



## ENCYCLOPEDIA OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS SECOND EDITION CONTRIBUTORS' INSTRUCTIONS

### PROOFREADING

The text content for your contribution is in final form when you receive proofs. Read proofs for accuracy and clarity, as well as for typographical errors, but please **DO NOT REWRITE**.

At the end of your article you will find a page which will contain several non-print items: abstract, author biographies and photographs, captions for any multimedia components, keywords (for indexing purposes), and the full contact details of each author. Full addresses are used to keep our records up-to-date (they will not appear in the published work) – for the lead author, this is the address that the honorarium will be sent. Please ensure that all of these items are checked thoroughly.

Titles and headings should be checked carefully for spelling and capitalization. Please be sure that the correct typeface and size have been used to indicate the proper level of heading. Review numbered items for proper order – e.g., tables, figures, footnotes, and lists. Proofread the captions and credit lines of illustrations and tables. Ensure that any material requiring permissions has the required credit line.

Any copy-editor questions are presented in an accompanying Manuscript Query list at the end of the proofs. Please address these questions as necessary. While it is appreciated that some articles will require updating/revising, please try to keep any alterations to a minimum. Excessive alterations may be charged to the contributors.

Note that these proofs may not resemble the image quality of the final printed version of the work, and are for content checking only. Artwork will have been redrawn/relabelled as necessary, and is represented at the final size.

PLEASE KEEP A COPY OF ANY CORRECTIONS YOU MAKE.

### **DESPATCH OF CORRECTIONS**

Proof corrections should be returned in one communication to your academic editor **ROSANNA SORNICOLA** by using one of the following methods:

1. If corrections are minor they should be listed in an e-mail to [sornicol@unina.it](mailto:sornicol@unina.it). A copy should also be sent to: [lali\\_proofs@elsevier.com](mailto:lali_proofs@elsevier.com). The e-mail should state the article code number in the subject line. Corrections should be consecutively numbered and should state the paragraph number, line number within that paragraph, and the correction.
2. If corrections are substantial, send the amended hardcopy by courier to **ROSANNA SORNICOLA, Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Filologia Moderna, via Porta di Massa 1, 80133 Napoli, Italy**, with a copy by fax to the Elsevier MRW Production Department (fax number: +44 (0)1865 843974). If it is not possible to courier your corrections, fax the relevant marked pages to the Elsevier MRW Production Department with a covering note clearly stating the article code number and title.

Note that a delay in the return of proofs could mean a delay in publication. Should we not receive corrected proofs within 7 days, the editors and Elsevier will proceed without your corrections.

### **CHECKLIST**

- |   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| Manuscript queries addressed/answered?                  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Affiliations, names and addresses checked and verified? | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 'Further Reading' section checked and completed?        | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Permissions details checked and completed?              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Outstanding permissions letters attached/enclosed?      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Figures and tables checked?                             | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If you have any questions regarding these proofs please contact the Elsevier MRW Production Department at: [lali\\_proofs@elsevier.com](mailto:lali_proofs@elsevier.com).

## Cultural and Social Dimension of Spoken Discourse

J B Haviland, Reed College, Portland, OR, USA

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

‘Spoken discourse’ is a fancy name for the sort of language we live with in the course of ordinary life, the source from which we all acquire not only language itself but, indeed, major aspects of our social and cultural worlds. It is largely through spoken interaction with others that we learn not only what sorts of social identities there are, and how to recognize them, but in fact how to construct and present ourselves as persons. Insofar as most meaningful social action is accomplished in large part discursively, it is also through speech that we carry out much of the business of our lives.

Within linguistics, the study of discourse is frequently distinguished from other structural inquiries simply by the size and scope of the units of analysis. When one looks at linguistic entities larger than sentences, takes into consideration the organization of textual fragments, or begins to encompass turns at talk across different speakers, tools that were useful in analyzing sounds, words and their parts, or clauses become insufficient. It is in the choice of larger bodies of language, too, that the communicative traditions of specific social and cultural communities become immediately and unavoidably relevant. For what warrants selecting some particular fragment of speech as a unit in the first place? What gives it coherence and separates it from other surrounding talk?

Cultural considerations are always at work in such judgments. What makes a stretch of talk into a complete ‘conversation’ or ‘mathematics lesson’ or ‘curing ceremony’ or ‘farewell’? Local criteria for what constitutes ‘talk’ in the first place can vary widely. From the beginning of anthropological attention to speech, theorists have grappled with differing notions of what is *real* talk—often highly specialized genres like prayer (‘talk with God’), or denunciation and declamation in ritual or highly public settings—versus what is simply ‘small talk’ (gossip, a casual conversation, a greeting on the path), or not even ‘talk’ at all (perhaps a gesture, the babbling of an infant, the calls of animals, or the voice of the wind—for some communities real communication, if by nonhuman interactants, whereas for others even true discourse with intentional, albeit not volitional, participants).

Equally variable, then, are the sorts of participants spoken discourse admits. Discourse requires interlocutors, and these come in different flavors, not all

equally endowed with voices or privileges to use them. (In some communicative traditions, ‘children are to be seen and not heard’; in others, wisdom comes ‘out of the mouths of babes.’) Different genders, castes, classes, ages, and ethnic identities may be differentially voiced or devoiced, and the resulting discourses will be differentially marked by what have been called ‘participation frames’: matrices of interlocutors, with different sorts of rights and obligations for speaking, differential access to the speech of others, and different sorts of statuses—whether recognized, ratified, authoritative, or the reverse—and stances (authoritative, indifferent, oppositional, etc.) in relation to the resulting talk.

The provenance of every piece of discourse is thus some social occasion for talk, and the textual sediment of the discourse will therefore always carry traces of its sociocultural (and political and historical) origins: why people had the linguistic interchange, and what happened (to them, between them, for them) when they did. An incidental but important consequence for research on spoken discourse is thus ethical: the identities and purposes of interlocutors may require careful treatment in any empirical description or analysis, since unlike canonical sentences, rarely are discursive fragments generated in the (relatively) neutral social and political climate of elicitation or introspection.

The social character of spoken discourse is also clear in the texture of speech itself. (Aspects of the spoken medium, incidentally, have analogues in other linguistic modalities, such as sign, a topic beyond the scope of this article.) By definition we think of the medium as verbalization—spoken words—but other sorts of signals are routinely involved. Spoken discourse routinely includes vocal sounds other than phonation, voice qualities, nonspeech vocalizations (e.g., sighs, laughs, grunts), and other noises, which may have local and partly conventionalized import (a finger snap, a clap, a stomp, a slap, even a slammed door, a tapping pencil, or a spoon on a glass). Moreover, gestures and in general motions and attitudes of the body—themselves subject to cultural shaping (think of a nod, a bow, a wink, or a shrug) and to ideological shading (‘it’s not polite to point’)—may form a central part of interaction, coordinating the discourse itself or complementing other signaling modalities. The popular idea that one can tell where people are from or who they are by watching them interact—whether true or not—confirms how folk linguistics understands that discursive *styles* are cultural products.

## 2 Cultural and Social Dimension of Spoken Discourse

p0035 Discourse is intrinsically four-dimensional, unfolding in both space and time in a way that defies the often linear idealizations of linguistic analysis at the clause level. Discourse is also typically both polyphonic and polyvocal, combining multiple voices sometimes simultaneously and sometimes in orchestrated and partially overlapping sequences. Both aspects of spoken discourse are complicated by the sociocultural matrix in which it is produced.

p0040 Because it always unfolds in space and typically involves multiple participants, discourse can be structured in part by how interactants are arranged: how they stand or sit with respect to one another, how they are distributed in the physical environment, how they orient themselves to one another, and what sort of access (visual and aural, if not tactile and olfactory as well) they have both to other interactants and to other entities in the surrounding environment. Cultural structuring of space is thus the fundamental grounding of the resulting talk.

p0045 More insistent still is temporal structure in discourse, which always emerges as sequences of smaller linguistic units. When there are multiple interlocutors, units can overlap, be truncated, or abort prematurely. Sequences can stop and restart or can embed themselves within one another. There can be gaps, long or short. Generally time is the platform for speech, so that interlocutors can play with rhythm, synchrony, and asynchrony. Differences in temporal styles, then, can also emerge, distinguishing cultures, event or activity types, and individuals, often with value judgments and cultural stereotypes attached ('fast talkers' do not simply talk fast).

p0050 The four-dimensionality of spoken discourse merges most directly with its sociocultural underpinnings in the turn-taking system. Because there can be competition for discursive resources—the 'floor' (or its avoidance, through reticence or silence); the topic, the story line, or the punch line; authority and responsibility (and their ducking or shirking)—speaking is always a matter of politics, though the power involved may be microscopic and subtle. Who gets turns, who takes turns, and who is denied turns—and how these turns are shaped—are thus always matters of social import. Society also defines who (and what) can be addressed, who can hear, and who must not. Accordingly, there are miniature social and political structures implicit in different systems of turn allocation (contrast a courtroom or a barroom with a classroom or a locker room).

p0055 Structures of participation in spoken discourse have a further sociopolitical dimension, in that interlocutors never interact in a biographical vacuum. Their identities and personal histories, to a greater or lesser extent public and shared between interactants,

shape their talk as well as talk directed to them or around them. Some discourse theory concentrates on the mutual building of 'common ground,' or shared knowledge, between interactants in talk, but discourse begins with most shared belief already in place, legislated by prior experience (centrally including prior discourse). The sometimes covert sociopolitical structure also gives rise to 'recipient design': the fact, noted long ago by Bakhtin, that discursive 'moves'—turns at talk—are specifically tailored, in the moment, both to the purposes at hand and to the specific social personae present. Not only 'semantic' content but everything from syntax and lexicon to accent and eye gaze is part of the 'design' of talk in relation to its socially constituted targets.

There are processing consequences of the sociocultural embedding of discourse, also a product of temporality overlain by participation structures. For some theorists (H. Clark, for example), the hallmark of talk is that it is a prototypical joint and collaborative activity that requires coordination of various kinds between interlocutors. It cannot be done alone, and to talk at all requires participants to find ways to coordinate, often without knowing exactly what is going to happen next. Both cognitive skills—the ability to infer meaning and intention, for example—and cultural routines (various 'scripts' that allow cultural experts to anticipate what will or should come next) may be involved in producing such coordination. Nonetheless, a hallmark of spoken discourse is that it is ordinarily neither preplanned nor (except in limited ways) editable, and thus it requires interlocutors to stay on their communicative toes. It is perhaps the extemporaneous quality of much spoken discourse that makes it, in Bakhtin's terms, a primary genre, a source of raw material that other sorts of language draw upon.

Spoken discourse is usually also employed for other cultural purposes: it is part of activity. Since multiple things can be happening within a single turn (Goodwin, 1990), 'parsing' discourse is not strictly a structural matter but rather requires both interlocutors and analysts to calibrate a wider context of activity and participation with the specific internal dynamics of an utterance. Such parsing is 'online'—immediate to the context and concurrent with anything else that may be going on—so that the indexical links between whatever is happening and forms of talk (the ways that speech indicates what is happening and that action partly determines the accompanying talk) are constantly in a process of revision and update. Discursive interlocutors can start off 'doing' one thing and end up accomplishing another, with multiple other 'speech acts' flitting in between.

AU:1

AU:2

AU:3

AU:4

p0060

p0065

p0070 The fact that spoken discourse ordinarily takes place ‘face-to-face’ also has social consequences. Some of these stem simply from the physical presence of interactants, equipped with all their bodily trappings and sensibilities. For example, physical co-presence means that corporal expressions of a cultural milieu are immediately available for discursive exploitation and incorporation. Smell and touch can be invoked as much as sound or sight, and the orientation and disposition of bodies in interaction is usually significant for discourse, signaling aspects of participation (or exclusion) and commitment to the discursive task at hand, and is sometimes itself socially regimented (the seating arrangements at a *fono*, or a dinner table). Co-presence means, too, that the *absence* or withholding of explicit signals may also be communicative; silence may do social work within conversation, as can avoidance of eye contact and physical distance and withdrawal.

AU:5

p0075 Similarly, speech occurs in a wider physical environment, mapped and rendered significant by cultural treatment. (Recall Goffman’s example of the outrageous hat that served as direct referent to the anaphoric ‘it’ in ‘I don’t like it.’) Not only may physical objects have cultural significance for discourse to feed on (the colored and significantly textured patches of ground in an archeology dig, for example), but so may the environment be populated with otherwise invisible ‘cultural entities’ (the space where a historical figure’s house once stood, for example, serving as an invisible mnemonic sign for the person himself).

AU:6

p0080 Finally, consider the cultural wrappings around both the digital and analogue signaling channels in spoken discourse. Words and morphemes in the stream of speech are of course subject to the familiar sociocultural and historical fashioning that produces any linguistic code. Additionally, culturally specific emblems—gestural holophrases—conventionally complement or substitute for speech, and these clearly differ from one speech tradition to the next. (Think of the different significance across the world of gestures with different raised fingers, for example.) Conventions of form as well as meaning apply (a ‘thumbs up’ gesture is not the same with any other finger or with the thumb placed slightly at an angle). Beyond the hands, there are nods, shrugs, and a variety of other conventionalized bodily signs that punctuate and modulate the ordinary linguistic channel.

p0085 However, many analogue signaling devices characterize spoken discourse, and these, too, may be subject to cultural shaping.

p0090 Discourse depends—minimally for successful reference—on indexical links between discursive elements and contextual entities. *Pointing* is a device for

indexically picking out a referent in the neighborhood (variously scaled and constructed) of interlocutors, and similar semiotic processes are involved in what Clark called *placing*—manipulating or moving entities in the environment as a way of incorporating something into discourse. Cultural convention often conditions how one is to point; e.g., in many Australian languages (and probably elsewhere), referents—even imaginary ones—are carefully located in space with respect to cardinal directions or other cultural standards. Analogue indexical devices are also typically ideologically charged. There may be socially polite and impolite ways to point or to handle things—for example, to pass them from one person to another. Speech that involves such gestures inherits properties from its component communicative acts. It also draws upon cultural conventions when, for example, the formation of ‘iconic’ gestures draws on local standards of ‘similarity.’

AU:7

A further analogue signaling device prominent in spoken discourse is gaze. Where interlocutors look can show both a speaker’s bid for an addressee’s attention and the other’s acquiescence, although here, too, cultural factors may alter both expectations (as when people ‘avert their eyes’ or ‘cannot meet your gaze’). Gaze can also be used to signal withdrawn or withheld attention. There are often accompanying ideologies (the admonition ‘Don’t stare!’ or the detective’s assessment of a ‘shifty look.’)

p0095

Facial expression more generally modulates the effects of speech: imagine an ironic smile accompanying rebuke or insult, or an angry look on top of an overpolite request. In sign languages, indeed, the face is one of the major ‘phonological’ articulators. In the verbal medium, of course, the most obvious counterpart is the voice, the final analogue signaling device to be mentioned.

p0100

Some speech communities conventionalize affect and emotion with ways of using the voice, and local theory may speak informally of, say, an ‘angry voice’ or relate a certain named voice quality (‘whispered’ or ‘hoarse’) to a particular communicative intent or to certain sorts of social identities (‘falsetto’ voice among Maya women, or ‘question intonation’ as a gender stereotype). The existence of such distinguishable speech symptoms also makes possible deliberate imitation or representation. ‘Voicing’ a protagonist by using his or her words and also his or her voice or bodily attitudes is the stock-in-trade of discursive virtuosi, among the most characteristic and versatile of cultural experts.

p0105

See also:

AU:8

**Bibliography**

- Bakhtin M M (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Briggs C L (ed.) (1996). *Discorderly discourse: narrative, conflict, and inequality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Clark H H (1996). *Using language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark H H (ed.) (2003). 'Pointing and placing.' In Kita S (ed.) (2003). *Pointing: where language, culture, and cognition meet*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 243–268.
- Duranti A & Goodwin C (eds.) (1992). *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards J A & Lampert M D (1993). *Talking data: transcription and coding in discourse research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goffman E (1964). 'The neglected situation.' *American Anthropologist* 66(6, pt. 2), 133–136.
- Goffman E (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin C (1981). *Conversational organization: interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin M H (1990). *He-said-she-said: talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Hill J H & Irvine J T (1992). *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverstein M & Urban G (eds.) (1996). *Natural histories of discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Urban G (1998). *Metaphysical communities*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

FIRST PROOF

**Author Query Form****Book: Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics  
Article No.: 00567**

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for typesetting some questions have arisen. These are listed below. Please check your typeset proof carefully and mark any corrections in the margin of the proof or compile them as a separate list. Your responses to these questions should be returned within seven days, by email, to Professor Rosanna Sornicola, email: [sornicol@unina.it](mailto:sornicol@unina.it), and copied to MRW Production, email: [lali\\_proofs@elsevier.com](mailto:lali_proofs@elsevier.com)

<b>Query</b>	<b>Details Required</b>	<b>Author's response</b>
AU1	Is this a reference to Bakhtin, 1986?	
AU2	Are you referring to a specific Clark work?	
AU3	Is this a reference to Bakhtin, 1986?	
AU4	I added 1990. Am I correct that this is the Goodwin work you're referring to?	
AU5	Not sure why the word " <i>fono</i> " is used here. Delete?	
AU6	Reword to make reference to the Goffman article listed in the bibliography?	
AU7	Reword to make this a clear citation of Clark, 2003?	
AU8	Please supply cross-references.	
AU9	Please provide photograph for Author Biography.	

## Non-Print Items

### Abstract:

Oral discourse is the primary site of language acquisition and of socialization in general. Sociocultural considerations are paramount in giving coherence to a discourse fragment, in defining its function and use in interaction, and in the politics of who has a discursive voice to begin with.

### AU:9 **Biography:**

John Beard Haviland, received an A.B. in philosophy in 1966 from Harvard College and a Ph.D. in social anthropology from Harvard University in 1972. He is an anthropological linguist, with principal interests in the social life of language. His major research has been on Tzotzil (Mayan) in highland Chiapas, Mexico, and its neighbors, as well as on languages from the area north of Cooktown, in far north Queensland, Australia. He is Professor of Anthropology and Linguistics at Reed College, Portland, Oregon, and concurrently Investigador Titular C at the Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social, Mexico.

**Keywords:** conversation, interaction, social action, turn taking, cohesion, genre, silence, participant structure, practice, gesture, style, voice, access, synchronicity, temporal structure, common ground, gaze, intertextuality

### Author Contact Information:

**John B Haviland**  
Department of Anthropology  
Reed College  
3202 S.E Woodstock Boulevard  
Portland, Oregon, 97202-8199  
USA  
johnh@reed.edu