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 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)
	evaluation	C. Goodwin (2006); M. H. Goodwin (2006)
	assessment	Labov and Waletsky (1967)
of probability, usability	evaluation	Berman (2004)
of propositional content	deontic attitude	Halliday (1994)
of propositional content	modalization	Biber and Finegan (1989)
of form or style of the utterance or text	style stance or manner	Martin (2000)
of the degree of reliability of proposition	epistemic stance	Biber and Finegan (1989)
	appraisal (appreciation)	Martin (2000)
	positioning	Harré and Vanlangenhove (1991)
of the degree of reliability of proposition	accountive (second order)	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)
of stances taken (own or others')	stance differential	Dubois (2007)
	second order stances	Kockelman (2004)
B. Reflecting Speaker's/Author's Positionality		
Commitment to propositional content (authorship)	performative positioning	Harré and Van Langenhove (1991)
	modality	Stubbs (1996)
Knowledge of/belief in/commitment to propositional content	epistemic stance	Biber and Finegan (1989)
	epistemological stance	C. Goodwin (1986)
Commitment to propositional content	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	assessment	Heritage and Raymond (2005)
Claims to authority, responsibility		
C. Attributing Position to Others		
	performative positioning / interpersonal stance	Harré & Van Langenhove (1991)

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 episte-mological 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, index-ing 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 VanLangenhove 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 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 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

between the agency connected to social and institutional position and the (sometimes separable) agency activated in social interaction.

In addition to examining the social consequences and implications of *linguistic* stancetaking, sociolinguistic approaches to stance look at the way that speakers draw upon *sociolinguistic* resources and repertoires to signal positionality. By *sociolinguistic resources* I mean forms of variation that have established social indexicalities. Below, I explore how a stance-based approach relates to a range of concepts and interpretive frameworks concerned with how speakers draw on both linguistic and sociolinguistic resources in practice to present the self, to stake claims to particular identities and positions, to do interpersonal work, and so forth.

Footing and Contextualization

Goffman's concept of *footing* and Gumperz's formulation of *contextualization cues* relate to the alignments speakers take up toward themselves and others by managing the production or the reception of an utterance. At a very basic level, stance can be seen as a form of *contextualization*, because stancetaking indicates how the speaker's position with respect to a particular utterance or bit of text is to be interpreted; contextualization cues are thus basic, culturally specific tools or resources for stance-taking. One way of thinking about stance, then, is as the inventory of footings taken in the course of communication: it is the "how" of the process of alignment (see Ribeiro 2006: 73–74).

From the vantage point of speech production, we can talk about degrees of *accommodation*, and their presumed social-psychological motivations. Sociolinguistic approaches to stance build on this notion in several ways. First, linguistic stance can be read as a more or less direct sign of a position, identity, or role with which an individual wishes to be associated. This line of analysis presumes alignment with conventional associations between linguistic form and expressive purpose, opinion, or identity. Using Goffman's terms, in such an analysis, author, principal, and animator are presumed to be congruent. Second, and perhaps more interesting, stance is the crucial operator for acts of *keying*, in which "a set of conventions by which a given activity (which is already meaningful in terms of a primary framework) is transformed into something patterned on this activity but seen by the participants to be something quite else" (Slembrouck 2004, paraphrasing Goffman 1974: 43–44). Keying redefines situations by introducing or laminating latent or potential frames and participant roles onto an interaction. Here, we see the connection with Bakhtin's notion of voice, and the inherently multivocal, dialogic nature of all utterances (1981: 353). A speaker may rekey a presumed authorial role as a "figure", a serious declaration as humorous, or a joke as serious. In all of these cases, what is shifting is speaker stance toward his or her words, the situation, or other social actors. Keying—or shifting stances and frames—signals the multiplicity and complexity of stances and identities: sometimes this very multiplicity can be the outcome or target of stance-taking (see discussion below). Stance is also implicated in *loading*, an extension of the notion of keying that refers to "the speaker's level of investment in the identity being negotiated" (Coupland 2007: 114). Although some conventional associations between "lighter" keys and lower identity loads (or greater potential role distance—

see discussion of performance below) can be made, Coupland makes the point that the stance of heavy or light investment in an identity cannot be read directly from key, but has to be interpreted in context (2007: 114).

Performative Approaches

The notion of sociolinguistic stance is a fundamentally performative one in the sense that a stance-based perspective views social identities as discursively constructed rather than fixed. Social identity can thus be seen as the cumulation of stances taken over time.

There are also more specific interconnections between stance, performance theory, and the sociolinguistics of performance. Let us begin with Bauman and Briggs, who write, "Performance puts the act of speaking on display—objectifies it, lifts to a degree from its interactional setting and opens it up to scrutiny by an audience" (1990: 73). Here they emphasize the marked, reflexive, artful nature of performance as well as the performer's accountability to an audience. In Bauman's more recent treatment of performance as reentextualization, he invokes "the dynamic tension between the ready-made, socially given element, that is, the persistent cultural entity that is available for recontextualization in performance, and the emergent element, the transformation of this element in the performance process" (Bauman 1996: 302). In short, every performance is recognized as the performer's "take" or stance on a particular speech genre, itself recognized as collective, cultural property. It is here that the audience is implicated and has an evaluative role to play; it is also here that we see connections between the esthetic and the social/moral orders...

The performance frame can also be indexed by particular acts of stancetaking (see also discussion of stylization below): linguistic and paralinguistic displays of stance can mark an utterance as performance, which implies a high degree of reflexivity with respect to form. The notion of *voice* is also implicated in a performance framework, as it is in discussions of footing, participation frameworks, and reentextualizations of speech through reporting, ironizing, and so forth. The degree to which speakers frame their utterances as performance and the degree to which their speech is *self-conscious* both have relevance for the interpretation of speaker alignment with the voice of an utterance. In general, higher levels of displayed orientations to performance can be seen as offering the greatest potential for displayed role distance (a possible stance).

With respect to the interpersonal dimensions of stance, studies of sociolinguistic style within a performative approach also provide a framework for understanding a range of orientations and motivations for the production of speech or writing. These include a focus on referee, recipient, and audience design (see Bell 1984, 2001, Schilling-Estes 2004, Coupland 2007), which focus on how speakers use and shift styles to align with various kinds of audiences (including copresent addressees, ratified and nonratified overhearers) as well as absent reference groups. This work emphasizes the point made above about the social-relational nature of individual expression, and provides some useful tools and categories for the understanding of the complex kinds of audience categories and roles to which speakers orient (copresent or not, ratified or not, etc.). Ethnographic, interactional, and discourse-analytic work also shows that stances taken in local interaction can presuppose or

posit relationships between copresent and absent audiences (see Irvine 1996, Hall, Sarangi, and Slembrouck 1997). This points to the way that audiences—and "publics"—can be imagined and idealized in performance (see Gal and Woolard 2001, Jaffe 2000, 2007a). Stance is implied/presupposed in performance, and performances also complicate audience(s); thus stance is at work in the discursive positioning of performers to audiences and audiences to other audiences. In this volume, for example, Bucholtz's discussion of media entextualizations of "whassup" and "güey" shows how they presuppose and index particular kinds of audiences: those who are either "in the know" about the indexicalities of these expressions and/or those who can read the intertextual links between different media representations.

Dynamic/Reflexive Approaches to Context

Over the last 20 years, work in interactional sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology has approached context as both a frame and a consequence of interaction (see Duranti and Goodwin's seminal 1986 volume); utterances are both "context-shaped" and "context-renewing" (C. Goodwin 2006: 443). To the extent that participant roles are a building block of context, this position implicates Goffman's notions of *footing* and *framing*, because frames are understood as inherently multiple and multilayered, and changes of footing are viewed as a "persistent feature of natural talk" (Goffman 1974, in Slembrouck 2004). Stances taken in interaction play a contextualizing role, creating a point of reference for subsequent utterances, which are both produced and interpreted in light of their relationship to prior talk. Acts of stance can thus be seen as one of the ways in which the multiplicity of contextual frames for talk get narrowed down or focused in interaction. Although this approach makes it clear that context cannot be seen as an independent variable that is detachable from specific interactions, it does not imply that all aspects of all contexts are fully negotiable by all participants. In this light, stance also has to be interpreted in light of the relative degree to which particular contexts shape or constrain individual action or expression. Put another way, conventional, socially and culturally embedded practices, roles, and expectations are the backdrop against which stancetaking occurs. For example, institutional contexts like schools heavily specify certain roles (student, teacher) and their interactional and linguistic prerogatives and patterns. Teachers and students may conform to or depart from these conventions (taking up diverse stances), but these conventions constitute a fundamental framework for the speech production and interpretation of those individual acts of positioning. A similar point can be made relative to the performance of gender, which, as Ehrlich points out, always takes place within a "rigid regulatory framework" that imposes "limits and constraints on speakers' agency in constructing [gender] identities" (2006: 139).

Indexicality: The Mediation of Sociolinguistic Variables and Social Identities

The role of stance in the indexical mediation of language practices and social identities is most clearly laid out in Ochs's 1993 analysis, in which she points out that linguistic variables conventionally assumed to have a direct link to gender actually

have an indirect link, mediated by stance. That is, particular ways of talking are associated with kinds of stances, or subject positions. Certain stances or clusters of stances become associated with gender through practice conducted within gendered and hierarchical social formations. Thus using "mitigating" language to make requests or demands is not a direct index of femininity, but rather represents a kind of stance that is taken up (or imposed on) a variety of less powerful people in society, including, but not limited to, women. At the same time, political and ideological processes may "naturalize" some of these indexical relationships such that they are treated as having a direct, even iconic connection to social identities (a point made by Bucholtz, Kiesling, and others in this volume).

A sociolinguistic approach to stance is distinguished, then, by this specific focus on the *processes of indexicalization*. In doing so, it goes beyond traditional correlations between linguistic variables and social identities conceived as more or less fixed and unproblematic categories. That is, as an analytical framework, stance does not essentialize social categories, but rather, looks at the subject positions and relationships that can be enacted through forms of talk and then, as a second level of analysis, how these are statistically and/or stereotypically mapped on to named linguistic systems ("accent," "dialect," "language," "mixed codes") or less explicitly named discourse categories (register, genre, discourse) made up of clusters of features. The linguistic systems indexed by stance are all embedded in political, social, ideological, and cultural fields of action. All individual acts of stance are thus, by definition, *indirect indices* of these fields, and play a mediating role in processes of identification (Eckert and Wenger 2005: 584, Ochs 1996). This focus on indirect indexicality is also related to the interactional, emergent, and coconstructed nature of stance discussed above with reference to paired (or clustered) participant roles. That is, when interactional and social meaning is embedded in presuppositions of talk, interlocutors are implicated through the very process of interpretation. This active role can be a form of intimacy or complicity in which the speaker invokes shared membership or values (as we see in Kiesling's discussion of immigrant interviewees' orientations to an immigrant interviewer). It can also sharpen the sting of a critique, as Shoaps's analysis illustrates, by making the recipient complicit in the negative framing of his/her behavior (see also Basso 1976).

Stance, as a form of indirect indexicality also posits, presupposes, or proposes relationships that go beyond the social and interpersonal. So, for example, using a stigmatized or minority code in a formal register could be, simultaneously, an individual claim to specific social membership(s) and authority, an act of interpersonal positioning, and a political and ideological statement about the status and relationship of the codes in circulation (the language chosen and the language not chosen). This leads us back to the cumulative effects of collective patterns of stance variation and the macrosociolinguistic implications of processes of indexicalization. Patterns of stances taken toward sociolinguistic norms or ideologies are part of this dynamic process, and become a new resource for the production and interpretation of speech. For example, in Dunn's analysis of Japanese honorific use, over 80% of speakers used humble forms in wedding speeches in conventionalized sections of the genre, showing conformity to and respect for normative uses of language to index conventional relationships associated with these events. However, when speakers

stepped out of the formal speechmaking role, these humble forms were used half as often (2005). These differentiated patterns of practice within the genre represent a shift or extension of conventional indexicalities (deference) associated with humble speech, establishing the contrast between humble and not humble as a resource for the expression of shifts (or inherent multiplicity) in speakers' relationships of "self" to utterance. In short, patterns in the cumulative results of speaker stancetaking shape both what is understood to be indexed by particular linguistic forms or practices and, potentially, the language ideologies that underpin how people look at the connections between language forms and practices and the social world.

Style, Styling, and Stylization

There are a number of important connections between sociolinguistic approaches to style and stylization and the sociolinguistics of stance. Contemporary approaches to sociolinguistic style focus on the interaction between socially recognized speech styles and personal style. As Irvine points out, those socially recognized speech styles are part of systems of distinction in which "a style contrasts with other styles, and the social meaning signified by the style contrasts with other social meanings" (2001: 22). The study of style thus involves documenting co-occurring linguistic features found in a social or personal style as well as the broader social semiotic system that establishes salient comparisons and contrasts between various styles and their elements. The same is true, of course, for stance: individual stances are only meaningful in relation to other possible stances from which they can be differentiated.

The connection between the social and the personal is realized in acts of *styling* (or *stylization*, discussed below). Work on styling offers an account of how people use sociolinguistic variation in "identity projections." Much of this work explores how speakers position themselves with reference to the kinds of macrosocial identity categories (ethnicity, gender, class, and place) that have long been the stock of variationist sociolinguistics. The focus on individual agency and creativity in styling identities posits these categories as resources for, rather than determinants of, individual linguistic practices (see Coupland 2007: 76, 138, Johnstone 2007, Rickford and Eckert 2001: 5). Put another way, the macro categories themselves become stance objects; styling is by definition a form of stancetaking. Speaker stance in styling is operationalized through processes of selection (of sociolinguistic variants) and elements of performance that deploy a range of semiotic resources. That is, speakers do not necessarily enact a socially salient style wholesale: they select particular features, which they perform along a continuum of intensity (vowel quality, location, length, etc.) and frequency (of use of particular variables) (Bucholtz 1999, 2001, Eckert 2000, Mendoza-Denton 2008). As Johnstone points out in her analysis of stancetaking in performances of Pittsburgh speech, speakers also lay claims to greater or lesser direct, personal knowledge of and relationships to the dialect. In doing so, they situate themselves as more or less "authentic" and thus authoritative speakers and evaluators of the local dialect (2007: 50). Similarly, Jaffe and Walton found that in performances of Southern speech, speakers took up stances of greater or lesser distance or affiliation with that variety of American English (2000).

This suggests that at the same time as stancetaking indexes sociolinguistic style, stance is also a crucial, if not primary, resource for style. Both Kiesling and Bucholtz (this volume) argue that indexical connections between particular ways of speaking (styles) and kinds of persons (and thus with identities to which a speaker may align) are constructed through stance (see also Bucholtz and Hall 2005, Eckert 2000, Kiesling 2004, Johnstone 2007). This is partly because, as mentioned above, the work of identity projection in interaction is also always the work of interpersonal relationships. That is, linguistic variation used to position speakers toward "big" identity categories is often simultaneously used to take up personal stances with interpersonal consequences. These include stances marking degrees of personal competence, control, authority, expertise, compliance with institutional or social agendas, and so forth. The co-occurrence of this foundational stance work, enacted locally ("interior" in Kiesling's terms), using sociolinguistically salient variation thus builds styles.

At the same time, we can view sociolinguistic style as a resource for stance, in the contextually specific ways in which sociolinguistic variables can be mobilized to do relational work. This is illustrated several recent works, including Ervin-Tripp's (2001) study of Dick Gregory, an African-American civil rights era political activist and comedian, and Rampton's analysis of the use of "posh" versus Cockney accents by adolescents. Rampton shows how "posh" and "Cockney" are used to articulate stances toward the body-in-society, in which he writes that "a *relatively standard* accent is used to articulate an incompetent or uneasy relationship with the body and with feelings and emotion…an apparent regard for social decorum…A Cockney accent…is associated with bodily activity…feeling unconstrained by social manners" (2006: 342, italics in original). In Ervin-Tripp's analysis, we see that although Gregory sometimes uses the contrast between black and white speech styles in a conventional way, to index black versus white attitudes and perspectives, that contrast is also layered with multiple social indexicalities (sophisticated versus unsophisticated protesters, ignorant parents versus youth and sacred texts, etc.) and used in unexpected ways (black personas given white voices and vice versa). These examples illustrate the dynamic relationship between contextualized acts of stancetaking across time and conventional sociolinguistic indexicalities. That is, the mapping of Cockney and "posh" onto stances to body-in-society and of black and white styles onto attributed political stances in the personas voiced by Gregory are not just "given," ready-made exterior resources simply taken up by particular social actors: those social actors have agency in creating them. At the same time, they do not come from nowhere, and are consistent with broader, historical contrasts and stereotypes: about class, control, and physicality (in Rampton's example) and about race and political ideology (in Ervin-Tripp's). Thus, in these examples, we can see particular dimensions of circulating social and sociolinguistic resources being actualized through local acts of stancetaking, which in turn may create new indexicalities that become subsequent targets for further acts of stance. This point is also illustrated in Adkins's analysis of how, in a particular theater company, "stage Irish" is used by the director at moments in interaction in which she manages transitions between activity types (giving instructions and doing rehearsals) (2007). This local function is in fact a stance (that indexes expertise, authority), which, by being enacted through stage Irish over time, builds an indexical relationship between this language variety

and those stances. It then becomes available to another (assistant) director for further stancetaking, who uses stage Irish in the main director's absence in order to signal and legitimate her claim to the authority of that position.

Another related point that is emphasized by both Kiesling's and Bucholtz's contributions to this volume is that stance is the dynamic operator that makes it possible for one set of indexicalities to be mobilized to do different (indexical) work in a different context. For example, when linguistic variants (like "dude") that index a kind of masculinity associated by "surfers" and "stoners" are taken up by people outside those categories to present themselves as having a laid-back, cool solidarity, it is those stances—not entire social category identities—that are being transported across speaker categories and domains of use. The same thing can be said about the phenomenon of "crossing" launched into the literature by Rampton and explored in subsequent work. When non-Asian teenagers use bits of Panjabi with teachers (Rampton 1995, 2005) or white male high school students adopt elements of African American speech styles (Bucholtz 1999), they selectively mobilize stances associated with those codes for immediate (and sometimes more enduring) social and interactional purposes. Bucholtz's contribution to this volume shows that this process of stance transfer (from "dude" to "güey") is not straightforward: the "old" and the "new" indexicalities exist in a certain tension, rendering them open to multiple and competing interpretations.

Crossing is of course relatively self-conscious speech, which brings us to the topic of *stylization* as a form of stancetaking that is deliberately and self-consciously performative, and which thus simultaneously draws attention to the agency of the performer in manipulating conventions and to the conventional associations between speech styles and identities and to the individual's stancetaking within those webs of associations. Eckert points to the constitutive role that stance and stylization play in the construction of social meaning and linguistic variation. In her analysis of iconic burned-out burnout girl speakers, it is the pairing of overtly stylized speech (such as emphatic uses of sociolinguistic variables) and other social displays of stance and style that "defines the meanings of the style that lead to the more general correlations between vocalic variables and social category affiliation" (2001: 125). We could argue that stylization in everyday talk and in its more overt occurrence in a variety of media genres makes stance its explicit object. Here, Coupland reminds us that stylization can "complicate the links between sociolinguistic practice and social meaning...[and]...also expose those links quite strikingly and make them available for critical reassessment" (2007: 171). These perspectives help us to understand the mixed reactions reported by Bucholtz (this volume) to advertisers' attempts to transfer the ironic, metapragmatic associations of "whassup" to the Spanish term "güey": the media frame lays the stance equivalence of the two terms open for public evaluation.

Examples of both the everyday and the stylized redeployment of stances across contexts and speakers highlight the significance of stances as both intimately linked to and situationally separable from styles and other relevant categories. In part, this is because of the multiple mappings of stances and other relevant categories. Describing Mendoza-Denton's work on young Latinas' styling, Eckert writes, "Class and gender...may be associated with stances such as toughness or intellectual superiority. A single linguistic feature, therefore, may be deployed in multiple styles

and combined with others to create a style rich in social meaning" (Eckert 2005: 101–102). Similarly, in this volume, Bucholtz shows how the use of "güey" by adolescents can be deployed to take a boastful stance or to create a relationship of "cool solidarity" much like "dude" in Kiesling's work. The coupling/decoupling of stance, style, and identity is also related to the inherently reflexive and metalinguistic nature of stance. In this respect, even the mundane use of stance seems to have features of "high performance" (Coupland 2007: 146), including what Bauman and Briggs characterize as "decontextualizability" and accessibility for future reentextualizations (1990: 73).

Metasociolinguistic and Ideological Dimensions of Stance

As Bucholtz shows in this volume, stancetaking can be a window on individual interpretations of and positions toward metapragmatic stereotypes, including the identities and relationships conventionally associated with particular discourses, variables, or forms of talk. Stancetaking can also have as its object the underlying assumptions, processes, and motivations behind those sociolinguistic correlations. That is, speakers can use sociolinguistically salient forms in such a way as to call into question—or leave unchallenged—specific language hierarchies: convictions that particular variables are inherently more or less prestigious, intimate, authoritative, and so on. At an even more basic level, people can take up stances toward the assumed connections between language and identity, from the individual to the collective level. We might call this display of an attitude or position with respect to language hierarchies and ideologies a *metasociolinguistic* stance.

Such metasociolinguistic stances are enacted in a variety of ways. For example, speakers may align with "standard language ideology" (Lippi-Green 1997) through overt commentary. This is illustrated in Johnstone's chapter about Barbara Jordan, who, in her autobiographical accounts of her socialization as a public speaker, explicitly subscribes to the notion that there is one correct way to speak. She also engages in hypercorrection, which is an indirect form of the same kind of alignment (see also Bucholtz's 2001 analysis of "superstandard" English by self-styled "nerd" high school students). Patterns of code choice are simultaneously a resource and an object. Here, we can consider patterns of code choice among individuals who have a repertoire that includes both high and low status codes. When they choose to use the low status codes only in informal or unofficial contexts, they align with standard language ideology by conforming to models of functional differentiation of use based on status. Conversely, use of low status codes in a high-status, public, and institutional context represents a stance of disalignment with standard language ideology. In this volume, Jaffe explores the stance implications of teachers' uses of Corsican and French against a highly politicized language ideological backdrop.

Metasociolinguistic stance is also implicated in speakers' self-conscious displays of consistency or inconsistency in their uses of sociolinguistically salient linguistic forms or codes. For example, Johnstone shows how Barbara Jordan's deflection of questions about adapting language to audience or context resisted the ethos of persona such adaptations invoke, insisting instead on an ethos of self, in which language is

to be seen as the reflection of durable, stable elements of personal character rather than as a mere response to social contingencies. In doing so, Jordan subscribes to the ideology that language = self and that consistency of language = personal and moral consistency. This contrasts with the stance taken by Dick Gregory in his display of inconsistency in the use of African-American speech forms (in the analysis by Ervin-Tripp, above), which emphasized an ethos of a political ideology of self (and worth) that is separable from language. Both of these examples show that people can be construed as taking stances not only in particular utterances and interactions, but as constructing such stances across their public trajectories as speakers (see discussion below).

As the discussion of processes of indexicalization (above) suggests, metaso-ciolinguistic stance can also be studied as a collective phenomenon, with a focus on patterns of collective positioning. That is, how often speakers do or do not align or comply with conventional sociolinguistic norms or indexicalities in their acts of stance plays a role in the reproduction (and potential change) of those norms and indexicalities.

Stance, Determinacy, and Indeterminacy

Processes of identification may be motivated by a desire to fix social categories and positions, because doing so can confer various forms of advantage/disadvantage on the stance taker (or on others). But identity work can also be oriented toward complex, multiple, and potentially ambiguous kinds of alignments and thus, toward the maintenance rather than the resolution of ambiguity and indeterminacy. That is, because it is often the case that multiple social and linguistic positions, identities, and stances are relevant or useful for particular social actors, they can have an inter-est in exploiting the fundamental indeterminacy or multivalency of stancetaking to maintain flexibility of self-presentation in potentially unpredictable or volatile social fields of reception and interpretation.

One use of indeterminacy is to defer moments of speaker commitment. Using linguistic variables that index multiple stances makes all of those stances potentially available to be claimed after the fact by the stance taker. Conversely, speakers can exploit indeterminacy to take up deniable stances, or in some way mitigate or mediate the extent to which they are held accountable for them. Some forms of stancetaking may also introduce uncertainty into interaction by drawing attention to the poten-tial gap between linguistic form and intention or authorship. This is illustrated in Shoaps's analysis, in this volume, of the use of irony as a form of moral criticism: she points out that the role of principal (with primary accountability) for the moral posi-tions taken through irony is not specifically attributable to the speaker. This gives the stance taken the value of a normative generalization: as emanating from the collec-tivity and its shared values (see also Scheibman 2007). Finally, there is the mediation afforded by the inherently multivocalic nature of stances that are actualized through other people's voices as they are reported (directly or indirectly), parodied, alluded to, recycled, repeated, ironized, and so forth. The robust literature on reported speech (see Besnier 1990: 426) shows how it can be strategically exploited by speakers who take up stances of simultaneous closeness to and distance from the stances in

the speech they report. That is, by imposing a frame in which participant roles are destabilized, speakers can allude to multiple possible stances while fully committing to none. For example, the reporter of speech can position the self as "only" being an animator, while simultaneously exploiting the potential leakage between different speaker roles such that actually voicing words acquires a degree of authorship.

In other cases, speakers themselves are fundamentally conflicted, and stance multiplicity and indeterminacy expressively mediates that conflict. We see this in McIntosh's analysis of the narratives of white Kenyans whose identities as whites are constructed in contrast with "irrational" black African belief systems that neverthe-less permeate their experiences and social practices as Kenyans. As a consequence, taking a position with respect to witchcraft and the occult causes existential con-flict. In response to this, McIntosh's interviewees introduce multiple "I"s into their accounts, privileging the "I"s that can't believe while simultaneously speaking from the "I"s who have had persuasive encounters with the occult. In doing so, they give voice to multiple selves, but privilege those identities that they have been socialized into as whites.

Stance across Trajectories of Time, Space, and Texts

Stance is constructed across interpersonal encounters, but it is not limited to fleeting or temporary positionings. As Johnstone's chapter in the volume illustrates, we can also speak about durable personal stances (or stance styles) across longer time frames: in the case she analyzes, the stances taken by politician Barbara Jordan across her entire career. Johnstone argues that it is the cumulative patterning of Jordan's stance choices that constitute her unique stance signature, and thus her identity as a linguis-tic individual. In fact, part of this individuality (and through it, particular claims to authority) is a form of "metastance": the choice to adopt a consistent speaker stance across a range of different contexts in which people might reasonably expect some variation. One could argue that the discourse of elite tourism described by Jaworski and Thurlow in this volume also has as its target a durable individual and shared stance disposition, defined by multiple iterations (and consumption) of discourses of distinction.

Individual speakers' histories of usage and repertoires are thus critical resources for the interpretation of their stance choices in discrete speech events (Jaffe 2007b). This is because, as Du Bois points out, interpreting an act of stance requires knowl-edge of individual histories of stances both taken and not taken (2007: 147). This framework for choice can be constrained or shaped by social or linguistic conven-tions as the discussion of agency, above, indicates. But it is the individual stance repertoire (intraspeaker variation) that maps out patterned variation (frequencies, distributions) at the level of the speaker. These patterns of individual variation, compared and contrasted with patterns of collective variation, set the scene for the production and interpretation of specific stance events. Let me illustrate this with a concrete example: a French speaker of my acquaintance who, by her own account, defies normative patterns in her use of "vous" with many people with whom she has warm and friendly relations. This pattern of choice (itself a stance with a number of interesting implications) colors the stance potentials of her uses of "tu," which may

carry a more intense affective stance of intimacy than the "tu"s of more normative speakers. Alternatively, although normative speakers' use of "tu" with acquaintances would simply be read as cordial, when she does the same thing it constitutes a departure from her preferred usage, and thus may be seen as a more significant act of social alignment with (or consideration for) interlocutors who desire a reciprocal "tu" usage with her.

Stances are also acquired, attributed, and accumulated through individuals' sequences of movement through participant roles. Jaffe's chapter on the Corsican classroom explores how teachers structure student stances and identities through the sequencing and scaffolding of student participation. Taken from this perspective, we can view movement itself as a crucial component of durable stance orientations in the individual, because the process itself establishes ideal sequences and paired stance relationships. From this perspective, different trajectories of apprenticeship arguably result in different stance outcomes, because they provide different social/ideological warrants for expertise.

A focus on trajectories of stancetaking resonates with a more general attention to histories of practice: to the chains of signification in which individual utterances derive their meaning(s). This perspective aligns with Bakhtin's notion of *heteroglossia*, in which all utterances carry the traces of past utterances and the social and cultural contexts of talk and action in which they were embedded (1981: 276). It is also consistent with more recent attention to *intertextuality* and *interdiscursivity*. With respect to stance, this means that prior texts and discourses are both resources for stancetaking as well as inevitable frameworks for their interpretation and meaning. Moreover, stance is centrally implicated in the creation of intertextual and interdiscursive links. This is because practices of entextualization, reentextualizaton (Bauman and Briggs 1990, Urban 1996, Van Leeuwen 2008) and resemiotization (Iedema 2003) are not stance-neutral: they always inflect the reproduction as having a particular kind of link with prior texts and discourses and position the agent of reproduction in particular ways. We see this in this volume in Irvine's and Jaffe's chapters, in which acts of reinscription/copying create text trajectories that variously empower or disempower different social actors involved in these sequences.

Ideology and Power in Cultural Context

Issues of ideology and power, anchored in specific cultural and social contexts, are critical to a sociolinguistics of stance. The issue of power has already been alluded to in the discussion of institutional constraints on individual agency and of the role of stance in reproducing or challenging dominant language hierarchies or ideologies. In general, we can think of stance as a resource for individual action that can be productively studied within sociolinguistic traditions focusing on political economies and ideologies of language. That is, we can analyze the way that culturally and historically specific social, institutional, and political formations structure people's access (as individuals and as categories of persons) to particular linguistic stances (especially valued ones such as authority, legitimacy etc.) as well as shape the stances that are attributed to them. As Blommaert puts it succinctly, discourse is "both creative at a micro-level and constrained (determined) at higher levels" (2005: 125). In Irvine's

chapter, Mr. Taylor's fragile social position means that he effectively has a legitimate stance to *lose*; his superiors, like the doctors in Coupland and Coupland's chapter, have stances to *give* and little threat of loss. The teachers in Jaffe's chapter, because of their institutional authority and paired, hierarchical relationships with students, also have stances to attribute. In Bucholtz's chapter, we discover that there are differing takes on the stance indexicalities of "güey" among adolescent users, teachers, and Spanish-speaking elders, and understand that issues of social and institutional power will influence which interpretations will prevail (and their consequences) in particular contexts. Thus the issue of individual agency that is central in scholarly assessments of access to linguistic capital is also central to the way in which stance is produced and interpreted.

To emphasize a point made above, cultural variability in this domain is also related to foundational ideologies of personhood and language ideological beliefs about the relationship of the "inner" life of the person and their "outer" or social, expressive behavior. As many authors have noted, although most Western cultural traditions take the distinction between the inner/personal and outer/social for granted (and often map the former onto notions of "true" or "essential" self), these distinctions are far less relevant in many other cultures (Besnier 1990, Duranti 1996, Stroud 1992). This has implications for the interpretation of stance: in cultures without the "inner/outer" dichotomy, all stances will be read as social or political rather than about some essential or private mental or emotional state. This would have the result of blocking, for example, certain kinds of individual stances, such as claims to have acted publicly in ways that conflict with "true" (hidden, interior) feelings or beliefs (see Shoaps, this volume).

Cultures also vary in their repertoires of spoken and written genres and discourses. One of the ways these repertoires inflect stancetaking is in the degree to which their components script personal participation and expression and thus define the nature and scope of individual agency. Genres of talk or writing that are heavily scripted/conventionalized and obligatory shape the variables that speakers deploy in stancetaking as well as the variables interlocutors attend to and the nature of their interpretation. To the extent that social actors are obligated to follow particular discursive scripts, following the required elements of those scripts cannot be read as a direct reflection of high personal alignment, affective stance (the individual's "true" feelings). This would be the case, for example, with certain politeness formulae. At the same time, the narrowing of space for individual maneuver can invest ever finer linguistic or sociolinguistic distinctions with significance for personal stance. We can extend the argument about obligation to a consideration of norms. To the extent that culturally specific genres establish some forms of linguistic usage as standard, normative or unmarked, they also define other variables (low frequency, nonnormative) as "marked" and thus as salient for the stancetaking and the interpretation of speaker intentionality (see Dunn 2005). To the extent that culturally specific genres, like performance, foreground and make issues of form explicit, they also provide a framework for the taking and interpretation of "metastances" (Harré and VanLangenhoeve's "accountive" positioning): the personal stances those speakers take up with respect to the social scripts and obligations, identities, and relationships they imply.

Wider cultural Discourses also have implications for stance in that they can serve as ready-made (ideological) scripts that can themselves be stance objects, activated by individual speakers/writers through the use of some subset of their elements (from phonological variables to specific phrases to chunks of discourse). Another cultural variable is the ideological load carried by particular discourses. In this respect, some discourses may be more "stance-saturated" than others: that is, they may be overtly recognized as sites for more or less obligatory positioning. In this volume, the topic of witchcraft among white Kenyans serves as just such a "stance prompt" for statements of belief (McIntosh); a similar claim is made for discourses on the body and aging in the United Kingdom and the United States (Coupland and Coupland) and for the issue of language choice and use on Corsica (Jaffe).

Stancetaking also plays a complex role with respect to the naturalization of social and linguistic ideologies and the social structures they legitimate. On the one hand, stancetaking plays a naturalizing role because it activates such ideologies indirectly. When ideologies are presupposed rather than articulated outright, they are represented as not being open to question or contestation, and the relationships between linguistic forms and social meanings may be perceived as direct (see Bucholtz, this volume, Irvine and Gal 2000). On the other hand, the performative dimension of some acts of stancetaking also puts on display the processes of indexicalization and iconization. This has the effect of "denaturalizing" the connections between linguistic and social forms by revealing those connections as situated, contingent, and socially created.

Plan of the Book

In chapter 2, Johnstone takes a discourse-analytic and rhetorical approach to the analysis of the speech and writing of Barbara Jordan, a prominent African-American politician, across different genres and contexts. This detailed analysis is coupled with interview, biographical, and historical research about the sociolinguistic and language-ideological contexts in which Jordan operated. Johnstone focuses on Jordan's repeated patterns of stancetaking, arguing that these patterns constitute a style associated with a particular individual. Jordan develops a durable stance that is rooted in a particular ideology about identity, character, and how they are/should be reflected in language that Johnstone calls an "ethos of self." This ethos of self is central to Jordan's political identity, in particular with respect to how she constructed a stance of moral authority that underpinned her rhetoric and was the cornerstone of her public career.

In chapter 3, Judith Irvine analyzes a nineteenth-century dispute between African missionaries documented in correspondence involving Nigerian missionaries, their local bishops, and church authorities in London. In this analysis, she shows how various social actors mediated—and took stances with respect to the "faultable" actions of one of the missionaries, Mr. Taylor. Like Johnstone's chapter, Mr. Taylor's moral authority is in question, but in this case, Taylor's agency in constructing his own stance is severely compromised. Irvine makes the important point that an overemphasis on speaker intentionality and agency in stancetaking obscures the way that speakers can have thrust upon them stances that are not of their own choosing, and are shaped by the structures of power and ideology in which they operate.

The fourth chapter, by Janet McIntosh, examines the multiplicity of first-person indexicality in interview data with white Kenyans in which they make statements of belief about black African witchcraft. McIntosh shows that in response to existential vulnerability posed by belief in "irrational" belief systems, speakers express a set of fragmented and hierarchically ordered ontological stances: one associated with the "true" (and rational) self and another that is influenced by encounters with the occult. This analysis shows that complexity and inconsistency in speaker stance can reflect profound states of anomie in a context of rapid social and cultural change.

Shoaps's chapter (5) is based on ethnographic research on Sakapultek speakers, and also involves the taking and attribution of moral stances. Shoaps analyzes a category of utterances she labels "moral irony" used in indirect stancetaking that presupposes certain values as shared. In this chapter, as in McIntosh's and Irvine's, the analysis involves the fragmentability of participant roles. The Sakapultek speakers Shoaps describes exploit this fragmentability to invoke absent principals for evaluative actions, and to mitigate the potentially negative social consequences of more direct forms of negative evaluations of others.

In chapter 6, Jaffe explores how teachers' stancetaking and scaffolding of participant roles positions the two languages of a Corsican bilingual school with respect to authority and legitimacy and simultaneously attributes stances of authorship and linguistic competence to the students in the school. She shows how, in particular institutional contexts in which there are paired and hierarchical roles, stancetaking by individuals has stance-attributing entailments for others. Jaffe also emphasizes how the language ideological context "saturates" language choice with stance potential, and how acts of stance across trajectories of time contribute to processes of sociolinguistic indexicalization.

Bucholtz's chapter (7) examines the relationship between stance, style, and identity in the use of a single slang term, *güey*, often translated as "dude." Drawing on naturally occurring conversations among Mexican-immigrant adolescents and in contemporary media advertising texts, Bucholtz shows how the multiple stance indexicalities of this term are drawn on in interaction to do the work of alignment and to create a particular gendered style. She emphasizes that it is the work of stancetaking that creates indexical relationships between particular linguistic forms and social identities.

This argument is consistent with the position Kiesling takes in chapter 8 that stance is where the "baptismal essentializations" (Silverstein 2003) of indexicality associated with sociolinguistic variation occur. Kiesling illustrates this point with reference to three data sets: his earlier work on the use of ING in a fraternity, the use of "nonstandard" forms of Pittsburgh speech in a multiparty conversation among women professionals, and the use of elements of New Australian English by immigrants in interviews conducted in Sydney and Melbourne. In each case, he shows that stance is the best predictor and explanation of patterns of sociolinguistic variable use.

Chapter 9, by Jaworski and Thurlow, analyzes how an elitist stance is discursively constructed in a corpus of travel writing in two major British newspapers. They explore how these texts produce distinction (social difference) through a variety of textual stancetaking strategies. Jaworski and Thurlow show how these textual

processes position both writers and readers as real or imagined consumers, and address the implications of these processes for the reproduction of dominant ideologies and social hierarchies.

In the final chapter, Coupland and Coupland examine the topic of body weight and health in two data sets: a corpus of policy texts and women's lifestyle magazines and a spoken corpus of geriatric doctor-patient interactions. Their analysis shows how authors and doctors, in taking up an authorial or discursive stance, attribute stances (moral and otherwise) to addressees or subjects of their discourse. It also highlights the connection between linguistic stancetaking and the production of a normative moral order.

Conclusions

To return to the agenda laid out in the introduction to this chapter, a sociolinguistics of stance is concerned with two broad issues: the social processes and consequences of all forms of stancetaking and how sociolinguistic indexicalities are both resources for and targets of stance. Situated within the theoretical frameworks I have surveyed above, I would like to propose the following summary of the orientations that define the terrain occupied by a sociolinguistics of stance. A sociolinguistics of stance:

1. situates linguistic acts of stance within the sociocultural matrices that give stances their social meanings and frame the ways in which this particular kind of linguistic behavior is socially consequential;

2. explores how established sociolinguistic indexicalities serve as backdrop and resource for acts of stancetaking, as well as how stancetaking contributes to the production, reproduction, and potential change of indexical relationships between ways of speaking and speaker categories and hierarchies;

3. takes account of language ideologies as both resources for the production and interpretation of stance and as potential stance objects;

4. focuses on the reflexive, metapragmatic, and "metasociolinguistic" dimension of human communication, with a particular interest in the ways that speakers take up positions with respect to core sociolinguistic issues that shape their worlds, including the conventional associations between language and social categories, linguistic ideologies, and language hierarchies;

5. treats speaker stance as a crucial component of interactional processes and practices that have long been a focus of sociolinguistic study, including core concerns with issues of alignment/disalignment and the negotiation of power, as well as with the subtle ways in which speakers can exploit indeterminacy to take up multiple and/or ambiguous positions vis-à-vis copresent as well as absent social others;

6. incorporates stancetaking into analyses of identity as it is performed, socially and interactionally constituted /coconstructed across time and over encounters,

This list can be read as a reflection of what sociolinguistics has to offer the study of stance—in particular, what is gained by bringing sociolinguistic variables and categories into the picture as stance objects and resources for stancetaking. Sociolinguistic approaches clearly complement work on stance in a variety of other disciplinary traditions. At the same time, I would like to suggest that sociolinguistic explorations of stance can play a privileged role with respect to sociolinguistic theory, providing insight into processes of indexicalization as they occur over time and in particular social, cultural, political, and ideological contexts.

References

Adkins, Madeleine. 2007. Performance at rehearsal: The use of stage Irish in liminal moments. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting, Washington DC.

Austin, John. L. 1965. *How to do things with words.* Ed. John O. Urmson. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination.* ed. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Basso, Keith. 1976. Wise words of the Western Apache: Metaphor and semantic theory. In *Meaning in anthropology,* ed. Keith H. Basso and Henry A. Selby, 93–121. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Bauman, Richard. 1996. Transformations of the word in the production of Mexican festival drama. In *Natural histories of discourse,* ed. Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, 301–329. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bauman, Richard, and Charles Briggs. 1990. Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 59–88.

Bell, Allan. 1984. Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13: 145–204.

———. 2001. Back in style: Reworking audience design. In *Style and sociolinguistic variation,* ed. Penelope Eckert and John R. Rickford, 139–169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berman, Ruth. 2004. Introduction: Developing discourse stance in different text types and languages. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 105–124.

Besnier, Niko. 1990. Language and affect. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 419–451.

———. 1993. Reported speech and affect on Nukulaelae Atoll. In *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse,* ed. Jane Hill and Judith Irvine, 161–181. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, Douglas, and Edward Finegan. 1989. Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text* 9(1): 93–124.

Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1981. *Language and symbolic power.* Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bucholtz, Mary. 1999. You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3–4: 443–460.

———. 2001. The whiteness of nerds: Superstandard English and racial markedness. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1): 84–100.

Bucholtz, Mary, and Kira Hall. 2005. Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7: 585–614.

Clift, Rebecca. 2006. Indexing stance: Reported speech as an interactional evidential. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10(5): 569–595.

Conrad, Susan, and Douglas Biber. 2000. Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse,* ed. Susan Hunston and Geoff Thompson, 56–73. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style: Language variation and identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Du Bois, John. 2007. The stance triangle. In *Stancetaking in discourse,* ed. Robert Englebretson, 139–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dunn, Cynthia Dickel. 2005. Japanese honorific use as indexical of the speaker's situational stance: Towards a new model. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 48: 83–92.

Duranti, Alessandro. 1996. *From grammar to politics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Duranti, Alessandro, and Charles Goodwin, eds. 1986. *Rethinking context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eckert, Penelope. 2000. *Linguistic variation as social practice.* Oxford: Blackwell.

———. 2001. Style and social meaning. In *Style and sociolinguistic variation,* ed. Penelope Eckert and John Rickford, 119–126. New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2005. Stylistic practice and the adolescent social order. In *Talking adolescence: Perspectives on communication in the teenage years,* ed. Angie Williams and Crispin Thurlow, 93–110. New York: Peter Lang.

Eckert, Penelope, and Étienne Wenger. 2005. What is the role of power in sociolinguistic variation? *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9: 582–589.

Ehrlich, Susan. 2006. Trial discourse and judicial decision-making: Constraining the boundaries of gendered identities. In *Speaking out: The female voice in public contexts,* ed. Judith Baxter, 139–158. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Englebretson, Robert. 2007. Stancetaking in discourse: An introduction. In *Stancetaking in discourse,* ed. Robert Englebretson, 1–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 2001. Variety, style-shifting and ideology. In *Style and sociolinguistic variation,* ed. Penelope Eckert and John Rickford, 44–56. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* London: Routledge.

Field, Margaret. 1997. The role of factive predicates in the indexicalization of stance: A discourse perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 27(6):799–814.

Fox, Barbara. 2001. Evidentiality: Authority, responsibility, and entitlement in English conversation. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11.2:167–192.

Gal, Susan, and Kathryn Woolard. 2001. Introduction. In *Languages and publics: The making of authority,* ed. Susan Gal and Kathryn Woolard, 1–12. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome's Press.

Gardner, Rod. 2002. *When listeners talk: Response tokens and listener stance,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis.* New York: Harper and Row.

Goodwin, Charles. 1986. Audience diversity, participation and interpretation. *Text* 6: 283–316.

———. 2006. Retrospective and prospective orientation in the construction of argumentative moves. *Text and Talk* 26(4/5): 443–461.

———. 2007. Interactive footing. In *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction,* ed. Elizabeth Holt and Rebecca Clift, 16–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. 1998. Games of stance: Conflict and footing in hopscotch. In *Kids talk: Strategic language use in later childhood,* ed. Carolyn Temple Adger and Susan Hoyle, 23–46. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2006. *The hidden life of girls: Games of stance, status and exclusion.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hall, Christopher, Srikant Sarangi, and Stefaan Slembrouck. 1997. Silence and silenced voices: Interactional construction of audience in social work talk. In *Silence: Interdisciplinary perspectives,* ed. Adam Jaworski, 181–212. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1994. *An introduction to functional grammar,* 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold.

Harré, Rom, and Luc VanLangenhoeve. 1991. Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 21: 393–407.

Heritage, John, and Geoff Raymond. 2005. The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68: 15–38.

Hodge, Robert, and Gunther Kress. 1988. *Social semiotics.* Cambridge: Polity.

Iedema, Rick. 2003. Multimodality, resemiotization: Extending the analysis of discourse as a multisemiotic practice. *Visual Communication* 2: 29–57.

Irvine, Judith. 1996. Shadow conversations: The indeterminacy of participant roles. In *Natural histories of discourse,* ed. Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, 131–159. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

———. 2001. Style as distinctiveness: The culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation. In *Style and sociolinguistic variation,* ed. Penelope Eckert and John Rickford, 21–43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Irvine, Judith T., and Susan Gal. 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities,* ed. Paul V. Kroskrity, 35–84. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Jaffe, Alexandra. 2000. Comic performance and the articulation of hybrid identity. *Pragmatics* 10(1): 39–60.

———. 2007a. Codeswitching and stance: Issues in interpretation. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 6(1): 1–25.

———. 2007b. Corsican on the airwaves: Media discourse, practice and audience in a context of minority language shift and revitalization. In *Language in the media,* ed. Sally Johnson and Astrid Ensslin, 149–172. London: Continuum Press.

Jaffe, Alexandra, and Shana Walton. 2000. The voices people read: Orthography and the representation of nonstandard dialect. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4(4): 569–595.

Johnstone, Barbara. 2007. Linking identity and dialect through stancetaking. In *Stancetaking in discourse,* ed. Robert Englebretson, 49–68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2007. The role of *I guess* in conversational stancetaking. In *Stancetaking in discourse,* ed. Robert Englebretson, 183–219. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kiesanen, Tiina. 2007. Stancetaking as an interactional activity: Challenging the prior speaker. In *Stancetaking in discourse,* ed. Robert Englebretson, 253–282. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kiesling, Scott. 2004. Dude. *American Speech* 79(3): 281–305.

Kockelman, Paul. 2004. Stance and subjectivity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 14(2): 127–150.

Labov, William, and Joshua Waletsky. 1967. Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7(1–4): 3–38.

Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1997. *English with an accent.* New York: Routledge.

Martin, J. R. 2000. Beyond exchange: APPRAISAL systems in English. In *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse,* ed. Susan Hunston and Geoff Thompson, 142–175. New York: Oxford University Press.

Matoesian, Gregory. 2005. Struck by speech revisited: Embodied stance in jurisdictional discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9(2): 167–193.

Mendoza-Denton, Norma. 2008. *Homegirls: Language and cultural practice among Latina youth gangs.* New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Modan, Gabriella. 2006. *Turf wars.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ochs, Elinor. 1993. Indexing gender. In *Rethinking context,* ed. Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, 335–358. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1996. Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In *Rethinking linguistic relativity,* ed. John Gumperz and Stephen Levinson, 407–438. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents.* London: Longman.

———. 2006. *Language in late modernity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rauniomaa, Mirka. 2007. Stance markers in spoken Finnish: Minun mielestä and minusta in assessments. In *Stancetaking in discourse,* ed. Robert Englebretson, 221–252. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ribeiro, Branca Telles. 2006. Footing, positioning, voice: Are we talking about the same things? In *Discourse and identity,* ed. Anna de Fina, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg, 48–82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rickford, John, and Penelope Eckert. 2001. Introduction. In *Style and sociolinguistic variation,* ed. Penelope Eckert and John Rickford, 1–20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, Emmanuel. 2001. Discourse as an interactional achievement III. In *The Handbook of discourse analysis,* ed. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi Hamilton, 229–249. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Scheibman, Joanne. 2007. Subjective and intersubjective uses of generalizations in English conversation. In *Stancetaking in discourse,* ed. Robert Englebretson, 111–138. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schilling-Estes, Natalie. 2004. Constructing ethnicity in interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8(2): 163–195.

Scollon, Ron. 1998. *Mediated discourse as social interaction: A study of news discourse,* Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Silverstein, Michael. 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of social life. *Language and Communication* 23(3–4): 193–229.

Slembrouck, Stefan. 2004. What is meant by discourse analysis? Rev. June 5, 2006. http://bank.rug.ac.be/da/da.htm.

Stroud, Christopher. 1992. The problem of intention and meaning in codeswitching. *Text* 12(1): 127–155.

Stubbs, Michael. 1996. *Text and corpus analysis: Computer-assisted studies of language and culture.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Thompson, Geoff, and Susan Hunston. 2000. Evaluation: An introduction. In *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse,* ed. Susan Hunston and Geoff Thompson, 1–27. New York: Oxford University Press.

Urban, Greg. 1996. Entextualization, replication and power. In *Natural histories of discourse,* ed. Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, 21–44. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Van Leeuwen, Leo. 2008. *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Verschueren, Jef. 1999. *Understanding pragmatics.* London: Arnold.

White, Peter. R. R. 2003. Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text* 23 (2): 259–284.

Wu, Ruey-Jiuan. 2004. *Stance in talk: A conversation analysis of Mandarin final particles.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stance, Style, and the Linguistic Individual

Barbara Johnstone

Overview

Repeatable linguistic styles emerge out of stancetaking strategies that prove repeatedly relevant and useful for particular speakers in particular kinds of interactions. Previous research has explored how styles can come to be associated with interactional situations (e.g., Biber and Finegan 1989) or social identities (e.g., Ochs 1992, Eckert 2000). In some language-ideological contexts, styles associated with individuals can also become ethnographically and interactionally relevant. This chapter uses a discourse-analytic case study of one individual's talk and writing across genres, together with interview, biographical, and historical research about the sociolinguistic and language-ideological contexts, to illustrate how repeated patterns of stancetaking can come together as a style associated with a particular individual. The individual in question, a well-known twentieth-century U.S. political figure, was known for how she talked, which was sometimes referred to as "the Barbara Jordan style." As I will show, Jordan drew on discursive resources from the African-American church and from American traditions of legal and political debate and oratory, as mediated by particular people in her environment, to create a linguistic style that she adopted across discourse genres and across time. In keeping with one of the two the dominant Western ideologies about the role of identity in persuasion, this style was understood to index rhetorical credibility by constructing and calling attention to moral and epistemological authority stemming from consistent personal identity rather than changeable social identity.

I begin by sketching the models of stancetaking and style I draw on, summarizing corpus-linguistic, anthropological, and sociolinguistic research that shows how