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This presentation builds on Philipsen’s (Philipsen, 1997; Philipsen, Coutu, & Covarrubias, 2005; Philipsen, 2008) Speech Codes Theory (SCT), which is an inductively derived descriptive framework within the Ethnography of Communication tradition. It consists of six propositions about the means and meanings of communication as a cultural practice. Our goal is to elaborate on proposition 2, which states that: “In any given speech community, multiple speech codes are deployed” (Philipsen et al., 2005, p. 59). Specifically, we aim at developing a more nuanced theoretical understanding of how multiple speech codes articulate with each other. Then, we will propose a method to analyze these intersections and interanimations among speech codes.

We ground our theoretical elaboration and methodological proposal in the work of Bakhtin’s framework of dialogism (Bakhtin, 1981; Bakhtin, 1984; Bakhtin, 1986), Baxter’s contrapuntal analysis (Baxter, 2007; Baxter, Foley, & Thatcher, 2008; Baxter, 2004; Baxter, 2010), Martin and colleagues work on Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005; White, 2003), and Simmel’s (Simmel, 1904) ideas on the sociology of conflict. In addition, we use a wide variety of existing scholarship on speech codes theory and dialogism to illustrate our proposal.

The method that we propose to understand how speech codes articulate with each other draws specifically the work of on contrapuntal analysis by Baxter (2010) and appraisal theory by Martin and White (2005). There are some discursive markers that indicate “how and to what ends, the textual voice [or social actor] engages with alternative voices and positions [or speech codes]” (White, 2003, p. 62). In other words, how does a speaker orient to a given speech code? and, why does a speaker talk about a speech code? White (2003) posits that as social actors we use discursive practices that are “dialogically expansive” and “dialogically contractive.” Respectively, these dialogic functions refer to “the degree to which an utterance entertains dialogically alternative positions and voices [or speech codes], or alternatively, acts to challenge, fend off or restrict the scope of such” (p. 262). By focusing on metacommunication, and specifically paying attention to markers or dialogic engagement and contraction, the analyst can get a richer and more nuanced understanding of the substance of speech codes. Furthermore, by learning how social actors orient to certain speech codes, the analyst can draw conclusions about such code’s discursive force in that speech community.


