Attitude and Stance in Discourse

Attitude and Stance in Discourse

Edited by

Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu
Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu
Gabriela Stoica
Șerban Hartular

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Attitude and Stance in Discourse

Edited by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu, Gabriela Stoica and Șerban Hartular

This book first published 2022

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-7610-8
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-7610-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC	accusative
Adj	adjective/adjectival
CL	clitic
DIST	distal
DOM	differential object marker
e.g.	*exempli gratia*
Engl.	English
EXALT	exalting form
F/fem.	feminine
Fr.	French
GEN	genitive
HUM	humble form
i.e.	*id est*
IMP	imperfect
Lat.	Latin
M/masc.	masculine
N	noun/nominal
NOM	nominative
PL/pl.	plural
POL	polite
PRES	present
PST	past
Q	question marker
Rom.	Romanian
s.v.	*sub voce*
SG/sg.	singular
T/V	*tu*/*vous*
TOP	topic marker
V	verb
vs	*versus*

INTRODUCTION

LILIANA IONESCU-RUXĂNDOIU

1. Preliminary Remarks

This volume includes a selection of papers presented at the international workshop *Attitude and Stance in Discourse*, held at the University of Bucharest, on November 23–24, 2018. The workshop aimed to address this complex topic from a wide range of perspectives and to promote dialogue among stance researchers from different countries, who have quite different professional backgrounds, experience, and scholarly interests. Some researchers joined our team afterwards. Their papers were also included in this volume.

One can speak of a certain "tradition" of scientific events devoted to stance and stancetaking. The panel organised by Shoaps and Kockelman at the 101st annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association (New Orleans/Los Angeles, 2002), the symposium organised by Englebretson at Rice University, Houston (2004), and the panel organised by Jaffe at Newcastle upon Tyne (2004) are among the best known. There is also a basic bibliography of the problem, which includes volumes such as: Hunston and Thompson eds. (2000), Graumann and Kallmeyer eds. (2002), Englebretson ed. (2007), Jaffe ed. (2009), etc.

Stancetaking is inherent in verbal communication. It involves both a subjective and an intersubjective side, as expressing a position with respect to a certain matter is open to challenge by the others. The negotiation of the opinions and the calibration of the subjectivities (Du Bois 2007, 162) are jointly realised in interaction (Du Bois 2007, 172–173). Stancetaking is a multifaceted activity, including not only a linguistic and discursive component, but also sociocultural, epistemic, and psychological components. At the same time, stancetaking has a cross-cultural, cross-linguistic, historical, and developmental nature (Englebretson 2007, 18).

The papers included in this volume analyse the functioning of stancetaking in different oral and written communicative forms, such as political and judicial discourse, journalism, social networks, school

debates, private correspondence, bilingual communication, fiction, and explore variations in meaning negotiation processes, as well as intercultural differences and diachronic aspects. The approach to these topics is mainly pragma-rhetorical and interactional, but also interdisciplinary: cultural anthropology and social psychology play an important part in the analyses. There is also a specific focus on possible practical applications of some key findings of stance research, such as improvement of communication in bilingual or multi-ethnic communities, as well as improvement of language planning and policies, improvement of teaching foreign languages or refining students' communicative abilities.

2. Terminological Remarks

There is a certain terminological variation when discussing the individual differences in viewing and evaluating a certain thing, person, event or state of affairs, which are inherent in communicative interaction.

Researchers who are native speakers of English prefer the term *stance*, whereas some others prefer the terms *perspective* or *viewpoint* (*point of view*), as *stance* does not have a proper equivalent in their languages (mainly in Romance languages, but also in German) and is accordingly felt as lacking a necessary transparency.

Stance appears as a rather paradoxical term in view of its etymology. *Stance* is a Romance borrowing in English, connected with the Latin verb *stare* ("to stand", but also "not to move"). Basically, it designates a physical position or posture, preceding a specific move (in connection with the games and sports), which should be held for a certain time. The meaning of "intellectual or emotional attitude" (which is mentioned only by Webster's Dictionary) is a derived one. What connects the two meanings is the idea of "immobility". But for pragmatics and communication studies the most important aspect is to analyse the possibility of calibrating the subjectivities (= stances) in and through interaction.

As for *viewpoint* (or *point of view*), as well as *perspective*, they originate in the researches of the French school of narratology (Bremond, Genette, Todorov, Kristeva), in the second half of the past century. Within the limits of the dominant – at that time – paradigm of structuralism, they defined the narrative situation in relation to three basic parameters: time, person, and mood (or modality), which are transparently provided by grammatical – in this case, morphological – descriptions. The choice of these parameters can be explained by the fact that narrative involves

action. Accordingly, the grammatical categories used to describe verbs have been reinterpreted and adapted for the description of narratives. Mood (modality) refers to the perspective (point of view) from which the story is told: the perspective of the narrator – who can be either an outsider or an insider in the fictional world (s)he creates – or the perspective of one or different characters.

This way of viewing narrative is useful, as it involves the idea of a large diversity of perspectives from which the same facts can be approached, understood, and evaluated.

More recent research on narratives use *focalisation* to describe the above-mentioned aspects (see Mey ed. 1998, 619). In his definition of *focalisation*, Mey (2000 [1998], 145) brings together the concepts of perspective and point of view. He calls *focalisation* "the general *perspective*", which has to do with the fact that "every presentation is made in relation to the *point of view* of the presenter and his or her *focus* on the world" (emphasis mine, LIR). Accordingly, perspective and focus appear as "*relative* to a particular world of 'seers'" (Mey 2000 [1998], 145), expressing "the absolute *relativity* of our world" (Mey 2000 [1998], 146).

Modern theories of perspective in literature have taken into consideration Ba(k)htin's (1982) ideas about the internal dialogisation of voices, orchestrated by the writer, which results in a specific plurivocality, based on a reciprocal adaptation of the characters' voices, as well as of the characters' and author's voices.

The system of concepts discussed above, currently used in narratology, highlights the idea of the great diversity of our representations about the world and accordingly of our opinions, but at the same time, via dialogism, the idea of the possibility of negotiating the differences. In other words, they appear as having more dynamic connotations than *stance*.

German specialists (see Graumann and Kallmeyer eds. 2002) are the ones who accredited *perspective*, and the derived forms *perspectivity, perspectivation*, as basic terms in the analysis of the most different forms of verbal communication. They make reference to *perspective* as a relevant aspect in the analysis of narratives, as well as to Ba(k)htin's contribution to the modern understanding of the concept (Graumann and Kallmeyer 2002, 5).

Starting from the general idea of the "relativity and perspectival structure of human knowledge", Graumann and Kallmeyer (2002, 1) define *perspective* or *viewpoint* as "a position from which a person or a group view something (things, persons, events) and communicate their

views". Admitting that human knowledge and cognition are "intrinsically perspectival" (Graumann 2002, 27), as the result of a subject's positioning in relation to a certain object (Foppa 2002, 17), *perspectivity* appears as an issue shared by different specialists, not only linguists, but also sociologists, psychologists, or literary theorists (Graumann 2002, 27), who have in view different elements of the perspectival structure of knowledge and communication. *Perspectivation* mainly concerns linguists, as it refers to the verbal practices speakers use to represent perspectives (Graumann and Kallmeyer 2002, 4), that is, linguistic possibilities of expressing perspective. The dynamic and interactional nature of perspectivation is brought forward by the possibility of a *re-perspectivation*, as a result of recontextualisation of different viewpoints (Graumann 2002, 35).

3. Definitions of Stance. Specific Features

No matter which term we prefer, stance and perspective basically refer to the same kind of aspects regarding human communication.

In 2007, Englebretson noticed the absence of "an agreed definition of stance from an academic perspective" (Englebretson 2007, 4). This fact can be explained by the large diversity of perspectives from which stance can be approached and examined, given the complexity of the aspects it involves. Beside the pragma-linguistic, discursive, and interactional views on stance (Graumann and Kallmeyer eds. 2002; Englebretson ed. 2007; Weigand 2010, 2016), there are also sociolinguistic (Jaffe ed. 2009) and stylistic approaches (Johnstone 2009; Kiesling 2009), cognitive and psychological approaches (Sakita 2006), as well as approaches more connected with ideology and politics, like critical discourse analysis, etc. Stance is by its nature an interdisciplinary field, shared by different specialists, who examine it in connection with their scholarly background and research interests.

Still, there is an important number of constants in defining stance (or perspective). All definitions make reference to language, conceived not as an abstract system, but as a system which is used in interaction, in specific contexts, by persons with a specific psychological and sociocultural background, who intend to achieve certain results (to fulfil some specific goals).

Different researches make reference to a similar core of features which define stance (or perspective). Linell (2002, 43–47) identified 15 such features. Leaving aside some partial overlap between them, one can characterise stance (perspective) as: (1) subjective (it belongs to a certain person), (2) relational (it concerns a certain referent or topic, but it is also

directed towards a certain partner, who is conceived in a certain way by the speaker), (3) indexed and grounded in discourse, without being asserted as such (when asserted, it becomes meta-discourse), but including some elements which guide the partner's interpretation, (4) dynamic (being usually only partially shared by the interlocutors, perspectives are negotiated; they can undergo changes in and through interaction, but also through recontextualisation), (5) associated with and subordinated to specific activity types and discourse genres, which make speaker's position predictable.

Quite similar views are expressed by Englebretson (2007, 3), who insists on the situated, pragmatic, and interactional character of stance. As a situated activity, stancetaking is indexical for a broader sociocultural framework. As a public activity, it can be analysed and interpreted by the others, and accordingly it can have consequences for its authors or for the institutions they represent (Englebretson 2007, 6).

Further researches refine the analysis of these basic features. Defining stance from a sociolinguistic perspective, Jaffe (2009, 4) maintains that stance is not transparent, but inferred from the empiric analysis of interactions, in a specific social and historical context. Accordingly, stance appears not only as socially variable, but also as both culturally grounded and culturally variable (Jaffe 2009, 7). Stance is inherent in talk, no matter if it concerns the form or the content of the discourse. Communicative forms can be more or less stance saturated; neutrality is in itself a stance (Jaffe 2009, 3).

Kiesling (2009, 177) underlines the indexical nature of stance. Stances create and reflect the context. Their indexicality is both interior (reflecting the moment of speaking) and exterior (connected with the lasting social contexts, and accordingly transportable from one speech event to other). Kiesling (2009, 174) defines personal styles as repertoires of stances. Accordingly, stancetaking is considered as "the main constitutive social activity that speakers engage in when both creating style and style-shifting" (Kiesling 2009, 175).

In Kiesling's opinion, learning stances and their indexicalities is part of learning a language. Children learn stance meaning as part of the grammar, even before their being exposed to the full social variation in a speech community and learning the social identity indexicalities (Kiesling 2009, 175–176).

Johnstone (2009, 31–33) expresses, in a way, similar views, when speaking of recurrent patterns of stancetaking over time and situation, which create styles associated with different situations and social

identities. A recurrent use of certain forms in a certain context becomes indexical for that context.

Coupland and Coupland (2009, 228) underline the dialogic nature of stances, which can comply or conflict with other possible stances. This is due to the fact that stances involve evaluation and appraisal of a given object or situation, which can be highly individual, but sometimes are connected with certain culture-specific (or group-specific, I can add) ideologies.

4. The Functioning and Functions of Stance

Considering the mechanisms underlying the process of stancetaking or perspectivation, one can notice some differences in their description. Perspectivation is seen mostly as combining two complementary activities, one originating in the speaker, who sets a certain perspective on a given matter, and the other, performed by the receiver, who takes in that perspective. Graumann and Kallmeyer (2002, 5) speak about the interplay of these activities, but at the same time they consider them quite different in nature. Perspective-setting is connected with language use, whereas perspective-taking appears as a mental process.

The description of the stancetaking processes captures their interactional nature in a more convincing way. Du Bois (2007, 162–163) views stancetaking as a unified act, which involves three basic activities, simultaneously achieved in dialogue by the participants: evaluation, positioning, and alignment in relation to a certain object. Accordingly, even if only one of these activities is explicitly performed by a certain speaker, all participants are able to draw inferences about the other activities.

Du Bois's stance triangle parallels, at a different level, some well-known argumentative models, from the "classical" triadic model of reasoning: thesis, antithesis, synthesis, to the model of critical discussion in the extended theory of strategic maneuvering, proposed by van Eemeren and his co-workers (2002, 2010). All these models involve the idea of a possible difference of opinion, but whereas in the case of reasoning model the approach is monologic, in the other two cases it is dialogic (the differences of opinion between the interlocutors should be diminished through strategic maneuvering – van Eemeren 2010, or, evaluating a shared stance object, stancetakers position themselves, and accordingly align with each other – Du Bois 2007).

The stance model representation in the form of a triangle, proposed by Du Bois, reflects the fact that evaluation, as well as positioning, are

connected with the interlocutors' subjective value judgments, attitudes, and feelings. When positioning themselves towards a shared stance object, interlocutors simultaneously define either a convergent or a divergent alignment with each other. The implicit stance alignment is crucial for the management of the intersubjectivity in the process of dialogic action, as it serves to calibrate the relationships between two stances. In Du Bois's view, alignment does not necessarily involve agreeing with the interlocutor, but rather accepting to discuss a certain matter. Agreement is jointly constructed and negotiated in and through interaction (Du Bois 2007, 142–144; 162–165).

Starting from the idea that language users are dialogic individuals, some newer orientations in pragmatics conceive the hearer not only as an interpreter of the speaker's sayings, but also as an interlocutor, who reacts to what is said by the speaker in an attempt to arrive at an understanding (Weigand 2017, 174–175). Relying on the existence of some common ground (Linell 2017, 112), participants in a dialogue continuously try to "adapt and adjust themselves to each other" (Gee 2017, 67). Accordingly, meaning appears as dynamic, co-constructed, "turn-based and interactive" (Gee 2017, 68). Nevertheless, sharedness of opinions and intersubjectivity should not be understood as complete, but as "sufficient for the current practical purposes" (Linell 2017, 110). This is due to the fact that each participant in a dialogue has his/her personality, biography (including a specific cultural background), goals, and interests (Garfinkel 1967, apud Linell 2017, 110). As a matter of fact, differences of opinion and subjective perceptions of individuals are the basic stimulus for communicative interaction (see also Linell 2017, 111).

The stance dialogic action can be strategically performed, depending on the participants' intentions and goals, but also on the general communicative context, as well as on the norms of a certain discursive genre in a given culture. Irony and its extreme variant, sarcasm, rhetorical questions or quotations are some of the most commonly used strategies. All of them are based on a particular form of speaker's voice management, namely double-voicedness. It involves a split between an asserting and an interpretive voice. Double-voicedness can be explicit, as in the case of quotation, or implicit, as in the case of irony, sarcasm, or rhetorical questions. In the case of quotations, in the speaker's voice, one can hear a second voice, explicitly named or easily recognisable. The two voices can be either consonant or dissonant regarding their evaluation and positioning related to a certain topic, and accordingly their mutual alignment can be either convergent or divergent. In the case of irony (and sarcasm), one can hear the interpreting voice only; the asserting voice is silenced. Evaluation

and positioning of the two voices are always contrasting; accordingly, their mutual alignment is excluded. In the case of rhetorical questions, only the asserting voice is heard, but its similarity to the majority of the interpreting voices regarding the evaluation and positioning is taken for granted. Accordingly, the mutual alignment between the two voices appears as normal (Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu 2012, 151–165).

The description of the main features that define stance and of its functioning mechanisms is relevant to the complexity of its functions. Far from being "a matter of private opinion or attitude" (Du Bois 2007, 171), stancetaking is emblematic for the interdependence between communication, society, culture, and ideology. As Jaffe (2009, 13) puts it, "the individual acts of stance become *indirect* indexes (via language choices; emphasis mine, LIR) of the political, social, cultural, ideological fields of action". As "the smallest unit of social action" (Du Bois 2007, 173), stance plays specific functions in a given community. Kiesling's (2009, 172–173) distinction between epistemic and interpersonal stances reflects the bivalent nature of the concept. Stances are related both to the content of a certain assertion (expressing the degree of the speaker's certainty about his/her sayings) and to socialness (expressing the relationships with the interlocutors, which are usually socially, but also culturally controlled). A speaker's linguistic choices can reflect an intention to explicitly mark his/her belonging to a certain social group or to claim a certain social identity (Kiesling 2009, 171). Taking a certain stance, a person implicitly construes and performs – via his/her linguistic and discursive choices – a certain individual, social, and interpersonal identity for him/herself (Jaffe, 2009, 24), which can be genuine or enacted (see also Kiesling 2009, 171). His/her choices define (or redefine) the performance situation and the communicative context, the role relationships included (Jaffe 2009, 10–13). At the same time, they are indirectly indexical (Jaffe, 2009, 13) not only for that person's value system, but also for the value system of the particular community (s)he belongs to (Jaffe 2009, 5, 21).

As Kiesling (2009, 177) notes, the recurrent presence of certain stances in the discourse of certain social groups makes them emblematic for those groups. Cultural models serve to mediate the association of different stances with different social groups (Kiesling 2009, 172).

Community-relevant values which are activated via specific stances define a frame of interpretation of the speaker's position for the other interactants (Du Bois 2007, 141). Accordingly, sometimes they can become the trigger of ideological disputes (Jaffe 2009, 5). Still, depending on the communicative situation, the speaker can exploit this indexical

aspect of stance (see also Coupland and Coupland 2009, 227) and strategically construe his/her stance. (S)he can suggest the community of values with the interlocutors (Jaffe 2009, 13), in order to avoid conflict and/or reach a certain goal. Sometimes, construing a stance can be manipulative.

Accordingly, among the social functions of stancetaking, one can mention the definition of the communicative situation, which sometimes might undergo important changes during the same communicative event. Verschueren (2019, 304) views stance and stancetaking (perspective and perspectivation, in his terms) as an important dimension of "contextual indexing", which is always intersubjectively achieved. The redefinition of a given situation depends on the evolution of the interactive process, on the general goals of the participants at a certain moment, as well as on their communicative flexibility.

As a primary concern of the speakers in the interactive processes (see Kiesling 2009, 179), stancetaking mediates the negotiation between the participants of the variables and variants (Kiesling 2009, 191). This can result in a redefinition of the whole communicative event, which is made possible by a specific interplay between the interior and exterior indices of contextualisation.

Evaluation of an object and positioning towards it, as basic components of the stancetaking activity, are shaped by individual value systems, but at the same time by the value system of the community the interlocutors belong to, which defines a specific culture (Du Bois 2007, 173; Jaffe 2009, 5). Being dialogically achieved and publicly performed, stances involve a reference system that is shared by the interlocutors (Du Bois 2007, 171). In taking a stance, a person selectively enacts and reproduces components of the sociocultural value system of a given community, but also reshapes it in a specific way and to different degrees (Du Bois 2007, 173). This happens in the case of both affective and epistemic stances (for this distinction, see Jaffe 2009, 7). Speaker's claims to a particular identity and status, his/her specific manner of self-presentation, as well as the way of evaluating the identity and status of his/her interlocutors (or of the audience), which define the affective stance, are grounded in a specific sociocultural value system. In the case of epistemic stance, the speaker's degree of certainty about the truth and validity of his/her statements depends on the specific perception of the relationship between knowledge and authority in a given culture as well. This relationship has a strong impact on the evaluation of the relative authority of the interlocutors. The interactional calibration of social roles, reflected in the way a speaker presents him/herself, is influenced by

his/her cultural perception about people's preference for reliable sources of knowledge or for a credibility based on social power, in a given community (see Jaffe 2009, 7–8). The right cultural choice gives the speaker the opportunity to have his/her stance unconditionally adopted by the others or to win in the subsequent negotiation process. Cultural models functioning in a given community mediate the association of certain stances with particular identities (Kiesling 2009, 172). At the same time, interpersonal stances reflect the culturally prevalent type of positioning towards the interlocutors (Kiesling 2009, 173).

Among the sources of cultural variability, Jaffe (2009, 21) includes the basic ideologies of personhood, as well as the way of evaluating the relationships between the inner and the outer (social) life, in a given society. One can invoke here Hofstede's (1980, 1997) dichotomy of individualistic vs collectivistic cultures, and even the dichotomy of masculine vs feminine cultures.

Accordingly, one can recognise cultural differences of conventionalisation regarding both the scripts of different genres and communicative forms, and the linguistic form of expressing personal opinions, as well as of relating and referring to others. Jaffe (2009, 22) notes that sometimes speakers can activate some ready-made cultural (mostly ideological) scripts, whose efficiency in imposing a certain stance has been proved in time.

Including, as it does, an evaluative component, which – as previously mentioned – is socially and culturally controlled, stance has an ideological nature (Jaworski and Thurlow 2009, 198). Taking a stance involves presenting oneself as a socially situated person, who has certain views of the world and certain opinions on the matters under consideration. At the same time, it involves evaluating the interlocutor(s) (and, sometimes, audience) as against speaker's own views and opinions. Depending on this evaluation and, of course, on his/her communicative skills, the speaker can insist on the similarities – when addressing in-groups – or can present his/her views as obvious and normal, when addressing out-groups. In both cases, this means doing some ideological work, i.e. communicating an attitude and position either directly, or by triggering inferences. Inference triggers can be strategically used as a resource for ideological transfer and accordingly for the dissemination of certain ideological positions, which are presented as normative. As Coupland and Coupland (2009, 246–247) note, in most of the cases, stances are not fully controlled by individuals, but they are the result of acknowledging – more or less consciously – some normative ideologies, which become popular in a given society. At the same time, speakers can present their own stances as largely accepted

or as belonging to an authoritative person, in order to get credibility and increase the chances of disseminating a certain ideology they adhere to. Still, for some communicative contexts and discursive genres (political discourse, for instance), expressing a stance can involve an explicit contestation of another ideological position.

Taking a stance does not involve only displaying epistemic certainty toward an ideological position and supporting it. Some communicative contexts and discursive genres are based on the competition between the interlocutors. Displaying doubt toward the validity of others' claims and even openly expressing disagreement with a different ideology is quite normative in these cases. Still, in order to be efficient, a speaker's challenging actions should make use of arguments and the points of view should be negotiated (for the whole problem, see Keisanen 2007, 253–256).

The social, cultural, and ideological functions of stancetaking are linguistically actualised in and through the dialogue between individuals who are engaged in different types of communicative interaction. Grammatical, lexical, semantic, and pragmatic resources are jointly activated by the interlocutors, who create both the form and the meaning of a discursive whole (Du Bois 2001, 8, apud Sakita 2006, 468; see also Sakita 2006, 468–469).

Taking Ba(k)htin's dialogism as a starting point, Du Bois (2007, 140) considers stance a "promising testing ground to explore the potential of a more explicit dialogic method in the context of conversational interaction". This method, called "dialogic syntax", is grounded in the direct observation of the fact that participants in a dialogue selectively reproduce components of the previous speakers' interventions. This kind of parallelism shapes the ongoing flow of conversation, reflecting the formal and functional resonance between successive stances, which are jointly produced in interaction (Du Bois 2007, 141), or as Sakita (2006, 494) puts it, "dialogic engagement" of the interlocutors.

Still, reproducing parts of another speaker's intervention does not mean that stances are always coincident. One can repeat somebody else's words not only to express a certain similarity of views, but also to dissociate from him/her. Resonance indicates only the abstraction of a communicative scheme, which is re-used by the participants in an interaction (Sakita 2006, 473, 494), and delineates a common topic. Invoking Jakobson's remark that vertical similarities can often express differences, Sakita (2006, 475–479) distinguishes between two types of dialogic parallelism: in integration and with discrepancies.

Du Bois's concept of dialogic syntax, as well as the phenomena of resonance, schematisation, and extension, which instantiate it, reflect the fact that, in communicative activity, language appears as a complex entity whose grammatical (syntactic, in this case) aspects are closely interwoven with its cognitive and dialogic ones (see Sakita 2006, 494).

Stance is a discourse organiser (see Johnstone 2009, 31), as it establishes a hierarchy of the topics that are approached and of their constitutive aspects, while marking a particular hierarchy of the speakers and a specific system of their interpersonal relations (Johnstone 2007, 51).

Stressing the dialogic nature of stances, which are taken either in alignment or in opposition to other stances and their supporters, Coupland and Coupland (2009, 228) make also reference to their dependence on the situational context, as well as on the discursive genre. One can add that these relationships are bidirectional, as in its turn, stance organisation becomes emblematic for certain situations and genres.

5. Expressing Stance: Formal Aspects

There is no "recipe" for a stance, as all we say, and even our silence, represent forms of stancetaking. Still, any language provides a large diversity of forms and structures that can be used as overt or hidden stance markers (Graumann and Kallmeyer 2002, 4–5; for a list of possible stance markers in Romanian, see Vasilescu 2010). They can indicate the speaker's attitude towards his/her own stance and/or his/her relative position – objectively or subjectively defined – within a certain type of social (local, professional, political, age, etc.) group, that is they can be connected with the actional aspect of communication, but they can also represent "reading" cues, destined to the interlocutors (and/or the audience), who are instructed how to take speaker's sayings and accordingly to calibrate their own stances, that is they can pertain to the interactional component of communication.

Speakers' linguistic choices depend on their communicative intentions, but also on their capacity for evaluating the basic parameters of the communicative context, whose main component are the receiver and/or the audience, in some cases, and the way they relate to the speaker. Anticipating and managing stance differences between the interlocutors call for a specific discursive rhetoric, which is not equally mastered by all speakers. Noting the fact that stances mark individuals' degree of competence, authority, expertise, and compliance with different agendas, Jaffe (2009, 14–16) considers style an important resource used by the speaker to do relational work. She distinguishes between styling and

stylisation: styling regards the projection of speaker's identity by specific linguistic choices, whereas stylisation involves the manipulation of conventions in particular interactional contexts.

Considering the three components of Du Bois' triangle, some specific aspects of expressing a stance can be observed. The evaluation component can reflect different degrees of the speaker's personal investment in his/her stance: *heavy*, marked by the use of the personal pronoun *I* (the speaker completely assumes his/her sayings), *light*, marked by the use of generic pronouns or nouns: *we*, *people*, etc., or *undetermined*, marked by the use of impersonal forms and structures: *it is…*, *one*…, *you* (impersonal).

Speaker's positioning can also be different in nature. It can be *epistemic*, *deontic*, or *affective*. Their specific markers are verbs as well as adjectives or adverbs predicatively used, which irrespectively include these semantic features.

As for the alignment, which reflects the interpersonal dimension of stancetaking, linguistic markers are different, depending on its convergent or divergent nature. The speaker can agree or disagree with his/her interlocutor's stance. The gradable nature of agreement and disagreement is reflected by a complex system of possible markers. Partial or total agreement can be directed at the content of the stance taken by the speaker, his/her attitude towards this content – emotional aspects included – or his/her degree of assuming its validity. There is a smooth transition from agreement to disagreement. As Rees-Miller (2000, 1094–1095) noticed, some forms of partial agreement can express a softened disagreement, alongside prefacing disagreement with positive comments, humorous expressions, use of inclusive 1st person forms, questions, downtoners (*maybe*, *sort of*), or verbs of uncertainty (*it seems*). Some other forms of disagreement, like contradictory statements or verbal shadowing, are neither softened nor strengthened. Still, there is also aggravated disagreement, which can be expressed by accusations or by the use of judgmental terms directed to the interlocutor(s), differing in their degree of severity.

Considering for the moment only cases of cooperative communication, a speaker's capacity for adapting his/her discourse not only to the situation, but also to the interlocutor – in other words, his/her versatility – can also mark specific types of alignment in stancetaking. The speaker can preserve a certain stylistic pattern during the whole communicative activity, which can be the signal of a consistent point of view, maintained by a person who is not open to concessions, or (s)he can try to adapt to the interlocutor, borrowing some components of his/her stylistic pattern,

which reflects a more concessive attitude and becomes an important resource of the relational work.

A specific role in avoiding conflict in different forms of communicative interaction is played by metacommunication. Metacommunicative activities involve specific adjustment operations performed by the speaker in order to prevent possible misunderstandings or distortions of his/her intentions by the receiver. These operations can take the form of various kinds of explanations, evaluations, or justifications provided by the speaker when taking a stance. They regard mainly the discourse organisation, the discourse content (commentaries and evaluations), and the linguistic expression (glosses). Although considered brackets in the communication flow (Schiffrin 1980), they are not perceived by the participants as superfluous. The fact that, in many cases, metacommunicative sequences proper cannot be easily distinguished from some other discursive phenomena, such as corrections or reported speech (Franceschini 1994, 66–68), proves their integration within the communicative flow. As a matter of fact, some authors consider reported speech or intertextuality as metalinguistic practices, alongside of metalanguage proper (see Park and Takanashi 2011, 187). Metacommunicative sequences are genuinely interactional, both when elicited by the interlocutors, and when initiated by the speaker, as in the latter case they are a sign of the attention given by the speaker to other's reactions.

Although mutual understanding does not involve identity of views between the interlocutors, adjustment operations are a necessary part in the process of meaning negotiation.

6. Negotiating Stances

As shown in the previous discussion, stance is not something given, but rather, it is continuously construed and adjusted in the communicative processes (Du Bois 2007, 171). Participants in a given form of verbal interaction do not necessarily express similar stances, because, usually, they have different opinions, purposes, and needs. In negotiating their interests, interlocutors can use either cooperative – that is persuasive – or confrontational strategies, based on differences in power (Weigand 2017, 184). They have to mediate between their self-interests and social concerns (Weigand 2016, 360). Considering this aspect, cultural differences (such as individualistic vs collectivistic cultures – see Hofstede 1997) should also be taken into account.

Still, even in the case of discursive genres that are defined by competition and an overt dissociative attitude of the speakers (like, for example, most varieties of political discourse), a form of common ground ought to be created by them. Commenting on her "mixed-game model", Weigand defines the participants in what she calls the "dialogic game" as "dialogical individuals" (2017, 474), who successively play the parts of speaker and hearer, and are able to adapt not only to "ever-changing environments", but also to each other (see also Gee 2017, 471). As "intersubjectively oriented minds", they should be able to negotiate meaning (see the metacommunicative aspects of communication) and understanding in and through dialogue (Teubert 2018, 72).

Teubert (2018, 70) considers "negotiability" as the essence of dialogue, given the fact that participants in a dialogue are free to interpret what they are told, to agree or disagree with their collocutors, and to propose alternatives. In fact, their sayings make reference to a "discursively constructed reality", not to "discourse-external reality" (Teubert 2018, 71).

The concept of "conversational negotiation" (Fr. *négociation conversationnelle*) has been previously discussed by Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2004, 17–41). In contrast to the Genevan school of Roulet (1985), which treats any conversation as a vast negotiation, she restricts the use of this concept to those cases where conflict and cooperation coexist, that is when an initial disagreement between the interlocutors is followed by their attempts to solve it. Conversational negotiations can have an intra-discursive and/or an extra-discursive object (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2004, 30). The participants' aim is to create intersubjectivity. The author notes that conversational negotiations are implicit (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2004, 26): metacommunicative forms or utterances are very seldom explicitly used by the interlocutors to define this type of verbal activity. At the same time, most of negotiations are not completed, but this fact does not affect the continuation of the conversation. Usually, the final result of such a negotiation is not an absolute consensus. Sometimes, absolute consensus between the interlocutors can result in silence (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2004, 40).

The persuasive component of the conversational negotiations reflects the rhetorical nature of all dialogic processes (Adams 2017, 478).

Van Eemeren and Houtlosser (2002, 132) consider that reasonable argumentation can occur in all spheres of life. Within the limits of their pragma-dialectical theory, all varieties of debates can be reconstructed as critical discussions, which include four stages. The confrontation stage, involving the existence of a difference of opinion, is usually implied in the definition of the activity type represented by a particular speech event. The

roles of protagonist and antagonist are either freely assumed by the participants or pre-assigned by some procedural rules. One can recognise an opening stage of the debate, where the two different positions are expressed, an argumentation stage, including the presentation by each participant of pros and contras, and a concluding stage, which may or may not bring a change in the initial position of the participants.

Strategic maneuvering, which, within the limits of this model, defines a specific form of managing discourse in order to diminish the potential tensions between the participants, characterises the communicative activity of both the protagonist and the antagonist. It involves mixing, in different forms and degrees, sound and fallacious argumentative moves, which have a situated character and sometimes are rather difficult to distinguish from one another (van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2002, 142). Strategic maneuvering degenerates when reasonableness is neglected by the participants in favour of their eagerness to be successful (van Eemeren 2010, 198).

Of course, this theoretical model is differently actualised in specific situations, contexts, and discursive genres, depending on their nature and complexity.

7. Methodological Perspectives in Stance Research

As a complex, multifaceted topic, stancetaking can be approached and studied from a large variety of scholarly perspectives, whose cooperation is required in order to get an adequate image of its forms and functioning. Linguistics, sociology, cultural anthropology, and psychology are deeply involved in understanding stancetaking activity.

Advocating for "a broader ethnographically-informed conception of stance" (as against an academically-oriented one), Englebretson (2007, 2–3) considers "a dialogue among stance researchers" and an "interplay among ideas" necessary.

The common ground of stance researchers is represented by approaching language – which offers the raw material for expressing stance – not in system-functional, but rather in discourse-functional and interactional terms (Englebretson 2007, 1). This means considering its use, which is marked by the situational context (and the discursive genre), as well as by the interlocutors' communicative ability. This also means taking into account the role of language use in shaping particular social identities and specific subjectivities.

Most approaches of stance have an openly declared *interdisciplinary* nature. In the following, we chronologically present some examples.

Reference to speakers' *rhetorical* tactics, involving others' perspective, is made by Shethar, in the volume edited by Graumann and Kallmeyer (2002, 182). Sakita (2006, 494) requires bringing together *cognitive grammar* and *discourse*, and insists on the close connection between the syntactic, dialogic, and cognitive aspects of language use. Du Bois defines stance as a "*linguistically* articulated form of *social* action" (emphasis mine, LIR), which involves *intersubjectivity* (2007, 139). He distinguishes between *affective* and *epistemic* subjectivity (2007, 143, 156); see also Keisanen (2007, 253). The contributions included in Jaffe's volume (2009) adopt, as indicated in the title, a *sociolinguistic* perspective. Jaffe (2009, 24) refers to *sociocultural matrices*, which give social meanings to the situated linguistic acts of stance. Johnstone speaks of *communicative styles* (2009, 31), which reflect an *ethos* of persona or of the speaker's self (2009, 32), and are associated with different situations or *social identities* (2009, 31). Jaworski and Thurlow (2009) discuss the *ideological* nature of stance and connect it with a symbolic order in a given *society* and with the *social control*. Coupland and Coupland use the concept of *persona*: "a socially construed person image" (2009, 227), strategically projected in dialogue via stancetaking. In another volume, Kecskes speaks of a *pragma-dialogue* (2017, 79) and also of a *socio-cognitive* approach of dialogue (2017, 86).

In this volume, the approach of stance is mainly *pragma-rhetorical* and *interactional*, but also *interdisciplinary*: cultural anthropology and social psychology play an important part in the analysis. There is also a specific focus on possible *applications* of some key findings of stance research.

8. A Brief Overview of the Volume

The papers included in this volume are grouped into six sections. The first section is devoted to the analysis of stancetaking in the political and judicial discourse. The object of the second section is represented by some online communicative forms. The third section analyses the use of some types of linguistic markers of stance in oral conversation and in fiction. In the fourth section, stancetaking is approached in a diachronic perspective, considering its different oral, as well as written forms (parliamentary debates, press, or private letters). In the fifth section, stancetaking is viewed from the perspective of intercultural communication, whereas in the sixth section the perspective adopted is that of applied linguistics.

Daniela Rovența Frumușani examines the public addresses delivered by the President of Romania between March 16 and May 14, 2020. Her analysis, both qualitative and quantitative, is focused on the stancetaking

resources and strategies that are used to index the crisis situation triggered by the COVID–19 pandemic. The author also uses the concept of conversational history to bring forward the relationship between successive presidential addresses.

In her paper, Liliana Hoinărescu analyses the persuasive force of the epistemic markers of certainty in a corpus of debates from the British and the Romanian parliaments, bringing forward some functional similarities as well as differences. She notices that these markers express not only speakers' discursive-rhetorical commitment, but also their politically engaged stance.

Adrian Toader discusses some image building strategies used by the Romanian parliamentarians when approaching a topic of tragic dimensions: the *Colectiv* nightclub fire in 2016. MPs claim responsibility through group identities, blaming others and disavowing their involvement.

Anca Gâță examines quotation as a reporting speech action allowing a person to specifically engage in an argumentative activity. She analyses the contribution of quotations to strategic maneuvering, as a substitute of argumentative moves. A special attention is given to official funeral speeches, where pseudo-quotations can appear as a strategy of valuing the deceased person.

Based on the transcript and the film of the Ceaușescu's trial proceedings, Andrea Cristina Ghiță discusses how the players involved in this atypical trial (the judge, the prosecutor, the defence attorneys, and the defendants) do their acting. In her opinion, the stance differential between them and their nonalignment are continuously escalated, as they constantly display a hybrid, fuzzy identity.

Considering the growing role of social media in expressing political opinions, Stanca Măda and Răzvan Săftoiu analyse, in a dialogic perspective, a post made by the former Mayor of Bucharest, Gabriela Firea, on her Facebook page, and the comments added by other Facebook users. The post was occasioned by a festive event, organised by the Mayor at the National Arena in Bucharest, that triggered some unforeseen reactions from the participants. The stances expressed in the comments concern some aspects of the public as well as private identity of the former Mayor and are based on a critical examination of her political performance.

Attitude and stance as generated by the *Colectiv* nightclub fire in Bucharest (2016), an event that had a strong impact on Romanian society, are also reflected in the comments made by online news readers to a news report dealing with this event. A corpus of these comments is examined in

Sorina Ciobanu's paper. They are quite different from those of the parliamentarians, analysed by Adrian Toader (see above). The epistemic viewpoints are rather prevalent, the authors' comments presenting themselves as "experts". Their comments reflect mainly a negative evaluation, harsh criticism, and disagreement with the report.

Andra Vasilescu tackles the problem of parentheticals. They are defined as cognitive stancetaking devices, mapped onto discourse as metacognitive speech acts, which have both discursive and argumentative functions. The author notices that parentheticals disrupt the syntactic linearisation of the discourse and dissociates between information centred, evaluative, allocutive, (auto)reflexive, and paralocutionary units, according to their discourse space of occurrence. She compares their forms and functioning in oral conversations and in written texts.

A particular reformulation marker: *adică* "I mean, namely", is analysed by Adriana Costăchescu in a number of excerpts from the Romanian literature, in connection with the topic of expressing stance. The author's intention is to explain why such a high-cost procedure, which involves supplementary efforts from both the speaker (production efforts) and the hearer (processing efforts), is quite frequently used in current communication.

Melania Roibu and Oana Uță-Bărbulescu examine the positioning of the MPs in relation to an event which took place in February 1933: the strike of the workers from the railway workshops in Bucharest, brutally repressed by the army. The authors analyse the indexical nature of the stance for the party affiliation of the MPs, as reflected in their linguistic and communicative strategic choices. Just like nowadays, the MPs try to keep a certain balance between reasonableness and rhetorical effectiveness, but their means were more elaborate before the Second World War than nowadays.

Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu examines how humour can function as a stancetaking mechanism in the Romanian humoristic press of the second half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the past century. She notices that, typically, the authors align themselves with their audience and disalign from the objects they evaluate, managing multiple identities. Framed as entertaining performances, authors of humoristic productions trigger an implicit intersubjective alignment of the receivers. Nevertheless, usually, the authors try to control the audience or to manipulate it ideologically.

Gabriela Stoica explores affective stancetaking in some letters from the first half of the nineteenth century exchanged between a father and his son. She points out the existence of a special form of conceptualising the filial-

parental love, as well as a particular construal of the self, which are culturally bound and historically dynamic.

The paper written by Lidiya Shamova and Bella Bulgarova is based on the analysis of the sociolinguistic situation in a bilingual community: Catalonia. The authors take into account such phenomena as code interferences and code switching, as well as speakers' explicit comments on the two linguistic codes currently used in Catalonia: Catalan and Spanish. On this basis, they describe speakers' attitude towards both codes, as well as some specific forms of stancetaking, connected with bilingualism.

Masanori Deguchi's paper provides a comparative analysis of Japanese honorifics and of Romanian politeness pronouns. In author's opinion, one can notice a certain similarity between the use of the Romanian second person politeness pronoun *dumneavoastră*, which requires a plural form of the verb, and the use of long forms of the Japanese honorifics. Both create social distance. At the same time, third person politeness pronouns *dumnealui* (masc.) and *dumneaei* (fem.) in Romanian resemble Japanese referent honorifics, encoding respect for the referent rather than formality. In both languages, politeness pronouns are used to index specific types of stances.

Hiromasha Tanaka's research is based on the data provided by a real-life intercultural project involving Japanese students who used English as a *lingua franca* to communicate with their Romanian partners. The author analyses the co-construction of stance by the participants, as well as the evolution of stancetaking practices, ranging from distancing to alignment and commitment, from a socio-cognitive perspective.

Carmen-Ioana Radu's paper provides a comparative analysis of two school debates in Karl Popper format, organised in Romania and in the USA respectively, on topics of interest among teenagers. The author notices some differences in stancetaking between the two debates. Cultural differences between Romanian and American society, that is, between a predominantly collectivistic and a predominantly individualistic society, can provide a partial explanation of this fact.

9. Final Remarks

Summing up, this volume presents some theoretical findings and their practical implications connected with the expression of subjectivity and the construction of intersubjectivity in discourse. It is meant to contribute to a better understanding of the social and pragmatic nature of communicative interaction, as well as of its culturally variable forms.