



Diary Writing and Creativity: A qualitative case study of self-consciousness

Katarina Polonsky

This assignment documents the evolving creativities of an individual's diary entries in the context of increasing degrees of self-consciousness. Popular diary genre studies generally reduce its potential for creativity as an individual's unpremeditated and congenital re-creation of the processes beneath their thinking (Wart 22). Such approaches recognize the genre's flexibility and possibilities yet refuse empirical studies into the connection between this creativity and the individual's self-consciousness. Similarly, though beyond the scope of this assignment, critics consider this genre's reflective and personal creativity as largely 'Eastern' (Lubart 1999:340). This oversimplifies and misses the genre's contextualized hybridity as part of the 'Western' literary tradition that promotes it.

This assignment builds off a 'Pilot Study' (2010), which recognized high levels of literariness and creativity in diary writing. It applied Carter's theory of everyday linguistic creativity to illumine its findings (2004). Carter informs everyday creativity is clinal, operating along degrees of intimacy, intensity and evaluation (117). The diary's register is highly intimate and informal, and therefore the individual projects their identity and self-expression through creativities termed 'language play' (Carter 82). However, Carter's focus on spoken, dialogic discourses between individuals revealed yet failed to consider the context of one individual's written dialogue with themselves. Moreover, this everyday linguistic creativity conflicts with Cook's emphasis on creativity as cognitive (1994). He finds creativity psychological, emerging from schema refreshment: creative 'discourses are designed to disrupt and reorganize' existing knowledge (190). Therefore in the diary writing context, there remains a critical gap between the individual's creative linguistic fulfilment of identity, and the genre's lack of dialogic co-creation, re-creation of the writer's thoughts and re-installment of their existing schema.

This assignment fills the gap. It builds off the 'Pilot Study' to pursue the same individual's creativity in diary writing when writing under increasing levels of self-conscious awareness. It explores: how creativity changes through rising degrees of self-consciousness; how and why self-consciousness affects the diary's fulfilment of identity; whether its effect is positive or negative for creativity; whether the genre changes. Though this study is atomistic, using the student undertaking the assignment, it manages these limitations by drawing upon data collected and carried out across an extended time period of three months. For the purpose of reliability and authenticity, this assignment utilizes itself and its 'Pilot Study' as its sources for self-consciousness. It explores patterns and changes within diary writing in a natural setting. Examples 1.1 and 1.2 are diary entries collected prior to the module and the 'Pilot Study', from the beginning of the semester. Example 2.1 was collected immediately upon completing the 'Pilot Study' and shows the writer's heightened awareness of everyday creativity. Example 2.2 was written exclusively for this assignment and shows explicit self-consciousness. This study also references example 3, an impromptu commentary written alongside 2.2. The evidence involves three dominant patterns: language and wordplay; narrative structure; graphological and formal layout. This study extends Carter's framework, arguing for a cline of self-consciousness within the context of creativity in diary writing. It

hypothesises creativity transforms from the traditional linguistic creativity of the ‘Pilot Study’, into hybrid and inventive creativities, advancing schema refreshment through discourse deviation (Cook 1994). This investigation shows transforming creativities as positive, bettering the writer’s awareness by re-constructing and transforming their self-expression.

Firstly, there is an important connection between diary writing and the concept of face illuminates how and why self-consciousness alters creativity. Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory, though focused on dialogic social interactions, informs the diary context (1987). Positive face is an individual’s self image and personality, which they project and validate through diary writing (61). Negative face is the individuals desire to be unimpeded by others and free from imposition, satisfied by their diary’s private and autonomous context (ibid). Self-consciousness becomes a face-threatening act (FTA). This assignment impedes their expressive freedom and threatens their self-image (62). The data’s dominant pattern therefore shows increasing degrees of self-consciousness pertaining to increasingly deliberate and inventive efforts to redress and satisfy face.

The first dominant pattern shows increasing self-consciousness as transforming the writer’s self-expression through increasingly hybrid and inventive linguistic creativities. For Carter, language play creatively confers pleasure and projects identity (109). Accordingly, hybrid and inventive creativities become direct consequences of self-consciousness, the writer manipulating language play to ameliorate their perception of identity and boost enjoyment. Three sub-patterns emerge: subject matter, creative lexis, and metaphor. On the level of subject matter, the writer’s self-consciousness disposes explicit and metalingual emphasis on fulfilling the diary’s function. Examples 1.1 and 1.2, show the writer confidently deploying unimpeded self-expression, validating their self-esteem by simply recording everyday experiences. Drifting topics record absent-minded present-moment reflections (‘Can I?’ ‘here I am’) and everyday events (‘this weekend’, ‘bizarre day’, ‘that night’). Neutral summarites underline these events as unexceptional: ‘v. gd’, ‘okay’, ‘it was interesting’. The conjunctive ‘Anyway’, links paragraphs 6 times, emphasizing the discourse as insignificant and offhand. The diary’s subject matter emerges as unfettered self-expression, example 1.1 in particular foregrounding an impromptu, affective interjection despite having signed off: ‘3rd YEAR YES YES!’. Metalingual awareness remains peripheral and indifferent. Example 1.2 shows one instance: ‘just wanted to record a v. good incident in my diary’. The lexical item ‘just’, meaning no more than, emphasizes the writer’s simple desire to validate everyday experiences; the possessive adjective ‘my’ foregrounds their private intent. The original diary focuses on the writer’s self-expression and identity fulfilment through inconsequential, conventional topics.

Example 2.1 shows increasing self-awareness prompting a conscious, metalingual appreciation of the diary’s face fulfilling expectations. Though ‘house issues’ and being ‘bitched’ over trigger its subject matter, the writer shows metalingual awareness post-Pilot Study’ by exploiting the diary to deliberately devise a ‘strategy’ that focuses ‘on being’ their ‘BEST SELF’. They deploy shorter, concentrated sentences and interpolate 16 loaded pauses (-). This increasingly controlled and premeditated underlines their conscious identity negotiation. Interchanging conjunctives transcend 1.2’s cavalier ‘Anyway’s, logically connecting loaded paragraphs under its incremental subject matter, redressing the FTA (‘Basically’, ‘So’, ‘Which’, ‘Whilst’). For instance, the conjunctive ‘so’ evaluates the consequences of their actions: having ‘chatted to Holly’ they ‘realize [their] flaws’ and therefore will ‘apologize’. This understanding prompts them to ‘focus on being’ a ‘Good friend’, and their discursive pragmatism encourages a metalingual appraisal: ‘Yes yes yes, GOOD WORK’. Self-consciousness motivates a calculated control of the diary’s face fulfilling function.

Example 2.2's imminent self-consciousness motivates the writer's endeavours to redress face damage, advancing this metalingual, increasingly hybrid subject matter. Self-consciousness cues their superficial reproduction of 1.2's naturalistic topical fluidity. However, this heightened awareness ironically centralizes the subject matter onto work related topics, drifting from writing for an assignment', 'job hunting', the 'library' and the writer's student 'house this year'. This subject matter becomes ironically metalingual, the writer showing awareness of its academic intent. Furthermore, this self-consciousness inspires secondary digressions which feature to redress 2.2's topical artificiality by interpolating spontaneous, candid observations. The writer comments explicitly on using language for projecting an authentic identity: 'I feel it necessary to put this down because what is more authentic'. Interjections like 'looming assignment writing', foreground this hybrid subject matter. The writer embeds sincere, self-conscious reviews into their artificially constructed discourse.

Example 3 climaxes this sub-pattern, its hybrid, meta-fictive subject matter advancing schema-refreshment (Cook 1994). It consolidates the free flowing self-expression of 1.1 and 1.2, the identity fulfilment of 2.1, with the metalingual awareness of 2.2. The writer sincerely documents their experience: 'Writing it v. unpleasant'; redresses their FTA: 2.2 was 'contrived', 'Definite censorship' against 'a betrayal' and therefore not [them] at all'; shows metalingual awareness, identifying the commentary with the demonstrative pronoun 'this': 'Is this more sincere?!'. Their 'new self awareness!' marks explicit schema-refreshment (Cook 1994). In the context of subject matter, increasing degrees of self-consciousness cultivate hybrid, inventive diary entries that advance the writer's identity realization.

The second subpattern involves their transformational deployment of everyday creative lexis into overtly metalingual and compound forms. Examples 1.1 and 1.2 show traditional language play, enjoyably and freely projecting identity by recreating the writer's self-schema. Non-core vocabulary confirms the playful context: intimacy ('Maaaaan'), intensity ('epic', 'horrific'), and informality ('chaos'), emerges in their diary writing (Carter 119). They also project their identity through: personal phono-aesthetic inventions ('EJARHAJRHEJRA!'); patterns of idiosyncratic morphological extensions ('drunkety drunk drunk'); interjectory evaluative exclamations ('HURRAH!'); slang abbreviations ('ppl'), informally vague quantifiers ('S000 MUCH'); affective modifiers ('bizarre'). Repetition like the recurring epinome 'Anyway, 'Anyway, just..', 'Anyway, this_' and repeated abbreviation 'v.' ('very') remains a simply enjoyable rhythm (Carter 119). Everyday language play reproduces self-schemata, freely conveying identity.

Examples 2.1 and 2.2 show self-consciousness eroding the diary's intimate and informal context, motivating their transformation of everyday language play into alternate forms, cautiously preserving face. For example, core lexical items supersede non-core vocabulary. The self-conscious data shows core adjectives like 'good' (appearing 18 times), 'bad', 'nice' and 'happy'; less informal abbreviations; formal expressions replacing intimacy contours ('I am a little bit sad'); overtly neutral evaluations ('a lot more', 'a lot better'). They also remove phono-aesthetic and morphological inventions and lessen affective exclamations. The FTA of self-consciousness creates an increasingly formal and neutral register.

Nonetheless, their need for preserving face negotiates this formal and neutral vocabulary with knowing, metalingual significance. For example, 2.1 patterns core word 'good' in an expressive, evaluative motif. They belabour positive face, purposefully mediating their strategy to be a 'Good friend, Good housemate, Good listener, Good presence' through emphatic, anaphoric clauses, with verbatim echoes at the end. They show metalingual awareness in dynamically patterning a core superordinate; its clear, unambiguous meaning applicable to every context affecting greater influence on their identity. The text

gains a powerful, core mantra. The self-conscious writer produces hybrid, metalingual play, artistically manipulating core vocabulary.

Example 2.2 involves the texts parentheses, inventing further hybrid and metalingual play for preserving face. It uses extensive parenthetical digressions, 9 compared to 2 in 2.1. These mark everyday language play, embedded into a formal, feigned discourse. Parentheses contain affective and evaluative contours, fulfilling their negative face's need for unimpeded expression ('gaahaha', 'HA DISGUSTINGLY'). They reinstall informal slang abbreviations ('wtf); mock laughter ('HO HO HO'); playful voice projections; deliberate hyperbole ('nudity and horses'); ironic understatements ('she actually does sod all'). These all show the writer's discourse inside parentheses as marked by a consciously informal register, redressing 2.2's formality. Occasionally, they signal tempo changes as conscious intermissions from simply 'getting words on a page' for the assignment. For example, ('...flow...flow...floooooowwww') and ('wicked wicked wicked') show repetition prolonging instances of traditional language play, arguably restoring their endangered personality and autonomy. Overt self-consciousness generates increasingly hybrid forms of metalingual play.

Example 3 explicitly consolidates traditional language play into a meta-fictive discourse. Its face redressing subject matter progressively restores their identity, recreating an informal and intimate context where they begin to reinstall traditional language play. For example, its infrequent instances of repetition ('Wont write', 'back and back and back and back') become more prominent towards the end as language play and non-core vocabulary increases. In particular, concluding clauses show affective exclamations ('Frustrating frustrating!!', 'Baaah'); expressive punctuation ('?!'); intensity evaluations and verbatim echoes ('How horrible', 'horrible horrible horrible', 'Horrible task'); humorous multilingual interjections ('Adios'); alliteration ('Violation', 'Vile'). Considering the data as a whole, the commentary becomes most hybrid and inventive, merging everyday language play with a meta-fictive discourse.

The third subpattern involves metaphors changing from instinctual modes of perception, into consciously metalingual and schema-refreshing vehicles (Cook 1994). Metaphors in 1.2 remain natural analogies involving the writer's self-conceptualization. They notably transfer their personality, the tenor, onto the vehicle of a bird. This metaphor requires little processing: they see themselves free as a bird, their freedom resembling an ability to fly. They re-pattern familiar idioms in light of this self-schemata, for example a woman who builds a home like birds build nests, becomes old-fashioned, a 'Victorian sparrow'. They later describe themselves as in a flap' and with a 'wild animal within'. The writer's everyday metaphors reinstall self-schemata.

By example 2.1, increasing self-consciousness generates purposefully inventive manipulations. Much like their metalingual attention to core vocabulary, the writer substitutes personal self-conceptualizations, for neutral, formulaic expressions, saving face against the FM of self-consciousness. These intentionally neutral expressions endow their face-saving endeavour with proverbial objectivity, boosting their cause. For example, they conceptualize their ability to describe the problem of the 'house issue' through the idiom, '- yes - hit the nail on the head there'. This impersonal expression reduces their emotional involvement with the problem, and also diffuses the problem conceptualizing it through a mainstream expression. An additional demonstrative 'there', shows metalingual awareness of language solving the problem. The evaluative exclamation, 'yes', marks the successful linguistic performance. Therefore writing resolves the issue', generating schema-refreshment (Cook 1994). Self-consciousness increases meta lingual and deliberate metaphors for saving face.

This subpattern continues with 2.2, metaphorical spaces for informality and intimacy emerging through parentheses inside the text. These fulfil Pope's conceptualization of 'in(ter)ventive' creativities (62): parentheses intervene with the formal, metaphor-lacking

discourse, inventing metaphorical spaces for greater self-expression. The writer discloses further metaphors in these metaphorical spaces. For example, 2.2's fifth parenthetical digression markedly re-invokes 1.2's personal, self-schematic metaphor, analogizing their suffering workload as a bird 'cooped up in a cage'. The parentheses also often feature metalingual metaphors, notably ('looming assignment), conceptualizing the assignment as obscuring their writing. Parentheses mark hybrid, metaphorical spaces for the writer's reconstructed self-expression.

The commentary enlarges these metaphorical spaces, becoming an innovative macro-metaphor for the writer's self-expression and identity fulfilment. Their experiences and identity form its tenor; the self-expressive discourse forms its vehicle; its re-installment of their freedom forms its dimensions. It analogizes the writer 'walking away' from 2.2's 'v. false and contrived' text. Rising degrees of self-consciousness generate hybrid and metalingual play for advancing the writer's self-expression.

Secondly, self-consciousness forms another dominant pattern involving the diary's increasingly inventive narrative structures. Labov's framework on the transformation of experience in narrative is useful to this writer's diary (1972). Labov defines narrative as a method for recapitulating past experience through sequences of temporally ordered clauses (226). Conventional narratives regularly begin by encapsulating the events with an abstract. They then orientate the situation, present the complicating action, evaluate the events and discuss the result. Often a coda will explain the past event's relevance with the present (227). Conventional diary entries follow this structure, as writers narrate their experiences. However, Labov argues fight narratives differ: 'the evaluation of the narrative forms a secondary structure' (234). The evaluation justifies the narrative, thus subjects of fight narratives spotlight this function to project specific, desirable identities (232). This connection between identity and evaluation marks an extension of Labov's model into the context of self-consciousness and diary writing. The FTA of self-consciousness emerges as a comparable form of 'violence' on identity (232).

The effect of self-consciousness as violent can be seen in a comparison of the narrative structures in 1.1 and 1.2 against 2.1 and 2.2:

Abstract

- 1.1 'Its GOOD TO BE BACKPPIIIPP'
- 1.2 'Bizarre, bizarre day'
- 2.1 'House issues', been bitched over
- 2.2 'I am writing this for an assignment'

Orientation

- 1.1 '19th Sep'; 'uni'
- 1.2 '3rd October 2010'; 'Australian man', 'R', 'Chav', 'Harri'; 'Grantham', 'Bingham', 'London', 'London Bridge'
- 2.1 '5.11.2010'; 'Holly and Kim': 'home'
- 2.2 'today', 'last year', 'tomorrow', '2pm', '13pmish', '1st Sept' 'boiler man', 'Tariq', 'Hanne in Venice' 'Rupert', 'Flo', 'Tom', 'dad', [X]; 'th house', 'library', 'Beeston', 'big tesco', 'SA'

Complicating Action

- 1.1 'was worried'
- 1.2 'didn't have a valid ticket'
- 2.1 'the issue is my disinterest'
- 2.2 'writing this for an assignment'

Evaluation

1.1 YEAR YES YES

1.2 'Mental', 'Damn', 'mad expensive', 'amazing', '.V.gd', 'I'm okay', 'thank god for him', 'I managed', 'v.cool', 'real tired', 'Happy times', 'I felt soooooo MUCH BETTER', 'I have a license', 'so so so so good', 'v. excellent', 'Hurraaaaah for life!'

2.1 'Is all v. unpleasant', 'knows me less', 'has a fuss', 'I don't see', 'my desire to work so hard', 'my disinterest', 'it must come across', 'If I can do all of these', 'will focus on being', 'ppl I care far', 'a MUCH better person', 'happy times', 'just a test of my personality', 'One must be positive and strong!'

2.2 'in a v. weird position', 'I feel it necessary', 'more authentic' 'will be natural', 'v.happy', 'I learnt a lot more', 'I am a little sad', 'I can only be grateful', 'I do wish', 'will be excellent', 'Genuinely feeling v.gd', 'Will do my best', 'JUST to be embarrassing', 'quite literally, I think', 'Cannot wait', 'V.v.v.v excited', 'wicked news', 'was daunting', 'realize I can', 'I figure', 'I hope', 'I trust', 'do my best'.

Result

1.1 'HURRAAAAAHHARHARHAR'

1.2 'Hurraaaaah for life!'

2.1 'GOOD WORK'

2.2 not quite sure what to do', 'I'm going to finish here'

The evidence suggests two subpatterns showing self-consciousness generating increasingly inventive and hybrid narratives. First, the self-conscious writer emphasises the evaluative aspect. Examples 1.1 and 1.2 lack self-consciousness thus they confidently and positively project identity through latent evaluations like 'v. gd', 'v. cool', 'v. excellent' and simple interjections 'Hurrah!'. In contrast, the self-consciousness of 2.1 and 2.2 shows overtly comprehensive evaluation, projecting a specific identity. In 2.1 they emphasize positive evaluations marking their diplomatic and judicious character, foregrounding 'Holly and Kim's defects Ca fuss'). Comment clauses demonstrate their honesty ('I guess', 'I don't think'); contingency adverbials show redemptive humility ('the issue is my disinterest', 'I guess it comes across'); hypothetical future clauses display their optimism and adaptability (If I can do all of these....). The 'major point of the argument' is therefore identity evaluation (Labov 233). By 2.2 the FTA of self-consciousness motivates them to Introduce various, loaded evaluative clauses. Here, they emphasize the personal pronoun 'I', a feature unnecessary and omitted in 1.1 and 1.2. These feature alongside overt point of view and attitude subjuncts to further emphasize sincerity and respectability ('genuinely', 'actually', 'admittedly'). The writer assertively projects their voice through evaluative syntactical structures, overstating their personality to redress face damage.

This betrays the second subpattern, the writer's self-consciously convoluted narratives. As discussed above, examples 1.1 and 1.2 show the writer freely recapitulating pertinent, past events. Here, orientations narrow to specific, interconnected stories like being at 'uni', their 'bizarre day'. In contrast, 2.2 shows a self-conscious and public text, forcedly broadening its orientation to pursue multiple plots. Its elaborate orientation emphasises prepositional phrases, concrete quantifiers, specific nouns and times, marking a contrived and artificially accurate narrative. For example, it is unlikely the writer would otherwise specify which 'Hanne' she had 'sisterly affection' with. Ironically, this synthetic narrative damages face.

Consequently the commentary's evaluative narrative structure becomes discourse deviating and schema-refreshing (Cook 1994). It disputes conventional narrative structures,

falsity further damages face. In contrast, the lower degrees of self-consciousness in example 2.1 permit the writer to more freely manipulate the diary's form for greater face fulfilment:

Good friend
Good house mate
Good listener
Good presence

The writer unexpectedly uses right alignment to foreground the text's face redressing motto. Similarly, in example 3 they use form to explicitly transcend genre conventions and engage in a straightforward identity fulfilling transaction.

Without a date and addressee, the writer directly engages in a straightforward dialogue with themselves. The discourse becomes contingent, an ongoing dialogue lacking a concluding full stop. They use form to satisfy negative face by using form to linearly re-create their unfolding thoughts progression; they fulfil positive face by validating salient observations, foregrounding each remark's importance with its own separate line. This formal discourse deviation triggers their new self-awareness' (Cook 1994). Self-consciousness prompts the writer to break these genre's rules and better their self-expression in an inventive, reconstructive form.

In conclusion, this writer's creativity in diary writing operates along a cline of self-consciousness, their most schema refreshing, hybrid and inventive creativities emerging in its highest degrees (Cook 1994). The critical conflict identified by the 'Pilot Study' between the writer's linguistic creativity and the genre's tendency to reinstall schematic knowledge can be understood in the context of self-consciousness and the linguistic construction of face (Brown and Levinson 1987). Private and sincere diary writing fulfils face needs and wants, whilst self-consciousness marks a FTA (61). Linguistic endeavours to redress face damage prompt hybrid and inventive modes of self-expression. In particular, this writer's face redressing efforts generate a new discourse, which transforms their self-awareness and self-expression. However, this study remains small-scale and atomistic, and therefore locates questions that warrant further exploration. The main question rests on the commentary's significance: what are the implications for diary writer's if instinctual, self-conscious jottings across a blank page show greater authenticity? Does the genre change? Does their creativity diffuse if this has been done before? And does schema-refreshment and discourse deviation make the diary literary (Cook 1994)? What are the implications for creativity when self-consciousness is understood as a reaction to external readers, an 'unintended collaboration'? (Harrington in Runco and Albert 1990: 144). Does this hypothesis stay consistent against more quantitative data? And what happens if other writer's demonstrate less creativity with self-consciousness? Can creativity be judged in diary writing? These questions are important and warrant further investigation. Nonetheless, this study underlines the remarkable influence of self-consciousness on a diary writer's creativity. In the context of this writer's diary, increasing degrees of self-consciousness better their creativity as they generate hybrid and inventive channels for new self-expression.

Bibliography

- Boden, Margaret. (1996) *Dimensions of Creativity*. MIT Press.
- Bolton, Gillie. (1999) *The therapeutic potential of creative writing: writing myself*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, pp. 29-61.
- Brooks, Peggy and Jay, Timothy. (2004) 'Self-Censorship in Course Diaries', *College Teaching* 52 (3): 82-86.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, Ronald. (2004) *Language and creativity: the art of common talk*. London: Routledge.
- Cook, Guy. (1997) 'Language play, language learning'. *ELT Journal* 51(3):224-231.
- Cook, Guy. (1994) *Discourse and Literature: The interplay of Form and Mind*, Oxford University Press.
- Delafield, Catherine. (2009) *Women's diaries as narrative in the nineteenth-century novel*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Eagleton, T. (1983) *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 172-4.
- Goodman, Sharon and O'Halloran, Kieran. (2006) *The Art of English: Literary creativity*. Chapter 1. 'Literature and Creativity in English', Janet Maybin and Michael Pearce (pp. 3-48).
- Kadar, Marlene. (1992) *Essays on life writing: from genre to critical practice*. University of Toronto Press.
- Labov, William. (1972) *Language in the inner city : studies in the Black English vernacular*. Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William. (1999) 'The Transformation of Experience in Narrative'. In Adam Jaworski and Nikols Cou bland (eds). *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Lubart, T. I. (1999) 'Creativity across cultures', in Sternberg, R. J. (ed.) *Handbook of Creativity*, Cambridge: Cambridge: University Press: 339-50.
- Maybin, J. and Swann, J. (2007) 'Everyday creativity in language: textuality, contextuality and critique'. In Swann, J. and Maybin, J, (eds) *Language creativity in everyday contexts*. Special Issue of *Applied Linguistics*, 28 (4): 497-517.
- Neubauer, Joan R. (1985) *Dear Diary: The Art and Craft of Writing a Creative Journal*. Ancestry Publishing.
- Polonsky, Katarina (2010). 'Pilot Study: Commentary on Creativity in Diary Writing', BA Essay, Nottingham University.
- Pope, Rob. (2005) *Creativity : theory, history, practice*. London : Routledge.

Sarangi, S. and Coulthard, M. (eds) (2000) *Discourses and Social Life*, Harlow, Pearson, pp. 155-69.

Verdonk, Peter. (2002) *Stylistics*. Oxford University Press.

Appendix**Data 1.1**

19th Sep —

DIARY!

Um back at uni...and...

Maaan its GOOD TO BE BACKm!!!!

Was so worried — ha! HURRAH!

EJARHAJRHEJRA! HURRAAAAHHARHARHAR

XXXXX

3RD YEAR YES YES !

Data 1.2

3rd October 2010

Dear Diary.

Bizarre, bizarre day. My ticket for home i.e. Notts is dated 31st Oct! Mental. Hmmm. - no - I cant sell it now. Can i? no. Damn. Damn damn.

But anyway, - so yeah - had a huge freakout be basically didn't have a valid ticket and didn't want to spend money (mad expensive train fare) OOH found out 2day R thinks he will be on 26k this time next yr!! amazing. V.gd. will be wealthy breadwinner whilst I build nest in manner of Victorian sparrow. oh god, am at Bingham. Where the hell is Bingham? Why am I at Bingham? Bizarre.

Anyway, I'm okay. Got off at Grantham to change and had horrific moment of panic that NO TRAINS GOING TO NOTTS COS OF TRAINWORKS!!!! Called Rupes in panic - and thank god for him - was in flap and he was v. calm and rational and man. But - I want to think I did this - I managed to do this via confidence in talking to scary ppl (piercings everywhere) and discovering mad bus would arrive!! Bus to take stranded people. And thus here I am. V.gd.

Am on it now with mad Australian man. V. nice. Anyway, just wanted to record a v. good incident in my diary. - when R came to Amersham and got off train in a suit and all he had epic fight with mad Amersham chavs!! Was v. cool - v. loud stoic voice booming 'GET OFF ME NOW and chav clinging to his leg trying to steal his laptop. His legs v. long so chav ultimately failed.

Anyway this weekend. V. good. Came up to London on the Fridafy, after a v. good week. I asked about Matter which had been bothering me a lot that night and he reassured me and told me he loved me and we talked and it was all okay. J gave good advice which helped. Life's too short!

Anyway, sat I couldn't sleep so woke real tired and we just chilled all day. Watched Hey Arnold. Hail! Happy times

Anyway so after sorting out Matter I felt 50000 MUCH BETTER and suddenly all empowered and excellent that it felt just - so so so so good - to be open! To be all out there. Fully present with things finally. Its almost like I've realised the wild animal within. I have a

license to be more out there now cos he knows and I think after so many yrs its inevitable and it feels goooooood. It was interesting.

All been v.gd since.

That night had impromptu drink at London Bridge w/ Harri too! Soo so so so drunkety drunk drunk and 3 bottles of wine. Someone got their social hat on but was v. excellent to see her again hurrah!

MUST GO!

Au revoir!

Hurraaaaah for life!

Data 2.1

5.11.2010

EURGH. Home alone, in bed and ready to go to bed -
House issues today.

Is all v. unpleasant.

Basically, my “workaholic” and introspective/introvert self has been bitched about over - Holly and Kim esp. Kim - who knows me less and has a fuss about it all being “communal”.

So, I chatted to Holly and realize my flaws - but equally - I care more about my studies and close friends.

I don't see Kim as worth sacrificing an evening over -
Which, I guess, is the issue - yes - hit the nail on the head there.

So I don't think my actions as much - or my desire to work so hard etc is the issue - I guess the issue is my disinterest to them - it must come across.

So I apologized to her and will focus on being a:

(At the end of the day
If I can do all of these...)

Good friend
Good house mate
Good listener
Good presence

Whilst doing my work and being close with ppl I care for, I will feel - and be - a MUCH better person and ill get third year done in a much nicer way.
Thus my strategy is...

Good friend, Good housemate, and Good presence...
Strategy is to be my best self.

I guess this is all just a test of my personality anyway - and how I can let Holly and Kim feel good and how I can feel good...happy times

One must be positive and strong!

Yes yes yes, GOOD WORK! Positive, successful, strong and have a good time this year.

X x X

Data 2.2

Dear diary,

Am in a v. weird position. I'm not quite sure what to do. So I am writing this for an assignment - well not exclusively for an assignment, as this is still my diary but it is looming over my head. I'm actually grinning awkwardly as I write this and I feel it necessary to put this down because what is more authentic than my facial expression?!

Anyway must concentrate, get back to normal, and refocus.

Now to vent.

(but does this mean I have to keep it short so that its useful for study?! No no, will be natural and let thoughts flow...flow..floooooowwww)

Anyway, yes, so - today - just had an excellent shower (finally the boiler works! hurrah - was actually v. funny as boiler man came to fix it with Tariq here, who was bragging about buying a boiler online 'for less than £100' - boiler man overheard and gave him disgusted look - turns out is v. illegal to do this and thus we have a boiler worth a grand. Ho ho ho Tariq HO HO HO) he is actually v. nice man and am v. happy to have him this year - if a little bit socially odd.

The house this year is a lot better than last year. I don't know if it because I feel I learnt a lot more (looming looming assignment writing gaahaha!) about how to deal with housemates and housemate etiquette, or whether last year's bunch were genuinely bad. Either way, its not as great as Rupert's house - which I am a little bit sad about - I do wish I had a good family-house atmosphere at University, but I guess I had a sort of sisterly affection with Hanne in Venice so I can only be grateful that this year's so much nicer than last. Though I haven't seen [X] for a few days now, and sense she is less than happy to come into my room...v. odd...but have no time/energy to deal with it as don't really see it as an issue.

Anyway HURRAH HURRAH Rupert's coming up tomorrow!!! V.v.v.v.v.v.v.v. excited. Will be excellent - and JUST to be embarrassing and childish etc, am going to see Harry Potter with Flo and Tom tomorrow! Cannot wait. Admittedly, despise harry potter films as think Daniel Radcliffe paralyzes when acting (also v. odd obsession with nudity and horses) - anyway - then we will go to pub for long boozey lunch. Cannot wait. V.v..vv excited! Always feel locked up inside during the week working away (quite literally, I think that's why she is pissed...also [x] made a good point that [x] feels threatened because she has always been workaholic and realizes she actually does sod all just eats dominoes etc whilst im cooped up in cage upstairs).

So plan is to go library tomorrow - seeing [X] (Yay! Her kidneys are on remission too - she broke up with [X] and suddenly her kidneys seem to be healing up! Absolutely wicked wicked news) and then at 2pm I have this careers 'interview skills' thing - should be good - maybe will have food too mmmm. And then study study study till 8pmish when I'll go to the big tesco (HA DISGUSTINGLY excited about that) to get food for the weekend (man food!) and then pick up Rupes from Beeston station. YAY! Genuinely feeling v. good about life. Feels like end is in sight. - actually ventured into job hunting territory today and was daunting and quite demoralizing (cant believe they all want like, MONTHS of work experience before they even consider you!!!! I have no radio experience wtf) but I spoke to Rupes and realize I can live with him after SA -and just throw myself into job hunting, and I trust ill find something. III give myself like, a month? I figure between 1' Sept and end of Sept I should find something...I hope so anyway. Will do my best. Have also asked dad to ask [X] be I trust he will have something good going. Helped me a lot with [X].

Anyway, I'm going to finish here.

Ciao!

XxxxXxxxxXxxxxX

Data 3

Writing it v. unpleasant

Realize is not me at all

Disliked it immensely - v. false, v. contrived, v. artificial etc. really not me at all

Started off being v. self conscious - hence loads of intertextual references

Gradually loosened up and started writing more easily and naturally like this...

But still towards middle of entry, keep getting awareness of public reading came in as soon as I criticise someone - hence have inserted [X] instead of their name but don't want to continue

Started using [X]'s more often towards the end - became aware that if I am respecting first person's privacy, my close friends deserve to have their privacy respected - particularly because she has a unique name

Wont write where I worked

Wont write who I want dad to ask

Wont write details involving Rupert

Emotionally, became more private and contained my diary's content. Tried to do free flow but only to the extent that would let anyone see it

Actively limited personal creativity - abstained from metaphors, abstained from personal references - decided not to call people by affectionate names. Avoid making convoluted

Definite censorship - idea of talking about certain facets of relationship didn't even cross my mind - unspeakable in public. Hence authenticity limited in actual diary - can't discuss

Felt compelled to write faster and speed up writing speed intrinsic to expression and representation of thoughts unfolding thus more authentic and sincere in expression

Eventually managed to push through self-consciousness - but it was still there, kept coming back and back and back and back

Deliberate omission of date, location, place - rushing into content - becomes less of a diary - all about getting words on a page. Insecure, panic, unpleasant, violation

Decision to do it today with assignment fresh in mind - the choice of doing it today means I actively chose to do it FOR THE ACADEMIC SAKE of doing it. No real need to write

Tone — writing the diary v. factual, less emotional. More contrived. Very aware of what I was doing. Hmmm

Distraction — less continuity and flow

Didn't want to finish it. No personal investment in it hence less incentive — Frustrating frustrating!!

Simply can't be bothered to write it.

Resigned, lethargic, kept walking away... Must stop procrastinating

New self awareness! Will I publish this into assignment??!
This is more authentic...less rules, less paranoia...

Maybe will include commentary...

Actually, feels like a betrayal, writing my diary and knowing someone will read it. Also knowing will be judged for it. How horrible.

Is this more sincere?! My feelings,,etc...horrible horrible horrible task!

REALLY don't want to continue it...didn't realize how sensitive I am!

Baah No interest. Will say goodbye. Adios. Horrible task. Violation! Vile!

Baaah that was VILE