——. 2008. Recasting language and masculinities in the age of desire. *Indiana University Linguistics Club working papers*. Department of Linguistics, Indiana University Bloomington, IN.

Labov, William. 1963. *The social motivation of a sound change. Word* 19(3): 273–309.

——. 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

——. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

——. 1989. The child as linguistic historian. *Language Variation and Change* 1(1): 85–97.

——. 2001. *Principles of linguistic change: Social factors*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Labov, William, Sharon Ash, and Charles Boberg. 2006. *The Atlas of North American English*. New York: Mouton deGruyter.

Mendoza-Denton, Norma. 2008. *Homegirls: Language and cultural practice among Latina youth gangs*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ochs, Elinor. 1992. Indexing gender. In *Rethinking context*, ed. Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, 335–358. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paolillo, John. C. 2002. *Analyzing linguistic variation: Statistical models and methods*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Podesva, Robert. 2007. Phonation type as a stylistic variable: The use of falsetto in constructing a persona. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11(4): 478–504.

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

Schieffelin, Bambi B., and Elinor Ochs. 1986. *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schilling-Estes, Natalie. 1998. Investigating "self-conscious" speech: The performance register in Ocracoke English. *Language in Society* 27(1): 53–83.

Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In *Meaning in anthropology*, ed. Keith H. Basso and Henry A. Selby, 11–55. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

——. 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication* 23(3–4): 193–229.

Smith, Jennifer, Mercedes Durham, and Liane Fortune. 2007. "Mam, my trousers is fa'in doon!": Community, caregiver, and child in the acquisition of variation in a Scottish dialect. *Language Variation and Change* 19(1): 63–99.

Tagliamonte, Sali. 2006. *Analysing sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trudgill, Peter. 1972. Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society* 1(2): 179–195.

Wagner, Suzanne Evans. 2008. *Language change and stabilization in the transition from adolescence to adulthood*. Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania.

Zhang, Qing. 2008. Rhotacization and the "Beijing smooth operator": The social meaning of a linguistic variable. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(2): 201–222.

9

Taking an Elitist Stance

Ideology and the Discursive Production of Social Distinction

Adam Jaworski and Crispin Thurlow

The Discursivity of Elitism

This chapter examines elitism as an everyday discursive accomplishment in the light of a critique of contemporary class privilege and social inequality. Empirically and conceptually it complements our earlier study of identity *stylization* in airline frequent-flyer programs (Thurlow and Jaworski, 2006). Our approach to stylization traces its origins to the work of Bakhtin (1981, 1986) on multivoicing, as well as of Austin (1961), Bauman and Briggs (1990), and Butler (1990) on performative language use and performativity, and follows Rampton's (1995) and Coupland's (2001, 2007) views of stylization as a knowing display of language style(s) deemed in a particular situation to be nonnormative, unpredictable, or "as if." According to Bakhtin, language is never monologic but always dialogic, which presupposes a rich mixing and multiplicity of "voices," or "heteroglossia," in all texts. Thus, "acts of identity" (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, 1985) involving stylized talk are not autonomous and separate but involve intercorporeal appropriation, reworking, and subversion of different social voices. In her discussion of how style may be used as a linguistic resource for performing an identity (*styling*), Cameron (2000) refers to Bell's (1997) "initiative shift" and Rampton's (1995) "crossing," both of which refer to speakers adopting a way of speaking that is not their own—in other words, putting on a voice (Coupland's *stylization*). These sociolinguistic approaches align with the broader framework of Fairclough's (2003: 159) notion of *style* as the discursive enactment of identity: "Styles are the discoursal aspect of ways of being, identities. Who you are is partly a matter of how you speak, how you write, as well as a matter of embodiment—how you look, how you hold yourself, how you move, and so forth."

Thus we take stylization to be the strategic (re)presentation, promotion, and imposition of particular ways of being (or styles) involving language, image, social practice, and material culture. Over time, if these different identificational meanings

endure through repetition and routinization, they may become habituated and "structurated" (Giddens, 1991) into a more extensive narrative of self and a *lifestyle* that in turn forms (or reshapes) one's *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1990). As we will suggest here, stance and style are themselves ideologically and interactionally coconstitutive. To start, however, we offer our general perspective on elitism.

For our purposes, we define elitism as a person's orientation or making a claim to exclusivity, superiority, and/or distinctiveness on the grounds of status, knowledge, authenticity, taste, erudition, experience, insight, wealth, or any other quality warranting the speaker/author to take a higher moral, aesthetic, intellectual, material, or any other form of standing in relation to another subject (individual or group). Elitism then is a claim or bid for an enduring identity position that requires constant, momentary, and interactive enactment. In this sense, too, we distinguish *elitism* as a discursively achieved identity and subject position from *elite* that, as it has typically been discussed in sociological literatures (e.g., Carlton, 1996; Field and Higley, 1980; Dogan, 2003), is usually conceived of as a material, social category describing those who rule or lead through instrumental, political power. We are thus more concerned—in this chapter and elsewhere—with the consensual power of cultural, nongoverning elites whose investment in systems of governance may be more hegemonic than directly political. (Both types of elite status are of course heavily implicated in economic privileging.) Through our interest in elitist stancetaking, we are also concerned less with any objective or descriptive categorization of elite groups per se, and more with individual subjectivities, passing acts of identity, and processes of self- and other-attribution by which people may appeal to the notion or "ideal" of, for example, exclusivity, superiority, or distinction.

Numerically and, to some extent, descriptively, the notion of "elite" is notoriously hard to define. It is far easier and, we suggest, more accurate, to examine elitism as part of Raymond Williams's *structures of feeling*, "meanings and values as they are actively lived and felt" (Williams, 1977: 132). Such structures of feeling are analytically accessible through discourse, in particular when members of a culture try to articulate or understand their experiences as they are changing at a particular time, for example, within a generation or period. Understood in this way, this feeling gives rise to discourse whereby an elite status/identity is *enacted*; in other words, it is talked into existence and otherwise semiotically achieved. In these terms, elite status is never allowed to be simply a marker of political status, economic affluence, or heritage. This has important political implications for the general critique we are advancing. Assigning elite behavior only to the obviously rich and powerful overlooks two things. First, social hierarchies are mutually (which is not to say equally) established; hegemonic order is maintained through the socially consensual, constant promotion and uptake of symbolic and material markers of privilege and status (Gramsci, 1971). Second, any assumption that elitism is done only by elites also tends to obscure wider global inequalities by which all "Western" consumption patterns can be viewed as elitist. Specifically, and in the context of our analysis here, it can be argued that all tourism, all travel-for-leisure, is elite—be it vacationing on Mustique, touring Italy with the kids, partying on the Costa del Sol, or backpacking through Thailand. It is for this reason that much of what we are currently examining we deliberately characterize as *superelite* travel (see also Thurlow and Jaworski, 2009).

In this chapter, we focus on the linguistic (and to some extent visual) manifestations of taking an elitist stance in the travel sections of newspapers. As we have stated, elitism is premised on the semiotic achievement of superiority, which is a specific instance of what Gunther Kress (1995) refers to as the production of social difference in texts. Drawing on the concepts of dialogism, heteroglossia, and intertextuality (Voloshinov, 1973; Bakhtin, 1981, 1986), Kress argues that all text production relies on past or current, recognizable or imperceptible contributions by copresent or absent speakers and takes place within social structures characterized by the unequal distribution of power. The production of different texts reinforces these structures, and social actors are then assumed and trained to adopt unequal positions of power in particular types of texts and interactions. These text types, or genres, are relatively stable and persistent encodings of social power relations "and are reproduced in the social structurings of occasions of linguistic (inter)action" (Kress, 1995: 121). However, in the production of texts, the interaction of participants with different subject positions or coding orientations results in struggle and contestation focusing on a particular set of the system of cultural classifications and representations, or what M. A. K. Halliday (1978) refers to as *field of discourse*: the social action, or the nature of the activity in which the text is embedded and the participants are engaged in doing.

Thus, text producers, their interpreters, and the social actors represented in these texts may differ with regard to their relative places in the political and economic hierarchy, mutual distance, and power relations, but the differences produced by these texts are never stable and incontestable. Stuart Hall's (1980 [1973]) model of three reading positions of texts—dominant (or "hegemonic"), negotiated, and oppositional ("counter-hegemonic")—is a useful heuristic in conceptualizing the dynamics of difference production in texts, as it suggests that stancetaking, understood here as production of difference, is a collaborative processes achieved (or rejected, contested, subverted, etc.) by coparticipants in a communicative act (cf. Du Bois, 2007).

Following Pierre Bourdieu (1977, 1984, 1991), we view communication as fundamentally about the pursuit of symbolic profit and that cultural capital achieved through language is simultaneously material, social, and economic. All spoken and written texts are thus ideological in that they (a) constitute identities and relationships; (b) reproduce systems of belief and power; and (c) maintain structures of inequality and privilege. In the texts we want to examine here, each of these ideological functions is in evidence in the stances taken up by authors and projected onto the implied reader.

Theorizing Stance: Evaluation, Relation, and Identification

Stance has many cognate terms in the (socio)linguistic literature. In their overview, Thompson and Hunston (2000) subsume stance under *evaluation* (cf. also Labov and Waletzky, 1976) as a superordinate term (see Jaffe's overview in the introduction to this volume). Consequently, the stance-evaluation nexus appears to permeate all aspects of meaning making, all communicative functions, and all levels of linguistic production. In our own view of stance, we start with Kress's view of texts as the site for the construction of subject positions and social difference (see above). We further align ourselves with the critical discourse analytic

approach to evaluation and modality. For example, Fairclough (2003) considers how people "commit" themselves in texts, distinguishing between *modality* (i.e., commitments to what is true or what is necessary) and *evaluation* (i.e., commitments to what is desirable/undesirable or good/bad). He also aligns his notion of modality to Halliday's (1994) and Verschueren's (1999), as well as to Hodge and Kress's (1988) rather wide-ranging treatment of *modality*, by which they mean a particular *stance*, expressed as a degree of *affinity* (expressed in terms of "power" or "solidarity") between participants in a communicative situation and their (participants') perspective on the message in terms of its status, authority, reliability, ontological status, and truth value. Furthermore, Hodge and Kress argue that the significance of modality is that it constitutes an essential site of political struggle, in other words, modality is a means of constructing and contesting knowledge systems, enforcing classifications, establishing one's preferred version of social reality as "knowledge" or "fact," as well as being a means of resistance and contestation (cf. also Foucault, 1978, 1980, on discourse/counterdiscourse, "regimes of truth," and "knowledge/power"):

> Modality is consequently one of the crucial indicators of political struggle. It is a central means of contestation, and the site of the working out, whether by negotiation or imposition, of ideological systems. It provides a crucial component of the complex process of the establishment of hegemonic systems, a hegemony established as much through the active participation of social agents as through sheer "imposition" of meaning by the more powerful on the less powerful participant. (Hodge and Kress, 1988: 123)

Furthermore, Fairclough (2003) links modality and evaluation to the process of self-identification of social actors:

> Modality is important in the texturing of identities, both personal ("personalities") and social, in the sense that what you commit yourself to is a significant part of what you are—so modality choices in texts can be seen as part of the process of texturing self identity. But this goes on in the course of social processes, so that the process of identification is inevitably inflected by the process of social relation. . . . The texturing of identity is thoroughly embedded in the texturing of social relations. (2003: 166)

Conceived of as Fairclough's (2003) "social relations," or Hodge and Kress's (1998) relations of power and solidarity between social actors, social identities or personas are shaped through the deployment of specific linguistic resources, in other words, the constitutive "work" of direct or indirect indexing of self or other in a rather complex matrix of linguistic forms and conventional associations linked to them (Ochs, 1992; cf. Fairclough's 2003 "relations of equivalence and difference"). These resources, including styles of speaking, gesturing, and dressing, taste, and so on, result in the production of a particular *styling* of self or the stylizing of other (see above).

Du Bois (2007) refers to stance as possibly "the smallest unit of social action" (p. 173) that he conceives of:

> 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. (p. 163)

There are a number of analogies and parallels in Du Bois's (2007) and Kress's (1995; Hodge and Kress, 1998) approaches to stance and the social production of language. Both find dialogicality a key, underlying concept in the production of meaning; Du Bois's notion of "sociocultural field" corresponds to Kress's use of Halliday's "field"; both view stance (Du Bois)/modality (Kress) as coconstructed by the participants, located intersubjectively between them. Social actors' convergent or divergent alignment positions proposed by Du Bois are reminiscent of Kress's theorizing of the acceptance or contestation of the dominant cultural classifications of the other, and constitutive of their identities emergent through the convergent or divergent alignment positions/relations. However, one seeming difference between the two approaches to stance is the explicit orientation to power and inequality by Kress (and other *critical* discourse analysts), although in his final characterization of stance, Du Bois emphasizes that it comprises "three key aspects of social life: act, responsibility, and value" (p. 173). By these, he means

1. the public enactment of stance, its cumulative effect and consequences for all possible domains of sociocultural life (act);
2. ownership of stance once taken by a speaker and accountability to self and others (responsibility);
3. "what stance is all about—literally" (p. 173), invoking, directly or indirectly systems of value (cf. ideology above), their enactment and reproduction (value).

It is precisely in these three key aspects of social life that the everyday enactments of power take place and its effects are rendered visible (cf. Blommaert, 2005). And herein, we think, lies the ideological nature of stancetaking, which brings us to our data examples and, eventually, to our own conceptualization of stance.

Taking an Elitist Stance: The Case of Travelogues

Not unlike many other newspapers around the world, the weekend editions of two national British papers, the *Guardian* (published on Saturdays) and the *Sunday Times*, include dedicated travel sections, with features, information, interviews, and advertisements on tourism-related themes. In particular, these two newspapers are often referred to as "broadsheet" or "quality" papers, the *Guardian* being known as more liberal and progressive than the *Sunday Times,* which is associated with a more conservative, right-wing, and affluent readership. Accordingly, the tone and, to some extent, content of their respective travel sections reflect these primary demographics in terms of education and class. The *Guardian* displays unquestionably better credentials in dealing with environmental issues than the *Sunday Times*, for example,

carrying a weekly note about all of the journeys taken by its writers being offset by paying a carbon emission fee to Climate Care, and encouraging the readers to follow suit and, if possible, to avoid flying when going on holiday. The *Guardian* also runs a regular "guilt-free" column, in which the environmental implications of travel and "eco-friendly" travel options are discussed. However, despite the *Guardian*'s folding of environmentalism into the attribution of elitism to its "progressive" middle-class readership, both newspapers pander to the pursuit of a consumerist lifestyle and pleasure (with their glossy magazines covering "style," property, food and drink, culture, and so on) and promote high-end, conspicuous consumption and leisure for their readers (even if only aspirational), allowing them to fantasize about joining the ranks of the "leisure class" (Veblen, 1979 [1899]; De Garzia, 1964; MacCannell, 1999), or espousing what we call here the elitist stance.

We now turn to our data to illustrate a number of key formal and semantic features through which stance is enacted and cumulatively established in this particular travel writing genre. The examples cut across epistemological and affective stances in Du Bois's (2007) sense, and they show overlap across the ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions outlined above. Moreover, by illustrating basic principles of stancetaking, they confirm the particularly ideological nature of this process. In each case, we focus on the thematic and lexico-grammatical forms used and the evaluated object chosen; ultimately, however, what interests us more are the identities and relationships being realized and the ideologies being promoted.[1]

Evaluation: Disdain for "Mass" Tourists (and Locals)

"Tourists dislike tourists. God is dead, but man's need to appear holier than his fellow lives" (MacCannell, 1999: 10). This sentiment is very prominent in tourism discourse (scholarly and lay), most typically expressed when the distinction is drawn between "tourists" and "travelers," between escapist, mass vacationers and those who travel more "independently" and with "serious" intercultural intent (see Cohen, 2004). Although scholars are critical of their own tendency to perpetuate specious tourist typologies (Franklin and Crang, 2001), this crude status hierarchy is one heard often from tourists/travelers themselves, for whom it clearly continues to have significance (McCabe, 2005). Not surprisingly, therefore, we find instances in the travelogues of stancetaking that plays on the simple, binary distinction between "good" (elite) and "bad" (nonelite) tourists. Importantly, this is a distinction that can cut across conventional markers of class status such as wealth and education—even if these are simultaneously invoked in the performance of the distinction:

Extract 1

(*Guardian Travel*, January 31, 2004. pp. 2–3)

> Barbados is one of those places that doesn't demand but eventually requires that you relax. For men, this tends to mean undoing that extra button on their short-sleeve shirt *without feeling a sleaze;* for women (though not, *she has asked me to emphasize*, my girlfriend), thinking they *might actually* look *chic* in a batik.... After three days relaxing, we moved hotel, not because of any problems, but just to see somewhere else. The Colony Club is, *or hopes to be*, a little more *upmarket* than Tamarind Cove. The guests, in other words, may read the same papers (the *Mail* is very popular), but at the Colony *they start from the front, not the back.* (Emphasis added by authors here and in subsequent extracts.)

Extract 2

(*Sunday Times Travel*, July 16, 2006, p. 26)

> Mass tourism is horrible. I hate arriving somewhere to find a horde of barbarians who've had that operation to weld a camera to their eyelids: they don't *really* see things, they *just* photograph them and get back on the *coach*.... Wherever I go, I try to mix with the locals, assimilate myself. That can backfire, of course. My car got broken into in Tunisia, and the policeman was so chatty, he ended up inviting us to supper at his home. What a nice idea, I thought: but we arrived to find a really *grim* police barracks, where he was cooking up *vile-looking* goat stew *over a Bunsen burner*.

In both of these extracts (by different authors) we see a range of objects—things and behaviors—evaluated: ways of dressing, ways of reading, ways of seeing (or photographing), and ways of eating or preparing food. Each of these is, of course, a common cultural marker and also a common marker of class (cf., respectively, Crane, 2000; Bourdieu, 1984; Sontag, 1977; Lévi-Strauss, 1966). The stances taken in extract 1, encode "undoing that extra button" as *sleazy* and batik as *not chic*, as well as the *Daily Mail* (a conservative, tabloidesque, national paper), and people who read the sports section first as *downmarket*. In extract 2, it is mass tourists' inability to see things "really" that is appraised as undesirable, as are snapshot photography and coach travel. The same author then expresses his distaste for not only the food being prepared but also the mode of preparation.

Clearly, in both extracts the authors position themselves as arbiters of good taste through their various evaluative, stancetaking acts. This subject position augments itself the more such stances are taken; that is, stancetaking is both reiterative and self-sustaining (see above). In each case, what strikes us is less the direct adjectival opinion markers (e.g., "grim," "vile-looking," "barbarians," "horrible," "upmarket," "chic," and "sleaze") but the evaluative force of a more indirect, deeply coded, fleeting stancetaking. In extract 1, we note the girlfriend's implied distress at possibly being thought of as a batik-wearer, the hedging of "might actually" and "or hopes to be," the parenthetical insinuation of the *Mail* as downmarket, and the metaphoric privileging of politics/issues over sports. In extract 2, meanwhile, it is the assumption that things may be truly or properly known that is noteworthy, as is the inappropriate use of a Bunsen burner for cooking, which arguably promotes "uneducated" before "poor" as a preferred interpretation.

Taking a stance of superiority through positive self- and negative other-evaluation is only superficially mitigated by understatement and hedging here (see especially extract 1). The former allows the author to "invite" the reader to take up these evaluations and collude in the coconstruction of this particular stance. Furthermore, these preferred readings are based on the assumption of shared attitudes and values between the author and the reader, creating a sense of in-group membership (hence, the reader is also positioned as "elite") (cf. Brown and Levinson, 1987). The use of positive politeness between authors and readers is also evident in the parenthetical

references in extract 1. They both introduce information extraneous to the evaluation at hand, and their main purpose appears to be providing the reader with additional interpretive work for establishing the boundaries of in-groupness that is meant to include the author, his girlfriend, the implied *Sunday Times* reader, but not the *Mail* readers.

Taken as a whole, one of the dimensions of an *elite* identity (i.e., the elitist stance) being created in both these texts is that of the seasoned, worldly traveler. This is most apparent in extract 2, where the author claims for himself the cultural capital of the "cosmopolitan" in the way Hannerz (1996: 103) defines cosmopolitanism:

> ...an orientation, a willingness to engage with the Other. It entails an intellectual and aesthetic openness toward divergent cultural experiences, a search for contrasts rather than uniformity. To become acquainted with more cultures is to turn into an *aficionado*, to view them as artworks. At the same time, however, cosmopolitanism can be a matter of competence, and competence of both a generalized and a more specialized kind. There is the aspect of a state of readiness, a personal ability to make one's way into other cultures, though listening, looking, intuiting, and reflecting. And there is cultural competence in the stricter sense of the term, a built up skill in manoeuvring more or less expertly with a particular system of meanings.

The author may indeed display an *orientation* to engage with local people and cultures, but his text also displays lack of *willingness* and *competence* in doing so, when circumstances do not conform to his idea of travel as "home plus" (Theroux, 1986). We see this very clearly in his negative description of the Tunisian policeman's living quarters and food, where there is no shade of sympathy and understanding of how global inequalities may structure his host's lifestyle. Such displays of "liberalism" (e.g., hedging racist remarks or claiming nonprejudicial intent, see Coupland, 1999), although simultaneously othering and eroticizing local people, emphasize the relational nature of stance.[2] An elitist stance here is being built on a contrast with both bad "tourists" and exotic "locals," albeit with the overtly negative evaluation of the "locals" mitigated/masked by a liberal rhetoric.

On the elitist theme of avoiding the "wrong" kinds of tourists, we also have a third extract that returns us to the underlying social judgment of mass tourists:

> Extract 3
>
> (*Sunday Times Travel,* July 2, 2006, p. 14)
>
> The Last Bit of *Brit-free* France. Winding valleys, wooden hilltops, sleepy hamlets: Corréze has all the charm of the Dordogne, but without the GB-plated *tailbacks*. Go before the *invasion*, says Stephen Clarke.

As before, the author/writer selects a specific object as a vehicle (in this case, also literally so: "tailbacks"—U.S. "gridlock"), for expressing his more general, ideologically motivated evaluation of mass tourism. Extract 3 is in fact an extended headline for the author's article, which paraphrases its content in the form of constructed reported speech (Tannen, 1986) focusing specifically on the article's mention of British tourists and second-home–owners identified as a separate "species" ("*Britannicus countryhousis*") spoiling the authenticity of rural France. The byline is a "stance follow" (Du Bois, 2007: 161) to that of the author's (Clarke) demonstrating the participants' inferencing with regard to one another and to stance object's "positioning, alignment, and evaluation" (Du Bois, 2007: 165). That is, the subeditor's voicing of the author's stance aligns them both in sharing their subjective orientation to the stance object (i.e., "mass British tourist"). Just as in extract 2, "mass tourism" appears to work metaphorically as a marker of class and education; in extract 3 it is additionally framed as an "invasion" (see also "horde" in extract 2) with all of its quantitative denotation and negative connotation. The phrase "Brit-free" relies on exaggeration of quantity (because the British journalist himself is there) and indirectly indexes and operationalizes a distinction between "desirable/acceptable Brits" and "undesirable/unacceptable Brits" (creating social differentiation, see Kress above). The author's/newspaper's stance therefore expresses disdain for bad tourists and places the author on the "right" side of the distinction. As in our discussion of the previous two extracts, we assume that the text's preferred reading position (interpretation of stance) is for the readers to align themselves with the elitist stance of the author, although, of course, the reader may reject the preferred reading and adopt a contested reading (or counterstance), or, in Du Bois's terms again (see above), the reader may or may not "take ownership" of the stance with the author and the newspaper. Either way, the reader is obliged to respond.

Celebrity Cachet

Of course, stancetaking is not only expressed through the lens of the negative. Much of it occurs through association with positively valued stance objects (positive affinity) that are exploited for their existing cultural capital. In this regard, a particularly productive link exists between "celebrity" and newspaper travel sections that typically include features on destinations used as locations in recent Hollywood blockbusters, often mentioning gossip from the life of famous actors on and off the filming set. Whereas traditional notions of class and elite status were based on heritage and breeding (note, however, the use of the word "stable" in extract 7), nowadays cinematic celebrity invariably trumps all (Turner, 2004).[3] In this regard, the first of our examples comes from an article featuring the Dominican Republic as the set for Cuba in *The Lost City*, a film starring Hollywood actor Andy Garcia and, less well known to British audiences, international model Inés Sastre.

> Extract 4
>
> (*Guardian Travel,* July 15, 2006, p. 3)
>
> Havana's domestic interiors were found in the privately owned homes in Santo Domingo's colonial district (visitors can wander along Calle Hostos to *sneak a view* of the *fronded* botanical splendour of their courtyards).

As sister countries in the Caribbean's Greater Antilles island group (the Dominican Republic shares an island mass with Haiti, to the east of Cuba and to the west of Puerto Rico), the landscapes (*sierras*, mountains, tobacco and cane) and brightly lit tropical climate were almost indistinguishable. Ideal for bagging those sweeping, scene setting *vistas* of old Cuba, then? Well yes, except for *a few human-sized flies in the tanning ointment.*

"There's a montage in the middle of the film where Fico [Garcia's character] and Inés's [Sastre] character Aurora go to the idyllic beach to get away from the city," said Garcia. "The beaches are pretty busy in the Dominican, but we eventually found Macao, on the eastern part of the island in the Punta Cana Region. It was perfect until 3 PM, when a hotel *dropped a busload of guests*—we had to film the most romantic shots of the day without sound, because just off-screen there were 50 tourists *partying* to a *portable system*."...

After a hard day of filming, Garcia would unwind in the bar of the Santo Domingo's Renaissance Jaragua Hotel, listening to the house band play a *bachata* and indulging in a *fine cigar*—one thing, he says, that the Cubans will always do better.

The piece relies first and foremost on glamorizing quotations from an interview with the Andy Garcia reporting the detail of his preferred ways to "unwind" and "indulgencies" he enjoys. Stance is therefore taken through the celebrity-embodied vehicle of Garcia himself. That Garcia's stancetaking can be quoted directly serves to augment the journalist's own stancetaking. In this sense, the article also demonstrates the typical paradox of the travelogues mentioned above: resentment of (mass) tourists whose presence "spoils" "unspoiled" destinations accessed by (elite) tourists (e.g., travelogue authors). The paradox lies in the fact that the travelogues are in fact veiled advertisements for the destinations, as well as for the tour operators, airlines, and other agents of the tourist industry sponsoring the authors' travels. Notwithstanding the actual problems for the filming a romantic scene caused by noisy company, the reference to "a busload of guests" and "50 tourists partying to a portable system," represents Garcia not only as a privileged Hollywood celebrity, but also as a tourist attributing a desire for exclusivity at a destination. This stance is taken up and amplified by the author in his depiction of other tourists as unwanted: "human-sized flies in the tanning ointment."

In addition to channeling Garcia and his antitourist stancetaking, the journalist's stancetaking also includes a register claiming the symbolic capital of an "expert" on the destination, and of a Hollywood "insider" and skilled writer commanding an elevated style that is at once poetic and polyglot (e.g., "fronded," "sierras," "vistas," "bachata") including the punning fly-in-the-ointment reference itself (see *intertextuality* below). It is these performative allusions that realize not only the ideologies of elite tourism but also of education and class. The positive evaluation underpinning these stances is established and clarified through the embedding of Garcia's own disapproving evaluation of the "partying" and "portable system" of the (mass) tourists.[4]

A similar sentiment is expressed in the next extract from the "on location" feature in the *Guardian*, inspired by the Disney production *Pirates of the Caribbean: Dead Man's Chest,* starring Johnny Depp, filmed on the Caribbean island of Dominica.

As the film's producer explains in the extract below, the island was chosen for its beauty and because it is "virtually untouched" and "totally undiscovered" (the latter claim being challenged by the author of the article in a section not reproduced here). Once again, also note the poetic register (e.g., "clothed," "veined," "glittering fairy glade"):

Extract 5

(*Guardian Travel,* July 8, 2006, p. 3)

Lying between Guadeloupe and Martinique, Dominica, with its volcanic mountains clothed in rainforest and veined with rivers and waterfalls, in fact, not unlike Depp's Sparrow: charismatic, beguiling, *unknowable*. And for just those reasons, it was chosen as a location for both Pirates 2, which opened this week, and, coming next year, Pirates 3. "We selected Dominica because it's beautiful and *virtually untouched*—and *totally undiscovered* by film makers," said producer Jerry Bruckheimer....

Disney brought a bit of its own treasure to Dominica, an island struggling in the wake of globalisation and the collapse of its banana industry: at least some of the film's US$300m budget—three times more than the government's annual expenditure—went on the logistics of housing, feeding and servicing an army of actors and technicians. Depp, meanwhile, *stayed on his yacht*. Yet gossip has it that he was seen as an *affable figure* among the locals. For example, he chilled out at Indigo Cottages, perched on a steep slope three miles from Portsmouth—and *did the washing up*. Owned by Clem Frederick, a Rastafarian, and his French-born artist wife, Marie, its buildings, including an *open-sided art gallery* with furniture made of driftwood, are set in a *glittering fairy glade* of tropical plants. Depp was generous with his time; and many a home can boast a photograph of Depp shoulder to shoulder with a Dominican extra, both grinning like old mates at the camera.

The second part of the extract continues to present the destination by retracing, at least in part, the footsteps of its celebrity visitor (Depp), and providing the reader with information on his accommodation and his contacts with the locals. Unlike in the Garcia/Dominican Republic extract above, the only other people mentioned in the text are the locals: two named hotel owners and unnamed extras, all seemingly adding "color" to Depp's experience of the island and mediating its exoticism for the reader. The name-dropping use of celebrities as stancetaking vehicles is also seen in extract 6 and, with the added traditional cachet of royalty and "A-listers," in extract 7.

Of greater interest than the fairly obvious objects of celebrity, poetic register, money ($300m budget), and fine art ("open-sided art gallery") is the way stance is expressed through the totalizing phrases "virtually untouched" and "totally undiscovered," as well as the personalizing "stayed on his yacht," "affable figure," and "did the washing up" in extract 5 (see also extract 7's "private island"). To begin, the elitism that underpins these particular acts of stancetaking relies on the favorable evaluation of newness and of excessive and exclusive space that together communicate the consumerist idealization of the new and unused (McCracken, 1988),

coupled with the neocolonial reevaluation of supposedly undiscovered, virgin territories as a hallmark of luxury tourism (see Thurlow and Jaworski, 2009; also extract 7 and the next section). Then, with regard to Depp's perceived friendliness ("affable figure"), the journalist's stance emphasizes not so much his personality as the relation between Depp and the "locals"—as well as his deigning to do the washing up himself. The interesting ideological work being done relates, therefore, to the rewarding of an "egalitarian elitism" expressed in part through understatement, and a kind of "inconspicuous conspicuous consumption" (cf. Veblen, 1979). As Bourdieu points out, however, this kind of linguistic maneuver can be read as a form of condescension: a move by a high-status individual to style him- or herself in the language or social practices of a subordinate group (Bourdieu, 1991). Invariably, argues Bourdieu, the condescension serves only to reinscribe hierarchical relations of inequality.

This paradoxical reframing of elitism is also evidenced in the "laid-back, low-rise glamour" and the characterization of elites as "regulars" in extracts 6 and 7.

Extract 6

(*Guardian Travel*, October 29, 2003, p. 8)

The atmosphere at Camps Bay, Cape Town's most *fashionable* beach resort, has something of the *laid-back, low-rise glamour* of Los Angeles about it, a feeling only heightened when the waiter mentions that Tiger Woods dined here the previous night, Vinnie Jones was a frequent visitor the week before and Jean-Claude Van Damme is currently relaxing between shoots on his latest movie at a *luxury* hotel a mile or so down the road.... *The list of celebrity visitors has been growing* ever since the Western Cape became a favourite location for filmmakers and commercials directors, and it comes as no surprise to learn that Cape Town is a regular body double for LA, Monterey and San Francisco.

Extract 7

(*Sunday Times Travel*, June 25, 2006, p. 2)

Who's the *Coolest* of them all? The Turks and Caicos, favourite *A-list* sun spot, has a new Aman resort. Can it knock Parrot Cay off its perch, asks Susan d'Arcy.... Parrot Cay, a half hour boat ride north of Providenciales *on its own private island*, is the hotel that brought the Turks and Caicos to international attention back in 1998, and it's far less expensive proposition. From the same *stable* as London's *ever-trendy* Metropolitan, it is Princess Stephanie to Amanyara's Princess Caroline: less serious, but no less attractive, especially if you like the circus. The celebrity circus, I mean. The main pool is so *packed with A-listers*, it looks like a 3-D version of Heat Magazine. Regulars include Julia Roberts, Matt Damon, Cindy Crawford and Bruce Willis.

In the short space of these two extracts, both authors manage to enact the positive-affinity stance reiteratively by their mention of the repeated return and appearance of celebrities. The value of the destination is established metonymically in relation to the visiting celebrities, and the authors use these references to establish

their own stance credentials as well. However, the authors' commitment to the veracity of these extracts is vague (note the hyperbole "the main pool is so packed with A-listers", and humour "it looks like a 3-D version of Heat Magazine" in extract 7) and suggests that encounters with celebrities are not part of the authors' personal experiences but imaginary associations with place and elite vacationing style. The characterization of celebrities as "regulars" in extract 7 claims a reduction of difference and distance between the celebrities, locals, and the author-tourist, but there is no "evidence" of contact other than secondhand gossip from a waiter (extract 6).

Stancetaking in these extracts and throughout our sample appears also to manage the tension between evaluating quality and quantity. Much of the time, contemporary elitism is predicated on comparative quality often expressed through the ambiguous lexicon of "fashionable," "luxurious," and "coolest." However, the traditional discourse of quantity (e.g., measurable wealth) is persistent and perpetuated through, for example, the growing list of celebrity visitors (extract 6) and "packed with A-listers" (extract 7). As with the promise of endless choice (see Schwartz, 2004), untamed exclusivity quickly begins to undermine itself. This tension is often managed most effectively through the use of lexicogrammatical superlatives (see below).

Empty Spaces, Silent Places

In our analysis of the representations of luxury tourist spaces in magazine advertisements (Thurlow and Jaworski, 2009), we have suggested that the visual linguistic landscape of the photographs depicting "high-end" travel destinations are frequently realized discursively by the mutual concepts of space and silence. Generally, these ads promise the superelite traveler vast, empty indoor and outdoor spaces, an escape from talk or noise, and exclusion of the babble of local people and the "drivel" of the masses (including other mass tourists). Thus "silence" (or the promise of silence) and "emptiness" become key symbolic resources for performing/promoting superelite travel and elitism. As we have already indicated, the same tropes are present in newspaper travelogues, whether in the visual representations of travel destinations or authors' accounts of various locations' desirability. Just a few examples from the reader-led section "Readers' Guide to..." on European beaches illustrate this point. Of the 25 beaches mentioned on a two-page spread, over half are described in a variety of ways as quiet, secluded, empty, vast, and so on.

Extract 8

(*Guardian Travel*, June 10, 2006, pp. 8–9)

One of the most beautiful and secluded beaches on the island... you'll be very unlikely to find *noisy gangs* of Brits.... Camping out over night on one of the otherwise *deserted beaches* to await sunrise is a truly wonderful experience.... The sand *squeaks* beneath your toes and the atmosphere is Mediterranean and *peaceful*.... It's *inaccessible by road*.... There's an imposing bay, with steep, pine-forested mountains and the ruins of ancient Aigosthena

immediately behind the largest beach.... You should feel aggrieved if you can't find *10 acres of empty space* to put your beach towel on.... A *pristine* National Trust beach... it's popular but *still undeveloped*, thankfully... with *huge sweeps of sand and dunes*... If you aim for the middle section, you'll avoid the *boy racers* (they're not intimidating—just a bit annoying). Out of season, you can rent a dinghy for a reasonable price and *have the place (almost) to yourself*. A village *tucked away*.... A *huge beach*.... Just a short bus ride or walk further up the coast from the town's main beach... but usually *a lot less crowded*. This sandy beach is *surprisingly quiet*.

Cutting across the discourse in extract 8, we note the repetitive and consistent evaluation of "acres of empty space," "huge sweeps of sand and dunes," and "huge beach." These topographical markers of exclusivity are in turn linked to social makers as in "deserted beaches," "inaccessible by road," and "tucked away." We also note again the neocolonial appraisals inherent in "pristine" and "undeveloped." Finally, we are brought to the explicit appreciation of quietude in "unlikely to find noisy gangs," "peaceful," and "surprisingly quiet" and the (relative) absence of others: "have the place (almost) to yourself" and "a lot less crowded." Silence is also implicit in being able to hear the squeaking sand beneath one's feet. In extracts 9 to 11, this general evaluation of social isolation/exclusivity is realized in stancetaking acts that combine the range of different objects listed thus far:

Extract 9

(*Sunday Times Travel,* May 28, 2006, p. 1)

Hide from the World: Ten Islands You Can Have to Yourself.

Extract 10

(*Sunday Times Travel,* April 30, 2006, p. 6)

Mine, ALL MINE. An *uncrowded island, a beach to call your own*—in the Med? In summer? It can be done, says Jeremy Lazell.

Extract 11

(*Sunday Times Travel,* July 9, 2006, p. 5)

Q: I am planning our first family trip to Disney World and would like to know how to *avoid the crowds.* Ian Haddon, Dundee

The appeal to/for exclusivity (expressed through the negatively evaluated object "crowds") in Disney World strikes us as highly unrealistic or just very optimistic. In either case, the validity or likelihood—in other words, the modality—of the claim is not what is at stake in stancetaking that centers on the underlying appraisal of crowds as undesirable. It is possible also that the aspirational stance of extract 11 reveals the uptake of the elitism that runs through more obviously "luxurious" elite destinations and modes of contemporary travel. It is also the very unrealizability of the aspiration that marks its elitist ethos. As we have noted before, "The goal is to keep people

covetous of their ideal by carefully balancing opportunities for its realization (e.g., by acquiring or possessing a concrete manifestation of the ideal) and sustaining the impossibility of its attainment" (Thurlow and Jaworski, 2006: 115).

Secrets, Hot Tips, and Insider Information

Our next set of stancetaking acts is closely allied to the illusory nature of exclusivity just discussed. In this case, one hallmarked value in tourism is being able to go "backstage" and behind the scenes for a glimpse (see, for example, "sneak a view" in extract 4) of local life that is perceived, or staged, as "real" or "authentic" (MacCannell, 1999). In this regard, we find a number of related stancetaking acts that inflect this general tourist trope with the added promise of its being privileged information or insight. Once again, the implication here is that the "secrets" (extract 14, 16, and 17) are to be had only by the knowledgeable, well-traveled person. Others would simply "never guess" (extract 13). Of course, a key feature of these commercial travelogues has to be the promise, as in extract 12, of an authoritative heads-up on "where to go and where not to go" that carries the same implication of discernment.

Extract 12

(*Sunday Times Travel,* April 16, 2006, p. 1)

Welcome to the South Pacific. *Where to go and where not to* for the ultimate tropical adventure

Extract 13

(*Sunday Times Travel,* June 11, 2006, p. 1)

Europe's new hot spots. *You'll never guess.*

Extract 14

(*Sunday Times Travel,* July 23, 2006, p. 1)

France's *best kept secret.*

Extract 15

(*Guardian Travel,* May 20, 2006, p. 1)

Look where you can go without flying. *We show you* how.

Extract 16

(*Sunday Times Travel,* July 9, 2006, p. 1)

The *secrets* of the Lake District.

Extract 17

(*Sunday Times Travel,* May 21, 2006, p. 26)

The island made for the weekend. Any plans for the weekend? How about a quick hop to Trogir, Croatia's *bite-size secret*, suggests Fiona Watson.

In positioning themselves as knowledgeable of the useful tips and information about tourist destinations, these journalists claim exclusivity and superiority of status by virtue of their having visited, experienced, and familiarized themselves with the places desired by their readers. This is the power/knowledge principle to be found across the whole spectrum of "lifestyle" magazines concerned with advising their readers on personal relationships, sex, beauty, work, leisure, and travel. As such features are premised on the "problem-solution" discourse schema (Machin and van Leeuwen, 2007), posing the problem of the most desirable tourist destinations as "secrets" is a necessary gambit for the travelogues from which they can establish their superior "expert" stance. In other words, it is not the inside knowledge itself that is of value but being in the know and performing this knowing. The *object* of the stance is thus exclusive knowledge per se and not the specifics of that knowledge.

Claiming the Superlative: "Best of..." Lists

In another type of lexico-grammatical marking, one form of stancetaking is achieved through superlative claims. One obvious example of this is the *Guardian*'s regular feature "Five Best...," examples of which we show in extract 18. In this case, the categories covered are not always particularly luxurious or glamorous in themselves, but the features imply a high degree of "expertness" and suggest that the authors have traveled to the locations to test them, reiterating the elitist claim to cosmopolitan status in itself (see above).

Extract 18

(in order, all *Guardian Travel:* April 1, 2006, p. 9; April 15, 2006, p. 10; April 22, 2006, p. 10; May 13, 2006, p. 10; May 20, 2006, p. 12; May 27, 2006, p. 10; June 3, 2006, p. 10; June 10, 2006, p. 10; July 8, 2006, p. 10; July 15, 2006, p. 10)

Five Best... Road Trips; Riverside Pubs; Rooms over the Channel; Cool Beach Hotels; Green Hotels; Summer Solstice Parties; Hostels in Europe; Beach Campsites; Rooftops; Lakeside Hotels

Of course, claiming a superlative ranking is a fairly obvious tactic, especially for a promotional genre; however, what makes this particular type of stancetaking remarkable is the largely unwarranted nature of those claims and the absence of any clear substantiation. Claims to being the best are impossible to prove or to disprove and so must be taken at face value. This is not to say that elitist claims to superiority are always as straightforward as "We're the best." In fact, they can be made with a host of oxymoronic rhetorical moves that, on the one hand, intensify the claim, and, on the other hand, hedge the claim—or at least appear to. Take the following slogan promoting the island of Mustique: *Unquestionably one of the most exclusive islands in the world.*[5] This sweeping superlative claim ("most exclusive in the world") is modified doubly by the intensifier "unquestionably" and the qualifier "one of." Whereas the former strengthens the boldness of the claim, the latter adds a pretense of modesty, while at the same time presupposing its membership in a necessarily small club of equally exclusive destinations. To challenge the preeminence of Mustique automatically positions the reader as the kind of person clearly not qualified to make the judgment.

Other examples of the "best of..." lists/features include the following:

Extract 19

(*Sunday Times Travel,* May 28, 2006, p. 6)

Crusoe Deluxe. Lots of resorts can offer luxury. Seclusion's harder to find. To get both, you want a hotel on its private island—and Susan d'Arcy has *10 of the best.*

Extract 20

(*Sunday Times Travel,* June 30, 2006, p. 1)

India's *Finest*. Alastair Sawday picks the *best* hotels on the subcontinent.

Extract 21

(*Sunday Times Travel*, June 25, 2006, p. 6)

Late Getaways: Summer's Sorted. Are there any great family holidays left this summer? You bet—and Stephen Bleach has *20 of the best.*

Extract 22

(*Sunday Times Travel,* June 11, 2006, p. 1)

Beat the Daily Grind. *The world's best* rut-busting holidays.

Extract 23

(*Guardian Travel,* April 15, 2006, p. 10)

World's best on a plate. Restaurant magazine editor Joe Warwick on five favourites from the *World's 50 best* restaurants list.

The same types of claims can, of course, also be made with grammatical superlatives:

Extract 24

(*Guardian Travel*, July 8, 2006, p. 1)

Jazz on a summer's evening. New York's *coolest* clubs.

Extract 25

(*Guardian Travel,* April 1, 2006, p. 1)

Planet Earth's *greatest* hits.

Extract 26

(*Guardian Travel,* June 10, 2006, p. 1)

Beach special. From Europe's *finest* to an American beauty.

Whether the authors of these lists are named (extracts 19, 20, 21, and 23) or anonymous, the precise criteria for these judgments are not always clear. It's also unclear why these cutoff points are chosen—why, for example, the "*five* best," why specifically 20 or 50, and so on? We suspect none of the details really matters. To some extent, the display of narrative detail simply works to legitimize the travel narrative or account as a whole—to establish the stance as somehow quantifiably accurate or valid (cf. Tannen 1989). In this sense, the evaluation has the added appeal of high modality. The important identificational and relational work being done in these acts of stancetaking positions the writer (first party) as the person who knows best—has access to privileged information—and implies that the reader (second party) deserves the best and should want the best. Lists then are a powerful subgenre in that they include only allowable items within agreed categories (e.g., private islands, beaches, and hotels) (cf. Sacks, 1992), and they conform to the marketing and consumerist ethos of the travel sections by providing their readers with a sense of endless choice (whether real or imaginary) from among equivalent products. These are not "to-do lists," like shopping lists (although they are not uncommon in travel writing), which allows the reader to aim or dream of visiting only one of the destinations to attain elite status.

Excess, (Self-)Indulgence, and Service

Not surprisingly, elitist stancetaking in the context of tourism also entails the positive evaluation of excess—a comparative judgment of having more than normal and/or having more than others. We have shown how this conspicuous performance of the have/have-not boundary is key to the maintenance of elite status in frequent-flyer programs and airline business-class services (Thurlow and Jaworski, 2006). In extracts 27 to 31 we see a number of different ways in which excess and indulgence is appraised as desirable and, we note, acceptable. In each case, what is important is that the primary objects being evaluated "indulgence," "gastronomy," "hedonists," "a party you'll never remember," and being "very, very drunk" are carefully qualified with "follows tough adventure," "Michelin-starred," "the handbook of," and "suffering from Glastonbury withdrawal."

Extract 27

(*Sunday Times Travel,* April 9, 2006, p. 1)

Travel...and relax. *Sheer indulgence* follows *tough* adventure on our perfect two-part breaks.

Extract 28

(*Sunday Times Travel,* June 6, 2006, p. 2)

Corking companions. Antony Sher is lightly fermented by Richard Wilson's company, *Michelin-starred gastronomy* and some vintage Burgundy wine.

Extract 29

(*Sunday Times Travel,* May 28, 2006, p. 2)

The handbook of hedonists. Katie Brown put on her dancing shoes, party frock and lucky knickers to road-test the wildest guidebook ever to hit London.

Extract 30

(*Sunday Times Travel,* July 16, 2006, p. 2)

Vodka with ice, and fire. *Suffering* from Glastonbury withdrawal? Head to the Westman Islands for *a party you'll never remember*, says Graham Little.

Extract 31

(*Sunday Times Travel,* July 30, 2006, p. 2)

...and I was very, very drunk. Each June, in the beautiful hills of Tuscany, the locals welcome in the new vintage. Vincent Crump helps them celebrate.

One available interpretation here is that elitist stancetaking needs justification; thi is why there is the added evaluation that excess/indulgence is rendered acceptable if is in some way earned or deserving (e.g., through effort or hard work—"tough" an "suffering"—or through spiritual growth; see below). Whether or not these reference are made ironically, the implication is being made and the ideological work is bein done. Incidentally, but not without significance, the phrase "...and I was very, ver drunk" would be recognizable to many British readers as an intertextual reference t the "13th Duke of Wybourne," a caricature of aristocratic excess from the very popul BBC comedy program *The Fast Show*. In much the same way, references to codifie standardized markers of acceptance ("Michelin-starred" and "handbook") arguably serv to mitigate social sanctions toward greed and self-indulgence. In so much of what w have been seeing in tourism discourse, travel for leisure is often justified by an underl ing "because I deserve it," "I owe it to myself" presumption of privilege. (As the cliche L'Oreal cosmetics commercial catchphrase has it, "Because I'm worth it.") Motivate at least in part, by the Weberian, work-related anxieties that both motivate and constra the pursuit of leisure, a substantial part of "tourist talk" likewise involves stories th frame travel as labor (e.g., the trials of booking a holiday and the tribulations of airplar journeys).

Extract 32

(*Guardian Travel,* May 27, 2006, p. 6)

So *hip* it hurts. A luxury *hand-crafted tent with a king-sized bed*—it's camping but not as we know it in the Archede.

Extract 33

(*Guardian Travel,* April 22, 2006, p. 4)

Self-catering—but not as you know it. In fact *you don't even have to cook for yourself*, because these Kenyan beach houses even *come with a chef*. Nick Maes can't believe such *glamour* can be had for £20 a night.

Extract 34

(*Sunday Times Travel,* May 12, 2006, p. 29)

Would sir care for a body sculpt? *Country-house posh* meets *spa chic* in deepest New Forestshire—*spiffing*, says Vincent Crump.

Closely related to the mitigated but ultimately positive evaluation of excess and (self-) indulgence is the particular stance taken toward the labor and preparation of tourism professionals in the shaping of the elite tourist experience. Key to management of the host-tourist encounter is the double bind demanded by such tourists of local people: that they be both friend and servant (Jaworski et al., 2003a). In luxury travel especially, this tension is managed through the complex presentation and performance of labor that must be simultaneously unobtrusive and apparent—what we might call "visibly invisible labor" (cf. Sherman, 2007). In extract 34, the body sculpt is clearly an evaluated object but, perhaps more important, it is the ingratiating tone expressed (however ironically) by "would sir care for" that is upheld as desirable. The spoof-like use of "spiffing" also offers the author a chance to disassociate himself slightly from the anachronistic elitism indexed by the image of the butler (or any other clearly labeled *servant*).

Elite (or superelite) travelers are therefore reassured constantly of the effort in preparing their experience but in ways that do not discomfort them. This is why luxury tourism promotion, including luxury hotel Web sites, shows endless images of highly manicured lawns, immaculately made beds, ornately arranged flowers, elaborately laid tables, and fastidiously prepared (*haute/nouvelle cuisine*) meals. In precisely the same way, it is not the deliberately mundane objects in extracts 32 and 33 ("tent," "self-catering") that are evaluated per se, but more so "handcrafted" and "chef" and the oxymoronic significance of self-catering with a hired chef and of "handcrafting" an object that typically signifies no-frills "roughing it." The king-size bed merely adds to this.[6] In fact, we would suggest that one rhetorical feature that characterizes (contemporary?) elitist stancetaking is the oxymoron and, in particular, the degree of oxymoron such that the greater the incongruity the more luxurious or elite. For example, we see this principle applied in luxury tourism advertising that continually juxtaposes ordered (or manicured) spaces and disordered ("natural") spaces, and commonly promotes itself in terms of casual elegance, affordable exclusivity, or contemporary tradition (see Thurlow and Jaworski, 2009). It is the performance of these contrasts that offers superelite tourists another resource for knowing themselves as elites.

Fashionable (but Affordable) Good Taste

Without going so far as to express a high-modality opinion or attitudinal evaluation (see our discussion of stance below), the stancetaking we see in our sample of travelogues is sometimes done through explicit adjectival markers that appraise any number of objects as desirable or undesirable—usually the first. In other words, without making an explicit claim to superiority, superiority is encoded in a more indirect lexicon. In extracts 35 to 40, this elitist lexicon

collectively establishes the value of being "cool," "stylish," "designer," "new wave," "newly revamped," and "chic." As before, what ultimately gets evaluated is the latest, the newfangled, the *en vogue*—but *not*, it seems, the trendy or popular that would work against the requisite exclusivity. Nor should the *avant garde* come at the expense of authenticity. Elitist stancetaking insists on having its cake and eating it.

Extract 35

(*Guardian Travel,* April 22, 2006, p. 1)

Kenya gets *cool.* Chill out *in style* on the Indian Ocean.

Extract 36

(*Guardian Travel,* June 24, 2006, p. 1)

All over for *design* hotels? Try telling the Italians.

Extract 37

(*Guardian Travel,* April 15, 2006, p. 1)

Mexican *new wave.* How Acapulco regained its sparkle.

Extract 38

(*Guardian Travel,* June 10, 2006, p. 4)

Cape cool. Cape May was the Hamptons of the 19th century, then forgotten for about 100 years. Now the *newly revamped* beach town is *more stylish than ever*, says Douglas Rogers.

Extract 39

(*Sunday Times Travel,* May 21, 2006, p. 24)

Bargains *with class.* This June, it's not just the Costas that are cutting prices—Mark Hodson finds *chic* trips *going cheap.*

Extract 40

(*Guardian Travel,* July 22, 2006, p. 1)

Raw Africa. How Zambia manages to keep it *real.*

Extract 41

(*Sunday Times Travel,* April 23, 2006, p. 1)

The naked Truth. You *don't have to spend a fortune* on a spa break.

Extract 42

(*Guardian Travel,* June 10, 2006, p. 6)

Beach *therapy.* A spa resort on the stunning Baltic coast mixes traditional and modern treatments at *ludicrously cheap prices.*

In keeping with the reference to "class" in extract 39, another set of adjectival stance markers includes those that index tradition and/or authenticity (extract 42). In this sense, we see how contemporary notions of elite status (e.g., the appreciation of newness) continue to be infused with old-fashioned ideas of status (e.g., the royalty reference in extract 7). See, for example, the coupling and positive appraisal of "country-house posh" and "spa chic" in extract 34. Once again, the stance(s) being taken here evaluate(s) not only country houses and spas, but also the combination of the two.

It is for this reason precisely that journalists can also afford to condescend to "good value," "affordable," and even "cheap" recommendations because what they ultimately uphold is the elitist notion of exclusivity, superiority, and distinction. By the same token, the ambiguity of any stancetaking act is easily resolved in the context of (a) tourism discourse generally, and (b) the promotional discourse of the travelogue. In this way, the apparent oxymorons of "bargains with class" and "cheap chic" (extract 39) are resolved through the presumed knowledge that the evaluated objects are worth more—whether in economic or symbolic terms. One may not have to spend a "fortune" (extract 41), but the "spa break" is *worth* a fortune and/or is what those who have a fortune do. These complex significations remind us why the "elite = rich" formula is too simplistic (see p. 196 above).

It is also important to remember that all the references in these travelogues have to be interpreted within the broader, elitist discourse of tourism. As such, many of the objects evaluated in the stancetaking we have looked at end up being doubly encoded as elite or superelite. Furthermore, because these are commercial travelogues (i.e., typically sponsored by travel organizations), the default appraisal of the stancetaking is favorable. In other words, unless specifically characterized as undesirable (e.g., extract 1's "might actually look chic in batik"), the promotional discourse of the travelogues assumes a positive evaluation—even if some things must be dismissed along the way. By the same token, the general stance of travelers presupposes an elitism, as does the general stance of the *Guardian* and the *Sunday Times*, as well as that of journalists or celebrity writers. In effect, therefore, stancetaking acts may indeed be small ones, but they appear to function collectively and cumulatively.

Spirituality and Transcendence

Another way in which the elitism of contemporary tourism arguably mitigates and justifies itself is through appeals to the high moral ground of quasi-religious spirituality. Although pilgrimage has always been an important part—a key precursor even—of tourism (MacCannell, 1999), it appears that the promise of things transcendental is becoming an increasing feature of contemporary, luxury travel. In this case, the spiritual/transcendental is itself appraised as a desirable aspect of the general elitist stance of tourism.

Extract 43

(*Guardian Travel*, July 22, 2006, p. 4)

Falls *paradise*. When Douglas Rogers was growing up in Zimbabwe, Zambia was considered a wild and under-developed neighbour—precisely what makes it such a *hot* safari ticket today.

Extract 44

(*Sunday Times Travel*, July 23, 2006, p. 1)

The Island of the Sun: A *magical pilgrimage* across Lake Titicaca.

Extract 45

(*Sunday Times Travel*, May 14, 2006, p. 10)

The hard way to *heaven*. If Rosie Thomas can get to Pakistan's Hunza valley in one piece, there'll be a *spiritual reward*, spectacular views and all the fruit she can eat.

Extract 46

(*Sunday Times Travel*, July 30, 2006, p. 1)

Paradiso! Italy's sexiest islands.

The stancetaking acts in extracts 43 to 46 (see also "idyllic" in extract 4) that reference "paradise," "paradiso," "heaven," "pilgrimage," and "spiritual reward" not only shore up the cultural capital of spirituality but, more important, deploy this capital in the service of framing many of the privileged activities of tourism as somehow more acceptable and/or worthy. The representation of spa treatment, which is at the heart of so much "luxury travel," and, in a similar way, the framing of the beach—or, more probably, lounging on the beach—as "therapy" achieves a similar end (see extract 42). In the historical context of Roman Catholic alms-giving and indulgences, buying one's way into heaven and to spiritual grace is certainly not new; what is new, however, is the New Age aestheticization and life stylization of spirituality; this is spirituality without dogma, transcendence with a cocktail. What is also noticeable sometimes is the dovetailing of tourism and Eastern religious or healing practices that evidences a renewed Orientalism (Said, 1978) in keeping perhaps with the neocolonialist reinvention of, say, the grand tour and elite travel in general.

Intertextual Cultural Capital

True to their reader demographic perhaps, the underlying (or cumulative) stanc taken with respect to tourism is that of the educated, discerning educated classes A frequently evaluated object—and one working arguably at an even more subtl level—occurs in the intertextual play that we found a number of times (recall th fly-in-the-ointment pun in extract 4). In almost tabloidesque style, these "witty" re erences are almost always located at the start of feature articles, in headers or sub headers such as those in extracts 47 to 52.

Extract 47

(*Sunday Times Travel*, June 25, 2006, p. 1)

Into Africa: by foot, by boat, by starlight—the safari that gets you up close and personal.

Extract 48

(*Guardian Travel*, May 13, 2006, p. 3)

The unbearable lightness of Barnsley. An extraordinary work of art in a Yorkshire field brings the sky almost close enough to touch.

Extract 49

(*Sunday Times Travel*, June 4, 2006, p. 10)

Walk on the mild side. You don't have to be super fit or rough to walk in the Himalayas. Stick to the foothills and enjoy the mountains from afar.

Extract 50

(*Guardian Travel*, July 1, 2006, p. 6)

Children and the revolution. Cuba with kids needs a bit of planning, but get it right and it offers far more than other Caribbean islands.

Extract 51

(*Sunday Times Travel*, April 23, 2006, p. 10)

Mission impassable. For most of the year, the Himalayan valley of Spiti is cut off from the world. Duncan Sprott climbs into a part of Tibet where life is harsh, but the locals still know how to party.

Extract 52

(*Sunday Times Travel*, May 28, 2006, p. 1)

They eat horses, don't they? In the obscure cluster of central Asian nations, Kazakhstan stands out for its fine art, naked choristry and equestrian recipes. Waldemar Januszczak investigates.

Elsewhere, other examples of this exploitation of cultural capital included "Walk on the wild side," "The greatest show on earth," "A star is reborn," "Natural thrillers," and "Laird of the Fairways." In the case of extracts 47–52, the range of cultural references made include Hollywood blockbusters (Brian De Palma's *Mission Impossible*) and Oscar-winning adaptations (Sydney Pollack's *Out of Africa*, also a novel, and *They Shoot Horses, Don't They?*), rock/pop songs (T-Rex's "Children of the Revolution," Lou Reed's "Walk on the Wild Side"), and novels (Milan Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*).

Of course, the reader doesn't really have to know where a particular reference comes from; he or she has only to recognize the phrase just enough to be able to know that it indexes some kind of shared cultural capital. Once again, the cachet lies in the knowing rather than the knowledge. The possibility exists that these moments of formulaic wordplay also serve to ridicule and/or frame as frivolous the significance of the destination culture; if not, their primary function is nonetheless the elevation of "people like us" or, rather, people who get the joke (see Jaworski et al., 2003b, on *linguascaping*). In many respects, these last examples best exemplify the kind of strategies of social control that privilege dominant cultural capital

and in ways that, as Bourdieu (1990: 127) notes, are not overt but usually "gentle, invisible [and] unrecognized"—and, it has to be said, often "misrecognized" by the writers themselves. In fact, we believe that it is precisely this kind of "symbolic violence" that characterizes all of the elitist stancetaking acts we have considered here. These fleeting, but performatively accreting, moments of elitist stancetaking reinscribe not only the cultural capital of the object being evaluated but also the notion of cultural capital per se as a necessary or sufficient marker of class status. We are also left wondering if this is not true of the inherent ideological evaluation that underscores all acts of stancetaking. Which brings us to our own conceptualization of stance, based on what we have seen here and with a view to elitism in particular.

Rethinking Stance: Ideology, Symbolic Order, and Social Control

> What thus seems to take place outside ideology, in reality takes place in ideology.... That is why those who are in ideology believe themselves by definition outside ideology: one of the effects of ideology is the practical denegation of the ideological character of ideology by ideology: ideology never says, "I am ideological."
>
> —Althusser, 1972: 118

Following Thompson and Hunston, and Du Bois, we view stance as an *evaluation* or appraisal of an *object* (whether a thing, a person, an event, a behavior, or an idea) as being somehow desirable/undesirable or good/bad. As we have seen above, in the case of *elitist* stancetaking the evaluation is made partly on the basis of the evaluated object but always through a claim to both distinction and superiority. So, where a stance might express the judgment "this is good," an elitist stance carries the added or specific implication of "this is better," or even "this is the best." In either case the object is evaluated in its own right, but primarily as a *vehicle* for expressing a relational, identificational, and, most important for our purposes here, ideological orientation.[7]

Ideology, as the collective imaginary, is characterized chiefly by its capacity to persuade us of its obviousness and its neutrality (Althusser, 1972). Stancetaking likewise often seeks to obfuscate and obscure itself. Typically, stancetaking obscures itself as judgment and conceals its evaluation as "neutral" and "normal." It is this that often gives stancetaking its power—the production and naturalization of knowledge without our being aware of it (Foucault, 1980). For Bourdieu (1977), the logic of self-interest that drives power relations is rendered all the more effective through the appearance of disinterest. Here is how Swartz (1997: 43) describes Bourdieu's position:

> Activities and resources gain symbolic power, or legitimacy, to the extent that they become separated from underlying material interests and hence go misrecognized as

representing disinterested forms of activities and resources.... Symbolic capital is a form of power that is not perceived as power but as legitimate demands for recognition, deference, obedience, or the service of others.

It is no coincidence perhaps that, in contexts of luxury, the performance of disinterest, of a studied insouciance, should itself come to be coded as "classy." All of which also leaves the presumed outsider in something of a double bind: either collude with the act of stancetaking or call it out as reprehensible and run the risk of marking oneself out as déclassé.

What gives stances their inherently ideological significance, then, is that they are less likely—relatively speaking—to draw attention to themselves. As with ideology, some claim to knowledge-about-the-world is made but in a way that is *apparently* less "committed" and therefore presented as more of a commonsensical taken-for-granted. In other words, the stances we have analyzed in this corpus do not often have the modal conviction of *attitudinal* statements flagged by phrases such as "I believe," "I think," "I feel," "I hate," "I agree," and so on. Rather, stancetaking tends to be subtle and is premised on inference rather than assertion of evaluation (Du Bois, 2007), as in extract 1, for example, "(the *Mail* is very popular), but at the Colony they start from the front, not the back."

In functional terms, we would therefore define stancetaking as simultaneously instantiating *ideology*, establishing interpersonal *footing*, *styling* the speaker/writer, and *stylizing* the second party hearer/reader and sometimes a third party who may or may not be present. Stance is thus an act of self-identification and social identification by which I say something not only about myself and my view of the world, but by which I also make a judgment about you and about others as being like me or unlike me. In the case of elitist stancetaking, this evaluation presumes that "we" are better than or superior to "they." Whether the immediate addressee (the second party) agrees with the appraisal or not, they are subjected to it. They must respond by agreeing or disagreeing, by affirming or disaffirming, or merely acquiescing. Stance is thus always interpellative (Althusser, 1972), a view that is consistent with social identity theory:

Social identities are not only descriptive and prescriptive; they are also *evaluative*. They furnish an evaluation... of a social category, and thus of its members, relative to other relevant social categories. Because social identities have these important *self-evaluative consequences*, groups and their members are strongly motivated to adopt behavioural strategies for achieving or maintaining ingroup/outgroup comparisons that favour the ingroup, and thus of course the self. (Hogg et al., 1995: 260, emphasis ours; see also Tajfel and Turner, 1979)

Thus we suggest that stancetaking is the *primary* discursive mechanism by which social identity is realized, through the shifting of footing (i.e., one's alignment to the addressee/audience) (Goffman, 1981), the positioning of self relationally (i.e., simultaneously styling oneself and stylizing others), and taking an orientation toward or affinity with the extralinguistic reality, in other words, the physical, social, and

mental referents and their discursive representations. Stance may be predicated c intellectual, moral, or affective grounds, but always indexes a particular ideologic position—political, social, cultural, economic, religious, and so on. Rather tha being equivalent to ideology, we view stancetaking as instances of activating or actu alizing particular aspects of ideology. In keeping with Hodge and Kress's (198 cited above) views of modality, stancetaking evaluations are unavoidably sites c ideological construction and contestation. (This allows both modality and evaluatic to function ideologically.)

By extension, new, often subversive stancetaking may eventually filter throug and become accepted as part of the collective ideology if its underlying associatior between linguistic (semiotic) forms and social meanings, or relations of equivalenc and difference, become sufficiently conventionalized. These small (see Du Boi above) discursive moments partly derive their influence through being small, subtl unobtrusive, and fleeting, yet normative. Their formulation, especially expressed b inference rather than assertion (see Du Bois, above) is sometimes ambiguous ar artful. It is precisely through their constant repetition that these momentary, perfo mative evaluations constellate and "solidify" (cf. Butler, 1990; also Giddens, 198 on *structuration*). Just as a passing alignment or *footing* may over time persist as *relationship,* and a *style* become an identity or even a *lifestyle,* innocuous momen of stancetaking endure as personal *stands* and, eventually, as collective ideologie These fleeting alignments, orientations and adjustments also become habituated ar "hidden."

In sum, we see the relationship between stancetaking and ideology as dialect cal. The term *ideology* is understood here as a general and abstract set of soci representations shared by members of a group and used by them to accomplis everyday social practices: acting and communicating (cf. Van Dijk, 1998; Billig c al., 1988; Fowler, 1985). These representations are organized into systems that ar deployed by social classes and other groups "in order to make sense of, figure ou and render intelligible the way society works" (Hall, 1996: 26). Instances of th deployment of such representations are referred here to as *stancetaking*. Widesprea adoption and conventionalization of particular stances turns them into an *ideology*

Herein too lies the social control. Ideology understood as a shared system of val ues and beliefs is articulated through acts of stancetaking. Whereas ideology favor the social order of class dominance and subordination, or privilege and disadvantage stancetaking becomes a force of social, cultural, political, and economic control an class inequality—a hegemony: "the whole lived social process as practically orga nized by specific and dominant meanings and values" (Williams, 1997: 109). Th reiterative, self-sustaining, and solidifying capacity of stancetaking discussed abov is crucial here, as hegemony is not a passive form of dominance. "It has continuall to be renewed, recreated, defended, and modified," and it is continually confronted resisted, limited, altered, and challenged by counter- and alternative hegemonie (ibid., pp. 112–113).

In the case of our focus on elitist stancetaking, especially in the context o the consumption of leisure as an identity resource, we have been interested her in the way that elite subjectivities and feelings are enacted and are structured b

what Rampton (2003: 68) calls "processes of symbolic differentiation" and, specifically, "dualities of high-low" (though in our case, the duality is perhaps more accurately one of "superior-inferior"). As our analysis suggests, elite subjectivity of newspaper travelogue writers and their implied readers adheres to and reproduces the "cultural semantic" of class contrast (cf. Stallybrass and White, 1996), through the reiterative, affective process of stancetaking. Rather than some essentialist fixity, it is a "structure of feeling" whose nature is, according to Williams (1977), always captured through ever-changing styles of speaking and writing, physical demeanor, dress, and so on (cf. Bourdieu's 1977 notion of "habitus"). Hence, in our data we see a clustering of slightly hedged, somewhat ludic or humorous ("I'm only joking..." cf. Billig, 1999), and apparently "liberal" discourses attempting to deflect accusations of outright arrogance or snobbery, but whose overall effect is that of othering local people and other tourists who fall short of partaking in exclusive modes of travel. The cumulative effect of conveying the social and material experience of elitism is thus achieved by invoking a range of different discourses or sets of representation. In no particular order, in our data we have identified the discourse of the "superlative," "celebrity" discourse, "silence and quietude," "excess and self-indulgence," "good taste," "power/knowledge," "intertextual knowingness," "disdain for others," and "repression of the miseries of service." No doubt, there are others.

In a world in which identity is supposedly indexed more by consumption-led lifestyle choices (Giddens, 1991; Featherstone, 1991) and self- and other-stylization (Rampton, 1995, 1999; Cameron, 2000; Coupland, 2007), the allegiances and identities are built around sets of stancetaking positions social actors as members or aspiring members of particular groups. Thus, reading stories about elite holidays (luxury or otherwise) may be seen as an ersatz form of consumption of such highly desirable *products* that position us as "modern," international," even "global" (Urry, 2002), but it remains an important semiotic resource for identifying (or not) with those who do the consuming. Furthermore, as we demonstrate in our analyses above, the media sources from which we quote engage in more or less subtle rhetorical work that allows the readers to orient to these stances in specific ways. In some respects, of course, the selection of which destination to cover or whose piece to feature is itself an act of editorial or journalistic stancetaking. Journalists and editors who position themselves as traveling elites claim knowledge and authority authenticating and legitimating their experience, potentially allowing them to produce more believable and amusing stories, and to sell more newspapers. But equally, the reader's act of purchasing a particular newspaper is an act of stancetaking and an identity resource (Scollon, 1997). In this sense, we might think of stancetaking as a multilayered, chain-like series of acts in the way that Fairclough (2003) talks of genres and discourses being networked into more complex "orders of discourse."

Acknowledgment

We thank the editor of this volume, Alexandra Jaffe, for her useful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

Notes

1. In each extract, we highlight the main stancetaking acts that we discuss either immediately or elsewhere in the chapter.
2. On the "denial of racism" as gambits for expressing prejudice see also Billig (1991, 1998), Wetherell and Potter (1992), and Van Dijk (1992).
3. On the celebrity-centered representation of tourism in British TV holiday programs and their foregrounding of "first-person narratives," see Dunn (2005, 2006), Jaworski et al. (2003a).
4. Certainly, partying on an exotic beach to a portable system may well be a sign of elite consumption to others. Tourism, not unlike other areas of high consumerism, creates hierarchies of values and tiers within tiers of elitist identities (Thurlow and Jaworski, 2006).
5. Source: http://www.mustique-island.com/.
6. That the author (extract 33) also "cannot believe such glamour can be had for £20 a night" says a lot about his grasp of foreign exchange or global inequality! In the same extract, the cook is slotted in the "amenity" position usually reserved for inanimate things—a typical trope for representing servers/helpers in travel journalism (Jaworski et al., 2003a).
7. The term *vehicle*, as used here, is chosen deliberately because the act of stancetaking typically has a metaphorical quality about it, expressing in figurative, familiar terms a more abstract notion (or "tenor").

References

Althusser, Louis. 1972. *Lenin and philosophy, and other essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Austin, J. L. 1961. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*, ed. Michael Holquist. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

——. 1986. *Speech genres and other late essays*. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Austin, TX: University of Texas 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. 1997. Language style as audience design. In *Sociolinguistics: A reader and coursebook*, ed. Nikolas Coupland and Adam Jaworski, 240–250. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Billig, Michael. 1991. *Ideology and opinions*. London: Sage.

——. 1998. Dialogic repression and the Oedipus complex: Reinterpreting the Little Hans Case. *Culture and Psychology* 4: 11–47.

——. 1999. Freudian repression: Conversation creating the unconscious. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Billig, Michael, Susan Condor, Derek Edwards, Mike Gane, David Middleton, and Alan Radley. 1988. *Ideological dilemmas*. London: Sage.

Blommaert, Jan. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of the theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——. 1984. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

——. 1990. *The logic of practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Polity.
——. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Edited and introduction by John B. Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity.
Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Originally published in 1978.]
Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
Cameron, Deborah. 2000. Styling the worker: Gender and the commodification of language in the globalized service economy. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4: 323–347.
Carlton, Eric. 1996. *The few and the many: A typology of elites*. Aldershot: Scolar Press.
Cohen, Erik. 2004. Who is a tourist? A conceptual clarification. In *Contemporary tourism: Diversity and change*, 17–36. Amsterdam: Elsevier. [Originally published in *Sociological Review* 22: 527–555, 1974].
Coupland, Nikolas. 1999. "Other" representation. In *Handbook of pragmatics 1999*, ed. Jef Verschueren, Jan-Ola Östman, and Chris Bulcean, 1–24. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
——. 2001. Age in social and sociolinguistic theory. In *Sociolinguistics and social theory*, ed. Nikolas Coupland, Srikant Sarangi, and Christopher N. Candlin, 185–211. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.
——. 2007. *Style: Language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Crane, Diana. 2000. *Fashion and its social agendas: Class, gender, and identity in clothing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
De Garzia, Sebastian. 1964. *Of time, work and leisure*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
Dogan, Mattei. 2003. Introduction: Diversity of elite configurations and clusters of power. In *Elite configurations at the apex of power*, ed. Mattei Dogan, 1–15. Leiden: Brill.
Du Bois, John W. 2007. The stance triangle. In *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, ed. Robert Englebreston, 139–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Dunn, David. 2005. "We are not here to make a film about Italy, we are here to make a film about ME..." British television holiday programmes' representations of the tourist destination. In *The Media and the tourist imagination: Converging cultures*, ed. David Crouch, Felix Thompson, and Rona Jackson, 154–169. London: Routledge.
——. 2006. Singular encounters: Mediating the tourist destination in British television holiday programmes. *Tourist Studies* 6: 37–58.
Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
Featherstone, Mike. 1991. *Consumer culture and postmodernism*. London: Sage.
Field, G. Lowell, and John Higley. 1980. *Elitism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The history of sexuality*, Vol. I. New York: Random House.
——. 1980. *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.
Fowler, Roger. 1985. Power. In *Handbook of discourse analysis*, vol. 4, ed. Teun van Dijk, 61–82. London: Academic Press.
Franklin, Adrian, and Mike Crang. 2001. Editorial: The trouble with tourism and travel theory. *Tourist Studies* 1: 5–22.
Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity.
——. 1991. *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. Footing. In *Forms of talk*, 124–159. Oxford: Blackwell. [Originally published in 1973.]
Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the prison notebooks*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
Hall, Stuart. 1980. Encoding/decoding. In *Culture, media, language: Working papers in cultural studies, 1972–79*, ed. Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, 128–138. London: Hutchinson. [Originally published in 1973.]
——. 1996. The problem of ideology: Marxism without guarantees. In *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies*, David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, 25–46. London: Routledge.
Halliday, M. A. K. 1978. *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
——. 1994. *An introduction to functional grammar*, 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold.
Hannerz, Ulf. 1996. *Transnational connections*. London: Routledge.
Hodge, Robert, and Gunther and Kress. 1988. *Social semiotics*. Cambridge: Polity.
Hogg, Michael A., Deborah J. Terry, and Katherine M. White. 1995. A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 5: 255–269.
Jaworski, Adam, Virpi Ylänne-McEwen, Crispin Thurlow, and Sarah Lawson. 2003a. Social roles and negotiation of status in host-tourist interaction: A view from British TV holiday programmes. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7: 135–163.
Jaworski Adam, Crispin Thurlow, Sarah Lawson, and Virpi Ylänne-McEwen. 2003b. The uses and representations of host languages in tourist destinations: A view from British TV holiday programmes. *Language Awareness* 12: 5–29.
Kress, Gunther. 1995. The social production of language: History and structures of domination. In *Discourse in society: Systemic functional perspectives. Meaning and choice in language: Studies for Michael Halliday*, ed. Peter H. Fries and Michael Gregory, 115–140. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
Labov, William, and Joshua Waletzky. 1967. Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In *Essays on the verbal and visual arts*, ed. June Helm, 12–44. Seattle: American Ethnological Society.
LePage, Robert and Andrée Tabouret-Keller. 1985. *Acts of identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1966. The culinary triangle. *Partisan Review* 33: 586–595.
MacCannell, Dean. 1999. *The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Originally published in 1976.]
Machin, David, and Theo van Leeuwen. 2007. *Global media discourse*. London: Routledge.
McCabe, Scott. 2005. "Who is a tourist?": A critical review. *Tourist Studies*, 5(1): 85–106.
McCracken, Grant. 1988. *Culture and consumption: New approaches to the symbolic character of consumer goods and activities*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
Ochs, Elinor. 1992. Indexing gender. In *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, ed. Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, 335–358. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
——, ed. 1999. *Styling the other*. Special issue of the *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3/4.
——. 2003. Hegemony, social class and stylisation. *Pragmatics* 13: 49–83.
——. 2006. *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on conversation*, vols. 1 and 2. Edited by Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Said, Edward W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Schwartz, Barry. 2004. *The paradox of choice: Why less is more*. New York: Harper Collins.

Scollon, Ron. 1997. Handbills, tissues and condoms: A site of engagement for the construction of identity in public discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 1: 39–61.

Sherman, Rachel. 2007. *Class acts: Service and inequality in luxury hotels*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sontag, Susan. 1977. *On photography*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Stallybrass, Peter, and Allon White. 1996. *The politics and poetics of transgression*. London: Methuen.

Swartz, David. 1997. *Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Tajfel, Henri, and John C. Turner. 1979. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, ed. William G. Austin and Stephen Worchel, 33–47. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tannen, Deborah. 1986. Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversation and literary narrative. In *Direct and indirect speech*, ed. Florian Coulmas, 311–332. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

——. 1989. *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Theroux, Paul. 1986. *Sunrise with seamonsters*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

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. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thurlow, Crispin, and Adam Jaworski. 2006. The Alchemy of the upwardly mobile: Symbolic capital and the stylization of elites in frequent-flyer programs. *Discourse & Society* 17: 131–167.

——. 2009. Silence is golden: Elitism, linguascaping, and "anti-communication" in luxury tourism. In *Semiotic landscapes: Language, image, space*, ed. Adam Jaworski and Crispin Thurlow. London: Continuum.

Turner, Graeme. 2004. *Understanding celebrity*. London: Sage.

Urry, John. 2002. *The tourist gaze*, 2nd ed. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 1992. Discourse and the denial of racism. *Discourse & Society* 3: 87–118.

——. 1998. *Ideology*. London: Sage.

Veblen, Thorstein. 1979. *The theory of the leisure class*. New York: Penguin. [Originally published in 1899.]

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

Voloshinov, Valentin Nikolaevich. 1973. *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Translated by L. Matejka and I. R. Titunik. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [Originally published in Russian in 1929.]

Wetherell, Margaret, and Jonathan Potter. 1992. *Mapping the language of racism*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.

Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Attributing Stance in Discourses of Body Shape and Weight Loss

Justine Coupland and Nikolas Coupland

The Stance Family

Stance, and concepts closely related to it, generally point to an ordering of
meaning between forms of talk and some higher order construct such as
tity." To take just a few instances, Elinor Ochs (1992) argued that speakers t
stances in talk—say a woman being supportive or consultative to a listener—
then, at a higher order of interpretation, can be construed as indexing the soc
egory "feminine." Barbara Johnstone (1995, this volume) defends the con
"mode of ethos," which might be thought of as a variable orientation toward
open versus strategic in talk, and which plays a role in indexing personal id
Erving Goffman's (1981) notion of footing refers to a negotiated relationa
on which social interaction proceeds, fully recognizing that footings are pote
ephemeral and do not define "the relationships" among participants in any c
dated way. In the sociolinguistics of style, the concept of persona (N. Co
2007) refers to a socially constructed person-image, which may well be a st
projection rather than a reliable index of the speaker's "real identity." Stan
these other concepts mark constructionist sociolinguistics' retreat from an
tialized view of identity and relationships, toward the view that languag
a constitutive role in social life. In fact Bronwen Davies and Rom Harré
argued that "who we are" is not necessarily a coherent notion. What we wo
is a set of autobiographical fragments linked to how we position ourselves
positioned by others in conversation, so positioning is another term in the
family of mediating concepts.