牛津社会语言学丛书

Stance

Sociolinguistic Perspectives

交际界位研究：

社会语言学视角

Alexandra Jaffe 编

上海外语教育出版社
SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS
www.sflep.com

牛津社会语言学丛书

Stance

Sociolinguistic Perspectives

交际界位研究：

社会语言学视角

Alexandra Jaffe 编

上海外语教育出版社
www.sflep.com

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

交际界位研究：社会语言学视角/亚历山德拉·亚费编.
—上海：上海外语教育出版社，2017
(牛津社会语言学丛书)
ISBN 978-7-5446-5019-9

Ⅰ.①交… Ⅱ.①亚… Ⅲ.①社会语言学—英文 Ⅳ.①H0

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2017)第 233178 号

图字：09－2016－736

出版发行：上海外语教育出版社
（上海外国语大学内） 邮编：200083
电　　话：021-65425300（总机）
电子邮箱：bookinfo@sflep.com.cn
网　　址：http://www.sflep.com.cn http://www.sflep.com
责任编辑：梁晓莉

印　　刷：上海叶大印务发展有限公司
开　　本：787×1000 1/16 印张 17 字数 444千字
版　　次：2018 年 1月第 1版 2018 年 1月第 1次印刷
印　　数：2 100 册

书　　号：ISBN 978-7-5446-5019-9 / H
定　　价：58.00 元
本版图书如有印装质量问题，可向本社调换

出版说明

社会语言学是研究语言与社会多方面关系的学科，它从社会科学的不同角度，诸如社会学、人类学、民族学、心理学、地理学和历史学等去考察语言。自20世纪60年代发端以来，社会语言学已经逐渐发展成为语言学研究中的一门重要学科，引发众多学者的关注和探究。

“牛津社会语言学丛书”由国际社会语言学研究的两位领军人物——英国卡迪夫大学语言与交际研究中心的教授Nicolas Coupland和Adam Jaworski(现在中国香港大学英语学院任教)——担任主编。丛书自2004年由牛津大学出版社陆续出版以来，推出了一系列社会语言学研究的专著，可以说是汇集了这一学科研究的最新成果，代表了当今国际社会语言学研究的最高水平。

我们从中精选出九种，引进出版。所选的这些专著内容广泛，又较贴近我国学者研究的需求，涵盖了当今社会语言学的许多重要课题，如语言变体与语言变化、语言权力与文化认同、语言多元化与语言边缘化、语言与族裔、语言与立场(界位)、语言与新媒体、语用学与礼貌、语言与法律以及社会语言学视角下的话语研究等等。其中既有理论研究，又有方法创新；既有框架分析建构，又有实地考察报告；既体现本学科的前沿和纵深，又展现跨学科的交叉和互补。

相信丛书的引进出版能为从事社会语言学研究的读者带来新的启示，进一步推动我国语言学研究的发展。

Stance

Sociolinguistic Perspectives

Edited by
Alexandra Jaffe

CONTRIBUTORS

MARY BUCHOLTZ, Associate Professor of Linguistics, University of California at Santa Barbara

JUSTINE COUPLAND, Reader in Interactional Sociolinguistics, Centre for Language and Communication Research, Cardiff University

NIKOLAS COUPLAND, Professor and Chair at the Centre for Language and Communication Research, Cardiff University

JUDITH T. IRVINE, Professor and Chair of the Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan

ALEXANDRA JAFFE, Professor of Linguistics and Anthropology, California State University, Long Beach

ADAM JAWORSKI, Professor and Head, Centre for Language and Communication Research

BARBARA JOHNSTONE, Professor of Rhetoric and Linguistics, Carnegie Mellon University

SCOTT F. KIESLING, Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Linguistics, University of Pittsburgh

JANET MCINTOSH, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Brandeis University

ROBIN SHOAPS, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, University of Chicago

CRISPIN THURLOW, Associate Professor of Communication and Linguistics, University of Washington

CONTENTS

Contributors v

1. Introduction: The Sociolinguistics of Stance 3
Alexandra Jaffe

2. Stance, Style, and the Linguistic Individual 29
Barbara Johnstone

3. Stance in a Colonial Encounter: How Mr. Taylor Lost His Footing 53
Judith T. Irvine

4. Stance and Distance: Social Boundaries, Self-Lamination, and Metalinguistic Anxiety in White Kenyan Narratives about the African Occult 72
Janet McIntosh

5. Moral Irony and Moral Personhood in Sakapultek Discourse and Culture 92
Robin Shoaps

6. Stance in a Corsican School: Institutional and Ideological Orders and the Production of Bilingual Subjects 119
Alexandra Jaffe

7. From Stance to Style: Gender, Interaction, and Indexicality in Mexican Immigrant Youth Slang 146
Mary Bucholtz

8. Style as Stance: Stance as the Explanation for Patterns of Sociolinguistic Variation 171
Scott F. Kiesling

9. Taking an Elitist Stance: Ideology and the Discursive Production of Social Distinction 195
Adam Jaworski and Crispin Thurlow

10. Attributing Stance in Discourses of Body Shape and Weight Loss 227
Justine Coupland and Nikolas Coupland

Index 251

Stance

Introduction

The Sociolinguistics of Stance

Alexandra Jaffe

This volume is a sociolinguistic exploration of one of the fundamental properties of communication: stancetaking. Stancetaking—taking up a position with respect to the form or the content of one's utterance—is central because speaker positionality is built into the act of communication. Although some forms of speech and writing are more stance-saturated than others, there is no such thing as a completely neutral position vis-à-vis one's linguistic productions, because neutrality is itself a stance. To take a simple example, when we choose a verb of saying to introduce speech represented as another's, our choices entail stances toward that speech, from neutrality ("said") to doubt ("alleged"); every choice is defined in contrast to other semantic options. By the same token, speech cannot be affectively neutral; we can indeed convey a stance of affective neutrality, but it will of necessity be read in relation to other possible emotional orientations we could have displayed.

Epistemic and affective stances are both socially situated and socially consequential, as will be explored below. Speech is always produced and interpreted within a sociolinguistic matrix: that is, speakers make sociolinguistically inflected choices and display orientations to the sociolinguistic meanings associated with forms of speech. Thus sociolinguistics has much to offer to the study of stancetaking.

The study of stance in the contemporary literature is wide-ranging and quite heterogeneous (see Englebretson 2007), and has a robust history in a number of analytic traditions, ranging from corpus-linguistic treatments of authorial stance as connected to particular academic genres, to critical discourse analyses of embedded stances in political, cultural, and persuasive texts, to studies of stancetaking as an interactional and discursive phenomenon, to the analysis of stance-saturated linguistic forms as they are used to reproduce (or challenge) social, political, and moral hierarchies in different cultural contexts. The aim of this volume is to map out the *sociolinguistics of stance,* bringing together analyses that allow us to explore both what the study of stance has to offer sociolinguistic theory, and to define the territory occupied by

sociolinguistic approaches to stance as it overlaps with and is distinct from the territory occupied by other approaches. This introduction is therefore not intended to be an encyclopedic overview of research on stance in all of the research traditions in which it has been used; nor is it intended to be an exhaustive review of research on stance in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. The goal is at once more modest and more focused: to identify dimensions of stance research that are particularly salient for sociolinguistics, and to situate the sociolinguistic focus on stance in relation to related concepts and currents of analysis within sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. With respect to these existing analytical traditions, I will argue that the concept of stance is a uniquely productive way of conceptualizing the processes of indexicalization that are the link between individual performance and social meaning.

Taken as a whole, the lines of research discussed below are concerned with *positionality*: how speakers and writers are necessarily engaged in positioning themselves vis-à-vis their words and texts (which are embedded in histories of linguistic and textual production), their interlocutors and audiences (both actual and virtual/projected/imagined), and with respect to a context that they simultaneously respond to and construct linguistically. One of the primary goals of a sociolinguistic approach to stance is to explore how the taking up of particular kinds of stances is habitually and conventionally associated with particular subject positions (social roles and identities; notions of personhood), and interpersonal and social relationships (including relations of power) more broadly. Secondly, a sociolinguistics of stance has a crucial role to play in theorizing the relationship between acts of stance and the sociocultural field: in particular the role these acts play in social (and sociolinguistic) reproduction and change.

As an emergent property of interaction, stance is not *transparent* in either the linguistic or the sociolinguistic, but must be inferred from the empirical study of interactions in social and historical context. A particular linguistic stance (or a set of stances taken over time) may index multiple selves and social identities; conversely, it may index a single social identity, a personal identity that endures over time (referred to in Johnstone, this volume, as an ethos of self) or a privileged, "core" self (McIntosh, this volume). Speaker stances are thus performances through which speakers may align or disalign themselves with and/or ironize stereotypical associations with particular linguistic forms; stances may thus express multiple or ambiguous meanings. This makes stance a crucial point of entry in analyses that focus on the complex ways in which speakers manage multiple identities (or multiple aspects of identity). The focus on process also foregrounds multiplicities in the audiences indexed by particular linguistic practices, and on the social dynamics and consequences of audience reception, uptake, and interpretation.

Locating the Sociolinguistics of Stance in the Broader Literature

Stance Terms and Definitions

A useful place to start is Du Bois's definition of stance as "a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means (language, gesture,

and other symbolic forms), through which social actors simultaneously evaluate objects, position subjects (themselves and others), and align with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field" (2007: 163). It is important to note that Du Bois's "stance objects" are not just material: in fact, "salient dimensions of the sociocultural field" can include language and stancetaking itself, a point to which we will return in some detail below.

Table 1.1 summarizes the various terms that have been used in the literature to describe different types of stancetaking, and represents a synthesis of my own and Jaworski and Thurlow's efforts to survey this terrain for this volume. The first segment of the table (A) shows the centrality of evaluation; the second two sections (B and C) illustrate the interconnectedness of evaluation and speaker/author self-positioning in pragmatic, systemic functional, anthropological, sociolinguistic, and critical discourse analytic traditions.

Evaluation and the Social

Evaluation as a broad category of focus is a nexus where the linguistic and social are implicated in a number of ways. First, evaluation of and through language takes place within and invokes moral and social orders, systems of accountability, responsibility, and causality (Clift 2006, Fox 2001, Harré and VanLangenhoeve 1991). As such, it can be "read" as an index of coherent individual or community value systems (Thompson and Hunston 2000: 5); conversely, it can be a site of political struggle and ideological contestation (Fox 2001, M.Goodwin 2006, Hodge and Kress 1988, Matoesian 2005, Modan 2006). Secondly, as Du Bois's definition of stance indicates, all acts of evaluation are simultaneously acts of alignment or disalignment (thus positioning) with other subjects. Goodwin's detailed analysis of these processes in girls' conversations illustrates how evaluation (or "assessment") of talk, objects, and other features of shared context is one of the key ways in which social actors take up stances and "make visible their current alignment with regard to others who are present or talked about" (2006: 191).

In this volume, the social and moral dimensions of evaluation are foregrounded in several chapters. In Coupland and Coupland's chapter, public and media discourses about obesity are both implicitly and explicitly evaluative, and position people as good or bad citizens within a moral discourse about weight, self-control, and health costs to the society at large. The textual strategies used in these texts impute stances of alignment with "expert" discourse and attribute stances of moral failure to the obese. Jaworski and Thurlow's analysis of the discursive construction of elite tourism (and tourists) in texts also shows how the descriptions of tourist consumables (including place) are always implicit evaluations that index systems of distinction (cf. Bourdieu 1981): it is partly by discursively identifying "bad" tourists that "elite" tourists define themselves. Readers are invited to align with the stances in particular texts, and by doing so, to align with a superordinate elitist stance that produces and reproduces social hierarchies. In Irvine's chapter, social (and possibly racial) hierarchies define who has the right to evaluate language. The evaluation of language is in turn connected with the moral order, and

TABLE 1.1 Stance Terms

	Term	*Author*
A. Evaluation		
of propositional content	**appraisal (judgment)**	Martin (2000)
	attitudinal stance	Halliday (1994)
	evaluation	Fairclough (2003)
	assessment	C. Goodwin (2006); M. H. Goodwin (2006)
	evaluation	Labov and Waletsky (1967)
	deontic attitude	Berman (2004)
of probability, usability of propositional content	**modalization**	Halliday (1994)
of form or style of the utterance or text	**style stance or manner**	Biber and Finegan (1989)
	accountive (second order) positioning	Harré and Vanlangenhove (1991)
	appraisal (appreciation)	Martin (2000)
of the degree of reliability of proposition	**epistemic stance**	Biber and Finegan (1989)
		Conrad and Biber (2000)
of the truth value of a proposition	**modality**	Fairclough (2003); Verscheuren (1999); Hodge and Kress (1988)
of the degree of affinity between speaker/addressee stance	**modality**	Fairclough (2003)
	stance differential	Dubois (2007)
of stances taken (own or others')	**second order stances**	Kockelman (2004)
B. Reflecting Speaker's/Author's Positionality		
	performative positioning	Harré and Van Langenhove (1991)
Commitment to propositional content (authorship)	**modality**	Stubbs (1996)
Knowledge of/belief in/ commitment to propositional content	**epistemic stance**	Biber and Finegan (1989)
	epistemological stance	C.Goodwin (1986)
	modalization	Halliday (1994)
Feelings about utterance or text	**affect**	Besnier (1993)
	Appraisal (affect)	Martin (2000)
	epistemological stance	C. Goodwin (1986)
Speaker/writer's opinion	**Appraisal**	Martin (2000)
Obligation/inclination	**modulation**	Halliday (1994)
Identity claims		
Claims to authority, responsibility	**assessment**	Heritage and Raymond (2005)
C. Attributing Position to Others		
	performative positioning	Harré & Van Langenhove (1991)
	interpersonal stance	

has a constraining effect on the kinds of stances that different social actors can successfully take up. Shoaps shares this focus on the relationship of stance to the moral order, investigating how "moral irony" is used interactionally to criticize the stances taken by unspecified social actors and thereby indirectly index "shared community values." Jaffe's chapter on a Corsican bilingual school looks at the way that teachers use their evaluative role to project bilingual identity and community on their students.

Affective and Epistemic Stance: Social Dimensions

Both affective stances that represent emotional states of the speaker and epistemic stances that convey speakers' degrees of certainty about their propositions are socially grounded and consequential. First, affective display can do the work of evaluation, self-presentation, and positioning that is central to stancetaking. Second, displays of affect have a variety of social and moral indexicalities. They can index shared, culturally specific structures of feeling and norms for its expression and can thus be mobilized in the drawing of social boundaries that is central to the work of social differentiation and categorization (Besnier 1990). Displays of affective stance are resources through which individuals can lay claims to particular identities and statuses as well as evaluate others' claims and statuses. In this volume, McIntosh's chapter shows how epistemological uncertainty leads white Kenyans to give affectively complex and conflicted accounts of their beliefs. In doing so, they attempt to navigate a satisfactory form of self-identification and presentation that both distinguishes them from black Kenyans and accounts for cultural experience that crosses racial lines.

Epistemic stance is likewise culturally grounded, because claims to know are embedded in and index particular regimes of knowledge and authority. Epistemic stancetaking thus serves to establish the relative authority of interactants, and to situate the sources of that authority in a wider sociocultural field. Speakers may use epistemic stance in the pursuit of the social capital that accrues to being recognized as having authentic or authoritative knowledge (as in Johnstone's 2007 analysis of stances towards Pittsburghese) and/or to legitimate further acts of evaluation. In some cases, individuals may project a stance of privileged personal knowledge; in other instances, speakers may use generalizations to shift the location of epistemic authority from the individual to the societal level. As Scheibman points out, indexing societal discourses as shared and compelling through the use of generalizations can indirectly strengthen speakers' stances (2007: 132). Conversely, epistemic stance markers can be used to downgrade speaker authority and attribute/acknowledge other interactants' greater claims to hold relevant information (Rauniomaa 2007: 232).

Stance and Its Relation to Key Themes in the Sociolinguistic Literature

Self- and Other-Positioning

The examples above draw our attention to the way that social relationships are entailed by self-positioning—or individual stance. These entailments take several forms. First

of all, because individual identities are defined within social formations, by taking up a position, individuals automatically invoke a constellation of associated social identities. In doing so, speakers project, assign, propose, constrain, define, or otherwise shape the subject positions of their interlocutors (see Harré and VanLangenhoeve 1991, Kockelman 2004, Matoesian 2005). An utterance framed as a performance, for example, positions receivers as an audience; a speaker who takes up an expert stance to give advice positions receivers as novices (or as otherwise needing or receptive to counsel). Similarly, speaker or author stance may construct or invoke proximal or distant, real or imagined audiences. In some cases, the interactional calibration of these socially paired roles is collaborative and consensual. In other cases, stance attributions are tools of control and ideological domination, and may be subject to questioning or contestation in what Harré and Vanlangenhove (1991) call "accountive positioning" (this dynamic is richly illustrated in C. Goodwin 2007 and M. H. Goodwin 1998, 2006). In Jaworski and Thurlow's chapter in this volume, readers of travelogues in prestige newspapers are invited to collude in the evaluative work of the authors, and thus to occupy a shared, elite status. Students in Jaffe's chapter are similarly positioned through teachers' structuring of participant roles as "connoisseurs" of esthetic features of texts in Corsican and thus, incorporated into their teachers' expert stances. In Coupland and Coupland's chapter, authors of articles in women's lifestyle magazines and geriatric doctors take up teaching roles and thus position readers and patients as learners. In some cases, these stance attributions (as well as claims to "know" readers' or patients' feelings and concerns) are collaborative and "donate" positive stances to their targets; in other instances, they have controlling, even patronizing functions. Moreover, as Scollon asserts, both stance and its social entailments are built into linguistic and communicative practice: in his discussion of conversational "maxims of stance" he makes the important point that that acts of interpersonal stancetaking are the necessary preconditions for the conduct of conversation; speakers cannot attend to topic until interactional stances have been established (1998: 71–75).

Second, many stances are "mobilized interactionally across turns," as Clift's analysis of how individuals index their epistemic authority relative to others using "interactional evidentials" shows (2006: 583; see also Heritage and Raymond 2005: 34). This draws our attention to the dialogic dimension of stance: that it is achieved and emergent in interaction, coconstructed with one's interlocutors (see Du Bois 2007; Gardner 2002; Kiesanen 2007; Ribeiro 2006; White 2003; Wu 2004). Constructing and negotiating stances is also clearly the object of much interactional work. In this respect, *uptake* of acts of stance can be critical. This uptake may take the form of audience/interlocutor stances of alignment, realignment, or disalignment (C. Goodwin 2007, Matoesian 2005): what Du Bois calls the "stance follow" (2007: 161). Stance follows also include whether or not interactants take up actions made relevant by the speaker's prior talk (Schegloff 2001: 241). At a basic level, all alignment moves (whether positive or negative) *recognize* the stance taken by a speaker and are thus (constitutive) traces of those stances. Uptake with alignment may also be one of the ways in which stance is implicated in the production of more enduring ideologies or "stands" (Jaworski and Thurlow, this volume) and, in turn, play a role in the "fixing" of indexical relationships between talk and social identities and cate-

gories. Three chapters in this volume take us in this direction (Jaworski and Thurlow, Jaffe, and Coupland and Coupland) by showing examples in which stance uptake and alignment is a relatively explicit objective of a broader social project which aims to incorporate audiences into "naturalized" textual and social stances.

In other instances, uptake may creatively transform, recast, or potentially undermine speakers' original stance claims. Advice (and thus the stance of legitimate advice giver) can be ignored, sources of authority contested, jokes taken as insults, and so forth. This dynamic can be seen in Marjorie Goodwin's work on stance in girls' playground games, in which peer group uptake (or recognition) of stance performances can be the primary goal of individual players (1998, 2006). Unratified stance claims in contexts in which positive uptake of stance is either a target or "felicity condition" (Austin 1965) of interaction may significantly undermine not just an individual's social position in the moment, but also may impede her future ability to make similar stance claims in the future. In this sense, stances taken in the present not only retrospectively frame other interactants' speech but have prospective implications (see C. Goodwin 2006, Kärkkäinen 2007, Rauniomaa 2007). In Irvine's chapter in this volume, Mr. Taylor suffers in just this way: his stance projections are unratified and his future position compromised.

Finally, all of these examples underscore the fact that personal stance is always achieved through comparison and contrast with other relevant persons and categories. Stance saturates talk about others, in which speakers engage in both explicit and implicit forms of social categorization and evaluation, attribute intentionality, affect, knowledge, agency to themselves and others, and lay claim to particular social and/or moral identities.

In this volume, we see the interplay between personal stance and the uptake and attribution of stances (the social-relational) in several chapters. Jaworski and Thurlow's chapter shows how an elite tourist stance is built both through discursive opposition with common tourists and through alignment with insider knowledge and consumables associated with luxury. Coupland and Coupland show that in their discourse, doctors working with elderly patients simultaneously take up expert stances and define patients as more or less virtuous in their attitudes and behaviors related to their own health and ageing. Shoaps also explores the role of indirect stancetaking in the "negotiation of moral norms" and performance of moral identities (Shoaps, this volume: 111); analyzing how moral irony (using a particular set of modal particles) in Sakapultek is used to negatively evaluate the behaviors of imagined or hypothetical persons or situations while positioning speakers as morally upright and their addressees as being less so. Like Coupland and Coupland, Jaffe explores how institutional roles, practices, and positions of power enable particular speakers (in this case, teachers) to project and attribute stances of sociolinguistic ownership and legitimacy with respect to students' relationships with Corsican. Irvine's analysis shows the same process of stance attribution, but used to a contrasting end. In her analysis the letters of Mr. Taylor go through chains of reinscription and reentextualization by others in ways that strip him of his authorial (and thus moral and professional) legitimacy. These chapters also foreground the exercise of agency and power in stance attribution, which is simultaneously a form of control of others and control over one's own projected stance. In these various examples, we see the interplay