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Aims of the study

Descriptive
The conceptualisation of the body in contemporary British and American English

Methodological
Develop quantitative methods to measure the effects of social variation on generalisations about conceptual structure
Problem

Operationalising Idealised Cognitive Models?

Introspection makes falsification of results difficult

Introspection makes identification of social variation difficult

Proposal 1

Choice of Keywords = Determined through relative frequency

Proposal 2

Patterns of characteristics of usage = index of Cognitive Model
Data

Choice of the body part terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK</th>
<th></th>
<th>US</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Freq/1000</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21191</td>
<td>4,12</td>
<td>hand(s)</td>
<td>92082</td>
<td>3,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6121</td>
<td>1,19</td>
<td>finger(s)</td>
<td>26134</td>
<td>1,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5157</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>lip(s)</td>
<td>23406</td>
<td>0,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4530</td>
<td>0,88</td>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>22944</td>
<td>0,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3966</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>skin</td>
<td>15552</td>
<td>0,63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Taken from the first 10 most frequent body part terms in the corpus.

Corpus

LiveJournal Corpus (Speelman & Glynn 2006 [2012]).

1000 occurrences

⇒ 50 occurrences of each lexemes in both American and British English in 2006 and 2012
Method - Multifactorial Usage-Feature Analysis

Step 1. Data Analysis - Manual annotation of usage-features
Step 2. Meta-data Analysis - Multivariate examination of results

Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSPICUITY of sexuality</td>
<td>Explicit, Implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSITY - in degree of sexuality</td>
<td>Likert scale 1 to 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER - of the referent</td>
<td>Masculine, Feminine, or Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON - of the referent</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} (Subjective), 2\textsuperscript{nd} (Interpersonal), 3\textsuperscript{rd} (Descriptive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXIOLOGY - moral judgement</td>
<td>Positive, Negative or Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis - Exemplification of feature analysis

1. PERSPICUITY (explicitness) of Sexuality
   a. Explicit Sexuality
   “finally letting my hard cock out. I suck my FINGERS quickly lubricating them then massage one around Danny’s tight entrance”

   b. Implicit Sexuality
   “Jack leaned in close his lips just brushing the sensitized SKIN of his neck. Ianto tried desperately to remember what he was going to say.”

2. INTENSITY of Sexuality - Based on Reduced Likert Scale 1-9
   a. Low Sexuality/or Non-Sexual
   “The combination of a wide forehead, prominent cheekbones and a pointed chin, generally with thin LIPS, are signs of a brilliant and, intelligence and ambition”

   b. High Sexuality
   “the lie was more interesting without his schoolboy smirk. Snape's FINGERS outlined the shape of Harry's cock. This was more interesting”

   c. High Intensity + Low Explicitness
   “he felt hot underneath him – hotter than he ever imagined she could feel. He heard her breath catch in her throat as his FINGERS brushed to the inside of her thigh.”
Analysis - Exemplification of feature analysis

3. GENDER of the Referent => looking at the pronoun linked directly to the lexeme
   a. Male
   “As the tension builds inside him they don't get faster they just get harder. His filthy HANDS tighten, her mouth feels crushed under his might, the hand that had held her forehead retreats to her scalp and collects an ever enlightening wind of her hair.”

   b. Female
   “She drove three fingers hard and deep into the Confessor without mercy, smiling as she felt her virgin SKIN resist for barely a moment before breaking. Cara screamed, her back arching off the bed as Kahlan”

4. PERSON of the Referent => looking at the pronoun right before the lexeme
   a. Subjective (1st Person)
   “quarter of the burger with a steak knife and ate it while all the sauces dripped down my FINGERS and arm, then I asked for a to go box for the rest.”

   b. Intersubjective (2nd Person)
   “You know what feeling I'm talking about right? Waking up to that person's breath on your neck, the warmth of their lips on your cheek, the touch of their fingers on your SKIN, and the feel of their heart beating in sync with yours?”

   c. Descriptive (3rd Person)
   “He leaned over (not in) and gave Sirius a rather clumsy kiss. Sirius moaned as Remus’s tongue gently licked open his LIPS and began its inexorable journey into his mouth.”
Analysis - Exemplification of feature analysis

5. AXIOLOGY – moral judgment
a. Positive
“she shattered the frame it was in a few months ago. With tender FINGERS, she tried to smooth out the wrinkles.”

b. Neutral
“and Clint presses his LIPS together to spot himself grinning.”

c. Negative
“‘You. Are. Mine.’ FINGERS pressing into his throat, careful to grip where the white collar would hide any bruising, holding tight enough to force him to slow his breathing”
Results – Exploring Overall Multidimensional Structure of BODY ICM

Dialect not Gender
US Masc./ Fem vs. UK Masc./ Fem

US body parts associated with explicit sexuality
UK body parts associated with implicit sexuality

Unknown Gender body parts
non-sexual uses
and
no difference between dialects

Explicit High Sexuality
only Descriptive (3rd Person)

Morality
Negative judgement associated with subjective and intersubjective uses of MOUTH
Results – Confirming Multidimensional Correlations of BODY ICM

Significant Correlations
US 3rdPers Explicit + Implicit Masculine Sexuality
UK 3rd Pers. Implicit Sexuality Masculine Sexuality

Significant Anti-correlations
Regardless of dialect or sexuality
1st Person M Masculine
Men don't talk about their bodies
The only exception might be
US explicit sexual reference
Results – Predictive and Quantitative Modelling of BODY

Binary Regression: Predictive Modelling of Dialect

Only PERSPICUITY and AXIOLOGY are significant predictors of Dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>(Predicting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSPICUITY Implicit Sexuality</td>
<td>0.8547</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSPICUITY Explicit Sexuality</td>
<td>0.8166</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXIOLOGY NEGATIVE</td>
<td>1.3312</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXIOLOGY POSITIVE</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stats
C: 0.602
C Bootstrapped: 0.5975
Highest VIF: 1.500642

Fixed-effects Only
Adding gender or body-part as random variables had no effect in the significance of the predictors or the relative effect-size of the predictors
Discussion

We have a multidimensional picture of how British and Americans talk about their bodies. This description is

   a. quantitative: calculate accuracy of description / falsify results

   b. variationist: includes differences between social groups

Is this also a picture of how they think about their bodies, the Cognitive Models of their bodies?

1. How can these results be tied to kind of qualitative research done by Lakoff (1987) and Wierzbicka (1990)?

2. How confident are we that frequency-based usage indices adequately capture socio-conceptual structure?
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