

Eva Bonn, Christian Knöppler,
Miguel Souza (Hg.)

Was machen Marker ?

Logik, Materialität und Politik
von Differenzierungsprozessen

EVA BONN, CHRISTIAN KNÖPPLER, MIGUEL SOUZA (HG.)

Was machen Marker?

Logik, Materialität und Politik von Differenzierungsprozessen

Finanziert vom Forschungszentrum Sozial- und Kulturwissenschaften Mainz (SoCuM).

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© 2013 transcript Verlag, Bielefeld

Die Verwertung der Texte und Bilder ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages urheberrechtswidrig und strafbar. Das gilt auch für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und für die Verarbeitung mit elektronischen Systemen.

Umschlagkonzept: Kordula Röckenhaus, Bielefeld
Lektorat & Satz: Eva Bonn, Christian Knöppler, Miguel Souza
Druck: Majuskel Medienproduktion GmbH, Wetzlar
ISBN 978-3-8376-2244-7

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier mit chlorfrei gebleichtem Zellstoff.
Besuchen Sie uns im Internet: <http://www.transcript-verlag.de>
Bitte fordern Sie unser Gesamtverzeichnis und andere Broschüren an unter:
info@transcript-verlag.de

Inhalt

Geleitwort

Walter Bisang | 7

Was Marker machen:

Versuch über die Materialität soziokultureller Differenzierung

Nils Lindenhayn, Nora Sties | 11

MARKER UND INTERAKTION

Situierte Markiertheit und *Accountability*:

Boxen als verkörperte reflexive Aktivität

Christian Meyer | 25

Die Semiotik soziolinguistischer Marker am Beispiel der Diskurspartikel *alter*:

Sprachliche Variation in einer Gesamtschule

Miguel Souza | 47

Marking subjectivity in interviews on political engagement: interpretive logics and the metapragmatics of identity

Jan Zienkowski | 85

Multimodale Marker in Museen

Yannik Porsché | 113

WIRKUNG VON MARKERN

Differenzmarkierungen einer Fernsehdokumentation:

Eine von ethnomethodologischen media studies

inspirierte Untersuchung

Désirée Bender, Johannes Beetz | 155

The Mark(er) of Evil: Die Markierung von Monstrosität
Christian Knöppler | 189

**„All I Ask is That You Behave Like an Adult!“:
Altersstufen als flexible Differenzmarker
in Mike Leigh's HAPPY-GO-LUCKY**
Anita Wohlmann | 213

**Ziemlich kraus – viel zu glatt:
Haariges in afrikanischen Filmen
und postkolonialen Diskursen**
Cassis Kilian | 239

**„I want people to appreciate the art of braiding“:
Differenz(de)konstruktionen entlang von Haar und Haarstilen
und deren Aushandlungen in einer Braidingschule**
Caroline Schmitt | 257

POLITIK VON MARKERN

**Zuschreibung oder anerkennende Berücksichtigung ethnischer
Unterschiede? Lehramtsstudierende mit Migrationshintergrund
im Fokus wissenschaftlichen Interesses**
Christine Schlickum | 297

**Das Recht auf Gleichbehandlung und die (Ir)Relevanz
von gruppenspezifischen Merkmalen am Beispiel des
Antidiskriminierungsrechts**
Doris Unger | 317

Autorinnen und Autoren | 343

Geleitwort

WALTER BISANG

Marker sind ein zentrales Beispiel für die Fähigkeit des Menschen zur Bildung von Symbolen und zum Umgang mit Zeichen und eignen sich daher hervorragend zur interdisziplinären Zusammenarbeit in den Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften, wie der hier vorliegende Band mit seinen Beiträgen zeigt.

Seit Grice wissen wir um die Offenheit des Zeichenbildungsprozesses, bei dem grundsätzlich alles, was sich als Konzept erfassen lässt, in einem geeigneten Diskurskontext als Zeichen genutzt werden kann. Wenn ein Sprecher auf die Frage, wie denn heute das Wetter wird, mit dem Finger auf die am Horizont auftauchenden schwarzen Wolken zeigt, werden die schwarzen Wolken in diesem Kommunikationsakt spontan als Zeichen für „Regen“ genutzt und aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach vom Hörer in diesem Sinn gedeutet. Dieser pragmatische Prozess der Zeichenbildung ist letztlich auch der Hintergrund für die Entstehung und die Verwendung von Markern als körperliche, sprachliche und dingliche Zeichen zum Ausdruck von sozio kulturellen Differenzierungen. Die Faktoren, die zum Verständnis von Markern und deren Produktion erforderlich sind, führen allerdings weit über die Pragmatik als Disziplin der Linguistik und der Philosophie hinaus. So stehen nach Bourdieu (1978: 278) hinter der Entwicklung von Elementen des Körperlichen zu Zeichen mit der Funktion der Differenzbildung zwischen Individuen und Gruppen von Individuen eigentliche Verteilungskämpfe: „Die Kämpfe zur Aneignung wirtschaftlicher oder kultureller Güter sind untrennbar symbolische Kämpfe um die Aneignung derjenigen *distinktiven Zeichen*, welche für die klassifizierten oder klassenbildenden Güter oder

Marking subjectivity in interviews on political engagement

Interpretive logics and the metapragmatics of identity

JAN ZIENKOWSKI

1. INTRODUCTION

In the humanities it has become commonplace to argue that the self involves multiple processes of identification. No matter whether we talk about the individual as being constituted by a multiplicity of communicative or social roles, by a polyphony of voices, by a variety of performances and strategies, or by a set of discursive interpellations, it has become quite acceptable to argue for the normality of the multiple personality. The particularities of the way such processes operate differ depending on the metaphors used to conceptualise the self. There are also studies emphasising the narrative, reflexive, creative, ethical, and/or aesthetic quest for some degree of coherence and continuity in the self. My own interest in self and subjectivity pertains directly to this tension between coherence and multiplicity of the self. It is also a direct result of my analyses of interviews conducted with activists and intellectuals with a Moroccan background in Flanders.

I was especially interested in the way these people articulated a political world-view with a preferred sense of self. Throughout my interviews, I asked them about the evolution of their political points of interest, their political engagements, and their political ideas – letting them decide what may or may not be ‘political’. The people I talked to included party politicians, minority activists, intellectuals, and social workers. Almost all of them had

a Moroccan background, were living in Flanders (the Dutch speaking region of Belgium), and enjoyed a relatively high degree of education. They have all publicly voiced their opinion on one or more issues central to the Flemish minority debates that revolve around notions such as identity, diversity, gender, Islam, language, norms, values and relationships between so-called autochthons and allochthons (see: van der Haar/ Yanow forthcoming: 17; Zienkowski 2011a: 242-245; Jacobs/Rea 2006: 21; Blommaert/Verschueren 1998: 47-50).¹

After conducting about forty interviews I was both impressed and disoriented by the myriad of topics raised throughout these interactions. People talked about global and international issues such as the financial crisis of 2007, the Iraq war, and Islamic terrorism. They discussed national and local issues, as well as personal discriminatory and emancipatory experiences. Moreover, I was usually able to identify over 200 identity labels. These labels, identities or subject positions (partially) defined the sense of self as articulated by my respondents in positive and negative ways within the interview context. Even more dazzling was the fact that these complex discourses on politics and identity seemed relatively transparent *in situ*. Things became less transparent as soon as I started my analyses.

A series of theoretical and empirical questions emerged. *How do these individuals manage to articulate and to co-construct a more or less coherent sense of self and other(s) in and through their language use? Why wasn't I significantly disoriented in spite of the manifold identification processes that were going on in practically every conversational turn of every interview? How do these people manage to trigger a subjective sense of coherence on my part? And how do they relate their various identities to the*

1 The binary pair allochthons - autochthons is a peculiarity of Dutch discourses on migration in Flanders and in the Netherlands. In mainstream political discourse, the notion of autochthony refers to supposedly ethnic Flemish or Netherland citizens who speak Dutch. The word 'allochthon' derives from the Greek words 'allos' (i.e. other) and 'chton' (i.e. country, land or earth). In practice, this latter notion is mainly used to designate lower class, ethnic and cultural minorities, mostly Moroccan and Turkish Muslims who migrated to Belgium or to the Netherlands. The allochthony - autochthony opposition is contested by most minority activist since the label of allochthony refers to the second and third generation of migrants as well as to the first.

utterances about the political debates under discussion? The analysis was further complicated when I realised that these people often used contradicting and different notions of culture, identity, politics, ethnicity and individuality (Zienkowski 2011a: 23-63).

All of these questions led me to ask *according to what interpretive logics interviewees mark their subjectivity in my interviews on political engagement*. Within the context of this paper, I will focus on this last question by means of a focus on their usage of metapragmatic markers. These linguistic markers are used by language users to orient, to instruct, and to guide each other throughout interpretive processes. They are useful entry-points for an analysis of the interpretive frames, repertoires and/or logics that are constitutive of the subjectivities and political engagements of my respondents. These markers are key to an adequate understanding of the way political awareness functions. As such, this paper aims to contribute to an empirical analysis of large-scale interpretive processes marked in discourse.

2. INTERPRETING THE SELF IN DISCOURSE ON POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT

Concepts such as politics, identity, integration, and assimilation perform key functions in the Flemish minority debates. They can be described in terms of empty signifiers over which a struggle for hegemony is being waged (Torring 1999: 301-302; Laclau 1994). At the same time, we are dealing with abstract categories that perform key functions in the value systems of concrete individuals (Zienkowski 2011a: 425-426). The intellectuals and activists I talked to display a high degree of awareness with respect to hegemonic uses of such notions in the Flemish public sphere. This awareness is indexed at various points in their discourse. Below, I will first clarify some key concepts used in this paper. These include metalinguistic awareness, political engagement, and metapragmatics. Secondly, I will demonstrate the close relationship between metalinguistic and metapragmatic awareness with reference to a discourse on 'identity' and 'integration' articulated by a Flemish / Moroccan youth worker critical of hegemonic discourse on minorities in Flanders.

2.1 On metalinguistic and political awareness

I already pointed out that my interviews focused on the political engagement(s) of intellectuals and activists involved in the Flemish minority debates. Their utterances and practices are considered to be political to the extent in which they attempt to challenge and/or rearticulate what they consider to be hegemonic and problematic (discursive) practices in the public sphere. Political engagement can therefore be defined as *a practice of discursively rearticulating social patterns in a public sphere by means of imagined collective action* (cf. Zienkowski 2011a: 205). My respondents engage themselves in a variety of contexts (e.g. political parties, youth organisations, pressure groups, ethnic and cultural organisations) and they may deploy different interpretive frameworks, political theories (e.g. Marxist, liberal, Foucaultian), and lived ideologies, but they have all voiced some kind of critique with respect to minority politics in Flanders on websites, in newspapers, and at public lectures or debates.

In line with the Essex school of discourse theory (Laclau 2000: x-xi), I favour a view that considers politics as an analytical category that designates those discursive practices, institutions and relations whose contingency is publicly challenged and rearticulated by various stakeholders. Of course, the question remains exactly *how* the contingency of concrete practices and discourses can be highlighted. I will argue that an empirical analysis of the metalinguistic or metapragmatic dimension of political discourse allows for an investigation of the various ways in which preferred modes of self are linked to preferred modes of politics. Metapragmatic and metalinguistic markers allow interlocutors to identify patterns of coherence in their subjectivities and in their political discourses.

It is not my intention to dwell on the historiography and intradisciplinary tensions within the broad field of linguistic pragmatics. I subscribe to the view of pragmatics as a perspective, attitude, or turn within linguistic approaches to communication. This perspective involves a turn towards a functional and interpretive approach to language use that transcends traditional disciplinary boundaries. It is an aggregate concept that designates those ways of conceptualising language use that allow us to highlight the process based nature of the intersubjective, contextual, functional and interpretive acts we perform when we talk and write (Zienkowski 2011a: 149-152). As such, I subscribe both to the early definition of pragmatics

provided by Charles Morris and to the more recent definition provided by Jef Verschueren.

“By ‘pragmatics’ is designated the science of the relation of signs to their interpreters. [...] Since most, if not all, signs have as their interpreters living organisms, it is a sufficiently accurate characterization of pragmatics to say that it deals with the biotic aspects of semiosis, that is, with all the psychological, biological, and sociological phenomena which occur in the functioning of signs.” (Morris 1938 cited in: Verschueren 2009: 3)

“At the most elementary level, pragmatics can be defined as the study of language use, or, to employ a somewhat more complicated phrasing, the study of linguistic phenomena from the point of view of their usage properties and processes.” (Verschueren 1999: 1)

The interdisciplinary view of pragmatics as a perspective has been criticised for being too broad. Even a proponent of this broad view such as Verschueren acknowledges the validity of Davis’ concern that “the problem with this broad view of pragmatics [as defined by Morris] is that it is too inclusive to be of much use” since it “includes almost all human activity, from baseball to the stock market”. The ultimate implication being that “all of the human sciences become part of pragmatics” (Davis 1991 cited in: Verschueren 2009: 14). Nevertheless, Verschueren does offer an alternative to what Mey calls the Scylla and Charybdis of either confining oneself to strict linguistic definitions of pragmatics or developing impossibly vague definitions that basically incorporate “as much social context as possible” thus blurring the boundaries between pragmatic and other (linguistic) disciplines (Mey 1999: 43).

Within pragmatics, context is not conceptualised as a container that surrounds utterances and texts. Rather, context is interactively negotiated. Language users indicate to each other what aspects of contextual reality should be taken into account in order to achieve a preferred mode of interpretation (Zienkowski 2011a: 182-87; Heritage/Clayman 2010: 21; Gumperz 1982: 153; also cf. Porsché in this volume). Within such a framework, context is not a vague notion: “contextual interpretations are actively signalled and/or used, and it is this fact that makes them most useful in linguistic analysis, because it is what makes them traceable”

(Verschueren 1999: 11). The social and the mental worlds get *activated* through choice-making practices (Verschueren 1999: 83-87). We mark relevant aspects of context by means of contextualisation cues that point to spatial, temporal, social and/or (inter)textual coordinates of reality. These indexes may be linguistic or non-linguistic. In either case, they prompt language users to engage in interpretive efforts whereby linguistic and non-linguistic aspects of reality are linked to each other (see also: Zienkowski 2011a: 429; Blommaert 2005: 251; Verschueren 1999: 77; Bauman/Briggs 1990: 68).

I will work with a notion of context that can be defined as *the flexible and temporal (result of a) discursive contextualization process that contributes to interactional clarity and/or to the establishment of an imagined common ground by means of indexical meaning generation*. As such, I subscribe to a pragmatic view on context as advocated by pragmatically oriented authors such as Jan Blommaert, Jef Verschueren, James Collins, Monica Heller, Ben Rampton, and Stef Slembrouck who do not refrain from using notions such as power, ideology, or hegemony, but who use these notions reflexively in dialogue with the empirical data at hand (cf. Blommaert et al. 2001, 2003; also cf. Souza in this volume). A study of the linguistic strategies used in order to communicate relevant contexts of interpretation to each other allows for an empirical analysis of large-scale interpretive logics leaving traces at the micro-level of language use (Zienkowski 2011b: 7-8). Markers of metapragmatic awareness perform a key function in this respect.

The phenomena discussed under the header of metapragmatics (Bublitz/Hubler 2007; Verschueren 2004; Caffi 1998) also figure in research on metalinguistics (Jaworski et al. 2004). There is no consensus with respect to the delineation of these terms. In this paper, I will follow Blommaert who points out that

“every discourse simultaneously says something in itself (e.g. it describes a particular state of affairs ‘out there’) and about itself, about how that discourse should be interpreted, situated in relation to context, social relations, and so on. Such indexical levels can also be called ‘metalinguistic’ (i.e. about linguistic structure) or ‘metapragmatic’ (i.e. about forms of usage of language).” (Blommaert 2005: 253)

This description highlights just one of three senses of metapragmatics. The notion of metapragmatics can also refer to a theoretical debate on pragmatics defined as a scientific discipline or perspective – irrespective of the specific definition given to this discipline. In addition, it may refer to the conditions that make speaker’s language use possible and effective. In this article, I am concerned with metapragmatics in the sense of “the investigation of that area of the speaker’s competence which reflects the judgments of appropriateness on one’s own and other people’s communicative behaviour”. Caffi points out that “This metapragmatics deals with the ‘know-how’ regarding the control and planning of, as well as feedback on, the ongoing interaction” (Caffi 1998: 581). This third sense is closely related to a view on language use as “the adaptable and negotiable making of linguistic choices, both in production and in interpretation, from a variable (and constantly varying) range of options in an interactive effort at generating meaning” (Verschueren 2004: 57). This implies that the interpretations of actors need to be “part and parcel of what needs to be described and explained” in pragmatic modes of discourse analysis (Verschueren 2004: 444-445).

Metapragmatics may be described as “the systematic study of the metalevel, where indicators of reflexive awareness are to be found in the actual choice-making that constitutes language use, is the proper domain of what is usually called metapragmatics” (Verschueren 1999: 188). Metapragmatic awareness can be defined as a mental awareness of the way an aspect of discourse is (or should be) used. Like any other reflexive process related to language use, it may or may not be marked explicitly in discourse. Lastly, metapragmatic markers are basically discursive (linguistic or non-linguistic) items that mark mental awareness of the way an aspect of discourse is (or should be) used (Zienkowski 2011a: 432). As such, they are empirically observable indicators of discourse strategies, frames, repertoires, and large-scale interpretive logics deployed by language users.

Reflexive awareness and subjectivity can be marked in discourse by linguistic forms that may be categorised as metapragmatic markers. These markers are functional entities. There is a metapragmatic dimension to all language use, but potential indicators include

“all of Jakobson’s ‘shifters’, Gumperz’s ‘contextualization cues’ (such as instances of code switching), anything ever discussed under the labels ‘discourse markers / particles’ or ‘pragmatic markers / particles’ (such as *anyway*, *actually*, *undoubtedly*,

I guess, you know, etc.), 'sentence adverbs' (such as *frankly, regrettably*), hedges (such as *sort of, in a sense*), instances of 'mention' vs 'use' (again as already suggested in Jakobson), as well as direct quotations, reported speech, and more implicitly embedded 'voices.'" [emphasis in the original] (Verschuere 2004: 446)

It is impossible to achieve either full explicitness or full implicitness (Verschuere 1999: 26-36). Metapragmatic performances also serve as a means of commenting on and interfering with ongoing discourse or text (Bublitz/Hübner 2007: 6). As such, these performances are fundamental to the articulation of social and textual critique. Even though we have no direct access to our own awareness or to the awareness of others, we do have access to a language that may indicate relevant aspects of our own awareness of the discursive processes we are involved in, as well as one's subjective stance towards a multiplicity of social and discursive phenomena articulated in discourse. As such, metapragmatic markers allow for an empirical analysis of both subjectivity and critique. In fact, the process of negotiating relevant context lies at the heart of political debate defined as a dialogic and intertextual network in which a variety of subject positions are activated in a political struggle over the meaning of empty signifiers that supposedly define identities, policy domains, political practices, norms, values, or any other aspect of discursive reality (Zienkowski 2011a: 429).

A pragmatic approach to the self, to politics and to subjectivity allows for an investigation of the way subjects relate themselves to the socio-political dimensions of their contextual realities. Since metapragmatic awareness involves an awareness of the way people use language, it is a precondition for the discursive articulation of socio-political critique. Moreover, metapragmatic awareness allows language users to identify (in)coherent patterns in the subjectivities and discourses of self and other. These principles will be exemplified with reference to interviews conducted with intellectuals and activists involved in the Flemish minority debates. These examples will illustrate why preferred modes of politics are linked to preferred modes of subjectivity.

However one may define subjectivity, it involves at least some degree of awareness with respect to oneself and with respect to the multiplicity of voices and meanings that may potentially be inferred from texts and discourses. Analysing subjectivities involves analyzing a multiplicity of potentially contradicting identities and meanings within more or less coherent in-

dividuals, groups, and discourses. The notion of subjectivity allows one to think of the self in terms of an exercise in balancing on the edge between coherence and a multiple personality disorder. As such, Donald E. Hall points out that "We may have numerous discrete identities of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc ... and a subjectivity that is comprised of all of those facets, as well as our own imperfect awareness of our selves" (Hall 2004: 134).

There are many perspectives that take the multiplicity of subjectivity into account: "[...] you may have heard of the Lacanian theory of the split subject according to which we cannot speak without letting the Other speak with us, you may have heard of Erving Goffman who suggested that rather than being one single source, the actor be divided into at least three different instances: author, principal and animator" (Angermüller 2008: 6). Nevertheless, the multiplicity of voices and meanings that may potentially be inferred from texts is limited by the operation of various interpretive rules that are triggered when we are confronted with various types of discursive markers.

Whenever I will talk about the self in the remainder of this article, I will consider the self in terms of a reification of the various processes that allow an individual to reflectively position itself as a more or less coherent whole with respect to the various spatial, temporal, social, and (inter)textual coordinates of contextual reality (Zienkowski 2011a: 434). Such a concept of selfhood can only be established when it is possible to identify large-scale interpretive logics that structure one's metapragmatic awareness of the various contexts through which one moves.

I use this definition in order to distinguish between specific identities, roles, and/or subject positions activated throughout my interviews on the one hand, and the more or less coherent and continuous sense of self that is being narrated throughout the interaction and which may provide consistency for self-experience beyond this particular language game. The fact that the terminology of the social sciences frequently overlaps with the terminology of (minority) politics, should not obscure the fact that the various actors involved in the debate may hold very different views on what abstract notions such as self and identity actually mean. In fact, most of my interviewees have pointed out that a struggle for a preferred meaning of these terms constitutes a major focal point in their socio-political engagements.

2.2 Najim Einauan on identity and integration

The close link between metapragmatic and political awareness can be exemplified with reference to an interview conducted with youth worker Najim Einauan. At the time of our interview, Najim was engaged in an umbrella organisation of youth organisations called PAJ (Platform Allochtone Jeugdwerkingen, i.e. Platform Allochthon Youth Organisations). He described his engagement for PAJ as a practice of ⟨wading through piles of prejudices⟩ in a Flanders that is ⟨faced with an identity crisis⟩. Below, I shall use the symbols ⟨ and ⟩ in order to illustrate that the words used are literally the same words as those used by my interviewees. Different usage of similar abstract categories such as ⟨identity⟩ necessitates the introduction of a visual contextualisation cue that highlights when and where the wordings of researcher and respondent overlap.

The excerpts below are useful for a number of reasons. First of all, they exemplify that metapragmatic markers allow for a differentiation between various modes of interpretation. In turn, this allows subjects to distinguish between their own political standpoints and those of others. Secondly, the examples demonstrate that metapragmatic markers are especially useful in order to differentiate various usages of abstract categories such as integration or identity. Thirdly, metapragmatic markers can be used in order to categorise the multiplicity of voices that constitute the public debate. This implies that they perform a key function in the pursuit of a more or less coherent world-view and sense of self.

Before we move on to discuss some of Najim's statements in detail, it is important to point out that he subscribed to my analyses. Nevertheless, a few years after our interview was conducted, he was quite surprised by the sharpness of his original statements. Because he was not very familiar with interviews at the time, he asked me to nuance his statements. His remarks with respect to Scouts and Chiro² were first and foremost a reaction to poli-

2 Youth organisations are increasingly popular in Belgium compared to most other European countries. *Chiro* was the biggest organisations in 2008 and counted almost 80 000 members. In 2009 there were 95 000 members and 15 000 leaders. *Scouts en Gidsen Vlaanderen* (Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts Flanders) counted almost 75 000 members in 2008. In 2009 they still counted 75 000 members and 13 000 leaders. Scouting and Chiro are the most popular youth organisa-

ticians who presuppose that the participation of a group of allochthon youngsters in a mainstream Chiro group would lead to an assimilation of these youngsters into an unchanging Chiro group identity. To Najim, this is absurd, since we are dealing with two groups with different sub-cultural tastes that are linked to variants in youth culture. He also emphasised that minorities have a right to establish their own organisations. In this sense, the argument of locking oneself away in one's identity might as well be directed at organisations of homosexual, lesbian, and bisexual people, which is absurd to Najim.

Both the original excerpt and Najim's comments a few years later illustrate the extent to which respondents may be aware of the problematic ways in which notions such as ⟨identity⟩ may be used by themselves as well as by socio-political opponents. Najim's remarks with respect to the discourse of his opponents exemplify how metapragmatic awareness is constitutive of political awareness. All forms of critique imply an awareness of the way meanings are generated through discourse.

Interview excerpt 1: Najim Einauan 03/07/2008

NE: My job and the job of all of my colleagues consist in uhm ... wading through piles of prejudices and trying to make something out of it nevertheless (laughs).

JZ: mmh

NE: I hear from uhm policy makers, and from journalists, and from politicians like "Allochthon youth work, come on, what is that good for? You lock yourselves away in your own identity. Why don't you just join Scouts and Chiro?"

JZ: mmh

NE: Then I think like, "come on man, wake up (laughs), they are not welcome over there, it is not adapted to them ... It's, it's an evolution." So, as far as the topic of integration is concerned, ... I think Flanders is faced with an identity crisis.

JZ: mmh (this interaction continues in the excerpt below)

In the excerpt above, Najim rearticulates the voices of ⟨policy makers⟩, ⟨journalists⟩, and ⟨politicians⟩ who question what ⟨allochthon youth work⟩

tions in Belgium. However, research from 2010 shows that the members predominantly belong to white middle class families.

is (good for). The excerpt contains various markers of metapragmatic awareness: discourse markers; direct reported speech; metapragmatic qualifications; shifts in prosody; and laughter. These markers perform various functions but together, they allow Najim to rearticulate some basic features of the Flemish identity debates as he interprets it.

Najim uses direct reported speech³ (see Holt 2009; Coulmas 1998: 778–779) in order to rearticulate arguments against an organisation such as PAJ: (You lock yourselves away in your own identity. Why don't you just join the Scouts and the Chiro?) (see Debusscher 2010; De Ceulaer 2009; Baumers 2008). He also articulates his response to such voices: (come on man, wake up, (laughs) they are not welcome there, it is not adapted to them ...). Through subtle shifts in prosody and tempo, Najim distinguishes between his own voice and the voices of (policy makers), (journalists) and (politicians). In the excerpts above and below, I have marked the points where such shifts occur with quotation marks. Najim's laughter and metapragmatic comments (come on man, wake up (laughs)) achieve a similar effect.

The distinction between both types of voices is not merely conversational. The rearticulated dialogue allows Najim to contextualise the interview discourse within a large-scale political debate on (identity). He counters reproaches on the part of (journalists), (politicians), and (policy makers) with respect to allochthons locking themselves away in their own

3 The term reported speech is used to refer to the presentation of discourse that purports to be from a prior occasion, and may originate from another author. Direct reported speech occurs when someone refers to another speech situation and (claims to) convey(s) the original speaker's exact words. Direct reported speech implies the articulation of two deictic centres or perspectives – that of the interaction one refers to and that of the ongoing communicative situation (e.g. *He looked at her furiously and said 'Why can't you stop it? Really! Why do you go on with this comedy'.* Indirect reported speech has only one deictic centre: that of the communicative situation. The point of view of the reported utterance and the report is the same (e.g. *He looked at her furiously and asked her why she could not stop it, and why she continued with the comedy.*). Quasi direct reported speech implies reference to two deictic centres without an explicit reference to another speaker or speech event (e.g. *Why couldn't she stop it? Really! Why did she go on with this comedy?*).

(identity) by claiming that (non-allochthon) Flanders is faced with an (identity crisis) itself. According to Najim, this (crisis) is fundamentally linked to (the topic of integration). Put differently, by emphasising the topical coherence of the debate as being about (integration) as well as about (identity), Najim is able to criticise the interpretive logic leading to a criticism of so-called allochthon organisations such as PAJ.

In the excerpt below, we are still discussing Najim's engagement as a practice of wading through prejudices in a Flanders with an identity crisis. Here, Najim frames the problem as follows: (one is faced with a schizophrenic phenomenon over here) in the sense that (one says like we "want to stimulate integration", but one wants assimilation). According to Najim, (allochthons who are incited to integrate themselves) are presented with a (totally unrealistic) (image). Contrary to this image, someone who follows (an *inburgering* course),⁴ who (speaks Dutch fluent), or who is (active in an association) and (friendly to his neighbours), will still have no guarantee of not being (discriminated). Note that the demands made of (allochthons) or (*inburgeraars*) are framed dialogically in terms of direct reported speech.

Interview excerpt 2: Najim Einauan 03/07/2008

NE: (this interaction is a continuation of the excerpt above) One is faced with a schizophrenic phenomenon over here. One says like "we want to stimulate integration", but one wants assimilation.

JZ: mmh

NE: One calls it integration, but the measures one proposes are assimilation, The image one presents new *inburgeraars* and allochthons who are incited to integrate themselves is totally unrealistic.

4 The Dutch notion of 'inburgering' is particular to Flemish and Dutch discourses on diversity and migration. It is a nominalisation of the process verb 'inburgeren'. The noun 'burger' means citizen. The notion of 'inburgering' refers to a metaphorical movement from a status of non-citizenship *into* a mode of citizenship. It is a frequently used politically correct notion within the context of discourses of 'integration'. As such, it is frequently used as a synonym for the concept of integration when emphasis is being put on the efforts that are being asked of individual immigrants to adapt themselves to supposedly hegemonic 'norms and values' in Flanders and Belgium. Governmental institutions in Flanders provide courses for immigrants in order to achieve this effect.

JZ: mmh

NE: If you simply take a look at what's going on in society. The image of public opinion, ... "you come to Belgium, ... you learn Dutch, ... you follow an inburgering course, and all doors will be opened to you, you will be equal, you will have all the opportunities your fellow country men already have, here in Belgium ...". It isn't like this Of course, it's good that one is inburgering eh (laughs). I don't have a problem with this, but we shouldn't pretend as if someone who is following an inburgering course, or who is pushing his kids to follow a nice education, or who speaks Dutch fluent and is active in an association, or friendly to his neighbours, pays his taxes in time, and puts out the garbage at the right time, ... that he will not be discriminated (laughs), ...

JZ: yes yes

NE: or that he, eh, that he will not be addressed uhm, feel addressed by these negative stories, and by the entire perception about this, So, I think that Flanders has to look at itself in the mirror

In the last line of the excerpt above, Najim stated that (Flanders has to look at itself in the mirror). In subsequent turns, he explains that this crisis involves a non-recognition of the ethnically heterogeneous image of the contemporary Flemish public sphere. His point is that the reproach of locking oneself away in one's identity might as well be directed at Flemish autochthons. A (Flanders) that looks (at itself in the mirror) would consist of autochthons who recognize the heterogeneity of the public sphere and who denounce a (romanticised or idealised image one has about oneself) and (about the Fleming) or (Belgian).

Metapragmatic awareness does not merely pertain to abstract categories such as (identity) or (integration). A little bit further down the interview, Najim and I started to discuss the topic of 'terminology and knowledge about Islam in the Flemish media'. Within this context, Najim advised me to (take a look at the news) and pointed out that (one has invented a whole new vocabulary) by taking (the predicate Muslim) and attaching it to (a common Flemish word). This (sad) phenomenon ultimately functions by means of a (pars pro toto) reasoning: (one reduces a person to the headscarf, or to a piece of his identity that makes him) (a Muslim), (as if) (one would constantly address) (everyone) (raised within the Christian tradition or who is only partially practicing) (on the basis of his Christian or Catholic identity). He thus proves to be engaged in a critical form of discourse anal-

ysis wherein he metapragmatically comments upon (pars pro toto) or metonymic language use (see Panther/Radden 2005; Geeraerts 1998: 586-587; Chantrell/Scott Mio 1996) with respect to (identity) and Islamic identity markers.

Interview excerpt 3: Najim Einauan 03/07/2008

NE: You should take a look at the news ... a Muslim man eh One has invented a whole new vocabulary. One takes the predicate Muslim and then one takes a common Flemish word one attaches it to. Sometimes, just for fun, I am making some up myself eh, a Muslim pet eh, you can combine it with anything A Muslim man, ... it's really just sad, it is sad through and through Imagine that one would talk about a Christian country in other countries (laughs), in East Africa eh, that makes one think about (laughs) the crusades A Muslim woman, ... a Muslim restaurant, a Muslim kitchen, a Muslim trip, a Muslim home, a Muslim organisation. I say, the sky is the limit. A Muslim headscarf. You can combine it with anything, and each time one zooms in on it, focusing on it,

JZ: mmh

NE: and one reduces, eh, what is it called again ... a pars pro toto eh. One reduces a person to the headscarf, or to a little piece of his identity that makes him, ... uhm, that makes him a Muslim. As if uhm, one would constantly address everybody I know who has been raised in the Christian tradition, or who is even partially practicing, on the basis of his Christian or Catholic identity. Uhm, ... or as if one would address women continually on the basis of their gender eh, or holebi's on the basis of their orientation. So, it's, it's, it's simply absurd, but apparently, it's a sign of our times

When Najim Einauan describes his engagement for the umbrella of allochthon youth organisations PAJ as a practice of (wading through piles of prejudices), it is important to realise that an awareness of these prejudices arises out of a metapragmatic evaluation of dominant discourses. More specifically, it involves a mode of critique in which dominant usage of ethnic, religious, and other abstract categories are linked to an analysis of unequal socio-political relationships. For this reason, metapragmatic awareness and political awareness are closely intertwined.

3. LARGE-SCALE INTERPRETIVE LOGICS CONSTITUTIVE FOR THE SELF

Changes in prosody, hedges, boosters, contextualisation cues, and other markers of metapragmatic awareness may sensitise us to the various voices to which an individual orients his or her subjectivity while talking about politics. But if we are to study the selves of interviewees and if we are to move beyond a study of highly contextualised identities, we need to answer the question how large-scale interpretations can be marked in discourse.

Notions such as frame, narrative, or interpretive repertoire may do the trick, but within the context of this article, I prefer to build upon the concept of logic as developed by Glynos and Howarth. Whereas frames, narratives, and /or interpretive repertoires are usually deployed by individuals, the notion of logic allows us to talk about the logic of a system, of a discourse, as well as of an individual or group. For instance, Howarth and Glynos point out that one might describe the “logic of the market” through a description of a set of subject positions (e.g. buyers and sellers); objects (e.g. commodities and means of exchange), and a system of relations that articulates objects and subjects with one another (e.g. a well functioning legal system). The notion of logic captures the conditions that make the continued operation of these practices, discourses, and subject positions possible (Glynos/Howarth 2007: 136).

Even though I think this is a useful way to analyse social processes, some caveats need to be made. Researchers are not the only subjects analysing the logics of their socio-political contexts. For instance, interviewer and interviewee co-construct a discourse through which they may articulate a critical stance towards socio-political processes and entities. Respondents may use various metapragmatic strategies in order to distinguish between what they consider to be legitimate and illegitimate discourses, subjectivities, organisations, and practices. This implies that one may criticise the logic of the capitalist system but that one cannot claim that this person deploys a capitalist logic. We need to distinguish between the logics externalised and criticised by actors on the one hand, and the logics that make up their preferred sense of self and subjectivity on the other hand.

It is quite difficult to distinguish between the self-interpretations of individuals and the social logics they may observe in reality. I therefore prefer to focus on the interpretive logics that positively or negatively define the

sense of self and the sense of others (re)articulated by my respondents. Such interpretive logics also structure preferred and disavowed modes of politics within the context of my interviews. The identification of processes in large-scale socio-political debates thus boils down to the question how an individual may articulate his or her sense of self in relation to the public debate. I will define the concept of logic as follows:

Logics are large-scale interpretive patterns informing a preferred mode of subjectivity. They are particular interpretive configurations of functional relationships between subject positions, statements, practices, (sub)topics, or any other aspects relevant to an understanding of self and other. In order to identify and name such logics, one needs to go through the self-interpretations of subjects which are marked metapragmatically in discourse. (cf. Zienkowski 2011a: 333)

In order to demonstrate how such large-scale interpretive logics may be identified and operate, I will refer to the case of Nadia Babazia (Zienkowski 2011a: 371-377, 383-384). Almost all of my interviewees implicitly or explicitly framed the development of their political awareness or engagement in terms of a reaction against interpellations and interactions that did not confirm to their preferred sense of self and/or politics. This involves a metapragmatic interpretation of specific speech events, speech acts, and language games (Zienkowski 2011a: 369).

It should also be noted that feelings of misrecognition often occur where contextual frameworks clash. Individuals switch between subject positions as they highlight different aspects of contextual reality. As such, they may identify themselves with particular ethnic, cultural, religious and /or political subject positions when discussing a particular topic. However, if interlocutors misrecognise subject positions relevant to the utterance of particular statements, this often triggers an emotional response. Interlocutors who are able to frame these responses by means of a metapragmatic analysis of the speech event, are able to politicise the interaction itself (Zienkowski 2011a: 369). This is what happens in my interview with Nadia Babazia.

3.1 Being a bridge for others: a logic of rapprochement

At the time of our interview, Nadia was involved in an organisation called SAMV (Support Centre for Allochthon Girls and Women). On a practical level, SAMV organised workshops, protest actions, and debates. The organisation sought to inform women of their rights and possibilities in society. After a while, SAMV also started to work with allochthon youngsters, including boys, in 2004. It developed educative games about sexuality, role patterns and relationships. Another project involved a play based on women's stories about sexuality, forced marriages, divorce, virginity, and Islam. As such, the organisation aimed to stimulate what it calls "the internal debate" within the so-called allochthon communities. This debate involves a discussion of topics such as partner choice, marital migration, inter-religious relationships, and homosexuality. Later on, the organisation would change its name to *Ella*, a name change that was informed by the following considerations:

"Whereas during the first five years, SAMV focused mostly on individual empowerment of allochthon women by means of various methods and courses, from 2006 on, SAMV developed a new track. Because, with respect to sensitive gender issues, 'taboo themes', and traditions that obstruct or hinder individual emancipation, the individual and communal levels are fundamentally intertwined. It is difficult to break certain taboos on your own, if there is no support within the community. We therefore never suggest only one solution or model. Rather, we want to stimulate people to think independently, to be critical with respect to common opinions / convictions within one's own community, and to make their own choices." (Bouzarmat 2010)

Within the context of our interview, Nadia Babazia discussed her <job> at SAMV in terms of an <engagement> with and within <the internal debate>. As such, SAMV constituted one of three different <worlds> through which she travels. In addition to SAMV, these worlds include a <Flemish>, <Belgian>, <white> <environment> and an <environment> provided by her <family>. These spatial metaphors are used in order to distinguish metapragmatically between three types of interpellations that are characteristic of three sets of speech events in which other interpretive logics are deployed.

At the very end of our interview, Nadia remarked that she thought the interview was <kind of interesting> and that she did not know <what to expect> when we made our appointment. This made me wonder what she did expect. She explained that she and her SAMV colleagues are frequently invited to interviews of all sorts.

Interview excerpt 4: Nadia Babazia 11/06/2008

NB: all sorts, yes, and sometimes it's rather ... well yes ... sometimes, sometimes you do get tired of always explaining this. And I liked it like right now, that it wasn't just about this aspect. Well, it went a step further, like well, "Why do you engage yourself?", so you don't have to talk that much, well, you do have to talk about yourself of course, but not ... well, I don't know, the basics, the basic identity ...

JZ: What do you consider to be basic?

NB: well, ... I don't know, like "Do you feel Moroccan or Belgian?", and "How about you being a Muslim", you know And you can really get quite exhausted after such a conversation. It's like "shit, yes, uhm how does this work again", and you think like "shit, that's not what I am working on at all", or "this is what I am working on", and that's so, ... well, sometimes, very exhausting, and then you're like ... "should I still do this sort of thing?"

The excerpt above shows that Nadia prefers interviews in which the <basic> <identity> questions do not have to be answered. She explains how questions asked by interviewers such as <"Do you feel Moroccan or Belgian"> are <exhausting> to her. She was interested by the fact that I <went a step further> by asking her <"Why do you engage yourself?">. This still meant that she <had to talk about> herself but presuppositions with respect to what she considered to be the <basics> of <identity> formation were left to function in the background of our interview. In order to understand this preference, we need to take a look at the interpretive logics that Nadia deploys in making sense of her socio-political engagement.

Nadia's preferred mode of subjectivity is characterised by what one may call a *spatial logic of rapprochement*. She uses a lot of spatial metaphors to distinguish between the various contexts or <worlds> in which she moves. This logic allows her to switch between the environments of SAMV, of her family, and of the Flemish public sphere while maintaining a high degree of interpretive coherence. Spatial metaphors perform an im-

portant function in this respect. Nadia explains how she would like to be a ⟨bridge for others⟩, connecting the interactional settings that make up her social reality. She also emphasises the difficulty of drawing ⟨a line⟩ between her self and her job. Moreover, she looks for a ⟨road⟩ between a ⟨Moroccan⟩ and a ⟨Belgian⟩ way of being. The interpretations associated with her usage of these metaphors inform her preferred mode of ⟨engagement⟩ as well as her description of her three ⟨worlds⟩.

Nadia characterises the three ⟨worlds⟩ or environments in which she moves with reference to three types of language games and with reference to different definitions of ⟨emancipation⟩ - a key concept constitutive of her preferred mode of political engagement. First of all, there is the SAMV environment. Nadia explained to me that she grew up in a provincial town in Flanders which she considered to constitute ⟨a very Belgian environment⟩, her family being ⟨practically the only Moroccan family over there⟩. At the age of ⟨fifteen⟩ and ⟨sixteen⟩ her friends started going out. At that point, ⟨all sorts⟩ of normative ⟨differences⟩ emerged with respect to a differential treatment of ⟨boys⟩ and ⟨girls⟩. In order to come up with ⟨arguments⟩ for the ⟨conversations⟩ she had with her ⟨father⟩, she started reading authors such as ⟨Fatima Mernissi⟩, a well-known Islamic feminist sociologist.⁵ After having explained this, she explains why her job is so important to her.

Interview excerpt 5: Nadia Babazia 11/06/2008

NB: [...] And I still feel this today, in my job, that you ... you're very much involved, also because it's about yourself ... Well, we work with allochthon women, and it's about emancipation and that sort of stuff, but ... Well, partly it's also about ourselves, and sometimes it's rather difficult to draw the line like "this is just my job" ... It's very close to uhm ... one another. But that's also what's so nice about it, I don't want something that's simply ..., well without engagement, or about a theme that does not really uhm ...

JZ: touch you (this interaction continues in the excerpt below)

NB: No, [...]

5 Fatima Mernissi is a Moroccan sociologist. She is also a well-known Islamic feminist who argues that the Koran does not justify an unequal treatment of men and women. Her publications can be found at the website: <http://www.mernissi.net/>.

In the excerpt above, Nadia explains that it is ⟨rather difficult to draw⟩ a ⟨line⟩ between her ⟨job⟩ and her self. Even though the focus of SAMV is oriented towards the ⟨emancipation⟩ of ⟨allochthon women⟩, the job and Nadia's sense of self are closely intertwined. Her ⟨engagement⟩ for this emancipatory organisation is framed as a project that relates to her self. The themes that are being dealt with within SAMV are ⟨close⟩ to her skin. Her ⟨job⟩ and her self are ⟨very close⟩ ⟨to one another⟩. This is why the border between her sense of self and the activities she is involved in is hard to draw.

Nadia explained that she recently did an apprenticeship for the Flemish soap opera called ⟨Thuis⟩ (English: Home) broadcasted by the Flemish public broadcasting company called VRT. Within this ⟨white environment⟩, Nadia is ⟨again confronted with questions⟩ that neither confirm to her preferred mode of ⟨engagement⟩, nor with her preferred sense of self. The excerpt below clarifies the fact that SAMV has ⟨passed this stage⟩. Even though this organisation focuses on emancipation, questions about ⟨girls⟩, ⟨the headscarf⟩, and the ⟨Ramadan⟩ are not asked ⟨for days⟩. These are the ⟨basic identity questions⟩ that exhaust Nadia so much. Note that Nadia sighs when discussing these questions. Her ⟨personal engagement⟩ within the ⟨white environment⟩ of the VRT ⟨was not deep enough⟩ to accept the ⟨full-time⟩ job she was offered there after her apprenticeship. Her ⟨themes⟩ - which are the themes being dealt with by SAMV - the issues related to the ⟨internal debate⟩ - required more attention.

Interview excerpt 6: Nadia Babazia 11/06/2008

NB: [...] I was at Thuis, ... the soap, and yes, that was a lot of fun, but still, within this white environment, you are once again confronted with all these questions (sighs), "Well, what about this Ramadan?", and "Girls?", and "Did you ever have to wear a headscarf?". So you get all these questions once again. And well, within the Support Centre, we have really passed this stage. Well, we simply do our jobs, I don't get this sort of questions for days and yes, ... It implied a lot less engagement with respect to content, it was kind of, I did like it, ... but that personal engagement was not deep enough in order to ... I was offered a full-time, but (sighs), I was like, "I am not ready at the Support Centre yet, I still want to ... work about these themes". And I still would like to work in the media, but yes, ... on my themes, not merely, ...

In addition to the SAMV and (Flemish) environments, Nadia discussed her family (environment). The (little world) of (the Support Centre) sometimes (clashes) with the realities of her (community) and family contexts. Note that at SAMV there is agreement on the importance of (emancipation). Nevertheless, the (clash) with other contexts, forces Nadia to ask her self (how to give meaning to) her (emancipation) (on a personal level). As we will see, different ideas concerning the meaning of (emancipation) are among the most distinguishing features between these environments that (sometimes) (clash) metaphorically.

Interview excerpt 7: Nadia Babazia 11/06/2008

NB: On the Support Centre we are like “yes, we have to stimulate the internal debate about role patterns, we have to stimulate it, men and women, and”, well, you know the theoretical ideas about that But in the evening you go home, and, and, I have a husband at home (laughs), and, and it’s not ... well, it clashes at times. Sometimes you can, well, you are within your own little world, and then you are confronted sometimes, often, with well, “what is it really like in the community” You know what I mean? Sometimes we can go on a weekend with the entire general assembly of the Support Centre, and then we are all like “we want this and that, and this and that”, after that, everyone comes home, ... and, and you too, have to manage, how to give meaning to your emancipation.

JZ: On a personal level?

NB: On a personal level, yes, And sometimes, ... well, sometimes, this is how I, with respect to my environment eh, how I deal with it I don’t know if this is a complete answer to

JZ: yes yes, but

NB: yeah, sometimes it can kind of clash.

At the beginning of this analysis, I pointed out that Nadia’s preferred sense of self is frequently articulated by means of spatial metaphors as well. This can be exemplified with reference to the excerpt below. She explains that she wants to be (a bridge to others). She does not want (to separate) from her (community) even though her social (trajectory went reasonably well). She values the (connection) she can make between the different (worlds) in which she moves.

Interview excerpt 8: Nadia Babazia 11/06/2008

NB: [...] it’s fun to work on ... on such themes uhm Because I feel like it’s not because I ... my trajectory went reasonably well, that I don’t want to be ... a bridge to others or, I don’t know. Well, somehow, I consider this to be my responsibility ...

JZ: And where do you think this comes from?

NB: Well, I don’t know, it’s, it’s, well, ... it’s a feeling, I don’t know, It’s a feeling I have, like ... “it is sort of my community ... I don’t want to separate from it”, or something. I do want to be able to do my own thing. And, ... probably, ... I don’t know what the Moroccan community, ... well, some will agree with some things and others won’t, but I, ... I do think it’s important to ... have a connection with it, and if possible, to bring a positive energy, ...

JZ: in it

NB: into it (laughs), yes, and especially with regard to youngsters.

The operation of a spatial logic of rapprochement should be clear at this point. It informs Nadia’s preferred mode of engagement as well as her preferred mode of subjectivity. Nevertheless, it should be emphasised that there are other logics to be identified as well.

3.2 Logics of enunciation

A closer analysis of the SAMV (environment), the family (environment) that is partially located in the (internal debate), and the (white), (Flemish), and (Belgian) (environment), shows that these (worlds) are characterized by different *enunciative logics* according to which the notion of (emancipation) gathers very different meanings.

Interview excerpt 9: Nadia Babazia 11/06/2008

NB: [...] But I do think that uhm, ... because I have been raised in a very Flemish environment ... and uhm ... well for instance, my physician can really say to me like, ... because I still go to my physician in Wuustwezel, ... like uhm “well, I really think it’s nice what you’re doing, you can play a very important role within your community”, but ... in such a paternalistic, mothering way Whereas I don’t want to, well, I do want to play a role for my community, but not in the way she means it She has like this image of women like “those

women are being repressed", and yes, ... you know, as if you ... as if you are liberating them or something, whereas I ... Well, I do not consider this to be my role. I do not want to deal with my community in this way, ... They give another meaning to it ...

JZ: Yes

NB: I think they may all be quite enthusiastic about uhm, about what I'm doing eh, but I think they give it another meaning ...

The excerpt above indicates that people in Nadia Babazia's (Flemish environment) tend to give another meaning to her engagement in SAMV than the one she prefers. Even though people such as her (physician) in Wuustwezel may be (enthusiastic) about the (role) she plays with respect to her (community), Nadia suspects they interpret this (role) in a rather (paternalistic) or (mothering) way. She does not consider it to be her (role) to liberate (women) in this particular way. Her preferred mode of engagement and emancipation is informed by a refusal to define these notions for others. Even within her own family context, she wonders (how to give meaning) to her (emancipation).

One might say that there are two different interpretive logics informing the discourse of her (white) and (Flemish) world on the one hand, and the logic of SAMV on the other. There is a *polysemic enunciative logic* that is part of her preferred mode of (engagement). Nadia refuses to define (emancipation) and (participation) on behalf of others. It should be noted that these logics are not simply individual concepts. For instance, this polysemic logic can also be observed in the speech given at the name change from SAMV to Ella: "It is difficult to break certain taboos on your own, if there is no support within the community. We therefore never suggest only one solution or model. Rather, we want to stimulate people to think independently, to be critical with respect to common opinions / convictions within one's own community, and to make their own choices." (Bouzarmat 2010)

Elsewhere, Nadia Babazia argues that SAMV and the (younger generation) of (feminists) refuse to do so as well. The logic informing her approach to minority and gender related themes is quite different from the logic informing the discourse of her physician and her co-workers at the VRT. The physician's (paternalistic) and (mothering) comments about Nadia's engagement, and the (questions) asked at the VRT involve rather nar-

row definitions of concepts such as (engagement), (emancipation), and (participation). One might say that questions and statements about Nadia's identity and engagement in (white) and (Flemish) environments are characterised by a *monosemic logic of enunciation*.

The enunciative logic informing the dominant mode of discourse in a particular context also informs the prevailing interpellations and forms of address. An individual's ability to identify large-scale enunciative strategies by means of metapragmatic language use correlates with his or her awareness of a preferred mode of interaction, politics, and self. Nadia Babazia is quite aware of the fact that the political tensions between individuals and organisations in the public sphere are to a large extent informed by different interpretations of the categories that give meaning to her preferred mode of engagement and subjectivity.

4. CONCLUSIONS: INTERPRETIVE LOGICS AND THE METAPRAGMATICS OF IDENTITY

Faced with complex discourses on social and political engagement one needs to distinguish between the interpretations externalised and criticised by actors on the one hand, and those interpretations that make up their preferred sense of self and subjectivity on the other hand. The notion of interpretive logics that are marked metapragmatically in discourse allows us to do this. Metapragmatic and political awareness are closely intertwined. This was exemplified extensively with reference to the case of Najim Einuan's discourse on identity and integration. The subjective sense of coherence one experiences in many large-scale interactions such as extended conversations or in-depth interviews emerges through manifold markers which are linked through a set of family resemblances. For instance, the many spatial metaphors deployed by Nadia Babazia were used in order to characterise a whole set of discourses and voices in the public sphere that are to be distinguished from her preferred mode of self and engagement. Every socio-political discourse is characterised by a set of interpretive logics. For purposes of exemplification, I have restricted myself to an illustration of how these logics may be identified. Two logics positively define Nadia's preferred mode of subjectivity: a polysemic logic of enunciation and a spatial logic of rapprochement. Both logics are negatively defined by

a monosemic enunciative logic deployed by various actors in mainstream Flemish society when they discuss the integration and emancipation of minorities.

Most of the notions used by Nadia also figure in mainstream political discourse. However, by putting these notions in new interpretive and functional relationships to each other, she is able to articulate a more or less coherent world view and critique. Depending on their usage, categories such as (emancipation) may function as personal values as well as objects of criticism. By metapragmatically highlighting the different usages of such notions, people are able to highlight the contingency of these concepts and the associated practices. As such, a politicisation of hegemonic discourses is enabled. A recognition of the fact that people deploy differential logics in the public debate when they use ethnic, cultural, religious, and other abstract categories may be the best antidote to counter processes of misrecognition among minorities and majorities in the public sphere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angermüller, Johannes (2008): "From discourse theory to discourse analysis" unpublished lecture, Copenhagen.
- Bauman, Richard/Briggs, Charles (1990): "Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life", in: *Annual review of anthropology*, 19, p. 59-88.
- Baumers, Koen (2008): "Jeugdbeweging populairder dan ooit", in: *De Standaard*, 07/08/2008, p. 8.
- Blommaert, Jan (2005): *Discourse*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, Jan/Verschueren, Jef (1998): "Debating diversity: analysing the discourse of tolerance", in: title, place, publisher?.
- Blommaert, Jan, et al. (2001): "Discourse and critique: part one", in: *Critique of anthropology*, 21 (1), p. 5-12.
- (2003): "Introduction", in: *Pragmatics: quarterly publication of the international pragmatics association*, 13 (special issue: ethnography, discourse and hegemony), p. 1-10.
- Bouzarmat, Imane (2010): "Speech 10 jaar SAMV". <http://www.ellavzw.be/pers/speech-10-jaar-samv/> (accessed 07/11/2011)

- Bublitz, Wolfram/Hübler, Axel (eds.) (2007): *Metapragmatics in use*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Caffi, C. (1998): "Metapragmatics", in: Mey, Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics, p. 581-586.
- Chantrill, Patricia A./Scott Mio, Jeffrey (1996): "Metonymy in political discourse", in: Jeffrey Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz (eds.), *Metaphor: implications and applications* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, p. 171-84.
- Coulmas, F. (1998): "Reported speech", in: Mey, Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics, p. 778-780.
- De Ceulaer, Joël (2009): "En toen waren ze nog met ...", in: *Het nieuwsblad*, 09/07/2009, p. 3.
- Debusscher, Michael (2010): *Wie zijn de leden van Scouts en Gidsen en Chiro: een profielonderzoek bij leden en hun ouders*, Zaventem: Cesor.
- Geeraerts, Dirk (1998): "Metonymy", in: Mey, Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics, p. 586-587.
- Glynos, Jason/Howarth, David (2007): *Logics of critical explanation in social and political theory*, London: Routledge.
- Gumperz, John J. (1982): *Discourse strategies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, Donald E. (2004): *Subjectivity (=The new critical idiom)*, London: Routledge.
- Heritage, John/Clayman, Steven (2010): *Talk in action: interactions, identities, and institutions*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Holt, Elizabeth (2009): "Reported Speech", in: *Handbook of Pragmatics*. <http://www.benjamins.nl/online/hop/> (accessed 15/06/2010)
- Hübler, Axel/Bublitz, Wolfram (2007): "Introducing metapragmatics in use", in: Wolfram Bublitz/Axel Hübler (eds.), *Metapragmatics in use*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 1-26.
- Jacobs, Dirk/Rea, Andrea (2006): "Construction and import of ethnic categorisations: allochthones in the Netherlands and Belgium", p. 29. <<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/12103/1/wp060068.pdf>>
- Jaworski, Adam/Coupland, Nikolas/Galasinski, Dariusz (eds.) (2004): *Metalanguage: social and ideological perspectives*, Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Laclau, Ernesto (1994): "Why do empty signifiers matter to politics?", in: Ernesto Laclau (ed.), *Emancipation(s)*, London: Verso, 36-46.

- (2000): "Foreword", in: David Howarth/Aletta J. Norval/Yannis Stavrakakis (eds.), *Discourse theory and political analysis: identities, hegemonies and social change* Manchester / New York: Manchester University Press, x-xi.
- Mey, Jacob L. (ed.) (1998): *Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- (1999): *Pragmatics: an introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Panther, Claus-Uwe/Radden, Günter (2005): "Metonymy", *Handbook of pragmatics*. <http://www.benjamins.nl/online/hop/> (accessed 15/06/2010)
- Torring, Jacob (1999): *New theories of discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Žižek*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Verschueren, Jef (1999): *Understanding pragmatics* (2003 edn.; London: Arnold).
- (2004): "Notes on the role of metapragmatic awareness in language use", in: Jaworski/Coupland/Galasinski, *Metalanguage: social and ideological perspectives*, p. 53-74.
- (2009): "Introduction: the pragmatic perspective", in: Jef Verschueren/Jan-Ola Östman (eds.), *Key notions for pragmatics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 1-27.
- Yanow, Dvora/van der Haar, Marleen (forthcoming): "People out of place: allochthony and autochthony in Netherlands identity discourse - metaphors and categories in action", in: *Journal of International Relations and Development*.
- Zienkowski, Jan (2011a): "Analysing political engagement: an interpretive and functionalist discourse analysis of evolving political subjectivities among public activists and intellectuals with a Moroccan background in Flanders", Phd, University of Antwerp.
- (2011b): "Discursive pragmatics: a platform for the pragmatic study of discourse", in: Jan Zienkowski/Jef Verschueren/Jan-Ola Östman (eds.), *Discursive pragmatics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Multimodale Marker in Museen

YANNIK PORSCHÉ

In diesem Beitrag möchte ich anhand einer Fallstudie, die sich mit einer französisch-deutschen Museumsausstellung befasst, präsentieren, was Marker in Interaktionen machen bzw. wie diese Marker in einer multimodalen Kontextualisierungsanalyse genutzt werden können. In zwei Interaktionen, die jeweils im Rahmen einer Führung durch die französische und deutsche Version der Ausstellung stattgefunden haben, lassen sich gesprochene Sprache als auch Gestiken, Mimiken, Bewegungen im Raum, der Gebrauch von Objekten etc. daraufhin untersuchen, wie sie Gruppenzugehörigkeit, institutionellen Kontext und epistemischen Status bzw. Behauptungen von Wissen anzeigen. Nach einer kurzen Präsentation der Fallstudie möchte ich anhand der Beispielanalysen Überlegungen anstellen, wie verbale und non-verbale Markierungen von Gruppenzugehörigkeit, institutioneller Kontext und epistemischer Status zusammenhängen. Zuvor werde ich kurz den Inhalt der Ausstellung skizzieren, welcher sich aus historischer und künstlerischer Warte auch mit Themen der Markierung von Gruppenzugehörigkeit beschäftigt, sowie den methodologischen Rahmen dieser Fallstudie.

Differenzierungsprozesse stehen heute im Zentrum interdisziplinärer Debatten. Marker tragen hierbei als Zeichen von Differenz wesentlich zur Wahrnehmung und Einordnung von Personen bei. Bewusst gewählte Marker wie Kleider und Accessoires wirken als wichtige Kennzeichnungen der Gruppenzugehörigkeit. Zwangsweise zugewiesene Marker wie die Beurteilung »durchgefallen« hingegen bedingen Exklusion. Die Beiträge des Bandes verdeutlichen: Theoretisch und empirisch lässt sich mit dem »Marker«-Begriff zeigen, wie sich Differenzen vergegenständlichen. Mit unterschiedlichen Perspektiven auf Marker betrachten sie die Logik, Materialität und Politik von Differenzierungsprozessen.