Editorial

Embodiment in Discourse

Over the past 20 years, approaches within disciplines across the social sciences and humanities, including Anthropology (e.g., Duranti, 1997; Duranti and Goodwin, 1992), Applied Linguistics (e.g., Goodwin, 1981; Ochs, 1992) , Education (e.g., Gutierrez, 1995), and Sociology (e.g., Heritage, 1984; Sacks et. al., 1974; Schegloff, 1972), have converged in their appreciation of language, interaction and culture as embodied phenomena (Schegloff, Ochs, & Thompson, 1996). While these various approaches share many elements, we believe one is central: language, interaction, and culture can be most fruitfully investigated via the detailed examination of courses of conduct unfolding in real time. Celebrating the core, as well as the broadest, elements of this convergence, UCLA's 1997 Conference on Language, Interaction, and Culture chose 'Embodiment in Discourse' as its theme. The fruits of this endeavor are collected in this volume.

Contributing in the first place to their own disciplines of Anthropology, Applied Linguistics, Education, Germanic Languages, and Sociology, the following seven papers participate in the above described 'core' by relying on transcripts and video stills drawn from audio and video recorded data. Beyond this shared element, however, these papers are most striking for their range of focus. Briefly introducing each should give some indication of the rich understanding facilitated by focusing on the embodiment of culture, language and interaction in discourse.

At its most literal, 'Embodiment in Discourse' can be understood to thematize that it is participants-in-bodies who conduct discourse. Both Kidwell and Wu focus on participants' active management of participation frameworks through a combination of gaze, gesture and talk. Kidwell expands our understanding of the category 'recipient' by focusing on what she aptly names 'recipient proactivity.' As Kidwell notes, the current literature on recipiency primarily emphasizes how speakers shape talk for their recipients. In contrast, she focuses squarely on recipiency itself as a course of action by analyzing a stretch of interaction in which an unaddressed participant constitutes herself as a recipient of in-progress talk. Kidwell describes how this participant first demonstrates her recipiency through gaze direction and escalates her intervention to include talk. While Kidwell's paper highlights that gesture, gaze and talk can be alternative resources, Wu demonstrates the depth at which they can work in concert. Wu first describes two turn formats that speakers of Mandarin deploy to involve previously inactive participants, one that continues the trajectory of prior talk, and a second that is disjunctive with it. Wu then demonstrates that the different ways that speakers comport themselves in the course of uttering these turns 'embody' their orientation to the

Issues in Applied Linguistics
ISSN 1050-4273

Vol. 8 No. 2, 81-83

degree the actions they initiate with them are disjunctive.

It is also participants-in-bodies that draw on combinations of gaze, gesture and talk to realize and organize activities in interaction. Taleghani-Nikazm and Vlatten examine the activities of instruction giving and instruction receiving during the course of a cooking lesson. They show (consistent with Kidwell) that recipients draw on a variety of gestures, other embodied actions, and talk to receipt, repeat, and initiate repair on instructions. For example, the authors note that, at times, it is a combination of a verbal token plus a gesture that marks receipt of an instruction, whereas in other cases, it is a gesture that serves to further the activity being undertaken. Likewise, the paper by Bhimji examines the verbal and nonverbal cues employed by parents while correcting their children's behavior. She argues that to correct their children parents draw on forms of teasing as well as "mitigated" and "unmitigated" forms of repair. Bhimji suggests that the differences between this and other studies of adult-child correction are tied to the different activities in which the participants are involved. From participation frameworks to the organization of activities then, these authors demonstrate the continuing importance of attending to the literally embodied character of human conduct.

But, this theme need not be read only literally. Embodiment in Discourse can also direct our attention to the myriad ways that interactants realize identities, political stances, and cultures as worldly objects in and through determinant courses of conduct. For example, Larson describes how a first grade teacher socializes her students using a writing process that primarily emphasizes whole language pedagogy, but that nonetheless draws on the 'basic' skills typically emphasized in the phonics approach. She notes that while these two approaches are frequently cast as mutually exclusive in political debates that treat teaching philosophies as disembodied phenomena, such views fail to engage what actually happens in the classroom. While Larson emphasizes the gulf between political debates about conduct and actual conduct, Clark focuses on how the abstract categories frequently drawn on in such debates are instantiated and reinforced in interaction. Clark describes how a teacher can alternatively foreground his identity as an African American or as a teacher through his use of particular rhetorical styles. Moreover, he argues that the teacher's modeling of "elite" styles of talk over "vernacular" ones further promotes middle class and white ways of talking.

Finally, moving to culture, Monaghan explores the issue of embodiment in terms of the intersection of sign language and space. Looking at the meetings of a New Zealand Deaf women's group, she explores the reflexive relationship between the interactants' use of space and their use of both sign language and lip speaking. Using a quantitative analysis of the seating patterns at these meetings, the author argues that in this Deaf community there is a general random pattern that reflects an emphasis on group interactions rather than on interactions with persons seated next to each other. This contrasts with what one might expect in hearing Western European culture. Viewed more broadly then, this theme invites us to re-engage aspects of human conduct too often treated as general, ephemeral

and omnirelevant and respecify them as embodied in detailed, concrete and particular courses of action.

This volume also embodies *our* first effort as new editors of *ial*: a collaborative effort with Geoff Raymond (Sociology, UCLA) serving as guest co-editor and Emmy Goldknopf (Applied Linguistics, UCLA) serving as assistant editor. Though Betsy Rymes' tenure as editor of *ial* ended with the last issue, we continue to reap the rewards of her expert stewardship. We thank her for this and only hope we can maintain and build on the high standards she established.

December 1997

Anna Guthrie
Geoffrey Raymond
Tanya Stivers

REFERENCES

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Duranti, A. & Goodwin, C. (1992). *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Gutierrez, K.D. (1995) Unpacking academic discourse. *Discourse Processes, 19*, 21-37.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.) *Rethinking context* (pp.335-358). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50,* (4), 696-735.

Schegloff, E.A. (1972). Sequencing in conversational openings. In J.J. Gumperz & D.Hymes (Eds.) *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 346-380). New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.

Schegloff, E.A., Ochs, E., & Thompson, S.A. (1996). Introduction. In Ochs, E.,

Schegloff, E.A. & Thompson, S.A. (Eds.) *Interaction and grammar* (1-51). Cambridge: Cambridge University.