CHAPTER TEN

THE EVIDENCE FROM DISCOURSE

Niko Besnier

In recent decades, scholars working in a variety of traditions of inquiry have
made the relationship between discourse and its ethnographic context the object
of their scrutiny. They argue that the complexity of this relationship and the
problems associated with it must become an integral part of the focus of an-
thropology. These scholars show that meaning cannot be solely and unproblem-
atically found in the content of talk; rather, meaning resides equally, if not more
importantly, in the medium through which verbal communication takes place
(e.g., discourse form, participant structure in interaction, linguistic ideology).
This chapter is an overview of how "discourse-centered approaches" (Sherzer
1987) integrate a focus on cultural dynamics and categories of concern to psy-
chological anthropology, on the one hand, and analytic attention to linguistic
practices and their sociocultural context, on the other hand.

   This survey is highly selective, being based on the premise that details on a
handful of studies provide greater insight into approaches and methodologies
than brief mentions of a large number of works. However, when relevant, I will
provide references to survey articles with broader scope than this chapter. Fur-
thermore, this chapter focuses principally on two areas of inquiry commonly
identified as central topics for research in contemporary psychological anthro-
pology, namely, emotion and personhood (cf. White 1992, 1993). The particular
success that discourse-centered approaches have had in furthering our under-
standing of these two notions also motivates this choice of focus.

   Traditionally, psychological anthropologists have relied heavily on language
as an ethnographic tool and heuristic device. Responses to interview questions,
talk produced in therapy and comparable contexts, and the structure of the lex-
icon and metaphors are examples of the type of data scholars concerned with
psychological anthropological issues seek during field research. These data en-

able anthropologists to draw analytic inferences about the psychological world of their informants. For example, a central concern of Rosaldo's (1980) masterful ethnography of the Ilongot was to unravel the cultural significance of key emotion concepts in the lives of this Philippine people, such as *liget*, commonly glossed as "anger." In this task, Rosaldo emphasized the importance of context in understanding words and the concepts that they denote. She thus based her analysis on interpretations of a rich array of linguistic data (provided mostly in English translation), including Ilongot sayings, songs, metaphors, explanations of particular events, theoretical statements about emotion categories, and scripts for social actions that she elicited from her informants.

In a trenchant exegesis of Rosaldo's and other works in psychological anthropology and cultural psychology, Rosenberg (1990) demonstrated that the insistence that language be studied in context proclaimed in works such as Rosaldo's falls short of its goal. While emphasizing the cultural specificity of notions like personhood and emotionality, psychological anthropologists assume, paradoxically, that the meaning of discourse can be read off, translated, and paraphrased unproblematically across languages and speech communities. For example, when field researchers elicit from their informants responses to definitional questions (e.g., "What is *liget*?"), they only subject to analysis the glossing of terms. Left untouched are such questions as respondents' understanding of what a definition is, the nature of the discourse that provides an environment for the definition, and local conceptualization of the relationship between form and meaning. Yet the mapping of meaning onto form, to focus on only one problem, is conceptualized diversely in different cultures, being dependent on such culture-specific notions as the nature of intentionality and the role of language in social life (cf. Duranti 1988; Friedrich 1990; Rumsey 1990; Silverstein 1979; Stroud 1992). In practice, then, even language-oriented works in orthodox psychological anthropology narrowly focus on decontextualized language (e.g., the "meaning" of words) rather than contextualized language use.

At the other extreme, sociolinguistic approaches to language commonly fail to address issues of concern to psychological anthropologists by ignoring or even denying the possibility of discourse being related to culture. Research stemming from linguistic approaches to interaction typically seeks explanatory links between structural characteristics and such psychological processes as constraints on memory, the nature of processing mechanisms, and ease of acquisition (see Coulthard 1977; Stubbs 1983; and Van Dijk 1985 for overviews). Even works that focus on social aspects of interaction appeal uncritically to allegedly universal sociocognitive notions like "interpersonal involvement," which are taken to transcend situational, social, and cultural boundaries (cf. Besnier 1994 for a discussion of problems with such analytic categories). While the possibility that culture can "influence" the structure of discourse is sometimes recognized, it is commonly shown to affect only "superficial" and least significant features of discourse and is rarely seen as playing a mediating role in the construction of meaning. In short, the insignificant role accorded to culture in the structuring

of discourse in these frameworks is symptomatic of the "cognitive bias" extant in general linguistics (Ochs 1979).

THE MEANING OF DISCOURSE FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Discourse is one of the most commonly invoked and least frequently defined terms in contemporary scholarship (as discussed in Macdonnell 1986). The multiplicity of meanings variously attached to the term is partly the consequence of the large number of disciplines in the human sciences, social sciences, and humanities claiming the study of communication in its various guises as their area of expertise. While all definitions seem to agree that talk and writing reside at the center of discourse, they diverge dramatically over which aspects of talk and writing should constitute an object of study: at one extreme, "postmodern" theory, inspired principally by Foucault (1981), views discourse as the historically situated symbolic order that frames and sanctions certain types of social action and statements (Frank 1992); at the other extreme, sociolinguists understand "discourse analysis" as the microscopic investigation of the linguistic form of talk and writing beyond sentence level. However, that the various entities of concern to different disciplines are called by the same term is not a happenstance. Indeed, there is a compelling, if complex, connection between discourse as symbolic order and discourse as linguistic form, in that the two constantly inform one another and depend on one another's existence. In other words, linguistic practice, even in the most mundane of contexts, is always grounded in symbolic matrices for social action and cultural understanding; in return, these matrices are constantly informed by social practice (Bourdieu 1977b), linguistic practice in particular.

Neither orthodox Foucaultian nor narrowly sociolinguistic agendas are of compelling relevance to the concerns of psychological anthropologists. Of greater analytic value are approaches based on a hybrid (and somewhat vague) definition of discourse that consider as their object of inquiry the relationship between linguistic practices and the social and cultural world in which these practices emerge. While they do not constitute an integrated theory with a distinctive methodology (hence my use of the plural form "approaches"), works in this vein share a number of characteristics. First, from a methodological standpoint, they are based on painstakingly transcribed recordings of (often naturalistic) language in use, rather than translations or impressionistic paraphrases, but remain keenly aware of the interpretive nature of recording and transcribing (cf. Tedlock 1983). Second, they view meaning as created through the interaction of microscopic features of linguistic form, semantic content, and sociocultural context, rather than just form, as in the work of sociolinguists, or just content and context, as advocated by Grillo (1989:19), among others. Third, they view the interaction between discourse and context as dynamic, dialogic, and potentially problematic (Goodwin and Duranti 1992). Finally, they analyze linguistic

action as one instance of social action and recognize that linguistic action shares numerous characteristics with other instances of social action (e.g., it can function as an instrument of power). What follows develops and illustrates these premises.

DISCOURSE IN SEMIOTIC PERSPECTIVE

Most of our understanding of the relationship between discourse and the psychological world derives from research that adopts, either overtly or tacitly, a semiotic perspective. The semiotic model developed by C. S. Pierce, which has proved most useful in the anthropological analysis of discourse, is based on a three-way classification of signs: symbols, arbitrarily and conventionally related to their referent; icons, which refer by physical resemblance; and indexes, whose relationship to that for which they stand is established by pointing, either physically or metaphorically. Of these three types, indexes are the most "slippery": not only does an index lack a specific meaning outside of a context, but, when embedded in a particular context, it commonly has many potential meanings. Furthermore, indexes usually work in conjunction with one another, so that their meaning is derived from the intersection of the possible meanings of each individual index.

The relationship between discourse and its sociocultural context is primarily indexical (Silverstein 1992), although it can also have iconic characteristics (Caton 1986; Irvine 1989; Urban 1988). For example, interactors rarely communicate emotional experience simply by naming emotion categories, an action that itself would have indexical characteristics and is thus more complex than usually assumed (as Crapanzano 1989 suggested); rather, they do so more opaquely, through such linguistic devices as word choice, syntactic structure, hesitations, tempo, and pitch, and through such interactive strategies as gestures and their alignment with talk (Goodwin 1981). Similarly, writing offers many comparable indexical tools, such as punctuation and writing material: the "same" message has widely divergent emotional qualities when it is printed on the page of a book published by a prestigious academic press and when it is spray-painted on a concrete wall (Street and Besnier 1994). The result is that any aspect of the structure of language and interaction can index emotion. Furthermore, a linguistic or interactional feature, such as particular intonational contours, the use of reported speech, or the strategic exploitation of vagueness and ambiguity, can index different emotions across different contexts, and, within the confines of a specific context, indexical relations are frequently ambiguous and open to negotiation and conflict (Besnier 1990).

In the light of such indeterminacy, what can a semiotic approach achieve? An illustration of the type of argument that such an approach can aim for is provided by Stroud's (1992) analysis of code switching in Gapun, Papua New Guinea. In multilingual communities, code switching obtains when speakers change languages in midtalk. There is a long tradition of inquiry into the mean-

ing of code switching in sociolinguistics, which has sought to provide a symbolic and hence essentially nonequivocal meaning to every instance of code switching. This literature has attempted to establish that code switches can variously express solidarity, informality, or emotional involvement, among many other things. In this body of work, interdeterminacy of meaning is presented as a problem, which both analysts and interactors must strive to resolve. Through a microscopic analysis of code switching between Tok Pisin (Neo-Melanesian) and Taiap, the language of Gapun, in an oratorical performance, Stroud showed that each code switch can have a broad variety of meanings, and that the resulting ambiguity *is* the meaning of code switching in Gapun. It is thus necessary to speak of the "cultural" meaning of code switching, that is, meaning that is irreducible to a one-to-one relation, but instead consists of an indexical relationship between the form of interaction and a broader cultural context. Gapun villagers view the meaning of talk as polysemic and interactionally constructed: multiple layers of meaning and intentionality can "hide" under the surface of discourse, and their "retrieval" (often characterized by a great deal of uncertainty) can only take place through the collaboration of all participants. This linguistic ideology is in turn embedded in a cultural definition of the person as a complex composite of various facets, some of which are displayed in particular contexts while others remain hidden from the scrutiny of others. Code switching, which is very frequent in Gapun, is one of the many ways in which the cultural definition of personhood and concomitant categories (e.g., an egalitarian ideology, the nature of intentionality, and so on) are displayed, enacted, and reproduced in discourse.

THE CONSTITUTIVE RELATIONSHIP OF DISCOURSE AND ETHNOPSYCHOLOGY

Stroud's analysis illustrates several points. First, discourse and culture are constitutively related. This point may be paraphrased as follows: linguistic practices provide a locus in which culture is created, confirmed, and perhaps debated at the same time that they result from cultural order. Thus the relationship between discourse and context is best understood as an ongoing process of dialogic negotiation, one that Bauman and Briggs (1990) called "contextualization." Second, the way in which Gapun villagers map code switching and meaning highlights the indexical nature of the relationship between discourse and context: Gapun villagers themselves view meaning as indexically derived, and their linguistic ideology is indexically related to the way in which personhood is constructed in their culture. Last, the Gapun notion of personhood affects not simply the referential aspects of discourse (i.e., the "content" of what is said), but, more crucially, the form of discourse and its relationship to linguistic ideology.

The constitutive relationship between language use and personhood is most evident in social contexts in which personhood and identity play a particularly

salient role. Examples of such contexts are greetings and other interaction-initiating moves (as well as farewells and closings, although these have not been subjected to the same detailed scrutiny). Generally speaking, at the beginning of an interaction, interlocutors need to align themselves metaphorically, or, to use Goffman's (1979) apt term, to establish the footing of the interaction. Footing is constituted by the way in which those facets of identity that interlocutors foreground fall into place. Thus greetings can be thought of as contexts in which interactors establish and negotiate their social identities. Caton's (1986) study of greetings in Highland Yemen provides a striking instantiation of this analysis. Caton compared the structure of greeting formulae across two Yemeni ethnic groups, the *sayyid*, reputed descendants of the Prophet, and the *gabīlī*, a "tribal" group. For both groups, piety and *ṣāraf*, usually translated as "honor," are important aspects of personhood; however, the *sayyid* value piety over *ṣāraf*, while for the tribesmen the latter encompasses the former. Caton found that these differing emphases are reflected in the structure of formulaic greeting exchanges. The *sayyid* greet one another in a soft voice, invoking God's name and echoing the greeting formulae uttered by their interlocutors with greater intensity; these features foreground humility and godliness, both manifestations of piety. In contrast, tribesmen exchange structurally symmetrical formulae in a forceful voice; the form of their greetings thus stresses interpersonal equality and assertiveness, qualities associated with *ṣāraf*. The discourse structure of greetings is determined by ideals of personhood among these two groups, but also reinforces these idealizations. The importance of the greeting as a locus for the definition and negotiation of personhood has been stressed in many other studies, such as Irvine's (1974) analysis of status negotiation in the Wolof greetings. In all of these works, the relationship between the social uses of language in everyday contexts and the cultural construction of personhood emerges as a fundamentally dialogic process.

This dialogic relationship is presumably learned early in infancy as part of the cultural equipment that children acquire through language socialization. But there are many contexts in the course of an individual's life that call for a transformation of some aspects of personhood, even in cultures that place a great deal of ideological emphasis on psychological continuity and constancy. For example, in middle-class American society, acknowledging that one has a drinking problem in the context of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) meetings involves learning how to construct oneself as a new person, one who is overpowered by addiction (Erchak 1992:154–59). Again, the greeting is an important index of this new identity. At AA meetings, where members affirm the efficacy of the group's ideology by narrating their biographies, a peculiar routine precedes each testimony: the speaker gets up, declares being an alcoholic, and introduces himself or herself by first name, to which the audience responds with a loud and cheerful "Hi, X!" This seemingly simple formulaic routine in fact has complex meanings: at the very least, it establishes membership in the group (and thus has a shibboleth-like quality); the exclusive use of first names also indexes the

emphasis that the group places on anonymity; and, perhaps most important, it foregrounds alcoholism as the central feature of the speaker's identity, in accordance with a major ideological tenet of AA. In other words, the structure of the routine enacts a very specific ideological agenda and constructs the person according to this agenda.

The pièce de résistance of AA meetings is the autobiographical narrative. Cain (1991) masterfully showed that a narrow range of topics and interpretations is allowed in these narratives; for example, when a novice speaker gives a "wrong" interpretation of a past event in his or her life, more experienced members subtly "correct" the "mistake" in a narrative of their own life story. In other words, becoming a member of AA means learning a particular way of structuring one's autobiography according to specific ideological principles. A fine-grained analysis of this process can shed light on the nature of these principles, on their grounding in the broader cultural context, and on how AA members (and Americans in general) understand personhood.

Stromberg's (1990, 1993) analysis of conversational narratives of religious conversions among American Evangelical Christians is another illustration of how discourse-centered psychological anthropology can unravel the complexities of the linkage between linguistic and psychological behavior. Focusing on autobiographical narratives of conversion experiences, Stromberg identified a number of recurrent themes, including the contextualization of conversion in times of moral and emotional ambivalence (e.g., conflicts between desire and duty, or body and soul). This ambivalence is not solved by conversion, but rather remains with the experiencer, who needs to resolve it repeatedly, and who uses the conversion narrative as an avenue for this resolution. Stromberg demonstrated how moral and emotional ambivalence is subtly indexed in narrative structure. For example, structural features of spoken discourse such as changes in voice quality occur at strategic points in the deployment of the narrative and index the speaker's stance vis-à-vis the narrated events.

Similar findings were reported in Hill (1989), a fine-grained analysis of weeping in a Mexicano (Nahuatl) woman's narrative of the injustices to which she had been subjected in the course of her life. In general, narratives constantly foreground and background different aspects of individuals' identities as they move across time, space, and social contexts, and narrators must negotiate between these various aspects. At the same time, narrators need to provide a connection between the various manifestations of their identities, particularly when they are the protagonist of their story, and they do so by distancing themselves from certain past identities, or by binding together different manifestations of their person. These negotiations take place at levels of meaning other than the referential or literal level. In the case that Hill analyzed, the speaker connected her various identities by skillfully coordinating weeping and narration; for example, she overlay changes in temporal frame (e.g., between past events and the context of narration, between various reported turns at speaking) with weeping, thus securing a sense of continuity across contexts and quoted speakers. In

short, members of all societies and cultures are constantly involved in creating reality, particularly psychological aspects of reality, and discourse is centrally involved in this process. As a genre that decontextualizes the reality of one context and recontextualizes it in another, the narrative is singularly well suited for the discursive construction of reality (Bauman and Briggs 1990).

THE PARTICULARISM OF DISCOURSE-CENTERED APPROACHES

Discourse-centered research on psychological anthropological issues is most successful when it focuses on particular strips of social life, rather than on the social life of a group in general. Even in very small-scale societies, individuals are complex entities, whose makeups, behaviors, and experiences vary from one social sphere or activity to the next (Poole 1991). Thus, rather than seeking broad generalizations about personhood and emotions that are allegedly consistent across all social situations (an enterprise that tacitly presumes that the "other" leads a homogeneous, variation-free life), discourse-centered approaches focus on specific social events, particular practices, and other types of social arrangements and seek to understand how discourse is constitutive of participants' actions and experiences in these particular settings. (See the chapter by Janis Jenkins in part I.)

Areas of social life that have yielded particularly rich material are what can be loosely termed "transformations," that is, settings in which aspects of ethnopsychological processes and categories are foregrounded, defined, modified, or reproduced. The prototypical example of a transformative context is the Western-style therapeutic encounter (Labov and Fanshel 1977; Wodak 1986). In non-Western cultures, many situations are bracketed for similar purposes: analyses of the discourse of conflict resolution and mediation, for example, can provide the analyst rich insights into ethnotheories of person and emotion, and the articulation of these theories with social practice (Brenneis 1988; Briggs 1988; Grimshaw 1990; Watson-Gegeo and White 1990). Spirit possession and mediumship (cf. the chapter by Erika Bourguignon in this volume) are other examples of transformative contexts in which local notions of personhood are foregrounded in a particularly dramatic way; unfortunately, possession and mediumship have been subjected to very little discourse-centered research. Also of interest to discourse-centered psychological anthropology are social situations in which psychological categories and processes are foregrounded in more subtle ways. For example, an examination of the oratorical, argumentative, and persuasive discourse that takes place in political or legal contexts can illuminate local theories of intentionality and agency (e.g., Duranti 1990), among other things. Situations of interest to discourse-centered approaches also include the mundane happenings of everyday life in which ritualization is less obvious (although it is never absent, as Goffman demonstrated); these include contexts in which biographical narratives play an important role, such as gossip.

One aspect of social life that has lent itself to particularly successful discourse-centered analysis is socialization. Research in the emergent "language socialization" framework (e.g., Kulick 1992; Ochs 1988; Schieffelin 1990) has shown that the linguistic practices that children are exposed to and immersed in from early childhood play a pivotal role in their social development. For example, it is through the structure, content, and context of the utterances that caregivers address to them that children learn to think and feel in socially sanctioned ways and derive a sense of what society expects of them and of what they can expect in return. The relationship between language use and the "messages" that adults and children exchange about the role of the person in the sociocultural context is complex and easy to dismiss, as Bloch (1991) did, without a proper understanding of the nature of linguistic practice and its articulation with social action and culture. By focusing on the ontogeny of the categories that concern psychological anthropologists, language socialization research provides a better understanding of how emotionality and personhood are constituted through everyday discursive practices (cf. the chapter by Joan Miller in this volume).

In making sense of transformative contexts, discourse can be centralized in various ways. First, the ethnographer can arrive at a fine-grained analysis of the linguistic behavior that takes place during transformation and tease out an understanding of how this behavior reflects and constructs psychological processes. For example, the content and form of a spirit medium's utterances can provide important insights into the dynamics at play between the various voices copresent in the mediumship session. A second approach consists in examining verbal accounts of transformational situations, for example, in narratives or explanations that members of social groups generate either spontaneously or in interview situations. Discourse-centered approaches to these materials foreground the semiotic complexity of the relationship between verbal accounts, the events that these accounts purportedly represent, and the context in which accounts are produced, rather than simply viewing the account as the straightforward representation of a discourse-independent reality.

DISCOURSE, PSYCHOLOGICAL PROCESSES, AND SOCIAL FORMATIONS

Some of the more promising discourse-centered work in contemporary psychological anthropology has addressed the relationship between discursive, psychological, and social processes. This body of research recognizes that personhood, emotions, and related categories are embedded in social structures and political contexts from which they cannot be divorced. Hence the attributions of certain psychological characteristics to particular groups or individuals can place these groups and individuals on the social map and provide a justification for resulting patterns of social inequality. Certain emotions and general "demeanors" (in Goffman's terminology, presentations of self) can be given

prestige, while others can be devalued; these evaluations can in turn give greater prestige to groups and individuals associated with valued emotions and demeanors at the expense of other groups (e.g., Hochschild 1983; Sennett and Cobb 1972). It is frequently through linguistic practice, the common locus of social legitimization and devaluation (cf. Bourdieu 1977a; Gal 1989), that psychological processes interact with social and political practice. For instance, among the Wolof of Senegal, members of the noble caste commonly display, particularly in social situations where rank is foregrounded, an emotional composure that contrasts sharply with the highly emotional communicative style of the low-ranking griots (Irvine 1990). In Wolof ideology, particularly as articulated by high-ranking individuals, these differences in presentation of self explain why the society is hierarchically structured. Even though rank manifests itself in many other ways, the Wolof view other manifestations as secondary and isolate emotionality and personhood as the primordial motivations for rank.

Ethnographic research on discourse and the politics of gender and emotion (reviewed in Gal 1991) illustrates how discourse-centered approaches can shed light on the interface of psychological and sociopolitical processes. For example, Briggs's (1992) analysis of Warao women's emotionally charged ritual wailing demonstrated how this genre affords women in this South American society a rare chance to present their perspective on the events that lead to the death of a mourned relative. The overtly stated purpose of wailing is to enable the wailer to express the sorrow and rage that the death occasioned. But wailing is unusual in being the only context in which women can claim a public voice in Warao society. In their wailed narratives, through strategic choices of kin terms and reported-speech constructions, for example, women often represent social relations and past events differently from the way men do in other contexts. These wailed accounts thus challenge received accounts and, at the same time, the legitimacy of men's versions of reality. Their effects can be far-reaching. Crucially, women employ a genre in which emotions play a central role to protest against and resist men's dominance. The emotions articulated in a particular performative genre, and the manner in which they are articulated, become intimately associated with counterhegemonic action in Warao culture, as well as in other cultures (e.g., Abu-Lughod 1986). In sum, by paying equal attention to microscopic aspects of social practice and to macroscopic processes at play in society and culture, discourse-centered approaches address the relationship between the various meanings of the term *discourse*.

Are the approaches I have described in this chapter appropriate to all cultural contexts? It is commonly recognized in anthropology (and, increasingly, in some subfields of psychology) that Western societies conceptualize person and emotions as bounded, cross-contextually consistent, and situated in the individual. This view is often contrasted with understandings attributed to most other cultures, in which these categories are context-bound and constructed in interaction (e.g., Geertz 1984; Heelas 1986; Markus and Kitayama 1991; Shweder and Bourne 1984). At first glance, discourse-centered approaches seem best suited

to the study of cultures where the "psychological" is viewed in transactional terms if one holds the view that ethnographic analysis is most successful when it closely resembles local assumptions about the construction of the world (a stance that itself is open to debate). Indeed, if personhood and emotions are located (or at least constructed) in interaction, then it is to interaction and discourse that the investigator must look for an understanding of their nature and ontogeny. Presumably, in cultures where psychological categories are located within the individual, interaction and discourse can only be taken as "symptoms" or "manifestations" of that which is hidden inside the person.

However, methodologies that pay particular attention to discourse have proved equally useful in studying communities that maintain classically individualistic conceptions of the person and emotions. In particular, discourse-centered approaches can demonstrate that social practice in the West betrays a considerably more diverse picture than the traditional individualistic model depicts. As argued by scholars of different persuasions (feminism, critical theory, social constructionism), individualism does play a pivotal role in Western (particularly North American) ethnopsychological models; but it does so in the context of a specific ideology that is related in a complex manner to social practice and to other ideologies with which it competes. An individualistic ideology reflects and enables the middle-class idealization of self-reliant upward mobility; however, these values are not necessarily shared by members of other social classes (cf. Bellah et al. 1985; Ehrenreich 1989; Ortner 1991; Sennett and Cobb 1972; and many others). In other words, the individualism of Western personhood and emotionality is of an ideological nature, and its promotion to the status of key symbol of the West in anthropological thinking instantiates the tendency to reify Western culture that Carrier (1992) aptly termed "occidentalism." Furthermore, the West does not have a monopoly on individualistic theories of psychological processes, as shown by Poole (1991) and Hollan (1992). Discourse-centered approaches are particularly well equipped to deconstruct current anthropological models of Western ethnopsychology (cf. Carbaugh 1989; Lutz 1990; Miller et al. 1990; Ochs, Smith, and Taylor 1989, among others), and to unravel the conflicts, ambiguities, and contradictions that arise across competing ideologies, between ideology and practice, and between discourse and social action in Western settings.

NOTE

REFERENCES

Abu-Lughod, L. 1986. *Veiled Sentiments: Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bauman, R., and C. L. Briggs. 1990. Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Social Life. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19:59–88.

Bellah, R., R. Madsen, W. M. Sullivan, A. Swindler, and S. M. Tipton. 1985. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Besnier, N. 1990. Language and Affect. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19:419–51.

———— 1994. Involvement in Linguistic Practice: An Ethnographic Appraisal. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

Bloch, M. 1991. Language, Anthropology, and Cognitive Science. *Man* 26:183–98.

Bourdieu, P. 1977a. The Economics of Linguistic Exchanges. *Social Science Information* 16:645–68.

————. 1977b. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Trans. R. Nice. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

Brenneis, D. 1988. Language and Disputing. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 17:221–37.

Briggs, C. L. 1992. "Since I Am a Woman, I Will Chastise My Relatives": Gender, Reported Speech, and the (Re)production of Social Relations in Warao Ritual Wailing. *American Ethnologist* 19:337–61.

————. ed. 1988. Narrative Resources for the Creation and Mediation of Conflict [Special Issue]. *Anthropological Linguistics* 30(3/4).

Cain, C. 1991. Personal Stories: Identity Acquisition and Self-Understanding in Alcoholics Anonymous. *Ethos* 19:210–53.

Carbaugh, D. 1988. *Talking American: Cultural Discourses on Donahue*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Carrier, J. 1992. Occidentalism: The World Turned Upside-Down. *American Ethnologist* 19:195–212.

Caton, S. C. 1986. *Salam Tahiiyah*: Greetings from the Highlands of Yemen. *American Ethnologist* 13:290–308.

Coulthard, M. 1977. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.

Crapanzano, V. 1989. Preliminary Notes on the Glossing of Emotions. *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers* 69–70:78–85.

Duranti, A. 1988. Intentions, Language, and Social Action in a Samoan Context. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12:13–33.

————. 1990. Politics and Grammar: Agency in Samoan Political Discourse. *American Ethnologist* 17:646–66.

Ehrenreich, B. 1989. *Fear of Falling: The Inner Life of the Middle Class*. New York: Pantheon.

Erchak, G. M. 1992. *The Anthropology of Self and Behavior*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Foucault, M. 1981. The Order of Discourse. Pp. 48–78 in R. Young, ed., *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Frank, M. 1992. On Foucault's Concept of Discourse. Pp. 99–116 in T. J. Armstrong, ed., *Michel Foucault, Philosopher*. New York: Routledge.

Friedrich, P. 1990. Language, Ideology, and Political Economy. *American Anthropologist* 92:295–312.

Gal, S. 1989. Language and Political Economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18:345–67.

————. 1991. Between Speech and Silence: The Problematics of Research on Language and Gender. Pp. 175–203 in M. di Leonardo, ed., *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Postmodern Era*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Geertz, C. 1984. From the Native's Point of View: On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding. Pp. 123–36 in R. A. Shweder and R. A. LeVine, eds., *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, E. 1979. Footing. *Semiotica* 25:1–29.

Goodwin, C. 1981. *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, C., and A. Duranti. 1992. Rethinking Context: An Introduction. Pp. 1–42 in A. Duranti

and C. Goodwin, eds., *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language, 11. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

Grillo, R. 1989. Anthropology, Language, Politics. Pp. 1–24 in R. Grillo, ed., *Social Anthropology and the Politics of Language*. Sociological Review Monographs, 36. London: Routledge.

Grimshaw, A. D., ed. 1990. *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations of Arguments in Conversations*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

Heelas, P. 1986. Emotion Talk across Cultures. Pp. 234–66 in R. Harré, ed., *The Social Construction of Emotions*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hill, J. H. 1989. Weeping as a Meta-Signal in a Mexicano Woman's Narrative. *Journal of Folklore Research* 27:29–47.

Hochschild, A. R. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hollan, D. 1992. Cross-Cultural Differences in the Self. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 48:283–300.

Irvine, J. T. 1974. Strategies of Status Manipulation in the Wolof Greeting. Pp. 167–91 in R. Bauman and J. Sherzer, eds., *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

————. 1989. When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy. *American Ethnologist* 16:248–67.

————. 1990. Registering Affect: Heteroglossia in the Linguistic Expression of Emotion. Pp. 126–61 in C. A. Lutz and L. Abu-Lughod, eds., *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Studies in Emotion and Social Interaction. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press; Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Kulick, D. 1992. *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction: Socialization, Self, and Syncretism in a Papua New Guinea Village*. Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language, 14. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

Labov, W., and D. Fanshel. 1977. *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

Lutz, C. A. 1990. Engendered Emotion: Gender, Power, and the Rhetoric of Emotional Control in American Discourse. Pp. 69–91 in C. A. Lutz and L. Abu-Lughod, eds., *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Studies in Emotion and Social Interaction. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press; Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Macdonnell, P. 1986. *Theories of Discourse: An Introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Markus, H. R., and S. Kitayama. 1991. Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation. *Psychological Review* 98:224–53.

Miller, P. J., R. Potts, H. Fung, L. Hoogstra, and J. Mintz. 1990. Narrative Practices and the Social Construction of Self in Childhood. *American Ethnologist* 17:292–311.

Ochs, E. 1979. Social Foundations of Language. Pp. 207–21 in R. O. Freedle, ed., *New Directions in Discourse Processing*. Advances in Discourse Processes, 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

————. 1988. *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language, 6. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E., R. Smith, and C. Taylor. 1989. Detective stories at Dinnertime: Problem-Solving through Co-Narration. *Cultural Dynamics* 2: 238–57.

Ortner, S. 1991. Reading America: Preliminary Notes on Class and Culture. Pp. 163–89 in R. G. Fox, ed., *Recapturing Anthropology: Writing in the Present*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Poole, F. J. P. 1991. Cultural Schemas and Experiences of the Self among the Bimin-Kuskusmin of Papua New Guinea. *Psychoanalytic Study of Society* 16:55–85.

Rosaldo, M. Z. 1980. *Knowledge and Passion: Ilongot Notions of Self and Social Life*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenberg, D. V. 1990. Language in the Discourse of the Emotions. Pp. 162–85 in C. A. Lutz and L. Abu-Lughod, eds., *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Studies in Emotion and Social Interaction. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press; Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Rumsey, A. 1990. Wording, Meaning, and Linguistic Ideology. *American Anthropologist* 92:346–79.

Schieffelin, B. 1990. *The Give and Take of Everyday Life: Language Socialization of Kaluli Children*. Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language, 9. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

Sennett, R., and J. Cobb. 1972. *The Hidden Injuries of Class*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Sherzer, J. 1987. A Discourse-centered Approach to Language and Culture. *American Anthropologist* 89:295–309.

Shweder, R. A., and E. J. Bourne. 1984. Does the Concept of the Person Vary Cross-Culturally? Pp. 158–99 in R. A. Shweder and R. A. LeVine, eds., *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

Silverstein, M. 1979. Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. Pp. 193–247 in P. R. Clyne, W. Hanks, and C. L. Hofbauer, eds., *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

——. 1992. The Indeterminacy of Contextualization: When Is Enough Enough? Pp. 55–76 in P. Auer and A. di Luzio, eds., *The Contextualization of Language*. Pragmatics and Beyond, New Series, 22. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Street, B. V., and N. Besnier. 1994. Aspects of Literacy. Pp. 527–62 in T. Ingold, ed. *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology, Humanity, Culture, and Social Life*. London: Routledge.

Stromberg, P. G. 1990. Ideological Language in the Transformation of Identity. *American Anthropologist* 92:42–56.

——. 1993. *Language and Self-Transformation: A Study of the Christian Conversion Narrative*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

Stroud, C. 1992. The Problem of Intention and Meaning in Code-Switching. *Text* 12:127–55.

Stubbs, M. 1983. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Language in Society, 4. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Tedlock, D. 1983. *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Urban, G. 1988. Ritual Wailing in Amerindian Brazil. *American Anthropologist* 90:385–400.

van Dijk, T. A., ed. 1985. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 4 vols. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A., and G. M. White, eds. 1990. *Disentangling: Conflict Discourse in Pacific Societies*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

White, G. M. 1992. Ethnopsychology. Pp. 21–46 in T. Schwartz, G. M. White, and C. A. Lutz, eds., *New Directions in Psychological Anthropology*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

——. 1993. Emotions Inside Out: The Anthropology of Affect. Pp. 29–39 in M. Lewis and J. Haviland, eds., *Handbook of Emotions*. New York: Guilford Press.

Wodak, R. 1986. *Language Behavior in Therapy Groups*. Berkeley: University of California Press.