Introduction
Public transcripts: entextualization and linguistic representation in institutional contexts

JOSEPH SUNG-YUL PARK and MARY BUCHOLTZ

Abstract

The articles in this special issue argue that entextualization—the process by which circulable texts are produced by extracting discourse from its original context and reifying it as a bounded object—is an indispensable mechanism for the construction of institutional authority. More specifically, they demonstrate that one particular mode of entextualization, that involving the inscription of speech into writing, plays an especially important role in modern institutions, as the transfixing power of the written record endows the institution with an enormous advantage in presenting itself as an authoritative voice that can define, describe, and discipline its subjects. The contributors to this special issue illustrate the role of entextualization in the consolidation of institutional power through the critical analysis of linguistic representation within three key institutions—the law, the media, and the academy—in a variety of languages and cultures in North America, Europe, and Asia.

Keywords: authority; entextualization; institutions; power; representation; transcription.

1. Introduction

An enduring concern for discourse analysts of various stripes has been the power of elite institutions to control and regulate the lives of their subjects, and particularly the ways in which this power is discursively reproduced. Analyses of interactional patterns that take place within the boundaries of institutions (Erickson and Shultz 1982; Gumperz 1982; Heller 2001; McElhinny 1997; Roberts et al. 1992; Sarangi and Roberts 1999; among others) have shown that the material and social power wielded by the institution is firmly grounded in discourse, as the interactional

constraints of talk in institutional contexts regularly support and naturalize the unequal power relations that buttress institutional authority. An important part of this discursive mechanism has to do with how agents of the institution use their power to represent subjects and their discourse. For instance, reported speech allows authorized speakers in institutional contexts to project asymmetrical speaker roles and relationships onto others as well as themselves and to align themselves with institutional activities and practices in various ways (Baynham and Slembrouck 1999). Represented discourse is also a crucial means of negotiating issues of authorship, evidentiality, and responsibility (Hill and Irvine 1993), all of which are important discursive concerns in the reproduction of the institution and its power.

In addition to spoken forms of language, a crucially important aspect of discourse representation within modern institutions is how writing comes to be a central project for the construction of authority. The act of writing down temporally prior language produced in interaction is an attempt to capture transient and ephemeral discourse by representing it on paper or in some other visual medium that guarantees a certain degree of fixity and permanence. The articles in this special issue focus on this inscriptional mode of entextualization as a key to understanding the way institutional power works through discourse.

Entextualization, or the process by which circulable texts are produced by extracting discourse from its original context (Bauman and Briggs 1990; Briggs and Bauman 1992; Silverstein and Urban 1996), is a fundamental process of power and authority. The role of power in this process is evident in the various strategies that entextualizing agents adopt for construing the relationship between the originary discourse and the textual product (and thus the relationship between the producer of the original discourse and the agent of entextualization). For instance, in decontextualizing and recontextualizing discourse, institutions may present subjects as making illegitimate claims that stand in contrast to the authority of the institution, or alternatively, they may infuse the original discourse with the viewpoint of the institution so that this perspective is constructed as inevitable and natural. Such strategies of maximizing or minimizing intertextual distance (Briggs and Bauman 1992) show that entextualization "always already has been deeply political" and always serves political goals (Briggs 1993: 390).

While the special status of the written record has been well recognized in previous research on institutional power, the specific role that the speech-to-writing transmodality of entextualization plays in modern institutions is less explicitly acknowledged. In the work of Certeau (1984), for instance, modern institutions are seen as systems constituted by massive

practices of recording as observed in the fields of law, medicine, and education, and this link is also what gives writing its salient position in conceptualizations of modernity (see also Foucault 1975). The social construction of literacy may also be seen as a mechanism through which powerful institutions come to serve as systems of control and exclusion (Street 1993, 1995; Collins and Blot 2003). As Gal and Woolard (2001a) note, in Western ideology the authorship of written language is often seen as constituting a public. That is, the permanent and systematized representation of discourse through writing projects itself as objective and disinterested—and hence as an impartial, public voice that purportedly represents all citizen-subjects. Moreover, entextualization by inscription gives rise to a written public record that is amenable to controlled and repeated scrutiny, archiving, and circulation. The process of entextualization is thus essential for the reproduction of institutional authority.

This special issue is a result of efforts to clarify the workings of this process. Focusing on entextualization as a central mechanism for the authorization and legitimation of institutions opens the door to detailed inquiries regarding the construction of institutional authority. What discursive and material conditions shape specific processes of entextualization in various institutional contexts? What are the ideological underpinnings and semiotic operations that facilitate institutional inscription? What are the outcomes of such processes, and how durable and constraining are the visions of institutional authority that result from discourse representation? These are some of the questions that the articles in this special issue aim to address. Through an analysis of textual practices in institutions of law, media, and academia in Asia, Europe, and North America, each article interrogates the ideologies, practices, and consequences of discourse representation, with the aim of uncovering the central role that entextualization by inscription plays in constituting systematic relations of power and authority.

The work presented in this special issue builds upon several important advances in sociocultural linguistic research, including both sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. First, a number of recent studies that focus on metalinguistics (e.g., Lucy 1993; Jaworski et al. 2004) as well as the voicing of others (e.g., Chun 2001; Dubois and Horvath 2002; Hill 2001; Rampton 1995, 1999; Schilling-Estes 1998) draw attention to the detailed mechanisms of how the voices of self and other are transformed in the process of representation. Second, studies of the semiotics of interdiscursivity (e.g., Agha and Wortham 2005; Lempert and Perrino 2007) underline how the relationships between texts (in the present case, between discourse and its written representation) shape larger-scale sociohistorical formations, including modern institutions of power. Third, the

large body of work on language ideology (e.g., Bauman and Briggs 2003; Blommaert 1999; Gal and Woolard 2001b; Kroskrity 2000; Schieffelin et al. 1998; Silverstein 1979, 2003) illuminates how situated and interested views of the social and political significance of language use deeply intervene in the construction of social actors and institutions. Finally, numerous studies of transcription in both academic and nonacademic contexts—a specific instance of entextualization by inscription, which always takes place in some type of institutional setting—extricate entextualization from its ideologies, conventions, and assumptions in order to demystify the notion of the transcript as a neutral and unmediated representation of discourse (e.g., Bucholtz 2000, 2007; Cook 1990; Green et al. 1997; Mishler 1991; Ochs 1979; Preston 1982, 1985). The contributors to this special issue take up the challenge posed by these advances and use them to inform the investigation of entextualization in institutional contexts. Current perspectives on the intertextual, interdiscursive nature of all language use help us to understand the process of entextualization as grounded in the semiotic details of linguistic representation. This process takes place within the space of multiple and often contradictory discourses while being situated within a complex network of social interests and positions. The following articles engage with these theoretical perspectives on the textual transformation of talk to investigate the question of how institutions and their agents use entextualizing practices to consolidate their authority.

Our title, ''Public Transcripts,'' is borrowed from James Scott's (1990) influential work within political anthropology. For Scott, public transcripts are not literal texts but rather the on-record interactional scripts or routines that typically transpire between powerful and powerless members of a society. These public transcripts contrast with ''hidden transcripts,'' the off-record, behind-the-scenes interactional practices whereby subordinated groups resist their subjugation. Understood in this manner, a public transcript is the official version of events, a particular representation of discourse that is sanctioned and legitimized as authoritative by institutions of power, upheld and projected as the model of interaction that should be followed as ordinary citizens engage in their everyday discursive lives. While Scott's framework is mired with many problems from the perspective of linguistic anthropology and sociocultural linguistics more generally (see Gal 1995 for a comprehensive critique), we find it useful to literalize Scott's metaphor without embracing his entire theoretical agenda. That is, we suggest that one fundamental way in which a public is constituted is by consecrating an institutionally sanctioned written record of the talk of citizen-subjects (i.e., a transcript or other inscription) as an official reading of discourse. Thus a public transcript, in our sense, is

one that confers authority upon institutions through the entextualization of the speech of ''private'' citizens (and, often crucially, noncitizens) and one that purports to speak to or on behalf of a consenting public. By adopting Scott's terminology and reframing it to highlight the role of entextualization by inscription, we hope to invigorate interest in the fundamental ties that exist between discourse, representational practice, and the construction of institutional power.

2.   Making and using public transcripts

Some of the key conditions, mechanisms, and outcomes of the institutional process of entextualization emerge in several of the articles in this special issue, although the papers also show great variability in the specific ways that these are manifested. We consider here six interrelated themes addressed in the following pages: the entextualizing conditions of temporality and incommensurability; the entextualizing mechanisms of professional hearing and visual representation; and two key outcomes of the entextualization process, the social positioning of participants and the reproduction of institutional authority.

Any act of entextualization depends on the conditions inherent in the transposition of discourse from one context into another. The articles collectively offer several such conditions, some of which are well known and others that have often been underplayed in previous research. Perhaps the most obvious aspect of entextualization is one that does not always feature in scholarly accounts: the temporality of the entextualizing process. This aspect is addressed most fully by Vigouroux, who reflexively lays out the distinct moments involved in the series of entextualizations that she herself enters into as a researcher studying another researcher's transcribing practice. Temporality also arises in other articles, with two authors examining the ways in which the temporal unfolding of discourse may be either suppressed or accentuated in subsequent textual representations. Rosenthal underscores the tension between the simultaneity of language produced in interaction and the sequentiality of its written documentation, an issue that is especially pressing in the case she considers, American Sign Language (ASL), which unlike spoken language is not limited by the linearity of the speech stream. And Park shows that entextualizations may exploit rather than erase simultaneity, demonstrating how subtitling in television programs allows speech and its representation to coincide rather than requiring them, as is more often the case in institutional inscription, to be temporally disjunct. These observations remind us that entextualization in institutions must deal with not only the

chronotopic distance between discourse genres (Bakhtin 1981) but also a concrete time-space, both in the sense that agents must navigate the constraints of time to reach an entextualized end product and in the sense that the dimension of temporality becomes an important aspect of discourse that must be entextualized in some way.

A second condition under which all entextualizing efforts must operate is the substantial interlingual and intertextual gaps between the originary discourse and the representational text. While these gaps are an inevitable consequence of entextualization as an act of discursive displacement, in specific instances they may be either maximized or minimized (Briggs and Bauman 1992). Moreover, dominant language ideologies that presuppose either equivalencies or boundaries and contrasts between languages constrain the entextualizing process by preceding any discursive strategies employed by agents to maximize or minimize intertextual distance. Rosenthal identifies a number of layers of such incommensurability (Povinelli 2001) between ASL and English, including not only the difference between simultaneity and sequentiality in the two languages but also the distance between three-dimensional signing and two-dimensional text. While the violence of translation (Venuti 1995: 20) is especially obvious in dealing with languages that rely on different modalities, it is also found in any situation in which one language is rendered in terms of another. Thus Jacquemet shows that the reductive translations of interpreters in European asylum hearings ignore the semantic nuances of the asylum seeker's testimony, and in some cases the transidiomatic English spoken by asylum seekers and interviewers alike gets in the way of communication. But it is important to remember that the ideology of linguistic difference can be just as potent as the myth of linguistic equivalence: as Park discusses, the Korean national ideology of Koreans as unable to speak English works as an unquestionable assumption for subtitling decisions on Korean television, which in turn promotes a hierarchical arrangement between languages and cultures that reproduces the hegemony of English.

Just as all entextualizing endeavors are shaped by the inevitable temporal and linguistic divide between discursive contexts, so too do they share two common mechanisms for effecting the work of textual transfiguration. These mechanisms, interpretation and representation (cf. Green et al. 1997), take different forms in particular acts of entextualization. In the interpretation of spoken language, for example, audition is a central mechanism, yet one that requires much more analytic exploration than it has received heretofore. Although in transcribing talk the fundamental task of determining what was in fact said often remains unproblematized (though not unrecognized), it is clear from the evidence of several of the articles that a central element of the institution's power is the right to hear

things in the way that best advances its own interests. Using the notion of "professional hearing," Bucholtz examines how practices of hearing in the legal system endow the institution with the power and legitimacy to control the lives of criminal suspects. Similarly, Jacquemet finds that government officials' culturally naïve hearings of refugees' testimony have a significant impact on the outcome of petitions for asylum. Although the stakes are generally not as high as in these situations, the authority of the institution to definitively settle questions of uncertain hearing is equally relevant to scholarly transcription. It is thus revealing to read Vigouroux's analysis of the interactional negotiation among a team of transcribers debating the seemingly simple question of what was said on a video recording of an interaction in which they all participated. This relatively rare behind-the-scenes glimpse of a collaborative transcription activity brings into public view the sort of interpretive decision making that is more often attributed to the authority of a single expert transcriber.

The interpretive work of entextualization leads to the work of representation, and in the case of entextualization by inscription, this matter essentially boils down to questions of visual representation. For instance, the issue of orthography has received a great deal of attention from researchers concerned with how those whose speech is set down in writing become vulnerable to further interpretation by the text's audience as variously uneducated, inarticulate, evasive, or criminal. An extensive sociolinguistic critique of nonstandard orthography in the representation of speakers with marked dialects or accents has led this discussion (e.g., Fine 1983; Jaffe and Walton 2000; Jefferson 1983; Powers 2005; Preston 1982, 1983, 1985). Yet as Jaffe's paper in this special issue shows, when sociolinguists make common cause with journalists to create educational media for the general public, their orthographic choices may fall into the same representational traps as those they critique. But orthographic choice is not the only aspect of visual representation that is involved in the depiction of subjects. Park demonstrates how the color, style, and placement of subtitles serve as important means of differentiating voices, with consequences for the assignment of responsibility and authority for various aspects of the discourse. The fact that these visual resources are always embedded in relations of power poses a challenge to researchers looking for more politically responsible ways of representing those whom they study, an issue that figures prominently in Rosenthal's article. Rosenthal considers the myriad ways in which scholars have sought to bridge the gap between the visuality of ASL and the textuality of written English, including the integration of images and text. Her article shows that the emergence of new media and technologies of representation

adds multiple layers of complexity to the problem rather than solving it, as those modes of representation such as video documentation must find a way to merge with still-dominant two-dimensional representations of language on paper. These articles take up Ochs's (1979) challenge to expand our representational horizons in discursive research, but given how rarely this issue has been addressed since Ochs's initial statement, the question of the role of visual resources in entextualization remains an urgent area for future studies (see also Mondada 2007).

A final set of issues raised by the articles involves the effects of entextualization on all participants in the entextualizing encounter: the language users whose discourse forms the raw material for the construction of a text; the audience to which it is directed; and the creator of the text as a representative of the institution that underwrites the entire text-making process. The representation of speech in writing is necessarily also a representation of the speaker whose language undergoes this transformation. In general, speakers have little agency to shape how their talk will be projected within an institutional text, as the task of inscription usually resides solely in the hands of the institutional representative, and typically, speaking subjects are positioned in ways that privilege not their own goals as producers of the original discourse but the goals of the institution that has taken up—or taken over—their words. Thus Bucholtz and Jacquemet respectively demonstrate that those who are accused by the state as well as those who seek its protection are susceptible to being positioned as unworthy of the rights accorded to upstanding citizens, as their language undergoes scrutiny by suspicious officials. And Jaffe argues that transcripts of speakers of nonstandard and regional dialects that are designed to educate the public about dialect diversity frame such speakers as ''authentic'' and thereby reconfirm the audience's view of such speakers as linguistic Others. It is also clear that the work of entextualization is not limited to the positioning of powerless speakers, for the ultimate goal of such work, as we have been arguing, is the construction of institutional authority. Jaffe's article, for example, explores the dialectical relationship between authenticity and authority, showing how the authenticity of ''real'' speakers stands in contrast to the authority of institutional experts such as journalists and academics, whose speech is generally represented as linguistically unmarked. Thus, the representation of speakers is implicitly (and in some cases, explicitly) also a representation of the institution. As noted above, speakers have very little room for resisting such dichotomous representations, as in almost all cases, institutional subjects have virtually no role in the entextualization process.

However, even with such asymmetrical rights to entextualization, the textual authority of the institution is not total, as can be seen in cases

where fault lines in the entextualizing process are exposed. Park reports cases where the shifting of moral responsibility away from the institution of the media through subtitles is not always successful, suggesting that authoritative entextualizations do not necessarily render institutions immune from criticism, although the highly naturalized representations endorsed by the institution severely constrain such criticisms. And as Vigouroux's analysis indicates, when institutional representatives such as academics willingly give up some of their structural power and invite collaboration with those whose speech is subject to entextualization, the outcome is far less determined than when the institution jealously guards its entextualizing authority. The lesson from these cases is that even though institutional constraints may systematically block lay speakers from actively participating in the entextualization process, the end product must be eventually placed back into dialogic context, and it is here that the potential for contesting the power of institutional inscription resides. Taken together, then, these articles offer glimmers of an alternative to the centrally held power of institutions to make textual sense of talk in the public sphere.

Nonetheless, the emphasis in this special issue is on the far more common situation in which such power circulates largely unchecked. All the authors amply demonstrate how the interpretive and representational work involved in entextualization serves to shore up the institution that authorizes this process and generally benefits from the result. As a technology of modernity, these articles argue, institutionally sponsored entextualization does not simply inscribe talk but more fundamentally inscribes and reinscribes relations of power.

3. Overview of the special issue

The articles examine three primary institutional sites of entextualization in modern societies: the legal system, the media, and academia. Because representation is fundamental to how all three of these institutions constitute their authority, their practices and products have been central targets of critique both within linguistic research and in other fields. The articles in this issue expand on such scholarship by delineating the various processes whereby textual representation is put to work in the service of the institution and its preservation of power.

Bucholtz's article engages with this issue by examining the first step in the institutional transformation of talk into text: the initial act of hearing. Building on Goodwin's (1994) influential concept of professional vision, or the socialization of profession-specific ways of seeing and thus

knowing, Bucholtz examines professional hearing in the process of building a legal case against criminal suspects through the entextualization of their words into documentary evidence. Through an analysis of FBI wiretap logs of suspected drug dealers, she shows that the professional hearing of the officials tasked with entextualizing suspicious speech on behalf of the law enforcement agency results in texts that systematically favor the interests of the institution over the interests of suspects. However, Bucholtz does not simply identify such practices in legal professionals; instead, she turns her analytic gaze on her own entextualization of the recorded events as a pro bono consultant. In that capacity, she finds herself in a very different position from her academic self whose specialization includes the critical analysis of transcription. Contrary to her practices in her own research, as a consultant she was unable to raise complex issues regarding the difficulties involved in transcription decisions, for doing so in the legal setting would raise questions about her own institutional authority as an expert. She recounts this experience as a demonstration of how the issue of professional hearing is never as simple as indicting individuals involved in the official entextualization process for their failures in representation. The lesson for critical researchers of both legal and scholarly transcription is that any attempt entirely to eradicate problematic entextualizing practices misses the mark in a basic way: although some representations are undoubtedly preferable to others from the standpoint of responsible linguistic scholarship, a complete and disinterested transcript is never possible.

In the next article, Jacquemet examines a very different sort of legal entextualization: the written decisions of European national commissions evaluating the testimony of refugees seeking asylum from persecution in their own countries. He argues that although such hearings involve ''transidiomatic practices,'' or deterritorialized, multilingual, and border-crossing forms of communication (Jacquemet 2005), these practices clash with the national language ideologies and cultural assumptions of the European officials conducting the hearings, to the detriment of those seeking asylum. Drawing on examples from his own ethnographic research as well as published accounts, he details various ways in which the entextualizations of European officials misrepresent the testimony of asylum seekers. For example, officials interpret asylum seekers' statements through the filter of their own cultural and institutional expectations, so that any divergence from these expectations in the testimony is taken to expose the illegitimacy of the asylum claim. The entextualizing process also compels the asylum seeker's words to turn against her or him, both through clumsy and oversimplified translations and through misunderstandings of what speakers have said. A striking theme in Jacque-

met's analysis is the pivotal role of names as mini-entextualizations that officials demand of asylum seekers, unaware of the vast cultural differences in how names are understood outside the European context. The problematic nature of names is exacerbated in the transidiomatic context of the hearings due to linguistic difference and orthographic variability, and any intertextual gaps between iterations of the ''same'' name are again taken to be evidence of the asylum seeker's deceit. In both Bucholtz's and Jacquemet's articles, then, entextualizing practices designed to serve the legal institution weight the process against those caught up in its machinery.

As in Jacquemet's study, linguistic difference and translation are central to Park's article on subtitling in Korean television. Park analyzes two distinct practices of entextualization via subtitles that result in different regimental arrangements of language in the service of institutional authority. The first of these is the use of subtitles to highlight or comment on ongoing discourse in light entertainment programs involving spontaneous rather than scripted talk. Producers insert such texts, which Park terms ''impact captioning,'' to enhance humorous moments, but they do so through the heteroglossic lamination (Bakhtin 1981; Goffman 1974) of their own words onto the bodies of the television host and guests, a kind of ventriloquism that allows producers to project a public moral authority while maintaining their own institutional neutrality. This effect is also accomplished through the use of disembodied captions that come across as representations of a disinterested, impersonal voice (but are in fact the voice of the producer). The second type of subtitling that Park considers is the type conventionally used by film and television media to render unfamiliar languages. In the Korean case, the language at issue is usually English, which has a strong presence in Korea but is ideologically viewed as difficult for Koreans to speak and understand (cf. Park 2009). Park illustrates this ideology through the subtitling practices of a television drama in which even simple English spoken by an American character is subtitled while the English spoken by a Korean character is not, implying that the latter is not ''real'' English. Through both kinds of subtitling practices, viewers are recruited into naturalized subject positions made available to them by the television producers (in the first case, as representatives of a shared moral order; in the second case, as poor speakers of English and hence authentic Koreans). In this way, the media institution confirms its own authority as cultural and linguistic arbiter.

The media is also the focus of Jaffe's article, which examines the entextualizations created via a collaboration between two cultural institutions that are often thought to be quite separate: the mass media and academia. Such ''edutainment'' joint ventures have become increasingly common in

the present era of the marketing of education and the commodification of scholarship (e.g., Giberson and Giberson 2009; Slaughter and Leslie 1997), producing a variety of hybrid texts that rely on the logics of both of their institutional progenitors. The locus of Jaffe's investigation is the representation of dialect difference on Web sites created to supplement radio and television programs on language broadcast in the United Kingdom and the United States, respectively. She demonstrates how in such representations the two different sources of institutional authority are synchronized to create a stereo effect that reasserts the representational power of both. In the entextualizations on these Web sites, academic and journalistic authority are undergirded through an appeal to the authenticity of the voice of the linguistic Other, the speaker of a regionally marked or nonstandard dialect. Using both quantitative and interactional methodologies, Jaffe analyzes the different orthographic choices made in representing the speech of different kinds of speakers—journalists, academics, and interviewees—in transcripts of the broadcast material. The transcripts present the institutional representatives as experts by using relatively more standard spelling in documenting their language; in contrast, the texts use more nonstandard spelling to position interviewees as ''authentic'' speakers who are included more for their colorful speech patterns than for anything they have to say. In the television broadcasts, the talk of such speakers is also sometimes visually embellished with subtitles in order to highlight its exotic otherness and thus its authenticity. As Jaffe points out, this projected authenticity lends greater authority to the institutional experts who comment on the picturesque locutions of their interviewees even as it subordinates speakers of marked varieties within the hegemonic sociolinguistic order.

Together with Jaffe's article, the next two articles engage with institutional entextualizations carried out under the auspices of the academy, particularly via the act of transcription within the language sciences. While Jaffe's article builds on a substantial tradition of research that exposes the politics of orthographic decisions in academic transcripts, Rosenthal examines a much less widely considered but equally troubling representational issue in linguistic scholarship: the transmodal move not just from speech to text but from signed language to written language. Noting that the incommensurability between languages is greatly heightened when they do not share a modality, Rosenthal argues that scholars' ideological valorization of the symbolic (i.e., arbitrary) and referential aspects of language (cf. Rumsey 1990; Silverstein 1979) over its more contextually grounded iconic and indexical properties often fails to capture the full discursive richness of languages such as American Sign Language (ASL) in written translations and representations. Moreover, the politi-

cally fraught history of ASL results in a tension between sign language and spoken language, with greater legitimacy and authority generally conferred on the latter, a fact that has consequences for which aspects of ASL are foregrounded in scholarly texts. Rosenthal examines three different means by which American Sign Language has been represented in academic writings—idiomatic translations into English, morpheme-by-morpheme glosses, and images such as photos, video recordings, and frame grabs—and shows how each form falls short of the ASL original that it attempts to construe. Even visual representations, she notes, which at least are anchored in the embodied world of sign language, do not completely resolve the problem, as ASL scholars themselves often acknowledge. The problem of incommensurability precludes a complete textual representation of ASL, and the selectional decisions made by scholars in their entextualizing practices inevitably highlight their own preoccupations rather than the complex totality of the linguistic systems they seek to represent.

In the final article in this special issue, Vigouroux offers a fresh perspective on entextualization as an academic knowledge-making practice by examining not only the material product of institutionally sponsored entextualization—the transcript or other official document—but also the process of its creation moment by moment in interaction. Whereas the process of institutional entextualization is often hidden and secretive in the sense that it does not hold itself up for public scrutiny (a fact that no doubt contributes to the mystification of official inscription), Vigouroux is able to open up the black box of the transcribing activity by considering a situation in which transcription is undertaken collectively between a researcher and her study participants/consultants. Such practices of collaborative and consultative entextualization may be particularly characteristic of academia, and especially of those fields—such as discourse analysis and linguistic anthropology—that take transcription as a primary heuristic device (see Blommaert 1997; Haviland 1996). Vigouroux finds that in the interactional dynamics of the transcribing activity, interpretive authority does not settle in any one place but moves from participant to participant as the meaning of a prior video recording is negotiated. Her article serves as a valuable reminder that scholars concerned with the theoretical, methodological, and political dimensions of transcription should not restrict their attention to the final transcripts that are produced but rather should give equal attention to the process that brought them into being, the agents of transcription and the different participant roles they have played in that process, and their temporal positioning within the chain of entextualizations that led to the finalized text. Further, her analysis, with its emphasis on the real-time practices that constitute scholarly

transcription as an activity, contributes to a growing body of reflexively oriented research that problematizes the taken-for-granted mechanisms of academic knowledge production as part of the broader goal of identifying how power works in and through language.

These latter studies make clear that academic entextualization is deeply implicated in the same sorts of authority-sustaining practices found in other institutional contexts. Nor is transcriptional representation the only way that academic authority becomes reinscribed in scholarly texts; the current reflexive concern with transcription in linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis echoes a wider concern with the politics of representation in ethnographic and other scholarly writings. As Rosenthal puts it in her article, in the same way that cultural anthropologists have become vigilant in identifying the ways that "writing culture" constitutes anthropological authority (Clifford and Marcus 1986), critical research on transcription reveals what is at stake when linguists engage in "writing talk."

4.   Conclusion

In sum, the articles in this special issue highlight the variable yet interrelated realities of entextualization by inscription across a range of institutional sites. The persistent effect of entextualization as authorizing the actions of the official representatives of the institution underlines the central place of inscription in the construction of institutional authority, while the variable conditions, strategies, and results of entextualization found across different sites demonstrate the ways in which such processes depend on semiotic and ideological operations. The challenge here is to uncover the shroud of mystification that surrounds the authority of powerful institutions to explore in greater detail how semiotic and interactional microprocesses operate ideologically in the service of such power. Normally concealed from the view of ordinary citizens, such processes are fundamental mechanisms through which an institutional vision is transformed into a public transcript. If linguistic researchers are to undertake politically engaged scholarship that addresses the social inequalities deriving from the hegemony of institutions, these processes need to be opened up more explicitly through close analysis. The articles in this special issue illustrate how this problem might be approached.

At the same time, this special issue reminds discourse analysts once again that our own work of analyzing and representing discourse is in no way separable from these processes, and this fact calls for even greater reflexivity in considering the consequences of our research beyond the con-

fines of our familiar (and often seemingly benign) institutional home (see also Duranti 2006). If the power of modern institutions resides in the way it convinces us to accept and participate in a naturalized social order governed by institutional authority, we must acknowledge that our own practices of entextualization are not the privileged viewpoints of objective scholars but extensions of the very institutional inscription from which we often wish to distance ourselves. In fact, not only do we rely on the same set of representational practices and ideologies as other elite institutions but we also sometimes collude with institutional authority in a convergence of interests. Although we cannot entirely overcome our own complicity in the institutions that sponsor our academic activities, we can at least seek to deconstruct our own public transcripts and the representational process through which they were produced with the same vigor that we apply to the investigation of institutional power in other contexts.

References

Agha, A. & S. E. F. Wortham (eds.). 2005. Discourse across speech events: Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in social life. [Special issue]. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1).

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bauman, R. & C. L. Briggs. 1990. Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19. 59–88.

Bauman, R. & C. L. Briggs. 2003. *Voices of modernity: Language ideologies and the politics of inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baynham, M. & S. Slembrouck (eds.). 1999. Speech representation and institutional discourse. [Special issue]. *Text* 19(4).

Blommaert, J. 1997. Workshopping: Notes on professional vision in discourse analysis. *Antwerp Papers in Linguistics* 91. Antwerp: University of Antwerp.

Blommaert, J. (ed.). 1999. *Language ideological debates*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Briggs, C. L. 1993. Metadiscursive practices and scholarly authority in folkloristics. *Journal of American Folklore* 106. 387–434.

Briggs, C. L. & R. Bauman. 1992. Genre, intertextuality, and social power. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2(2). 131–172.

Bucholtz, M. 2000. The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32. 1439–1465.

Bucholtz, M. 2007. Variation in transcription. *Discourse Studies* 9(6). 784–808.

Certeau, M. de. 1984. *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Chun, E. W. 2001. The construction of white, black, and Korean American identities through African American Vernacular English. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1). 52–64.

Clifford, J. & G. E. Marcus (eds.). 1986. *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Collins, J. & R. Blot. 2003. *Literacy and literacies: Texts, power, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, G. 1990. Transcribing infinity: Problems of context presentation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14. 1–24.

Dubois, S. & B. M. Horvath. 2002. Sounding Cajun: The rhetorical use of dialect in speech and writing. *American Speech* 77(3). 264–287.

Duranti, A. 2006. Transcripts, like shadows on a wall. *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 13(4). 301–310.

Erickson, F. & J. Shultz. 1982. *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews*. New York: Academic Press.

Fine, E. 1983. In defense of literary dialect: A response to Dennis R. Preston. *Journal of American Folklore* 96(381). 323–330.

Foucault, M. 1975. *Discipline and punish*. New York: Random House.

Gal, S. 1995. Language and the "arts of resistance." *Cultural Anthropology* 10(3). 407–424.

Gal, S. & K. A. Woolard. 2001a. Constructing languages and publics: Authority and representation. In S. Gal & K. A. Woolard (eds.), *Languages and publics: The making of authority*, 1–12. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Gal, S. & K. A. Woolard (eds.). 2001b. *Languages and publics: The making of authority*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Giberson, T. R. & G. A. Giberson (eds.). 2009. *Knowledge economy: The commodification of knowledge and information in the academic system*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame analysis*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Goodwin, C. 1994. Professional vision. *American Anthropologist* 96(3). 606–633.

Green, J., M. Franquiz & C. Dixon. 1997. The myth of the objective transcript: Transcribing as a situated act. *TESOL Quarterly* 31(1). 172–176.

Gumperz, J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haviland, J. B. 1996. Text from talk in Tzotzil. In M. Silverstein & G. Urban (eds.), *Natural histories of discourse*, 45–78. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heller, M. 2001. Undoing the macro/micro dichotomy: Ideology and categorization in a linguistic minority school. In N. Coupland, S. Sarangi & C. N. Candlin (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and social theory*, 212–234. London: Longman.

Hill, J. H. 2001. Mock Spanish, covert racism, and the (leaky) boundary between public and private spheres. In S. Gal & K. A. Woolard (eds.), *Languages and publics: The making of authority*, 83–102. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Hill, J. H. & J. T. Irvine (eds.). 1993. *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacquemet, M. 2005. Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language and Communication* 25. 257–277.

Jaffe, A. & S. Walton. 2000. The voices people read: Orthography and the representation of non-standard speech. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4(4). 561–587.

Jaworski, A., N. Coupland & D. Galasinski (eds.). 2004. *Metalanguage: Social and ideological perspectives*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jefferson, G. 1983. Issues in the transcription of naturally-occurring talk: Caricature vs. capturing pronunciational particulars. *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature* 34. Tilburg: Tilburg University.

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

Lempert, M. & S. Perrino (eds.). 2007. Entextualization and the ends of temporality. [Special issue.] *Language and Communication* 27(3).

Lucy, J. A. (ed.). 1993. *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McElhinny, B. 1997. Ideologies of public and private language in sociolinguistics. In Ruth Wodak (ed.), *Gender and discourse*, 106–139. London: Sage.

Mishler, E. G. 1991. Representing discourse: The rhetoric of transcription. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 1(4). 255–280.

Mondada, L. 2007. Commentary: Transcript variations and the indexicality of transcribing practices. *Discourse Studies* 9(6). 809–821.

Ochs, E. 1979. Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (eds.), *Developmental pragmatics*, 43–72. New York: Academic Press.

Park, J. S. 2009. *The local construction of a global language: Ideologies of English in South Korea*, (Language, Power and Social Process 24). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Povinelli, E. A. 2001. Radical worlds: The anthropology of incommensurability and inconceivability. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30. 319–334.

Powers, W. R. 2005. *Transcription techniques for the spoken word*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Preston, D. R. 1982. 'Ritin fowklower daun 'rong: Folklorists' failures in phonology. *Journal of American Folklore* 95(377). 304–326.

Preston, D. R. 1983. Mowr bayud spellin': A reply to Fine. *Journal of American Folklore* 96(381). 330–339.

Preston, D. R. 1985. The Li'l Abner syndrome: Written representations of speech. *American Speech* 60(4). 328–336.

Rampton, B. 1995. *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.

Rampton, B. (ed.). 1999. Styling the other. [Special issue]. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4).

Roberts, C., E. Davies & T. Jupp. 1992. *Language and discrimination: A study of communication in multi-ethnic workplaces*. London: Longman.

Rumsey, A. 1990. Wording, meaning, and linguistic ideology. *American Anthropologist* 92(2). 346–361.

Sarangi, S. & C. Roberts (eds.). 1999. *Talk, work and institutional order: Discourse in medical, mediation and management settings*, (Language, Power and Social Process 1). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Schieffelin, B., K. A. Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (eds.). 1998. *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schilling-Estes, N. 1998. Investigating "self-conscious" speech: The performance register in Okracoke English. *Language in Society* 27(1). 53–83.

Scott, J. C. 1990. *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Silverstein, M. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks & C. L. Hofbauer (eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels*, 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Silverstein, M. 2003. The whens and wheres—as well as hows—of ethnolinguistic recognition. *Public Culture* 15(3). 531–557.

Silverstein, M. & G. Urban (eds.). 1996. *Natural histories of discourse.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Slaughter, S. & L. L. Leslie. 1997. *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Street, B. V. (ed.). 1993. *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. V. 1995. *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography, and education*. London: Longman.

Venuti, L. 1995. *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London: Routledge.

Joseph Sung-Yul Park is Assistant Professor in the Department of English Language and Literature at the National University of Singapore. His research interests include language ideology, language and the media, and interactional linguistics. His recent work focuses on globalization and English in Asian contexts, with a particular focus on South Korea. Address for correspondence: Department of English Language and Literature, National University of Singapore, AS5, 7 Arts Link, Singapore 117570 ⟨ellpjs@nus.edu.sg⟩.

Mary Bucholtz is a professor in the Department of Linguistics at the University of California, Santa Barbara, where she specializes in sociocultural linguistics with a particular focus on language, identity, and power. Her research on institutional and cultural practices of linguistic representation, including transcription, appears in *Discourse Studies*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, and *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, among others. Address for correspondence: Department of Linguistics, 3607 South Hall, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3100, USA ⟨bucholtz@linguistics.ucsb.edu⟩.