Introduction:
Language and society in cinematic discourse

JANNIS ANDROUTSOPOULOS

Based on a thematic panel at *Sociolinguistics Symposium* 18 in South-ampton (2010), this double special issue of *Multilingua* explores cine-matic discourse as an under-examined field of sociolinguistic inquiry. Drawing on film and television data from various countries and lan-guages, the seven articles that follow ask how cinematic discourse repre-sents linguistic heterogeneity, what conceptual and analytical tools in sociolinguistics are adequate to its study, and how this might challenge and further sociolinguistic theory. It would be inaccurate to speak of a neglect of media in current sociolinguistics. An increasing number of scholars are turning to objects of study that are usually thought of as the 'territory' of disciplines such as literary, film and media studies. 'Post-variationist' sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, social semiotics and critical discourse studies all contribute to this turn, and media data have been pivotal for the theorising of notions such as stylisation, lin-guistic flows or performativity within the discipline (e.g. Coupland 2007; Pennycook 2007; Alim *et al.* 2009). We think that cinematic discourse ought to figure large at this intersection due to its popularity as a site of sociolinguistic representation and its complexity as a multimodal semi-otic artefact. However, we feel that film has not yet found due attention as a sociolinguistic site of inquiry, though of course important predeces-sors do exist.

The contributors to this issue are spread around the world in terms of their academic homes and objects of study. They examine American films (Bleichenbacher, Higgins & Furukawa, Petrucci) and television series (Bednarek) as well as European productions from Cyprus, France and Germany (Tsiplakou & Ioannidou, Planchenault, Androutso-poulos). Ranging from comedy and drama to post-modern satire, these films and series tell stories of everyday life and intercultural encounters in urban or rural settings. They stage style-shifting and code-switching between a number of dialects and languages, including varieties of Eng-lish (Hawai'i English, African-American Vernacular English); French (*Parler banlieue* and *Patois*), German ('Interlanguage German'); Greek (Cypriot-Greek dialect); Hawaiian and Hawai'i Creole; and Turkish. The

analyses offered are mostly qualitative, though with some instances of quantification (Bednarek, Bleichenbacher). Together, these seven articles offer snapshots of the diversity of sociolinguistic representations in contemporary audio-visual fiction, and by so doing, they reveal some common themes in theory, method and analysis, which I attempt to outline in this introduction.

Setting the scene

A couple of conceptual clarifications on film, cinematic and telecinematic discourse are in order before we proceed. 'Cinematic discourse' is a term in current usage, though apparently not a firmly established academic concept. I do not use it here as a quasi-synonym to 'language in film', but rather in order to delimit the site of inquiry in a more inclusive way. Its difference to 'film' can be conceived along the lines of discourse theory and Critical Discourse Analysis. Following the distinction between text and discourse practices (Fairclough 1995), I think of cinematic discourse as the ensemble of film-as-text and processes of its production and consumption. 'Cinematic discourse' pinpoints a contextualised approach to film as a site of sociolinguistic representation, including its relations to production and/or reception and the sociolinguistic knowledge that it articulates and presupposes. This is not trivial from a language studies perspective, since film-as-text is already difficult to handle analytically with regard to the role of language in a complex system of audio-visual signifiers, which produce meaning in their interrelation.

The term 'cinematic' conceals the fact that two of the seven papers in this issue (by Bednarek and Tsiplakou & Ioannidou) examine television data, and therefore strictly speaking *tele*cinematic discourse (Piazza *et al.* 2011). However, 'cinematic' and 'telecinematic' primarily define a medium-related distinction. Assuming clear-cut boundaries between the two is in my view both empirically futile and theoretically unproductive in the context of contemporary transmedia flows, where films are screened on television, TV serial productions adopt film narratives and visual aesthetics, and all of the above is increasingly transferred to the internet. The joint focus of all contributions here is on audio-visual fictional narrative, and key aspects of analysis, such as the relation of linguistic variability to characterisation, are common to both.

Though these seven articles generally focus on telecinematic texts, their links to production and/or reception practices are reflected and in part also examined. A number of articles draw on the 'double framework' that shapes telecinematic (and other) fiction. In this variant of the classic communication model that is common in literary studies, com-

munication in the fictional world is embedded into the communicative relation between 'author' (or 'producer') and 'reader' (or 'audience'). This distinction is theoretically and analytically necessary if we are to account for the fact that sociolinguistic choices at the fictional level are constrained by audience design at the level of target audiences (see Bednarek 2012, Richardson 2010). The papers by Bednarek, Higgins & Furkawa, and Androutsopoulos suggest that characters and their speech are designed so as to enable (imagined target) audiences to identify with or sometimes distance themselves from them. Planchenault offers insights into the production practices of the two films she examines, notably with regard to their directors' background and language-ideological intentions. She discusses the directors' stances to dominant language-ideological discourses on non-standard varieties of French, and their aim to challenge 'common stereotypical views'. However, she also points out that in so doing, these directors reproduce some of these views, notably the association of non-standardness with unintelligibility. Furthermore, three papers consider reception and audiences. Planchenault examines expert and audience responses to the films she studies, thereby supporting her argument on the 'flattening' of indexical orders that takes place at film reception. Bleichenbacher examines discussions on selected films in public web forums, comparing these to the language-ideological positions articulated in the films themselves. Petrucci reports on findings of an 'informal audience response exercise' by which he assesses the impact of translation techniques, i.e. subtitling or dubbing, to audience interpretations of two characters in a particular scene.

In addition to their own findings, these papers suggest that media ethnography or audience research can be a useful part of the sociolinguistic analysis of audio-visual fiction. For example, taking film scripts or dialect coaches into account can offer valuable insights into the processes by which sociolinguistic difference is scripted and performed (see Bucholtz 2011; Kozloff 2000; Richardson 2010; Walshe 2009). At the other end of the communication chain, working with audiences can help us understand how active viewers negotiate responses to the staging of sociolinguistic difference in film, which may well differ from both the 'preferred', hegemonic readings anchored in films themselves and the interpretations offered by analysts.

Filling the gaps

This special issue is not the first attempt to examine film, and fictional discourse more generally, through a sociolinguistic lens. Its antecedents can be divided by chronology, subject matter or discipline. The representation of dialect and code-switching in written fiction has a tradition of

scholarship in literary theory and especially stylistics (cf. Bakhtin 1981; Culpeper 2001; Hess 1996, and a theme issue of *Language and Literature*, 10(2), 2001). It has also been of interest to dialectologists and sociolinguists (e.g. Haas 1983; Johnson 2005; Mesthrie 2005). As far as film is concerned, most papers in this special issue look back to pioneering research by Jane Hill (1995) and Rosina Lippi-Green (1997) whose studies of the representation of Mock Spanish and African-American Vernacular English have not only demonstrated the relevance of popular entertainment media to the reproduction of linguistic discrimination, but also established conceptual and methodological pathways for their study. Other relevant contributions are disparate and hardly ever synthesised. These are three examples from my own experience: Rey (2000) studies language and gender in *Star Trek* and draws on register variation analysis to examine how changing language styles reflect changing social and cultural attitudes to gender. Geeraerts (2001) focuses on morphosyntactic variation analysis in Belgian soap operas and reveals patterns of sociolinguistic stratification by character status. Georgakopoulou (2000) examines heteroglossia in popular Greek cinema of the 1960s, and uses Bakhtin to analyse conflicting relations among various sociolects stylised in films. Thus quite some time before the current interest in the sociolinguistics of fictional performance (cf. Richardson 2010; Bell & Gibson 2011), linguistic variability in (tele-)cinematic discourse has received attention by sociolinguists across countries, languages and frameworks.

However, as I argue below in more detail, some of this previous work focuses on restrictions of linguistic variability in film and television series. It asks where film stops short of reflecting the rich patterns of sociolinguistic variation in 'real life' rather than asking what film actually does with the sociolinguistic contrasts it represents. The papers in this special issue are an attempt to go beyond this perspective. They draw on concepts and frameworks which prioritise a discourse- and action-based analysis of linguistic variability, and therefore faciliate the study of cinematic discourse as a site of social action in its own right; and they bring into the discussion insights from other disciplines, notably film, television and translation studies (see Petrucci, this issue).

While we certainly do not claim to have exhausted the limits of the interdisciplinary exercise that an interest in film inevitably implies for language scholars, it must be emphasised that interdisciplinarity by itself does not fill any gaps. Just as audio-visual fiction is a neglected area of language performance in sociolinguistics, sociolinguistic aspects of language seem neglected in film studies, as suggested by the absence of related entries and topics in glossaries, handbooks or textbooks (see, e.g., Stam 2000; Eder *et al.* 2010). Hutchby (2006) argues that media studies predominantly conceive of language as a 'transparent' medium,

a container for 'content', which is then subjected to narrative analysis or other forms of scrutiny. Another reason may be the shift away from the verbal and towards the visual mode of signification in audiovisual texts, by which film/cinema studies 'emancipated' themselves from literary studies. Together, these led to a marginalisation of indexical aspects of language in the analysis of audio-visual fictional narratives and characters. This is not to say that no such analysis exists. Accent and dialect, jargon and code-switching are well recognised as stylistic resources that film dialogue can draw on (Kozloff 2000), but their treatment in film studies does not seem go much further than a mere notice, even with genres such as contemporary migrant cinema which often use non-standard varieties, migrant languages and code-switching (see Planchenault and Androutsopoulos, this issue).

The benefit from engaging with film studies, then, will probably be less in what it has to say on language and more in its insights into other aspects of cinematic discourse that may have an impact on how film producers and performers deal with sociolinguistic differentiation. Character and characterisation is one such aspect (discussed in detail below), which could well provide an interdisciplinary interface at which linguists could demonstrate beyond their own discipline the importance of linguistic differentiation in audio-visual narrative. Culpeper & McIntyre (2010) argue that how characters use language is in part what defines their activity types in fiction. Extending their argument, suggest that stylistic choices in character speech can be a resource for indexing emotional and affective states or social types and styles. In this interdisciplinary dialogue, linguists can counterbalance the erasure of indexical dimensions of language from film studies, but may also learn not to overestimate the role of language in the multimodal meaning-making system of film.

Points of departure

None of the articles here presents in itself a comprehensive framework for the sociolinguistic analysis of cinematic discourse, but our contributions converge around a number of common themes and perspectives, which delimit what could become such a framework. In the remainder of this Introduction, they are summarised in six interrelated points.

1. A site of sociolinguistic inquiry in its own right

We approach cinematic discourse not as a substitute to something else, but as a legitimate area of sociolinguistic inquiry in its own right. This might sound trivial, but it needs to be said in view of past and present

research that goes the opposite way, i.e. draws on audio-visual fiction as evidence for everyday language. For example, Tagliamonte & Roberts (2005: 280) study intensifiers in a US-American television series and discuss the 'viability of media-based data as a surrogate to "real-world" data in sociolinguistic research'. They examine the distribution of intensifiers by season and sex of character as well as in comparison to corpora of spoken English, and conclude that 'media language actually does reflect what is going on in language' (ibid.: 296). The articles here, however, demonstrate that language in audio-visual fiction is far too varied to conform to this assertion. Moreover, they argue that what we can learn from cinematic discourse may have more to do with a society's language ideologies (see point 5 below) rather than with patterns of actual language use in a speech community.

2. Selective views

Compared to how other disciplines study film, the research presented here is selective. Unlike a thorough multimodal analysis of film that aims at reconstructing 'how films mean' (cf. Bateman & Schmidt 2011), the authors here are rather interested in how sociolinguistic difference 'means' in film. This entails restrictions in terms of what films to examine, and what portions within them to focus on. For one thing, not all films seem equally suited to sociolinguistic scrutiny. This is not to suggest that some audio-visual fiction would be 'sociolinguistically neutral' – none is. But linguistic heterogeneity can be woven into cinematic narratives in different ways, and in the perspectives offered here, films that use dialect as a defining feature rather than a requisite of 'local colour' (Mesthrie 2005), or films in which indexical and iconic dimensions of language are a key aspect of the narrative (Planchenault, this issue) will be the material of choice. Likewise, 'characters whose development on the screen is crucially linked to the linguistic variety they speak or react to' (Petrucci, this issue) will be more relevant than other characters. No doubt a certain 'vernacular bias' exists in these analytic choices, but then again this is what makes film relevant to a sociolinguistic examination of, among other things, the language ideologies that underlie cinematic representations of socio-cultural difference (see also Bucholtz 2011; Bucholtz & Lopez 2011). In the same vein, a sociolinguistic view may focus on earlier rather than later parts of a film, as stylistic differences by character are usually established early on in the plot (see Petrucci and Androutsopoulos); it may focus on one pivotal scene, or just one character (Petrucci, Bednarek, this issue). The tripartite analytic framework of repertoires, characters and scenes proposed by Androutsopoulos (this issue) can serve as a grid in order to contextualise such selections with

respect to an entire film. Bednarek makes use of this grid, focusing on one character and his dialogue.

This selectiveness of analytic approach extends to the multimodality of film. All authors are aware of the integration of visual and linguistic resources in cinematic meaning making. Most articles touch on this at some point in their analysis, notably with reference to particular scenes or dialogues. Bednarek also uses web image search to explore the visual dimension of the social typification that she focuses on in linguistic analysis. Higgins & Furukawa show that stylisations of 'local' Hawaiian characters rely on visual cues, which contribute to the reproduction of orientalist stereotypes. Tsiplakou & Ioannidou demonstrate that filmic, generic and linguistic bricolage collaborate in shaping 'the show's uniquely deconstructive identity'. These analyses make it plain that in audio-visual fiction the 'strategic inauthenticity' highlighted in the socio-linguistic study of stylisation (Coupland 2001) does not rely on language alone. However, none offers a thorough multimodal analysis, and it is fair to say we are still far from an integrated sociolinguistic/multimodal approach to film, or perhaps even more importantly, from a full under-standing of how far a language-focused analysis must go down this path.

3. Beyond 'fidelity checks'

A third point of departure is the suggestion that a sociolinguistic view of audio-visual fiction need not be reduced to the question whether the fictional representation of linguistic variability is 'in fact real'. This sort of question seems to have preoccupied linguists and literary scholars alike, and studies of how accurate historical novelists represent a given dialect are common (e.g. McCafferty 2005). However, evidence suggests that there is no uniform answer to this. A repeated finding is the reduc-tion and suppression of variability in fiction (e.g. Haas 1983; Androutso-poulos 2001; Mesthrie 2005; Bucholtz 2011). More specifically, the com-plexity of a vernacular variety as spoken in a community can be reduced in fictional representation by means of the overgeneralisation of some features and absence of others, or in terms of the environments in which certain features occur. At the level of individual character, stylistic varia-tion is often suppressed in fictional representation, leading to 'monostyl-ism' (Mesthrie 2005), i.e. an invariant style in character speech. These are common features of stereotyping, by which reduced linguistic vari-ability is tied to generalised social categories, producing crude and undif-ferentiated images of how certain social types use language. The literary link of dialect to the figure of the 'peasant' is perhaps the oldest and most obvious example of such stereotyping (Haas 1983).

However, reduction of variability and stereotypisation of difference cannot be generalised across *all* fictional representations of dialect. Genre, authors, performers, market placement, target audience and other aspects of the pragmatics of fiction constrain the quantity and quality of sociolinguistic representations in complex ways. Some literary representations of dialect have been assigned a high degree of accuracy and detail (see, e.g., chapters in the collection by Taavitsainen & Melchers 1999). Familiarity with the represented dialect is a relevant factor here, as is the author's or director's representational strategy with its orientation to realism, social-criticism, or deliberate exaggeration. Comedy treats linguistic diversity differently to drama or action films (Bleichenbacher 2008; Mesthrie 2005). Actors who rely on dialect coaches will perform dialect differently than those with first-hand experience of it, even though the latter may not be free from the pressure to reproduce stereotypes of their own speech when performing (see Planchenault, this issue).

In this special issue, the comparison of language in film in terms of its 'fidelity' or 'accuracy' to everyday conversational speech or academic documentation of vernaculars is neither the sole nor the predominant issue. A number of papers draw on such a comparison in establishing stylisations or character-specific speech patterns (Tsiplakou & Ioannidou, Higgins & Furukawa, Bednarek). However, they integrate this with the analysis of characterisation and/or stylisation and their language-ideological underpinnings. This way, they avoid what I have termed a 'reflection fallacy' (Androutsopoulos 2010), which in turn echoes a wider 'reflective' approach to representation (Hall 1997a). What this means is an epistemological and methodological stance, a 'lens' through which language scholars may decide to examine variation in fiction, thereby focusing on its relation to assumed 'authentic' speech, only to eventually conclude that such straightforward correspondence is not borne out by cinematic facts.

The shortcomings of a 'reflective' approach are particularly obvious in the discussion of hyper-dialectal stylisations. The 'accented' film analysed by Planchenault (this issue) stages working-class, migrant-background teenagers who code-switch between (scripted) urban vernacular, classical literary French, and contemporary standard French, thereby creating a hybrid combination of codes that produces language-ideological messages by its difference to everyday usage and its opposition to popular assumptions of linguistic 'deficiency' of such teenagers. The Cypriot Greek series (Tsiplakou & Ioannidou) is likewise shaped by dissonant stylistic choices, such as English slangy expressions co-occurring with basilectal forms of Cypriot-Greek. The point of this linguistic bricolage is to stylise previous stylisations of the dialect rather than to repro-

duce it in any straightforward way. Its meaning emerges through its intertextual relation to 'well-established Cypriot comedy media genres' which stylise 'the language and the lifestyle of the "rural" part of the speech community'. Appearing 'larger than life and transparently inauthentic' (Coupland 2001: 346) is a precondition on which stylised dialect can expose stereotypes and raises reflexivity on difference. A 'reflective' approach also obscures the fact that for vast numbers of audiences around the world, cinematic experience depends on translation which, be it dubbed or subtitled, alters straightforward orality. Translating non-standard varieties of language always raises the problem of constructing social equivalents. Petrucci's paper shows that subtitling and dubbing affect the perception and evaluation of character in different ways. Together with Queen (2004), he points out that sociolinguistic difference can be 'lost in translation'.

4. *Characters and characterisation*

Rather than just focusing on the language varieties used in film, the papers in this issue develop character-based approaches to linguistic heterogeneity in cinematic discourse, taking their cues from long-established frameworks in literary studies, film studies and stylistics (see Culpeper 2001; Eder *et al.* 2010). For our purposes, a character-based approach assumes that linguistic choices in cinematic discourse become meaningful through their assignment to particular characters and their deployment in dialogic contrasts against the backdrop of (dominant) language ideologies. Bednarek offers the most elaborate discussion of characterisation in this issue, drawing on the rich opportunities offered by television series for the development of fictional characters. Her analysis combines corpus linguistics, dialogue analysis, impoliteness theory, and web image searches. Petrucci discusses how character equivalence is dealt with in film translation when vernacular speech is essential in shaping a character conflict. In the article by Tsiplakou & Ioannidou, character stereotypes such as the 'village priest' are important as background knowledge which the sitcom's extreme bricolage dismantles. The papers by Androutsopoulos, Bleichenbacher and Higgins & Furukawa all show how particular types of characters are shaped by, and correlate with, particular linguistic choices. Bleichenbacher (2008 and this issue) elaborates on the dimensions of narrative evaluations and narrative importance and relates these to the amount of dialogue in a language other than English in mainstream English-language films. Higgins & Furukawa show how staple types of characters contribute to the sociolinguistic repertoires of Hawai'i films. Androutsopoulos examines the codes assigned to characters with different narrative importance in a Turkish−

German comedy, focusing on the repertoires of protagonists and the ways they are contrasted in scenes of conflict.

Characters are pivotal in the reconstruction of a film's sociolinguistic repertoire, defined as a set of relations between characters (typified by genre) and linguistic choices. In the asymmetric organisation of character repertoires, protagonists typically align to mainstream legitimate language, and code-contrasts come to accentuate, and often iconise (Irvine & Gal 2000), character contrasts. Returning to the previous point, an analytic focus on characters complies with and contributes to the theoretical shift from authenticity to authenticating, i.e. the process by which claims of authenticity are discursively constructed and linguistic features come to be positioned as 'authentic' with regard to a place or group (Bucholtz 2003). In this vein, characters are authenticated by the linguistic choices made for them by scriptwriters and performed by actors. And pre-empting the following point, a focus on fictional characters is entirely compatible with a language-ideological approach to film, as language ideologies are mapped on character contrasts in the cinematic representation of social difference.

Again, this perspective is not entirely new. Culpeper's (2001) model of characterisation, a largely shared reference of the articles here, classifies accent and dialect as 'implicit textual cues' to characterisation in drama and prose. The relation of language varieties to (types of) characters has been examined in some of the pioneering research referenced above. In Lippi-Green's (1997) study of Disney animated movies, the correlation of dialect choice to character status (the latter determined by narrative evaluation, narrative importance and fictional 'socio-demographics') is the main evidence for the claim that the distribution of non-standard speech to characters amounts to linguistic discrimination. Geeraerts (2001) shows that morphosyntactic variation in Belgian soap operas reflects status differences in predictable ways, with lower-status characters using more non-standard variants and vice-versa. Taavitsainen & Melchers (1999: 13) offer this generalisation in a discussion of writing in non-standard English:

> In fiction non-standard forms are mostly found in dialogues and they are used as a powerful tool to reveal character traits or social and regional differences; that is what they 'do' in texts. Thus the function of non-standard language in literature is to indicate the position and status of the character, and often such features are used for comical purposes to release laughter. It is mostly the low and the rural that are presented as speakers of non-standard; humorous parts are attributed to minor characters and non-standard language to side episodes.

Some contributions to this special issue offer findings that basically conform to this scheme, for example the allocation of 'Interlanguage German' to working-class minor characters in the comedy analysed by Androutsopoulos. However, others do not. A rigid correlation of fictional dialect and character status would entirely miss the hyper-dialectal stylisations discussed by Tsiplakou & Ioannidou and Planchenault. It therefore seems important to allow for a degree of complexity in the language style designed for fictional characters, and it could well be the case that contemporary cinematic representations are becoming more complex in this respect, not least due to the changing indexical values of vernaculars in late modernity (Coupland 2009; Androutsopoulos 2010). Reduced indexicals of local or social belonging are still there, but so too are strategic uses of linguistic variation by characters who are designed with the capacity to stylise and strategically transcend their default speech style (Petrucci and Androutsopoulos, this issue).

5. Cinematic language ideologies

As already alluded to, the contributions to this issue examine stylistic choices in film dialogue in terms of their underlying linguistic ideologies. The notion of language ideologies − broadly defined as sets of beliefs and evaluations of language structure, language use and language/society relations (Milani & Johnson 2010) − is used here as a bracket for a range of concepts endorsed by the authors and applied in their articles. Bleichenbacher draws on the notion of linguicism, Higgins & Furulawa on orientalism, Planchenault draws on the notions of standard language ideology and orders of indexicality and, together with Androutsopoulos, on the language ideologies framework proposed by Irvine & Gal (2000).

What makes language ideology a powerful perspective for the study of cinematic discourse is the way it permeates all its nodes and layers. In a reflexive relationship, language in audio-visual fiction is both shaped by (dominant) language ideologies and potentially shaping the language ideologies of audiences. As argued by Planchenault, the film directors' stylistic choices interact with dominant language-ideological discourses, endorsing, opposing or in some way negotiating them. This echoes earlier suggestions such as that 'dramatists can capitalise upon the attitudes stereotypically associated with particular accents and dialects' (Culpeper 2001: 206), or that popular media represents 'the language scriptwriters imagine that [people] will produce' (Rey 2001: 138). As a consequence, film dialogue offers a window to 'the ways in which language affirms and reinforces, at best, mainstream and, at worst, stereotypical beliefs and attitudes' (Georgakopoulou 2000: 119). In such an analysis, for example, changes in the language style and interactional

conduct of female and male characters will be interpreted in terms of how they index changes in popular stereotypes of gender and language (Rey 2001).

The papers in this issue demonstrate a range of options for language-ideological analysis (in the broadest sense of the term) of film and television data. Androutsopoulos reconstructs the language-ideological underpinnings of the representation of language and class, ethnicity, gender and generation in Turkish−German comedy. Planchenault argues that the language-ideological stance of the films she studies is not recognised as such by reviewers and audiences, but 'erased in favour of a pre-ideological or semiotic level'. Thus 'second-order indexicality is often misinterpreted as first-order indexicality' as viewers and reviewers fall back on a 'reflective' (see point 3 above) reading of these films. Bleichenbacher asks 'to what extent the English-language cinematic mainstream embodies the fictional counterpart of … linguicism'. His argument is in line with interdisciplinary critique of mainstream US-American cinema as a site of stereotyping and 'othering' of non-English speaking minority groups (see, e.g., Stam 2000: 273−280). Drawing on a corpus of mainstream Hollywood and European productions, Bleichenbacher examines linguistic discrimination quantitatively and qualitatively. He suggests that 'a lot of non-English dialogue typically serves to make the respective L1 speakers more negatively salient', and that metalanguage in film dialogues contributes to multilingualism among L1-English speakers being 'prominently highlighted, while the inverse is true for speakers of another language'. His case study of audience discussions in a movie forum suggests that there is no straightforward relation of the language ideologies encoded in film to their 'decoding' by viewers; rather, cinematic stereotyping is negotiated by audience members. Higgins & Furukawa's approach resembles Bleichenbacher's critical stance to Hollywood's representations of linguistic and cultural otherness. Drawing on the notion of orientalism, they argue that the four movies they examine offer coarse, if not discriminating stereotypes of 'Locals' against which the moral superiority of the white protagonists and their character development during the narrative can stand out. Their findings echo Bucholtz' (2011) critique how 'wigger' stereotypes in Hollywood movies reinforce racial boundaries. These Hawai'i movies nicely illustrate the linguistic iconisation of boundaries between locals, non-local protagonists, and the quasi-local characters that mediate between the two.

6. Styling and stylisation

Our last point of departure is the suggestion that telecinematic data, not least by virtue of their scriptedness and audio-visual richness, call for

conceptual and analytic refinements in the sociolinguistic study of performance and stylisation. Most authors in this issue find in dialect stylisation as elaborated by Coupland (2001, 2007) a productive frame for the analysis of performed character speech. Some aspects of stylisation suit film well: stylisation evokes and enacts *personae* who represent well recognisable social types. In this process, stylisation works with stereotypes, thereby presupposing a knowing audience that shares a common stock of cultural knowledge. Several articles in this issue illustrate how stylisation departs from naturalistic usage and draws on exaggeration in order to achieve a semiotic 'condensation' of social types (Higgins & Furukawa, Tsiplakou & Ioannidou, Planchenault, Androutsopoulos). However, other characteristics of stylisation do not seem to fit film equally well. Stylisation in spoken conversational data is typically studied as a transient stage of on-going interaction, in which speakers temporarily 'put on a voice' and speak *in persona*, thereby breaking with contextual expectations. However, film is entirely based on speaking 'in character', a fact that makes a view of stylisation as a temporary stepping-out of an established interaction frame less adequate.

In this spirit, Androutsopoulos and Higgins & Furukawa distinguish between styling and stylising. Here styling is the concept with the broader extension, understood as the design of character in terms of language style, leaving stylisation to focus on more specific discourse processes. Thus stylisation can focus on a particular mode of character styling, which draws on overtly stereotyped and obviously exaggerated realisations of dialect or language/dialect mixing (Tsiplakou & Ioannidou). Stylisation can also focus on the tension between an actor's ordinary voice and their put-on voice in a film (Planchenault). Alternatively, and closer to the term's conventional usage, stylisation captures the cinematic moments when characters step out of their ordinary voice and into adopting a different voice (Androutsopoulos). With this distinction, it is possible to describe stylisation-within-styling as well as styling-by-stylising, i.e. to locate instances of stylisation within the more regularly patterned styling of cinematic speech, and to think of characterisation as drawing on either styling and/or stylisation (Higgins & Furukawa).

Furthermore, these articles are instructive with regard to the political implications of cinematic language stylisation. The two analyses of stylised hyperdialectisms in particular demonstrate how stylisation in audiovisual fiction can aim at challenging language stereotypes and reframing local and stigmatised ways of speaking. Tsiplakou & Ioannidou argue that beyond its comical effect, *Aigia Fuchsia* offers a 'performative destabilizing of dominant folk linguistic constructs', whereby dialect stylisation is a key resource in deconstructing 'usual' representations of local rural communities in Cyprus. But again (as the authors also point out), this

analysis cannot pre-empt the range of possible reading positions: not everyone may read this deconstruction in the same way.

It is interesting to compare in this respect the analyses by Higgins & Furukawa, on the one hand, to those by Planchenault and Tsiplakou & Ioannidou on the other. In the first, the stylisation of Local/Hawaiian characters bears disrespectful traits and perpetuates Orientalist discourses, echoing the claim that Hollywood stylisations of 'wigger' characters perpetuate racial divides (Bucholtz 2011). In the latter, stylisation reframes the status of non-standard varieties and their speakers, and subverts hegemonic modes of imagination by exposing their constructedness. Now, it would probably be too simplistic to see here a 'typical' difference between 'Hollywood' and 'European' telecinematic traditions. But the comparison does suggest that much can be gained by broadening the scope of telecinematic data in sociolinguistic research. As Bell & Gibson (2011: 536) point out, at this stage of research it is impossible to say to what extent findings may be skewed by the dominance of English language data in the available scholarship, for example as far as stereotypical representations of multilingualism or standard/dialect contrasts are concerned. This special issue suggests that studying a range of languages, industries/markets and cinematic traditions is bound to contribute to a more complex and probably messier picture of language and society in audio-visual fiction.

University of Hamburg

References

Alim, H. Samy, Award Ibrahim & Alastair Pennycook (eds.). 2009. *Global linguistic flows: Hip Hop cultures, youth identities, and the politics of language*. New York/ Oxford: Routledge.

Androutsopoulos, Jannis. 2001. 'Ultra korregd Alder!' Zur medialen Stilisierung und Popularisierung von 'Türkendeutsch'. *Deutsche Sprache* 4. 321−339.

Androutsopoulos, Jannis. 2010. The study of language and space in media discourse. In Peter Auer & Jürgen Erich Schmidt (eds.), *Language and space: An international handbook of linguistic variation*, Vol. 1, 740−758. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Auer, Peter & Jürgen Erich Schmidt (eds.). 2010. *Language and space: An international handbook of linguistic variation*, Vol. 1. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bateman, John & Karl-Heinrich Schmidt. 2011. *Multimodal film analysis: How films mean.* London: Routledge.

Bednarek, Monika. 2010. *The Language of Fictional Television.* London/New York: Continuum.

Bell, Allan & Andy Gibson. 2011. Staging language: An introduction to the sociolinguistics of performance. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15(5). 555−572.

Besch, Werner, Ulrich Koop, Wolfgang Putschke & Herbert Ernst Wiegand (eds.). 1983. *Dialektologie. Ein Handbuch zur deutschen und allgemeinen Dialektforschung,* 2nd Vol. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Bleichenbacher, Lukas. 2008. *Multilingualism in the movies: Hollywood characters and their linguistic choices.* Tübingen: Francke.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2003. Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(3). 398−416.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2011. Race and the re-embodied voice in Hollywood film. *Language and Communication* 31. 255−265.

Bucholtz, Mary & Qiuana Lopez. 2011. Performing blackness, forming whiteness: Linguistic minstrelsy in Hollywood film. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15(5). 680−706.

Conrad, Susan & Douglas Biber (eds.). 2001. *Variation in English: Multi-dimensional studies*. Harlow: Longman.

Coupland, Nikolas. 2001. Dialect stylization in radio talk. *Language in Society* 30. 345−375.

Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style. Language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coupland, Nikolas. 2009. The mediated performance of vernaculars. *Journal of English Linguistics* 37(3). 284−300.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2001. *Language and characterization: People in plays and other texts*. Harlow: Longman.

Culpeper, Jonathan & Dan McIntyre. 2010. Activity types and characterisation in dramatic discourse. In Jens Eder, Fotis Jannidis & Ralf Schneider (eds.), *Characters in fictional worlds*, 176−207. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Eder, Jens, Fotis Jannidis & Ralf Schneider (eds.). 2010. *Characters in fictional worlds: Understanding imaginary beings in literature, film, and other media.* Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Media discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Geeraerts, Dirk. 2001. Everyday language in the media: The case of Belgian Dutch soap series. In Andrea Lehr, Matthias Kammerer, Klaus-Peter Konderding, Angelika Storrer, Caja Thimm & Werner Wolski (eds.), *Sprache im Alltag*, 281−291. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2000. On the sociolinguistics of popular films: Funny characters, funny voices. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 18(1). 119−133.

Haas, Walter. 1983. Dialekt als Sprache literarischer Werke. In Werner Besch, Ulrich Koop, Wolfgang Putschke & Herbert Ernst Wiegand (eds.), *Dialektologie. Ein Handbuch zur deutschen und allgemeinen Dialektforschung,* 2nd Vol., 1637−1651. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Hall, Stuart. 1997a. The work of representation. In Stuart Hall (ed.), *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices,* 13−74. London: Sage.

Hall, Stuart (ed.) 1997b. *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage.

Hess, Natalie. 1996. Code switching and style shifting as markers of liminality in literature. *Language and Literature* 5(1). 5−18

Hill, Jane. 1995. Mock Spanish: A site for the indexical reproduction of racism in American English. URL: *www.disabilitystudies.jp/nakamura/courses/linguisticanthro/hill1995/index.html* <2012-02-20>

Hutchby, Ian. 2006. *Media talk: Conversation analysis and the study of broadcasting*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Irvine, Judith T. & Susan Gal. 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities*, 35−84. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Jonsson, Carla. 2005. Code-switching in Chicano Theater: power, identity and style in three plays by Cherríe Morage. PhD Thesis. Umea Universitet: Institutionen för moderna sprak.

Kozloff, Sarah. 2000. *Overhearing film dialogue*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

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

Lehr, Andrea, Matthias Kammerer, Klaus-Peter Konderding, Angelika Storrer, Caja Thimm & Werner Wolski (eds.). 2001. *Sprache im Alltag*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1997.Teaching children how to discriminate: What we learn from the Big Bad Wolf. In *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States,* 79−103. London: Routledge.

McCafferty, Kevin. 2005. William Carleton between Irish and English: Using literary dialect to study language contact and change. *Language and Literature* 14(4). 339−362.

Mesthrie, Rajend. 2005. Assessing representations of South African Indian English in writing: An application of variation theory. *Language Variation and Change* 17. 303−326.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2007. *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London: Routledge.

Piazza, Roberta, Monika Bednarek & Fabio Rossi. 2011a. Introduction: Analysing telecinematic discourse. In Roberta Piazza, Monika Bednarek & Fabio Rossi (eds.), *Telecinematic discourse: Approaches to the language of films and television series*, 1−17. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Piazza, Roberta, Monika Bednarek & Fabio Rossi (eds.). 2011b. *Telecinematic discourse: Approaches to the language of films and television series*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Queen, Robin. 2004. 'Du hast jar keene Ahnung'. African American English dubbed into German. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8(4). 515−537.

Rey, Jennifer M. 2001. Changing gender roles in popular culture: dialogue in Star Trek episodes from 1966 to 1993. In Susan Conrad & Douglas Biber (eds.), *Variation in English: Multi-dimensional studies*, 138−156. Harlow: Longman.

Richardson, Kay. 2010. *Television dramatic dialogue: A sociolinguistic study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stam, Robert. 2000. *Film theory: An introduction.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Taavitsainen, Irma & Gunnel Melchers. 1999. Writing in Nonstandard English: Introduction. In Irma Taavitsainen, Gunnel Melchers & Päivi Pahta (eds.), *Writing in Nonstandard English*, 1−26. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Irma Taavitsainen, Gunnel Melchers & Päivi Pahta (eds.). 1999. *Writing in Nonstandard English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tagliamonte, Sali A. & Chris Roberts. 2005. So weird; so cool; so innovative: The use of intensifiers in the television series *Friends*. *American Speech* 80. 280−300.

Walshe, Shane. 2009. *Irish English as represented in film*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.