sions, such as Swan 1988 and Palander-Collin 1999, which suggests that the number of epistemic phrases corresponding to *I think* was not as limited in Early Modern English as Wierzbicka argues.

Despite the problems with the historical research, the message of this book is highly significant. In the modern world, where English is increasingly used as the global language, people should be aware of its "cultural baggage," the values and patterns of thought that underlie the semantics of many of its concepts and phrases. The back cover of the book expresses the hope that it will appeal not only to linguists and others concerned with language and culture, but also to everyone interested in English and English as a second language. Unfortunately, the length of the volume, over 350 pages in small print, will probably put off potential readers. I would very much welcome a popular version of this book, shorter, less repetitive, and less technical, which could be included in the course requirements for teacher training, for both nonnative and native speakers of English.

REFERENCES

Palander-Collin, Minna (1999). Male and female styles in seventeenth-century correspondence: I THINK. *Language Variation and Change* 11:123–41. Also published in her *Grammaticalization and social embedding: I THINK and METHINKS in Middle and Early Modern English*. (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 55), 228–49. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 1999.
Swan, Toril (1988). *Sentence adverbials in English: A synchronic and diachronic investigation*. Oslo: Novus.

(Received 12 March 2007)

JANET HOLMES, *Gendered talk at work*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. Pp. viii, 251. Pb $35.00.

Reviewed by NANCY L. DRESCHER
English, Minnesota State University, Mankato
Mankato, MN 56001 USA
nancy.drescher@mnsu.edu

In this book, Janet Holmes sets out to "explore some of the diverse ways in which women and men in a number of mainly white-collar, professional, New Zealand organizations manage workplace discourse, and illustrate how they re- spond to the varied contextual conditions and communicative demands of their different 'communities of practice.' " She accomplishes this goal and more.

Each chapter of the book provides a clear theoretical framework that focuses on a different aspect of gendered language. Holmes presents multiple examples to illustrate her points. Her valuable insights about gendered language allow for accessible understanding of the background that brings Holmes to her analysis.

The chapters each work as stand-alone, theoretically grounded readings, but read together, they provide a fairly comprehensive overview of the field, with in-depth coverage of gendered language within the context of the New Zealand workplace.

The first chapter delivers an extensive review of the literature, clearly situating the research within a social constructionist or "communities of practice" approach (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1992) and an interactional sociolinguistic analysis of gendered practices. This chapter is also where we get some insight into the methodology. Holmes briefly describes her ethnographic approach, which used data collected for the Wellington Language in the Workplace (LWP) project. While it would have been useful to give more attention to the methods, this introductory chapter is in itself a valuable addition to the field in that it provides a comprehensive, scholarly, and entirely readable summary of current approaches and sets the stage for understanding the rest of the book.

In chap. 2 Holmes supplies many short examples, as well as a longer case study of one manager, with clear analyses of each in order to illustrate a number of gendered ways of "doing leadership" (43). In this chapter she begins the process of systematically pulling together pieces of her research (e.g., Holmes 1997, 2000, 2005a, 2005b) along with that of other researchers (e.g., Bergvall 1996, Coates 1997, Kendall & Tannen 1997, Vine 2004) in order to create a clear picture of feminine/masculine style continua for conducting business.

Holmes uses Fletcher's (1999) concept of Relational Practices (RP) to frame the third chapter. She continues to examine concepts from the gendered practices literature and begins to incorporate the literature from organizational communication. She starts the chapter by clearly defining relational practice, using a number of examples from the LWP corpus. After insightful analysis about how people conduct relational practice according to Fletcher's framework, Holmes problematizes Fletcher's concept of RP as feminine by providing convincing examples of masculine ways of conducting RP.

Chap. 4 examines humor in the workplace. It is in this chapter that Holmes verges on examining differences between men and women. These differences, however, are framed within the discussion of normative behavior rather than making claims that women or men "do humor" in certain ways. This chapter explores two continua simultaneously. The first is the propositional orientation, which relates to the content of the message and goes from "supportive" to "contestive." The second continuum examines participants' stylistic orientation, which refers to the way in which humor is constructed and runs from "collaborative" to "non-collaborative." This chapter provides one example of the problem of missing discussion of methodology. There are particular examples that left this reader wondering how Holmes constructed her approach to the analysis. For example, example 4.15 (p. 133) examines men and women discussing "a good bloke." As part of Holmes' analysis, she says that "women and men have recognized in the course of the exchange that they have rather different views about at least some of the characteristics of '*a good bloke*'" (135). I would argue that the men in the

interaction recognize and agree with the women's stance that the man in question might not be an entirely good bloke and that he might be more part of the "good old boys' club" than a truly good man would be. Although they are teasing the women, the gender lines that they are drawing seem to be artificial ones in that the men are bringing the subject of sexism forward to point out the conflict with the man's affiliations.

Chap. 5 goes on to inspect ways of disagreeing. In this chapter Holmes focuses on the ways in which linguistic choices for disagreement construct a gendered workplace environment. This chapter comes into clear conflict with the ways in which gendered language has previously been defined. She effectively demonstrates the multiplicity of interpretations and uses of differently gendered interaction styles. She examines strategies such as avoidance and negotiation, but stops short at offering judgment about what works and what does not work.

Chap. 6 is the final chapter of direct analysis. Here Holmes focuses on the ways in which participants use narrative to construct their identities, further workplace cultural norms, and in some cases resist dominant workplace norms or reconcile conflicting professional identities. Holmes argues persuasively that narrative, like humor, provides women (and men) in leadership positions a chance to reconcile a normatively feminine identity with their authoritative (normatively masculine) roles. This chapter offers a clear example of how the lack of methodological explanation brings up questions with regard to the analysis. Holmes uses this example (ex. 6.10), from a conversation among male coworkers about how one of them likes to visit restaurant kitchens, to illustrate a normatively masculine narrative:

Cal: you'll be off to the kitchen pretty quickly though /won't you?\

Eri: /yeah I\ know yeah

Bar: cooking

Eri: after that third bottle of wine I'll be in there / () \

Bar: /[laughs]\ [laughs]: making dinner: [laughs]

Eri: /I haven't\ I haven't done that kitchen so /that'll be\ one

Cal: /yeah\

Eri: for the collection

Bar: [laughs] [laughs] you /can't you can't\ remember it:

Eri: /() [laughs]\

Mar: there's a lot of kitchens he doesn't remember (197)

This example seems problematic on a number of levels. If the definition of narrative is what we would intuitively expect (the telling of a specific event), then it is somewhat unclear how this example serves to illustrate a narrative, in that the references to any actual occurrence or event are indirect at best. Furthermore,

the co-constructed nature of the interaction seems normatively feminine, rather than masculine as Holmes seems to be arguing. The content of the humor is intuitively masculine but is not examined with reference to a clearly defined continuum. If Holmes had provided the methodological steps to her analysis, we might come to the same conclusion, but without a specific taxonomy, the example raises questions.

Holmes concludes the book with a chapter entitled "Giving women the last word." Here she provides clear and convincing discussion about how leaders in the workplace can use the various methods of integrating normatively feminine and masculine strategies to effectively construct their identities within a range of workplace cultures.

Throughout the book, Holmes offers insightful analyses of both content and linguistic features. She avoids comparing men and women, focusing on the ways men and women both choose from among various gendered discourse choices to construct and enact their identities and further their goals. While this choice is certainly dead-on with current theories of gendered language, each chapter leaves readers to question whether some of these choices were more effective than others within their particular communities of practice. The final chapter explains that one of Holmes's goals is to provide alternatives to the current stereotypes in order to establish normatively feminine ways of effective leadership. In order to meet that goal, it would have been useful to have more information about how effective the various alternatives were, and additionally to know if they were equally effective when used by men and women. Certainly within any community of practice we see people with a range of approaches to interaction, and we realize that not all of those approaches are equally effective. Holmes makes few judgments about the various styles she describes, except to say that some people are more or less comfortable with them. If the book were to be truly useful to leaders making choices about how to construct their identities, it seems that we would need to know the outcomes of the brief excerpts.

While Holmes presents a fairly extensive description of the corpus, her approach to examining the data is ultimately unclear. Her methods are never provided in a way that would be usable for subsequent analyses. Each chapter includes a great deal of information on the theoretical underpinnings of the analysis, but each leaves many aspects of the research design to the readers' imaginations. How does Holmes define and choose examples of conflict, humor, narrative, and so on? What is she leaving out? What are the definitions of the specific linguistic features to which she refers? (She often refers to gendered linguistic features such as hedges and intensifiers that support her analysis, but those features are defined only through example.)

Taken as a whole, the book is a valuable resource in the field of sociolinguistics. Holmes once again effectively examines gendered language in the workplace and provides clear ties to current theoretical frameworks. The only real shortcoming of the book is the lack of transparent taxonomies of analyses.

REFERENCES

Bergvall, Victoria (1996). Constructing and enacting gender through discourse: Negotiating multiple roles as female engineering students. In Victoria L. Bergvall, Janet M. Bing & Alice F. Free (eds.), *Rethinking language and gender research: Theory and practice*, 173–201. New York: Longman.

Coates, Jennifer (1997). One-at-a-time: The organization of men's talk. In Sally Johnson & Ulrike Hanna Meinhof (eds.), *Language and masculinity*, 107–29. Oxford: Blackwell.

Eckert, Penelope, & McConnell-Ginet, Sally. (1992). Communities of practice: Where language, gender and power all live. In Kira Hall, Mary Bucholtz & Birch Moonwomon (eds.), *Locating power: Proceedings of the second Berkeley Women and Language Conference*, 89–99. University of California: Berkeley Women and Language Group.

Fletcher, Joyce K. (1999). *Disappearing acts: Gender, power, and relational practice at work*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Holmes, Janet (1997). Story-telling in New Zealand women's and men's talk. In Ruth Wodak (ed.), *Gender, discourse and ideology*, 263–93. London: Sage.

——— (2000). Women at work: Analysing women's talk in New Zealand workplaces. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 22(2):1–17.

——— (2005a). Workplace narratives, professional identity relational practice. In Anna De Fina, Deborah Schiffrin & Michael Bamberg (eds.), *Discourse and identity*, 166–87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——— (2005b). Power and discourse at work: Is gender relevant? In Michelle Lazar (ed.), *Feminist critical discourse analysis*, 31–60. London: Palgrave.

Kendall, Shari, & Tannen, Deborah (1997). Gender and language in the workplace. In Ruth Wodak (ed.), *Gender and discourse*, 81–105. London: Sage.

Vine, Bernadette (2004). *Getting things done at work: The discourse of power in workplace interaction*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

(Received 16 March 2007)

Ofelia García, Rakhniel Peltz, Harold Schiffman, & Gella Schweid Fishman, *Language loyalty, continuity and change: Joshua A. Fishman's contributions to international sociolinguistics*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2006. Pp. xii, 180. Hb $89.95, Pb $34.95.

Nancy Hornberger & Martin Pütz (eds.), *Language loyalty, language planning and language revitalization: Recent writings and reflections from Joshua A. Fishman*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2006. Pp. xiii, 259. Hb $109.95, Pb $44.95.

Reviewed by Bernard Spolsky
Bar-Ilan University (Emeritus)
Ramat Gan, 52100, Israel
bspolsky@gmail.com

In the 15 years since the publication of the festschrift that celebrated his 65th birthday (Cooper & Spolsky 1991) and the focusschrifts that gave room to all who wished to join the celebration (Dow 1991, García 1991, Marshall 1991), Joshua Fishman (henceforth F) has continued to publish prolifically, as the updated bibliography prepared by his wife for Garcia et al. attests, and to attract