richards, Wilson & Woodhead, 1999) and examined for her negotiation of blame and implication in the Panorama interview (Abell & Stokoe, 1999; Bull, 1997). Other research work has focused on the period following Diana's death and examined the 'grieving of the nation' (Anderson & Mullen, 1998) and analysed the allocation of blame to the paparazzi for her death (Macmillan & Edwards, 1999). This paper differs by looking at how emotion discourse forms an integral part of the accounting structure for Diana in the Panorama interview and examines how the gendered constructions of female emotionality can be reconstructed in order to fulfil rhetorical purposes.

Gender and emotion

This paper takes the issue of gendered emotion as its topic and I argue that emotion discourse and concepts can be used rhetorically and indexically to construct versions of character. There is strong evidence for constructed gendered perceptions of

emotionality and in particular, the stereotypical view of female emotionality. In terms of feminist thought, the gender differences that appear in emotionality can be seen as being due to cultural expectations of emotional expression and long-held stereotypical notions of 'emotional female' and 'non-emotional male'. This position proposes that emotionality is culturally coded as feminine, whereas rationality is coded as masculine (Lupton, 1998), and that masculine identity is bound up with restrictive emotionality (Jansz, 2000). The gendered aspects of emotional experience are clear and the traditional stereotypes of emotional female versus non-emotional male are culturally evident and endorsed (Fischer, 1993; Lupton, 1998; Lutz, 1990). The construct of females as emotional is a taken for granted assumption which can be hard to undermine, as Shields and Crowley note:

"Stereotypic representations of the emotional female / unemotional male are so prominent in North American culture that these stereotypes reinforce the notion that the starting point for any gendered-based analysis of emotion should be gender *differences* in emotion". (Shields & Crowley, 1996: 219, their emphasis).

Although historically these viewpoints have been held, recently such gender stereotypes may have 'softened'. However, as Fivush and Buckner (2000) note:

"Although the traditional stereotype of the weeping female and the stoic male have softened somewhat over the past twenty years (Basow, 1992), one of the strongest stereotypes related types related to gender continues to centre on emotionality" (Fivush and Buckner, 2000: 234).

Why are women culturally constructed as more emotional than men? The answer may lie in the *expression* of emotion, and a number of studies back up this position. For example, Fischer (1993) proposed that women are more willing to talk about and express emotions than men. Brody (2000) found that display rules of emotion generally conform to gender stereotypes. Similarly, Van-Leeson, Todd and Parkinson (1998) found the regulation of emotions to be consistent with gender emotion norms. Furthermore they argue that both men and women use discourses of masculinity, femininity, and biology when discussing emotion and behaviour, such that these folk notions of gendered emotion are evident in people's talk. Fischer (1993) argues that emotionality should not be considered one of the basic dimensions to distinguish the sexes, and that the "claim that women are more emotional than men tells us more

about our cultural stereotypes than about actual sex differences in emotions".
(Fischer, 1993: 312).

With regards to the non-verbal expression of emotion, numerous research has been
conducted to ascertain if these gendered assumptions hold some water or basis in
'fact'. Hall (1984) conducted a meta-analysis of facial expressiveness and found that
females were more facially expressive than men. However, in more recent work, Hall,
Carter and Horgan note that 'non-verbal behavior does not necessarily signify
emotion" (Hall, Carter & Horgan, 2000: 97). Although such non-verbal studies are of
interest in the larger issue of gender and emotion, the purpose of this paper is to focus
on the discursive uses of emotionality as they occur at local, interactional levels and
examined for their role in accounting for, and constructing events.

Dispositional emotionality
Emotionality is in itself a value based judgment, whether people use it to explain their
own behaviour (emotional 'avowal') or, as it seems most often to be used in this
gendered context, in describing other people (emotional 'ascription'). The latter case
is often used in constructions of women, and its generally negative value is closely
associated with its gendered character (Shields, 1991).

Rhetorically, emotion concepts can be used in many differing ways (Edwards, 1997;
1999). What is of interest here is the contrast between 'reactive' emotion and
dispositional emotion. Reactive emotion refers to being emotional in a particular
situation where the emotion is produced as an understandable reaction to a specific
event or object. Dispositional emotionality however removes this situational element
and is treated as a uni-polar personality trait that is stable over time and neglects to
take into account the social and cultural contexts of emotion (Fischer, 1993). Being
dispositionally emotional allows a number of other categories to be inferred and
attached to the label, most notably notions of irrationality, as emotion is typically
contrasted with rational thought, and instability. Thus to ascribe dispositional
emotionality to a person can be a way to blame them for their actions, while managing
your own accountability (cf. Edwards, 1994; 1995 on the uses of 'script and
disposition' formulations in relationship counselling).

In looking at emotionality, the notion that females are more emotional than males is so ingrained in our cultural beliefs that it is hard to dismantle this myth as a social construction. As Shields and Crowley note "[i]n so far as they are foundational to our understanding of emotion, we may not even recognise them as beliefs, but rather revere them as reality" (Shields & Crowley, 1996: 223).

The rhetoric of control

Emotion is seen to weaken the person who experiences it and being 'too emotional' is seen as a character deficit. Emotion is culturally linked with gender and power and in terms of emotional expression there is a rhetoric of control (Lutz, 1990). There is a shared cultural view that emotions, if not controlled, can be dangerous. Yet, as Catherine Lutz notes, the culturally constructed emotionality of women has a number of contradictions. On the one hand she is pliant and weak, and on the other she is potentially dangerous, powerful and uncontrollable (Lutz, 1990). The corollary of emotional weakness is an elevation of social status for those who have the ability to control their emotions (Lutz, 1990; Parrott, 1995), and most commonly this is seen to be a male characteristic. 'Being emotional' is seen as not being in control of your emotions (Parrott, 1995), and thus perhaps acting irrationally. Therefore to construct someone as emotional is a way of apportioning blame for their actions, and negativity to their character or disposition. However, rhetorically there is another construction here that being unemotional, cold or aloof is seen as a negative characteristic. As the analysis will demonstrate, Diana constructs her emotionality as justified and reactive against the problematic, unemotional nature of the royal family.

The rhetoric of emotion (Lutz, 1990) suggests a set of roles and here is where the gendered aspects become most apparent, as does the negotiation of power. As Kenneth Gergen has noted: '[e]motion terms are socially and politically loaded" (Gergen, 1999: 108), in that emotionality is used as a subtle and indirect means of evaluating a person. Gergen cites examples of common binaries in western society, for example: '*rational versus emotional', 'effective versus ineffective',* and *'strong versus weak'*, and notes the imbalance provided in the binaries, arguing that the former term is often privileged over the latter, i.e. it is deemed to be better to be rational rather than emotional. These binaries are often used in depictions of gender with men being associated with the privileged terms. Lutz makes a similar point, that

"qualities that define the emotional, also define women. For this reason, any discourse on emotion is also, at least implicitly, a discourse on gender" (Lutz, 1990: 151).

Emotionality and its colluders

As mentioned, emotionality as a concept brings with it, by implication, other notions such as irrationality and instability that are attached to the person with the emotional label (Fischer, 1993; Locke & Edwards, forthcoming). What these colluders, as I have termed them here, do interactionally is to strengthen the impact of emotionality as a label, and make it more of a blaming and accounting device. In the analysis offered here, Princess Diana was labelled as highly emotional and mentally imbalanced. This may come as no surprise, given that some feminist researchers argue that women are *expected* to be unstable and out of control (Burns, 1992).

Interactionally the use of emotional labels is crucial. At one level it serves to dismiss or downgrade the opinions of the emotional person, accounting for them as irrationally grounded and explained away. At a more extreme level it enables us to create a notion of the emotional woman as being mentally ill. Jane Ussher notes:

'To pathologize the individual woman is to neutralize her as a threat to the dominant order. There is no need to look to society - to men - to political factors to understand and ameliorate her situation. There is no need to heed her comments or her complaints, her cries for help. Everything she has previously experienced can be seen as part of her pathology, and her previous life rewritten to fit the psychiatric scenario" (Ussher, 1991: 177).

Accountability of emotionality

As the literature under discussion has demonstrated, there is a well-established cultural construction of emotionality and gender. This takes many forms from stereotypical notions of emotion, emotionality and expression of emotion and the rhetoric of control, to the pathologizing of women.

Being emotional is an accountable matter and, as I argue throughout this article, a means of accomplishing blaming of the person for their actions. As Lutz (1990) and Gergen (1999) have noted, avowals and ascriptions of emotionality can be considered a means of negotiating power, as emotion is gendered against the female with

rationality held as the desired state in western culture, over emotionality. Perhaps then, examining uses of emotion language is a way in to examining the power differentials within a gender driven interaction. Thus although emotion discourse may be a means of locating power in interactions within a discursive framework, to perhaps blame or make a person accountable, it can also work in a contrary way, to excuse or explain the behaviour and action of the emotional person as being situationally caused rather than personally, and dispositionally, attributable.

One of the pragmatic virtues of emotion concepts, in everyday talk, is their surprising flexibility in managing blame and accountability for actions (Edwards, 1997, 1999). In terms of (constructed) power relations, emotionality can be used to blame or discredit, but also to justify and account for actions, or in the case of the analysis offered here, can be reconstructed as a positive attribute to possess, while marking the 'unemotional' as problematic. This paper demonstrates that Diana does so by rhetorically marking her emotional expression as understandable and positioning the royal family's restrictive emotional nature as strange. The argument pursued through the paper makes no claims as to the 'realities' of emotionality between genders, rather it treats labels of emotionality as constructions designed to perform interactional business. Thus the issue here moves away from 'real' gendered differences in emotions to examining common-sense notions of emotion and gender, and how they are worked up and put to work in discourse.

Method

The material used in this study was the interview between Princess Diana and Martin Bashir, which was broadcast on the BBC's 'Panorama' programme on 20 [th] November 1995. The programme was video-recorded and transcribed using conventions established for conversation analysis by Gail Jefferson (see Atkinson & Heritage, 1984), which are summarized in Appendix 1. The resulting transcript was analysed using a discursive approach that draws upon both discursive psychology (Edwards & Potter, 1992) and conversation analysis (Sacks, 1992)

The transcript was read repeatedly in conjunction with the video data, and sections relevant to the analysis of emotion terms and events were identified and coded as

pertaining to one or more of three emerging analytic themes: (1) accounting for the emotional label; (2) blaming others for the label; and lastly, (3) reconstructing the emotional label into a positive attribute. It is a feature of the discourse deployed here, that these themes overlap and the two extracts used to demonstrate the analysis, contain a number of these overlapping themes.

Analysis

I focus on the reflexive implications, for her own character, role and motives, of Diana. However, the analysis offered here neither endorses nor opposes any particular version of her situation but, rather, examines Diana's descriptions within a specific discourse setting, for the kinds of interactional and rhetorical work that those descriptions perform. That 'work' is performed locally by the details of talk, but attends to general concerns of the interaction as a whole.

Theme 1: Accounting for the emotional label

Prior to the following extract, Diana has been discussing the royal family's reaction to the birth of William, and the relief that Diana had a boy. She goes on to discuss her post-natal depression that she attributes to working too hard in her role as Princess of Wales, and needing to rest. Bashir establishes that this depression was out of character for the Princess and as this analysis will go on to show, his corroboration here with Diana is crucial in order to dismiss claims of her being dispositionally emotional and unstable. Extract one focuses on how the royal family reacted to Diana's post-natal depression.

```
Extract One: Panorama MB/Diana: 5 (0:10)


1    MB:        what was the (.) the family's reaction to your
2               post-natal depress↓ion
3    Diana:     well maybe I was the first person ever to be in
4               this family (0.8) who ever (0.4) had a depression
5               (.) or was ever openly tearful (.) .hh (.) and
6               obviously that was daunting because if you've never
7               seen it before how do you support it
8               (2.5)
9    MB:        what effect (.) did the depression have on your
```

```
10              marriage
11              (1.2)
12   Diana:     well it gave everybody (0.2) a wonderful (0.2) new
13              label (0.2) (it's) Diana's (.) unstable (.) and
14              Diana's um (0.2) mentally imbalanced (.) and
15              unfortunately that seems to have stuck on and off
16              over the years
17              (1.0)
18   MB:        are you saying (.) that that label stuck within
19              your marriage?
20              (0.8)
21   Diana:     I think people used it (.) and it stuck (0.2) °yes°
```

Bashir asks for the "family's" reaction to her post-natal depression (lines 1-2). Diana seemingly offers reasons as to why the royal family reacted the way they did, but this construction of them here makes possible reflexive constructions of Diana later on in the interview, and this is something that will be examined later on in this paper. She proposes that perhaps she was the "first person ever…in this family" (lines 3-4) to suffer depression. She uses the extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1986) of "ever" throughout this turn in line 3, line 4 'who ever ..had a depression", and line 5 "ever openly tearful", to build up the extremity of the situation described. Extreme case formulations are used in rhetorical environments of this kind, in making contested events accountable (Pomerantz, 1986). Diana's extreme account perhaps can be heard as ironic (Edwards, 2000), in that it seems implausible that she could be the first person to have cried in front of others in the royal household. However, rather than ironical, it may serve to construct or conjure the long-established unemotional nature of the royal family. This is the first step to reconstructing her 'emotionality' from a dispositional weakness or character deficit to focusing on the impassive and problematically nature of the unemotional royal family.

Diana is apparently proposing that it was not the family's fault that they reacted in the way they did, because they simply did not or *could* not understand how she felt. This is a crucial rhetorical move for her as she constructs the "family" as not understanding what is a common condition, and not being able to cope with overt expressions of emotion. She bolsters this notion of outward expression (of emotion) in lines 5-7, that

she may have been the first person who 'was ever openly tearful'. An interesting part of Diana's account is how in line 4 she labels her condition 'depression' and then produces a description of emotional behaviour that in folk logic, accompanies this condition being "openly tearful" (line 5).

Theme 2: Blaming others for her label

Bashir asks Diana what effect 'the depression' (lines 9-10) had on her marriage. Note here his use of 'the depression' as her condition rather than focusing on her emotional reactions, which endorses her description of her condition as medical and understandably caused, rather than stemming from some kind of deep rooted personal instability.

Diana's turn starting at line 12 blames 'everybody' for the " wonderful…new label" that came out of this depression, that Diana was 'unstable' (line 13) and 'mentally imbalanced' (line 14), and again her use of language here is hearably ironic ('wonderful'). She comments that this label had 'unfortunately... stuck on and off over the years' (lines 15-16). Diana's account of how labels got ascribed to her is a demonstration of emotionality and its colluders. She was understandably, reactively, "openly tearful", but this got turned, via a series of inappropriate attributions, to notions of instability and mental imbalance.

Bashir asks Diana for validation of what she is implying in lines 18-19, when he asks if the label had stuck 'within your marriage?', which is an indirect way of asking whether Charles himself believed her to be unstable or, by implication, treated her as such. Diana's response in line 21 blames a generalised 'people' for using the label and then reiterates that the label had stuck, followed by a softly and quietly spoken "°yes°" to answer Bashir's question that the label stuck in her marriage. In other words, while aligning with Bashir's delicacy in not mentioning Charles directly in an accusatory manner, we are to understand that Charles colluded in this construction of her as unstable. In addition, her claims of the label having 'stuck' does some interesting narrative sequence where it appears that it is the consistency of the use of the label, rather than Diana's distress that is used to explain the label's persistence.

Extract one is an account of where, according to Diana, her misperceived instability and emotionality arose from – a medical condition of post-natal depression that the family failed to understand. In addition, her construction of the royal family not knowing how to react to her being tearful and depressed, signifies a problem with the family itself, rather than her. They appear to have some difficulty with emotional expression, and perhaps are abnormal in this respect. Lastly, Diana suggests that the emotional and unstable label was "used" (line 21) by members of the royal family, including Charles.

Theme 3: Reconstructing the emotional label

The second extract from Diana follows on from a discussion between Diana and Bashir as to whether she would ever be queen. Diana answers that the "establishment" had previously decided that she was a "non-starter" for that position, and that she wanted to be a "queen of people's hearts". This notion of her being a "queen of hearts" builds upon her construction in extract one of the royal family as unemotional, or as having difficulty with emotional expression, and thus being perhaps in need of someone to play such a role in the nation's hearts.

```
Extract Two: Panorama MB/Diana: 21 (0: 49)


1    MB:        why do you think they've decided that
2    Diana:     .hhhh because I do things differently (0.2) because
3               I don't go by a rule book .hh (.) because (0.2) I
4               lead from the heart not the head (0.4) and albeit
5               that's got me into trouble in my work I understand
6               th↑at (0.4) but s↑omeone's got to go out there and
7               love people (0.2) and show it.
8               (0.8)
9    MB:        and do you think that (.) because of the way you
10              (0.2) behave (.) that's (.) precluded you
11              effectively from becoming (.) queen
12   Diana:     yes I- (.) >well not<  precluded me I wouldn't (.)
13              say that (.) .hh u:m (.) I just don't think I have
14              as many supporters in that environment than I did
15              (.) I did yeah
16   MB:        you mean within the royal household=
17   Diana:     =mm hm (0.2) mm (1.2) they see me as a (0.2) a
18              threat of some kind (0.4) and I'm here to do good
```

```
19                   (.) not to d- I'm not a destructive person
20   MB:             why (.) do they see you as a threat
21   Diana:          I think every strong woman in history has had to
22                   walk down a similar path (.) and I think (.) it's
23                   the strength (.) that causes the confusion and the
24                   fear.
```

Bashir asks Diana why she thinks that the royal family regard her as a non-starter.
Diana claims that she does things differently (from them, implicationally), that she
does not follow a rule book and finally she replies again in emotion metaphorical
terms, that she leads from 'the h̲eart not the h̲ead" (line 4). The distinction between
heart and head is a metaphorical construction for emotional versus rational, and by her
implication, that emotional is more desirable. This claim is made possible through her
construction of the royal family in extract one as being, contrastively to her,
unemotional, and gives further claim to her wishing to be a 'queen of people's
hearts". Thus to recap on the notion of emotionality and its discursive uses, Diana has
turned the rhetorical tables on her accusers, proposing that it is the royal family who
do not understand emotions and feelings, with their over-emphasis on the 'h̲ead" to
the neglect of the 'h̲eart".

Diana goes further, arguing that her willingness to lead emotionally from the 'h̲eart"
has got her 'into trou̲ble in my work" (line 5), but then removes her own
accountability from this by going on to say 'but s↑omeone's got to go out there and
love pe̲ople and sh̲ow it" (lines 6-7). This is a rhetorical move from her and bolsters
her existing construction of herself as emotional because people need her to 'love"
them and to "sh̲ow it". Again this implies a kind of royal job vacancy, that this role
needed to be fulfilled by someone royal, but that the royals either *could* not or *would*
not express their emotions to "pe̲ople". Note how Diana manages her stake here, a
stake arising from her own candidature for that role (cf. Edwards & Potter, 1992), by
using the expression 's↑omeone" in line 6 rather than 'I', implying that the need for
such a role was independent of her, that anyone might have fulfilled it, except that she
happened to be in a position, and with the required attributes, to do it herself. The
reflexive implications concerning her own character are evident here. It bolsters her
characterization as the caring, emotionally uninhibited 'queen of hearts", again in

rhetorical contrast to the deficits of a royal family dispositionally unable to fulfil that essential role. In addition, through Diana's delicate management of stake (lines 6-7), it closes off another line of inference that one may make about emotionally intense individuals, that they are narcissistically fulfilling their own ambitions in their dealings with others. She stepped into this role off loving 'others' rather than being 'loved' or basking in publicity.

Bashir goes on to ask Diana if her behaviour may have precluded her from becoming queen (lines 9-11). This question about her behaviour could be problematic, in that it could imply that Diana's behaviour was wrong and that she is accountable for this. Diana's answer in lines 12-15 sidetracks that issue, replying that her behaviour did not in itself preclude her, but that she did not have the support in the environment that she previously had. Bashir in line 16 asks her to clarify whom she means by the "environment" and suggests to her (again somewhat delicately, without naming names) that it may be the "royal household". Diana answers with an account as to why she no longer has this support (lines 17-18). Note here that the issue of Diana's behaviour and emotionality is not picked up by her now, rather she focuses on the impression of others about her.

Diana turns her focus to others' impressions of her. Her construction here is that the establishment see her as a threat. She states that she is not a "des tructive person" (line 19) and wants to do good. Her statement is in line with folk notions of gendered emotion with women seen as emotional and weak, yet with the potential to be uncontrollable and dangerous (Lutz, 1990).

Bashir questions why Diana believes that the royal family would consider her to be a threat (line 20). Her answer positions her as part of a gender specific generalized category - "every strong woman in history" (line 21), and here she is aligning herself with other women, and specifically with women who are strong leaders, thereby constructing herself also as strong in direct relation to the weak, emotional and imbalanced character that has been constructed through the media by the 'establishment'. Such claims of embracing emotionality as a positive characteristic are evident in 'difference' or 'celebratory' feminism (e.g. Miller, 1976)

Diana goes further to argue that it is in fact the *strength* of her character that "causes the confusion and the fear" (lines 22-24), once again in some group of un-named, but inferrable people. Here again she has turned around the issue of her being emotional and weak, to her being strong, and the others (the royals) feeling confused and afraid because of this. The implication is that they are the emotionally weak and irrational ones, reinforcing Diana's construction of them as unable to express themselves, and now feeling threatened because of her contrastively normal, even laudable openness.

Conclusions

I have approached the issue of female emotionality from the perspective of discursive psychology (cf. Edwards, 1999) focusing on Princess Diana. As the analysis of Diana's talk demonstrates, to be portrayed as emotional can bring with it connotations of instability and irrationality. I have argued that such labels are highly gendered and can be used as part of a set of blaming practices, making persons accountable for their actions. Yet these labels can also be reconstructed, as the example of Diana shows, in how she was able to reconstruct the label positively and invert the emotional pathology onto her accusers. The start point for that inversion was her attribution of her open tearfulness to a documented medical condition of post-natal depression, rather than a feature of her character or personality.

Diana went on to contrast her (now normal and understandable) emotional states to those of the strangely non-emotional royal family, and builds a basis for her identity as the queen of hearts; she leads from the heart and not the head. Her emotionality is thus reconstructed as a positive aspect of her character (character and disposition now, not just a symptom of post-natal depression), and she claims that it is in fact the royal family who have the emotional problem of not being able or willing to express their feelings. Finally, when asked why the royal family turned on her and gave her this emotional label, she claims that they feared her due to her *strength* of character, and aligns herself with 'other' strong women in history.

In terms of emotion discourse generally, there are a number of theoretical implications of emotionality as a discursive construct and it can be used in a number of ways:

    1. Emotionality can be used discursively to undermine a person's credibility, and to build dispositional elements of character. Such uses of emotionality are based

on well-documented gender stereotypes (e.g. Lupton, 1998; Shields & Crowley, 1996).

2. However, as this paper demonstrates, the rhetorical uses of emotion allows for many flexible uses of emotion concepts (Edwards, 1997; 1999) and emotionality can be reconstructed by the speaker to be a positive and 'caring' element of character. Such a rhetorical use of emotionality as positive can invert negative attributions made by other persons, and re-assign negative characteristics to them, in particular the problematic issue of their lack of emotion.

The analysis of the late Princess of Wales has served to demonstrate both the interactional currency of gendered stereotypes of emotionality, and the rhetorical uses that may be deployed in order to counteract such claims.

References

Abell, J. & Stokoe, E.H. (1999). 'I take full responsibility. I take some responsibility. I'll take half of it but no more than that': Princess Diana and the negotiation of blame in the 'Panorama' interview. *Discourse Studies* 1 (3) 297-319.

Anderson, D., & Mullen, P. (Eds.) (1998). *Faking it: The sentimentalisation of modern society.* London: Social Affairs Unit.

Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J.C. (Eds.), (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brody, L.R. (2000). The socialization of gender differences in emotional expression: Display rules, infant temperament, and differentiation. In A.H.Fischer (Ed.) *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 24-47). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bull, P.E. (1997). Queen of hearts or Queen of the arts of implication? Implicit criticisms and their implications for equivocation theory in the interview between Martin Bashir and Diana, Princess of Wales. *Social Psychological Review* 1 (1), 27-36.

Burns, J. (1992). Mad or just plain bad: Gender and the work of forensic clinical psychologists. In J.M.Ussher & P. Nicolson (Eds.). *Gender Issues in Clinical Psychology.* Routledge: London

Buttny, R. (1993). *Social accountability in communication*. London: Sage.

Campbell, B. (1998). *Diana, Princess of Wales. How sexual politics shook the monarchy*. London: Women's Press.

Edwards, D. (1994). Script formulations: A study of event descriptions in conversation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 13* (3), 211-247.

Edwards, D. (1995). Two to tango: Script formulations, dispositions, and rhetorical symmetry in relationship troubles talk. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 28 (4), 319-350.

Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse and cognition*. London: Sage.

Edwards, D. (1999). Emotion discourse. *Culture & Psychology*, 5 (3), 271-291.

Edwards, D. (2000). Extreme case formulations: Softeners, investment, and doing nonliteral. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 23 (4), 347-373.

Edwards, D. & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.

Fischer, A.H. (1993). Sex differences in emotionality: Fact or Stereotype? *Feminism*

and Psychology, 3 (3), 303-318. London: Sage.

Fivush, R. & Buckner, J.P. (2000). Gender, sadness and depression: The development of emotional focus through gendered discourse. In A.H.Fischer (Ed.) *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 232-253). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gergen, K.J. (1999). *An invitation to social constructionism*. London: Sage.

Hall, J.A (1984). *Nonverbal sex differences: Communication accuracy and expressive style*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hall, J.A., Carter, J.D. & Horgan, T.G. (2000). Gender differences in nonverbal communication of emotion. In A.H.Fischer (Ed.) *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 97-117). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harré, R., & Gillett, G. (1994). *The discursive mind.* London: Sage.

Heelas, P. (1999). Diana's self and the quest within. In J. Richards, S. Wilson, & L. Woodhead, (Eds.). *Diana. The making of a media saint* (pp. 98-118). London: I.B.Tauris.

Jansz, J. (2000). Masculine identity and restrictive emotionality. In A.H.Fischer (Ed.) *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 166-186). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Locke, A. & Edwards, D. (forthcoming). Bill and Monica: Memory, emotion and normativity in Clinton's Grand Jury testimony. *British Journal of Social Psychology*.

Lupton, D. (1998). *The emotional self*. London: Sage.

Lutz, C.A. (1988). *Unnatural emotions*: *Everyday sentiments on a Micronesian atoll and their challenge to Western theory.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lutz, C.A (1990). Engendered emotion: Gender, power, and the rhetoric of emotional control in American discourse. In C.A. Lutz & L. Abu-Lughod (Eds.) *Language and the politics of emotion* (pp.151-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macmillan, K. & Edwards, D. (1999). Who killed the Princess? Description and blame in the British press. *Discourse Studies*, 1 (2), 151-174.

Miller, J.B. (1976). *Towards a new psychology of women*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme Case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies*, *9*, 219-229.

Parrott, W.G. (1995). The heart and the head: Everyday conceptions of being emotional. In J.A.Russell, J.M. Fernande-Dols, A.S.R. Manstead, & J.C. Wellencamp (Eds.). *Everyday conceptions of emotion: An introduction to the psychology, anthropology, and linguistics of emotion* (pp. 73-84). Dordecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Richards, J., Wilson, S. & Woodhead, L. (Eds.) (1999). *Diana. The making of a media saint* (pp. 98-118). London: I.B.Tauris.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Volumes I and II. Edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Shields, S.A. (1991). Gender in the psychology of emotion: A selective research review. In K.T.Strongman (Ed.) *International review of studies on emotion: Volume 1*. (pp. 227-245). Chichester: Wiley

Shields, S.A. & Crowley, J.J. (1996). Appropriating questionnaires and rating scales for a feminist psychology: A multi-method approach to gender and emotion. In S. Wilkinson (Ed.) *Feminist social psychologies. International perspectives* (pp. 218-232). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ussher, J.M. (1991). *Women's madness: Misogyny or mental illness?* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Van-Leeson, T., Todd, Z. & Parkinson, B. (1998). Emotion and the social order. In R. Forrester & C. Percy (Eds.) *Proceedings of the international conference on discourse and the social order.* Birmingham: Aston University Business School.

White, G.M. (1990). Moral discourse and the rhetoric of emotions. In C.A Lutz & L. Abu-Lughod, (Eds.), *Language and the politics of emotion* (pp. 46-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix 1: Transcription Symbols

These are derived from the system developed mainly by Gail Jefferson for conversation analysis (see also Atkinson & Heritage, 1984).

[ ]	Square brackets mark the start and end of overlapping speech.
↑↓	Vertical arrows precede marked pitch movement.
<u>Underlining</u>	signals emphasis; the extent of underlining within individual words locates emphasis, but also indicates how heavy it is.
CAPITALS	mark speech that is obviously louder than surrounding speech.
º↑<u>I</u> know it,º	Raised circles ('degree' signs) enclose obviously quieter speech.
(0.4)	Numbers in round brackets measure pauses in seconds (in this case, 4 tenths of a second)
(.)	A micropause, hearable but too short to measure.
she wa::nted	Colons show degrees of elongation of the prior sound; the more colons, the more elongation.
hhh	Aspiration (out-breaths); proportionally as for colons.
.hhh	Inspiration (in-breaths).
Yeh,	Commas mark weak rising intonation, as used sometimes in enunciating lists.
y'know?	Question marks signal stronger, 'questioning' intonation, irrespective of grammar.
Yeh.	Periods (stops) mark falling, stopping intonation, irrespective of grammar.
bu-u-	hyphens mark a cut-off of the preceding sound.
>he said<	'greater than' and 'lesser than' signs enclose speeded-up talk.
solid.= We had	'Equals' signs mark the immediate 'latching' of successive talk, whether of one or more speakers, with no interval.
(...)	This shows where some talk has been omitted from a data extract or from within a turn at speaking.