

some of the recordings on the accompanying CD were made in or before 1979, it would have been useful if the CD track listing (xiii) had included dates of recording and ages of the speakers at the time of recording, as any comparisons made between these are now as much diachronic as diatopic.

Minor criticisms aside, this new edition of *English accents and dialects* represents a timely and invaluable update to what is still the best single-volume textbook and introduction to varieties of English in the British Isles.

REFERENCES

- Anderwald, Liselotte (2002). *Negation in non-standard British English*. London: Routledge.
- Fletcher, Janet; Grabe, Esther; & Warren, Paul (2005). Intonational variation in four dialects of English: The high rising tune. In Sun-Ah Jun (ed.), *Prosodic typology and transcription: A unified approach*, 390–409. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foulkes, Paul (2005). Sociophonetics. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, 2nd ed., 4041–46. Amsterdam & London: Elsevier.
- _____, & Docherty, Gerard J. (1999). Phonological variation in the English of England. In David Britain (ed.), *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____, _____ (2007). Phonological variation in England. In David Britain (ed.), *Language in the British Isles*, 2nd ed., 52–74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, Howard; Baker, Susan; & Fielding, Guy (1975). Communication length as a behavioural index of accent prejudice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 6:73–81.
- Kerswill, Paul (2003). Dialect levelling and geographical diffusion in British English. In David Britain & Jenny Cheshire (eds.), *Social dialectology: In honour of Peter Trudgill*, 223–43. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Stockwell, Peter (2002). *Sociolinguistics: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Tagliamonte, Sali, & Smith, Jennifer (2002). Either it isn't or it's not: NEG/AUX contraction in British dialects. *English World Wide* 23:251–81.

(Received 18 July 2006)

Language in Society 36 (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507070807

JAKE HARWOOD AND HOWARD GILES (eds.), *Intergroup communication: Multiple perspectives*. New York: Peter Lang, 2005. Pp. viii, 277. Pb \$29.95.

Reviewed by ANGELA REYES
*Department of English, Hunter College, City University of New York
New York, NY 10021 USA
arreye@hunter.cuny.edu*

Social psychologists have long been concerned with the ways in which group categories operate in the organization of social life, but communication scholars have been slower to examine such intergroup processes. Editors Jake Harwood and Howard Giles present a pioneering collection on intergroup communication, which, they argue, deserves to stand on its own as a distinct research area. It is notable that while this volume examines intergroup issues, this endeavor is – in and of itself – intergroup in nature, bringing together the fields of social psychology and communication. Covering an impressive breadth of

social groups and contexts, the chapters in this collection draw heavily on social identity theory (SIT) in the study of intergroup communication. Linguistic anthropologists and qualitative sociolinguists investigate many of the same issues covered in this volume – most notably culture, gender, sexuality, and multilingualism – with vastly different theoretical models and methodological tools. Still, this book should appeal to all types of scholars who may be at the very least curious about how theoretical trends in social psychology and communication might inform shared areas of concern, despite what may be irreconcilable ontological differences.

Following the introduction, which presents SIT – as well as other theories that have emerged from social psychology and communication – as the common theoretical approach to intergroup communication in this volume, the book unfolds into three parts. Comprising five chapters, Part 1 examines communication within and across a wide range of social group categories: culture; gender and sexuality; language; age; and disability. In contrast, Part 2 contains four chapters that look not across social groups but across communication contexts: small group, organization, mass communication, and the Internet. Part 3 is an epilogue that promotes the benefits of self-categorization theory (SCT) in intergroup communication research. Most of the chapters contain substantial literature reviews of previous research, synthesizing and situating prior studies within a conceptual framework that underscores their contribution to intergroup communication. Several authors also identify gaps in the literature and articulate future research agendas on their chapter topics. For these reasons, this volume is extremely suitable for introductory courses at the graduate or advanced undergraduate level, but less useful to those who are interested in reading individual research studies or have questions about the data and methodology upon which arguments and conclusions are built.

Written in a straightforward and concise manner, the introduction, “Intergroup theory and communication processes,” by Harwood, Giles & Nicholas A. Palomares, justifies the need for this book, delineates the parameters of intergroup communication, situates this area of research within a central theoretical framework, and provides an overview of the structure and contents of the volume. Though one might assume that intergroup communication is communication that occurs between groups, the authors are quick to note that this is not the case. Defined broadly as communication that “occurs when either party in a social interaction defines self or other in terms of group membership” (2), intergroup communication happens only when the group memberships of individuals influence communication processes. Thus, communication between a man and a woman becomes intergroup communication only when the categories of “man” and “woman” (or other relevant social categories of the participants) are made salient. Interpersonal communication, on the other hand, is communication between people when they deal with each other as individuals. The authors do not place intergroup communication and interpersonal communication on two ends

of a continuum; rather, they argue that both types of communication likely occur simultaneously, with one being of greater or lesser relevance at different moments in an interaction.

One of the most admirable aspects of this volume is its persistent attention to matters both practical and political. For example, “‘I just want you to know that ‘them’ is me’: Intergroup perspectives on communication and disability” by Ellen B. Ryan, Selina Bajorek, Amanda Beaman & Ann P. Anas offers an empowering communicative strategy called “selective assertiveness,” which persons with disabilities can use in everyday intergroup situations. “Social identity, influence, and communication in small groups” by Michael A. Hogg & R. Scott Tinsdale and “Multilingual communication and social identification” by Itesh Sachdev & Richard Y. Bourhis overflow with insight into contemporary political process, such as emergent leadership within governments and current immigrant and language policy debates in the United States.

Yet the first thing that will likely strike the reader is the omnipresence of SIT as the theoretical underpinning of each and every chapter. Created by Henri Tajfel and colleagues in the early 1970s, SIT is an influential theory in the field of social psychology, offering an intergroup approach to the study of social identity. SIT is a theory of group behavior in a rather broad sense, informed primarily by quantitative methods. The basic principle is that people divide the world into social groups, categorize themselves into ingroups and others into outgroups, and compare groups so as to reflect positively on the ingroup. If, as a result of comparison, the ingroup is unfavorably positioned, SIT predicts that individuals will engage in assimilation, creativity, or competition to achieve a positive social identity. While the reader might appreciate the way in which SIT provides theoretical cohesion throughout the volume, it would have been refreshing if at least one chapter diverged from SIT and embraced a different theoretical base in the study of intergroup communication.

This is not to say that the chapters do not engage with other theoretical constructs. Because SIT was not formulated as a theory of language behavior, most of the chapters supplement SIT with models that are better equipped to offer insight into communicative processes. For instance, communication accommodation theory (CAT) and ethnolinguistic identity theory (ELIT), which emerged from the field of communication, are extensively utilized throughout this volume. Developed from foundational principles of SIT, these two theories offer more focused attention to the linguistic processes of intergroup communication. For this reason, the chapters that engage with CAT and ELIT tend to be more satisfying to the reader who is primarily interested in communicative behavior. Itesh Sachdev & Richard Y. Bourhis, for example, make elegant use of CAT and ELIT to shed light on micro-level interactional processes and macro-level language policy issues, respectively.

Yet for all its efforts to examine communication processes closely, this volume still, for the most part, conceptualizes language and interaction in their

broadest sense. Particularly in “Social identity theory and mass communication research” by Jake Harwood & Abhik Roy and “Intergroup dimensions of the Internet” by Tom Postmes & Nancy Baym, communication is conceptualized more as the site of analysis and less as the object of analysis. Perhaps with the exception of “Organizations as intergroup contexts: Communication, discourse, and identification” by Neil Paulsen, Phil Graham, Elizabeth Jones, Victor J. Callan & Cindy Gallois, which promotes a critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach to the examination of language use, the chapters are generally content with doing research based on what people say they do. Of course, this type of metalinguistic information is an important source of data in the study of communication; however, it can provide only a partial glimpse into the complexities of interaction. For the most part, the authors are up-front about the fact that they draw conclusions about communicative behavior based on participant reports about communicative behavior. Yet the reader often has to keep this in mind when conclusions are occasionally framed in terms of what people do as opposed to what people say they do.

Notwithstanding this criticism, which may be aimed more at the field of social psychology and less at this book, this volume is enormously significant for directing scholarly attention to the dynamic research area of intergroup communication. This collection is poised to inspire future research across several disciplines, continuing to deepen scholarly knowledge on social group and identity processes for many years to come.

(Received 1 August 2006)

Language in Society 36 (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507070819

ROY HARRIS, *The semantics of science*. London: Continuum International, 2005.
Pp. xvi, 240. Hb \$149.00, Pb \$49.00

Reviewed by RANDY HARRIS
Department of English Language and Literature, University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1
raha@watarts.uwaterloo.ca

At least back to *The language myth* (1981), Roy Harris (not related to this reviewer) has plied variations of the same salvationist argument, in his customarily grumpy and entertaining style. If you're familiar with this argument, leap ahead to the third paragraph; if not, a quick synopsis, both of the errors he wants to save us from and of the salve he wants us to buy, will best place *The semantics of science* for you.

Thinking about language – by philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, linguists, and most everyone else – is beset by a cluster of related errors, Harris says. Prime among these errors is what Harris calls the “telementation fallacy,” the notion that language exists to transfer thoughts among heads. Further, this