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Community and Contest: Midwestern Men and Women Creating Their Worlds in Conversational Storytelling

BARBARA JOHNSTONE

It has often been noted (Labov 1972, Polanyi 1985, Johnstone 1990b) that the anecdotes Americans tell about their lives in the course of ordinary conversations tend to have a climactic structure. The plots of spontaneous oral narratives, like those of traditional folktales and many literary stories, center around disturbances in the usual flow of events, which must be overcome or lived through. Situations become dangerous or embarrassing, failure looms, unusual people or supernatural apparitions are encountered. Protagonists manage these disturbances, in their stories about them, by calling on various sources of strength. In some stories, disturbances are resolved as a result of individual characteristics of the protagonist: willpower, cleverness, or physical prowess. In others the power to overcome or understand disturbances is communal: the help and advice of friends or neighbors, the law, or the dictates of religion. Still other stories involve supernatural sources of power. Each of these choices about how to present disturbances and their resolutions involves the creation, in the story, of a world: a world of contest in which individuals act alone to overcome challenge or threat, or a world of community in which disturbances in the status quo are managed jointly, or a world in which supernatural forces and personalities can create and resolve disturbances.

The story I call "When I Was Really in Shape" illustrates the first of these options. Its teller, a white, twenty-five-year-old student, is talking to a friend of the same age who is taping the conversation for a class project. They are in Dave's apartment. The friend, Ron, has just been talking about accidentally scaring a coworker, and Dave responds with a reminiscence about a longtime friend and former roommate, "Mr. McCoy," and a misaimed karate kick.

When I Was Really in Shape

Dave: When I was really in shape (I'd) throw kicks at him all the time, shit that was when I could kick to my Adam's apple. Used to practice at home! Had this light cord hanging down you know? Just... practice kicking it up in the air. I'd... kick at him once I kicked him. He was closer than what I thought he was, well he wasn't closer, yeah he was. Kicked his goddamn bowl of soup out of his hand, just reaction he [slaps hand] turned around and hit me man, [gesture of turning around as he hits fist against palm] and it backed me [up against the goddamn] refrigerator.

Ron: [laughs]

Dave: and wow... what is this shit? ...'cause Mister McCoy MELLOW you know,

Ron: Yeah, [laughs]

Dave: Oh man, he felt bad as hell about that for a long time.

He finally told me he said, "Yeah I don't feel too sorry about that no more." [imitating deeper voice] [laughter]

The disturbance of normality around which this story revolves is Dave's accidentally kicking his roommate's soup bowl out of his hand. Dave delivers the next few lines in a voice ranging from loud to shouted, accompanied with iconic gestures of hitting and being "backed up," and punctuated with "goddamn," "wow," and "shit." These heavily evaluated lines call maximum attention to how Mr. McCoy resolves the disturbance: by hitting Dave, "just reaction," hard enough to "back [him] up against the goddamn refrigerator." Although he is referred to by his last name in the story, McCoy is an old friend of Dave's, and for a time he feels "bad as hell" about the accident. But eventually, in the only words Dave presents him as actually saying, McCoy announces that he doesn't "feel too sorry about that no more." "When I Was Really in Shape" is a story about friends; it is in fact an illustration of friendship. But friendship, in the world Dave creates in this story, expresses itself in contest of the most elemental kind: kicks and punches. Neither of the friends regrets the inadvertent fight for very long, and their relationship survives intact.

The second option, resolution of disturbance by means of community, is illustrated in "The Gift Box," another story about friends. The storyteller is Ruby, a white twenty-three-year-old housewife with some high school education. She is part of a group consisting of her husband, Fred; her brother, Rob; and her sister-in-law, Sammie, all in their early twenties,
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who are sitting in her living room chatting about childhood antics. Sammie made the recording.

The Gift Box

Ruby: Now when we were younger, me and Ann my sister, and Ellen and Marlene the neighbor kids, used to go out, and like we at first we started out with just purses, We'd hide in those shrubs that were along the road, and we'd set a purse out there with a piece of fish string tied to it. [laughs] Well we'd always get a dollar and stick out of it, and this was you know, right around sun set where it was getting kind of dark, and we'd ... hide in those bushes, [laughs] and then cars would go by you know, and they'd see that purse laying in the middle of the road, sprung open here was a dollar hanging out of it you know, and they'd ... stop and they'd back up, and while they were backing up, we'd pull the purse back in, [laughs] and here they'd be out a-looking you know in the road, knowing they'd seen that you know. And we'd do this and do this, and then finally, One ... you know that got kind of boring after while, so we found this box, [laughs] and Ann said ... “Let's set this out in the middle of the road,” well (1.0) she said “Let's fill it with all the trash we can find.” Well she'd just went in the bathroom and used the bathroom, and she goes “Oh I didn't even flush the toilet.” [laughs lightly] Well she took this spoon and started scooping:

Sammie: =Oh gross=
Ruby: =this stuff out, [laughing]

Fred: [Only Ann.]

Ruby: and putting it [in this box]

Fred, Sammie:

Ruby: And then we went outside to Ellen and Marlene's dog Happy, and gathered up his turds, [laughs]

Sammie: Oh God,
Ruby: and put them in there, [laughs]
And we put old chicken bones,
Fred: ( )
Ruby: grease ... old food, everything we could think of that was nasty and awful into this box, and then we took it and gift-wrapped it and put this big bow on it, [laughs] and a little card.

Well we set it out in the road, and waited and waited you know and nobody ever came by. (1.5) And at this time also, there was these Mexicans that lived down the road from Ellen. And she kind of looked Mexican herself and his name was Javier, [laughs lightly] and he was you know really such a lover, [laughs lightly] and he'd go ... go by “Mu mu mu” [kissing noise] to that Ellen you know, [laughing] “Eh baby eh baby” [imitating Javier; laughing] always to her. Well who would pull up in that van but Javier. [laughs] We about lost it you know. [laughs] We about gave ourselves away from laughing so hard. [laughs] And here he comes you know, “Asee neee,” [imitating Javier] talking in this Spanish as fast as he could seeing that box there. [laughs lightly] Him and this other ... Sancho ... [was with him.]
[laughs]

Fred, Sammie:

Ruby: You know and here they come, and stuff and they get out buddy and grab that box, you know excited as can be, [laughs] you know thinking they've really found something here. [laughs] Well ... [laughing] they get that thing in the van and the van stops, and we're laughing so hard we can't hardly control it, and all of a sudden man we hear them start this loudest Spanish talking ever, growing louder and louder and all of a sudden, [laughing] this box comes a-flying out of that van all, they're cussing in Spanish, [laughs] and that stuff is scattered all over the road. [laughs] We were er you know here we were scared to death they were gonna hear us a-laughing in these bushes and come and get us. [laughs]

Fred, Sammie:

Ruby: [draws in breath]

Fred, Sammie:

Ruby: But it was just wild, [laughs]

The disturbance in “The Gift Box” occurs when Javier, the irritating but also somewhat alluring Hispanic, happens to stop with his friend Sancho to take the girls' gift box bait. What was meant as a harmless, if disgusting, joke to be played on strangers suddenly looks like a personal insult to a “lover” and his friend, who could “come and get” the girls. Though Ruby has presented Javier’s sexual baiting of Ellen in light parody (“He'd go ‘Mu mu mu’ . . . ‘Eh baby eh baby’”), the girls know they need to keep themselves hidden: they “were scared to death [the men] were gonna hear [them] a-laughing in these bushes.” The disturbance is resolved (the girls don't get caught) through their mutual attempts to con-
control their laughter. Throughout the story, the girls are a team; the story’s protagonist is almost always the communal we, never an individual I, and an individual she (Ann) only in the three lines of the bathroom episode. Ruby uses her friends’ names repeatedly in the story, as well as the name of the neighbor’s dog and those of the men, and key parts of the story, such as the girls’ decision to fill the gift box, Javier’s history of sexual harassment, and the men’s reaction to the gift, are represented as actual speech.

A third option for a storyteller is to create a world in which disturbances can be resolved in supernatural ways. White, middle-class Americans seem rarely to create such a world in personal-experience stories: “ghost stories” are about often apocryphal others, and stories involving the teller’s being spooked usually end with a rational explanation of the incident.2 “The Presence of a Presence,” told by a businessman about a distant relative of his, is thus somewhat unusual.

The Presence of a Presence

In 1976 my aunt’s mother-in-law died, she lived in Rockville Indiana, and my aunt and her two daughter-in-laws went to this woman’s house to clean out her possessions.

After a hard day’s work she bedded down in the downstairs bedroom with her young grandson Robert, the two daughter-in-laws were sleeping upstairs.

As she was drifting off to sleep, she was aware of the presence—of a presence at the foot of her bed.

4.0

It was a tall man dressed in black with a beard.

She wasn’t frightened at all, because he had a sweet beneficent smile on his face.

4.0

And she waved him off, and told him to go away, that she was tired.

And then ... uh went uh ... to sleep.

In the morning she chuckled to herself, thinking that this was all a dream, and how silly it was, then at breakfast.

4.0

her grandson Robert asked her “Grandma who was that man in black in our room last night?”
and she dropped her fork.

They went through the family album that day, and found ... that the man ... was the father of the dead woman, and he had died in that room.

5.0

And they found his picture, it matched perfectly with the vision seen the night before.

“The Presence of a Presence” is a well-rehearsed, written presentation of a story, quite dissimilar from the two personal-experience narratives. The disturbance in this story, the apparition of the man in black, is resolved the next day when the family figures out whose ghost it was. The world created in this story is one in which the supernatural has a part, even if people are skeptical at first.

To recapitulate, then, personal-experience stories can create worlds of various kinds. Some of these “talearealms” (Young 1987) center around contest; others around community; others, less commonly created in white, middle-class Americans’ stories, around the supernatural. “When I Was Really in Shape” exemplifies the first of these possibilities—a world of contest. This story was created by a man. “The Gift Box” exemplifies the second—a world of community. This is a woman’s story. In the remainder of this essay, I explore this correlation between gender and story type.3

To do this, I examine a corpus of spontaneous personal experience stories which includes “When I Was Really in Shape,” “The Gift Box,” and “The Presence of a Presence,” stories told by white, middle-class midwestern men and women. I explore whether there are any systematic differences between these men and women with regard to the worlds they create in their stories and with regard to the linguistic resources they use in doing so. Specifically, I examine the plots to which the men and women adapt their experience; the men’s and women’s use of details to create social and physical worlds in their stories; and the men’s and women’s representation of their own and others’ speech.

I have two aims in doing this. My first aim is to contribute to the empirical, descriptive study of the discursive practices of a group of female Americans who are rarely studied: white, middle-class, urban midwesterners. These are women who would identify themselves, as they are identified by others, as members of the “mainstream”; they are women of the “silent majority” of the “heartland” of America, with whom women of various minority groups are often implicitly—but much more rarely explicitly—compared.4 I show that women’s personal experience stories, in the Indiana city I have been studying, do in fact tend to revolve around joint action by communities of people, whereas men’s stories tend to be about acting alone, and that women’s stories include more details about people than do men’s, more reported talk, and different ways of talking about talk. I also examine a story created about and by the community in which these women and men live: a story that belongs to the city of Fort Wayne. I show that community stories like this are in some ways more like women’s stories than like men’s.

My second aim is a theoretical one, which bears on the study of women and language in a more general way. I am interested in the relationship between the social world created in a story by means of a teller’s linguistic choices and the social world that gives rise to the story. I suggest that women and men make the choices they do in storytelling not simply because they have different psychologies or participate in different subcultures, if they do, and not simply because their stories reflect their differential access to power in the real social world, but also because they are actively creating different worlds in and through their stories, worlds
which are at the same time reflective and constitutive of men’s and women’s psychological, social, and cultural worlds outside their stories.

**Discourse, Gender, and World**

Evidence of a variety of kinds suggests that men and women do not—or do not always—use and interpret language the same way. As discourse analysis and sociolinguistics have become increasingly sophisticated, early descriptions of “women’s language” (Lakoff 1975) based on intuition and informal observation have inspired empirical studies of how men and women interpret others’ speech (Tannen 1982) and how women use language, in conversation with men (Zimmerman & West 1975, Fishman 1978, Maltz & Borker 1982, West & Zimmerman 1983) and among themselves (Harding 1975, Kalkik 1975, Jones 1980, Rakow 1986), in joking (Mitchell 1985), in public image making (Adams & Edelksky 1988), and in the writing (Warshay 1972, Flynn 1988) and telling of personal stories (McLaughlin et al. 1981, Baldwin 1985, Mills 1985, Jahner 1985, Silverstein 1988). As has much other work in discourse analysis and sociolinguistics, work on language and gender in the United States has tended to be about well-educated middle- to upper-middle-class women, who are white and either Jewish or Christian. Universal claims about what women and men do based on research about a subset of women and men must be examined critically; however, since I am explicitly interested in the white middle class, much previous research is potentially relevant to mine.

Explanations for gender differences in language use have been of several kinds. Some scholars see the differences between men’s talk and women’s as reflections of psychological differences (Gilligan 1982, Boe 1987). Others claim that the differences are social in origin, based in differential status and prestige (O’Barr & Atkins 1980, Kramarae, Schulz, & O’Barr 1984). Others attribute language-use differences to cultural differences, noting that girls and boys are socialized, in same-sex peer groups, into different forms and functions of talk (Maltz & Borker 1982, Tannen 1990). These approaches are by no means mutually exclusive, of course. All could be subsumed under the general claim that men and women live in different worlds, be these affective and/or cognitive psychological worlds; social worlds involving relationships of prestige, power, and status; or worlds of belief and knowledge created by culture; and that the world in which a person lives helps to shape the person’s talk.

But talk and world are connected in a variety of ways. Talk is certainly often about the world and reflects what the world is like. At the same time, though, worlds are created in talk. This is in fact most obviously true of narrative talk, since stories, by means of introductory abstracts, summary codas, and other linguistic framing devices, explicitly take teller and audience out of the “storyworld” in which their conversation takes place into a “talerealm” in which the narrative takes place (Young 1987:19–68).

Many students of personality suggest that stories are central to people’s identities. As Ursula K. LeGuin (1989) puts it:

Narrative is a central function of language. Not, in origin, an artifact of culture, an art, but a fundamental operation of the normal mind functioning in society. To learn to speak is to learn to tell a story. . . . [Narrative] is an immensely flexible technology, or life strategy, which if used with skill and resourcefulness presents each of us with that most fascinating of all serials, The Story of My Life. (39, 42)

Telling one’s story is at the heart of the psychoanalytic process, which, according to Roy Schafer (1981), is about “the self as telling.” Jerome Bruner (1986) argues that while natural reality can be understood by means of logical rationality, human reality is essentially narrative: people make sense of human actions by telling stories about them.

The sociocultural world is also at least partly constituted through talk. Victor Turner (1981) points out that “social dramas” and tellings about them both reflect the same underlying process: stories take the form of social life and social life takes the form of stories. People use stories not simply to perpetuate social reality but also to create it and manipulate it (Johnstone 1987). Stories are not merely—if they are at all—icons of a preexisting extratexual world of cultural norms and social relations. The worlds created in stories do provide evidence of how psychological and social reality constrains people’s tellings about it, but in addition, and more interestingly, the social worlds created in stories provide evidence about the nature of the creative power wielded by people who talk.

**Men’s and Women’s Narrative Worlds**

I now turn to fifty-eight personal experience narratives, all of which arose in the course of spontaneous conversation among familiar. All were told by white middle-class Americans from in and around an Indiana city of about 300,000 inhabitants. Thirty-three stories were told by women and twenty-five by men; the tellers’ ages range from fourteen to around seventy. I will move from general observations about what these men’s and women’s personal experience stories tend to be about to increasingly specific claims about what sorts of social worlds the women and men create in their stories and how they make differential use of the resources of English to do this.

On the most general level the women’s stories tend to be about community, while the men’s tend to be about contest. The men tell about human contests—physical contests such as fights as well as social contests in which they use verbal and/or intellectual skill to defend their honor. They tell about contests with nature: hunting and fishing. Stories about contests with people or animals can take the form of tall tales, which are themselves a kind of contest between a teller and an audience. When a male storyteller is not the protagonist in his story, the protagonist is a man; men rarely tell stories involving women.

The women’s stories, on the other hand, revolve around the norms of the community and joint action by groups of people. The women tell about incidents in which they violate social norms and are scared or en-
barrassed as a result; about people helping other people out of scrapes; about sightings of apparent ghosts which are then explained by others; about meeting their mates and acquiring their cats. The women tell about peculiar people, dramatizing their abnormal behavior and setting it implicitly in contrast with social norms. They tell stories about themselves, about other women, and about men.

Looking in more detail at the plots of stories in which the teller is the protagonist—in other words, people's stories about themselves—one finds striking differences in how often male and female protagonists act alone and how often they act in concert with others, and what the outcome is in each case. Table 3.1 summarizes the figures to be mentioned.

Of a total of twenty-one men's stories about themselves, thirteen are about men acting alone, in such situations as these:

A young man is hassled by another man in a bar but says the right threatening thing to put an end to the situation; he is with others, but no one else is involved in this interchange.

The players on a semiprofessional softball team pour ice water on the club's public relations director, as a sort of initiation ritual; the victim responds in just the right clever way, by breaking into the song "Stormy Weather."

By calling on his own willpower, a high school boy enables himself to beat forty or fifty other contestants in a cattle-judging competition.

When men act alone, the outcome is usually positive, as in these examples.

Of the twenty-six women's stories, protagonists act alone in only ten. In seven out of these ten, the outcome is bad: embarrassment, fright, pain, or failure. In one case, not consulting others is explicitly the reason for the bad outcome:

A woman pays respects to the wrong corpse at a funeral home, and, worse, signs the visitors' book, a gaffe she could have avoided by asking someone for directions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 Individual vs. Joint Action by Protagonists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men's Stories (N = 21)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protagonist acts alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with bad outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with good outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protagonist acts with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others are just there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others help and advise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the other three stories in which female protagonist/tellers act alone, they are successful.

Eight men's stories are about acting in concert with others. Of the eight, however, four have men doing things together, but not advising or helping each other: deer hunting, training to be pilots, hunting for fishing worms, and fishing. Only four out of a total of twenty-one men's stories about themselves involve their actively helping or being helped or advised. In one (a tall tale), the protagonist asks for advice after he inadvertently shuts a cat in a freezer. In another, a mechanic sends his assistant to help with a car that won't start (though the mechanic himself is the one who eventually solves the problem). In another, a soldier and his buddies survive being stranded with a broken-down vehicle in a remote part of Germany, all working together. In the other, a driver prevails on a sheriff who has providentially arrived on the scene to do something about an erratic tailgater.

Sixteen women's stories have the woman acting in concert with others. In five of these, people are simply doing things together: trashing a laundromat, throwing crabapples at cars, joyriding in a friend's brother's car, vacationing in Europe, visiting socially. In the other eleven, though, the outcome depends crucially on cooperation with others. Examples are these:

What could have been an embarrassing mistake (saying "Good God" instead of "Good morning" in Spanish) is shrugged off when the Spanish speaker being addressed laughs about it, because he's such a nice fellow.

A woman trying to rescue her drowning nephew almost drowns too, but her sister borrows a life raft and saves both.

A woman deals with the aftermath of a frightening skid in the snow with the help of neighbors, who give helpful advice, and the local police officer, who accompanies her back to the scene of the accident to retrieve her license plate and check for damage.

To summarize, the men's stories tend to be about contests in which the protagonist acts alone and is successful. When groups of men act in concert, they tend not to stand in relationships of advice or support, but rather simply to act as copresent buddies. The women, on the other hand, tell stories which stress the importance of community. When women's protagonists act alone, they tend not to be successful, and when groups of women act together, they do so in mutually supportive ways.

**Language and Storyworld**

In addition to the thematic choices I have just described—choices about which events to narrate, about who does what in a story, and about how it comes out in the end—the men and women use a variety of strategies for how to talk—discourse choices—as they create their worlds of contest and
community. I examine two of these here: extrathematic detail and reports of speech, both direct and indirect.

In many of the stories, both men’s and women’s, the teller includes more detail than is strictly necessary to move the story’s plot along or provide minimal identification of its setting and characters. I call this type of detail “extrathematic.” When there is extrathematic detail in a story, it can take the form of extra specifications of place or time, titles of events like movies, descriptions of objects such as cars, or people’s names—even sometimes when the storyteller’s audience does not recognize the names. Table 3.2 shows what types of extrathematic detail occur in the men’s and women’s stories.

While the men specify place and time more often than do the women, the women use personal names more than twice as often as do the men. The figures in the table do not include unsuccessful attempts to recover proper names—sentences like “Now let’s see, what was his name?” or “I wish I could remember his name.” Attempts like these are made only by the women.

An additional type of extrathematic detail consists of reports of speech events that take place in the background—details like “we were just talking and visiting,” “there they mostly spoke English,” “he would sit and talk to my mother,” or “I’m talking to, you know, somebody.” While six of the women’s stories mention such background talk, only two of the men’s stories do. Especially interesting in this regard is one man’s story, in which talk is rather conspicuously not mentioned as one of the things that went on during a long Saturday on a hunting trip:

The Saturday of that weekend, we just did a lot of shooting, and actually just lounging around camp a lot. Did a little bit of hunting. Really just ... took it good and easy that day.

Hunting trips are, in fact, traditionally silent events, I am told; stories like this help create and perpetuate that tradition.

| Table 3.2 Types and Numbers of Occurrences of Extrathematic Detail in Stories |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------|
| Type of Detail              | Women’s Stories | Men’s Stories |
| specifications of place     | 11        | 18       |
| specifications of time       | 3         | 7        |
| descriptions of objects      | 1         | 5        |
| titles of events             | 2         | 1        |
| people’s names               | 15        | 7        |
| narrated reports of speech acts | 6         | 2        |

Choices of detail, then, and especially choices of extrathematic detail, help create different worlds in the men’s and the women’s stories. People in the women’s stories have names, and they sit around and talk; people in the men’s stories are more often nameless, and their environment is more silent.

Talk is not just a possible background activity in these stories. Story plots sometimes revolve crucially around talk: saying the right thing can defuse a dangerous situation, for example, or a person’s verbal response to an event can create the humor in a story. Perhaps because reported speech serves as an evaluative device (Labov 1972) in narrative, underscoring the point of a story by creating drama, and because the drama created through “constructed dialogue” helps establish rapport between storyteller and audience (Tannen 1986, 1989:98–133), both the male and the female storytellers use reported speech at least once in over half of their stories, as is shown in Table 3.3.

But while there is little difference between the men and the women in the percentage of stories that include reported speech, there is a notable difference in the percentage of breath-group times that report speech. As Table 3.4 shows, half again as many women’s story lines report speech as men’s.

This is to say that when the women report speech in their stories, they do so at greater length and more often in the story. This is related to the observation reported previously that talk seems to be a more salient sort of detail for the women than for the men. Female tellers are sometimes frustrated when the exact words of their characters don’t come to mind: “and I said ... I wish I could remember what I said!” One woman creates words in a foreign language she doesn’t know (the Hispanic men who receives the disgusting package in “The Gift Box” are described as saying “Aace, aace”), and, in one story, a woman uses direct discourse to report words she—fortunately—didn’t say to a patient delivering a large urine sample at her husband’s rural medical office:

So I was ... I was saved from terrible embarrassment, because I hadn’t actually said, ‘My husband will sure enjoy this, he loves cider!’

To report speech that wasn’t spoken is clearly a creative choice. Maybe more obviously than most but no differently from any other, this story-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3 Men’s and Women’s Stories Including Reported Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Stories (N = 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported speech present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reported speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teller is creating a world, not just reporting about one. This woman's world is like the worlds many women create in their stories: a world in which what you don't say is as important as what you do say; a world in which linguistic interaction is crucial.

**A Community Story**

I now turn to an illustration of the use to which stories like the women's can be put in a larger social context. In the spring of 1982 there was severe flooding in the city in which (or around which) these stories were collected. Thousands of people had to leave their homes, and millions of dollars worth of property was damaged. In the course of the two-week-long disaster a public story about it was created in the local and national news media. What began as reports of water-level and evacuation statistics turned into a well-developed narrative, with animate characters (the water as calculating enemy, the city as war-weary hero), consistent imagery (both militaristic and Christian), and a clear moral. This story was told and retold in various guises. The version which follows is from a special souvenir tabloid section of the evening newspaper, which appeared after the crisis was over (Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, special section “The Flood of ’82,” March 19, 1982, p. 2):

They are charming rivers some springs. Their banks green with budding plants and trees, the three waterways glide gracefully past homes and parks in Fort Wayne, a delight for fishing, canoeing or a moment’s peaceful contemplation.

But in the spring of 1982, the Maumee, the St. Marys and the St. Joseph rivers became an awesome and devastating natural force when the worst possible weather conditions—a record winter’s snow and ice, heavy rain and a rapid thaw—sent tons of water pouring into their channels.

In a disaster that was heard about around the world, the bloated rivers outgrew their banks and burst their streams, reclaiming thousands of acres of lowlands and plundering cars, homes, farms and lives.

“When I went to sleep Saturday night, there wasn’t any water,” said one stunned Nebraska resident. “When I woke up Sunday morning, it was at the front door.”

Nebraska neighbors—and later, those along Sherman Boulevard and Superior Street—clung to their homes until the rising rivers began pouring into their streets and basements, bursting up through sewers with a force that popped off manhole covers and bubbled into houses through drains and toilets.

And then the two rivers gushed into the backed-up Maumee at the confluence in the heart of Fort Wayne. By March 18, when it crested at 1 a.m., the Maumee had become a 25.93-foot wall of treacherous water, straining the city’s aging dikes and holding 4,000 neighbors in the Lakeside area and 2,000 others who were evacuated for precautions in suspense for days.

Only the superhuman labors of hundreds of other neighbors, most of them teen-agers, saved the graceful, old neighborhoods. With water seeping through the muddy mound of the Pemberton Drive dike on the city’s northeastern side on the night of March 17, the volunteers swallowed their fears and strained under the weight of 25,000 sandbags an hour to bolster the sagging dikes.

But The Flood of ’82 left a mark on Fort Wayne that the cleanup effort can’t erase. After two years of morale-beating recession and unemployment, Fort Wayne warmed the nation’s soul—and surprised itself in the measure—with an outpouring of care and help from its citizens.

The estimated 60,000 volunteers, serving meals, filling sandbags, building dikes, turned the battle against the rivers into a triumphant celebration of neighborly love. In a city that celebrates the three rivers each July, the flood fight lent new eloquence to the meaning of the Festival of the Three Rivers.

This story presents elements of contest and community both. The contest is that of the city against the rivers. But the city is a collectivity: it is the fact that people worked together that allowed the city to prevail in this contest. This is a story, then, in which community overcomes contest. The segments I have italicized highlight this theme. People are referred to as “neighbors” or “volunteers” who have to “swallow their fears” and “strain” to save the city. They “care” and “help.” What starts out as a contest—a battle with the rivers—ends up as “a triumphant celebration of neighborly love.” This celebration of community allowed the story to be used, later, as the basis for a very effective public relations campaign for the city, designed around the slogan “The City That Saved Itself.” The city thus created itself as a world and presented itself to the world in the terms of a story of community.

**Discussion**

This analysis of some midwestern men’s and women’s personal experience stories has shown that there is a tendency for the women’s stories to involve social power: disturbing or dangerous events are overcome through the power of interdependence and community. Accordingly the women tend to include more details about people than do the men and more reported conversation. The men, on the other hand, tend to create worlds of contest in which power comes from the individual acting in opposition to others. The men tend to use more details about places,
times, and objects than do the women, and they tend to report less of others’ speech.

I have argued that neither of these two strategies for resolving the disturbances that give rise to narrative is inherently more powerful or reflective of greater power than the other. To make this point, I showed how the story that arose out of a disturbance in the life of the city in which these men and women live invoked the power of community most often represented in the women’s stories as well as the power of contest most often represented in the men’s. The theme of the flood story is the theme of many American stories, including the American Revolution as it exists in the popular mind: a beleaguered group of citizens acts as a community to defeat an unjust force from outside.

I have also suggested that women’s and men’s narratives are not simply the products of women’s and men’s worlds. People create worlds in discourse, as they create selves, communities, and places (Johnstone 1990b). The women storytellers I have been talking about often present themselves, as individuals, as powerless: things happen to them, and when they act alone they are unsuccessful. The women need other people, and when they act in concert with others they overcome the challenges they tell stories about. The community is thus the source of the women’s power, and this social power is tapped through discourse—through real talk among named people. I see the women’s stories, then, not as examples of powerless discourse or of women’s discourse about their powerless worlds. I find it more useful to see these women’s stories as statements about the world-creating power of discourse.

NOTES

I am grateful to the men and women whose stories I analyze here, and to the student field workers who collected them. Versions of this chapter were presented at the “Discourses of Power” conference held at Arizona State University in October 1988 and at the “Georgetown University Bicentennial Conference on Women in America” held in April 1989; audiences at both conferences made useful suggestions, as has Deborah Tannen. Delma McLeod-Porter passed along some relevant articles uncovered in her research on girls’ and boys’ written narratives.

1. The stories discussed in this chapter were collected between 1981 and 1984 by students at Indiana University–Purdue University, Fort Wayne. The field workers taped ordinary, casual conversations among their families and friends and later transcribed stories that had been told during the conversations. See Johnstone (1990b:12–14) for a description of the project.

The transcription system used here is fairly conventional. Stories are transcribed in lines, each of which corresponds to a breath group and ends with final rising or falling intonation. This way of transcribing oral narrative and the rationale for transcribing this way are described in Chafe (1980). Rising intonation is indicated with a question mark. Falling intonation is indicated with a comma, if the line ends with an intermediate drop in volume and pitch, or a period, if it ends with a sentence-final drop. Hesitations of less than a second are marked with from one to three dots; hesitations of more than a second with the number of seconds, in parentheses. Nonverbal accompaniments to the talk are described in square brackets. Overlap (simultaneous speech or laughter) is indicated with brackets connecting the overlapping segments. Talk that follows immediately on another’s talk is indicated with equals signs connecting the relevant turns. Raised volume is indicated with italics, and especially loud talk is in small capital letters. Unfilled parentheses, in one place, show that what was said is not intelligible on the tape.

2. This is not the case, for example, for Thais (Neill 1987), whose stories about personal experience often include supernatural explanations for events.

3. Stories about the supernatural are, as I have mentioned, relatively rare in the corpus of narrative with which I am working. When they are told, they often sound more like rehearsed recitations than spontaneous anecdotes. More are told by women than by men—“The Presence of a Presence” is an exception— but there are not enough of them to support generalizations. I will not discuss stories of this type in what follows.

4. The “mainstream” is not, of course, a monolithic whole, and the data I am discussing are not to be taken as representative of all of mainstream culture. As I have shown elsewhere (Johnstone 1990a, b), these stories are closely and in many ways tied to the community in which they were told. Whether they are representative of the narrative style of any larger group is an empirical question, with which I have not been primarily concerned. As Senta Troemmel-Ploetz has pointed out to me, my concern with maintaining a specific, particularistic stance vis-à-vis these data mirrors, in a way, the concern of the women storytellers with specific, named people, and with real talk. It also reflects my theoretical orientation toward the “linguistics of particularity” (Becker 1984, 1988).

5. Mills (1985) finds the same pattern in oral narratives of women and men in Afghanistan: “men tend to tell stories about men, whereas women tell stories about women and men” (187).

6. In a study of 236 written narratives by white midwestern college students, Warshay (1972) found that the males involve themselves more in relation to events than do the females, locating events in a personal sphere of activity and making less reference to others than do females. Females, on the other hand, locate events in an interacting community, “seek[ing] satisfaction in primary relations in the local community” (8). Warshay’s findings are strikingly similar to the results of the analysis reported here, as are those of Flynn (1988), who analyzes four student narratives and finds that “the narratives of the female students are stories of interaction, of connection, or of frustrated connection. The narratives of the male students are stories of achievement, of separation, or of frustrated achievement” (428). Flynn’s students are probably midwesterners (they are first-year students at a Michigan college); their race is not identified. McLeod-Porter (1991) finds similar distinctions in an analysis of written stories by black and white adolescents in east-central Texas.

7. Extratematic detail is discussed in greater detail in Johnstone (1990a).

8. There is a great deal more that could be said about this story, some of which I have tried to say elsewhere (Johnstone 1990b:109–125).
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