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Referential/Anaphoric Choice and the Speaker's Emotion in English Conversation

Keiko NARUOKA

1. Introduction

This paper investigates how American English speakers choose a referential/anaphoric expression in conversation, focusing on the use of demonstrative expressions including this, that, these, and those. Based on the analysis, it illustrates that the speaker's emotion and attitude toward the referent and/or the addressee can be one of the factors involved in choosing the linguistic form from various referential/anaphoric expressions.

2. Previous Studies

2.1. Studies on referential/anaphoric choices

This section briefly reviews studies of referential/anaphoric forms. This section also includes studies that do not specifically mention the use of demonstrative expressions in order to show how the three approaches—“discourse structure,” “topic continuity,” and “cognitive state of the participants”—occupy in investigating the referential/anaphoric choice. First, I will describe the main studies that deal with English referential/anaphoric choices or claim universality on the referential/anaphoric choice. Then, I review recent studies that are useful to my analysis.

(1) The English data for this study are American English. Throughout this paper, I mean American English or American English speakers, even when I mention simply “English” or “English speakers.”
The discourse structure model on the referential/anaphoric choice is represented by Fox (1987). In her examination of the referential choice of third person pronoun reference, she states that a full noun phrase is used at the initial position of the discourse and that it tends to be mentioned with a reduced anaphoric expression, i.e., pronouns, later in the same discourse structural unit.

The topic continuity model of the referential form, associated with Givón (1983, 2001), explains that when the topicality is high, i.e., the referential distance is short and there is no interfering referent in the sequence, a reduced anaphoric expression such as a pronoun is usually used. On the other hand, when the topic is less continuous, a longer referential form will be applied, such as an indefinite noun phrase.

As for cognitive modes, Chafe (1987) distinguishes three degrees of activation involved in accessibility: “active” when the referent is in focus of consciousness, “semi-active” when the referent is in peripheral focus, and “inactive” when the referent is neither active nor semi-active. His examples from conversation data illustrate that the demonstratives are often used to identify “active” concepts. In her study of accessibility, Ariel (1990, 1991) explains that what a referring expression encodes is not the geo-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zeros</th>
<th>HIGH ACCESSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unstressed pronouns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressed pronouns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressed pronouns + gesture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximal demonstrative (+ modifier)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal demonstrative (+ modifier)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short definite description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long definite description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full name + modifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOW ACCESSIBILITY

Figure 1. The accessibility hierarchy (Ariel 1991: 449)
graphic location of the referent but the degree of accessibility in memory. She illustrates that depending upon the kind of referring expression, the accessibility ranges from high to low. That is, accessibility marking indicates how easy or difficult it is to retrieve the referent. Ariel (1991) lists the following types of linguistic expressions in English, as shown in Figure 1. As can be seen in the figure above, she claims that the more-accessible referent is referred to by the so-called proximal demonstrative (*this*) and that the less-accessible one is referred to by the distal demonstrative (*that*) (1990: 51).

Gundel et al.’s (1993) “givenness hierarchy” is closely related to the notion of accessibility. They examine English, Japanese, Chinese, Russian, and Spanish and claim that the six cognitive statuses in the givenness hierarchy—in focus, activated, familiar, uniquely identifiable, referential, and type identifiable—appear to be sufficient for describing the appropriate use of demonstratives, articles, and pronouns in the five languages. The givenness hierarchy shown in Figure 2 categorizes the cognitive statuses of information from high to low and lists the associated referring expressions in En-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Givenness</th>
<th>Cognitive status</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>In focus</td>
<td><em>it</em></td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activated</td>
<td><em>he/she</em></td>
<td><em>kare ‘he’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>that</em></td>
<td><em>kore ‘this’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>this</em></td>
<td><em>sore ‘that’ medial</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>this N</em></td>
<td><em>are ‘that’ distal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>kono N ‘this N’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>sono N ‘that N’ medial</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td><em>that N</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ano N ‘that N’ distal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniquely identifiable</td>
<td><em>the N</em></td>
<td>Ø N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referential</td>
<td><em>indefinite this N</em></td>
<td>Ø N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Type identifiable</td>
<td><em>a N</em></td>
<td>Ø N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. The givenness hierarchy (Gundel et al. 1993: 284)
lish and Japanese ("N" refers to noun in the figure). Gundel et al. (1993) explain that the forms that signal the most restrictive cognitive status, i.e., in focus, are always those with the least phonetic content, namely unstressed pronouns and zero pronominals. In addition, all demonstrative pronouns require the referent to be at least activated, which is of course related to the fact that the minimal descriptive content of a demonstrative pronoun indicates little, if any, basis for identifying the object (1993: 285).

Although the above-mentioned three approaches are representative of the main streams in the studies of referential/anaphoric choices, there are several researchers who try to explain the choices employing different perspectives. Sacks and Schegloff (1979) propose the maxim of "recipient design": the speaker considers the addressee's cognitive state when choosing a form, assessing whether the addressee can recognize the referent or not. They claim that the speaker often chooses the form which the addressee can easily recognize, or he or she chooses more than one form in order to avoid confusion of the addressee. In Ford and Fox (1996), they examine the motivations for formulating different referential forms using the following utterance (Ford and Fox 1996: 154, italic original):

Curt: *He* had. *This* guy had, a beautiful, thirty-two O:lds.

From video data, Ford and Fox (1996) find the shift of the eye gaze of the speaker from one person to another in conversation, and they state that the shift of the referential form, from the pronoun "he" to the full noun phrase "this guy," which "creates a locally initial form" (1996: 159), is caused by the shifting recipiency. The finding of Ford and Fox (1996) does reveal the importance of looking into nonverbal cues in studying the referential forms in interaction.

In her study on personal reference in English conversation, Stivers (2007) illustrates that when the marked expressions, or what she calls "alternative recognitionals" are used to refer to something, they do more than merely indicate some objects to make
addressee recognize the object. For instance, when a daughter is complaining to her mother about her mother's sister, it is more appropriate to use the expression “your sister,” rather than “my aunt” or “Aunt Alene,” because the expression “your sister” can put the referred-to person (aunt in this case) into the addressee’s (the mother’s) responsibility, not in the speaker’s.

Finally, I would like to introduce Maynard’s (2002) study on the referential/anaphoric choice, though it is not a study of English demonstrative usage, because it illustrates an important aspect to my study. Maynard demonstrates that the available approaches to anaphora, including models based on discourse structure, topic continuity, and the cognitive state of the participants, are insufficient to explain all of the referential/anaphoric choices. Maynard follows Japanese newspaper articles on a collision incident between two vessels and examines how these two vessels are referred to. Her results indicate that the different levels of elaboration and specificity seen in these referential choices are motivated partly by the reporter’s emotive perspective. The present study has the same stance as Maynard’s (2002). That is, the inner state of the speaker/writer can influence even the referential/anaphoric choice in discourse, and the existing three major models reviewed above are not always enough to fully explain the choice of the speaker/writer.

This study, following the research approach of Stivers (2007) and Maynard (2002), conducts a qualitative analysis on how referential/anaphoric expressions are chosen in English conversation, and examines whether there is any interrelationship between the expressions and the speaker’s emotion and attitude.

2.2. English demonstratives and the speaker’s emotion

My focus in this paper is the use of demonstrative expressions as referential/anaphoric choice in English conversation, and how one factor, the speaker’s emotion, can influence the choosing of a form among others. Several studies on demonstratives reveal the process of the use of English demonstrative that indicates speaker’s emotion,
including Lakoff (1974), Strauss (1993), Cornish (2001), and Naruoka (2008). The following four processes are employed when indicating emotions with English demonstratives:

Process A. Giving the referent strong focus in the conversation <this/these>
Process B. Presenting the referent as if the speaker (as well as the addressee) is in a different context from the current speech situation (often, the context of a past event) <this/these>
Process C. Indicating that the speaker and the addressee hold the same viewpoint toward the referent <that/those>
Process D. Locating the referent away from the speaker (and the addressee) <that/those>

3. Data

The data for this study are taken from the published American English conversational corpus called “Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English.” We employ eight different casual conversations among friends, family, and relatives, each conversation lasts approximately 25 minutes, with 192 minutes in total.

4. Analysis

This section illustrates how American English speakers choose referential/anaphoric forms in conversation and how their choices relate to their inner state, i.e., emotion. Section 4.1 illustrates the uses of this/these demonstratives, and section 4.2 describes the uses of that/those demonstratives. 4.3 shows the instance in which more than one demonstrative form is used to describe the referent in a short discourse to display a more dynamic aspect of referential choice that confirms the link between the use of referential form and the speaker’s emotion or attitude.
4.1. *This* and *these* demonstratives

In this section, I illustrate the uses of *this* and *these* demonstratives which indicate the speaker’s emotion. The demonstratives *this* and *these* are used to refer to an element or elements that are inside the speaker’s sphere. Examples below show that the speakers express their strong emotion by using process A, which gives the referent strong focus in the conversation, and process B, which presents the referent as if the speaker (and the addressee) is in a different context from the current speech situation.

Example (1) shows that the use of the demonstrative *this* creates a situation in which the person in question is around, even though he is not, and expresses the speaker’s antipathy toward him directly. The conversation is between two female cousins in their 30s, and the speaker Alina tells Lenore about a party she has recently attended.

(1)

1 ALINA: Then,
2 LENORE: (Hx)
3 ALINA: ... *this* new [wa=ve] of people comes in.
4 LENORE: (H)
5 ALINA: ... And *these* three guy=s walk in and,
6 (H) one guy,
7 ... was so geeky,
8 he's in a suit.
9 ... Who the hell do you know,
10 goes to a party in a suit.
11 (H) I mean who .. is this g=ek.
12 (H) So anyway,

First, let us look at the use of *this* in line 11. In this excerpt, the speaker Alina uses three different phrases to refer to the same person. In line 6, she introduces the person
as "one guy," and in line 8 she refers to the same person again with the personal pronoun "he" (dotted lines). And then, in line 11, the same person is referred to as "this geek." It is unmarked usage to keep using the same person pronoun (such as "he") after the first introduction with a noun phrase (such as "one guy") in English discourse, except when there is more than one possible way to interpret the pronoun or when the addressee could not recognize the referent (Givón 1983, 2001, Sacks and Schegloff 1979). In the case of line 11, the speaker does not use the pronoun "he" and uses this plus a noun form instead, even though there is no other element to confuse the interpretation of the pronoun "he." Of course, the noun "geek" adds a certain (negative) meaning compared with the use of the pronoun "he," but we may ask why the speaker adds the demonstrative this to the utterance. I argue that the use of this provides vividness to the utterance and functions to emphasize the speaker's emotion at the time—i.e., a feeling of antipathy toward the person.

In lines 6–11, it is apparent that the utterances of Alina are emotive. She uses the form of rhetorical questions, "Who the hell do you know...?" and "Who is this geek?" to be offensive toward the person, and she also uses the expression "hell" to emphasize the emotion. Along with these elements, the demonstrative this plays a crucial role in intensifying the feeling. Because of the use of this, which refers to the element inside the speaker's sphere, the context in which the referent ("this geek") is around the speaker is created in the narrative. In other words, the speaker recreates the past event in her narrative and expresses her emotion toward the person vividly.

This example illustrates the flexible nature of "discourse frame" (Hanks 1990, 1996). When the speaker uses "he" in line 8, the perspective stays in the current situation of her telling the conversational partner about the past event. On the other hand, when the speaker uses "this geek" to refer to the person, the discourse frame moves to the past event. Transferring the frame to the past event and having perspective in the past event gives vividness to the utterance and further stresses the speaker's emotion during the past event.
It is true that the choice of the word “geek” itself adds a negative connotation, as mentioned above. However, when we compare the use of the pronoun “he” as in (2a), with this plus the more neutral expressions “guy” (2b) and “man” (2c), the phrases with the demonstrative this (b and c) add vividness to the utterance and emphasize the speaker’s emotion toward the referred-to person more than the use of pronoun as in (2a). In addition, the word “geeky” is used by the same speaker prior to line 11 (in line 7). Thus, the word “geek” in line 11 is not a new idea and not very informative. Rather, it is used to intensify the speaker’s emotion by repeating the word, together with the demonstrative this.

(2)
  a. I mean who is he?
  b. I mean who is this guy?
  c. I mean who is this man?

Now, let us look at the use of this and these in lines 3 and 5 of example (1). This type of this/these and their function in discourse is often discussed, mostly in the field of functional grammar. However, I would like to give an explanation from the expressive perspective for this use of this/these in this example, as well as the example (3) below. In example (1), the speaker uses this (“this new wave of people”) and these (“these three guys”) when she introduces the new items into her narrative. Both “new wave of people” and “three guys” appear for the first time in this conversation, and the uses of this and these are not anaphoric (i.e., not referring to the element that appeared in the prior discourse.) These uses of this/these are called “new-this” (Wald 1983), “specific indefinite article” (Diessel 1999, Wright and Givón 1987), or “important indefinite marker” (Givón 2001). According to Wright and Givón (1987), many languages distinguish two types of indefinite nouns. One is non-specific nouns that are usually used only once in a discourse. The other is specific indefinite nouns that have a specific ref-
ent and that are often used to introduce an element which is meant to stand out in the discourse and which becomes a topic in the subsequent discourse (also in Diessel 1999, Gernsbacher and Shroyer 1989, Prince 1981, Wald 1983). English does not grammatically distinguish specific and non-specific indefinite nouns, and both of them are identified by the indefinite article *a/an*. However, previous studies listed above show that the demonstratives *this/these* in spoken English often function to mark the specific indefinite nouns. That is, the use of *this/these* in spoken English functions to mark the main topic, which stays as a topic in the subsequent conversation. Strauss (1993) reports that this specific indefinite *this*, or what she categorizes as “non-phoric” *this*, is used as frequently as the situational use (1993: 407). This usage is also seen at high frequency in my American English conversation data.

Wright and Givón (1987) state that, even though it is derived from the adnominal demonstrative form, the specific indefinite articles *this/these* are different from the adnominal demonstratives *this/these*, and they lose the deictic feature. It is also said that the grammatical marker of an important indefinite “instructs the hearer to open and activate a file for the referent” (Givón 2001: 921). However, I would like to argue that when these *this/these* are used, they still possess the same feature as the adnominal demonstrative, locating the referent in the speaker’s sphere. Furthermore, by moving the discourse frame from the narrative situation to the past event, and by locating referent inside the speaker’s sphere, certain vividness is created in the utterance rather than just marking it as a specific indefinite. We will see a more explicit example in example (3) to demonstrate this point.

Interestingly, in example (1), where the use of *this* and *these* appears in lines 3 and 5, the verb is in present tense even though the speaker is describing a past event (“comes” in line 3 and “walk” in line 5). This literary device is called the “historical present” tense and is usually used to add vividness in narrative (Johnstone 1987, Schiffrin 1981, Wolfson 1982). Historical present tense creates vividness because the present tense helps to bring the past event to the present (narrative) situation. In the same way, the
use of *this/these* could also be considered to bring the past situation to the current speech situation by putting the referent in the speaker’s sphere, and to create vividness to some extent. As in this example, the specific indefinites *this/these* are often seen together with the historical present tense in my American English data.

The next example explicitly shows that what is called a “specific indefinite article” or “new-this” has more of a role than just as a grammatical signal to activate the referent. The repeated use of *this* and *these* in example (3) provides strong focus on the referent, and the speaker’s emotion toward the referent is expressed by the strong attention. In this conversation, the speaker Lynne, who is a college student, is talking to her mother and a visitor Lenore. She is talking about the class she took in the previous semester, and the class teaches how to trim horses. She explains that she had to practice with dead horse hooves before she did the real horse hooves and how disgusting it was. The topic “dead horse hooves” first appears in line 10, and she uses *this* and *these* when referring to horse hoof/hooves several times throughout this excerpt. I explain that the uses of *this* and *these* function to provide a vivid effect for her narrative and emphasize her feeling of disgust toward the referent.

(3)

1  LYNNE:  I’ve probably,
2       .. only shod about,
3       .. five horses.
4       .. (H) Trimmed a lot of em.
5       (H) And you know what we start out with?
6       [This is the] grossest of everything.
7  LENORE: [<_X What X>_].
8  LYNNE:  (H) We start out,
9       (H) .. with,
10   .. dead horse hooves.
.. (H) = I mean,
12 % % you know,
13 <X the% X> the canneries,
14 you know and stuff you know=?
15 .. The people that-
16 (H) = ... that-
17 .. kill the horses for meat and stuff?
18 .. You know they have all these legs and stuff?
19 (H) = And-
20 .. I don't know,
21 everybody [%=] -
22 LENORE: [I thought] they used the (THROAT) the horsehooves
in .. for gelatin,
23 That's not so?
24 LYNNE: ... (H) <HI You know,
25 I think they do HI>,
26 I think a lot of times,
27 but,
28 .. then they,
29 .. they probably use em for everything--
30 I don't know what all they use em for.
31 (H) But anyway,
32 we= ..(TSK) get .. these horse hooves,
33 from this one cannery,
34 .. (H) they-
35 they have to go,
36 .. a long ways to go get em,
37 like back East somewhere,
to get these horse hooves.

(H) For the college.

(H) They go back % East,

and they get em.

and they freeze em, you know?

.. (H) So we have this frozen horse hoof,

that we have to start out on,

cause you don't want to cripple up a .. (H) really good horse,

and like,

my first hoof,

(H) .. that horse would have been,

.. lame,

@ @ <@ like crazy.

@ @ (H) But @>,

(H) it was just,

and,

oh,

God,

it's so gross,

because,

.. sometimes if you get one that's been thawed out a little bit,

.. they start really stinking and stuff?

Oh,

it's the grossest thing.

Oh,

it's just so icky.

<HI I mean,

you have this HI> .. piece of @horse @@@@@,
<@<HI I mean this leg that's @> HI>,

oh,

it's just gross.

When the speaker first introduces the topic in line 10, she uses a regular indefinite phrase, “dead horse hooves.” Then, starting with line 18, she repeatedly uses this and these in front of the noun phrase (“these legs” in line 18, “these horse hooves” in lines 32 and 38, “this frozen horse hoof” in 43, “this piece of horse” in 65, and “this leg” in 66), for a total of six times. It is true that “horse hooves” is the main topic of conversation and that this and these are used to signal the referent “thematically important” (Givón 2001). However, I would like to argue that the repeated use of this and these shows that they not only signal cognitively but also mark emotionally significance. The speaker uses the demonstratives this and these several times even though these utterances can be uttered without the demonstratives, an indefinite article a can be used instead of the demonstratives, or the whole phrase can be replaced by the pronoun. The repetition of the demonstrative creates and further intensifies the feeling of disgust toward the referent. The emotive motivations of this and these is apparent when we compare the utterances in which the same speaker employs the pronoun “them (em)” in the excerpt. In most of the cases, the pronoun “them (em)” is used when she explains the events that she does not directly deal with, for instance, when she explains for what the horse hooves are used as in lines 29 and 30, and how the college got the horse hooves in lines 36, 41, and 42 (except line 38 in which she uses these).

When we look closely at the six utterances in which the speaker uses this and these, we can tell that the utterances become increasingly vivid and give clearer images of the horse hoof/hooves that the speaker is describing. First, she tells where the hooves come from in lines 18, 32, and 38. At this time, she uses the plural form to indicate the referent. But after that, she employs the singular form of this plus a singular noun phrase. Uttering it in the singular form “this frozen horse hoof” in line 43, “this piece of
horse" in line 65, and "this leg" in line 66, the speaker creates a more vivid image of the referent in front of the addressees because employing the singular form rather than the plural form gives the referent to have more specificity even when it is a generic use\(^{(2)}\).

In this excerpt, by bringing the past event in her narrative by transferring the discourse frame (Hanks 1990, 1996), the speaker Lynne creates the scene from her experience vividly to her audience. Laury (1997) claims that the function of the demonstratives does not always reflect the real interactional situation but instead provides a creative presentation of the speaker’s (imaginary) interpretation of the situation (1997: 59). Thus, in this example, by using this/these demonstratives that locate the referent inside the speaker’s sphere, the speaker creates a situation in which the horse hoof is near the speaker, which enables to send the vivid image to the addressees.

Furthermore, the subject “you” in the utterance in lines 65 and 66 makes the image even closer to the addressees. The subjects of the utterances in lines 18, 32, 38, and 43 are “they” or “we,” and Lynne explains as it is what the college does or it happens in her classroom. On the other hand, the use of the generic “you” in lines 65 and 66 implies that it can happen to the addressees, which makes addressees imagine the same existence of the “frozen horse hoof” and “leg” in front of them. This imaginary situation toward the end of this excerpt leads the addressees to feel the same way as the speaker Lynne, who had the “grossest” experience in real life.

4.2. That and those demonstratives

In this section, I examine the expressive function of that and those in English conversation. The demonstratives that and those are used to refer to an object or objects

---

(2) In the study on “generic demonstratives,” Bowdle and Ward (1995) mention that plural demonstrative generics are felicitous when the kind in question is relatively homogeneous, while singular demonstrative generics require certain specificity. This may be the reason that the singular expressions can show clearer and more vivid image of the referent in the excerpt.
that are outside of the speaker’s sphere. In the following two examples, the demonstrative *those* indicates the negative emotion of the speakers by using process C, in which the speaker and the addressee share the same viewpoint, as well as process D, which locates the referent away from the speaker.

In example (4), the use of *those* functions to activate the specific shared knowledge and feeling between the speaker and addressee. This shared knowledge and feeling toward the referent create solidarity in this excerpt. Marilyn is telling her husband and their friend Pete a topic about which she read in the magazine *New Yorker*.

(4)

1 MARILYN: Well I read it in the New Yorker,
2 and I thought,
3 <Q oh no,
4 one of those New Yorker articles,
5 you know,
6 .. [yuck Q>].
7 PETE: [<X Right X>].
8 MARILYN: And I-
9 .. It was really-
10 .. I read the whole thing,
11 which is pretty rare @.

Marilyn uses *those* in “those New Yorker articles” in line 4. This *those* is not used in an anaphoric sense in this utterance, as it is the first time “New Yorker articles” appears in this conversation. Nor does the *those* indicate any specific articles. Instead, the speaker’s use of *those* in this utterance indicates a certain implication toward the referent, i.e., toward *New Yorker* articles. In this case, it implies a negative attitude toward the referent, as the use of *those* locates the referent away from the speaker, and this non-acceptance
of the referent in the speaker's sphere can mean that the speaker does not believe in it very much. Also, from other expressions "oh no" in line 3 and "yuck" in line 6, we can assume Marilyn implies that some articles in the New Yorker seem fake and unreliable and that she thought the article she read was one of them.

In addition, the use of those creates a context in which the speaker and the addressee have mutual knowledge and a (negative) image about New Yorker articles. Lakoff (1974) states that that and those establish a link between the speaker and the addressee because they enable the speaker and the addressee to relate spatially and emotionally to each other through the intermediacy of the referred-to item (1974: 353). In other words, the use of those removes the referent from the speaker’s sphere and makes it a shared referent with the addressee. This emotional link that the speaker is trying to have appears in other parts of this interaction. For example, the speaker’s “you know” in line 5 shows speaker’s assumption that the addressee could easily understand what the speaker means, and the addressee’s reaction “Right” in line 7 confirms that he understands the implication. The addressee’s feedback reveals that the sharing of a negative attitude toward the referent, and the emotional solidarity that the those tries to imply are successful.

The next example shows that the use of those detaches the referent from the speaker and expresses a negative feeling. A couple, Jamie and Harold, are talking about the noisy teenagers in their neighborhood.

(5)

1 JAMIE: @ (H) And they were banging their .. their soccer ball up against our-
2 .. below the bedroom .. th- the study window?
3 HAROLD: So ~Jamie the old lady went and yelled at em.
4 JAMIE: [I opened %] –
5 PETE: [Mhm], (386)
JAMIE: (H) <VOX Ah=, you mind moving, getting away from there, thank you= VOX>.  
10 @(@x)@I [felt like] such an old lady.

PETE: [@@]

HAROLD: It's so [2bad,

JAMIE: [2With those ki=ds2],

HAROLD: they make us feel2] so ol=dl.

Jamie uses “they” to refer to the neighbor teenagers in line 1, and her husband Harold also uses “(th)em” in line 3 and “they” in line 14 to indicate the teenagers (dotted lines). These anaphoric choices indicate that the same topic is continuous and it is cognitively highly accessible. Thus, it is unmarked to apply reduced anaphoric expression in the following utterance based on the existing models on the referential/anaphoric choice (e.g., Ariel 1990, 1991, Fox 1987, Givón 1983, 2001, Gundel et al. 1993). However, in the utterance of “I felt like such an old lady with those kids” in lines 10 and 13, Jamie uses “those kids” to indicate the teenagers. I argue that the expression “those kids” instead of the pronoun “them” is emotionally motivated.

Since the demonstrative those indicates that the speaker excludes the referent from her sphere, the use of those plus noun phrase instead of a pronoun functions to detach the referent from the speaker. Doing so, Jamie expresses her antipathy toward the teenagers. The noun “kids” after the demonstrative those further provides the implication of “childish” to the people who are referred to and also emphasizes the contrast between them and the speaker, who is called by her husband and calls herself as an “old lady.”

In the same manner as example (5), Stivers (2007) demonstrates that, in the situation where the speaker complains about her neighbor, it is more appropriate to use the ex-
pression "that next door neighbor," rather than the expression "our next door neighbor," because the former can detach the referent from the speaker's domain of responsibility by the use of the demonstrative that (2007:86–87). From this example, Stivers (2007) describes that the appropriate choice for the referential form depends on the act that the speaker is performing in the situation. My data show that demonstrative expressions are chosen in many situations where the speaker is willing to express their strong emotion in conversation.

4.3. Shifting referential/anaphoric forms in interaction

This section illustrates the instance in which more than one demonstrative form is used to describe the referent in a short discourse, and shows a more dynamic aspect of demonstrative use that confirms the link between the use of demonstratives and the speaker's emotion or attitude.

In the following example, Miles is talking to his friends about what he saw in the lambada dance party. He saw that a married woman, who is a psychotherapist, was dancing very closely with a man. Miles first thought the man was the woman's husband, but he later found out it was not true. Throughout the conversation, the man is referred to several times.

(6)
1 MILES: ... (SNIFF) (CLICK) (CLICK) (CLICK) .. I meet this psychotherapist.
2 ... who tells me she's addicted to this dance.
3 which I th=--
4 think is a ... interesting choice of words for a psychotherapist to use.
5 (H) ... But uh,
6 ... she's marrie=d,
and apparently she's there= .. without her husband.

... She has her wedding ring on.

... And it's like she's with this guy=,

and they're kinda like all over each other (Hx).

.. And I'm thinking,

we=ll,

... I guess that's her husband,

JAMIE: .. Uh-oh [did you] say @something?

MILES: [but I−] −

JAMIE: @ @

MILES: but I was thinking,

(H) but the thing is,

... you know she's kind of all sophisticated and everything,

and I'm thinking,

you know,

this guy %,

%= I can't .. really believe that guy's her husband.

So I don't know what's going on here.

... And of course later on I find out,

.. that's not her husband.

... (H) ... <%%HI So=,

I'm thinking,

you know HI>%

I don't know what's going on here.

In this excerpt, the woman, after she is introduced with a so-called “new-this” (Wald 1983) or “specific indefinite article” (Diessel 1999, Wright and Givón 1987) (see more in 4.1.) plus the noun “this psychotherapist” in line 1, is indicated only by the personal (383)
pronoun "she" throughout the discourse. On the other hand, the man who was dancing with her is never referred to by the pronoun "he" but instead is referred to by a demonstrative or a demonstrative phrase: "this guy" in lines 9 and 22, "that" in lines 13 and 26, and "that guy" in line 23. Why isn't he referred to by the simple pronoun "he"?

This guy in line 9 is the first appearance, and is again so-called the "new-this" or "specific indefinite article," which marks that the referent becomes a topic of the subsequent conversation. Here, I would like to pay attention to the use of the demonstrative phrases "this guy" and "that guy" in lines 22 and 23, respectively, and illustrate that they display the marked situation in terms of the speaker's inner state toward the person.

The phrases "this guy" and "that guy" express the same speaker's attitude from the different perspectives. As the woman is contrastingly described as "sophisticated" in line 19, we can assume that the speaker has a certain attitude of insult toward the man. This attitude is expressed by the two different perspectives. In line 22, although the speaker does not finish his utterance completely, the speaker uses "this guy" to refer to the man. At this time, the speaker's viewpoint is as if he were at the dance party, looking directly toward the man. This view is evidenced by the use of this, which locates the referent inside the speaker's sphere. On the other hand, when the speaker refers to the person as "that guy" in line 23, the attitude of insult is expressed by the ground of the current speech situation. That, which excludes the referent from the speaker's sphere creates emotional distance.

Hanks (1990, 1996), in his work on deixis in the Mayan language, illustrates the instances in which two demonstrative forms are used in one metalinguistic utterance, and explains that the two forms are uttered from two different discourse frames: the frame

(3) I exclude the analysis of the use of "that" in lines 13 and 26 because opinions vary on whether or not the use, by native American English speakers, of "that" rather than the pronoun "he" has some emotional ground. Some informants interpret the use of "that" as displaying an emotional distance toward the person to some extent, by following the same process as in example (5).
in which the speaker is narrating at the moment, and the frame of a past or imaginary
situation. Transferring the two different demonstrative forms in example (6) can be ex-
plained by these two frames. That is, when the speaker employs the expression “this
guy,” he utters it from the discourse frame of looking at the man in the dance party in
the past. On the other hand, “that guy” is uttered from the frame when the speaker is
describing the past event to his friends in the current speech situation. In this manner,
by expressing the speaker’s emotion from two different frames in conversation (not
limited to the metalinguistic utterances), the speaker is able to intensify his or her emo-
tion and make a conversation more exciting.

5. Conclusion

This study illustrated the uses of English referential/anaphoric expressions from con-
versational data and demonstrated that the speaker’s emotion and attitude can be one of
the factors deciding a referential/anaphoric choice in English. It also described that the
previous studies based on discourse structure, topic continuity, and cognitive state of
the participants are not enough to explain actual referential/anaphoric choices.

Furthermore, in the previous studies on demonstratives, the three contextual ele-
ments, the speaker, the addressee, and the referent, are considered, but they do not in-
clude detailed information about these elements, such as how the speaker sees the rela-
tionship with the addressee, or what kind of emotion or attitude he or she has toward
the addressee and/or the referent. Also, previous demonstrative studies tend to have
static ideas on contextual elements, and overlook dynamic aspects of them such as how
these elements are changing during interaction. By employing naturally occurring con-
versational data to examine demonstratives as a referential/anaphoric choice, I contend
that we can better understand the function of demonstratives in conversation, as well as
how the speakers choose the referential/anaphoric expressions in conversation.
Symbols for Discourse Transcription

[words]: Overlap; -=: Lengthening; -: Truncated word; ...: Pause; (H): Inhalation; (Hx): Exhalation; (TSK): Tongue click; %: Glottal stop; @: Laughter; <@ words @>: Laugh quality; <X words X>: Indecipherable words; <HI words HI>: High pitch level; <Q words Q>: Quotation quality; <VOX words VOX>: Unique voice quality; (words): Comment.
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