INTRODUCTION
REFRAMING FRAMING: INTERACTION AND THE
CONSTITUTION OF CULTURE AND SOCIETY

Joseph Sung-Yul Park and Hiroko Takanashi

Abstract

This special issue revisits the notion of framing based on several recent developments in the fields of sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and linguistic anthropology, particularly the current interest in the notions of stance, style, metalinguistics and language ideology. In doing so, the contributions highlight the importance of framing not only in the management of micro-level interactional practices but also in the reproduction of cultural ideologies and social relations.

Keywords: Framing; Stance; Style; Language ideology; Interaction.

This special issue aims to renew the interest in framing as a key concept for the analysis of interactional discourse. In particular, it highlights the role of framing in mediating the constitution of culture and social order in interactional contexts. Based on interactional data gathered from diverse contexts of Africa, Asia, and America, and building upon recent developments in the study of stance, style, and language ideology, the papers in this collection underline how speakers' practices of framing can be understood as a locus for the dynamic reproduction of cultural assumptions and social organization. Goffman's (1974, 1981) formulation of framing, based on Bateson's (1972) work, has already had a major influence on how we understand the way participants in interaction intersubjectively negotiate and manage social meaning and social relations: that is, how they understand what is going on in the situation at hand, how they make sense of utterances produced, how they determine the positions they should take in relation to each other (Tannen and Wallat 1987). But the papers in this collection draw our attention to how such interactional management of talk has a much more enduring significance, as it also plays an important role in the construction and reproduction of social structure and cultural beliefs.

As Gumperz (2001) points out, framing can be understood as "a filtering process through which societal-level values and principles of conduct are transformed and refocused so as to apply to the situation at hand," thus "bridg[ing] the verbal and the social" (p. 217). That is, as participants negotiate, through practices of framing, their situated and cultural understanding of the interaction in which they are engaged, they are providing concrete manifestations - on the level of language use - of a wide range of broader cultural and social beliefs, such as shared knowledge schemas, normative structures of discourse, repertoire of participant roles, and so on. At the same time, they do not merely reproduce those broader conceptual structures in interaction, but

manipulate and resignify them to adapt them for their local context. In this sense, framing is where broader social categories and micro-patterns of language use meet, providing students of the relationship between language and society with a reliable vantage point for further investigations. Indeed, it is this power of framing that has made it a strong inspiration for various influential analytical frameworks in sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and linguistic anthropology, such as Gumperz's (1982, 1996, 2001) research on contextualization, Tannen (1993, 2004, 2006) and her colleagues' (Gordon 2002, 2008) work on frame analysis, and the linguistic anthropological study of performance, genre, and intertextuality (Bauman 1977, 2004; Bauman and Briggs 1990; Briggs and Bauman 1992), which in turn produced a large body of works that build upon them. But detailed accounts of how links between interactional patterns and broader social categories may be made through framing are still lacking, and this special issue aims to fill this gap by combining the conceptual frameworks of those earlier works with insights from more recent studies on interaction; thereby, this special issue hopes to highlight once more the importance of framing for our understanding of language use in social context.

The special issue's revisiting of framing is motivated by recent developments in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology that provide us with a more precise lexicon that can be employed in the characterization of framing. In particular, there are three main ideas that either build upon or are highly relevant to framing:

- Stance: The notion of stancetaking, understood as dialogic acts through which speakers position and align themselves towards an entity or proposition, as well as towards each other, has been explored in great detail recently (Hunston and Thompson 2000; Englebretson 2007; Jaffe 2009). Expanding Goffman's analysis of footing (1981), these studies provide greater specification of the interpersonal and intersubjective dimensions of framing and how speakers deploy linguistic resources in this process. For instance, resonance, or the systematic recycling process of prior linguistic elements for the construction of stance relationships (DuBois 2001, 2007; Oropeza-Escobar 2011), is shown to have clear implications on speakers' interpretation of the interaction at hand, since patterns of resonance iconically represent positions of social alignment among participants (Lempert 2008). Such negotiation of social positions in turn may also serve as a basis for the establishment of shared social values (such as constructs of responsibility or morality; see Hill and Irvine 1993), as common evaluative stances are repeatedly achieved through interaction.

- Style: Recent studies on sociolinguistic style have shifted their interest from analyses of systematic patterns of intra-speaker variation to the ways in which speakers manipulate the meaning of linguistic variables to construct and project new identities and personae (Rampton 1999; Eckert and Rickford 2001; Eckert 2004, 2008; Hill 2001; Bucholtz and Hall 2005). Under this view, the identities and personae that speakers adopt through styling build upon existing social stances and stereotypes, but also are an outcome of interactional processes through which linguistic forms are resignified and reinterpreted. In this sense, the process of styling and stylization provides the grounds for framing, as it is inherently about intersubjective negotiation and interpretation of the social

meaning of sociolinguistic variables, about constructing frames of reference within which various identities and personae can be understood.

- Metalinguistics and language ideology: The reflexive nature of language, as manifest through reported speech (Lucy 1993), intertextuality (Bauman 2004; Bauman and Briggs 1990; Briggs and Bauman 1992; Silverstein and Urban 1996; Agha 2007), and metalanguage in general (Jaworski, Coupland, and Galasiński 2004), has been a central topic in linguistic anthropological research of recent decades. The framework of language ideology (Silverstein 1979, 1985; Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity 1998; Kroskrity 2000, 2004; Gal and Woolard 2001) emphasizes how such metalinguistic practices are fundamental to the construction of social positions and relations, serving as a mediating factor between broader social meanings and linguistic form (Woolard 1998). Speakers' manipulation and negotiation of interactional frames, then, must be seen as inherently dependent on language ideological interpretations of language varieties, discourse structure, and the social significance of talk, as it is through such beliefs that participants come to make sense of language use within the ongoing interaction.

The contributions to this special issue link one or more of these concepts to the analysis of framing, in order to build a stronger grounding upon which we can investigate speakers' practices of linking the social and the verbal in interaction. They thereby seek to explore the ways in which framing can have a consequence that reaches beyond the immediate interactional context to facilitate the constitution of culture.

Harrison's article discusses how the use of constructed dialogue contributes to the discursive construction of responsibility in Fulfulde (West Africa) narratives, by focusing on how the framing achieved through reported speech allows speakers and recipients to jointly reproduce socially-shared images of responsible personhood. Here, the grammatical resources for coding reported speech, through the mediation of Goffmanian roles of *addressing self*, *principal*, and *animator*, allow the Fulfulde speaker to distribute responsibility for past actions and to claim a culturally knowledgeable and morally approvable position - e.g., one who knows the way of the bush, or one who displays sensitivity towards other's property rights. In this sense, the discursive space created through framing serves as a site for the reification and reproduction of dominant cultural ideologies.

Oropeza-Escobar highlights the interactive nature of word searches in traditional narratives told by bilingual Totonac-Spanish storytellers, and their sensitivity to such factors as discourse- and event-level frames, participants' roles and point of view. Searching for a word due to forgetfulness or low codability of a concept is an activity mundane enough, but Oropeza-Escobar emphasizes how such contingencies are resolved not only by reference to immediate interactional dynamics but also to broader socio-cultural framing of the speech event. In the case of Oropeza-Escobar's data, the speech event is that of the researcher's ethnographic collection of narratives, which makes the word search a relevant discursive locus for the reproduction of ideological categories and social relations such as authoritative storyteller or local authority, thereby linking micro-level practices with broader social positions.

Takanashi's article discusses how play framing in Japanese interaction may be mediated through the resource of style. The focus of her analysis is what she calls

complementary stylistic resonance, in which a first speaker's playful shift of speech style to dramatize a fabricated persona is responded to by the second speaker's style shift into a matching persona in social life; for instance, a "teacher style" may be responded to by a "student style," and "husband style" by a "wife style." Since such resonance is spontaneously and inferentially realized, what such practice illustrates, and in fact reinforces, is the highly shared nature of such paired social roles and their complementary images. Thus, through such play framing, the speakers not only achieve close alignment of interactional stance, but also jointly participate in the cultural reproduction of social roles and expectations.

Finally, Park's article explores the role of affect in the constitution of framing by analyzing how various resources for display of emotions or feelings may contribute to the negotiation of stances that come to constitute interactional frames. His paper focuses on a particular metadiscursive practice commonly found in Korean interaction, in which speakers disparagingly speak of their own English language skills, thus constructing themselves as incompetent speakers of English. Park shows that the reproduction of such language ideologies is mediated, on the interactional level, through displays of affect, allowing speakers to jointly take a problematizing stance towards their competence in English. Such recurrent stance relations in turn may result in more enduring frames for speaking about English, thus serving as the discursive ground for the reproduction of dominant language ideologies.

By adopting the insights from recent developments in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology to the analysis of framing, these articles specify the linguistic, interactional, and ideological processes that are involved in speakers' management of intersubjective understandings of the talk at hand. They emphasize the complex nature of framing by carefully outlining speakers' methods of negotiating the meaning of linguistic resources, and demonstrate how such methods are ultimately strategies for navigating the space of sociolinguistic significance configured by webs of social relations and networks of competing indexical values and language ideologies. This special issue thus contributes to the study of human interaction by suggesting the ways in which analysis of micro-level interaction can be situated within larger processes that shape the constitution of culture and social order.

References

Agha, Asif (2007) *Language and social relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bateson, Gregory (1972) A theory of play and fantasy. In *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, pp. 177-193.

Bauman, Richard (1977) *Verbal art as performance*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Bauman, Richard (2004) *A world of others' words: Cross-cultural perspectives on intertextuality*. Malden: Blackwell.

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

Briggs, Charles L., and Richard Bauman (1992) Genre, intertextuality, and social power. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2.2: 131-172.

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

Du Bois, John W. (2001) Towards a dialogic syntax. Ms., University of California, Santa Barbara.

Du Bois, John W. (2007) The stance triangle. In Englebretson, Robert (ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 139–182.

Eckert, Penelope (2004) The meaning of style. In Wai Fong Chiang, Elaine Chun, Laura Mahalingappa, and Siri Mehus, (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Symposium about Language and Society – Austin. Texas Linguistic Forum* Vol. 47: 41–53.

Eckert, Penelope (2008) Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12: 453-476.

Eckert, Penelope, and John R. Rickford (eds.) (2001) *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Englebretson, Robert (ed.) (2007) *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gal, Susan, and Kathryn A. Woolard (eds.) (2001) *Languages and publics: The making of authority*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Goffman, Erving (1974) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Goffman, Erving (1981) *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gordon, Cynthia (2002) "I'm Mommy and you're Natalie": Role-reversal and embedded frames in mother–child discourse. *Language in Society* 31: 679–720.

Gordon, Cynthia (2008) A(p)parent play: Blending frames and reframing in family talk. *Language in Society* 37: 319-349.

Gumperz, John J. (1982) *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, John J. (1996) The linguistic and cultural relativity of conversational inference. In John J. Gumperz and Stephen C. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 374-406.

Gumperz, John J. (2001) Interactional sociolinguistics: A personal perspective. In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton (eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis*. Malden: Blackwell, pp. 215–228.

Hill, Jane H. (2001) Mock Spanish, covert racism, and the (leaky) boundary between public and private spheres. In Susan Gal and Kathryn Woolard (eds.), *Languages and publics: The making of authority*. Manchester: St. Jerome, pp. 83-102.

Hill, Jane H., and Judith T. Irvine (eds.) (1993) *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hunston, Susan, and Geoff Thompson (eds.) (2000) *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jaffe, Alexandra (ed.) (2009) *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jaworski, Adam, Nikolas Coupland, and Dariusz Galasiński (eds.) (2004) *Metalanguage: Social and ideological perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kroskrity, Paul V. (ed.) (2000) *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V. (2004) Language ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. Malden: Blackwell, pp. 496-517.

Lempert, Michael. (2008) The poetics of stance: Text-metricality, epistemicity, interaction. *Language in Society* 37: 569-592.

Lucy, John A. (ed.) (1993) *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oropeza-Escobar, M. (2011) *Represented Discourse, Resonance and Stance in Joking Interaction in Mexican Spanish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Rampton, Ben (ed.) (1999) *Styling the other*. Special issue of *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3.4.

Schieffelin, Bambi B., Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Silverstein, Michael (1979) Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer (eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 193-247.

Silverstein, Michael (1985) Language and the culture of gender: At the intersection of structure, usage, and ideology. In Elizabeth Mertz and Richard Parmentier (eds.), *Semiotic mediation: Sociocultural and psychological perspectives*. Orlando: Academic Press, pp. 219-259.

Silverstein, Michael, and Greg Urban (eds.) (1996) *Natural histories of discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tannen, Deborah (ed.) (1993) *Framing in discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, Deborah (2004) Talking the dog: Framing pets as interactional resources in family discourse. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 37: 399– 420.

Tannen, Deborah (2006) Intertextuality in action: Reframing family arguments in public and private. *Text & Talk* 26: 597– 617.

Tannen, Deborah, and Cynthia Wallat (1987) Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Examples from a medical examination/interview. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50.2: 205-216.

Woolard, Kathryn A. (1998) Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-47.