

## REVIEWS

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506210340

MIRIAM A. LOCHER, *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Language, Power and Social Process, 12. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004. Pp. xvi, 365. Pb.

Reviewed by DOUGLAS J. GLICK  
*Anthropology/Linguistics, Binghamton University*  
Binghamton, NY 13902  
dglick@binghamton.edu

This is a study of the interface between power and politeness as manifested in verbal disagreements. It begins with a number of chapters devoted to a discussion of the key concepts that define the author's theoretical conceptualization of social interaction. These concepts are power, communication, relational work, and politeness. The author then applies the model to four (transcribed) interactions. The first, and most extensively analyzed, is a dinner conversation among friends and acquaintances. The second is an organizational meeting in a physics laboratory. The final two come from official transcripts of a radio interview of President Clinton and Supreme Court proceedings relating to the vote count in the U.S presidential elections of 2000. Common to them all, in the author's view, are instances of disagreement.

Theoretically, interactants are understood to engage in two broad functional types of discourse: transactional and interactional. The former is defined as "optimally efficient transmission of information," and the latter aims at the "establishment and maintenance of social relationships" (pp. 50–51). These discourse types are understood to overlap functionally, and their overall meanings are interpreted through a process of "contextualization." Committed in general to a theory of the culturally constructed nature of social "reality" (45), the author embeds interactants in a complex web of sociocultural constructs. She thus locates the interactants' contextualization efforts at the intersection of event frames and norms. These are understood to incorporate knowledge of the "what, where and when" of event types as well as cultural knowledge, both conscious and unconscious, about social identities, gender, speaking styles, history, and the unfolding interactional context itself (57). Contextualization thus takes place when interactants judge behavior against this cultural world of frames and norms and classify it as particular kinds of events that are, more broadly speaking, negative or positive, marked or unmarked, and appropriate or inappropriate (48).

In addition to this general list of contextualizing influences, the author also, and somewhat problematically, relies on more familiar academic ideological constructs. In the constant struggle between providing information and negotiating

relationships, individuals attempt to protect whatever social “face” they may take on in a particular interaction by attempting to balance two competing functions: involvement and independence. Though interestingly distinct from some prior formulations of this now classic academic take on social interaction, the basic model here has not changed. Individuals must mediate their “efficient” transactional flow of information against the kinds of challenges that such statements can present to one’s own face or that of one’s interactants. Such “face-threatening acts” are thus to be found in the form of linguistic expressions of disagreement that further index higher-order categories of “politeness” and “power.”

In closing in on the target phenomena, Locher puts much effort into arriving at working definitions of power and politeness. She draws on an impressive array of social scientific approaches to the concept of power. In the end, she concludes with a series of principles about the nature of power in social interaction. Some of these are very general. For example, she argues that power is relational, dynamic, and contestable, and can be expressed through language (39). The three specific principles that have the potential to be applied to actual instances of verbal interaction are that freedom of action is needed to exercise power; that the restriction of an interactant’s “action-environment” often leads to the exercise of power; and that the exercise of power involves a latent conflict and clash of interests that can often be obscured because of society’s ideologies (40).

Politeness is theorized as “marked relational work” in terms of the concept of interactional face. Interactants mediate their face concerns based on the often competing functional pulls of involvement and independence. Locher calls this “relational work” (57). A polite utterance is thus understood at the theoretical level to be a “speaker’s intended, marked and appropriate behavior which displays face concern” and “the motivation for it lies in the possibly, but not necessarily, egocentric desire of the speaker to show positive concern for the addressee and/or to respect the addressees’ and the speaker’s own need for independence” (91). Politeness is thus a linguistic strategy for mediating between the opposing functional forces of involvement and independence. It is what happens when one’s utterances are called back to a “social equilibrium” between these two forces (4, 99–100). It is marked linguistic usage because it still reflects a lack of “just saying” what we mean (and being “direct”).

The abstract form of Locher’s theoretical constructs makes operationalizing them for use in analyzing particular transcripts quite challenging. The first event studied, a dinner conversation among friends and acquaintances, explores power by beginning with word counts. Following this section, about which she is herself a bit apologetic, the author turns to a detailed empirical exploration of particular “strategies” found in the transcripts. Though the link to the earlier theoretical work is unclear, she reviews and documents many interesting types of linguistic use: hedges, giving personal or emotional reasons for disagreeing, modal auxiliaries, shifting responsibility, objections in the form of a question,

the use of *but*, repetition of an utterance by a next or same speaker, and unmitigated disagreement. Her empirical work here allows her even to capture some of the specific differences in “verbal style” among the interactants.

With the focus of this part of her analysis on the expression of disagreement, Locher readily admits that power and politeness—her theoretical foci – are considered only “marginally” (113). It is here, though, that we find a central problem with this study. What are these “strategies” expressing, if not power and politeness? And, if they are, shouldn’t we be able to see the link between the theory and the empirical data much more clearly? Indeed, perhaps the most troubling fact is that although the examples are linked to a full transcript of the interaction in the book’s appendices, the empirical counts – upon which all general conclusions are based – can’t be traced in the same way. The all-important contextualization of these strategies as being related to power or politeness thus can’t really be cross-checked. Neither are they correlated with self-reports from the interactants (or any other data from native speakers), nor can they be interpretively checked in each particular context. The theoretical link here is simply to translate these strategies into the second-order theoretical language of “mitigating” vs. “non-mitigating” disagreement strategies (143).

The rest of the book focuses on “close readings” of example selections from all of the focal interactions. It is here that the disagreements are to be linked explicitly to power and politeness. Here, however, is where one finds a gap between the empirical work and the theory. Two things occur in these chapters, and they repeat consistently for each of the interactions that are reviewed here. First, analytical examples of disagreements are provided by paying close attention to their linguistic realization (as FTAs of various degrees). These are then translated (problematically) into the theoretical language of mitigated and unmitigated disagreement strategies. Second, the analysis of each interaction closes by reviewing the ways in which the examples *GENERALLY* relate to the principles that were used to define “power” and “politeness.”

With regard to the first, the problem is that quite often the “contextualization” of the examples given easily lends itself to different “close readings.” One example will have to suffice here (163). Certain lines are identified as FTAs that are said to show mostly unmitigated, direct disagreements. It becomes clear later in this segment, however, that they were intended to be humorous. The point though is not what “really” happened but the fact that these “readings,” as the author explicitly calls them, are problematic ones. They are thus even more problematic when they are read through the frame of the larger theoretical model that the author built in the first part of the book. Second, for each interaction, the conclusion that links how politeness and power are interconnected in disagreements comes only in the form of a review of the basic theoretical principles. As these are principles that constitute either indisputable opening assumptions (e.g., power is relative and negotiable) or definitions that are empirically indetermi-

nate (e.g., power requires freedom of action and restricts the environment of the other), the gap between the data and the theory is again visible.

Thus, this book is a thought-provoking but frustrating contribution to the literature on power and politeness. There is, on one hand, much to commend here. There is an attempt to study the EMPIRICAL realization of interactional categories such as disagreement, power, and politeness. The types of interactions that are selected for study reflect wise methodological choices. The transcriptions are detailed and present material that would be of interest to any student of social interaction. The theoretical reviews of key concepts, such as power and politeness, are thought-provoking and thorough. The subtle theoretical revisions of many theorists working in these areas are important ones. Accordingly, the principles that Locher arrives at are typically important opening assumptions for this kind of linguistic work. Most important, however, is her excellent theoretical understanding of the concept of contextualization (49). She also recognizes how important the process of contextualization is in the emergence of meaning in contexts of social interaction, and thus to the kind of empirical project that she presents. The frustrating irony is that this theoretical understanding of contextualization does not inform the actual analyses of her data. Although she reports that meaning cannot be contextualized without reference to cultural, subcultural, and even individual differences, she goes on to apply a series of academic ideologies to the framing of all her readings. She fails to acknowledge the ways in which they are themselves ideologies that play a reflexive role in her own particular readings of these interactions. With power defined in ways that are essentially always true to a degree – for example, one's actions limiting the freedom of the others – the foci of the study, politeness and power, are only “found” in the ideological terms of the theory itself. There is no way to link the actual utterances to arguments about the regular ways in which linguistic signs in conjunction with native ideological constructions index functional categories like “power,” “politeness,” or even “disagreement” into relative social existence. Instead, we are presented with a “reasonable” ideological construction of these phenomena, but not a reflexive investigation of them (cf. Glick 1996). We are going to have to move beyond analytical strategies that seek to document linguistic functions as if they emerged from clear “models.” We are going to have to allow a more reflexive approach that includes native ideologies in the relative constitution of these kinds of metapragmatic “ways of speaking” (cf. Silverstein & Urban 1996 for examples). This, I believe, will force us to ask what we are trying to do. Is the goal of our analysis to model what we think politeness is? Is it to predict what others think it is? Why? However we answer these questions, unless we change the way we think about such linguistic phenomena, I fear that we are not going to stop seeing ourselves in our theory, and thus in our data.

## REFERENCES

- Glick, Douglas (1996). A reappraisal of Brown and Levinson's *Politeness: Some universals of language use*, eighteen years later. *Semiotica* 109:141–71.
- Silverstein, Michael, & Urban, Greg (1996). *Natural histories of discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

(Received 5 March 2004)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506220347

### The discursive approach to polite behavior: A response to Glick

Miriam A. Locher  
Department of English Languages and Literatures,  
University of Berne  
3000 Berne 9, Switzerland  
locher@ens.unibe.ch

In his review of *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication* (2004), Douglas J. Glick raises two important points: (i) the issue of identifying politeness in language, and (ii) the ideological framework employed in language analysis. Before explicating my understanding of politeness, I need to clarify that in chap. 5 on disagreements, as Glick has noted, I do indeed focus on linguistic strategies to express different points of view without discussing politeness. For example, I deliberately refrain from labeling strategies such as boosting or hedging as more or less polite. In other words, I do not wish to imply that I have already witnessed manifestations of politeness by simply identifying hedged utterances (or indirectness), nor that I have witnessed impoliteness by identifying unmitigated linguistic strategies (or directness). In this way, my approach to politeness differs significantly from the more classical view, initiated by Brown & Levinson 1987 and followed by many others, which equates mitigation with politeness and directness with impoliteness. Conversely, in my understanding, I use “mitigation” as a purely technical term, and I make no claim that any given linguistic form is inherently polite or impolite.

With the knowledge gained about the linguistic strategies employed to express disagreement by the interactants of my data, I proceeded to the second level of analysis, in which I look at relational work and offer “close readings.” I use the latter term for the process of interpretation that looks at the interaction turn by turn in order to discuss its dynamics. This process is necessarily the researcher’s reinterpretation of what happened. I explicitly leave open the possibility for a (limited) number of alternative readings, which must be informed by the theoretical framework proposed. My definition of politeness also leaves open the possibility for different perceptions (2004:91):

Politeness for the speaker: A polite utterance is a speaker’s intended, marked and appropriate behavior which displays face concern; the motivation for it

lies in the possibly, but not necessarily, egocentric desire of the speaker to show positive concern for the addressees and/or to respect the addressees' and the speaker's own need for independence.

Politeness for the addressee: Addressees will interpret an utterance as polite when it is perceived as appropriate and marked; the reason for this is understood as the speaker's intention to show positive concern for the addressees' face and/or the speaker's intention to protect his or her own face needs.

What is important to stress here is that there is no guarantee that what one speaker intends to be (im)polite is also perceived to be (im)polite by the recipient. Although this statement may hark back to the more general wisdom that a message sent is not necessarily a message received, it is nevertheless crucial to recognize this for the level of relational work involved in language. Far too often in the aftermath of Brown & Levinson's theory, entire populations have been labeled "positive" or "negative politeness" cultures, on the basis of equating linguistic strategies on a one-to-one basis with politeness. What is meant and perceived as polite in a given context, however, will depend on judgments of appropriateness and markedness. These judgments are based on cultural knowledge of NORMS of appropriateness, and these are – as we all know – constantly changing. This understanding of politeness is further developed in Locher & Watts 2005, where we call it "the discursive approach to politeness" and stress that there is an ongoing struggle over forms of appropriateness in any given group of people over time.

In my analysis of language in use, I wished to move away from a clear-cut dichotomy between polite and impolite behavior, and in particular to leave open the interpretation for behavior that is considered unmarked and neither polite nor impolite. This latter interpretation is rarely available in the literature on politeness, most of which automatically treats everything that is not polite as impolite. In my close readings, therefore, I attempted to look for markedness and offered INTERPRETATIONS of possible instances in my data that may be OPEN to an interpretation of politeness by the interactants.

The second issue that I would like to address briefly is Glick's concern about the ideologies that we as researchers impose on our work. I agree that it is crucial that the framework employed is made clear from the very beginning (see my theoretical chapters). It is equally important to read others' work with an open and critical mind, perhaps to detect ideological underpinnings that might not have been discussed enough. But at the end there is no neutral, non-ideological way of approaching language studies or even of using language in any context for any purpose. Our own education and training and who we are will always have an impact on the way we conduct our research. The best we can do is to be as transparent as possible and to acknowledge our own limitations in this respect.

At the end of his review, Glick raises these questions: "Is the goal of our analysis to model what we think politeness is? Is it to predict what others think it

## REVIEWS

is? Why?" For my own research, I can state that it is not my aim to impose my own culturally dependent understanding of politeness on others, nor is it possible to predict IN GENERAL what others may think politeness is, for the reasons mentioned above. I strongly believe, however, that an approach to politeness that is aware of the discursive nature of this phenomenon and nevertheless tries to find evidence of it in minute analysis of natural data can illuminate language in use and constitute a first step in moving politeness research away from simply equating linguistic form with social function.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, Penelope, & Levinson, Stephen C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Locher, Miriam A. (2004). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- \_\_\_\_\_, & Watts, Richard J. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1:9–33.

(Received 26 October 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506230343

ANETA PAVLENKO & ADRIAN BLACKLEDGE (eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2004. Pp. 312. Hb \$44.95.

Reviewed by SYLVIE ROY  
Faculty of Education, University of Calgary  
Calgary, Alberta Canada T2N 1N4  
syroy@ucalgary.ca

This is one of the best books I have read this year. The topic is up to date and relevant for many contexts. Each author contributes to the originality of this edited book. The editors, Pavlenko & Blackledge, have done a wonderful job in putting together a series of texts that demonstrate how negotiation of identities is embedded within larger socioeconomic, sociohistoric and sociopolitical contexts. In order to situate their own framework, the editors start by examining different approaches to the negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. The sociopsychological approach examines the negotiation of identities in second language learning and language use. However, this approach treats learning trajectories as linear and unidirectional, with little acknowledgment of the fact that learning language and identity building are more complex. Interactional sociolinguistics focuses on the negotiation of identities via code-switching and language choice. This approach sees social identities as more fluid and constructed through linguistic and social interaction. However, even though much sociolinguistic research examines the negotiation of languages choices and identities in

multilingual contexts, Pavlenko & Blackledge claim that few have tried to theorize it. In this book, they propose a poststructuralist and critical theory approach to negotiation of identities. Based on the work of Gal 1989, Heller 1988, 1992, 1995a, 1995b, and Woolard 1985, 1989, 1998, the editors argue that language choice in multilingual contexts is embedded in larger social, political, economic, and cultural systems. Their interest is in how languages are used to legitimize, challenge and negotiate specific identities, and to open new identity options for groups and individuals who are subjugated. Their framework combines aspects of the social constructionist approach, which focuses on discursive construction of identities, and the poststructuralist emphasis on power relations. The editors explain in detail what they mean by identities embedded within power relations with the work of Bourdieu. They also focus on identity narratives that reconstruct the links among past, present, and future, and they impose coherence where it was missing.

The book has four central themes: (i) Linguistic and identity options are limited to specific sociohistoric contexts, contested and reinvented; (ii) diverse identity options and their links to language varieties are valued differently; (iii) some identity options may be negotiable, while others are imposed or assumed; and (iv) individuals are agentive and are constantly seeking new social and linguistic resources that allow them to resist identities, produce new identities, and assign alternative meanings to the links between identities and linguistic varieties.

In chap. 1, Aneta Pavlenko discusses narrative identities constructed in the autobiographies of immigrants to the United States at the beginning of the 20th century, who discuss their stories of assimilation. She explores ways in which these immigrants imagine and legitimize new identities for themselves and their fellow immigrants. She also compares the autobiographies of the first immigrants with those of the ones who are writing now. She shows how some immigrants imagined themselves as legitimate Americans, while racial minorities (e.g., Asian immigrants) had no access to the negotiation process. She demonstrates how second language learning is more powerful now for immigrants in their memoirs than in the past, when national identity was more a concern for them. I particularly enjoyed this chapter because it demonstrates the difference between the past and the present in immigrants' narratives, and how second language learning is more difficult now than it was in the past, for different reasons.

In the second chapter, Adrian Blackledge examines how the "race riots" in northern England in 2001 challenged English legislation. Blackledge analyzes speech and texts from the British Parliament in order to understand the discourses on learning English for new immigrants; he discovers that understanding English is linked with good race relations, and that "good English" has become a condition for social cohesion. The language debate is a struggle over whether English people can be multilingual when English is thought of as the route to assimilation and homogeneity for new immigrants.



In chap. 3, Meredith Doran proposes a study on the use of the variety “verlan” in suburban Paris and how children use this language to build a third space. This chapter looks at young people using verlan as a mediation tool between themselves and as a means of distinguishing themselves from mainstream French speakers.

In chap. 6, Giampapa examines how three Italian-Canadians negotiate their identities in relation to the notion of center and periphery from different perspectives (workplaces, peer relations) (Giddens 1984, Grimard & Labrie 1999). In this chapter, the author demonstrates well how the discourses of identity, language, and the representations of *italianità* play a defining role with regard to who is at the center and who is at the periphery. The author demonstrates how some identities are negotiable and others are not.

In chap. 7, Celeste Kinginger presents four years in the life of Alice, an American girl who wanted to learn French and went to France, having been attracted by myths and false ideas about France. In the chapter and after reading Alice’s notes, we discover how Alice had to negotiate her social, linguistic, gender, and class identities. She had a mission when she went to France, and she was disappointed at first. She expected some cultural consciousness; she thought that everyone would be “cultural”; she thought that she would meet a lot of people and they would invite her into their lives. By the end, she made contacts with natives and discovered that learning a second language requires effort, and she had to focus to continue to learn. In this essay, Kinginger demonstrates how social practices are relevant to the foreign language learning field.

All the chapters are very well written. They all make effective use of data (texts, interviews, observations, journals) to make their points. All the authors know how to apply their ethnographic or discourse analysis methods profitably. The book is interesting, and one of a kind in the field of sociolinguistics and critical discourse analysis. It is also very useful for teachers or anyone interested in second language learning and the construction of identities. At the end, I was disappointed only by the fact that I would have liked the editors to provide a concluding chapter, as I didn’t want the book to end.

## REFERENCES

- Gal, Susan (1989). Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18:345–67.
- Giddens, Anthony (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Grimard, Marcel, & Labrie, Normand (1999). Silence, mots-tabous et hégémonie, ou comment les gais et lesbiennes francophones produisent un discours identitaire. Paper presented at 28<sup>e</sup> *Colloque annuel sur l’analyse de la variation linguistique*, N.W.A.V.E., Toronto, October.
- Heller, Monica (1988). *Code-switching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (1992). The politics of codeswitching and language choice. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13:123–42.
- (1995a). Language choice, social institutions, and symbolic domination. *Language in Society* 24:373–405.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1995b). Code-switching and the politics of language. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 158–74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Woolard, K. (1985). Language variation and cultural hegemony: Towards an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory. *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 66:85–98.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1989). *Double talk: Bilingualism and the politics of ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin et al. (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*, 3–47. New York: Oxford University Press.

(Received 20 January 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S004740450624034X

COLIN B. GRANT (ed.), *Rethinking communicative interaction: New interdisciplinary horizons*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp. 325. Hb, \$95.

Reviewed by JOSÉ ANTONIO FLORES FARFÁN  
CIESAS, Tlalpan 14000  
Mexico City, DF, Mexico  
flores@ciesas.edu.mx

Reading *Rethinking communicative interaction* (henceforth *RCI*), I realized that the final word of the subtitle, “horizons,” is an accurate allusion to the main difficulty and contribution of the book: the quest for interdisciplinarity. *RCI* advances the idea of communication as a fiction; the same applies to interdisciplinarity, a commonplace in the social sciences to which *RCI* at least contributes a “programme,” as Colin Grant suggests in his Introduction, acknowledging the difficulties of “pluri-disciplinarity.” A wealth of sources to advance such an ambitious project is presented. *RCI* develops key methods to fulfill the interdisciplinary endeavor: ways of bridging the macro and micro gap by studying the connection of the self’s participation in the social construction of the communicative process and the interplay between linguistic and biological facts in human evolution and language acquisition, among others.

Most telling in regard to the state of the art of communication studies, *RCI* oscillates among many approaches that reflect methodological, political and ethical dilemmas related to different orders of observation: Bakhtinian theory embracing dialogical analyses (Ivana Markova’s “Dialogicity as an ontology of humanity”), computational neuroscience (Bernd Porr & Florentin Wörgöter’s “Autonomy, self-reference and contingency in computational neuroscience”), theoretical debates in the sociology of communication (Loet Leydesdoff’s “Interaction versus action in Luhmann’s sociology of communication), communication and cognition in second language use (Beatriz Mariz Maia de Paiva), ethnomethodological analysis of language games (Brian Torode), an ergonomic approach to conversation (Mario Cesar Vidal & Renato José Bonfatti); even more “applied” research – as described in Kesi Mahendran’s “The dialogues of a Young

Person's Centre" with its reflections on the need for shifting the balance of power in the doing of research. Moreover, in *RCI*'s final chapter, "Constructing the uncertainties of bioterror," Austin Brabow & Mohan Dutta-Bergman allude to the incipient possibility of bridging the gap between academic work and public opinion, a badly needed exercise in public sociology or anthropology. Since it is impossible to discuss all this wide diversity here, I concentrate on what I find most appealing for the readers of *Language in Society*.

Theories of interaction are usually far behind actual empirical phenomena, as witnessed in new forms of communication such as the Internet (Crystal 2002), an interesting study of which is found in *RCI*, "'Flaming' in computer mediated interaction" (Avgerinakou). This invites rethinking both the universal claims sustaining current theories of communication and their empirical bases. To cope with the ecodynamics of the often-denied phenomena of uncertainty, contingency, vagueness, or the role of the self in shaping communicative realities, *RCI* revisits communication from at times overtly antagonistic historical and philosophical traditions, ranging from information theory to reproduction theories, symbolic interaction, and phenomenology. While such developments nurture the debate on the nature of communication, facing key albeit fuzzy issues such as the self's role in communicational variability, *RCI* ironically emphasizes the lack of cross-disciplinary fertilization between different social sciences, such as the tradition of linguistic anthropology (see the recent collections of Goodwin & Duranti 1992 and Gumperz & Levinson 1996, which also invite rethinking communication).

Dialogicity is key to defining communication, as the idea of co-authorships advanced by Marková suggests, from the perspective of both the analyst and speakers themselves. But dialogue is seen as the field of conflictive interactions and their resolution, as in Davey's exploration of the fictionality of dialogue and subjectivity in contending interpretations of individual biographies suggests. This not only permits a critique of solipsistic approaches to language, with their essentialist perspectives, but also enables conceiving dialogicity and communication as conflictive, not just as reciprocal and mutual, appealing to different levels of interaction organization, both universal premises as well as the specific political economy of languages.

Opposing cognitive to representational approaches, echoing heteroglossic voices in the human sciences, *RCI* shows that against received paradigms, which view the ontogenetic development of the self as an instructional process, knowledge and the development of the self cannot be conceived as corresponding to an "objective, external reality." Rather, cognition is a proactive (constructivist) process. Contributions to understanding the role of the self in the complex construction of communicative variability include the concept of autopoiesis, with its implied "organizational closure," which allegedly allows for self-imputation of the individual's identity and its (relative) cognitive autonomy. Such conceptualizations view language as an instance in which all individuals socially recognize

themselves, albeit allowing for self-perception and differentiation, as unique participants in interaction, giving rise to personal experience and consciousness. Along these lines, in the chapter “Language, communication and the development of the self,” Renato Proietti opposes the reduction of language to its referential function, opening up the distinction between inter- and intra-subjectivity. As an excellent illustration of an interdisciplinary approach in *RCI*, Proietti leads us through the connections of the development of cultural and material artifacts. The “progressive expression” of “the non-linear rules” of human evolution corresponds to different stages in the emergence of linguistic abilities, from the vocal grooming of the macaque to the “vocal and body language expressions” of *Homo erectus*, to the emergence of *Homo sapiens*, with its “looking glass self,” enabling the first forms of “mentalism” and incipient alter-ego constitution. This is parallel to the barely explored field of early language acquisition in which the newborn develops “emotional schemata,” ranging from the non-self-conscious emotions embedded in protolanguage and conversation to the awareness of the self, materializing in feelings such as shame and pride in the first year of existence and foundational of the emotional substrate of the human being. Thus, cognitive abilities are not a reflex of a presumed objective reality, but rather the interplay of emotive and referential knowledge that gives rise to the appropriation of meaning by the persona.

Opposing the concept of the sovereignty of the self characteristic of Western thought, *RCI* opens up the possibility of conceiving interaction as dominated by teleological (power) issues. The array of perspectives contained in *RCI* provides a wealth of elements to explore the complexity of human interaction in *hic et nunc* situations. *RCI* also theoretically explores the series of paradoxes that enable the possibility of communication, such as the “openness by closeness” of human communication (Luckman), or what I have called the “conversational paradox” (Flores Farfán 2003). Such paradoxical complexity of communication is reviewed in Grant’s “Complexities of self and social communication.” Exploring what Leydesdoff terms “the communicative turn,” going beyond the concept of referentiality that has dominated linguistic thought ever since Saussure’s linguistic turn, the concept of fictionality is an important one in this respect. Cognition in relation to communication is conceived as the “closure” of the individual mind to which the individual has a privileged access, while simultaneously facing the contingency of social interaction – another paradoxical fiction or “form of indeterminate determination” (Grant 2003:103). Developing a critique of monologism and stability in communication, Grant appeals for a substitution of presumed universal principles such as Habermas’s validity claims. But how can intersubjectivity be possible with only contingency and complexity? If communication is a fiction, it is a consensus fiction by which actors orient themselves in interaction; that is, communication operates by means of “functional fictions” (Schmidt). I see no dramatic difference between this approach and the classical ideas of phenomenology’s anticipations of reciprocal perspectives (Schutz 1973),

as different ways of phrasing the conditions of possibility for human communication. What I found most valuable in the theory of fictionality is a set of concepts (such as the porosity of communication) to account for social human interaction in EMPIRICAL situations – that is, at the level of specific rather than universal pragmatics. After all, connecting (presumed) cognitive autonomy to social orientation as a homeostatic coupling of expectations is not so different from the rational counterfactual orientation of Habermas’s ideal speech situation. The concepts advanced by *RCI* are all valuable additions to our means of understanding the complex, multiphasal phenomenon of interaction in human communication. If, as Grant states, meaning escapes nothing, not even the negation of meaning, or as Schmidt’s doublets suggest, communication should be seen in terms of “the fictions of fictions,” “the reflexivity of reflexivity,” or “the imputation of imputations,” the idea of the “double contingency of communication” might be a gateway to reconcile universal and empirical pragmatics, advancing a deeper understanding of language in society.

## REFERENCES

- Crystal, David (2002). *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
 Flores Farfán, José Antonio (2003). Al fin que ya los cueros no van a correr: The pragmatics of power in Hñahñu (Otomi) markets. *Language in Society* 32:629–58.  
 Goodwin, Charles, & Duranti, Alessandro (eds.) (1992). *Rethinking context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
 Gumperz, John J., & Levinson, Stephen (1996). *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
 Schutz, Alfred (1973). *Collected papers: The phenomenology of the social world*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

(Received 24 January 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
 DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506250346

LINDSAY AMTHOR YOTSUKURA, *Negotiating moves: Problem presentation and resolution in Japanese business discourse*. Oxford: Elsevier, 2003. Pp. xxi, 370. Hb \$85.00.

Reviewed by SHOJI TAKANO  
 English Department, Hokusei Gakuen University  
 Sapporo 004-8631, JAPAN  
 takano@hokusei.ac.jp

*Negotiating moves* contributes to the understanding of typical negotiation strategies shared by Japanese business professionals, with an emphasis on empiricism. Given that only anecdotal evidence is available from prior investigations of Japanese conflict management, Yotsukura conducted her study based on a large number of naturally occurring interactions extracted from more than 540 authentic business calls at companies in the Kanto (eastern) and Kansai (west-

ern) regions of Japan. Major thrusts of this study include its ingenious framework of analysis, which goes beyond the traditional “context-free” approach of conversation analysis (CA) (p. 2). It integrates ethnographic dimensions into analyses and interpretations and adapts the Bakhtinian notion of speech genres. Genres are derived from commonalities and shared communicative activities that native speakers are assumed to develop through recurring experiences in their everyday lives. This study also rigorously explores cultural reasons why Japanese people behave linguistically in certain ways, based on some metalinguistic traits unique to the culture. While it may be quite debatable whether all of these theses bear fruit in research outcomes, the actual negotiating processes to which Japanese business professionals typically resort are well documented and described in a manner comprehensible even to a general audience, as well as to learners of Japanese as a foreign language.

Chap. 1 presents the theoretical framework of the study, which stresses the necessity of accommodating ethnographic elements in the analysis and the utility of Bakhtin’s notion of speech genres as a heuristic tool for identifying the rigid rules of interaction observed by Japanese people in a particular communicative situation, such as telephone calls. Following brief critical overviews of previous studies on Japanese business discourse and negotiation, as well as those in a Western context, actual spoken data and their sample analyses are presented, along with a brief introduction to language-specific elements such as *maeoki* ‘pre-announcements’ and the extended predicate construction (*n[o] da, n[o] desu*). In the end, the author presents the four specific goals of the study: (i) to describe how the service recipient facing problems conveys information to the service provider; (ii) to identify what particular types of linguistic functions and forms the service provider typically uses in response to problem reports; (iii) to account for the ways in which those functions and forms identified in (ii) are linked to the notion of speech genres as well as larger cultural norms and values; and (iv) to supply practical information to linguists, business professionals, and teachers of Japanese regarding Japanese ways of problem presentation and resolution that are cross-culturally distinctive.

Based on a critical review of the potential deficiencies of linguistic data elicited by such intuition-based tasks as discourse completion and questionnaires, chap. 2 first discusses the rationale for data elicitation, particularly arguing for the advantages of ethnomethodological approaches to naturally occurring interactions. The present database is then described in detail in terms of collection methods, volume and quality, informants, and the purposes – the study of problem reports and their resolution. The rest of the chapter is devoted to formal discussions of various definitions of speech genre as well as register and style, relevant findings of prior CA studies (e.g., adjacency pairs) with illustrative examples from the present database, and a review of previous studies on offers in Japanese.

Chap. 3 centers on structural descriptions of the canonical structure of Japanese business telephone calls. The canonical sequential organization consists of reciprocal call openings involving self-identification, formal salutations and personal greetings, transitional moves to business transactions with extensive use of *maeoki* in conjunction with the extended predicate, the main points of business (to be discussed in detail in chap. 4), pre-closing strategies, and closing moves with a variety of terminal routines. Specific linguistic features that are typically used in many of those phases are also described, and their illocutionary functions are interpreted as “contextualization cues” (168). For example, a *maeoki* statement with the extended predicate *moosiwake nai n desu ga* ‘it’s that it’s inexcusable, but’ can function as a transitional device to help the participants zoom in on the upcoming reason-for-call or the topic of business. In addition, some cultural explanations of those features are explored. For example, such strategies of “company-affiliation-as-self-identification” as *Kansai Yunyuu de gozaimasu* ‘This is Kansai Imports’, which is typical of call openings, are attributed to Japanese emphasis on “situational position rather than individual attributes in a given frame,” which is fostered by strong group consciousness and orientation prevalent in the culture (107–8).

Chap. 4 provides more detailed accounts of three specific types of business transactions: general inquiries, merchandise orders, and shipping confirmations. The author stresses striking similarities in the sequential organization of moves commonly exploited by the participants in each of the transactional types. Those similarities are again colored by extensive use of *maeoki* and the extended predicate construction.

Chap. 5, the nucleus of the book, deals with Japanese culture-specificity in problem presentation and resolution based on two contrasting types of conversations, which are labeled as interactional “synchrony” and “asynchrony” (203). In the synchronic negotiation, a service recipient (trouble-teller) and a service provider (solution-giver), who interact with each other on a regular basis, work smoothly together toward an amicable resolution, whereas in the asynchronous negotiation, two parties who share no established business relationship face some difficulties in communicating their intentions. In both cases, however, the generic organization of a series of negotiating moves, as well as particular linguistic features adopted (e.g., the extended predicate, conjunctive particles such as *kedomo* ‘but,’ the consultative *-masyoo ka?* ‘shall I/we ... ?’), are strikingly similar. Elements of Japanese *maeoki* are also commonly used to frame the context of problem reports effectively.

The author argues that the key to success in reaching a satisfactory resolution lies in the participants’ familiarity with or cultural knowledge of this particular genre, which has been shaped over time through recurring everyday encounters in the culture. As evidence that the above-mentioned patterns of problem report and resolution are specific to Japanese culture, the author compares them with

interactions of a similar type from English. Though the author admits that the English database is rather limited in terms of both quality and quantity, her analyses seem to indicate that Japanese problem reports differ from their English counterparts in terms of sequential organization of moves and the alignment of turns between the caller and the recipient, and also that they are less direct, with more mitigating devices and hesitation markers. As for problem resolution, Japanese strategies and English equivalents are quite parallel, with synchrony as the interactional goal. But the former in particular can be characterized by stronger cultural preference for maintaining harmony. For example, the extended predicate, along with conjunctive particles (e.g., *ke[re]do*), is exploited to create a common ground between the trouble-teller and the solution-giver, which represents another negotiating device – called *nemawashi* ‘groundwork preceding formal decision making’ – that is unique to Japanese culture.

In chap. 6, the author tries to tie what has been discussed in the preceding chapters to a wide range of well-known Japanese cultural norms and values in order to account for why Japanese business calls are conducted as they are. While what the author calls “metalinguage” concepts, such as *ki* and *sassi*, *omoiyari* and *kikubari*, *ma*, norms of *enryo-sassi* communication, *uti-soto* deixis as well as high-context cultural traits are all clearly explained, her argument here seems rather shaky, in that the observed phenomena are related exhaustively to abstract descriptions of cultural values and norms, but the argument suffers from a critical lack of direct support from her empirical findings discussed in the preceding chapters.

In chap. 7, “Conclusions,” the author evaluates how the above-mentioned four goals of the book are met, summing up all her major findings and arguments regarding the culture-specific strategies for reporting problems and arriving at appropriate resolutions. In doing so, she sets up further inquiries to recapitulate the main points of her findings as well as highlights the significance of the notion of genre, which is closely linked to the behavioral norms of the culture in question. The chapter ends with a few comments on potential topics for future research that might build upon the results of the book.

Although the overall objectives of this book are quite appealing and its innovative framework of analysis, which supplements CA tradition with the affirmative use of an ethnographic perspective, is, I believe, on the right track, it seems to me that the author’s ambitions are not fully accomplished, producing research outcomes partly incompatible with what the reader expects to gain from the book. The fundamental problem I find with this study is an overgeneralization of complex realities, which is typically derived from the lack of an internal perspective – the indigenous standpoint of the members of a given culture (Saville-Troike & Johnson 1994). One of my foremost reactions against this study is concerned with the author’s a priori, at times stereotypical presupposition that Japan consists of a single culture in which all its members put the same cultural norms and



values into practice in harmony (chap. 6). Though I do not mean to reject the idea that those behavioral norms are a significant part of the very foundation of Japanese culture, I, as a legitimate member of the culture, cannot help acknowledging the other, “dark” side of indigenous realities: It is a too common experience, even for the members of this allegedly homogeneous culture, to be displeased with or even offended by the consequences of service encounters (Hama 1996, 2000). This quite ordinary breakdown in the cultural model of negotiation is presumably due to a mismatch between the participants’ expectations regarding those behavioral norms and their variable ways of practicing them in actual social interactions.

Throughout the book, however, the author highlights as the culturally constructed genre exclusively the commonalities of Japanese negotiating moves based predominantly on ordinary interactions between the informants who share regular business contact. Though the author provides a very brief sketch of interactions between people with no established business affiliations (e.g., the *Hahaha no hanasi* call), I believe that the very target for this study to fully accomplish its general objectives should rather be the other type of business negotiation, one that is potentially threatening to the participants’ expectations regarding cultural norms and values. Although the author’s findings provide very useful information on “typical” patterns of negotiation, particularly for such readers as learners and teachers of Japanese as a foreign language, internal diversity or “atypical” elements in the use of negotiating moves are perhaps a more critical part of the reality experienced by the members of the culture. I believe that more extensive discussions of the latter type, in which behavioral norms are breached and the participants are obliged to exploit culturally appropriate strategies for remedy, would provide a true service for potential readers such as business professionals who are likely to confront serious conflict.

The overgeneralization of Yotsukura’s theses can also be confirmed by some empirical evidence from domestic studies on regionality in service communication. While the author points out the scarcity of research on Japanese negotiation from naturally occurring interactions, this perception turns out to be mistaken once we extend our scope of literature reviews to adjacent branches of scholarship. In fact, we can find a great deal of empirical evidence against Yotsukura’s thesis of homogeneity in Japanese business negotiations, provided mainly by industrial psychologists working in Japan. Some of their studies eloquently demonstrate that Japanese patterns of communication in service encounters via telephone (Hama 1995, 1996, 2000) are far from being homogeneous, with a great deal of regional variation. Hama (1996, 2000), for example, compares service providers’ responses to inquiry telephone calls at hotels, travel agencies, and restaurants in various regions, including Tokyo (Kanto region) and Kyoto and Osaka (Kansai region), and finds regional differences to a statistically significant extent for many of the variables investigated. As for Kanto

(Tokyo) vs. Kansai (Osaka, Kyoto) regions – the two research sites of this book – the former is characterized as being least informative and dry in manner of response, whereas the latter is described as highly informative and more conscious of professionalism.

Despite these empirical facts, Yotsukura deals with the two major subcultures in Japan (Kanto and Kansai) as a single cultural entity. For her claims and arguments to be more persuasive from an indigenous point of view, however, the possibility of regional differentiation in her corpora needs to be addressed in some way for a future study. More specifically, I would suggest that the author at least provide some quantitative evidence to demonstrate to what extent the patterns of negotiating moves she identifies are actually shared by the two subcultures, since the primary concern of the book is a high degree of ubiquity in language use. Furthermore, the author should indicate some objective yardstick for what proportion of the entire database of 540+ calls represents “typical” or canonical patterns of negotiating moves shared by the members of Japanese culture, and what proportion was left out of consideration because of its deviant nature. None of these types of information is available to the reader. I am aware that such quantitative accounts are not contingent to the traditional CA approach, but they certainly lead to whatever the author intends to establish as the new framework of analysis of conversations.

Putting aside these fundamental questions, I find this study highly successful, particularly in portraying the vivid processes of negotiation typically employed by Japanese business personnel. In addition, the author’s analyses and interpretations of the phenomena are generally precise and trustworthy. Her insight into a fruitful integration of CA and an ethnographic perspective is promising, and I certainly hope that this kind of theoretical challenge to the status quo will contribute to the emergence of large-scale discussions of analytical approaches to discourse for the future progress of the discipline.

## REFERENCES

- Hama, Yasuhisa (1995). *Sekkyaku komyunikeeshon no chiiki hikaku kenkyuu* [A comparative study of regional differences in service communication]. *Proceedings of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Japan Group Dynamics Conference*, 116–17.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1996). *Denwa ootai no chiiki hikaku kenkyuu* [A comparative study of regional differences in telephone call response]. *Proceedings of the 63<sup>rd</sup> Japan Applied Psychology Conference*, 92.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2000). *Saabisu no chiikisei to shoohi koodoo* [Regionality in service and consumer behaviors]. In Kazuhisa Takemura (ed.), *Shoohi koodoo no shakai shinrigaku* [Social psychology in consuming behavior], 130–41. Kyoto: Kita-ooji Shobo.
- Saville-Troike, M., & Johnson, D. M. (1994). Comparative rhetoric: An integration of perspectives. In L. F. Bouton & Y. Kachru (eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

(Received 25 January 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506260342

NEIL DEVOTTA, *Blowback: Linguistic nationalism, institutional decay, and ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004. Pp. 204.  
Hb \$55.00, Pb \$22.95.

Reviewed by PATRICK EISENLOHR  
*Department of Anthropology, Washington University*  
*1 Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1114, St. Louis, MO 63130-4899*  
*peisenlo@wustl.edu*

In this well-argued analysis of linguistic nationalism and ethnic conflict, Neil DeVotta places more weight on language than do most other accounts of conflict and civil war in Sri Lanka. DeVotta's main argument is that language politics informed by linguistic nationalism was not just one among several forces leading to the breakdown of peaceful coexistence of the Sinhalese and Tamil communities of the island, but indeed the single most important cause of the conflict and its later violent manifestations. Accordingly, the 1956 decision by the Colombo government to declare Sinhala the sole national language of Sri Lanka represents the crucial turning point in the relationship between ethnic Sinhalese and Tamils on the island. DeVotta argues that the 1956 Official Language Act was motivated by a desire among leaders of the Sinhalese majority to facilitate socioeconomic mobility among their ethnic constituency, and that it subsequently prompted further ethnocentric legislation openly favoring the interests of the ethnic majority at the expense of the Tamil minority. This inability of Sinhalese leaders to compromise in turn led to a severe loss of confidence in the government and other state institutions among Tamils, who began to experience the Sri Lankan state as an alien entity. Finally, this process of "institutional decay" set off by the 1956 imposition of Sinhala as sole official language in state institutions and education then provoked separatist Tamil nationalism and a spiral of violence culminating in a devastating civil war.

In the introduction, the author outlines the conceptual framework of the study, situating it within an institutionalist approach. Political and state institutions provide the framework for shaping actors' goals and decisions, most prominently the use of linguistic nationalism by Sinhalese elites in order to achieve their preferences, while the ensuing loss of confidence in state institutions among the island's Tamil minority crucially conditioned their separatist response. Chap. 2 introduces the ethnic diversity of Sri Lanka and the history of the late colonial period, with an emphasis on the "Buddhist revival" among the Sinhalese population. Chap. 3 examines linguistic nationalism among users of Sinhala and Tamil and describes the political shift toward a rejection of official recognition of both Sinhala and Tamil in favor of a Sinhala-only policy. The fourth chapter details the events leading to the 1956 Official Language Act, in particular parliamentary debates, early warnings and predictions with regard to the likely conse-

quences of a Sinhala-only policy, and the first Sinhalese-Tamil riots. Chap. 5 examines the first two decades after the passing of the 1956 Official Language Act, showing how the 1956 decision led to further anti-Tamil discriminatory measures, setting off a process of “institutional decay” which in turn provoked an extremist Tamil reaction. Chap. 6 describes the further intensifying instances of anti-Tamil violence, the final stages of “institutional decay,” and the internationalization of the conflict, now turning into civil war. The seventh chapter examines the Tamil guerrilla organization Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), while seeking to explain why a peaceful resolution of ethnic conflict became increasingly difficult. The final chapter recapitulates the general argument about how discriminatory language policy led to institutional decay and finally civil war, concluding with a number of lessons drawn from the Sri Lankan scenario for the resolution and prevention of ethnic conflict elsewhere.

DeVotta considers the emergence of linguistic nationalism and ethnic conflict as illustrative of the difficulties of a transition from a predominantly agrarian society to a modern, complex one with greater possibilities and expectations of social mobility. In this, especially when accounting for the rise of separatist Tamil ethnolinguistic nationalism in Sri Lanka, DeVotta’s approach resembles Inglehart & Woodward’s (1972 [1967]) analysis of the origins of linguistic nationalism in the 19th-century Austro-Hungarian Empire. Linguistic nationalism is explained as a reaction among members of an ethnic minority or otherwise subordinate population in a modernizing state in which they face blockage of socio-economic mobility and political exclusion owing to the imposition of a language of state other than the vernacular language they share. Since effective access to state-sponsored education and employment in state institutions is denied by the imposition of a language different from their own vernacular, members of such a minority then begin agitating for a nation-state of their own. The institutions of this new state would presumably function in a standard form of their vernacular, thus providing the opportunities for socioeconomic mobility denied by the state under whose rule the population in question has lived so far.

As an anthropologist reading DeVotta’s lucid historical narrative, I could not help but be reminded of the enduring disciplinary differences between political scientists and anthropologists in their approaches to linguistic nationalism. DeVotta, like other political scientists, tends to approach language and linguistic practice emphasizing their role in regulating access to state power and state institutions. Such modalities of access and exclusion are conditioned by linguistic diversity, which establishes communicative boundaries. Thus, language plays above all the role of a communicative medium, which is politically manipulated in controlling access to resources, and linguistic nationalism is explained as the possible end product of such processes in situations of linguistic diversity. Anthropologists, in contrast, have tended to resist understanding linguistic nationalism as a reflection of other political and social processes not immediately concerned with language. Instead, they have emphasized language as a cultural

site in which nationhood and national subjects are often originally produced and shaped, and then inform processes of political exclusion.

What makes *Blowback* a rich and interesting study is that DeVotta provides ample evidence for both perspectives. Nevertheless, the analysis clearly places more emphasis on the first view. But the historical narrative of chap. 3 can also be read as a demonstration of how the imagined boundaries of the Sinhalese nation were at least partly produced by politically charged ideas about language. This is evident, for example, in the characterization of Sinhala as an Indo-European language, adopted from the work of Orientalists. The image of Sinhalese as an “Aryan race,” constructed on the basis of such reasoning about linguistic difference, then contributed to a process of hierarchical boundary making vis-à-vis perceived others, in particular Tamils. Chap. 3 also illustrates a similarly language-focused dynamic for Tamil nationalism. Some more explicit recognition of the productive role of linguistic nationalism as a mode of regulating social life, in particular the fashioning of national subjects and senses of symbolic citizenship, would have strengthened the author’s case for the centrality of language in ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka. It appears from his own historical account that Sinhalese linguistic nationalism has actively shaped a sense of Sri Lankan nationhood in which Tamils appear as foreigners, both motivating and legitimizing exclusion and violence. At the same time, Tamil linguistic nationalism has made the demand for a separate state seem naturally justified, and as others have shown, language has played a similarly constitutive role in the formation of Tamil nationalism in the Indian context (Ramaswamy 1997). The significance of linguistic nationalism lies not only in a reaction to processes of exclusion in institutions, or in a strategy of monopolizing access to social mobility, but also in the motivating and legitimizing of such exclusion, in making an ethnically pure nation imaginable in the first place, which then informs political decision making.

My only genuine concern about this insightful study is the lack of a more sustained treatment of multilingualism, as it cannot be assumed that ethnic Sinhalese and ethnic Tamils are in every instance monolingual users of Sinhala and Tamil, respectively. An account of multilingualism in Sri Lanka would have strengthened the author’s argument, which relies to some degree on the assumption that ethnic Tamils in post-1956 Sri Lanka experienced discrimination and exclusion because they had insufficient command of and literacy skills in Sinhala. From a comparative perspective, studies of separatist linguistic nationalism have sometimes found that it is precisely those multilingual urban intellectuals among a disaffected minority or subordinate population with a full command of the dominant language of state who initiate separatist linguistic nationalism, and not the monolingual rural masses often imagined to be “typical” members of the new nation claiming a separate state (e.g., Urla 1993:822). Thus, those not actually facing any form of linguistic exclusion in state institutions under the political status quo may turn into separatist linguistic nationalists. This attests to the importance of nationalist ideologies centered on images of language in creating

boundaries between people. The power of such nationalized visions of linguistic differentiation often exceeds the significance of language as a communicative medium providing or denying access to crucial socioeconomic resources. This point notwithstanding, *Blowback* is impressive testimony to the centrality of language in processes of ethnonational identification.

## REFERENCES

- Inglehart, R., & Woodward, M. (1972 [1967]). Language conflicts and the political community. In Pier Paolo Giglioli (ed.), *Language and social context*, 358–77. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ramaswamy, Sumathi (1997). *Passions of the tongue: Language devotion in Tamil India, 1891–1970*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Urla, Jacqueline (1993). Cultural politics in an age of statistics: Numbers, nations and the making of Basque identity. *American Ethnologist* 20:818–43.

(Received 5 February 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506270349

MAYA HICKMANN, *Children's discourse: Person, space and time across languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pp.vii, 392. Hb \$55.

Reviewed by ASTA CEKAITE  
*Department of Child Studies, Linköping University,  
Linköping, SE-581 83, Sweden  
astce@tema.liu.se*

This monograph explores the universality and variability of the language acquisition processes. Arguing that universal learning mechanisms, on the one hand, or innate capacities within specific domains, on the other, are incomplete as theoretical explanations, this book addresses two major questions regarding first language acquisition: What structural and functional factors determine the acquisition process? What are the universal and language-specific aspects of this process? (p. 1).

These questions are explored through cross-linguistic analysis of children's narratives elicited from two picture sequences in an experimental study. The study involves four languages (Chinese, English, French, and German) and 200 subjects across a wide age span: children 4 to 10 years old, and adults. Specifically, it focuses on the acquisition of referent introductions, spatial semantics, and time-aspectual markings.

The underlying concern is to account for the effect that the multifunctionality of linguistic devices has on first language development. Noting that linguistic devices simultaneously contribute to syntactic-semantic and discourse-pragmatic levels, Hickmann suggests that this type of multifunctionality is a fundamental problem for children to solve as part of their language acquisition. Accordingly, she argues that when examining the acquisitional process, studies must attend to both the sentence and the discourse levels of language.

Inspired by theoretical perspectives originating in Vygotskian developmental psychology and Whorf's linguistic relativity hypothesis, the study endorses a functionalist framework. Nonetheless, the book is designed to be accessible to researchers of different theoretical paradigms, and it combines a critical overview of previous research in linguistics and developmental psycholinguistics (part 1) with a cross-linguistic study of children's narrative development (part 2).

Chap. 1 presents the overall organization and introduces some general theoretical orientations of the study. Here Hickmann spells out some specific developmental questions in the three domains of language to be examined. Chap. 2 lays out different theoretical perspectives on first language acquisition. The emphasis here is on the issues debated in the light of contradictory views on the relation between language and cognition in language development, including the assumptions held by recently revived research on linguistic relativity (cf. Gumperz & Levinson 1996). Chap. 3 offers a concise overview of general typological dimensions in languages, specifically pointing to cross-linguistic invariants and variations in each of the three domains – person, space, and time.

The groundwork for the study is further laid out in chap. 4, with an up-to-date survey of studies on children's narrative development and their acquisition of discourse coherence as well as cohesion skills. The important issue explored here is how particular linguistic devices simultaneously contribute to two aspects of discourse organization, indicating important interrelations between children's knowledge of cognitive schemata for stories and their linguistic realization in discourse activity, all of which indicates the need to relate coherence to cohesion skills in language development.

Chaps. 5 and 6 offer a review of previous research on children's acquisition of referent introductions and spatial and temporal-aspectual devices. Importantly, it presents studies that invoke universal cognitive determinants to account for similar developmental patterns, and recent cross-linguistic studies demonstrating that language-specific factors affect the rate and course of development.

The methodology of the study is thoroughly discussed in chap. 7, which also deals with matters of longitudinal vs. cross-sectional experimental design, showing an unmistakable preference for the latter. It follows the tradition of studies of children's narrative development on the basis of picture sequences (cf. Berman & Slobin 1994). Here Hickmann presents her basic methodological point: that research on acquisition of discourse organization skills must be conducted in an experimental situation where the listener cannot see the picture sequence that forms the basis for the subjects' narrations. Thus, the subjects have to rely on language *in vacuo*, as it were. The author maintains that, in large part, these requirements have rarely been fulfilled in functional studies. In consequence, some prior studies have demonstrated children's precocious discourse-internal skills, whereas, Hickmann argues, despite such early use there is evidence that children in fact do not master particular linguistic devices fully until a rather late age.

The strength of the present method is that it allows for control of a number of variables that have implications for the abilities that may or may not be displayed by children. Variables include same-discourse situations, minimal task and adult interventions, and minimal reliance on extralinguistic context. In effect, such an approach allows us to determine the timing of children's expository skills (discourse-internal uses of linguistic devices). However, the book does not discuss the social dynamics of an experimental set-up for the study of children's narratives. Considering that this is the central method of the study, this lack of reflection is notable. Although the analysis of information dynamics goes beyond sentence boundaries, the role of prosody for marking information status should have received some consideration (cf. Linell 2005). What is not marked syntactically or on the discourse level can at times be marked prosodically.

The analyses and results of the study are presented in chaps. 8 through 10. The empirical focus is on children's and adults' uses of referential expressions and clause structure for referent introduction and maintenance, situation types denoted by various predicates across languages, ways of grounding spatial information in narratives, the defective tense hypothesis, and development of temporal anchoring in discourse.

Finally, chap. 11 seeks to answer the question of how developmental patterns observed across the languages are related across the three domains. Here, we learn that multiple factors influence the rhythm and path of acquisition; some aspects of development are universal, while some others are clearly language-specific. We find that children are sensitive to key typological properties of their languages from an early age in that they encode form-meaning relations in ways that are more similar to how this is done by adult speakers of the same language than to how it is done by children of the same age speaking other languages.

The overall patterns of developmental changes demonstrate that children's acquisition of discourse-internal functions of linguistic devices to organize information is a protracted process, probably stretching beyond age 10. This developmental progression is similar in all languages, and it is attributed to universal cognitive factors, demonstrating children's late ability to regulate the information flow in extended discourse.

With regard to the general impact of cognitive factors on the patterns of development, the author holds a partially "relativistic" view, pointing out that the cognitive complexity of linguistic devices is due to the special properties of the language being acquired. Further, even though universal cognitive processes are involved, they are constrained by language-specific properties.

The orientation of this monograph stands out in the field of developmental research in that the focus is not limited to one determinant factor; instead, it combines multiple factors involved in later language development. The analyses provide evidence and new arguments that the rhythm and path of acquisition in the three domains is best explained in terms of an interplay between universal and language-specific factors.



## REVIEWS

One of the strengths of the book is that it brings together different theoretical approaches to first language acquisition and previous research in the relevant domains of child language. This offers the reader a nuanced picture with regard to the rhythm, path, and determinants in first language acquisition. The book generously provides examples from previous research, typological distinctions of the languages involved, and the data from the study, including full-length narratives. It will be thought-provoking and interesting reading for anyone working in the area of child language. Thanks to the extensive overview offered in part 1, it is even accessible for novices in the field.

I did encounter some problems in reading this book, mostly related to the organization and disposition of the chapters, which results in overlapping information and occasionally in outright tedious reading. Although the first part lays the groundwork for the study in the second part of the book, the balance between the two parts is not optimal. For example, the presentation of typological properties of languages appears under several headings in chaps. 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10 in connection with results in specific domains. We could easily do away with at least some of these sections.

In sum, this rich monograph achieves its aim to raise our awareness of the importance of rethinking and broadening the empirical scope in child language acquisition, clearly demonstrating how cross-linguistic analyses provide a more complete view of first language acquisition.

## REFERENCES

- Berman, Ruth, & Slobin, Dan (eds.) (1994). *Different ways of relating events in narrative: A cross-linguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gumperz, John, & Levinson, Stephen (eds.) (1996). *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linell, Per (2005). *The written language bias in linguistics*. London: Routledge.

(Received 15 March 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506280345

HUBERT DEVONISH, *Talking rhythm stressing tone: The role of prominence in Anglo-West African Creole languages*. Kingston, Jamaica: Arawak Publications, 2002. Pp. 192. Pb \$20.00.

Reviewed by OTELEMATE G. HARRY  
*Linguistics, University of the West Indies, Mona*  
otelemate.harry@uwimona.edu.jm

*Talking rhythm stressing tone* attempts to accomplish two equally significant aims. First, it attempts an exposition of a theory of prominence that provides a coherent synthesis of diverse views on phonological prominence. Second, it at-

*Language in Society* 35:5 (2006)

753

tempts an explanation of the structure of some prosodic features of Anglo-West African creoles using this theory. The proposals of the theory of prominence provide fresh insights into issues such as moracity, tone and stress assignment, and syntax-tone interaction. The theory proposes that well-known issues such as the association of stress and tone with moras or positions within a domain in languages result from phonological prominence effects. This is the first time an integrated approach, in the form of prominence theory, has been proposed to look at these issues.

The exposition of the theory of prominence is presented in chaps. 1, 3 and 4. Devonish proposes two major prominence types, positional prominence and lexical prominence. Positional prominence, a predictive prominence, assigns focus and places emphasis on a unit within a phonological domain by rule. Positional prominence may be additive or subtractive. The phonetic manifestations of positional prominence are segmental and tonal features – segmental in terms of duration, and tonal in terms of pitch. Lexical prominence, an unpredictable prominence, assigns tone and intonation to units in a phonological domain that already has lexical specifications of the same phonetic features, duration and pitch. The two types of prominence do interact in certain cases. Devonish illustrates elements of the theory by drawing from several prosodic analyses of language data from previous publications as instances of prominence effects. For example, prosodic data were drawn from English, the African languages Twi, Yoruba, and KiKongo, and an Amerindian language. What seems to be a serious problem here is that Devonish uses loanwords in the African language data only, while in the other languages he uses indigenous items to illustrate his points. I believe readers would see this as an imbalance in this work. Also, there is no critical analysis of the theoretical positions that the data taken from other publications were selected to support. This may be a serious weakness in mainstream phonological literature, but it saves us the mental torture of having to spend grueling hours going through complicated and sometimes irrelevant critiques of other theories. Devonish's theory is a complementary and not a competitive prosodic theory.

Chap. 2 addresses the history of Anglo-West African pidgins and creoles, beginning with a justification of using the term "Anglo-West African" in the work. He states that earlier terms are inadequate on the grounds that they give "the unfortunate impression that one is dealing with basically English linguistic systems which have been Africanised" (p. 22). He proposes that "Anglo-West African" avoids this negative connotation. In my opinion, the term is not transparent, and Devonish's criticism of earlier terms can be applied here, as well. An alternative is the term "Caribbean English-lexifier Creoles," used by Faraclas (ms.). This term simply implies a strong English lexical base for the creoles that developed in this region. Further, in this chapter and throughout the work, Devonish implies a major distinction between Guyana and the

Caribbean. This may create an unjustified distinction in the reader's mind. Linguistically, sociohistorically, and culturally, Guyana and the rest of the Caribbean have always been known and called "the Caribbean." Geographically, this distinction may be acceptable, but it is not one that is necessary in a work of this nature.

Chaps. 5 and 7 address the historical evolution of rhythm and tone in English lexifier creole varieties in the Americas. Devonish uses modern creoles such as Saramaccan, Djuka, Kwinti, Paramaccan, and Boni to trace the phonological history of earlier varieties of Caribbean and Guyanese creoles. He proposes that these varieties with major African traits provide the best source for the reconstruction of rhythm and tone in these creoles with the strategies applied in loan adaptations found in the major source African languages (Twi, Yoruba, and KiKongo) as the bases for the prominence effects on the Caribbean creoles. A survey of the vowel systems of the creoles provides the necessary background for understanding the evolution of tone and stress in the English lexifier creoles in the Caribbean. The problem in these chapters is the highly speculative nature of the discussion, with very little primary data to illustrate the evolutionary processes in the creole varieties discussed.

Devonish continues the analysis of Guyanese prosody in chap. 6. He incorporates the well-known phenomenon of extrametricality to account for the behavior of certain deviant prominence patterns. Subtractive prominence is major factor in Guyanese Creole. Although the analysis of Guyanese is quite insightful, nevertheless the acoustic data derived from a single speaker of Guyanese Creole is not sufficient evidence to illustrate prominence.

Chap. 8 considers prosodic structures of creoles in West Africa (Krio, Cameroon/CP, and Nigerian Pidgin English/NP). (The use of this term suggests that NPE is a variety of English, but Nigerian Creole scholars now use the more neutral term Nigerian Pidgin/NP.) These Creoles have prominence manifested in similar ways: penultimate prominence, which also attracts segmental prominence. Evidence in support of the similarities between Krio and other West African creoles is not conclusive. Devonish relies on the prosodic structure of English loan words. Krio, CP, and NP are spoken in an environment surrounded by hundreds of African languages. The choice of English loan words provides a partial picture of prominence effects in these Creoles. A complete picture of prominence in these and other West African creoles can be accomplished only through a study of the effects of indigenous African loans, English loans, and items unique to these creoles.

In chap. 9, Devonish compares the position of H tone in many English-derived bisyllabic words in the Caribbean creoles and those of West Africa. He notes that tone-shifted items differ significantly between the West African varieties and their counterparts in the Americas. The difference is found on the first syllable: HL versus L. In both cases, however, the HL surfaces on the

second syllable. Devonish proposes three possible sources for this difference, two of which are flawed. The third is argued to be the plausible source: that tone shift was an innovation in Barbadian Creole that subsequently spread to other creoles in the Americas and across the Atlantic to West Africa. The source for H-tone shift is a very interesting issue that is arguably open to further research.

The crucial issue raised in chap. 10 is prosodic relexification in Anglo-West African creoles. At the suprasegmental level, relexification involves adapting the citation HL melody of the English forms and applying it across the board in the entire lexicon. A very strong point in this chapter is Devonish's use of a step-by-step derivational process of items of KiKongo origin in Saramaccan (191). Although very little prosodic analysis of African loans is carried out, the proposal that the application of HL citation melody across the board in the lexicon of these creoles is suspect.

Like many theories, linguistic and nonlinguistic, the work draws heavily from data taken from published sources. This is an unavoidable weakness. Another problem is the book's organization. Related discussions are split between non-contiguous chapters. For example, chaps. 1 and 3 discuss the exposition of the theory. Chap. 2 should have been the first chapter. Chaps. 5 and 7 could either be combined into one or run sequentially. Further, a graphical representation would have greatly enhanced the exposition of the theory.

Despite the weaknesses pointed out in this review, Devonish's work is highly commendable in that it provides a cohesive view of an integrated theory of phonological prominence. It does this elegantly with language that even a non-phonologist can readily comprehend, a characteristic lacking in many a theory of phonology. The addition of an appendix containing creole language data makes this work even more attractive to readers and phonologists in particular.

In the scheme of things, creole language data have had little attraction or impact in the development of mainstream phonological theories. This work serves as a major departure from that trend. This should be seen as a major contribution to linguistic scholarship. It further demonstrates the potential contributions creole language data can make to any overall theory of phonology. Although the analysis in the study presents the theory as a theory of prominence in loan phonology, I see the potential for the application of the theory to other issues addressed in the prosodic phonologies of creoles and other languages.

## REFERENCE

Faraclas, Nicholas. Nigerian Pidgin. Ms., University of Puerto Rico.

(Received 17 March 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506290341

HERBERT L. COLSTON & ALBERT N. KATZ (eds.), *Figurative language comprehension: Social and cultural influences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005. Pp. xi, 347. Hb \$89.95.

Reviewed by LIONEL WEE  
*Department of English Language & Literature*  
*National University of Singapore*  
*ellweeha@nus.edu.sg*

The field of psycholinguistics has a history of ignoring sociocultural factors and, to a lesser extent, figurative language. By choosing to focus on both, this book deals simultaneously with two relatively marginalized areas of language processing. This fact alone makes the book an important and welcome contribution. Excluding the first chapter (an overview by one of the editors, Herbert Colston), the book contains twelve articles that cover a range of figurative language phenomena and a host of sociocultural variables. The phenomena discussed include irony, metaphor, and proverbs; the variables include gender, occupational roles, and social status.

The articles are rather confusingly organized into four parts: “Sociocultural knowledge influences” (Part I), “Sociocultural phenomenological influences” (Part II), “Sociocultural processing influences” (Part III), and “New sociocultural influences” (Part IV). It is not clear how distinct “knowledge influences” are from “phenomenological influences,” nor why a discussion of metaphors in sign language (“Metaphors in sign language and sign language users: A window into relations of language and thought,” by Marc Marschark) should come under the rubric “New sociocultural influences.” In fact, Colston seems to admit as much when he states, “Categorizing the chapters into coherent, separable sections according to their content proved to be a very difficult task” (2). In that case, perhaps both he and his co-editor, Katz, should have exercised their editorial prerogative either to dispense with the section structure altogether, or to ask their contributors to focus their discussion more narrowly so as to facilitate organization. Regarding the latter option, Colston, in a discussion of the relationship between sociocultural variables and figurative language comprehension, describes three themes that he feels constitute important points for research (4). The first concerns the degree of dependence that exists between forms of language and specific kinds of contexts. Are there systematically different aspects of the context that are called on in figurative language comprehension? The second has to do with whether an all-encompassing theory provides the greatest explanatory power, or whether multiple theories are needed. Will it suffice to analyze figurative language comprehension using (mainly or wholly), say, the concept of implicatures, or would a more eclectic approach be more appropriate? Finally, if it does turn out that a more eclectic approach is indeed called for,

then how are the different mechanisms and processes to be related to one another? Are the different mechanisms working independently, or is there a common processing space where they “merge”? Do we need to appeal to the notion of conflict resolution? These are interesting themes, and they could have been adopted usefully in organizing the various chapters, even as we acknowledge that some overlap of content is inevitable.

In addition to the organizational problem, the book also contains a fair number of typographical and other editorial errors, such as “an entity to be studied on its own” (ix); “Dresher and Hornstein (1976: 330) Thus, one could start with ...” (146). It is not clear if the word “Thus” begins a quote from Dresher and Hornstein because there is no punctuation before it; (iii) “each of which need not leads to enhanced persuasion” (149). There are references to “Giora, in press” in the text (187, 194, 203), but in the references we only find Giora (2003). The name Eckert is misspelled “Ekert” (189, 205).

The foregoing comments deal mainly with form. As far as substance is concerned, there are a number of theoretically significant contributions here, including those by Dale J. Barr & Boaz Keysar (“Making sense of how we make sense: The paradox of egocentricism in language use”), Albert N. Katz (“Discourse and sociocultural factors in understanding nonliteral language”), and Penny M. Pexman (“Social factors in the interpretation of verbal irony: The roles of speaker and listener characteristics”). Barr & Keysar make the interesting argument that people appeal to commonly shared knowledge far less than is supposed. For example, a speaker may expect an addressee to appreciate that she is being sarcastic even when the addressee cannot reasonably know that this is what the speaker intended. Thus, Barr & Keysar argue that people frequently disregard shared knowledge in favor of a more egocentric stance.

Katz proposes a processing model that treats sociocultural variables as constraints. The advantage of this model is that both sociocultural and linguistic variables are given a unified treatment as imposing constraints of varying intensities that need to be satisfied. Thus, Katz (203) suggests that knowledge of a speaker’s occupation might lead the hearer to construe a phrase metaphorically, but this construal might be moderated by the hearer’s own familiarity with the phrase itself.

Pexman explores the extent to which social cues such as the speaker’s membership in certain social categories can influence the comprehension of ironic speech. Especially interesting is the developmental aspect of Pexman’s work, which tries to take into account how individuals build up and modify their ideas about the relationship between personality traits and communicative intent. For example, Pexman (220, 225) suggests that younger children rely much more on personality traits in interpreting speaker’s intent than do older children (7–8-year-olds). The latter have a growing appreciation that although such traits may be relevant, they are not strong predictors of how a speaker intends to be understood.

Individually, each of the chapters in the book demonstrates a high standard of argumentation, making for informative and engaging reading. My main grouse, however, concerns the extent to which all can be said to deal with the topic promised in the title: sociocultural influences on figurative language comprehension. On the one hand, the term “figurative language” is broadly interpreted so that contextual expressions (“Contextual expressions and common ground,” Richard J. Gerrig & William S. Horton) also count as figurative. I don’t assume that such a broad interpretation is necessarily wrong, but surely only *SOME* contextual expressions are figurative (“Don’t *Walter Cronkite* me!”), while others are questionably so (“a *mountain vacation* would cheer me”) (43–44). Thus, some explanation of why the phenomena being analyzed are pitched at the relatively general level of contextual expressions as opposed to the more specific level of, say, eponymous contextual expressions would have been welcome. And if all kinds of contextual expressions are processed similarly, then some discussion of the implications for any presumed distinction between figurative and nonfigurative language would have been appropriate. On the other hand, the chapter by Rachel Giora, Noga Balaban, Ofer Fein & Inbar Alkabetz (“Explicit negation as positivity in disguise”) seems to deal with neither sociocultural factors nor figurative language. I actually enjoyed this chapter tremendously. Giora et al. provide very interesting evidence demonstrating that the use of negation does not lead to the suppression of the negated information (the “suppression hypothesis”). Instead, the negated information is retained (the “retention hypothesis”) and influences the resulting interpretation, so that “the outcome is a mitigated product involving both the negativity of the negation marker and also the expressed meaning of the negated item” (239). However, what the chapter does in the end is to make a case for the role of negation in language comprehension. What this has to do with the specific topic of figurative language and sociocultural factors is left unexplored.

I want to end with the observation that almost all of the authors in this book treat sociocultural influences as variables that are discretely identifiable to some extent. This is perhaps to be expected of a volume that boldly addresses issues relatively ignored in much of psycholinguistics. But I would hope that as more work is undertaken in this area, there will be attempts to pay greater attention to more recent works in social theory that treat the notions of, say, gender, class, or ethnicity as complex constructions where the criteria for category membership are not just observer-dependent but based on norms that often are not fully explicable, even by those doing the categorizing. I have in mind the works of theorists as varied as Zygmunt Bauman, Pierre Bourdieu, and Judith Butler. Something of this sort is already happening in sociolinguistic theorizing, where there are attempts to move beyond the variationist paradigm (Eckert & Rickford 2001, Sealey & Carter 2001). It would therefore be nice if in trying to account for sociocultural influences on language processing, advances in psycholinguistics were not held back by outdated social theorizing.

## REFERENCES

- Eckert, Penelope, & Rickford, John R. (eds.) (2001). *Style and sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sealey, Alison, & Carter, Bob (2001). Social categories and sociolinguistics: Applying a realist approach. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 152:1–19.

(Received 16 March 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506300346

ELIZABETH GORDON, LYLE CAMPBELL, JENNIFER HAY, MARGARET MACLAGAN, ANDREA SUDBURY & PETER TRUDGILL, *New Zealand English: Its history and evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pp. xix, 370. Hb \$85.00.

Reviewed by BARBARA M. HORVATH  
*Linguistics, University of Sydney*  
*Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia*  
*bhorvath@mail.usyd.edu.au*

Between 1946 and 1948, Radio New Zealand established a Mobile Unit that visited many towns throughout the country, seeking out people who were long-time residents of small towns in order to record their oral histories. In 1986 Elizabeth Gordon was told of these archived recordings. The uniqueness of this data corpus is that the speakers, born between 1851 and 1904, were all participants in the formation of a new dialect, New Zealand English (NZE). It is unlikely that other data sets will be found in which tape recording technology and a first generation of speakers come together. English had arrived in 1840 with the original colonizers, who were mainly English, Scottish, and Irish. The story gets complicated by the arrival of many English-speaking immigrants from Australia, descendants from a penal colony founded in 1788, which had formed its own new dialect earlier with input from English, Scottish, and Irish settlers. Moreover, settlers often spent time first in Australia and then moved to New Zealand, and there was considerable contact between Australia and New Zealand from the start. It is within this historical setting and with this database that the Origins of New Zealand English (ONZE) project researchers set out to describe early NZE in order to examine its origins.

Although there is no detailed description of the interviews – for instance, no discussion of technical or stylistic quality, length, or sample transcriptions – it is clear that these are ordinary people. The map of the geographical distribution of the Mobile Unit interviews indicates that the speakers came mostly from small towns, with concentrations in the southern part of the South Island and the northern part of the North Island. It is clear that the radio broadcasters were not interested in the urban settlements of Auckland and Christchurch, although Wellington was included. Since the analysis shows that towns of mixed ethnic makeup are



most advanced in the changes that will become NZE, one can perhaps speculate that these two major cities were the most advanced.

The project researchers represent an impressive group with a number of specialties among them: historical linguistics, dialect geography, sociolinguistics, and phonetics, all perspectives that inform the data analysis and interpretation. That the researchers have different interests in the interpretation of the data is clear though understated, and it is probably this characteristic that makes the book so compelling. This is exciting science with much at stake.

The book opens with three chapters devoted to background information about the ONZE project, New Zealand English, and the settlement history of New Zealand. This is followed by a thorough account of the plethora of commentaries, myths, speculations, and theories about the origin of New Zealand English in particular and about new dialect formation in general.

A methodological chapter presents the three procedures used in the data analysis. The first was a broad auditory perception study of 95 speakers; it involved listening to interviews to obtain an overall evaluation of the speakers' phonetics and phonology and to listen for specific features of lexical phonology. Narrow IPA transcriptions were made where relevant, and some relative frequencies were noted. The variables included all of the vowel phonemes of NZE, including the unstressed vowels, consonants such as /r/ and /l/, and other items of particular interest. Although no statistical analysis was made of these data, the information was computerized and could be interrogated for specific linguistic features. Second, an acoustic analysis was made of the entire vowel systems of five women and five men; the normalized vowel plots are given in an appendix. The third approach to the data involved the detailed quantitative analysis of eight linguistic variables and four social variables for 59 speakers. The linguistic variables included the presence of post vocalic /r/; the presence of word-initial /h/; the /h/ ~ /hw/ contrast; the centralization of the KIT and DRESS vowels; the raising of the TRAP vowel; the fronting of the START vowel; and the merger of the unstressed vowels. An index was derived for each speaker for each linguistic variable, and this became the input to the statistical analysis. The social variables were speaker's date of birth, sex, parents' birthplace; and town type (Scottish, English, Mixed, etc.). Statistical analysis revealed a break between the linguistic patterns of speakers born before and after 1875, and almost all of the quantified variables are reported with this age variable.

The researchers use three statistical techniques in the quantitative analysis of the data. They used linear regression to model the speakers; a linguistic index was calculated for each speaker for each linguistic variable, and the social characteristics (sex, date of birth, parents' birthplace and type of town the speaker lived in) retained by the model are said to play a statistically significant role in predicting the patterns of variation. Logistic regression (similar to VARBRUL) was also used to model the contextual structure of the linguistic variables, including preceding and following environments, as well as the social variables.

Raw data are displayed on the graphs, and the authors decided not to provide the correlation coefficients for ease of interpretation by readers unfamiliar with the techniques. It is surprising, however, that the correlation coefficients are not presented in an appendix for those readers who do want to examine them. Further data exploration involved the use of CART regression trees; this statistic produces a series of binary splits in the data in an attempt to predict, for instance, the speakers' index of rhoticity. It was the repeated split of the variables based on speakers' date of birth that led to the discovery of a significant age division between speakers born before and after 1875.

Chapter 6, "The Variables of Early NZ English," is the empirical heart and takes up almost a third of the book. Nineteen phonological variables are discussed; the eight mentioned above are given the full quantitative treatment. In all cases, the account of the variables begins with a detailed phonetic description of the variants of the variable and is followed by an often lengthy discussion of the potential variants that were brought to New Zealand by the English and Scottish migrants in particular, but also by Irish and Australians in some cases. Many of the variants being studied had already begun to change in England and Scotland. Of particular interest to the researchers are Scottish features (centralization of the KIT vowel or [r] pronunciation of non-prevocalic /r/, for instance), because many scholars and other commentators attribute a number of features of NZE to Scottish input. Following this introductory material, the data are analyzed using the techniques described above. Although it is not easy or perhaps even wise to generalize across so many variables, one is left with the impression that almost all of the social and linguistic variables are statistically significant, as is the time factor (born before or after 1875). For a number of variants, the results challenge the received wisdom; for instance, it is speakers whose parents were born in New Zealand who centralize the KIT vowel, and not those with Scottish-born parents. The authors recommend caution in claiming a Scottish origin for this feature.

Chapter 7 returns to the subject of ideas about the origin of NZE that were canvassed earlier. Most are dismissed quite easily, including the Cockney and Scottish connections. The "Cockney" label was used to disparage NZE rather than accurately to describe it, and Scottish is shown to have influenced primarily the rhoticity of a small region in New Zealand. However, even these speakers showed low frequencies for rhoticity, and it has almost disappeared in modern NZE. The two conflicting origin stories considered at length are that NZE has been influenced by Australian English (AusE), and that Trudgill's theory of new dialect formation can account for the facts without considering any AusE influence. This theoretical juxtaposition builds up throughout the book, and readers may be disappointed by the final outcome – especially knowing that it would be hard to find a better data set to demonstrate that one case is more persuasive than the other. For both perspectives, both supportive and ambiguous evidence is brought to bear, leading to the conclusion that neither theory can be fully sup-

ported nor can either theory be dismissed. Trudgill 2004 has published his own book arguing his interpretation in support of new dialect formation.

I would like to add a comment about the use of the vowel variant in words of the DANCE class; much is made of the variable use of /æ/ and /a:/. In arguing for the process of reallocation (where, in the process of new dialect formation, such a variable acquires a sociolinguistic function rather than being a distinguishing characteristic of a separate dialect), the authors inexplicably illustrate their point by using an AusE example rather than one of the NZE variables. They claim that the [æ ~a:] for the DANCE class is a sociolinguistic variable; Horvath & Horvath's (2001) study of six cities in Australia found this variable to be a strong regional variant but not a sociolinguistic variant in any city.

This book would make an ideal centerpiece for a graduate seminar: the data set is truly unique, the multiplicity of analytical approaches is instructive, and the interpretation of the findings make lively discussion likely.

## REFERENCES

- Horvath, Barbara M., & Horvath, Ronald J. (2001). Short A in Australian English: A geolinguistic study. In David Blair & Peter Collins (eds.), *English in Australia*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Trudgill, Peter (2004). *New dialect formation: The inevitability of colonial Englishes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

(Received 31 March 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506310342

ALAN DAVIES & CATHERINE ELDER (eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004. Pp. viii, 866. Hb \$139.95.

Reviewed by JOHANNA RENDLE-SHORT  
*Linguistics and Applied Linguistics Program,*  
*Australian National University*  
*ACT 0200, Australia*  
*Johanna.Rendle-Short@anu.edu.au*

*The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* is the latest in the Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics Series, which covers the major subdisciplines within linguistics. The previous 16 volumes have provided an extensive state-of-the-art overview of areas ranging from *Child Language* to *Morphology*, and from *Contemporary Semantic Theory* to *Language and Gender*. This latest volume collects 32 articles within the field of applied linguistics, adding to the list of recent major publications in applied linguistics (e.g., Cook 2003, Gass & Makoni 2004, Kaplan 2002, McCarthy 2001) that, with varying emphases, demonstrate the broad range of the discipline as well as indicating some of the different ways in which it can be conceptualized.

*Language in Society* 35:5 (2006)

763

The editors have divided the *Handbook* into two parts: “Linguistics applied (L–A)” deals with the application of linguistics to real-world language data with the purpose of understanding language and evaluating linguistic theory; “Applied linguistics (A–L)” investigates real-world language with the goal of understanding language use and ameliorating social problems (pp. 11–13). Although the division provides some structure to the broad area of inquiry, such a division is not without its problems, because it goes to the heart of what applied linguistics is about – whether applied linguistics is indeed a discipline, and how applied linguistics practitioners and theorists view their work in relation to related fields and disciplines, in particular linguistics.

The questions of whether applied linguistics should be classified as a discipline, and what applied linguistics actually is, constitute one of the themes taken up by Alan Davies and Catherine Elder in the General Introduction (“Applied linguistics: Subject to discipline”). They argue that no definition of applied linguistics is straightforward because of the close relationship between applied linguistics and linguistics. They ask, “What is linguistics?” If applied linguistics is concerned with real-world problems or issues, what would such problems or issues look like? Is the distinction between linguistics and applied linguistics similar to the distinction between theory and data, as Kaplan 2002 proposes? Answers to such questions are not simple; they come up against the tension between researchers who predominantly do L–A through their application of linguistic theory to real world data, and A–L researchers who are predominantly interested in language education, language learning, and language teaching.

An additional difficulty is that decisions have to be made as to where different subdomains of applied linguistics should be placed. For example, does chap. 5, “Discourse analysis” (Hugh Trappes-Lomax), belong in L–A, when it could just as legitimately belong in the A–L section when applied to language learning and teaching? Does chap. 30, “Language planning as applied linguistics” (Jo Lo Bianco), belong in A–L when in fact it has very little to do with language education, learning, or teaching? Although the decision taken by the editors was that chapters predominantly to do with language were placed in Part 1 (L–A), whereas chapters predominantly to do with language learning and language teaching were placed in Part 2 (A–L), as they themselves point out (13), the distinction between L–A and A–L is not necessarily in terms of actual topics; rather, it is evident in the orientation of researchers themselves toward particular problems, and their approach to the collection of data. They argue that researchers tend to regard themselves either as linguists applying linguistics, or as applied linguists doing applied linguistics. In other words, they ask questions such as: Are they investigating something because they wish to validate a theory? Or are they investigating something because they wish to seek a practical answer to a language problem? The editors note in passing, however, that some researchers have “both interests at heart” (19).

However, tying applied linguistics so closely to linguistics is not a view shared by all the contributors. Kanavillil Rajagopalan, for example, in “The philosophy of applied linguistics,” takes a very different perspective. Rajagopalan argues that applied linguistics has moved away from its general linguistic origins to become an interdisciplinary field, involving disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, education, and cognitive science, although in the 1990s researchers became aware of the need to conceive of applied linguistics as a transdisciplinary field of inquiry. In other words, applied linguistics should be seen as traversing “conventional disciplinary boundaries in order to develop a brand new research agenda which, while freely drawing on a wide variety of disciplines, would obstinately seek to remain subaltern to none” (410). Such a view is clearly at odds with the overall tenet of the *Handbook*, which positions applied linguistics as tied to its theoretical linguistic origins. Joseph Lo Bianco, in “Language planning as applied linguistics,” similarly argues that applied linguistics is a coherent and distinctive academic discipline not dependent on formal linguistics. He demonstrates how language policy and planning research draws on knowledge far beyond linguistics and that “abstractions of descriptive linguistics . . . and further, the abstractions of those branches of sociolinguistics that derive conceptually from descriptive linguistics, lead to models for studying language planning that are weakly descriptive, a-social, and a-historical” (738). Clearly, not all contributors are comfortable with the division into L-A and A-L.

As for the audience for a volume such as this, the publisher’s blurb calls it “a valuable resource for students and researchers in applied linguistics, language teaching, and second language acquisition.” At first glance this would seem a reasonable assessment. However, when reading the individual contributions, one is struck by the variety of approaches taken by different authors as they position themselves within the field of applied linguistics. Some of the authors clearly see their contribution as providing useful background information to applied linguists. For example, Anthony J. Liddicoat and Timothy J. Curnow, in “Language descriptions” (chap. 1), state the aim “to introduce applied linguists to the broad themes and general concepts within which linguists work in developing descriptive accounts of languages” (51). In contrast, other authors feel it necessary to show how their particular topic is relevant to applied linguistics – for example, Alan Kirkness’s chapter “Lexicography.” There are, of course, authors who do not feel any need to justify their position within the field of applied linguistics – for example, David Birdsong’s “Second language acquisition and ultimate attainment,” or most of the chapters in Part 2. Finally, certain chapters are seen as tools to aid applied linguists in their research, such as James Dean Brown’s “Research methods for applied linguists.”

Such diversity of aims among the authors indicates that the volume is attempting to do a number of things for a variety of audiences. On the one hand, it is attempting to show students of applied linguistics what is, or should be, included

in that field. This is an important aim, for students often grapple with understanding the relationship between linguistics and applied linguistics. However, the *Handbook* also plays an educative role for researchers who are already working within the field of applied linguistics but are interested in broadening their knowledge base to related areas of research. This is particularly useful for researchers who work within educational institutions and are required to cover all areas of applied linguistics in their teaching and supervisory roles, as well as for applied linguistics researchers who work within a limited subdomain of the field. In addition, the *Handbook* provides tools and additional background information for potential researchers who are less confident about research possibilities within applied linguistics. Although this aspect of the *Handbook* is not large, it is particularly useful for graduate students and early researchers who wish to develop their skills in this area.

As Alan Davies notes in his “Introduction to Part 1,” problems arise not only in determining whether topics should be L-A or A-L, but also in determining the order of individual contributions. The editors’ decision to group chapters into sections on “a cline from closest to the linguistics of language to the more distant connection” (19) is not very helpful. Placing the more linguistic topics at the beginning of the volume subtly suggests the primacy of descriptive linguistics within applied linguistics. Furthermore, the topics within the sections do not always fit well together. For example, Section 3 includes chapters as diverse as “British Sign Language” (Rachael Sutton-Spence & Bencie Woll), “Assessing language attitudes” (Howard Giles & Andres C. Billings), “Language attrition” (Monika S. Schmid & Kees de Bot), “Language, thought and culture” (Claire Kramsch), and “Conversation analysis” (Rod Gardner). These topics might hold an increasingly distant connection to the linguistics of language (although I myself cannot see this); however, on other grounds they do not fit well together.

Finally, because the eleven sections have no titles, readers are left wondering what connection links particular topics to particular sections. This is where I think the editors could have grouped particular topics more carefully, or not have grouped topics at all within the two parts (L-A and A-L). For students of applied linguistics trying to come to terms with the range of disparate subdomains within the broad discipline, the editors have missed a useful opportunity for guidance on how they themselves see the overall structure of applied linguistics.

In this respect, Alan Davies’s “Introduction to Part 1” is somewhat disappointing. There is minimal discussion of why topics were so grouped. There is also minimal overview of the topics as a whole and how they fit or link together. For example, there is no discussion of why chap. 10, “Conversation analysis” (Gardner), is grouped with the other topics in that section, nor is the reader even confident that Davies understands what conversation analysis is about when he states, “To what extent the systematic use of conversation should take account of ‘local design and quiddity of instances’ remains unclear” (22). When he does comment about the way topics are linked, the comments seem minimal. For example, he

states that Susan Ehrlich's "Language and gender" presents "a relativist neo-Whorfian view and fits well with the Kramsch discussion above on language, thought and culture" (23). However, there is no discussion of why this might be so, and A-L applied linguists less confident within an L-A approach could be left thinking that approach may not have much to offer those interested in the practical aspects of language teaching, learning, and education. On a minor note, there are a number of typos in this chapter: chap. 6 ("British Sign Language") is in Section 3, not 2 (21); closing brackets are missing (23); there are incomplete quotes (24); and full stops are used instead of commas (24).

Part 2 contains topics that would more traditionally be included in a volume on applied linguistics, such as "Second language learning" (William Littlewood), "Individual differences in second language learning" (Rod Ellis), "Social influences on language learning" (Gary Barkhuizen), "Literacy studies" (Eddie Williams), "Fashions in language learning" (Bob Adamson), "Computer aided language learning" (Paul Gruba), "Language teacher education" (Richard Johnstone), and "The practice of LSP" (Helen Basturkmen & Catherine Elder). This part also provides useful information for students and researchers alike on applied linguistics research. For example, James Dean Brown, in "Research methods in applied linguistics," gives a clear overview of the nature of research, research methodologies within applied linguistics, the difference between quantitative and qualitative research, and ethical and professional responsibilities.

However, once again there is the problem of ordering of topics: Part 2 has also been set up "on a cline, in the opposite direction, starting from what we have classed 'weak' A-L (i.e., drawing on multiple disciplinary sources often including linguistics; concerned to some extent with practical issues but not ameliorative in its goals) and moving towards 'strong' A-L (again transdisciplinary, but concerned little if at all with linguistics and focused predominantly on corrective action or praxis) at the end" (423). As with Part 1 (L-A), I am not convinced by such an ordering, mainly because, once again, it places too much emphasis on the link between applied linguistics and linguistics, rather than allowing applied linguistics to stand alone as a discipline (or multidiscipline) in its own right.

In contrast, the final chapter in the *Handbook*, "Critical applied linguistics" by Alastair Pennycook, addresses issues of applied linguistics from quite a different angle. Pennycook argues that critical applied linguistics (CAL) is not simply a way of critiquing applied linguistics, nor is the concept "critical" just a way of emphasizing the political element in applied linguistics; rather, the role of CAL is to raise issues of identity, sexuality, power, and performativity within the discipline.

In spite of the reservations mentioned above – for example, the difficulties that result from drawing a L-A vs. A-L distinction, and the lack of agreement over whether there still exists a link between descriptive and applied linguistics – I find *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* an important addition to the Blackwell Linguistics Series. It is comprehensive in its coverage of important topics and will certainly be useful for students and researchers alike (whether

L-A or A-L) in understanding some of the wider issues within the discipline of applied linguistics.

REFERENCES

- Cook, Guy (2003). *Applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
Gass, Susan, & Makoni, Sinfree (2004). *World Applied Linguistics*. *AILA Review* 17.  
Kaplan, Robert B. (2002). *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
McCarthy, Michael (2001). *Issues in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 2 April 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506320349

PHILIP GLENN, *Laughter in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pp. xi, 190, Hb \$75.00.

Reviewed by E. CABELL H. GATHMAN  
*Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison*  
Madison, WI 53703  
cgathman@ssc.wisc.edu

Drawing on extant research in conversation analysis (CA) and other fields, Glenn's entry in the "Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics" series is both an excellent introduction to CA for those outside the field and an interesting exploration of the social phenomenon of laughter. The first chapter gives a general survey of the research, which has often focused on the physicality of laughter and its relation to humor. Ultimately, however, the chapter suggests a function of laughter beyond expressing amusement: affiliation with co-participants in social interaction. In chap. 2, Glenn provides a helpful outline of CA. He emphasizes CA's focus on participants' perspectives and provides a cogent explanation for CA's meticulous transcription conventions with the example of silences, marked on CA transcripts in tenths of seconds. To leave them out, he argues, would be to assume from the beginning that silences in talk mean nothing (p. 37) – an idea that most competent talkers, let alone CA researchers, would reject out of hand.

This meticulousness extends to the transcription of laughter in CA. Gail Jefferson's early transcriptions included orthographic renderings of laughter, which allowed analysts to see exactly how participants embed laughter tokens in talk and thus mark utterances as "laughable." Glenn is careful to point out that "laughable" is a retroactive term; it is only from the laughter in a sequence that the laughable can be identified. At times the referent is not clear to participants, who may demand clarification from laughing co-participants. Glenn also describes his own data in this chapter, most of which are audio recordings of telephone conversations, as is common in CA data. While the observer's paradox defined by William Labov may minimally affect recorded conversations, Glenn suggests



that most social laughter is already affected by the observer's paradox insofar as people are sensitive to the contexts in which they laugh (41). Participants in Glenn's data were not given subjects to talk about or told that laughter was going to be the subject of study.

Chap. 3 addresses shared laughter, drawing heavily on Jefferson's study (1979) of laughter invitations and acceptances/declinations. The recipient of such an invitation may laugh along, remain silent, or engage in serious talk; only the last definitely rejects the invitation, since speakers may pursue a laughter response in the face of silence. In cases where laughter invites laughter in response (i.e., not in troubles talk or self-deprecation), participants may actively work to extend shared laughter once it has begun in order to display affiliation more strongly. Glenn identifies three devices for this: extended laughter, repetition of the original laughable, and the production of new laughables thematically linked to the original (82). Extended laughter and repetitions can only go so far, but the production of new laughables by participants may be drawn out at some length.

Although laughables may be ambiguous and identified only retroactively, chap. 4 addresses the more concrete question of who laughs first. Glenn briefly returns to review CA by describing the turn-taking system in conversation and the effects of group size on that system. He suggests that a general participant bias against self-praise, described in early CA research (Pomerantz 1978), also constrains "laughing at one's own jokes." In multi-party interactions where there are several possible laughers, therefore, speakers generally do not laugh first. In two-party interactions, however, he claims that the laughable-producing speaker *MUST* laugh first if shared laughter, and the affiliation it promotes, is to occur (101). The ambiguity of some potential laughables makes the possibility that the recipient will "miss the joke" too great. Thus "speaker laughs first" is common in two-party interactions but not multi-party ones. First laughter in Glenn's data works, among other things, to mark previous utterances as non-serious, to show a willingness to laugh at/tease oneself, and to disambiguate problematic or marginal laughables. A minor point that might have produced further interesting results is the role of physical cues in these interactions. Glenn does earlier describe a piece of video data in which smiling indicates receptiveness to joking/laughter (71), and he notes that the majority of his two-party interactions were telephone conversations, while the multi-party interactions occurred mainly face-to-face, but he does not explore the larger role of the body in face-to-face instances of shared laughter.

In chap. 5 Glenn distinguishes between affiliative and disaffiliative laughter. He identifies four keys to distinguishing "laughing at": Someone co-present is identified as the laughable; someone other than the butt laughs first; second laugh is produced by another co-participant, not the butt – in two-party interactions, there is no second laugh; and subsequent talk references "laughing at." Both affiliative and disaffiliative laughter may be converted to their opposites. Jokes, which often function as "understanding tests," may lead to laughter at a participant who doesn't get them, or at an inadequate joke teller. In cases where a co-

present person has been made the butt of laughter, she may transform “laughing at” to “laughing with” by participating in subsequent laughable production.

In chap. 6 Glenn addresses the use of laughter in both “laughing along” and resisting teasing to constitute relationships and identities. He cites earlier research on laughter, particularly Jefferson, Sacks & Schegloff 1987, that identifies laughter as a midpoint between disaffiliation and explicit affiliation in response to “improprieties” in interaction. Improprieties, like teasing, may create and display intimacy between participants engaging in a common form of moderately risky play. While laughter signals some appreciation of such utterances, however, it does not in itself agree with them. Accompanying utterances are necessary to clarify any particular laugh. Glenn presents two interesting cases of teasing interactions in which female laughter resists sexual teases from male co-participants. One case involves a long sequence of wordplay in which both participants humorously produce incorrect verb tenses. The wordplay turns sexual with the use of the word *come*; the female participant laughs but follows up with a non-sexual continuation of grammatical play despite the sexualized referencing in the previous utterance (131–41).

The second case is taken from the popular National Public Radio program *Car talk*; a female caller’s name is marked as interesting in the opening of the call. She claims her (unspoken) last name is “even wilder”; one of the male hosts then produces a sexual joke: “[the caller] is even wilder than the last girl I went out with” (145). His co-host produces the first laugh and is joined by both the original speaker and the caller. The caller ends her laughter first, however, and then produces *well* in a tone that suggests mock indignation. Early CA research showed that *well* often prefaces disagreements or dispreferred utterances; together with her tone and cessation of laughter, the female caller effectively closes the sexual joke. The hosts retreat to non-sexual wordplay on her name. Accordingly, the caller is able to acknowledge the humorous intent of the sexual joke without affiliating with it, and to initiate movement away from potential offense.

Glenn discusses Jefferson’s work on how men and women laugh differently; she found a “tentative pattern” with women tending to laugh more affiliatively and men more disaffiliatively (154–55). Glenn suggests that male and female laughter differs in courtship-relevant and non-courtship-relevant interactions. Men tend to respond more to women’s laughter invitations in non-courtship-relevant interactions; in courtship-relevant interactions, however, women respond more often to men’s laughter invitations. Laughter that does not invite further laughter in response (in troubles-telling, etc.) is more common in courtship-relevant interactions than others, is more often produced by women, and is more often at the woman’s “expense” (157). Despite these asymmetries, and although gender is an interesting and often powerful construct, we do not “live our communicative lives in the aggregate” (158) – in any single interaction, gender may be more or less relevant to the participants themselves. This work answers a call for more study of talk-in-interpersonal relationships without assuming that variables like gender

are omnirelevant. Although Glenn concedes that talk and relationships are different things, he asserts that talk is essential to the constitution of relationships. Laughter plays a large part in characterizing relationships; its ambiguity allows participants to explore relationship possibilities without fully committing to them. Future research, he suggests, might focus on laughter's role in the "social constructions of power in relationships," particularly in enforcing dominance (169).

Glenn provides thorough background for his own work on laughter, drawing largely from CA sources, but the book offers much more than a summary. Early CA research did address laughter in "general conversation," but more recent work has mostly addressed it in specific institutional settings (Haakana 2001, Lavin & Maynard 2001). The more we know about "free" laughter in relatively unconstrained naturalistic interactions, the better we can understand how participants use the resource of laughter in settings where it may be more constrained. In this light, Glenn's book is an important contribution. His use of CA highlights the importance of context and sequential placement; it also foregrounds the orientations of participants themselves and presents a compelling argument for increased sensitivity to what individuals do in PARTICULAR interactions.

## REFERENCES

- Haakana, Markku (2001). Laughter as a patient's resource: Dealing with delicate aspects of medical interaction. *Text* 21:187–219.
- Jefferson, Gail (1979). A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance or declination. In George Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, 79–98. New York: Irvington.
- \_\_\_\_\_; Sacks, Harvey; & Schegloff, Emanuel (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In Graham Button & John R. E. Lee (eds.), *Talk and social organization*, 152–205. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lavin, Danielle, & Maynard, Douglas W. (2001). Standardization vs. rapport: Respondent laughter and interviewer reaction during telephone surveys. *American Sociological Review* 66:453–79.

(Received 16 April 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506330345

STUART GREENE & DAWN ABT-PERKINS (eds.), *Making race visible: Literacy research for cultural understanding*. New York & London: Teachers College Press, 2003. Pp. xi, 220. Hb \$52.00, Pb \$24.95.

Reviewed by SHANAN FITTS  
*Education, University of Colorado–Boulder*  
Boulder, CO 80309  
Shanan.Fitts@Colorado.edu

*Making race visible: Literacy research for cultural understanding* (2003) reveals that racialized ways of thinking, relating, and teaching continue to be integral aspects of our society and our schools. An important task for researchers

*Language in Society* 35:5 (2006)

771

and practitioners concerned with social justice is the examination of race and racism, and this is the primary undertaking of the authors who contributed to this volume. It presents research conducted both by university-based scholars and by practitioners (teachers who are doing research), providing rich insights from a variety of perspectives. In examining issues of race and racism in literacy instruction, the authors included have four main objectives: to study local literacy practices through long-term commitments to communities; to acknowledge and theorize their own racialized positions as literacy researchers; to examine the ethics of their research agendas; and finally, to use literacy research for positive social change.

In her foreword, Gloria Ladson-Billings, a renowned educator and author of *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children* (1994), argues convincingly that the concepts of race and racism are implicit and ever-present in the discussion and implementation of literacy and literacy instruction. She explains, and the research presented in this volume demonstrates, that these concepts need to be made explicit. In foregrounding the historical roots of literacy as an aspect of liberation for many oppressed people, she calls for researchers to do more than just illuminate the social inequities that continue to exist in our public schools: She calls for research as activism, as praxis to change the inequities that exist.

In their useful and thorough introduction, Stuart Greene & Dawn Abt-Perkins state that they focused explicitly on race because there continue to be distinct links among being a person of color, being poor, and lacking access to equal educational opportunity. They note that although race may be a social construct, it has real social, economic, psychic, and physical consequences. The chapters that follow use the precepts and assumptions of critical race theory (CRT) as a framework to examine the ways in which racism affects the research and practice of literacy instruction. A key underlying assumption of CRT is that racism is a permanent feature of our society (Bell 1992), an institutionalized and normalized system of privilege, and a fundamental aspect of our social organization. Rather than uncritically assuming that democracy and racism are incompatible, critical race theorists attempt to uncover the ways in which racism has been integral to the founding of the democratic U.S. nation. Following critical race theory, many of the authors in this volume use storytelling and narrative inquiry as their primary methods of collecting and communicating data. Personal experience and reflection are crucial aspects of their projects. The research process is thus made transparent and open for inquiry. Not only is the reader made privy to the researchers' decision-making processes, but the authors also strive to make space in their work for alternative framings and interpretations of data.

The book is organized into three sections. The chapters in the first section, titled "Recognizing teacher and student racial identities," focus on teachers' and researchers' burgeoning self-awareness of the salience of race and racism in their own work, classrooms, and writings. The opening chapter by Courtney

Cazden prepares the reader for the various perspectives portrayed in the following chapters by juxtaposing insider (practitioner) and outsider (university-based) research on issues of racism, teacher attitudes and expectations, and educational opportunity. On the one hand, she shows the value of practitioner research for understanding the complex, intensely interpersonal emotional issues related to racism. On the other, she illustrates how university-based researchers can provide a view of the wider social and historical context in which racism is embedded. The other two chapters in the first section are self-reflexive and autobiographical. Arlette Ingram Willis, discussing her undergraduate students' reactions to texts and activities focused on racism, reflects that in her eagerness to move her more privileged students toward deeper understandings of their own racialized selves, she may have tailored the class to suit her white students at the expense of the students of color. Deborah Appleman explicitly addresses the dangers inherent in "writing up" ethnographic research and the potential ways that narrative vignettes of participants may reinscribe racial and class stereotypes.

The two chapters in part II, titled "Working against 'color blind' practices and contexts," demonstrate how long-term and self-reflective research can illuminate how race and racism are produced in institutional contexts. Joanne Larson draws from two long-term research projects to illustrate how the issues of race that surfaced in her fieldwork "had specific consequences on access to data and public revelation of findings" (p. 89). She found that many teachers had deficit views of their students and their language practices. Her subsequent research report was censored by the school district because it revealed teachers' low expectations and negative attitudes regarding their African-American students. Larson argues that students' literacy practices were frequently marginalized through a process she terms "reciprocal distancing . . . a discourse process in which teachers and students invoke sociohistorical and political distances between their communities in classroom interaction" (92). For example, one teacher she interviewed noted that her African-American students lacked the "natural" ability to conjugate verbs, and chuckled about her students' use of Black English. Larson interpreted this teacher's laughter as perhaps "indicating a colluding stance" (95) with her, the white researcher. She notes: "The idea of collusion presents an ethical dilemma for me. Do I participate in this collusion to get the data? Or do I point out the potentially racist implications of her comments?" (95). Larson chose to remain silent during this particular interaction to "get the data," which she then shared with other teachers and administrators, thus facilitating positive social change. In her own words: "To use a colluding stance and not challenge their negative assumptions to get the data was a choice I made because I felt it was more important to expose the insidious workings of the deficit model as it plays out in today's classrooms" (102).

Part III, "Making visible power and discrimination," relates insights and findings based on empirical research done in K–12 classrooms in public schools.

The research reported in these chapters explores students' exposure to the themes of racism and social injustice in school, and their interpretations and analyses of texts that deal with these topics. For example, in the final chapter, Colette Daiute & Hollie Jones study students' uses of "diversity discourses" in third and seventh grade classrooms. The authors explain that "diversity discourses are the stated or implied assumptions, expectations, or goals about social relations in oral and written language" (178). This chapter focuses more on the authors' methods of data analysis than on their findings. The authors examine their data, which include class discussions as well as various forms of student writing, using three distinct analytical frames. First, the researchers read across all data sources looking for the ways that teachers and students talk about issues of difference – their diversity discourses. Second, they categorized the use of diversity discourses by genre, or by the context in which the data was collected. The purpose here was to determine whether certain kinds of discourses were privileged in particular settings (such as teacher-led discussions vs. personal narrative essays about conflicts.) Finally, they looked at students' conflict narratives across the racial categories of White, Latin, and African-American to see what patterns emerged. The authors emphasize the importance of doing multiple kinds of analysis to avoid reinforcing stereotypes and essentializing groups, especially when addressing issues of racial and ethnic identity.

The book is closed by a short Afterword by Sonia Nieto, who points out that although researchers often hide behind claims of objectivity, the authors in this volume "demonstrate in numerous ways that research is not neutral, and they show how it can be used to either uphold the status quo or disrupt it" (203). Although *Making race visible* includes much more self-reflection than is typical in the reporting of sociological and educational research, the authors generally avoid the self-indulgence that occasionally accompanies such a perspective. As a graduate student and novice researcher in the field of education, I found the authors' reflexivity and openness refreshing. All too frequently, decisions made by researchers during the research process are not included in the final polished product: Findings are presented as though unproblematic and disconnected from real people and real lives. The gap between educational research findings and educational practices continues to be wide. One way to narrow this gap is for practitioners and researchers to communicate with one another with respect and honesty, because both parties have something to offer and something to learn. The essays in this book are an important contribution to that endeavor.

## REFERENCES

- Bell, Derrick (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well*. New York: Basic Books.  
 Ladson-Billings, Gloria (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

(Received 9 May 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506340341

DARRELL T. TRYON & JEAN-MICHEL CHARPENTIER, *Pacific pidgins and creoles: Origins, growth and development*. (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 132). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004. Pp. xix, 559. Hb \$123.20.

Reviewed by JEFF SIEGEL  
*School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics, University of New England  
Armidale, NSW 2351, Australia  
jsiegel@une.edu.au*

The authors of this substantial volume each have more than 30 years of research experience in the Pacific region, primarily in Melanesia – especially Vanuatu (formerly the New Hebrides). This focus is reflected in the content. Despite the title, the book deals only with Pacific pidgins and creoles that are lexified by English, thus leaving out, for example, Tayo (a French-lexified creole of New Caledonia). Furthermore, it concentrates almost entirely on the three dialects of Melanesian Pidgin: Tok Pisin (Papua New Guinea), Pijin (Solomon Islands), and Bislama (Vanuatu), with an emphasis on the latter.

The volume consists of eleven chapters, including six figures and 39 tables, and two appendices. Chap. 1 is a short introduction giving some background about the authors and an outline of the contents. Chap. 2 consists of brief sketches of most of the English-lexified pidgins and creoles of the Pacific. The third chapter gives an overview of theories of development from the past 30 years that are relevant to the Pacific – first for pidgins and creoles in general, and then for those in Oceania. This is done by focusing on the work of particular scholars: Derek Bickerton, Peter Mühlhäusler, Ross Clark, Roger Keesing, Bill Camden, Jean-Michel Charpentier, Tom Dutton, Jakelin Troy, and Terry Crowley.

The next seven chapters are concerned with the historical development of Melanesian Pidgin and other relevant pidgins. Four different periods are distinguished: 1788 (the first year of the British invasion of Australia) to 1863 (the beginning of the importation of indentured laborers from the Pacific islands); 1863 to 1906, the end of indentured Pacific islands labor in Australia; 1906 to 1975, the year the first Melanesian nation, Papua New Guinea, became independent; and 1975 to the present. Linguistic data from before the 1960s comes from historical sources such as diaries, travelers' accounts, government reports, and court records.

Chap. 4 outlines contacts that occurred from 1788 to 1863 between Europeans and indigenous people of Australia and various Pacific islands. These occurred as the result of the occupation of the Australian continent by European settlers, and the subsequent maritime links between Sydney and Pacific islands in connection with whaling, the pork trade, and the collection of sea slugs (*bêche-de-mer*) and sandalwood. The following islands are discussed: Tahiti, Cook Islands, Gilbert Islands (now Kiribati), Ponape (Pohnpei), New Caledonia, Loyalty

Islands, New Hebrides (Vanuatu), Solomon Islands, and Fiji. Chap. 5 portrays the varieties of language that developed as the result of these contacts with examples and word lists, first from New South Wales Pidgin (1788–1850) and then from the “Pacific Pidgin” that was developing in the islands listed above. This chapter clearly demonstrates the influence of Australian pidgins on Pacific pidgins, as first reported by Baker 1993.

Chap. 6 discusses contacts from 1863 to 1906 resulting from the Pacific labor trade. During this period, nearly 100,000 Pacific Islanders – mainly from Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Loyalty Islands, Papua New Guinea, and Kiribati (to use the modern names) – were recruited to work on European-owned plantations primarily in Queensland, Samoa, and Fiji, but also in Hawai‘i, French Polynesia and New Caledonia, and in the three other Melanesian countries as well. This chapter describes plantations in each of these places and the origins of the laborers working there. Chap. 7 goes on to present and discuss linguistic data from this period, illustrating the emergence of stable pidgin languages in the region. Written sources provide pages of examples from New South Wales and various Pacific islands. Testimony from the 1885–1886 Royal Commission on the Pacific labor trade held in Queensland, as well as records from the Christian missions working in Queensland, provide data on “Queensland Canefields English.” Examples from tape recordings are also presented, first from interviews conducted in the 1960s with elderly Pacific Islanders in Queensland who had been plantation workers there between 1885 and 1890 (Dutton 1980), and second from recordings of older speakers of Bislama in Vanuatu, made by several researchers in the late 1960s and 1970s. A detailed comparison of data from these two sources confirms the close connection between the pidgin of the Queensland plantations and Melanesian Pidgin.

Chap. 8 concentrates on the period from 1906 to 1975, when the indentured labor system had come to an end in Australia and most Pacific Islanders had been repatriated to their home islands. The chapter describes the establishment of colonies in these islands by European powers – Britain and France in the New Hebrides, Germany in New Guinea and Britain in Papua (both later taken over by Australia), and Britain in the Solomon Islands. But more important, the chapter documents the internal, colonial plantation system that began to expand in each country during this period. Detailed information is given about the location of the plantations and the sources of laborers from within the colony, and also about the effects of World War II in each country.

In investigating the linguistic situation during this period, the authors conclude in chap. 9 that by the end of the labor trade, there was already “a generally uniform Pacific Pidgin spoken throughout Island Melanesia” (349). Their main goal in this chapter is to demonstrate the subsequent differentiation into three separate varieties that occurred as the result of the internal plantation system in each country. The concentration is on lexical differentiation – the adoption of



from 5% to 10% of vocabulary from different local indigenous languages in the New Hebrides variety and in the New Guinea variety, as well as lexical items from French in the former and from German in the latter. In contrast, the Solomon Islands variety retained a much larger proportion of vocabulary derived from English. The chapter includes many texts from the literature for each variety and concludes with a summary of some lexical and morphosyntactic differences among the three modern dialects, Bislama, Pijin, and Tok Pisin.

Chap. 10 examines the role of the Melanesian Pidgin dialects in politics, writing, and education in the postcolonial era (1975 to the present). Bislama in Vanuatu gets the most coverage (52 pages), followed by Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea (16 pages) and Pijin in the Solomon Islands (6 pages). Chap. 11 is a short summary and synthesis of data presented in the preceding chapters. This is followed by Appendix 1, consisting of the Bislama version of the Vanuatu constitution, and Appendix 2, containing 30 maps. There is also a general index.

This volume synthesizes an impressive amount of historical and linguistic data. The authors present some interesting new information, such as statistics showing the importance of Ponape as a “major axis” in the Pacific between 1840 and 1860 (91) and details of older forms and regional variation in Bislama (279–94). However, the overall conclusions generally reinforce those of previous work, including research on internal plantations and dialectal differentiation (Siegel 1998), not mentioned in the book. The discussion of post-independence language planning deliberations in Vanuatu (in which the authors were directly involved) is an interesting contribution to the field, but again a previous publication covering some of the same ground is not mentioned (Crowley 2000).

It is unfortunate that the authors are not very comprehensive in their coverage of recent research in the area, and some of the literature they cite is out of date. For example, the references they give for “a fuller discussion of modern-day Tok Pisin and its roles” (336) are from 1979, 1985 and 1986; they do not refer to important recent publications on Tok Pisin, such as Smith 2000, 2002.

The strongest point of this volume is the enormous amount of historical linguistic data it provides. However, much of this data is presented without comment or analysis, and in many cases without translation (e.g., 441). This brings into question the particular audience that the authors had in mind. Chaps. 2 and 3 would serve as a good introduction for those unfamiliar with Pacific pidgins and creoles and research on Melanesian Pidgin, but familiarity with the features of the language seems to be assumed in later chapters, as well as a familiarity with Vanuatu and its history. (For example, most readers would not know that “Santo” [322] is used to refer to the town of Luganville mentioned earlier on the page.)

Another problem with the volume has to do with terminology. First, the distinction between pidgins and creoles is not made clear. For example, the Pitcairn-Norfolk language is called a pidgin (11–12, 296) although by any definition it would be a creole because it is the native language of its speakers. Also, there is

no explanation of the fact (briefly mentioned on p. 24) that Melanesian Pidgin itself is often called a creole because it has native speakers and an expanded grammar and lexicon (see, e.g., Thomason 1997:79–80). With regard to Bislama, Pijin, and Tok Pisin, they are sometimes referred to as three varieties of Melanesian Pidgin (2) and sometimes as three separate Pidgin Englishes (3). Furthermore, the term “Bislama” is normally applied to the modern variety spoken in Vanuatu, but in the text it is used to refer to the early Melanesian Pidgin spoken in the 1800s (108) and to Pacific Pidgin in general (152). And in some places, the term “pidgin” is used in place of “Bislama” (e.g., 446).

Terminological problems are especially acute with regard to Hawai‘i, where in addition to the indigenous language, Hawaiian, there are three different contact varieties. Pidgin Hawaiian (lexified by Hawaiian) and Hawaiian Pidgin English (lexified by English) are no longer spoken. Hawaiian Creole English, locally known as “Pidgin,” is the native language of a large proportion of the population of Hawai‘i. (Many linguists refer to this as Hawai‘i Creole [English] to avoid association with the Hawaiian language.) All of these languages are confused in this volume. On p. 3, Hawaiian Pidgin English is said to be treated fully in Roberts 1995, but this work is about Pidgin Hawaiian. Elsewhere, Hawaiian Pidgin English is equated to Hawaiian Creole English (e.g., 12). In discussing Bickerton’s (1981) Language Bioprogram Hypothesis, the authors say it was “based on the example of Hawaiian” (24) and that “Bickerton distinguished ten similarities shared exclusively by Atlantic Creoles and Hawaiian”. Of course, this should be Hawai‘i Creole, not Hawaiian.

Some inaccuracies can be found in the text. For example, the Tok Pisin word for ‘evil spirit’ is *masalai* not *marsalai* (387), and ‘chicken’ is *kakaruk*, not *kukuruk* (394). An in-text reference to Mühlhäusler 1987 should be 1978 (21), and the reference listed for Siegel 1997 is incorrect (546). Other errors, too numerous to mention here, should have been picked up by the editors, especially with regard to missing and superfluous words, and the many cases of repetition. In one instance, three complete sentences of one paragraph on p. 109 are repeated verbatim (except for one word) on p. 154, and again on p. 250.

It is to be hoped that these editing problems as well as terminological matters and inaccuracies can be remedied in a future edition with updated references. But even as it stands now, the volume will be useful to those interested in the historical development of Melanesian Pidgin.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, Philip (1993). Australian influence on Melanesian Pidgin English. *Te Reo* 36:367.  
 Bickerton, Derek (1981). *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.  
 Crowley, Terry (2000). The language situation in Vanuatu. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 1:47–132.

- Dutton, Tom (1980). *Queensland Canefields English of the late nineteenth century*. (Pacific linguistics D-29). Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- Roberts, Julian M. (1995). Pidgin Hawaiian: A sociohistorical study. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 10:1–56.
- Siegel, Jeff (1997). Using a pidgin language in formal education: Help or hindrance? *Applied Linguistics* 18:86–100.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1998). Dialectal differences and substrate reinforcement in Melanesian Pidgin. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2:347–73.
- Smith, Geoff P. (2000). Tok Pisin and English: The current relationship. In Jeff Siegel (ed.), *Processes of language contact: Studies from Australia and the South Pacific*, 271–91. Montreal: Fides.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2002). *Growing up with Tok Pisin: Contact, creolization, and change in Papua New Guinea's national language*. London: Battlebridge.
- Thomason, Sarah G. (1997). A typology of contact languages. In Arthur K. Spears & Donald Winford (eds.), *The structure and status of pidgins and creoles*, 71–88. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

(Received 15 May 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506350348

GENE LERNER (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*.  
Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004. Pp. 300. Hb \$138.00, Pb \$65.95.

Reviewed by JACK SIDNELL  
*Anthropology, University of Toronto*  
*Toronto, Ont. M5S 3H1, Canada*  
*jack.sidnell@utoronto.ca*

Conversation analysis developed in the mid to late 1960s in a collaboration initially between Harvey Sacks and Emanuel Schegloff and, somewhat later, with the addition of Gail Jefferson. By the early 1970s, several students joined the group, by this point based at the University of California campuses at Irvine and Los Angeles, to form what Lerner calls “the first generation.” Conversation analysis has continued to grow, indeed has flourished, in the years since. Today conversation analysts are to be found not only in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, but also Japan, Korea, Germany, Finland, the Netherlands, and many other countries. There are conversation analysts in departments of sociology, linguistics, anthropology, communication, and psychology, as well as in many modern language and applied programs. The widespread success of conversation analysis is largely attributable to three characteristics of its research program:

1. Formal/Generalizing: Its emphasis on the development of formal accounts that allow for significant generalization across a wide range of instances. The goal of any CA study is to account for all instances of a phenomenon. This is well illustrated by Schegloff’s (1968) study which showed that a “summons-answer sequence” better accounted for the data of 500 tele-

- phone openings than did “a distribution rule” that specifies “answerer speaks first”.
2. Empirical: Its grounding in close observation and detailed analyses of particular instances recorded mechanically and therefore capable of being replayed an indefinite number of times. The robustly empirical character of CA is evidenced, for instance, in the importance placed on transcription and transcription of a particular kind (Heritage 1984:234–38).
  3. Cumulative: The cumulative and interlocking nature of findings arrived at through application of its methods. A handful of early studies have provided a foundation on which many others have been based. The turn-taking paper (Sacks et al. 1974) is now over 30 years old but remains unchallenged as the best available account of how this domain of human conduct is organized. Subsequent research on turn-taking in other contexts and among other groups has strongly supported, and sometimes elaborated, rather than undermined the original analysis.

Lerner’s collection of important early papers provides strong evidence that these three features have characterized CA from its inception. The book opens with a brief history and overview of the papers by Lerner. Following this is the first of three contributions by Gail Jefferson. As in her 1985 paper on similar matters, here Jefferson shows that seemingly small phonetic differences can have significant consequences for the production of action and the organization of sequences. Jefferson is, of course, uniquely situated to demonstrate the importance of disciplined observation cultivated, in large measure, through the practice of transcription, having invented, more or less from scratch, the system of conventions now used.

Part I of the book, titled “Taking turns speaking,” begins with a highly compressed account of turn-taking in conversation by Harvey Sacks. This is an early distillation of the analysis that was to become “A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation” and well illustrates the formal and generalizing character of CA. With a few basic rules (or principles) Sacks accounts for many grossly observable features of conversation: overwhelmingly one party talks at a time; gap and overlap are common but minimal; size of turns is not fixed but varies; number of parties varies; and many other observations.

Jefferson’s second chapter in the volume examines overlap within three conditions: overlap-onset, within-overlap talk, and post-overlap talk. With respect to overlap onset, Jefferson is primarily concerned to show that it can be the product of “systematic procedures” such as displaying (independent) knowledge or showing recognition, and moreover that it is systematically generated – occurring recurrently, for instance, at points of possible completion (“when a possible completion point turns out not to be the actual completion and ongoing speaker appends a syntactically coherent next utterance component while a next speaker

is starting up"; p. 45). This chapter draws together many of Jefferson's observations on overlap published earlier (Jefferson 1973, 1983) and develops as well an analysis of post-overlap talk distinguishing between marked and unmarked modes of retrieval.

The next section, "Implementing actions," begins with a chapter by Schegloff which examines turns that answer the summons embodied in the ring of a telephone. The three forms given extensive consideration here are *yeah*, *hello*, and self-identification (*police desk* in Schegloff's corpus). The essay is centrally concerned with the basic issue of selection. The selection problem can be simply put: Where several alternative forms, formats, or formulations are available, what occasions the selection of one from among them? Within conversation analysis, the problem is not to predict which form will be selected on any particular occasion but rather to determine how participants themselves understand selection to be in operation. Thus Schegloff notes that "the telephone ring, as a form of summons, is not treated by members as displaying selectionality" (66). In contrast, "there is a selection possibility with the class of clearance cue answers" (66–67). Schegloff takes this selection and "what each selection may be said to accomplish" as the focus of his chapter. He suggests that "the answer is fitted not so much to the summons . . . as to features of the setting in which the answerer is located, and to which the summoner is presumed to be oriented in calling" (67). Schegloff shows that the selection of answers such as *yeah* and *hi* "presumptively types the prospective conversation as 'foreknown,' as one in which the answerer takes it he has warrantable information about the caller and the prospective course of action."

These answers stand as the marked option relative to the unmarked (at least in this context) *hello*. Schegloff notes that "a first question to be addressed with respect to "hello" as an initial utterance in telephone conversation is whether it is an answer, whether it is an answer to a summons that is to be analyzed" (74). Consider the following:

- A: Hello  
 B: Eddy  
 A: Yeah  
 B: Guy Huston  
 A: Hi Guy.

Here an initial *hello* does not receive a return but rather a candidate identification of the answerer (A). After this is confirmed (*yeah*), the caller self-identifies and it is only then, once the identities of the parties are established, that a greeting *Hi Guy* is produced. What this indicates is that at the beginning of telephone conversations, callers treat identification of the parties as a priority task. This in turn explains why, for telephone conversations, *yeah* and *hi* answers to summons are marked relative to unmarked *hello*. *Yeah* and *hi* treat the identification task as a *fait accompli*. Schegloff's chapter well illustrates the strongly cumulative and interlocking nature of CA, illuminating some hitherto poorly understood aspects

of telephone openings while at the same time providing support for other parts of a larger analysis (e.g. Schegloff 1968, 1979).

Pomerantz begins her chapter by noting, "In a fair number of jobs, at least some of the work that employees perform involves interacting with others. In these cases, the talk is not incidental to the work; rather it is the way the work gets done" (109). Elaborating this theme, she examines calls from a clerk in a high school to the parents of possibly truant students. While this chapter develops a detailed and nuanced account of one setting and the various practices that characterize it, the relevance of the findings is not limited to this setting. Pomerantz shows, for instance, how the design of the clerk's initial inquiry has consequences for the rest of the call. A question such as *Was Mark home from school ill today?* incorporates a legitimate excuse for the reported absence that can be confirmed or disconfirmed in next turn. In contrast, when the clerk says *I was calling about Michelle she has a couple of absences sin:ce: u-oh:: las:t, Thursday, .hhh She's been reported absent (0.2) .t all day last Thursda:y*, she does not offer any possible reason for the absence and in this way establishes different relevances for the response. Pomerantz's observations then illustrate the meeting of generic resources (of turn design and alternate formulations) and context-specific interactional practices (investigating absences). Moreover, insofar as this study resonates with more recent ones on talk at work, it nicely illustrates the cumulative character of conversation analytic research (especially in her emphasis on neutrality; see Clayman 1988).

Jefferson's third contribution in the volume presents a powerful analysis of the preface *At first I thought. . .*. Drawing on a wide range of materials from conversation, newspaper reports, and personal anecdotes, Jefferson shows that this is a device for normalizing extraordinary events. When asked about extraordinary happenings such as airplane hijackings, assassinations, or natural disasters, witnesses recurrently report that their first inclination was to hear (or see) their initial evidence as some unexceptional event such as a car backfiring or a film being made. The analysis is powerful, and the paper also includes a very interesting discussion of the project's history (it began with some observations by Sacks).

The final section of the book, "Sequencing actions," contains three papers. The first, by Alene Kiku Terasaki, is a classic study originally published in an obscure sociology journal that has served since the 1970s as the standard analysis of pre-announcement sequences such as the following:

- D: Didju hear the terrible news?  
R: No. What.

As later work by Levinson 1983 and Schegloff 1988, among others, has shown, analysis of such pre-sequences has wide significance for an understanding of topics such as indirection, conventionalization, and action sequencing. Terasaki's analysis focuses on three turn types within the sequence: the pre-announcement, the solicitor, and the announcement itself.

In the penultimate chapter, Lerner examines collaboratively constructed turns with a focus on the small sequences they may engender. He shows that the production of a completion establishes a position in which the original speaker may accept the completion, reject it, or do something “somewhere between acceptance and outright rejection,” as in the following:

- Daughter: Oh here dad (0.2) a good way to get tho:se corners out  
(0.2)  
Dad: is to stick yer finger insi:de.  
Daughter: → well, that’s one way.

The analysis is presented with exceptional clarity, and Lerner develops an elegant description of the phenomenon itself while at the same time pointing to the various interactional ends it is used to accomplish.

The final chapter, by Goldberg on amplitude shift, explores an aspect of prosody that has not been extensively examined by conversation analysts (or others, apart from earlier work by the same author). What this paper nicely illustrates is early attention to how multiple channels (prosody, semantic content) work together to produce coherent courses of action; in this way Goldberg anticipated a recent emphasis on intonation and multi-modality.

This volume is an outstanding contribution to conversation analysis. The importance of the book is not merely historical. Given the three characteristics of CA mentioned above, these studies remain just as relevant and significant as they were when they were written. Of course, the history is here – and it is fascinating – but the book is much more than a collection of “golden oldies.” These studies are no less contemporary for being 30 years old.

## REFERENCES

- Clayman, S. (1988). Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. *Social Problems* 35:474–92.  
Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.  
Jefferson, G. (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica* 9:47–96.  
——— (1983). Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset. V. D’Urso & P. Leonardi (eds.), *Discourse analysis and natural rhetoric*, 11–38. Padua: Cleup.  
——— (1985). An exercise in the transcription and analysis of laughter. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis*, 3:25–34. New York: Academic Press  
Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
Sacks, H.; Schegloff, E. A.; & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50:696–735.  
Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70:1075–95.  
——— (1979). Identification and recognition in telephone openings. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language*, 23–78. New York: Erlbaum.  
——— (1988). Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12:55–62.

(Received 17 May 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506360344

HO WAH KAM & RUTH Y. L. WONG (eds.), *English language teaching in East Asia today: Changing policies and practices*. 2nd ed. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, 2004. Pp. 474. Hb \$30.00.

HO WAH KAM & RUTH Y. L. WONG (eds.), *Language policies and language education: The impact in East Asian countries in the next decade*. 2nd ed. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, 2004. Pp. 384. Hb \$30.00.

Reviewed by MEE-LING LAI  
*Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong*  
mllai@ied.edu.hk

These two volumes, edited by two distinguished scholars in language education from Singapore, provide basic, essential, up-to-date information about the language situations and development of English language teaching in East Asian countries. Together they form a valuable encyclopedic reference work that will give scholars, teachers, and language policy makers a bigger picture of the Asian region through which they can better understand the position of their own countries and learn from the experience of others. Although the two volumes can be read independently, it is more logical to sequence *Language policies and language education* before *English language teaching in East Asia today* because the former provides an overview of language policies and language education in the region from a macro perspective, which helps to set out the necessary contextual background for a micro exploration into issues of English language teaching in the second volume. The editors take pride in the fact that the two books provide an “insiders’ perspective,” meaning that all the country-based chapters were written by scholars who have lived in the given country for a long time. Indeed, this helps to establish high credibility for the information provided. On the good foundation that these two volumes have laid, comparative studies across countries in the region can be conducted more easily and efficiently.

In both volumes, the term “East Asia” also covers Southeast Asia (Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam) and Northeast Asia (Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, China, and Taiwan). Mongolia, in eastern Central Asia, though often neglected in the literature, is also included in these two volumes. In *Language policies and language education*, 17 political entities are covered, including North Korea, which however is omitted from *English language teaching in East Asia today*. Both books feature a consistent style and a coherent manner, beginning with the editors’ introductions, which lay out some common threads underpinning the chapters and provide an overview of the general situation in each country. The main body of both volumes is the country-based chapters, arranged in alphabetical order. At the end, the editors provide an epilogue that summarizes the main thrusts of the chapters, with an aim to throw light on the future development of



language education and English language teaching in the region. For the sake of clarity, I shall discuss the two books separately.

Participants in international conferences on language education are always keen on finding out about the sociolinguistic situations and language education policies in countries other than their own. With the help of *Language policies and language education*, related information in the Asian region no longer has to be collected piecemeal. This book is easy and convenient to read, and it provides essential foundational information about the development of language policies and language education in 17 political entities. The term “East Asia” is used to cover Southeast Asia and central East Asia. Apart from geographical location, the countries also represent different levels of economic success, with Japan being the “economic miracle” and Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong, and South Korea the “four little dragons” whose GDP will achieve 98.5% of that of the United States in 2025 (cited in chap. 1). In addition, there are the economically developing countries (the People’s Republic of China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Brunei Darussalam, Thailand) and the new members of the open market economy (Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar, Vietnam, Mongolia). Of the three groups of countries, the third one appears to be the most intriguing because countries like Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam have just rejoined the international community after a long period of political instability and warfare, and information about these countries is relatively scarce. However economically well-developed these countries are, as revealed in this book, they found it necessary to give way to the spread of English under the impact of an open economy and the pressure of globalization. While the newly opened countries need English for new trading and international relations even within the region, the economically more successful countries cling to English as an essential means to maintain their competitiveness.

The introductory and summarizing chapters at the beginning and the end of the book are useful. In the former, the editors set the scene by highlighting the essential factors that affect the development of language policies and language education in different countries. Toward the end of the introduction, they also draw out commonalities among the countries that enable readers to see the significant issues across different countries beyond each factual case. In the last chapter, the editors summarize the important facts about each country to allow readers a quick review of the 17 political entities. Common features across the countries are also highlighted, among which the “national-functional tradition” best depicts the typical experience of many countries in establishing one official national language to serve the need for national unity and identity while also making efforts to preserve dialects to maintain cultural diversity. Nevertheless, for pragmatic reasons of economic and political survival under the great pressure of globalization, foreign languages, especially English, become an indispensable part of language education planning in these countries.

There is no fixed structure for the 16 country-based chapters in this volume; contributors write about the important issues of their own countries under the broad concept of language policies and language education. Since the authors are insiders who know their own countries best, this liberal format gives them autonomy to decide what important issues should be brought to readers' attention. For example, in chap. 7, the authors spell out the unique qualities of Japanese culture that hinder the learning of English. Unlike the other chapters, they also describe Japan's national effort to teach Japanese to speakers of other languages. Such autonomy enables unique communication between each writer and the readers. However, this is not without drawbacks. Because each chapter is structured in a different way with different headings, comparisons across countries are made less easy and efficient. Although some comparison tables supplied by the editors compensate in this respect (e.g., "Literacy in East Asia," 25; "Languages in education in East Asia," 26–28), it would be very useful if the volume had included an appendix giving more comprehensive cross-country comparisons on each of the common themes of the chapters.

Because this book aims to provide basic essential information on the language policies and language education development in different countries, the chapters mainly give a descriptive account of facts, with only occasional critical discussion of issues. This may lead to an impression that language planning and education in these countries will be successfully carried out as long as a policy is in place. Details about how well the language policies are implemented and the difficulties encountered during the implementation process are not mentioned in most of the chapters. However, the bibliographies at the ends of chapters provide useful clues for interested readers, especially helpful for outsiders who do not know where to begin.

While *Language policies and language education* mainly provides descriptive facts about policies without much critical discussion about how successfully the policies are carried out, *English language teaching in East Asia today* complements it by providing in-depth micro analyses of the difficulties and dilemmas that different Asian countries are facing in connection with English language teaching (ELT). Like the former, this volume is an encyclopedic resource giving comprehensive accounts of the ELT experiences of 16 different countries in Asia (excluding North Korea).

This volume consists of 27 contributions covering 16 countries. There are two main parts: The first four chapters form the first section, which deals with general issues around ELT. The first chapter is an overview of the ELT situation in East Asia; the second addresses the issue of mutual intelligibility among varieties of English; the third is about the role of SEAMEO Regional Language Centre in Singapore in developing ELT among the members of ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations). The fourth shows how computer technology can be used as a self-access tool for students to learn English. The second section consists of 23 chapters about ELT development in 16 countries. Although the four

articles in the first section add information beyond that given in the country-based chapters and thus bring a wider perspective to the volume, none but the first chapter is essential for readers to understand the ELT situation in the region. Despite this, I found Tony Hung's chap. 2, "English as a language of wider communication in East Asia today: The issue of mutual intelligibility," very intriguing. Hung asserts that L2 speakers of English do not need to conform to native standards. Some inner-circle features of English are in fact unnecessary for L2 speakers as long as the prime rules of "intelligibility" and "clarity" are fulfilled. Through this, Hung helps to voice the rights and identity of Asian speakers as users of English as a language for wider communication rather than as failed native speakers (Cook 2002). In fact, such an urge for an Asian identity underpins many of the country-based chapters, especially when these countries are considering what English to teach. For example, in chap. 8, Lawrence Jun Zhang echoes Hung's point in calling for a more liberal view toward the English language. He says that "trainee-teachers in China should at least have the chance to be exposed to different varieties of English," and "China/Chinese English should not be despised" (146). Similarly, in chap. 12, Nobuyuki Honna & Yuko Takeshita are optimistic about the future of ELT in Japan provided that "Japanese students can be assured that they can speak English and sound Japanese at the same time" (217).

The 16 countries in the volume represent different stages of ELT development, and as a result, the problems that they encounter are different. In countries that have just departed from prolonged political instability and are at the preliminary stage of practicing ELT in schools (e.g., Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam), there is an outcry over scarce resources, such as not having enough textbooks, teaching aids, and qualified English teachers. In countries with rich experience in ELT (e.g., Hong Kong, Brunei Darussalam, Japan), ELT practitioners are crying out for solutions to enhance the effectiveness of English language teaching. Although these places have a long history of teaching English, they still find themselves caught in a maze, struggling hard to find the way out of the three dilemmas described by the editors in the epilogue: traditional vs. modern (old ways of teaching remain unchanged while the new teaching methodology is adopted only as official rhetoric); continuity vs. change (teachers continue to use traditional methods of teaching they regard as effective); and quantitative vs. qualitative (many teachers are needed yet their proficiency and knowledge in the language has to be improved). Such challenges are especially pertinent when most of the ELT pedagogical thinking and principles are imported from the West and cannot be easily transplanted into the Asian context without much modification. The above dilemmas are especially well illustrated in chap. 9, where Alice Chow & Angela Mok depict the winding road along which English language teaching in Hong Kong has developed, highlighting the tensions between tradition and new innovations during different periods of transition in Hong Kong. According to the authors, the tension between the government and school practitioners is

always acute when the former is considered to be placing “excessive faith in the western language teaching approach which has yet to be proven effective for the local language classroom, which still operates within the traditional, examination-oriented education system” (160). Although Hong Kong has much experience in adopting innovations in ELT, after almost three decades it is still searching for the model that best suits the local context and culture. Though the authors appear a little pessimistic, the experience of Hong Kong does help to caution developing countries that success in ELT takes a lot more than just abandoning “outdated” teaching approaches (i.e., the grammar-translation approach). As pointed out in Lawrence Jun Zhang’s chapter, no one method of ELT can suit the needs of all EFL countries: “A compromise between the western approach and the local culture is therefore necessary to cater for the needs of the EFL learners” (147).

In brief, these two books contribute significantly to the literature of language policies and language education, and they provide a very useful starting point for comparative studies across countries in the Asian region. They are therefore highly recommended for language educators, researchers and policy makers, not just in Asia but in all countries around the world.

## REFERENCE

Cook, V. (2002). *Portraits of the L2 user*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

(Received 2 June 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506370340

REBECCA ROGERS (ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004. Pp. 266, Hb \$59.95, Pb \$27.50.

Reviewed by STEVE BIALOSTOK  
*Education, University of Wyoming*  
Laramie, WY 80271  
smb@uwyo.edu

*An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* has eleven chapters, three by the editor, Rebecca Rogers. The volume attempts to apply Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to various formal and informal educational settings, and to situate CDA within a theory of learning. Most chapters begin with definitions of “central concepts,” and Rogers has sprinkled discussion prompts throughout.

Rogers wants to make the linguistics of CDA accessible to educators – especially graduate students – an important goal given that education is a major arena for the reproduction of power, social relations, and identity formation (indeed, a voluminous literature within sociolinguistics, anthropology, and education has asserted this). CDA, as Rogers rightly points out, has a significant role to play in

educational research. Thus, it is good to see that nearly all of the authors in the volume, from diverse academic backgrounds, are educators. Unfortunately, I judge the book to fall short of achieving its goals.

Rogers's introduction covers a lot of useful territory, but it assumes too much background knowledge for an "introductory" text even for graduate students. She and her contributors want to integrate the discourse theories of the linguists James Gee and Norman Fairclough (both of whom have written excellent chapters). Rogers views Gee's and Fairclough's work as complementary, and her discussions of both these scholars take on the formidable task of summarizing and then melding the work of the two. She thoroughly reviews the theoretical orientation of CDA (particularly from its systemic functional linguistic roots) as well as Gee's distinction between "d" and "D" in discourse. Educators do read Fairclough. But they soak up Gee with special eagerness, and for good reason. Gee – whose work has focused on social linguistics and literacies – has written amply about his "d" and "D" distinction for more than 15 years. When Rogers discusses the integration of CDA into educational settings, she defers to Gee's highly influential *Social linguistics and literacies* and *Introduction to discourse analysis*. Unfortunately, her discussion fails to contribute any understanding beyond what graduate students might get from simply reading these originals. Furthermore, Rogers's preoccupation with Gee and Fairclough limits her analysis. For instance, while the linguistic anthropologist James Collins has written a foreword for the volume, no serious attention to this field, which also has a substantial "critical" dimension, is found elsewhere in the book. Fortunately, Rogers recognizes the importance of ethnography and context – a neglected area in the CDA literature – and she has been careful to ensure that all chapters address this gap. But no chapter in the book comes close to the nuanced analysis of talk and activity that can be found in recent work in linguistic anthropology or in related areas in sociolinguistics and pragmatics, as represented in the solid insight and analysis on indexicality in Wortham & Rymes's (2003) edited volume on linguistic anthropology and education.

Rogers summarizes criticisms of CDA but ultimately dismisses them as matters of implementation that are irrelevant to the foundations of the theory. For instance, in her chap. 3, "A critical discourse analysis of literate identities across contexts," Rogers presents a case study of one woman's experiences in special education classes as a child. By providing an extremely detailed discourse analysis, Rogers hopes to demonstrate that CDA is a trustworthy methodological tool in the social sciences if it is "conducted in a standardized manner." In terms of CDA's efficacy, Rogers also claims that "researchers should avoid starting their data analysis assuming power is embedded in the data" (68, and earlier on 15). But since Rogers does not make clear who might be accused of using "non-standardized" methods in CDA, this case comes off as a straw-man argument. And with reference to her caution about the sites of power, isn't the *raison d'être* of CDA the Foucauldian assumption that power circulates and is deployed every-

where? And from a CDA perspective, isn't discourse the most manifest form of ideology, the nexus of ideology and power?

A fundamental – and vital – aspect of CDA is that it takes social theory as its starting point. Curiously, no author in this book goes from text analysis to social analysis deeply enough to learn what language tells us about society. For example, in her chapter “Cultural models and discourses of masculinity,” Josephine Young analyzes interviews of the 18-year-old middle-class Latino Chavo, his mother, and his teacher to uncover how his construction of masculinity shapes his participation in school literacy practices. Young scrupulously organizes her transcripts “into lines and stanzas as defined by Gee” (153), designed to help her uncover cultural models. But the chapter fails to ask an equally important question: How does the power of school literacy practices and context shape Chavo's understanding of what it means to be a boy in a literacy classroom? To me, Young's analysis is more philosophical than “critical.” The “cultural models” that Young “uncovers” seem fairly transparent from one or two readings of the transcript, and the preparation of the transcripts for stanzas seems superfluous. Young's methodology has been to analyze the “social language” and “situated meanings” (again, using Gee's theory and method) to determine how Chavo “used language to represent himself in different social contexts” (151). For example, she writes that Chavo “used the phrase *it sucks* when he described the humanities class to his teammates so that he appeared to be a certain kind of guy” (151). This rather obvious conclusion is typical of Young's method and results. The central problem with this chapter is that no research at all was necessary to know that *it sucks* is intended to convey “a certain kind of guy.” Extracting cultural models requires more linguistic finesse than Young uses.

CDA relies on interpretive links between everyday texts and institutional and social configurations. This is best exemplified in the current volume by Haley Woodside-Jiron's “Making sense of public policy,” a two-year study of California's public policy related to literacy education. Woodside-Jiron extends critical analysis to policy “to include explanations of how political power constructs and is constructed by larger social practices” (200). She focuses on understanding how radical policy changes in reading education policy occurred in California between 1995 and 1997. What, she asks, made such upheaval possible? Woodside-Jiron examines the process of “naturalization” by combining a Halliday/Fairclough framework with that of Basil Bernstein, and by examining the structural analysis of various policy documents to examine how ideologies are embedded.

Good CDA is rigorously grounded in the text. While not stating it explicitly, Woodside-Jiron adheres to Fairclough's three-dimensional framework for conceiving of and analyzing discourse. But Woodside-Jiron, like so many scholars in this book, leaves herself open to a common criticism of CDA: that it is inattentive to reception. She does not show that the texts she analyzes might not be read

in other ways, nor does she demonstrate that her reading is like that of what we might call “average consumers” of these texts.

In “Discourse in activity and activity in discourse,” Shawn Rowe connects CDA with sociocultural approaches to learning. He also wants to demonstrate “a way of transcribing and analyzing talk and activity simultaneously” (80). He provides two transcriptions, demonstrating how his “microgenetic analysis” allows for the “analysis of privileging, appropriating, and rejecting particular members’ resources and mediational means as part of activity” (93–94). Rowe does this effectively enough. However, he neglects a substantial existing literature in transcription by linguistic anthropologists such as Elinor Ochs, Charles Goodwin, and John Haviland, the latter two especially important for their work on the nonlinguistic semiotic systems that are important to Rowe.

One question raised even by the stronger chapters in the volume is “Why CDA in contrast to another system of analysis?” For example, Cynthia Lewis & Jean Ketter’s “Learning as social interaction: Interdiscursivity in a teacher and researcher study group” will be useful for those involved in teacher education. In this four-year study, the teachers read multicultural young adult literature with Lewis and Ketter “in ways that would help them make decisions about whether and how to teach these works in their community” (118), and to see how texts are shaped by ideological power and how they position readers. The teachers were encouraged to explore their collective assumptions about issues of race and identity and how these assumptions shaped decisions about text selection and pedagogy. The authors analyze several phases of the conversations over time, sometimes pointing out the obvious and at other times delving more deeply. What remains unclear is why CDA – specifically – was the necessary tool for this analysis. In a better article about the same material (Lewis, Ketter & Fabos 2001), Lewis and Ketter do not mention CDA once, but their analysis is the same as in the new work. Why is CDA more useful now? No case is made. Is this analysis CRITICAL or just smart discourse analysis?

What I found most troubling about this volume is the extent to which Rogers and her contributors seem to be decentering power from their analyses and replacing it with social identities. That’s a perversion of what CDA was meant to do. (Doesn’t “critical” mean “about power”?) There is no empirical basis for asserting that “identities” are the universally relevant organizing feature of linguistic interaction, or that “identities” are more salient than “power: in that regard. If anything, “identities” is the narrower, more specialized concept and should therefore generate more suspicion than “power” does as an analytic framework. Yet Rogers seems to find “power” suspect and takes “identities” for granted. Why? What model of power is she proposing? It can’t be Foucault’s; it can’t be Marx’s or Althusser’s.

*An introduction to CDA in education* was a good idea, and I looked forward to reading it. Unfortunately, the many problems with the volume keep it from

being the introduction that will place CDA at the center of our thinking about education.

REFERENCES

- Lewis, C.; Ketter, J.; & Fabos, B. (2001). Reading race in a rural context. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 14:317–50.
- Wortham, S., & Rymes, B. (eds.) (2003). *Linguistic anthropology of education*. Westport, CT.

(Received 23 June 2005)

*Language in Society* 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506380347

AARON A. FOX, *Real country: Music and language in working-class culture*.  
Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004. Pp., 363. Hb \$79.95, Pb \$22.95.

Reviewed by DAVID SAMUELS  
*Anthropology, University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01003  
samuels@anthro.umass.edu*

The past decade has seen a spate of books about country music. Following in the footsteps of classic work by Bill Malone, a number of these recent works are outstanding, but even the best among them (Peterson 1999; Tichi 1994, 1998; Jensen 1998) have taken a Nashville-centric perspective (or, in the case of Ching 2003, anti-Nashville-centrism), exploring and interrogating the development of country as a commercial genre. Aaron Fox's *Real country*, by contrast, is distinctive in its detailed ethnographic exploration of country as a lived working-class reality expressed in linguistic and musical discourse forms.

Fox treats country not simply as an indexical musical genre but as a trope, a “reflexive and deeply felt construction . . . a class-specific and cultural response to changes in the regional, national, and global economy in which American blue-collar manual workers have experienced a loss of both cultural identity and economic security” (p. 21). To be sure, Fox's sense of real country overlaps strongly with country music as a commercial category, but he traces the trope through landscape, interior decoration, bodily habitus, and especially forms of everyday interaction and verbal art in the honky-tonks in which he did his fieldwork. Fox is especially focused on the voice, and how the vocality of the embodied speaking or singing voice creates a striving for (and recognition of) crystallized moments of authentic working-class identity.

This striving for authentic voice is complicated in Fox's treatment by its immediate, always already commoditized status in the form of Nashville recording studios, Wal-Mart undevelopment, and the “visual and aesthetic disruption” (75) of the peri-urban margin. The alterity of country is complex and ambivalent. As Fox writes, “Many of the people who appear in this book would happily describe themselves as ‘rednecks,’ though they might resent being described that way by



me" (24). In this shifting and haunted context, real country is a cultivated "art of memory" (49), an "affective archaeology" (91), consisting of moments of "feeling" and "relating" made manifest in heightened poeticity, and "pervasively keyed to musical signifiers" (97). For Fox, art "is not an EXCEPTIONAL domain of culture; it is the very HEART of culture" (36). The barstools, tables, dance floor, and bandstand at Ann's Other Place in Lockhart, Texas are filled with organic intellectuals, artists whose everyday talk is shot through with poeticity and whose very voices embody working-class sociability. Fox's intimate knowledge of the people and places of his project, coupled with the depth of his analysis, make this book extremely special.

The book is divided into nine chapters grouped in three broad sections. In the first, Fox traces for the reader the working-class framework of Lockhart and a town in central Illinois that he dubs "Parkville." The second section explores and unpeels the intertextual and affective connections between country song lyrics and melodies, and between country singing and everyday speaking (these being, as Fox notes, distinctions of only limited value). The third section of the book focuses more directly on the voice as a locus of authentic country identity.

The book opens with an evocative "Prelude" in which Fox introduces his readers to some of the main characters in his story, especially Hoppy and his "house of mem'ries." Chap. 1 then takes the reader through Fox's major ethnographic and theoretical concerns: the importance of art, the importance of class, and the central role of the voice in expressing cultural identity. In chap. 2 Fox brings us into Lockhart in two ways: through a narrative of his own introduction to and growing familiarity with the community, and through a presentation of the community's economic, demographic, and geographic contexts. Chap. 3 extends this analysis of the intimate relationship between semiotics and materiality by exploring how "working-class social experience is sensuously modeled in the production of self and sociability in place and time" (81). Chap. 4 pushes this exploration even further with a powerful evocation of "the fool in the mirror," a character whom Fox figures as a split subject, teetering between a sense of the individual as a "social person" and the individual as an autonomous "psychological self" (125). Honky-tonk discourse consistently pulls between these two aspects, as individuals continually push against sociability through an "aesthetics of eccentricity" (113) and are at the same time pulled back into sociability through feelingful talk and song. Here, Fox uses his intimate knowledge of the community and his acute understanding of the intellectual histories of language and culture to demonstrate how pronominalization ("the split subject emerges in a juxtaposition of poetically resonant pronouns" [149]), direct and quasi-direct reported speech, double-voiced utterances, and intertextuality are artfully layered by interlocutors in creating real country sociability around the talk and song circulating in the honky-tonk.

Sherry Ortner's blurb on the back of the book says that "the chapter on 'The Fool in the Mirror' alone is worth the price of the book." For me, the two

subsequent chapters fill that bill. They are quite simply the best work on the relationship between words and music, musical semantics and poetics, lyrics, melodies, arrangements, and performances – what ethnomusicologists often call “text and tune” – that I have seen. Chap. 5 covers Fox’s discussion of “feeling” and “relating.” Feeling is an “inchoate quality” (155) of country songs, involving both verbal cleverness and a sense of embodied movement. That is, feeling “is simultaneously about sound and meaning” (169), and paired with “relating,” accounts for a great deal of country music’s affective and “mnemonic power” (172). Chap. 6 then carries through this discussion in noting the pervasive similarities between speech and song.

Chap. 7 enters into an exploration of the gendered nature of discourse forms in working-class culture as a means of unpacking what is at stake in the effective command of verbal/vocal expressions. Fox centers on the “reverse,” a carnivalesque performance in which command of gendered discourse genres is put on display. The final two chapters bring together the preceding in an extended colloquy on the voice – singing in country music performances, and on “the character of the voice” (chap. 9), the ways in which the skillful vocal embodiment of a single word in a Johnny Cash song can create lyrical moments in which a “long life of grueling labor and . . . veiled pain [are] laid out before us in the flash of a single line” (314).

A few caveats about the book. Teaching it at the undergraduate level can be somewhat challenging, in part because students may already feel a sense of familiarity with much of the musical material that Fox discusses: Who doesn’t know who Johnny Cash and Patsy Cline are? Fox is aware of this, often warning the reader, for example, that “Against a background of apparent familiarity, subtle differences have a way of appearing transparent” (108), and he covers it more fully in the “Coda” that ends the book. Still, I sometimes wished for more.

There is a tension in the book that contributes to this sense, which has to do with the various levels at which the author’s claims operate, between Ann’s Other Place; Lockhart; Texas; Illinois; working-class; and perhaps the United States most generally. Fox tacks between celebrating the distinctiveness of his interlocutors at Ann’s and arguing for a wider applicability of his observations to working-class culture. This is intensified by Fox’s skilled ear for extremely subtle and complex examples, for instance how Mstislav Rostropovich’s televised return to the Soviet Union was an instance of real country. Fox’s examples work deftly to reveal the polyphonic nature of “redneck” consciousness, but I found in teaching the book that students needed to figure out how Ann’s in Texas was any different from their local bar at home in New Jersey. In his analysis of country song texts and honky-tonk verbal interaction, Fox demonstrates how these are constructed by alternating between epic and lyric modalities. That is, lyrical moments arrest the everyday narrativity of the passage of time, stories repetitively capped by indelible, crystallizing images. My sense is that Fox emulates this aesthetic in his own writing, but his more complex examples are not always up to that task.

## REVIEWS

These small caveats aside, this book should be read carefully by anyone interested in language and poetics, emotion, social class, music, interaction, and indexicality. Fox's work brings an important and much-needed sense of a truly materialist ideology to the study of language. It is, as well, perhaps the finest ethnographic work on music and class to have been published in the past 20 years.

## REFERENCES

- Ching, Barbara (2003). *Wrong's what I do best: Hard country music and contemporary culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, Joli (1998). *The Nashville sound: Authenticity, commercialism, and country music*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Peterson, Richard A. (1999). *Creating country music: Fabricating authenticity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tichi, Cecilia (1994). *High lonesome: The American culture of country music*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) (1998). *Reading country music: Steel guitars, Opry stars, and honky-tonk bars*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

(Received 27 June 2005)