Penn Libraries
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

GSE Publications

Graduate School of Education

March 1996

Mapping Deictics: A Technique for Discovering Teachers' Footing

Stanton Wortham

University of Pennsylvania, stanton.wortham@bc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs

Mapping Deictics: A Technique for Discovering Teachers' Footing

Abstract

This article presents a systematic technique for uncovering interactional patterns in conversation. While an indefinite number of verbal and paralinguistic cues can potentially establish interactional structure, one type of form often plays a central role. Deictics systematically index aspects of the context, and these forms often sketch out the framework of an interactional event. This article discusses and illustrates the methodological usefulness of one type of deitic in particular - participant deitics, or "personal pronouns". It analyzes five minutes of a classroom conversation, and shows how systematic attention to participant deitics helps uncover the interactional dynamics. The paper ends by considering the limitations of this methodological technique.

September, 1994

MAPPING PARTICIPANT DEICTICS:
A TECHNIQUE FOR DISCOVERING SPEAKERS' FOOTING

Stanton E. F. Wortham
Department of Education
Bates College
Lewiston, ME 04240
USA
(207) 786-6062
FAX (207) 786-6123
e-mail swortham@bates.edu

ABSTRACT

This article presents a systematic technique for uncovering interactional patterns in conversation. While an indefinite number of verbal and paralinguistic cues can potentially establish interactional structure, one type of form often plays a central role. Deictics systematically index aspects of the context, and these forms often sketch out the framework of an interactional event. This article discusses and illustrates the methodological usefulness of one type of deictic in particular—participant deictics, or "personal pronouns." It analyzes five minutes of a classroom conversation, and shows how systematic attention to participant deictics helps uncover the interactional dynamics. The paper ends by considering the limitations of this methodological technique.

Whenever people speak, they interact. Participants in any conversation occupy roles with respect to each other and participate in some type of social event. Many things contribute to the interactional happenings in a conversation—the physical and social context, the history of the participants' relationship, both verbal and nonverbal cues. Language use itself often has the greatest effect. Speakers' utterances influence their relationships with each other and shape the interactional event they are participating in.

In determining how language use creates and transforms relations, participants and analysts must at least implicitly identify the discursive structures that partly constitute those relations. As Psathas (1992) argues, single utterances or short sequences often do not suffice to establish what type of relation is going on. Participants and analysts must in many cases identify some larger discursive structure—an "extended sequence" in Psathas' terms—that provides relevant context for determining the type of activity and relations that are occuring.

One type of linguistic form—deictics or "shifters"—often has a central role in establishing the larger discursive structures that create and transform relationships (Silverstein, 1976). The denotational value of *here*, *this*, *now*, and other shifters depends on aspects of the interactional context in which they are uttered. In using shifters to refer, speakers *also* send messages about the interactional context which these forms index. *We*, for instance, can both refer to and establish an interactional group.

Thus shifters provide both participants and analysts with cues about the interactional significance of an utterance. This paper explores the interactional potential and methodological promise of one group of shifters—participant and non-participant deictics, or "personal pronouns." Speakers often use these forms to establish what roles they are playing

3

with respect to each other. Because of this, analysts can focus on personal pronoun use when they want to uncover participants' interactional positions.

The first section below describes past research on deictics and their role in verbal interaction. The second section illustrates a methodological technique—which I call "deictic mapping"—that can help analysts uncover interactional patterns established through deictics. The third section presents a warning about the methodological use of deictics: they do systematically presuppose interactional structure, but they do not *inevitably* establish interactional organization. Analysts may begin with deictics, but they must go on to examine other aspects of the context in each particular case.

1. Participation frameworks and participant deictics

Goffman (1979) uses a nice metaphor, "footing," to describe participants' interactional positions in any encounter. Whenever people interact, verbally or not, they take up some sort of position with respect to others. Messengers, for instance, generally cannot be held responsible for the content of their messages, because participants understand that they are simply delivering a message from someone else. Goffman would say that messengers have different interactional "footing" than speakers who express their own beliefs.

Different speech events typically involve different types of footing. A lecture has a lecturer and an audience, each with interactional rights and responsibilities. Meetings, intimate dyadic conversations, and other types of speech event typically involve participants with particular types of footing. Goffman (1979) calls the relative footing of participants in a conversation the "participation framework" of the interaction at that moment.

4

Acculturated individuals come to expect standard participation frameworks in given settings. Participants' footing can often be predicted, once one knows their role and the type of event going on. Goffman emphasizes, however, that participation frameworks are often transformed in ongoing interaction, such that participants' footing shifts in unexpected ways. Speech events provide norms and constraints, but speakers can revise participation frameworks in practice.

To explain how footing gets established in practice, Goffman (1979) claims that systematic verbal and nonverbal "cues and markers" indicate the relative footing of participants in a conversation. Goffman himself did not go much further than this general insight, except to provide many illustrations of footing being established. This leaves us with an important question: how do verbal and nonverbal cues determine what participation framework organizes an interaction?

Others have begun to answer this question, by elaborating Goffman's insights on footing. One promising line of research claims that a particular type of linguistic form often provides cues about participation frameworks—*deictics* (Levinson, 1988; Hanks, 1990). Deictics are forms like *we*, *here*, *this*, and *now*, which have their referents fixed by parameters of the speech situation itself.

Jakobson (1957/1971) provides a seminal account of deictics. Following Jespersen (1924/1965), he calls these linguistic forms "shifters." Jakobson's account of shifters rests on his distinction between the "narrated event"—what speakers are talking about—and the "speech event"—the interaction among participants in the conversation. Because I reserve the term "speech event" to refer to a *type* of verbal interaction with a typical interactional structure, following Hymes (1972), I will use "narrating event" for Jakobson's "speech event."

5

I mean "narrate" here in a broad sense, to refer to all language use and not simply storytelling.

Shifters bridge the narrating event and the narrated event, because they depend on aspects of the narrating event to identify what they are saying about the narrated event. Personal pronouns, for example, refer to individuals or groups and thus contribute denoted content to what the participants are talking about. But they successfully refer by indexing some person or group that occupies a particular interactional role in the narrating event. *I* refers by indexing the person speaking in the narrating event. Thus the name "shifters," because the referents of these forms shift with a change in the interactional context (in the case of *I*, a change in the role allocation of speaker).

Jakobson and others have been interested in shifters because they establish that reference depends on context. Jakobson argued that shifters "anchor" the denotational content—the description of the narrated event—in the context of use. Such anchoring seems to be essential to the referential function of language in all kinds of conversation (Hanks, 1990).

Others have explored shifters' role in the interactional functions of language use. As the backing or warrant for referring, shifters index a model of the narrating event. *We*, for example, refers to some set that includes the speaker and some other(s). Consummated use of *we* establishes reference to that set—thus contributing to the anchoring of the narrated event in the narrating one. It *also* entails a representation of the speaker's footing, by presenting him or her as a central or defining member of a certain interacting group. Thus use of shifters helps organize the interaction going on in the narrating event.

My work on shifters' systematic interactional effects has focused on personal pronouns.[1] This has been dictated partly by the nature of the particular speech events I have worked on—"participant examples" (cf. Wortham, 1992; in press)—which rely heavily on personal pronouns for both denotational and interactional organization. But it can be productive to focus on personal pronouns in studying many types of verbal interaction. "From an interactional viewpoint, more may depend on acts that somehow identify persons, especially speech partners, than on any other aspect of linguistic style, and such acts are performed with personal pronouns, titles, proper names, kin terms, and combinations" (Errington, 1988:111). *Any* form, shifter or not, can potentially be decisive in signalling footing (Levinson, 1988). An adequate analysis will take into account other types of cues. But personal pronouns often play a central role.

Brown and Gilman (1960) opened up the study of shifters' interactional functions with their work on familiar and formal second person pronouns. Consummated use of French *tu* (German *du*, Spanish *tu*, etc.) not only refers to the addressee, but also indexes a familiar or intimate relationship between speaker and addressee. Brown and Gilman showed, further, that a single use of a second person pronoun does not establish the character of the relationship, because both symmetric and asymmetric use can happen. When a speaker uses *tu* to refer to another, the addressee can answer with either *tu* or *vous*. Symmetric use of *tu* generally indicates an intimate relationship, while use of *tu* by one speaker and *vous* by the other indicates that the speaker who gives *tu* and receives *vous* has more power.

Errington (1988) also studies shifters' interactional functions. Like Brown and Gilman, he pays particular attention to personal pronouns, which get their "referential meaning by virtue of the existential and interactively immediate connections they presuppose

between the persons who are at once parties to and objects of pronominal reference: the speech partners engaged in face-to-face interaction" (1988:132). In their descriptions of narrated events, speakers refer to participants using personal pronouns, such that the participants become "objects" of reference. But to accomplish such reference, personal pronouns index a model of the narrating event that participants are "parties to." In his work on Javanese, Errington describes how speakers draw on the presuppositions of personal pronouns to send messages about interactional happenings in the narrating event.

Silverstein (1984) goes beyond Brown and Gilman, and Errington, in his analysis of deictics. He maps out complex, emergent patterns of deictic use in a segment of talk, and argues that speakers' systematic use of deictics helps establish conversational coherence. His analysis focuses on the following example. A and B are previously unacquainted graduate students at the University of Chicago.[2]

```
        A:   Hu- uh an' how do you like Chicago compared, did you go
             to school there or uh,        ⌐wa
        B:                                 ⌐I did go to school there, I
             went to school here also,     ⌐um   um, so I came=
5       A:                                 ⌐oh, uh-huh
        B:   =back kind of, I wa
        A:   oh, uh-huh, an' you went to undergraduate here or
        B:   in Chicago at, uh, Loyola
        A:   oh oh oh oh oh I'm an old Jesuit boy myself,
10           ⌐ unfortunately
        B:   ⌐oh are ya, where'd you go
        A:   Georgetown, down     ⌐in Washington
        B:                        ⌐ o:h yeah,  yeah
        A:   it's too bad, I-
15      B:   did you finish
        A:   um yeah well this is my second year here
        B:   oh uh- ⌐huh
        A:          ⌐and, uh, I don't know, it was nice, I sorta
             enjoyed it- I, this place is really really- di
20           different- I mu'- yeah, I must say, but, uh,, I don't
             know, I I enjoyed the education there, and it really
```

8

```
                was good, It ⊢wasn't
B:                    ⊢I think- Jesuit edu ⊢cation changed, ...
A:                                  ⊧ overwhelming
```

Silverstein argues that the speakers create a "poetic" structure in this segment, and that this provides essential organization for both the denotational and the interactional messages. The speakers build this structure using the deictics *there-then* and *here-now*. The denotational content of the utterances is fitted to and molded over the framework provided by these deictics.

In lines 1-2, there is a contrast between *here-now* (the University of Chicago, where both A and B are currently enrolled) and *there-then* (referring to Iowa; B has just said he lived in Iowa before coming to The University of Chicago). In lines 4 and 6, B establishes a *here-then* and a *there-then*. Prior to attending The University of Chicago, B went to school in Iowa; and prior to that he went to school "here." This *here* is ambiguous: did B go to school at The University of Chicago then, or somewhere else in the city of Chicago? At line 7, A moves to clarify this, and at line 8 B establishes that *here-then* was a different university from *here-now* (the deictic structure becomes more complex: $here_{city}$-$there_{univ}$-*then* and $here_{city}$-$here_{univ}$-*now*).

With this deictic framework established, B questions A about where he went to school. For A, $there_c$-$there_u$-*then* is Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. As we see in lines 18-24, A enjoyed his time at Georgetown ($there_c$-$there_u$-then). In contrast, however, he finds the University of Chicago ($here_c$-$here_u$-now) overwhelming. The two sets of deictics here provide structure in establishing what places and universities the speakers are denoting.

In this aspect of his analysis, Silverstein focuses more on the deictic framework as a key to denotational coherence, not interactional structure in the narrating events (but cf.

9

Silverstein, 1992). He also focuses on spatial and temporal deictics, not personal pronouns. But Silverstein's methodological advance—to lay out the patterned uses of deictics as a key to uncovering conversational coherence—underlies my analyses of personal pronouns and interactional organization.

Jakobson, Brown and Gilman, Silverstein, and Errington have established that personal pronouns can have systematic interactional effects. My research on classroom conversation has used their insights to uncover complex patterns of personal pronoun use—patterns that provide the core interactional organization of narrating events (see Wortham [in press] for several examples). In this research, I have developed a systematic methodological technique that helps uncover patterns in shifter use across a conversation.

2. Deictic mapping

The details of verbal interaction can only be analyzed systematically from transcribed recordings. Any conversation contains many interactionally relevant cues, and they go by quickly. The conversation analysts (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974) have shown that unexpectedly complex patterns can be uncovered through transcription and analysis.

Subtle linguistic and paralinguistic cues can play an important role in determining the interactional significance of any utterance. To maximize the chances of catching significant cues, I follow the conversation analysts in doing relatively fine-grained transcriptions. Much of the time this detail is not necessary, and it can make reading the transcripts somewhat difficult. However, since we cannot predict in advance when subtle cues will provide a crucial clue for the analysis, we must have the detail available in all transcripts.

10

When I am looking for interactional organization, I begin by "mapping" the deictics used in the conversation. This requires a chart that systematically maps out every shifter used and its referent, for several categories of shifters: personal pronouns, demonstrative, spatial and temporal deictics (English *this, that; here, there; now, then*), and verb tense. I also code each utterance for the realm it refers to: the narrating event (e.g., "what did you just say") or the narrated event.

Here is a brief example of such a deictic map, done from the following transcript.[3] At this point in the conversation, one student's (Tony's) past behavior has been introduced as an example: he used to bother another student (Lucia) in class. This example illustrates a positive sense of the concept *discrimination*. We say that someone has a "discriminating mind" when s/he makes relevant distinctions and discerns appropriate courses of action. The class decides that Tony lacked a discriminating mind, because he failed to control himself and bothered Lucia in class. From lines 161-165, the teacher (T/M) reads from the text, hoping that they can move back from the example to the general issue of discrimination, as it is presented in the text.[4]

```
161  T/M:                    ((* reading *)) the senses,
            say the wise are the horses, the roads they travel are
            the mazes of desire, the wise call the self the enjoyer
            when he is united with the body the senses and the
165         mind. we:ll, you sensed that you wanted to talk to her?
            and uh- it was a desire, so you did it. what's wrong
            with that.
     ST?:   nothin.
     ST?:   say it again? I didn't hear it.
170  TYI:   that's not what he's supposed to be doing, so...
```

LINE	SPEAKER	1ST PERSON	2ND PERSON	3RD PERSON	SPATIAL	TEMPORAL
162	T/M			they-senses		
164	T/M			he-the self		
165	T/M		you-TON	her-LUC		
166a	T/M		you-TON	it-talk		
166b	T/M					
167	T/M					
169a	ST?			it-utterance		
169b	ST?	I-ST?		it-utterance		
170	ST?			he-TON		

... (ctd.)	TENSE	DEMONSTRATIVE	NARRATED/-ING
(162 ctd.)	pres.		narrated
(164 ctd.)	pres.		narrated
(165 ctd.)	past		narrated
(166a ctd.)	past		narrated
(166b ctd.)	pres.		narrating
(167 ctd.)		that-talking	narrating
(169a ctd.)	pres.		narrating
(169b ctd.)	past		narrating
(170 ctd.)	pres.	that-talking	narrated

Such a chart makes patterns in deictic use more accessible. In line 165, for instance, the teacher opposes *you* (referring to Tony) to *her* (referring to Lucia). The use of these pronouns puts Tony and Lucia in two separate groups in the narrated event. If the teacher had wanted to place them in the same group, he would have referred to them together, as *they* or *you*.

Speaking in line 165, the teacher also speaks *to* Tony (as *you*) and *about* Lucia (as *she*). This organizes the narrating event: the teacher and Tony are participating in a conversation about Lucia, with Lucia temporarily excluded. When Tyisha speaks at line 170, however, she indexes a different organization for the narrating event. She refers to Tony as *he*, not *you*. Tyisha speaks about Tony, and excludes him from the conversation.

12

Of course, momentary patterns in shifter use like this may not mean anything. With a deictic map for larger stretches of conversation, however, an analyst can easily see which patterns recur. In this classroom discussion, the map shows that speakers *do* systematically include and exclude Tony, by switching from *you* to *he* and back. They interview Tony in short interchanges, soliciting information from him about the facts of his behavior toward Lucia. Then they turn toward each other, and exclude Tony while they interpret and comment on his behavior. In the narrating conversation Tony serves primarily as an exhibit, not an interlocutor.

As another example of how this deictic map highlights useful patterns, consider the shift in verb tense from line 165 to 170. In line 165 the teacher uses the past tense to refer to Tony's actions within the example—his inappropriate pestering of Lucia. In line 170, Tyisha refers to the same actions in the present tense. This tense shift metaphorically brings Tony's delinquent behavior closer to the narrating classroom interaction.

It turns out that this metaphorical shift helps Tyisha and other girls tease Tony about his *ongoing* inappropriate behavior. The tense shift, along with other cues that come later, signals that the class is no longer speaking analytically (at a distance) about a past event. They are moving toward making Tony's *current* behavior an issue. This shows up in the deictic map as several of the deictic categories shift from distal to proximal—from past to present, from *then* to *now*, from *there* to *here*, etc.

This brief example introduces deictic mapping as a technique, and illustrates the kinds of interactionally relevant cues revealed by such a map. The following, more extended example shows how systematic use of personal pronouns during a longer interaction can establish participants' footing, and how deictic maps can help us uncover that footing.

13

This example comes from another ninth grade history class, studied as part of the same project described in Wortham (in press). In order to understand the interactional dynamics in this discussion, we need some background. Two teachers, Mr. Smith and Mrs. Bailey, are running this class. These teachers regularly teach together, but they do not get along particularly well.

As a teacher, Mr. Smith often presents himself as a powerful figure that the students had better accommodate to. He gets students to cooperate by using rewards and punishment—offering grades and threatening disciplinary action. Mrs. Bailey more often presents herself as a friend of the students. She elicits cooperation by treating students charitably and expecting the same in return.

Partly because of their different teaching styles, the teachers have been feuding all year. Although they remain on speaking terms, in private conversations with me each one complained about the other on several occasions. Mrs. Bailey feels that Mr. Smith treats students harshly, has bad rapport with them, and is arrogant. He feels that she treats the students too leniently, does not understand the material as well as he does, and does not have high enough intellectual standards. Mr. Smith also seems a bit jealous of Mrs. Bailey's rapport with the students and her position in the school. He has substantially more trouble than she does fitting in with both faculty and students.

For this particular class session, students have read Cicero's letter to Atticus, in which Cicero ponders what he should do about the tyranny of Caesar and the plot to overthrow him. Should he tell Caesar? Should he join the plotters? Or should he just keep quiet? In this respect, the text describes a three-part interactional structure in Rome: Caesar the tyrant, those plotting against him, and Cicero stuck between the two.

14

Mr. Smith gives an example to illustrate Cicero's dilemma:[5]

> T/S: Mau_rice_ let's give a good example, you'll love this.
>   sup_pose_ this dictator, _me_. there was a plot going on.
> 150   and _you_ found out about it. and you _knew_ it was gonna-
>   it's existing (3.0) among the people you knew. would
>   you te:ll me. (5.0)

This example presents an interactional structure analogous to that in Rome: Mr. Smith-the-tyrant, the conspirators plotting to push him down the stairs, and Maurice-the-potential-informer stuck between the two.[6]

As the class begins to discuss this example, we see evidence of the conflict between the teachers. Right after Mr. Smith gives the example, Maurice says that he would not warn Mr. Smith-the-tyrant about the plot, for fear that the plotters would then come after him. Mrs. Bailey immediately asks, "would you tell _me_?" Implicitly, Mrs. Bailey competes for the students' affections here. If Maurice had answered yes, he would have been affiliating with her and excluding Mr. Smith. But he answers no.

Mr. Smith then uses _we_ to refer to himself and Mrs. Bailey as dictators. Thus he amends the example to include two dictators. By including Mrs. Bailey as a fellow dictator, Mr. Smith defends himself against Mrs. Bailey's attempt to cut him out. If they come together as an interactional unit, the students cannot affiliate with her and exclude him.

The deictic map for the entire interaction (although this segment of it is not included here, to save space) shows evidence of the struggle between the teachers. Mrs. Bailey uses _we_ to refer to the teachers as dictators only twice. She more often refers to Mr. Smith and herself separately, as _he_ or _you_, and _I_. Mrs. Bailey does not seem to want to be in the same group as Mr. Smith. In contrast, Mr. Smith uses _we_ fourteen times to refer to the teachers as dictators.

15

Later in the interaction, Mrs. Bailey creates another opportunity for the students to affiliate with her against Mr. Smith. In the following passage, she begins to summarize the example. Pedagogically, she is trying to connect it back to the analogous case of Cicero and Caesar. As we will see, however, her move also has interactional implications.

```
425   T/B:   cou- maybe we should go through the- you know playing
             the analogy back.  ⊦    OK?
      T/S:                      ⊦mmhmm?   sure
      T/B:   let's- Maurice is our Cicero character here. K, a:nd
             the issue °I- I'm going to leave myself out of this
430          one.° the- the issue is Mr. Smith who we all know has
             been oppressing you all year.
      ST?:   mmhmm.
      T/B:   O ⊦K.
      MRC:     ⊦mmhmm.
435   T/B:   a:nd a group of people have decided that (1.0) it is
             time to end the oppression. especially when you've said
             look at how much is left in the history book, you are
             to go home and in the next two weeks learn everything,
             and your final exam and last grade will be based on
440          mastery of all of the stuff that's left in the history
             book that we haven't done this year. you know what
             you're history books have left in them ⊦right?
      T/S:                                           ⊦centuries.
      T/B:   OK. so that's the oppression. he's got total control
445          over your grade. if you don't do that you know you're
             going to end up in summer school, wonderful way to
             spend the summer, so, some some of you get together and
             say this will end and we'll end it by doing in Mr.-
             Smith, between class periods on the stairs.
```

At lines 429-430 Mrs. Bailey eliminates herself from the example, and leaves Mr. Smith as the sole dictator. In his classroom manner he does fit the role better than she. But she did not have to exclude herself. Doing so gives her an interactional advantage, because she can cast herself as a friend of the students.

We can see how she uses this interactional advantage in Table 1.[7] This table presents a partial deictic map for the five minutes of conversation beginning just before the segment above. The table contains only the personal pronouns used over the five minute segment.

16

The full deictic map reveals other interesting interactional patterns, but here we only have space for two illustrations using the personal pronouns. See Wortham (in press) for a more extended analysis of this and other classroom interactions, and further guidelines in how to use deictic maps. Note also that this map is not as exhaustive as the one given above. It does not record every utterance of every personal pronoun. If, in one speaking turn, a speaker uses the same pronoun to refer to the same person, this deictic map records those uses only once. For instance, between lines 428 and 442 Mrs. Bailey uses <u>you</u> several times to refer to the students, but the map only enters this once. This sort of abbreviation saves time and generally does not obscure interactionally relevant patterns—although we must note that repetition can be salient. (For this reason an initial deictic map should generally include all instances of every deictic. Table 1 is abbreviated only because of limited space.) When making detailed interpretations, of course, the analyst should always look closely at the actual transcript.

———————————————————————Insert Table 1 about here———————————————————————

This map lets us see, first, that Mr. Smith does not use any personal pronouns at all in these five minutes of conversation. In fact, he speaks only twice. Both utterances are background comments, like that in line 443. Mr. Smith's uncharacteristic reticence happens here largely because Mrs. Bailey excludes him from the conversation. She and the class talk *about* Mr. Smith.

We can see this in the deictic map. Mrs. Bailey and the students refer to Mr. Smith in the third person in seven separate speaking turns (444, 479, 493, 502, 505, 515, 516). In these five minutes he is never *you* or *I*. Mrs. Bailey begins this exclusion at line 444, when

she opposes Mr. Smith (*he*) to the students (*you*). Thus she turns toward the students, excludes Mr. Smith, and speaks about him. The deictic map makes it easy to see that this pattern continues through Mrs. Bailey's turn at line 516. After this, in a segment of the map not shown here, Mr. Smith and Maurice reenter the interaction, as *I* and *you*.

The systematic exclusion of Mr. Smith, shown in the personal pronoun use, alerts us that Mrs. Bailey is probably making an interactional move here. Having seen this, we can look more closely at other interactionally relevant aspects of the conversation. From lines 435-449, Mrs. Bailey describes how tyrannical Mr. Smith-the-tyrant is. According to her, Mr. Smith-the-tyrant gives unreasonable, even sadistic assignments. He abuses his power, by enforcing his unreasonable demands with the threat of unwarranted punishment. Note that Mrs. Bailey here molds denotational content over the deictic framework. Her use of *he* for Mr. Smith—opposed to *you*, the students, and *we*, herself and the students—lays out three groups. Her description of the tyrannical Mr. Smith fleshes out this framework.

In her characterization of Mr. Smith-the-tyrant, Mrs. Bailey speaks in an impassioned tone, because her description is only partly hypothetical. Aspects of it come directly from his actual relationship with Mrs. Bailey and the students. Both she and the students have complained all year that he demands too much—expecting the students to understand difficult material quickly and belittling them when they do not. Mrs. Bailey and Mr. Smith also disagree regularly about how far along they should be in the history textbook (which she mentions at line 442). So Mrs. Bailey's complaints about the hypothetical Mr. Smith correspond to her complaints about the actual Mr. Smith.

In the personal pronoun use, then, we see that Mrs. Bailey excludes Mr. Smith and talks with the students about him. The content of what she says furthers this interactional move.

18

By complaining about Mr. Smith's unfair teaching practices, she puts herself on the same side as the students. Both she and they are fed up with Mr. Smith and are talking about it among themselves. Simultaneously, she scores two interactional victories over Mr. Smith: she complains publicly about his undesirable behavior, and she gets the students to affiliate with her and exclude him.

Mr. Smith's isolation becomes even more acute at lines 506*ff.* Throughout the five minute segment mapped in Table 1, Maurice has been excluded from the narrating conversation, as *he.* Mrs. Bailey and the other students discuss Mr. Smith and Maurice's hypothetical interaction, referring to both as *he.* At one point, Mr. Smith and Maurice become a *they*, opposed to *you*, the other students (line 493).

But from lines 506-522, Mrs. Bailey turns toward Maurice and includes him in the discussion, while continuing to exclude Mr. Smith. She completes the isolation of Mr. Smith, by including even Maurice in the group of students on her side.

	T/B:	OK- what's another thing you could do that might put
		the <u>whole</u> class in danger. (5.0) Mr. Smith is in the
		room and he's <u>talk</u>ing away, he's got his <u>back</u> to you
		because he's writing on the blackboard. what do you
510		<u>do</u> Maurice? you're <u>ev</u>il, now remember. ⊨ do the=
	STS:	⊨hahahnh
	T/B:	=most ex<u>treme</u> thing, get rid of Mi- get rid of Mr.
		Smith, his <u>back</u> is to you at the blackboard, what can
		you do.
515	CAS:	<u>throw</u> something at him. I don't know.
	T/B:	<u>throw</u> something at him? like a- an e<u>ra</u>ser? is that
		going to do much good?
	ST?:	or a chair
	ST?:	a book
520	T/B:	a <u>book</u>?

As we can see in the deictic map for this segment, the *he* excludes Mr. Smith, as a third person, and the *you* includes Maurice with Mrs. Bailey and the other students. It was by noting this shift in the deictic map that I was first able to identify this interactional move.

The content of Mrs. Bailey's description here also changes the students' position with respect to Mr. Smith-the-tyrant. They no longer just complain about him, and passively acquiesce to his assassination. Now they actively send Maurice as the assassin to do the job himself. Maurice shifts from being a potential informer to being an assassin. This revised role for Maurice's character reinforces the interactional barrier between Mr. Smith and the students. Mrs. Bailey now sides with the students and coaches Maurice in how to do away with Mr. Smith.

Thus the deictic map has directed us toward another interactional pattern in the conversation. Because this article aims primarily to illustrate the usefulness of deictic mapping as a methodological technique, I will not explore interactional events in this classroom conversation further.[8] Wortham (in press) provides more extended analyses of this and other classroom interactions, and illustrates how deictic mapping can be followed up with a more complete interpretation of interactional structure.

3. *The insufficiency of deictic maps*

Despite shifters' interactional potential, and despite the methodological usefulness of deictic maps, systematic analysis of shifter use cannot *suffice* to uncover interactional organization, for two reasons. First, all verbal interaction relies at least in part on other types of cues. Second, deictics do not always have their generally expectable interactional effects.

Deictic maps are an extremely useful first methodological step in analyzing verbal interaction, but they must be followed up with other techniques.

Even the truncated analyses presented in the last section rely in part on interactional cues other than deictics. For instance, Mrs. Bailey does more than just distance herself from Mr. Smith when she refuses to use a *we* that refers to both of them. She goes beyond separating herself into a different interactional group, by characterizing Mr. Smith as oppressive. She does this characterization largely through non-deictic indexicals and denotational content.

Shifters provide only a minimal interactional framework. Systematic opposition of *we* and *you* may divide teachers and students into two interactional groups, but actual interactional organization always goes beyond assigning participants to groups. Speech relevant to participants' footing separates them into groups, and then *characterizes* the groups in social terms. Real interactions are rarely organized simply as "us" vs. "them," but, more likely, "us the good guys" vs. "them the bad guys"—or even "us the dispossessed minority fighting off obstacles and improving ourselves through hard work" vs. "them the oppressors desperately trying to keep us down to defend their privileges, but unable to win out against justice in the end."

Many types of cues contribute to these more complex characterizations of interactional groups. Wortham and Locher (1994) provide a more systematic description of these cues, and illustrate their interactional effects. Direct and indirect forms of quoted speech, for instance, can be a rich resource for giving someone a particular social identity. Saying that someone "expostulated on the social history of Tasmania for several hours," for instance, narrows down the type of person we might be characterizing. Once deictics have been used

21

to split participants into groups, speakers use devices like quoted speech to further describe and index participants' social identities.[9]

The methodological technique of deictic mapping is useful, but only a first step in analyzing verbal interaction for a second reason. Deictic maps also do not suffice to uncover interactional organization because deictics' expectable presuppositions do not always hold. As it was presented above, personal pronouns' interactional value could be codified into a set of rules that connect certain forms with certain interactional effects. Such an approach would follow early attempts to model pragmatics after syntax—like speech act theory (Searle, 1969) and theories of communicative competence (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972). Such a rule might say, for instance, that use of *he* as opposed to *you* separates the referent of *he* from the speaker's group.

However, no account of linguistic action in terms of such quasi-grammatical rules can explain what Prague School linguists called "foregrounding" (Havránek, 1932/1955). Quasi-grammatical rules say that, given appropriate presupposed contextual features, utterance of a certain type of form will count as a given type of act. However, any such regularity can be flouted for interactional effect. Speakers often utter forms in "inappropriate" contexts and achieve definite effects.

The analogy between interactionally effective and grammatical utterances breaks down. Violating a grammatical rule generates incorrect structure, but speakers often act contrary to pragmatic regularities and nonetheless successfully generate interactional effects. A quasi-grammatical analysis of linguistic action could propose a new rule to explain every effective flouting of a regularity. But such an explanatory strategy gets awkward quickly, and it seems unlikely that people carry around rules covering all possible foregrounded uses. Furthermore,

any theory of linguistic action that depends only on quasi-grammatical rules must be incomplete. No matter how many rules are proposed, the last one can always be flouted.

Contemporary critics of quasi-grammatical pragmatic rules have reiterated this criticism, and added another (Goffman, 1976; Levinson, 1981). Appropriate forms can be uttered in apparently appropriate contexts, but yield unexpected results. Some aspect of a context unforeseen by the rule can always be made salient so as to negate or to transform the expected effect of an utterance. An indefinite number of potentially relevant aspects of interactional context can be made salient in any case.

These critiques of quasi-grammatical pragmatic theories do not mean that no form-effect regularities exist. Any theory of language use must propose some connections of this sort. But a theory that relies *solely* on such regularities cannot explain creative uses of language. We must also attend to how language use *creates* interactional organization in particular contexts (Schegloff, 1984).

As with any other type of interactional cue, speakers can flout shifters' expectable presuppositions, and subsequent speakers can recontextualize shifter use so as to alter its typical interactional effects. Shifters' interactional presuppositions do not determine interactional consequences such that we can predict, at the moment of utterance, what the effect of a given shifter will be. Personal pronouns do index interactional alignments for the narrating event. These habitual presuppositions often serve as resources speakers use to organize their interactions. But specific interactional effects do not happen automatically. At times, floutings and unexpected consequences occur.

Because shifters are not inevitably tied to their expectable presuppositions, analysts can only describe the resources generally provided by shifters, and, *post hoc*, analyze interactional

23

events in particular conversations. This means that the interactional patterns suggested by deictic maps must be considered provisional. Shifters do often provide a methodological tool for discourse analysis, because speakers often use shifters' presuppositions to establish interactional organization, and deictic mapping often provides valuable initial insight into particular interactions. In all cases, however, an analyst must carefully consider whether patterns in shifter use fit with other cues potentially relevant to speakers' footing.

NOTES

*   I would like to thank Michael Silverstein for his help with this project, and Mike Locher for comments on an earlier draft. Two unnamed referees, and Jacob Mey provided useful editorial advice.

1   As Benveniste (1956/1965) noted, the folk term "personal pronouns" refers to two distinct types of forms—the true participant deictics and the third person anaphors. These latter forms do not necessarily presuppose anything about the narrating event itself. In some cases, however, including those described below, third person anaphors are systematically opposed to participant deictics—such that they do give information about the organization of the narrating event. For example, the shift from *you* to refer to a particular participant to *he* for that same person can signal exclusion from the conversation. In the rest of this article, I use the term personal pronouns—because my research focuses on both the participant deictics and the third person anaphors when they index something about the narrating event.

2   Transcription conventions are in Appendix A.

3   This transcript comes from a ninth grade history class, in which teacher and students are discussing a story from the *Upanishads*. I collected these data, and those discussed below, during a larger study of classroom language use (cf. Wortham [in press] for a full description of this project). In all, I observed eight English and history classes, led by six different teachers, over three years. All classes were in one inner city public high school, with an ethnically mixed student body (about 50% black, 25% Hispanic, 15% white, and 10% Asian). I spent 128 hours in the school, observing classes and interviewing teachers, students, and administrators. In the final year I observed and audiotaped 81 class sessions, in one ninth grade English class, one ninth grade history class, and one twelfth grade English class.

4   "T/M" refers to the teacher in this class, Mrs. Mullins. "ST?" refers to an unidentified student. "TYI" refers to Tyisha, a student. "TON" refers to Tony and "LUC" to Lucia.

5   In these transcripts, "T/S" refers to Mr. Smith, "T/B" to Mrs. Bailey, "MRC" to Maurice, "GAR" to Gary, "CAN" to Candace, "MAR" to Mary, "CAS" to Cassandra, "ST?" to an unidentified student, and "STS" to several students speaking at once.

6   The introduction of an example complicates the structure of the talk here. Now we have the narrating event, and *two* types of narrated events: one set in ancient Rome, and the example. Characterizations made of teachers' and students' roles *within* the example have relatively direct interactional implications for their interactional position in the narrating classroom conversation. Space limitations prevent further elaboration of this issue here. For further discussion of examples' role in interactional dynamics, and

for further background on the particular class session discussed here, see Wortham (in press).

7   Transcripts representing the beginning and end of the mapped segment are presented in the text. The intervening lines of transcript (450-505) are in Appendix B.

8   In this interaction, Mr. Smith has the last laugh. At the end of the class, discussion of the example has progressed such that Mr. Smith has been killed and the school needs another teacher. Mr. Smith takes this opportunity to put Mrs. Bailey back in the role of dictator. He excludes Mrs. Bailey from the narrating event, referring to her as *she*.

T/S: ah but suppose Mrs. Bailey, who now knows I was pushed
        down the stairs begins to worry she's the next one.
        what happens to sweet Mrs. Bailey.
MRC: hnh she gets killed.
T/S: HAHAha you get killed. o:h?

Maurice cooperates with Mr. Smith's interactional move here, by imagining that Mrs. Bailey would be killed also. This delights Mr. Smith, who turns toward Mrs. Bailey (with *you*), as if to say "in your face." Now Mrs. Bailey is no longer allied with the students against Mr. Smith. The students would rather be rid of both of them. The adjective "sweet" sarcastically indexes Mrs. Bailey's classroom persona as a friend of the students. By showing here that she and the students are not really friends, Mr. Smith undercuts her attempt to ostracize him. He shows that she does not belong to the students' group either. Mrs. Bailey has successfully isolated him from the students, but he does the same to her. Isolating her is more of a blow, since her classroom persona depends more on solidarity with the students.

9   In a verbal interaction, deictics do nonetheless play a central role in assigning identifiable roles to participants. We might call this process "deictic mapping," in another sense of the term. Speakers set up a deictic structure that provides a framework over which interactionally relevant indexicals and denotational descriptions are molded. In the discussion of Mr. Smith-the-tyrant, for example, Mrs. Bailey organizes the classroom interaction by using personal pronouns to separate herself and the students from Mr. Smith. Then this whole structure gets *mapped* into the narrat*ing* conversation, and comes to organize the interaction there. Mrs. Bailey's description of Mr. Smith as a hypothetical tyrant comes to be her account of the narrating classroom interaction.

        Thus speakers "map" structure set up in describing the narrated event onto the narrating event, in order to organize their interaction. See Silverstein (1992) for elaboration of "mapping" as a theoretical concept that helps explain how verbal interactions can become coherent. By setting up frameworks that sketch out interactional organization, deictics often play a central role in this process, but they do not suffice. Denotational characterizations and other indexicals play important roles as well.

APPENDIX A: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

'-'	for abrupt breaks, stops (if several, stammering)
'?'	for rising intonation
'.'	for falling intonation
'_'	(underline) for stress
'CAPS'	for heavy stress
(1.0)	for silences, to the nearest second
'⊢'	indicates simultaneous talk by two speakers
'='	interruption or next utterance following immediately,
	or continuous talk represented on separate lines because of need to represent
	overlapping comment on intervening line
'[...]'	doubtful transcription or conjecture
'((*...*))'	transcriber comment
':'	elongated vowel
'°...°'	segment quieter than surrounding talk
','	pause, breath without marked intonation
'(hh)'	laughter breaking into words while speaking

450   ST?:   mm<u>hmm</u>.

        T/B: OK. Mau<u>rice</u>, because some of you in the room are
blabbermouths. Mau<u>rice</u> is <u>aware</u> of this. K he's not
particularly <u>fond</u> of the assignment Mr. Smith has
given. OK. so <u>now</u> let's see how we can compare

455   Mau<u>rice's</u> situation at this point to the <u>op</u>tions that
Cicero is articulating or lining out for his friend
Atticus. take the <u>first</u> one would you Gary. (4.0) just
take the <u>first</u> one. <u>read</u> it and let's see what we can
<u>do</u> with it. how does Mau<u>rice's</u> situation compare with

460   Ci- <u>Ci</u>cero's situation.

        GAR: ((* reading *)) should a man continue to live in his
own country under a dic- tatorship.

        T/B: OK, what would <u>that</u> mean as far as Maurice.

        CAN: shou- should he stay in the room even though Mr.

465   Smith's been a <u>bad</u>- a <u>hard</u> teacher.

        T/B: °I wouldn't call it <u>hard</u> I'd call it im<u>pos</u>sible.
unfair.°=

        T/S: ty<u>ran</u>nically impossible. (1.0)

        T/B: OK so- should Mau<u>rice</u>, con<u>tin</u>ue in this room, quietly

470   going along (2.0) with the situation. OK do number <u>two</u>
Ivory.

        IVR: °should he do everything possible to overthrow the
dictatorship. do th-°

        T/B: could you read it <u>louder</u> and <u>slower</u>.

475   IVR: ((* reading *)) should he do everything <u>pos</u>sible to
overthrow the dictatorship. do the ends justify the
means even if it place the <u>state</u> it<u>self</u> in danger.

        T/B: OK. now what does <u>that</u> mean Ivory.

        IVR: ((* reading *)) should he do everything- (6.0)

480   everything that- (5.0)   ⊨   should he do=

        T/B: ⊨Mau<u>rice</u>.

        IVR: =everything he c- he <u>could</u> to make Mr. S- Mr. Smith
reconsider his a- as<u>sign</u>ment even if it means putting-
the class in danger.

485   T/B: O:K. even if it means putting the class it<u>self</u> in
danger, <u>nice</u>ly done. OK now what are some of the things
he could have done. (2.0)

        IVR: um (2.0) he could have a meeting with Mr. Smith or
something.

490   T/B: have a <u>meet</u>ing with Mr. Smith. what would be the <u>danger</u>
of talking to Mr. Smith about the im<u>pos</u>sibility of this
assignment.

        IVR: they could get into an <u>ar</u>gument. he can- [3 syll]

        T/B: he gets into an <u>ar</u>gument. and what might result for the

495   rest of the class. one of you just said <u>state</u> equals

class.

STS: ((* 6 sec unintelligible comments *))

T/B: you don't like this? do twice as much. right? you've
certainly've all run across that line at different

500 points. OK that might put you in danger. what also
might put you in danger. more extreme danger.

ST?: he could just nail the whole class.

T/B: pardon?

ST?: he could just nail the whole class.

505 T/B: OK that- that could be another danger the class could face.

LINE	SPEAKER	1ST PERSON	2ND PERSON	3RD PERSON
420	T/B	we-class	you-students	
428	T/B	our-class	you-students	them-history
		I-T/B	you-T/S	books
444	T/B	we-plotters	you-students	he-T/S
451	T/B	us-class	you-plotters	he-Maurice
			you-Gary	it-text
				his-Cicero
461	GAR			his-man
464	CAN			he-Maurice
466	T/B	I-T/B		it-T/S
				behavior
469	T/B		you-Ivory	it-text
475	IVR			he-Cicero
				it-plot
479	IVR			he-Maurice
				his-T/S
				it-joining
				plot
485	T/B			it-joining
				plot
				he-Maurice
488	IVR			he-Maurice
493	IVR			they-T/S and
				Maurice
				he-Maurice
494	T/B		you-students	he-Maurice
498	T/B		you-students	
502	ST?			he-T/S
505	T/B		you-Maurice	he-T/S
515	CAS	I-Cassandra		him-T/S
516	T/B			him-T/S

Table 1. *Partial deictic map for the segment*

30

REFERENCES

Benveniste, Emile. (1956/1965). La nature des pronoms. In Problèmes de linguistique générale (Vol. 1) (pp. 251-258). Paris: Gallimard.

Brown, Roger & Gilman, Arthur. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), Style in language (pp. 253-276). Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Errington, Joseph. (1988). Structure and style in Javanese. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Goffman, Erving. (1976). Replies and responses. Language in Society, 5, 257-313.

Goffman, Erving. (1979). Footing. Semiotica, 25, 1-29.

Gumperz, John. & Hymes, Dell. (1972). Directions in sociolinguistics. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Hanks, William. (1990). Referential practice. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Havránek, Bohuslav. (1932/1955). The functional differentiation of the standard language (P. Garvin, translator). In P. Garvin (Ed.), A Prague School Reader (pp. 1-18). Washington, D.C.: Washington Linguistics Club.

Hymes, Dell. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), Directions in sociolinguistics (pp. 35-71). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Jakobson, Roman. (1957/1971). Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb. In R. Jakobson, Selected writings (Vol. 2) (pp. 130-147). The Hague: Mouton.

Jespersen, Otto. (1924/1965). The philosophy of grammar. New York: Norton.

Levinson, Stephen. (1981). The essential inadequacies of speech act models of dialogue. In H. Parret, M. Sbisa, & J. Verscheueren (Eds.), Possibilities and limitations of pragmatics (pp. 473-492). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Levinson, Stephen. (1988). Putting linguistics on a proper footing. In P. Drew & A. Wootton (Eds.), Erving Goffman (pp. 161-227). Boston: Northeastern University.

Psathas, George. (1992). The study of extended sequences. In G. Watson and R. Seiler (Eds.), Text in context (pp. 99-122). Newbury Park: Sage.

Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emmanuel, & Jefferson, Gail. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. Language, 50, 696-735.

Schegloff, Emmanuel (1984). On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), Structures of social action (pp. 28-52). New York: Cambridge University.

Searle, John. (1969). Speech acts. New York: Cambridge University.

Silverstein, Michael. (1976). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In K. Basso & H. Selby (Eds.), Meaning in anthropology (pp. 11-55). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.

Silverstein, Michael. (1984). On the pragmatic "poetry" of prose. In D. Schiffrin (Ed.), Meaning, Form, and Use in Context (pp.181-199). Washington, DC: Georgetown University.

Silverstein, Michael. (1992). The indeterminacy of contextualization: when is enough enough? In A. DiLuzio & P. Auer (Eds.), The contextualization of language (pp. 55-75). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Silverstein, Michael. (1993). Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In J. Lucy (Ed.), Reflexive language (pp.33-58). New York: Cambridge University.

Wortham, Stanton (1992). Participant examples and classroom interaction. Linguistics and Education, 4, 195-217.

Wortham, Stanton (in press). Acting out participant examples in the classroom. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wortham, Stanton & Locher, Michael. (1994). Implicit Moral Messages in the Newsroom and the Classroom: A systematic technique for analyzing voicing. Paper presented at the Pragmatics and Language Learning Conference, University of Illinois, Urbana.