

tic and semantic) structure. In doing this kind of prosodic analysis, grammarlike consistency or unity of meaning cannot be assumed. Rather, one looks for general patterns in the use and functioning of prosodic cues within and across speakers, in relation to particular discourse tasks (such as giving a narrative account).

The notations used in transcribing prosodic and paralinguistic cues were developed by Gumperz and his collaborators based on Trimm's work. In this system, tone group boundaries are indicated as major "/"/ or minor "/". Within the tone group, pitch contour on the nucleus is indicated as follows: "low fall, high fall, low rise, high rise, high rise, fall-rise, fall-rise. Secondary heads are high or low. Paralinguistic features are indicated as follows: a) shift to high pitch register "c" or shift to low pitch register "c" (both applying to the entire tone group), b) pausing indicating a break in timing and "acc" indicating a measurable pause, c) vowel elongation following the elongated syllable, d) speech rate: "acc" indicating accelerating tempo, and "dec" indicating slowing down, e) loudness over an entire tone group is indicated by "p" (soft) or "f" (loud). Doubling of any one of the above symbols indicates extra emphasis.

## REFERENCES

- Au, K. H. (1980). On participation structures in reading lessons. *Anthropology and education quarterly* XI, number 2: 91-115.
- Collins, J., & Michaels, S. (1980). The importance of conversational discourse strategies in the acquisition of literacy. In *Proceedings of the sixth Annual Meetings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*.
- Cooley, R. (1979). Spokes in a wheel: A linguistic and rhetorical analysis of Native American public discourse. In *Proceedings of the fifth Annual Meetings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*.
- Erickson, F. (1971). Studying black rhetoric and logic: An anthropological approach to contrastive analysis. Paper delivered at American Educational Research Association, New York City.
- Erickson, F. (1975). Gatekeeping and the melting pot. *Harvard educational review* 45: 44-70.
- Gumperz, J. (1976). Language, communication, and public negotiation. In P. Sanday (ed.), *Anthropology and the public interest*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, J., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1976). Context in children's speech. In *Papers on language and context* (Working Paper # 46) Berkeley: Language Behavior Research Laboratory, University of California.
- Ladd, R. (1980). *The structure of intonational meaning: Evidence from English*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Michaels, S., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1979). A study of sharing time with first grade students: Discourse narratives in the classroom. In *Proceedings of the fifth Annual Meetings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*.

## REVIEWS

## DIMENSIONS OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS

K. R. SCHERER and H. GILES (eds.). *Social markers in speech*. Cambridge University Press, 1979. Pp. 395.

Social scientists have recently recognized the similarities between their own endeavors when explaining and predicting social behaviors and the day-to-day endeavors of the subjects they study. Social scientists draw hypotheses from formal theories and assess the validity of theoretical hypotheses by collecting data systematically on social behavior. Similarly, their subjects regularly draw upon implicit theories about personalities and social interactions to prepare for and engage in social behavior. Although the hypotheses people derive from their implicit theories are occasionally discarded because they receive disconfirming social information (e.g., if Einstein spoke slowly, you might reject the stereotype of slow-speaking people being unintelligent), in most instances these hypotheses are resistant to substantial revisions because of the mitigating influence of biased assimilation and behavioral confirmation. It is imperative in the study of social behavior, therefore, to determine (a) what cues people use to make judgments regarding the personal characteristics, social group memberships, and psychological states of others; (b) under what conditions such judgments are made accurately versus inaccurately; and (c) what degree of control people can exert in projecting specific cues.

Scherer and Giles's edited volume (1979), *Social markers in speech*, represents a systematic attempt to review the diverse literatures (cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural) concerning the influence of speech cues in this process of interpersonal judgment. The term "speech marker" refers to noncontent speech cues, which listeners utilize (or could potentially utilize) to derive working hypotheses about a speaker's biological, psychological, and social characteristics. Since the goal is to go beyond speech stereotypes (links between speech cues and attributions), the correspondence must also be established between speech cues and actual characteristics of speakers. A speech cue that is correlated with a speaker characteristic is said to be an "etic" marker, while an etic marker that also has social meaningfulness in terms of interpersonal judgments is said to be an "emic" marker. The study of speech markers must be concerned primarily with emic markers, but a good understanding of the range of etic markers (the candidates for emic status) is a necessary base.

A variety of perspectives is reflected in the chapters. In Chapter 1, Laver and Trudgill provide a linguistic framework for the classification of etic markers.

They make the distinction between permanent vocal features deriving from anatomical differences among people (e.g., voice quality), quasi-permanent voice settings (e.g., some aspects of particular regional accents, such as a nasal voice), communicative paralinguistic cues (e.g., tone of voice), and transient articulatory realizations of phonological units (i.e., segmental and suprasegmental variants). Grammatical, lexical, and discourse variations are also considered speech markers. While permanent features are not under muscular control and can serve only as physical markers, all the other variations can serve as social and psychological markers. In a brief commentary on listeners' use of markers, the authors distinguish between actual markers and two important classes of apparent markers: misleading markers, under the speaker's control, and misinterpreted markers, mistakenly taken to be signals of a speaker characteristic.

Brown and Fraser in Chapter 2 build upon the analysis of speech markers by providing a sociological perspective. Fundamentally, speech markers are viewed as multiply ambiguous in that they are typically linked to a number of social variables. They distinguish between dispositional and situational influences on speech and verbal styles and caution the reader not to underestimate the importance of the situation. Specific instances are described in which social markers in speech might appear contingent on individual characteristics, but are in fact importantly dependent upon situational factors (i.e., setting, participants, and purpose). For example, apparently personal attributes such as social status or power have associated with them a set of markers (e.g., "powerful" vs. "powerless" speech). These personal attributes, however, are not as intrinsic to the participant as one might initially judge, but rather are highly dependent upon the setting and the activity. As the authors note, a doctor may employ a more powerful form of speech when speaking with a lawyer about a heart condition in a hospital than when discussing a legal issue in the lawyer's office. Not only can setting and purpose alter the use and interpretation of speech markers, but the use of speech markers can also alter the interpretation of situation (e.g., a switch to the in-group dialect to signal increased intimacy vs. a switch from first name to title and last name to signal increased social distance).

Helfrich describes the speech and verbal styles that are associated with age in Chapter 3. This unique life-span developmental review includes discussions of phonological, syntactic, semantic, paralinguistic, and extralinguistic features. Although the coverage and the available literature are heavily weighted toward the young child (except for the extralinguistic features), the attention to speech markers associated with age differences among adults is an important contribution. A further distinction is made between sender (encoding) and receiver (decoding) markers of age. "Sender age markers" are speech cues that indicate to the listener the probable age of the speaker. For instance, certain syntactic and phonological patterns allow listeners to determine a child speaker's approximate age. The same patterns, however, would be considered a "receiver age marker" if the child employed them only when adapting his speech for younger children. A more parsimonious conception for the above distinction is presented in the

final chapter by Giles, Scherer, and Taylor. They describe "probabilistic" speech markers as those designating a particular state some percentage of the time regardless of the context in which they are used. "Conditional" speech markers are those that appear in identifiable contexts or in response to specific cues. Hence, sender age markers could be viewed as probabilistic, whereas receiver age markers could be viewed as conditional. Helfrich concludes, as did Brown and Fraser, with a caveat regarding the inevitable ambiguity of speech markers: "Even an apparently straightforward feature like voice is affected not only by biologically determined age-related processes, but also by social and emotional factors which may or may not be associated with age" (97).

The fourth chapter concerns sex markers in speech. In this chapter, Smith distinguishes between speech markers (i.e., etic markers) and speech stereotypes (inferences concerning the link between speech and individual attributes). Scherer, in Chapter 5, employs a similar perspective in his survey of speech markers of personality. Each author initially reviews the evidence for sex-based or personality differences at several levels of linguistic analysis (e.g., pitch, pronunciation, vocabulary). The focus then moves from differences in speech production to differences in speech perception and impression formation. Smith, for instance, points to the research indicating that the perception of sex-based differences in speech was similar for men and women, but that speech cues were used differently when forming an impression of a male versus a female speaker. Overall, the actual speech differences between the two sexes are much smaller than the speech stereotypes, which can be viewed to a significant extent as misinterpreted markers. Unfortunately, it is unclear whether the sex-based differences in speech production and in cue-utilization are intrinsic to gender or to the assumed roles (e.g., social position) of men and women. What Smith refers to as sex stereotypes, therefore, may be more parsimoniously viewed as being social role stereotypes.

Scherer discusses primarily the speech markers of extroversion and adopts a more deferential posture regarding the importance of setting and social roles than does Smith. In particular, his cross-cultural data argue strongly for culture-specific correspondences between personality traits and speech cues. Scherer introduces the valuable concept of *marker power*, the likelihood that the speech cue will lead to a correct attribution of a particular personality trait (or social group membership). Relatedly, the tendency toward overestimation of marker power is a pervasive phenomenon that must be incorporated into any theory of speech markers. Interestingly, Scherer also addresses the self-presentational strategies that speakers can employ by varying consciously their speech cues, a point that is highlighted in the epilogue by Giles, Scherer, and Taylor.

In the next two chapters, Robinson examines etic and emic markers of socioeconomic status, and Giles reviews markers of ethnicity. Robinson questions whether SES is a useful explanatory variable, suggesting that analyses both on a more global sociostructural level and on a more specific level (in terms of role relationships and in-group/out-group relations) would be more valuable.

Useful methodological critiques of a variety of approaches in the study of speech markers are offered. Giles identifies variations in speech that are to be found among different ethnic groups, but goes further by discussing intra-individual variations in speech style during conversation with in-group versus out-group members. An important theoretical framework is outlined; it proposes that the use of ethnic (or other social) markers can be understood in terms of current and potential relative group status, search for positive personal and group identity, perception of ethnolinguistic vitality, and perception of the penetrability of ethnic boundaries. This model can predict differences in ethnic speech not only for different groups but also for separate individuals within the same group, for a given individual under varying circumstances, and for changes in a group across time. Finally, Giles emphasizes the fact that ethnic groups may adopt the language of the majority group (assimilation) while retaining their ethnic identity by using distinctive speech cues (e.g., pronunciation, vocabulary usage, grammatical markers).

The penultimate chapter by Brown and Levinson is an insightful critique of the theoretical status of social markers in speech. The authors note that analyses of speech markers of age or sex, for instance, have confounded the influences of the targeted biological factor (i.e., age or sex) and social relationships (e.g., adults generally have more power and status than children). Brown and Levinson also argue explicitly against the assumptions underlying several of the preceding chapters: (a) that there are direct correlations between selected social and linguistic variables; (b) that these covariations are perceived and utilized in the conduct of interaction by participants; and (c) that an inventory of these covariants constitutes a theory of social markers. The authors conclude that an adequate model of the extraction of social information from speech must include an account of how participants utilize information about the interrelationships among sociostructural, interactional, and linguistic systems.

The epilogue by Giles, Scherer, and Taylor adds cohesiveness to the book. The authors propose that social markers in speech function at two levels. "At the most fundamental, [speech markers] serve as easily perceived auditory stimuli which permit speakers to reveal their association with broadly defined biological, social and psychological states, and listeners to categorize others accurately in these terms" (343). At this rudimentary level, speech markers provide the auditory counterpart of the visual trappings of social role, biological disposition, and psychological state. Giles et al. suggest that level 1 speech markers operate at a relatively automatic, unintentional level and are typically redundant with other cues.

The second level of speech markers is distinguished from the first by the emotional significance of the cues to the interlocutors and, to a lesser extent, by the purposive component of their emission by speakers and utilization by listeners. "At [this] second and psychologically more important level, speech markers permit interlocutors indirectly to communicate important attitudes, beliefs, val-

ues, and intentions about their social states as well as processing the emotional significance of the social states of others" (344). The operation of level 2 speech markers can be further specified as facilitating the organization of social information by speakers and listeners and as helping speakers obtain and maintain a self-concept. The cognitive organizational function is exemplified by a speaker deliberately altering his or her speech style to communicate more effectively with a listener and by the listener forming and acting upon impressions of the speaker. In terms of the identity maintenance function, the speaker may utilize particular speech cues (e.g., a prestigious accent or an advanced vocabulary) to project or protect a particular self-image, while the listener may interpret or misinterpret these speech markers for the same reasons. The relative importance of these two functions depends upon the salience of self-image (or group identity) within an interaction.

The remainder of the chapter is used to present additional distinctions important for an eventual theory of speech markers and to provide evidence for these and for the above taxonomy of speech markers. The fact that much of this is drawn from the preceding chapters helps to integrate the book. The authors conclude by emphasizing the need for simultaneous analyses of clusters of speech markers rather than single markers; studies of the interaction of situational and dispositional factors in the production and interpretation of speech markers; and examinations of the dynamic stream of speech markers in conversations rather than static ctes in contrived monologues.

Although these future directions have merit, readers may feel uncomfortable traveling in new directions before several issues raised in the volume are resolved. This book does not offer a theory of speech markers, but rather detailed descriptions of an impressive diversity of etic markers, on the one hand, and speech stereotypes, on the other hand. As various authors readily acknowledge, the identification of true (emic) speech markers requires the simultaneous analysis of both aspects. Since such analyses have rarely been conducted, the present volume reflects the state of the art. Yet, given this distance between the empirical data and the notion of marking, one would have expected that a more insistent, unanimous plea for the two-part complete investigation of speech markers would have been a central theme.

The editors' goal for the book was to provide the groundwork from which could evolve a theory of speech markers. In addition to the comprehensive reviews of candidates for emic status, this volume presents a number of distinctions critical for such a theory to incorporate as well as strong arguments against any potential theory that would ignore the dependence of markers on situational and sociostructural variables. The only real candidate offered for the eventual theory is the accommodation theory of interethnic communication discussed by Giles. Since this theory can be applied to any social categories and since it is sensitive to both sociostructural and situational variables, it provides a promising beginning for analyses of the use and interpretation of level 2 speech markers.

Finally, it is unclear what role speech cues play in initiating the processes of biased assimilation and behavioral confirmation in particular or in accounts of nonobvious or important social behavior in general. How do people integrate the information provided by speech with other cues? A number of sophisticated theories of impression formation (e. g., information integration theory), which go unmentioned in this book, might be useful in addressing this issue. Under what conditions are judgments based on speech cues made accurately or inaccurately? When are these judgments based on overestimation of the correlation between trait and speech cue or overgeneralization of the situations in which the correlation exists? When do these judgments lead to stereotypic responses in social behavior? Various authors provided suggestions and hypotheses regarding the behavioral significance of speech markers, but the reader will find that this book raises far more questions than it answers.

Reviewed by ELLEN BOUCHARD RYAN  
*Department of Psychology*  
*University of Notre Dame*  
*Notre Dame, IN 46556*

and  
 JOHN T. CACIOPPO  
*University of Iowa*  
*Iowa City, IA 52242*

(Received 24 March 1981)

#### DISCOURSE

PETER BAYLEY, *French pulpit oratory, 1598-1650: A study in themes and styles, with a descriptive catalogue of printed texts*. Cambridge University Press, 1980. Pp. x + 323.

Since preaching surely comes within the purview of sociolinguistics, we do well to occupy ourselves with a diachronic perspective in the study of sermonizing in the Christian tradition. What has persisted and what has changed through the dramatic events that have altered Christianity from century to century and from one country to another? These are questions worth considering. They are, of course, our questions, those of us who are trying to understand more and more about the way language functions in human experience.

This book takes us back almost 300 years, but contemporary preaching has vestiges of canons, techniques, and styles that can be traced to that era. In fact, when Bayley describes the rhetorical learning that was the foundation of early seventeenth century preaching, he is tracing our history back to Aristotle.

Because Bayley's concerns are primarily literary, he has chosen a period that for him separates those that preceded and followed. His argument is that "Pulpit oratory . . . is a gauge of changing prose styles, a guide to the background of literary convention and sensibility in a period, and an autonomous art form"

(180, see also 6, 13). His position is valid because he examines published sermons: they were a significant part of literature of that period, and they were also produced with great attention to literary craftsmanship (3). Moreover, these were not your common garden-variety sermons that survived because, like last summer's flower, they were pressed into pages for preservation. They were associated with special occasions (14), although this was more true of the Catholic sermons than the Protestant ones.

Most of the analysis is devoted to formal matters, for example, the rhetorical training and models that constrained the writing of sermons, their "prose patterns," and their structure and stylistic implications. Two chapters are devoted to themes and their imagery, but this is not a book concerned with stylistics as such.

In an era characterized by extreme libertarianism in creative writing (and when university students resent a professor's editing of what they superciliously esteem mere "style"), it is difficult for us to appreciate the great emphasis laid throughout this period on the rules of rhetoric, taught in manuals, examined in great writers, and practiced in essays and oratory. In the period under study the diocesan seminary did not exist, and clergymen got the same training that any schoolboy got (38). By the middle of the seventeenth century the classical model was beginning to weaken in its grip on writers, but in the first part it was still pretty strong.

The sermon, as socially situated speech, presupposes a relationship between the speaker and his audience. In the early seventeenth century, as now in many circles, the preacher was expected to appear learned, leading to what Bayley calls the "thesaurus sermon," one "built up by the indiscriminate heaping together of undigested material culled from . . . reference works and the preacher's own commonplace-book" (78), the last being his personal collection of things he could use. The preacher was advised to appear as impressive as possible (26). It got so bad that critics complained that eloquence seemed to be measured by how much a discourse had to be interpreted (35).

In those days, preachers, exercising what they learned in school, practiced a great deal of word analysis. This preoccupation with language as material for the display of intelligence, learning, and verbal skill was extended, among other ways, to the creation of new words (27, 32) and the introduction of many foreign words.

Here is an instance, I think, where the classical tradition has persisted to this day, watered down to practically nothing in those styles where sermons (Catholic, Protestant, or even Jewish of the Reformed variety) are like nonreligious lectures, but thriving in those religious communities where the sermon is the keystone to religion and performance is liable to subjective evaluation. In this milieu one can find techniques so nicely used that one must talk about a living art (Rosenberg 1970; Samarin 1972). (One only reveals one's bias by calling it "folk art.") A close analysis of television preacher-healers is rewarding in this respect. For example, Ernest Angley uses the epithet *sin-bearer* with reference to