FROM SUBMISSION TO ASSERTION: A STRUCTURAL FUNCTIONAL APPROACH TO SHAW'S PYGMALION

Shahid Abbas, Dr. Muhammad Safeer Awan

Abstract

This paper investigates gender specific traits and power asymmetry patterns by applying Structural Functional Approach to Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion*. Linguistics, in general, and the tools of discourse analysis, in particular, can help to unfold the underlying structures like gender dominance in the exchanges between the major characters. The study focuses on how male-female disputes and the underlying power relations are created, negotiated and maintained by characters in the world of drama. In this regard, the researcher aims to provide a consummate model for conversational analysis in order to make a hallmark contribution in the domain of language and gender studies. This research is based on Birmingham School of Discourse Analysis and Structural Functional approach with slight modification in order to cater to the needs of the dramatic art. Moreover, the study unfolds the recurring patterns of dominance of Professor Higgins and Eliza Doolittle by tracing the frequency of the acts, moves, exchanges and transactions in the conversation. The findings of the study are that Shaw reflects and moulds traditional femininity with empowered femininity and tries to provide a balance between these two extreme positions. Shaw differs from his predecessors (Renaissance dramatists) in the portrayal of the female as he is dedicated in his fight against the romantic depiction of love and sex. Previously, female characters were invisible and submissive (for instance, Ophelia in *Hamlet*), but Shaw has given strength and stature to them. The significance of the present study is that it analyzes the text in an objective and empirical manner and presents unbiased judgments about Shaw's ideas and thought, without referring to his life or biography as a yardstick for interpretation. Thus, the present study is a step towards rereading and re-evaluating Shaw's *Pygmalion* in the light of Structural Functional Approach.

Key Words: G.B. Shaw, Structural Functional Approach, Birmingham School of Discourse Analysis, Woman

Language is a cultural medium through which social positioning of the interlocutors is determined. Language is not only a means of communicating linguistic information but also an important and distinctive humanistic tool for establishing and maintaining social relationships amongst the members of a speech community. The studies, which are based on gender-based linguistic variation, (e.g. Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002; Tannen, 1993) put into limelight the functional aspect of language. Hence, language is a tool of enforcing ideologies. It is such a powerful weapon that not only reflects the ideologies of the speaker, but it also functions at the deeper cognitive level. Not only that, it is a

---

*Lecturer in English, University of Sargodha
Professor of English, NUML, Islamabad*

source through which interlocutors assert power over others in conversation as ordinary talk is governed by the principles of regularity and orderliness. This orderliness is not motivated and governed by any innate cognitive patterns of language, in fact, it is drawn and governed by socially organized structure of interpersonal action. Moreover, meaning is not hidden in words but constructed in discourse; the relationship between the syntactic form and function of a language is quite flexible. No linguistic form – a word, phrase or sentence can simply refer to one particular function or meaning. Tannen comments on this linguistic relativity (1993):

> The same linguistic means can be used for different, even opposite, purposes and can have different, even opposite, effects in different contexts. Thus, a strategy that seems, or is, intended to dominate may in another context or in the mouth of another speaker be intended or used to establish connection. Similarly, a strategy that seems, or is, intended to create connection can in another context or in the mouth of another speaker be intended or used to establish dominance. (p. 181)

This relativity is not confined to any particular linguistic strategy. As a matter of fact, Tannen (1993) has studied "the relativity of five linguistic strategies; indirectness, interruption, silence versus volubility, topic raising and adversativeness, i.e. verbal conflict" (p. 181). Thus, the meaning of any act varies from context to context. It implies that the notion of power and solidarity in a discourse is a constructed one, and there is a need to formulate a methodology in which they can be studied accurately.

The past studies have ignored the distinction between gender and sex focusing on "gender by merely looking at the speakers' biological sex" (Wodak, 1997, p .1). This study attempts to fill this gap by adopting a context-based linguistic approach to studying gender and language relationship. The methodologies used in the past to study gender and language field ignore relativeness of linguistic devices and are based on intuitive observations than being based on empirical data (e.g. Lakoff, 1975).

This study examines the role of power structure among male and female characters in Bernard Shaw's plays, assuming that an understanding of construction of gender in a text is critical to grasp

Shaw's concept of womanhood. Like other plays, Shaw's plays revolve around power conflict between male and female characters. Shaw differs from his predecessors (Renaissance dramatists) in the portrayal of the female as he creates strong female characters with independent voice. Previously, female characters were invisible and submissive (for instance, Ophelia in *Hamlet*), but Shaw has given strength and stature to them. However, Shaw's plays have been received with contradictory opinions: on one hand, we come across active and confident heroines (like Eliza, Candida, etc.) but on the other hand, Shaw's faith in patriarchy cannot be overlooked. That is why, Griffith (1993) is of the following opinion: "Shaw's reflections on sexual equality are inherently controversial, inviting conflicting interpretations as to their meaning and worth" (p. 157). Some critics are of the opinion that Shaw has an "unflagging intellectual commitment to feminism in his life" (Peters, 1998, p. 117). Greiner (as cited in Griffith, 1993) considers him as antifeminist and believes "Shaw perceived woman's position as a product of male, middle-class society" (p. 169). Elsie Adams (1974) reinforces the same arguments and asserts:

> Undeniably, Shaw portrays arresting and powerful women. But in spite of his departure from the nineteenth-century stereotype of the demure, fragile, womanly woman, he more often than not creates women characters who belong to types familiar in western literature. In play after play, he presents us with various combinations of the traditional figures of temptress, goddess or mother. (p. 17)

The central female characters of Shaw's texts swing from one extreme to another, that is, from conventional women of the 19th century to the New Women (liberated one) of the twentieth century. Since there persists an ambivalent attitude of Shaw towards feminism, an extensive treatment of gender studies and politics is required. While the works of other dramatists like Ibsen has been subjected to rigorous analysis by scholars with an interest in gender and feminist studies, Shaw's work has received comparatively cursory attention.

George Bernard Shaw is esteemed as one of the most significant British dramatists of the twentieth century since he is "the most prolific of all twentieth century authors" (Innes, 1998, p. xvii) with 60 plays and 5 novels, in addition to insightful treatise in music and theatrical

criticism. He was born in Dublin in 1856 to a poor and unhappy family as his father was an irresponsible and drunkard person who was abhorred by his mother. He matured to become as the second greatest English playwright, after Shakespeare. Shaw died at the age of 94, as a renowned socialist, a Fabian, and a semi-feminist vegetarian, who advocated for social justice and equality throughout his life.

There are several reasons for choosing Shavian plays for linguistic analysis. Firstly, Shaw is widely acclaimed as a notable writer of the modern age because of the ambiguities and contradictions in his major works. Innes (1998) has mentioned the ambiguous nature of Shaw's work by stating that "no other figure of his stature and visibility has been so thoroughly misunderstood" (p. 3). Secondly, there are many book length studies on Shaw, but most of them are devoted to his biographical details and personality rather than based on critical analysis of his works. Moreover, the critics have tried to interpret his works in the light of his life. Consequently, Shaw became a controversial figure, and his works are interpreted as potentially ambiguous and contradictory.

System of Analysis

This research explores the notion of power and dominance in the dialogues between the main protagonists of the drama. In particular, power structure and gender dominance are unearthed by analyzing and highlighting the dominant patterns of the interactants. In this research model, i.e., Structural Functional, there is a fusion of Speech Act theory, Conversational Interactional and Halliday's Functional theory (Morrish & Sauntson, 2007). In Structural Functional approach, each linguistic element in a conversation is described in terms of the specific function performed in relation to other elements of the discourse and in relation to the social context of the conversation. Each conversational component has no meaning in isolation, and therefore cannot be analyzed if it is taken out of context. Importantly, this model is premised upon the notion of linguistic perfomativity. Its strength is ease of use and it can serve as an analytical device and act as a stimulus to do interactional analysis.

The researcher is of the opinion that Structural Functional approach owes much to Malcolm Coulthard and John Sinclair, who in their much-discussed seminal work *Towards an Analysis of Discourse* (1975) made an attempt to produce an analytic framework for the investigation of the structure of classroom discourse. Sinclair and

Coulthard developed a hierarchical rank scale model of discourse, based on Halliday's rank scale (1985) to organize the units of grammar. Each rank is made up of elements from the rank below. They propound a hierarchy of discourse units consisting of move, exchange, transaction and lesson. At the heart of this model is the three-part exchange structure: Initiation, Response and Follow-up, developed as a result of their analysis of teacher-fronted classroom discourse. Their system has been further developed with the passage of time by linguists and more recently applied to everyday conversation.

Later on, discourse analysts have adapted and modified the Birmingham school of discourse analysis model (i.e., Sinclair and Coulthard rank scale model). In this regards, Burton's contribution in the adaptation and revision of the discourse analysis model of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) is worth mentioning. Sinclair and Coulthard's model is a systematic descriptive framework for analyzing spoken discourse but is geared specifically for the analysis of formal classroom interaction. Burton (1980) has modified this model to make it more suitable for analyzing casual conversation by retaining Sinclair and Coulthard's emphasis on the rank framework underlying the interaction. This emphasis leads Burton to propose that an extended sequence of conversational turns can be analyzed, and that the model is therefore particularly suited to the analysis of dialogue in drama and novels.

Burton (1980) is well aware of the fact that the original model was based on interaction between the teacher and the students in the classroom, where the discourse is rigidly structured and controlled by one interlocutor, the teacher. But, in casual conversation, the structure of interaction alters radically because of its collaborative and non-authoritarian features. Burton expanded the horizons by focusing not only on consensus-based exchange as they happen in classroom discourse but also introduced contrast based exchanges, by giving the concept of supporting and challenging moves in a conversation. This means that there is a wide range of options open to the receiver of an initiation. She also states that some responses do not maintain the prospection and fulfill the presuppositions set up by the initiation. She labeled them as challenges, and relabeled those that do maintain prospection as supporting moves. She further argues that the follow up move is redundant as it hardly ever occurs except in extended formal talk

or may be "used in informal talk as a device for conveying sarcasm" (p. 141). Burton (1982) also adopts this topic orientated view of transactions, re-labeling boundary and teaching exchanges as 'pre-topic' exchanges, when a speaker shows that "they are going to, or want to, broach a topic" and 'topic' exchanges which "carry the main business" of an interaction (p. 102). Pre-topic exchanges are optional; Burton comments that "for the most part people do not necessarily bother with the pre-topic exchanges at all" (p. 102).

The striking quality of the model is that it is quite flexible in nature and it is clear that there could be different number of acts and moves depending on the structure of the text to be studied. Francis and Hunston (1992) found that Sinclair and Coulthard's list of 22 classroom discourse acts was inadequate to describe the complexity of language in everyday conversation, and also many of the acts Sinclair and Coulthard did identify turned inappropriate outside classroom discourse. They increased the number of acts to 32, by adding more acts to the list. In this way they hoped to arrive at a system of analysis for their data, but interestingly, they make no claim to a comprehensive system for all types of everyday conversation. In fact, Francis and Hunston (1992) argue that "it is neither feasible nor desirable to present a complete inventory of all the acts necessary to analyze every conceivable conversation" (p. 134).

The division and identification of the dialogue into acts, moves and exchanges illustrate the different dimensions of dominance. The proposed system utilizes rank scale for describing each element of conversation, in other words, larger conversational components consists of smaller chunks. Transaction dealing with large sections of conversation usually revolves around particular topic, which consists of sequence of exchanges showing two or three speaker turns. Exchanges further consist of the smaller elements of moves which, in turn, consist of acts having the smallest conversational component. Each component in the rank scale is labeled according to the particular function it performs, in the context of the rest of the conversation, rather than according to the linguistic form it takes. The rank scale is discussed below in detail:

Acts

Starting from below on the rank scale, act occupies the first position in the hierarchy of conversation. It is the smallest unit of spoken discourse. The function of an act is to express the intention of the speaker in a piece

of conversation and "it corresponds most nearly to the grammatical unit clause" (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 27). Acts are devised by keeping in mind the research area and needs. For example, Sinclair and Coulthard have identified twenty-two speech acts while analyzing the conversation between the teacher and pupil. Burton (1980) has mentioned twenty-one speech acts while discussing the extract from Pinter's *The Dumb Waiter*. Burton studies the relationship between the two characters in the light of Speech Act theory and reveals that Ben is dominant in the conversation: Ben performs 60 Directives and is continuously evaluating Guss. Francis and Hunston (1992) identify thirty-two acts of everyday conversation in their attempt to cover all aspects of possible conversation at its smallest analyzable level. The present study has pointed out nineteen speech acts while discussing Shaw's *Pygmalion*. Following is the list of the acts which are used in the coding, along their functions, symbol and examples:

1. **<Marker>** A marker is used to show boundary in conversation, that is, the speaker intends to introduce a new topic or initiate a move. Its symbol is "M" and realized by the words like Ok, Now, Good, Right, Well. For example,

    > HIGGINS: [stupent] **Well!!!** [Recovering his breath with a gasp] What do you expect me to say to you?
    > THE FLOWER GIRL: **Well,** if you was a gentleman, you might ask me to sit down, I think. Don't I tell you I'm bringing you business?

2. **<Elicit>** An Elicit is used to get a verbal response from the hearer. Its symbol is "El" and it is realized by a question. For example,

    > HIGGINS: [stupent] Well!!! [Recovering his breath with a gasp] **What do you expect me to say to you**?
    > THE FLOWER GIRL: Well, if you was a gentleman, you might ask me to sit down, I think. Don't I tell you I'm bringing you business?

3. **<Reply>** A reply gives a response in the light of Elicit. Its symbol is "Rep" and it is realized by statements, questions. For example,

    > HIGGINS: [stupent] Well!!! [Recovering his breath with a gasp] What do you expect me to say to you?

THE FLOWER GIRL: Well, **if you was a gentleman, you might ask me to sit down**, **I think**. **Don't I tell you I'm bringing you business?**

4. **<Comment>** Its function is to explain, justify or to provide additional information (usually one's own) about the ongoing topic. Its symbol is "Com" and it is realized by statement and tag question. For example,

> HIGGINS: **I know you can. I told you you could.**
>
> LIZA: [wounded, getting away from him to the other side of the ottoman with her face   to the hearth] I know you did, you brute. You wanted to get rid of me.

5. **<Direct>**A direct is an attempt to cause action and is used to give instructions, advice or to order someone especially lower in status or rank. Its symbol is "D" and realized by imperatives or command. For example,

> LIZA: **And I should like Professor Higgins to call me Miss Doolittle.**
>
> HIGGINS: I'll see you damned first.

6. **<React>** Its function is to provide a response in the light of preceding Direct or to express strong feelings. Its symbol is "Rea" and it is realized by a reaction. For example,

> LIZA: And I should like Professor Higgins to call me Miss Doolittle.
>
> HIGGINS: **I'll see you damned first.**

7. **<Inform>**Its function is to provide information (factual information) about the ongoing topic. Its symbol is "I" and it is realized by statements such as, the point is, as a matter of fact, actually, etc. For example,

> LIZA: [weeping] **But I ain't got sixty pounds. Oh**--
>
> MRS. PEARCE: Don't cry, you silly girl. Sit down. Nobody is going to touch   your money.

8. **<Acknowledge>**An acknowledge, as an interactional category, does no more than indicating that the initiation has been heard and suggests continued auditory presence. Its symbol is "Ack" and it is realized by the words such as Ok, All right, Oh dear, etc. For example,

PICKERING: Higgins: I'm interested. What about the ambassador's garden party? I'll say you're the greatest teacher alive if you make that good. I'll bet you all the expenses of the experiment you can't do it. And I'll pay for the lessons.

LIZA: **Oh, you are real good. Thank you, Captain.**

9.   <**Evaluate**>An evaluate is used to judge the value or worthiness of the preceding contribution. Its symbol is "Ev" and it is realized by statements and tag question such as That's right, What's the matter with you, What about that. For example,

THE FLOWER GIRL: [resenting the reaction] **He's no gentleman, he ain't, to interfere with a poor girl.**

THE DAUGHTER: [out of patience, pushing her way rudely to the front and displacing the gentleman, who politely retires to the other side of the pillar] What on earth is Freddy doing? I shall get pneumonia if I stay in this draught any longer.

10. <**Accuse**>Its function is to blame the hearer. Its symbol is "Accn" and it is realized by a statement, question or a command. For example,

HIGGINS: I can't turn your soul on. Leave me those feelings; and you can take away the voice and the face. They are not you.

LIZA: Oh, you are a devil. You can twist the heart in a girl as easy as some could twist her arms to hurt her. Mrs. Pearce warned me. Time and again she has wanted to leave you; and you always got round her at the last minute. And you don't care a bit for her. And you don't care a bit for me.

11. <**Prompt**>: Its function is to reinforce an idea or to demand some performance. Its symbol is "P" and it is realized by Go on, Hurry up, Quickly. For example,

HIGGINS: [thundering] Say your alphabet.

PICKERING: Say it, Miss Doolittle. You will understand presently. Do what he tells you; and let him teach you in his own way.

12. <**Check**>: Its function is to ask for clarification about the preceding issue. Its symbol is "Ch" it is realized by the words such as, I am sorry, What/ Where/ When, I beg your pardon, etc. For example,

HIGGINS [to Pickering, reflectively] **You see the difficulty?**

PICKERING. Eh? What difficulty?

13. **<Request**>: Its function is to seek action politely or ask somebody to perform something. Its symbol   is "Req" and it is realized by words such as beg, implore, etc. For example,

> THE FLOWER GIRL: [to Pickering, as he passes her] Buy a flower, kind gentleman. I'm short for my lodging.
> PICKERING: I really haven't any change. I'm sorry [he goes away].

14. **<Surprise>:** Its function is to respond in such a way to show an element of surprise or shock. Its symbol is "Sur" and it is realized by the use of words such as Oh dear! My goodness, etc. For example,

> HIGGINS: If I decide to teach you, I'll be worse than two fathers to you. Here [he offers her his silk handkerchief]!

LIZA: What's this for?

15. **<Resolve>**: Its function is to show some sort of determination to perform or to   make up one's mind to do something. Its symbol is "Res" and it is realized by the use of words such as determine, undertake, etc. For example,

> HIGGINS: [becoming excited as the idea grows on him] What is life but a series of inspired follies? The difficulty is to find them to do. Never lose a chance: it doesn't come every day. I shall make a duchess of this draggletailed guttersnipe.

LIZA [strongly deprecating this view of her] Ah--ah--ah--ow--ow-- oo!

16. **<Summons>**: Its function is to capture the hearer's attention to show the seriousness of issue. Its symbol is "Summ" and it is realized by calling the name of another participant. For example,

> PICKERING: **Higgins:** I'm interested. What about the ambassador's garden party? I'll say you're the greatest teacher alive if you make that good. I'll bet you all the expenses of the experiment you can't do it. And I'll pay for the lessons.

LIZA: Oh, you are real good. Thank you, Captain.

17. **<Threat>**: Its function is to tell the hearer to do something specific, otherwise, face the music or punishment. Its symbol is "Th" and it is realized by the use of words such as trouble, harm, etc. For example,

> HIGGINS: Eliza: if you say again that you're a good girl, your father shall take you home.

> LIZA: Not him. You don't know my father. All he come here for was to touch you for some money to get drunk on.

18. <Offer>: Its function is to show willingness for doing or giving something to the hearer. Its symbol is "Off" and it is realized by the use of words such as available, provide, etc. For example,

> PICKERING: Higgins: I'm interested. What about the ambassador's garden party? I'll say you're the greatest teacher alive if you make that good. I'll bet you all the expenses of the experiment you can't do it. And I'll pay for the lessons.

LIZA: Oh, you are real good. Thank you, Captain.

19. < Greet>: Its function is to say or to perform an act to welcome or adieu the hearer. Its symbol is "Gree" and it is realized by the use of words such as welcome, hello, etc. For example,

> MRS. HIGGINS: [coming to Higgins] Good-bye, dear.
> HIGGINS: Good-bye, mother.

Moves

Moves are the basic and key units of discourse structure in conversation and come after acts in the ascending order. Different acts combine to form a move, but in a move essentially there would be one act at least (one or more than one act). A move is defined as "a verbal action that carries the conversation forward" (Stenstorm, 1994, p. 36). Moves are often coincidental with turns in conversational interaction. Francis and Hunston (1992) have identified two basic moves categories; organization and conversational. Organizational moves are further divided into framing, opening and answeringmoves. They perform a purpose of indicating the opening or ending of a conversation. Conversational moves consist of eliciting, informing, directing, clarifying and acknowledgingmoves. Their purpose is to direct some action or request some information and to acknowledge prior utterances in a discourse.

The present study advocates that there are five classes of moves, based on the function in the conversation: opening, supporting, challenging, bound opening and reopening moves. The function of an opening move is to kick off conversation by introducing the new topic and stir others to participate in an exchange and its symbol is "Op". The function of supporting move is to deliver an appropriate response to opening move and its symbol is "Sp". It often concurs with the opening move in the process of discourse. Challenging move is not meant to be

hostile by any means. It just holds up the smooth progress of the conversation. It rather aims to divert the direction of the talk in an amicable way and its symbol is "Ch". Challenging move occurs when an addressee withholds the anticipated second part of the conversation.

Bound opening expands on a topic once it has been established by adding relevant and semantically cohesive details and its symbol is "Bo". For example,

HIGGINS: Listen, Eliza. I think you said you came in a taxi.	Opening move
LIZA: Well, what if I did? I've as good a right to take a taxi as anyone else.	Supporting move
HIGGINS: You have, Eliza; and in future you shall have as many taxis as you want. You shall go up and down and round the town in a taxi every day. Think of that, Eliza.	Bound-opening move

Reopening move is used when the speaker reasserts a topic in spite of the fact that the hearer has challenged it and its symbol is "Ro". For example:

LIZA. I don't want to hear anything more about that. All I want to know is whether anything belongs to me. My own clothes were burnt.	Challenging move
LIZA. I want to know what I may take away with me. I don't want to be accused of stealing.	Reopening move

Exchanges

In the hierarchy of conversation, exchange comes after moves in the ascending order. Exchange is "the minimal interactive unit and involves the negotiation of a single piece of information" (Stenstorm, 1994, p. 48). In simple words, exchange comprises a dialogue between two parties. Burton has identified two types of exchanges: pre-topic exchange and topic exchange. The drawback with Burton's classification is that it is superficial as it does not provide any significance for dividing exchanges into pretopic and topic. It seems that the exchanges are divided just to label the category and nothing else. In order to address the problem, the researcher has classified exchanges into four patterns: Questioning, Requesting, Stating and Commanding exchanges. In a questioning exchange, the dominant pattern is question-answer. The

requesting exchange carries the general pattern of request-accept. The stating exchange normally depicts the patterns of comment-inform. The commanding exchange highlights the pattern of directive-agree.

The present research identifies the nature of an exchange by looking into the fact that who is initiating the move. Thus, acts and moves play a vital role in assessing the nature of exchange. This can be studied with the help of the following table.

| | Speaker A | | Speaker B | | |
	Acts	**Moves**	**Acts**	**Moves**	**Exchanges**
1	Elicit	Opening	Reply	Supportive	Questioning
2	Request	Opening	Acknowledge	Supportive	Requesting
3	Comment	Opening	Inform	Supportive	Stating
4	Direct	Opening	Accept	Supportive	Commanding

Transaction

Transaction occupies the highest place in the hierarchy of discourse structure of conversation. Stenstorm (1994) states that "a transaction consists minimally of one exchange dealing with one topic, but usually of a sequence of exchanges dealing with the same topic" (p. 55). In simple words, transaction may consist of one or series of exchanges but its determining feature is that it deals with one topic. Thus, a change of transaction means typically a change of topic. Transaction is the final levels of discourse structure. In the present study, transactions comprises numerous patterns of exchanges.

Determination of Labels

The determination of appropriate labels of acts, moves and exchanges is the main challenge and certainly, a complex one. Among them, the labelling of speech acts is one of the most formidable tasks. Acts performed in a conversation are social as well as linguistic acts (Gies, 1995). It is really hard to determine the exact nature of speech act because there is no one to one relationship between form and function in language. Also, one form could be used to perform multiple functions (Stubb, 1983; Burton, 1980). The speaker performs a speech act intentionally, and the hearer deciphers it appropriately in order to understand it. Typically, different tests are combined to label an act. The researcher believes conversation takes place in context and this contextual information is vital for understanding the utterance.

　　　　The researcher has fully grasped the way Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Carter and Burton (1982) have assigned labels to the analysis of the text. Instances where the already available labels are found insufficient, a need for inserting appropriate labels will arise. While assigning label, the researcher felt that sometimes the function of an act overlap and it becomes difficult to assign labels, especially of acts. In such a case, a label is assigned which seems more appropriate to the act. Once the speech acts are identified, the other labels are easy to assign.

Selection of Relevant Text for Analysis

The present study attempts to study the conversational patterns to highlight the dominant or dominated behavior. It would be an empirical study as the findings are based on the descriptive system, not on the intuition of the researcher. The source of data is confined to the dialogues in the *Pygmalion*. Further, as far as linguistic study of the text is concerned, the play is divided differently by keeping in mind the changes occurred in the protagonists. The traditional division of the play into different acts (normally five) is done to facilitate the formal aspect of play and performance of the play. This division is not valid for linguistic analysis of the play. In *Pygmalion*, the researcher has divided the play into two events: Event 1 comprises the scenes in which Eliza is submissive and obeys the commands of Professor Higgins, whereas, Event 2 starts from the scene where Eliza asserts her say and starts challenging the orders of the Professor.

Results and Discussions

This section reports the results, based on the frequency of acts, moves and exchanges, being performed by the protagonists of the play.

Event 1

Acts

Higgins's Speech Acts	Frequency	Liza's Speech Acts	Frequency
Comment	24	Comment	19
React	23	React	22
Elicit	17	Elicit	1
Direct	15	Acknowledge	9
Inform	13	Inform	6
Reply	8	Reply	10
Check	5	Check	4
Acknowledge	4	Request	5
Marker	3	Marker	4

Resolve	2	Evaluate	1
Threat	1		
Accuse	1		
Surprise	1	Surprise	6
Prompt	1		
Offer	1		
Summon	1		

Moves

Higgins's Moves	Frequency	Liza's Moves	Frequency
Opening	54	Opening	13
Supportive	32	Supportive	51
Bound opening	22	Bound opening	21
Reopening	3	Reopening	Zero
Challenging	Zero	Challenging	1

Exchanges

Higgins's Exchanges	Frequency	Liza's Exchanges	Frequency
Stating	20	Stating	22
Questioning	8	Questioning	5
Commanding	3	Commanding	1

Event 2

Acts

Higgin's Speech Acts	Frequency	Liza's Speech Acts	Frequency
Comment	32	Comment	2
React	29	React	33
Reply	7	Accuse	3
Acknowledge	6	Acknowledge	5
Surprise	3	Surprise	1
Elicit	3	Elicit	17
Marker	2	Resolve	2
Request	1	Check	13
Greetings	1		
Inform	1	Inform	28
Direct	1	Direct	3

Moves

Higgin's Moves	Frequency	Liza's Moves	Frequency
Bound opening	37	Bound opening	23
Supportive	31	Supportive	13

Opening	13	Opening	32
Challenging	2	Challenging	5
Reopening	Zero	Reopening	4

Exchanges

Higgin's Exchanges	Frequency	Liza's Exchanges	Frequency
Stating	3	Stating	62
Questioning	1	Questioning	Zero
Commanding	Zero	Commanding	5
Requesting	Zero	Requesting	Zero

The analysis of the play in terms of acts, moves and exchange aids to determine and identify genders of Higgins and Eliza. Also, the frequency is used as a valid tool to ascertain the power structure. In Event 1, gender roles are quite traditional, that is, the traditional stereotypes of male (Higgins) and female (Eliza) are portrayed in which power, control and authority rests with the male. Women are suppressed on the plea that they hold subordinate position as compared to men. However, Eliza defies her traditional role as a dependent, weak, and suppressed female in Event 2. She strives for her liberation and reconsideration of social values.

It is often assumed that Eliza's abrupt change in behavior goes unaccounted for on the ground that there is no convincing justification for such a bold stance of playing truant in her character. The study of acts, moves and exchanges traces certain development in her character from the very beginning of the play. Eliza argues with Higgins whenever he threatens her freedom. Eliza, at the beginning, is a passive and submissive pupil, but this does not imply that she fails to express her opinion at all. In Event 1, the use of 22 React, 19 Comment and 6 Inform clearly points towards the fact that she does differ from her teacher in certain respects. In event 2, the text reveals that the professor's power diminishes as he uses 3 Elicit which can be compared with 17 Elicit in event 1. Eliza uses 28 Inform in event 2, as compared to 6 Inform in event 1. This is because of the realization on the part of Eliza that she has been a tool of experiment in the hands of Higgins. Higgins tries to pacify and console her but she reacts with immense anger and at the end she

makes use of 3 Accuse to blame Higgins for all her ills and 2 Resolve to live in her own way.

The same results can be derived from the study of moves and exchanges. In event 1, the conversation is monitored and controlled by Higgins as he performs 54 opening moves as compared to Eliza's 13 opening moves. In event 2, the situation is reversed as Eliza performs 32 opening moves as compared to Higgins 13 opening moves. Same is true for supportive moves. In event 1, Higgins performs 32 supportive moves, whereas, Eliza 51 opening moves. This is reversed in event 2 in which Higgins performs 31 supportive moves and Eliza performs 13 supportive moves. Her challenging moves reflect that she is in no mood to sacrifice her independence. Similarly, the number of stating exchanges performed by Eliza in event 1 is 22, whereas, in event 2, she performs 62 stating exchanges. This shows her penetration in the conversation with the professor as she resolves to disobey Higgins.

The linguistic analysis of the play in terms of acts, moves and exchanges speaks at length about the awakening in Eliza as she is not going to comply with the orders of her mentor from now onward in the play. However, at the end, she becomes defiant and revolted to the extent of leaving her mentor and new home at Wimpole Street. From 'a squashed cabbage leaf', and 'a draggle-tailed guttersnipe', 'a baggage', she has turned into a 'consort battleship'. The metaphor is used with a purpose, i.e. Eliza is at the driving seat of her life and in this war of wills, and she is no longer ready to compromise her identity. Thus, the researcher has tried to objectify transformation in Eliza's character, i.e. transformation from a submissive woman to assertive one.

Interestingly, in event 2, Higgins performs 3 Surprise acts as he could not figure out the revolting vein of Eliza. The bold stance of Eliza is because of her realization that she has been a tool in the hands of Higgins and makes use of 3 Accuse to blame the professor since she is incompatible with Higgins's world. From this point onwards, she has a different vision of life, which is not confined to putting on new dresses or speaking in acceptable manners. This realization gives her the courage to assert her independence and resist any romance with Higgins. As a matter of fact, Eliza is transformed internally and externally and she is ready to keep her identity intact.

One of the prominent aspects of Shaw's dramaturgy is his portrayal of the New Woman, an emerging class of females, economically independent and sexually liberated. The Shavian women are portrayed strong, practical, educated, and unromantic. They do not harbor feelings of animosity or strangeness towards men, instead, learn from them. They have rejected their conservative roles of submissive daughters and doll-like wives and have captured roles of leading nature. They have set a new way of approaching life by defying the male rules and thereby, there is an attempt to reform the prevalent norms of the world. Thus, Shaw is actively engaged in the fight against the romantic depiction of love and sex in his dramas. Shaw's heroines make the most of their abilities as they are ready to surmount difficulties. They are the real women. In this regard, Shaw uses a bold depiction of Eliza to shock the Victorian audiences. Praising her economic and spiritual independence, Eliza is in striking contrast with the romantic heroines. She chooses to marry Freddy as she is not looking for a master, but a life partner, not superior to her.

REFERENCES

Adams, E. (1974). Feminism and female stereotypes in Shaw.*The Shaw Review*, 17(1), 17-22.

Burton, D. (1980) *Dialogue and discourse: A sociolinguistic approach to modern drama dialogue and naturally occurring conversation.* London: Kegan Paul.

Burton, D. (1982) Through glass darkly: Through dark glasses. In Weber Jean Jacques (Ed.), *The stylistics reader: From Roman Jakobson to the present.* London, New York, Sydney & Auckland: Arnold.

Carter, R., & Burton, D. (1982).*Literary text and language study*. London: Edward Arnold.

Coulthard, M. (1985).*An introduction to discourse analysis*. London and NY: Longman.

Francis, G., & Hunston, S. (1992). Analysing everyday conversation.In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. (pp. 123-161). London: Routledge.

Geis, M. L. (1995). *Speech acts and conversational interaction.* New York: CUP.

Griffith, G. (1993). *Socialism and superior brains: The political thought of Bernard Shaw*. London & NY: Routledge.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *Introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Innes, C. (1998). *The Cambridge companion to George Bernard Shaw*. UK: CUP.

Lakoff, R. 1975. *Language and woman's place.* NY: Harper and Row.

Litosseliti, L., & Sunderland, J. (Eds.).(2002). *Gender identity and discourse analysis.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Morrish, L., & Sauntson, H. (2007).*New perspectives on language and sexual identity*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Peters, S. (1998). Shaw's life: A feminist in spite of himself. In Christopher Innes (Ed.) *The Cambridge companion to George Bernard Shaw*. UK: CUP.

Shaw, G. B. (2005). *Pygmalion: A romance in five acts.* London & NY: Penguin Books.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975).*Towards an analysis of discourse*: *The Englishused by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: OUP.

Stenstrom, A. B. (1994). *An introduction to spoken interaction*. London and NY: Longman.

Stubbs, M. (1983).*Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistics analysis of natural language*. USA: The University of Chicago Press.

Tannen, D. (1993). The relativity of linguistic strategies: rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. In Deborah Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction.*(pp. 165-185). NY: OUP.

Wodak, R. (1997). Introduction: Some important issues in the research of gender and discourse. In Ruth Wodak (Ed.), *Gender and discourse.* (pp. 1-20). London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage.