

INTRODUCTION

The communities of practice (CofP) framework is a relative newcomer to sociolinguistic research which demonstrates great promise as a means of analysing and better understanding both the functioning of groups and the individuals that comprise them. To date, however, the body of research in the area is small, and consequently, the parameters that govern the framework are largely undefined. While potential communities suitable for analysis are limitless, previous studies in the field have typically concerned pedagogical scenarios, gender-based groups, or ‘institutional communities’ (such as office workers). Specifically, it seems that there is a lack of CofP-based research where unstructured social communities are concerned.

Following a review of the development and current findings of the CofP approach, I present a small-scale case study of a semi-structured community comprised of musicians and their core fan-base. Key findings concerning group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change within the group are then discussed with reference to contemporary literature. This discussion highlights the successes and shortcomings of the CofP framework as a means of analysing communities with structures thus far unaccounted for by CofP research.

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Sociolinguistic research first began to prosper under the Labovian paradigm that was by the mid-1960s beginning to take hold. William Labov’s pioneering work on language variation in Martha’s Vineyard (1963) and New York City (1966) demonstrated the capabilities of sociolinguistics as a means of illuminating the relationship between language and macro-level constructs such as gender, race and social class. While earlier structuralist linguistic methodologies sought to examine languages as they would be spoken and processed by a fictitious ‘ideal speaker/hearer’ (i.e. Chomsky 1965), Labov’s work was concerned with real speakers and actual language use. His framework for studying this—variationalism—used quantitative data gathering, in the form of surveys and interviews, coupled with contextual information about the speakers’ identities in order to determine ‘probable truths’ about the language variations speakers were found to produce.

More recently, however, sociolinguists have come to reject a number of the methodological aspects of the variationalist approach. Coupland (2007) explains that while Dan McDonald

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

variationalism has had a number of successes, there are some constructive criticisms that must be addressed. The four main criticisms he presents are essentially that:

1. The use of quantitative data washes the social meaning(s) from the utterances.
2. The interview procedure disallows language to be produced in a natural setting.
3. Variationalist research often goes no further than simply documenting the existence of a particular variation.
4. The kinds of results gained from such studies are of little use to the communities studied (Coupland 2007).

These criticisms are echoed by seminal CofP researchers Penelope Eckert and Sally McConnell-Ginet (1999), who additionally note that the survey-based approach taken by most variationalist research results in the ‘homogenisation of a broad range of uses’ (p. 194), ‘[bleeds variationalism of its access to social meaning’ (p. 191) and eliminates distinction at an individual or local level (p. 192).

These purported shortcomings of the Labovian paradigm can be seen as responsible for the development of the CofP framework, which essentially implements both the core principles of variationalism and its recent criticisms in order to analyse the practices of groups.

Understanding communities of practice

The main focus of the CofP approach is to analyse the way in which any of a broad range of communities engages in meaning-making within its members. This could include limitless areas of analysis: both linguistic practices (such as phonology, gesture, use of slang, etc.), and non-linguistic practices (hairstyle, clothing choice, brand affinities, to name a few) may be studied by researchers in order to understand the phenomena present in a given community. Analyses of these practices provide insights on a number of levels. While the discovery of a particular language variation may be interesting in itself to sociolinguists, such data can also be used to make judgements on the internal structure of the community being studied.

Essential to the discipline is the strong focus on the analysis of the aforementioned practices or *shared repertoire* of these groups. As Bethan Davies explains:

‘The core of the community of practice concept resides in the importance of *doing*, and, more particularly, doing things in a way

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

which reinforces membership in that community of practice’ (2007, p. 3).

This foregrounding of practices is seen by Bucholtz (1999) as both the overarching benefit of the approach and the main point of difference between CofP and other sociolinguistic frameworks such as speech communities and social network analysis.

The CofP methodology

The CofP framework can additionally be characterised by the distinctive methodology it typically employs to both collect and analyse data. As noted above, CofP places an equal focus on both linguistic and non-linguistic practices. This idea stems from the earlier concept of practice theory, which argues that since there is no clear separation between linguistic and non-linguistic practices in the eyes of the user(s), analyses of either type of practice by researchers ‘should be approached in analogous ways’ (Bourdieu 1991, as cited in Bucholtz 1999, p. 210). This essentially means that the importance of a lexical item used by the group is seen as being on an equal plane to that of a gesture, a style of clothing or a cosmetic choice. Yet the emergence of this concept may be as problematic as it is beneficial: while broadening the number of analysable practices beyond the purely linguistic leads to more thorough findings, there is as a result an inherent lack of qualification in the practitioners of the field when it comes to studying these non-linguistic cues. While most have undergone a great deal of training in linguistics, there is no equivalent training in the analysis of the non-linguistic practices that are integral to the strength of the CofP framework.

CofP is further characterised by its qualitative, bottom-up approach. This idea, in opposition to the variationist paradigm, prioritises information gathering at the level of the individual, rather than the community, and analysis at a local, rather than global, level. To be more specific, data collection is likely to involve interviews with individuals rather than surveys of groups, and categories formed during analyses will be informed by the data presented rather than by a global context. Bucholtz notes that because of this bottom-up approach, the CofP framework can elegantly account for the fluidity and variation of notions of gender (and other such constructs) that exists cross-culturally (1999, p. 210).

CofP can thus be characterised as a complex framework that employs the methodologies of a number of separate, but related, disciplines. Consequently, in addition to an understanding of the main tenets of CofP, it is also important to distinguish it from the

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

frameworks from which it seeks to remain autonomous (Holmes & Meyerhoff 1999). Therefore, outlined below are a number of such frameworks, coupled with an explanation of how they differ from CofP.

CofP and social identity theory

Social identity theory is a framework that analyses the relationship between an individual and one or more groups to which that individual belongs. The main separation from CofP is in focus: social identity theory is concerned with individual psychology and cognition, where CofP is focalised on the *joint repertoire* of the community (Holmes & Meyerhoff 1999).

CofP and speech communities

The differences between speech communities and CofPs have been presented in Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1999 and eloquently summarised in Davies 2007. Davies explains that the differences are threefold:

1. The speech communities model is more geared toward ‘emphasiz[ing] the pattern of variation produced, rather than the perception of that variation by different members of the speech community’ (p. 3).

- 2 The speech communities model leads to a marginalisation of the outliers of a group, where CofP seeks to account for the outlier status.

3. The speech communities model uses a top-down approach, which imposes global categories on the populations studied (e.g. class, gender, race), where CofP groups individuals at a local level.

The other notable separation from CofP is in the potentially analysable data: only linguistic variation is examined under the speech communities framework, where CofP seeks to examine all practices equally.

CofP and ethnographic approaches

Ethnographic approaches to understanding communities are perhaps closer to the CofP model than the speech communities framework, in that they are both concerned with micro- or local-level analyses of groups. They remain distinct, however, as ethnographic approaches are typically reliant on the speakers’ own judgements regarding their language use, rather than on an analysis made by the researcher (Davies 2007). Additionally, as with the speech

Dan McDonald

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

communities model, ethnographic approaches to understanding the practices of communities are strictly limited to linguistic datasets.

CofP and social network analysis

While social network analysis and CofP book seek to analyse links between members of a group, there remain two primary distinctions between the frameworks. The first difference is in scope: social networks may possess weak ties between members, but members of a CofP must be more closely linked. Secondly, analyses of these social networks are generally focussed on the links between these members rather than the practices the members share. Holmes & Meyerhoff (1999, p. 180) also note that SNA looks at *quantity* of interaction, whereas CofP looks at *quality*.

What constitutes a community of practice?

With an understanding of the place of the CofP framework within sociolinguistic research, and the differences between similar methodologies defined, we can come to look at what exactly constitutes an analysable CofP. First, it is likely best to start with Eckert & McConnell-Ginet’s perennial definition of the term:

‘A community of practice is an aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor. Ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations – in short, practices – emerge in the course of this mutual endeavor. As a social construct, a CofP is different from the traditional community, primarily because it is defined simultaneously by its membership and by the practice in which that membership engages’ (1992, p. 464).

In addition to this definition, Etienne Wenger (1998) sets out three predominant criteria that a CofP must possess. These are:

Mutual engagement

This entails that the members of the group interact with one another regularly. No restrictions are placed on the modes of communication; members may communicate face-to-face, by telephone or online.

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

Joint enterprise

This is a ‘process’ whereby the members of the community are mutually accountable for the attainment of a shared goal (Holmes & Meyerhoff 1999, p. 175). Yet this criterion is more salient in the pedagogical scenarios that Wenger researched; researchers have noted that more amorphous communities appear to lack such a specific and shared goal (Davies, 2007). Therefore, at this stage, the concept of *joint enterprise* remains vague, and research in the field is still too limited to provide a more sound or precise wording. There is a consensus, however, that a more rigorous definition of *joint enterprise* will be required if CofP hopes to gain further explanatory power.

A relevant example of the difficulty associated with the notion of *joint enterprise* is presented in Meyerhoff (1999), where it was concluded that women speaking Bislama do not constitute a CofP, despite sharing a linguistic ‘practice’ in their use of *sore* (sorry), due in part to an indistinct ‘enterprise’. (Consequently, Meyerhoff argued that the women instead constituted a speech community.)

Shared repertoire

Meaning is derived from a repertoire of practices that are shared and understood by members of a CofP. As has already been noted in this paper, these are not limited to linguistic cues. Relevant examples of documented practices include Eckert’s study of jean-width as a part of shared repertoire of high-school students (cited in Davies 2007) and Holmes & Meyerhoff’s conclusion that meals formed a shared practice for policy units in New Zealand (1999, p. 176).

Focuses of CofP research

Given the broad nature of the three aforementioned criteria, the range of communities suitable for study is vast. Eckert & McConnell-Ginet specifically state that ‘a choir, a gang, a secretarial pool, a family, a garage band, a friendship group, or an academic department’ may all constitute CofPs (1999, p. 186). Yet a review of the studies that have been conducted to date shows a trend toward studying pedagogical relationships (Lave & Wenger, 1991), gender-based groups (Eckert 1990a, 1990b) and communities within formal, institutional settings (Brown and Duguid 1991). Bucholtz accounts for these particular focuses by explaining that the CofP framework was designed by Lave and Wenger to work on pedagogy,

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

and was very quickly adapted for language and gender research by Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (1999, p. 207). Thus, despite Eckert & McConnell-Ginet’s note that ‘A CofP can develop out of a formally or informally constituted enterprise’ (1999, p. 186), it seems that there is a deficiency in understanding the latter.

Notable findings of CofP research to date

Membership

Gradable membership is an important element of CofP theory that has been appropriated from social network analysis. It allows researchers to divide members of a group into the categories of ‘full’, ‘periphery’, and ‘marginal’ based on their usage of the *shared repertoire*, their orientation toward the common goal, and their ‘established patterns of engagement with other members’ (Holmes & Meyerhoff 1999, p. 176). In the CofP framework, these three classes of membership inform a number of hypotheses concerning notions such as trajectory, brokering and linguistic change. While it is difficult to draw far-reaching generalisations from the few studies that deal with the aforementioned phenomena, a summary of CofP’s understanding of their mechanisms is certainly possible and is thus presented below.

Legitimate periphery participants and trajectory

Trajectory concerns the potential movement of participants from one membership class to another. Wenger (1998) explains that in pedagogical scenarios, the *legitimate periphery member* is in the best position for learning, as such members are in a position to practice the repertoire without fear of consequence for making a mistake, while simultaneously being able to observe the accomplished practices of ‘full’ members. Davies explains that these ‘[legitimate periphery participants] are considered to be in an inbound trajectory, headed for full participation in the community of practice’ (2007, p. 6).

Brokering and linguistic change

Another element of CofP theory with only a rudimentary understanding to date is the concept of brokering. In the context of a CofP, brokering is essentially the process by which new practices—linguistic or otherwise—are brought into the group. The traditional understanding of brokering, as seen by Wenger (1998), consists of the idea that legitimate periphery participants ‘[yield] enough distance to bring a different perspective, but also enough

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

legitimacy to be listened to’ and are thus able to posit the practices from one group into another (p. 110). This idea was partially furthered by Bucholtz (1999) whose study of ‘nerd girls’ showed that a ‘socially flexible’ female (Carrie) was able to introduce the nerd girls to words from the ‘cooler’ groups. Yet Davies (2007) contends that Bucholtz’s analysis is incomplete. She argues that ‘it is hard to imagine peripheral members having sufficient legitimacy to affect group practices’ (p. 9), and that new practices must be sanctioned or ratified by ‘full’ members of the group. Davies then cites Eckert (1999) as evidence for this idea of ‘sanctioning’. In Eckert’s study, a girl who was known for bringing new fashions into her school was looked at by her peers with scorn; it was only after a popular girl from a different clique wore a similar item that she felt ‘licensed’ to wear the high-fashion items.

CofP theory has, however, only taken tentative steps toward an understanding of the likely process by which new these practices come to be undertaken or ‘ratified’ by a community. Orlikowski & Yates explain that new parts of a repertoire appear to be established by either ‘custom’ or ‘reflexive’ agency. The former involves new practices being brought about by ‘inadvertent slippage or improvisation’ by a member while trying to reproduce an old practice; the latter refers to conscious decisions to alter old practices by ‘trial and error, learning from others, or actively searching for and switching to alternative routines’ (1994, p. 548). An alternative hypothesis, voiced by Milroy (1992), is that the brokering and sanctioning process is undertaken by an *innovator* (whose ‘weak ties’ to a group allow him/her to ‘escape the pressure to conform’) and an *early adopter*, (who ratifies the new practice within the core group).

It is important to note, however, that thus far, few attempts have been made within CofP research to determine why ‘full’ members of a group would choose to sanction new practices, especially in cases where the new practice takes the place of an already established one.

CASE STUDY

The case study I present in this paper is a response to a proposition made by Eckert & McConnell-Ginet:

‘A basic beginning in the search for valid generalizations with explanatory significance must be the examination of a wide variety of local communities of practice, along with serious consideration of apparent exceptions to candidate generalizations’ (1999, p. 190).

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

As it appears that to date, the variety of communities studied is not particularly ‘wide’, I have chosen to research the thus far unexamined social categories of *rock band* and *fan-base*.

The relevant community is best explained as existing in two overlapping parts: the band itself—*The Thod*—comprised of eight Australian males, aged 20-22 (*Sammy, Duke, Matcott, Jayden, Peeny, Aidan, O’Brien and myself*); and the girlfriends, siblings, friends and fans of the group who, combined with the band members, form a wider group (of around 35) that meets both socially and for ‘gigs’.

The collected data is in two forms. The first is a videotaped interview with the members of the band (recorded 31/5/2010), in which I ask the interviewees about the origins and usage patterns of a number of practices that were deemed to be local to the band’s community. The second dataset, which comprises of my personal observations and field notes that span the five years of the band’s existence, was used primarily to determine the list of practices to be brought up for discussion in the interview. It should be noted that the methodology is typical of CofP research: the interview was recorded in the band’s practice space by a band member (thus preserving social meaning), the data is qualitative in nature, and attempts to label or categorise the group and subgroups have been made after, rather than before, the data analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In the following section, results of the data analysis are divided by topic, evidenced and exemplified with quotations and personal observations as required, and discussed with reference to contemporary CofP literature.

Mutual engagement

Although the study was initially focused on the band members themselves, it became clear that the CofP also included the girlfriends, siblings, friends and fans that were often present alongside the ‘core’ group. The decision to class both subgroups as a single CofP stemmed from both the *mutual engagement* and *shared repertoire* criteria set forth in Wenger 1998. In terms of *mutual engagement*, the band itself met approximately three times weekly for rehearsals, gigs or social events. Within the accompanying social group, around 25 were deemed ‘likely’ to attend one or more gigs or social events per week. This appeared to be a sufficient level of engagement to satisfy the criterion.

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

A secondary observation that demonstrated the singularity of the group was the observed in the use of the lexeme *Thod* to describe both members of the band and the surrounding social group, in instances such as:

Jayden: ‘All the Thod people say it.’

In a similar vein, the phrase ‘*Thod party*’ was used by a number of members of the CofP to denote parties at the houses of both members of the band and the fan-base. The interrelated nature of the groups is also evident in Duke’s talk:

Duke: ‘People think [a close friend of the band members] is in the band — they say to him, “you’re in *The Thod*,” and it’s kinda like nah, but yeah I mean, there’s two *Thods*’.

Shared repertoire

My personal observation also concluded that the 35 member social group has a number of unique linguistic and non-linguistic practices that are understood by even the most marginal members of the CofP. Furthermore, ‘full’ (i.e. band) members and periphery members (generally closer friends, girlfriends and siblings) appeared to be equally fluent in these practices. While it must be acknowledged that those outside the band were not interviewed, it is still noteworthy that all band members recognised the practices they were asked to consider (see *appendices two and three* for a list).

While there was opposition from certain interviewees concerning the idea of their non-linguistic practices being part of a group repertoire, it was evident through the use of the first person plural *we* that interviewees did indeed share such non-linguistic practices.

O’Brien: ‘**Our** jeans are blue, right, because **we** don’t wanna look like every other group [by wearing black jeans]. But I don’t think **we** ever *decided* to do that—it just happened.’

Duke: ‘[Dunlop] Volleys — **we all** — they’re just practical and cheap.’

One member even noted the relationship between the shared practice of fashion choice in the group and the macro-level perceptions of both the band and the style of clothing:

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

Matcott: ‘We all wear kinds of clothes that kind of suggest we’re artistic people.’

Joint enterprise

The most difficult of Wenger’s three criteria to apply to the group is the idea of *joint enterprise*. This appears to be due to the unstructured nature and varying shared goals of the group. In the interview, Duke contends that the goal of the band is to ‘get famous enough to quit our jobs’, and Peeny talks of ‘touring’ as a goal. While these two ideas can be easily synthesised into a schema of ‘attaining success’, it cannot be convincingly argued that the fan-base of the band share such goals. For non-band members, it seems that the goal of their involvement in the community is primarily social.

Therefore, while the 35 member group fulfils the criteria of *mutual engagement* and a *shared repertoire*, the issue of *joint enterprise* may lead to the disqualification of the group as a CofP by some researchers (as was the case in Meyerhoff 1999). It would seem that the only solution would be to argue that band members appear to also possess the same social goal as the fan-base (evidenced in their appearance at social functions), thus demonstrating a single *joint enterprise*. Yet this analysis is extremely problematic: while it satisfies the *joint enterprise* criteria and thus makes the group a more typical CofP, it would also mean that the band’s original goal of ‘attaining success’ has been marginalised by the social goal, which was formed later and is largely carried by the peripheral and marginal members of the CofP. In light of this issue, it appears pertinent for CofP research to either form a hypothesis regarding the notion of overlapping CofPs (mentioned briefly in Davies 2007) or to reconsider the rule of singularity that currently governs the notion of *joint enterprise*.

Structure, membership level and trajectory

Analysis of the group also yielded results that may elucidate the thus-far vague concepts of structure and trajectory. To date, researchers such as Eckert & McConnell-Ginet have tended to categorise groups into either being self-constituted or part of an institution (1999). Yet the community studied here appears to contain aspects of both purported ‘types’ of CofP: the eight band members have rigorously structured roles and expectations (to write and record songs, to practice and play gigs, etc.), while the ‘social members’ are free from any such obligation. This notion of a *semi-structured* community of practice, which could be exported

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

to other artistic communities, fraternities, sororities, sporting teams and their supporters, etc., is thus far unexamined in CofP literature.

The semi-structured nature of The Thod’s social group also has ramifications on ideas of trajectory. Davies’ 2007 paper essentially equates the divisions of full, periphery and marginal participation with assumed static, inbound and outbound trajectories, respectively. Yet this analysis appears unsatisfactory in the case of The Thod’s CofP. Periphery members are not mobile but static: due to the structure of the eight band members as a ‘core’, those on the periphery are essentially barred from further inward trajectory by the mandated structure of the core group. Again, this kind of finding is unseen in other CofP research.

Brokering

The interview elicited a number of insights relating to the concept of brokering within the CofP. Essentially, it can be seen that linguistic brokering within The Thod’s community is realised in a variety of ways:

Matcott: ‘Vav’s brought in heaps of stuff — his whole group has.’

Duke: ‘The kids from Want Me a Mule (a band with members inside The Thod’s CofP) — yeah, they give us heaps [of words].’

Duke: ‘We get heaps of shit from Rangz (a member of Want Me a Mule).’

Here we see peripheral members of the CofP emerging as brokers: Vav and his friendship group, as well as Rangz and his fellow band members in Want Me a Mule. Observation of The Thod’s CofP revealed that Rangz and Vav conform to criteria set forth by Wenger (1998) regarding broker-status: they each had ‘membership [in] multiple communities of practice’ and both ‘[yielded] enough legitimacy to be listened to’ (p. 110).

An interesting sidenote concerning brokering is the possible existence of what I will call ‘broker-communities’. It can be clearly seen in the interview excerpts above that the band members perceive that both individuals *and* groups are responsible for new words (and therefore likely other practices) entering their community. Perhaps it is most clearly stated by Duke:

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

Duke: Isn’t it interesting that those two groups (Vav’s friends and Want Me a Mule) could be classified as the scummiest groups we know? And that’s where the cool words are!’

This finding stands in contrast with CofP theory to date (i.e. Bucholtz 1999, Davies 2007), which sees brokering as the role of individual, legitimate periphery participants. From this case study, it could be hypothesised that the groups surrounding The Thod’s social sphere are kinds of interrelated broker-communities. The question of whether or not this finding is anomalous to The Thod’s CofP, or whether the idea of broker-communities is valid in other CofPs, will of course also require further research.

Sanctioning

Sanctioning was equally apparent upon an analysis of the interview:

Sammy: [on lexeme *steeze*] ‘Well I got it from a mate who got it from a mate who got it from a mate, probably.’

Sammy: ‘*Degs* came from me and The Wierce, talking about the movie *Snatch*, where he’s like—where Brad Pitt’s like, “you like *degs*? Yeah, I like dogs.” And so me and The Wierce, we’d go out for a dick, and then we called it a dart, and then we started calling it a *degs*’.

The above examples demonstrate the ‘sanctioning’ process as described by Eckert (1992), or the ‘early adapter’ process proposed by Milroy (1992). In the first example, Sammy claims that he ‘got’ *steeze* from an unknown person outside the band, and implies that he is thus responsible for bringing it to the CofP. In the second example, he explains that the term *degs* was appropriated from a film by himself and a friend from outside the group. In both cases, as required by Davies, Sammy can be seen as providing ‘a conduit of information about alternative practices’ (2007 p. 17).

Linguistic change

The final point of discussion relates to linguistic change. A number of the hypotheses relating to this phenomenon are consistent with the data presented here.

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

Duke: ‘We say [*cheeky* in falsetto] because of when [a member of the group] got really bent – remember, he kept giggling and going “pass the *cheeky* (in falsetto).’

Sammy: ‘*Degs* came from me and The Wierce, talking about the movie *Snatch*, where he’s like—where Brad Pitt’s like, “you like *degs*? Yeah, I like dogs.” And so me and The Wierce, we’d go out for a dick (obsolete word for cigarette), and then we called it a dart (also obsolete), and then we started calling it a *degs*.’

The first example here exemplifies the process of custom agency set out by Orlikowski & Yates (1994, p. 548): the misuse of *cheeky* in falsetto caused an imitation of the utterance by the other CofP members that has since become the new standard. The second example demonstrates the idea of ‘reflective agency’. Here, Sammy explains that there was a conscious decision between him and The Wierce to use *degs* to denote cigarette. Presumably, Sammy’s status as a ‘ratifier’ of new practices allowed the usage to pass into the wider group.

AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The overarching themes presented in the case study point to a need for a great deal of future research in CofP. While the CofP framework appears to be capable of analyses of diverse and complex groups, there is simply not enough data available to provide explanations for the problematic elements of semi-structured communities such as the one presented.

Given the small scale of the study, and the near-complete lack of data from non-band members, it seems that the conclusions drawn in this paper cannot be used to form valid generalisations on the behaviour of communities of practice more generally. An interesting avenue for future research could involve the study of communities of visual artists, poets, and other types of musicians, in order to gauge whether the phenomena present in The Thod’s CofP are common in other communities rooted in the creative arts.

CONCLUSION

The case study of the CofP surrounding rock band *The Thod* demonstrates the successes and shortcomings of the CofP model, as well as a number of avenues suitable for a great deal of future research. While the framework successfully explains the phenomena of brokering and linguistic change, and while it copes relatively well with multilayered group structures and

Dan McDonald

'Thod Party': an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

trajectories, it appears that the key criterion of *shared repertoire* may need more flexibility if CofP practitioners hope to gain future insights into the myriad of unexamined groups that are worthy of CofP analysis.

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, J. S. And Duguid, P. (1991). 'Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning and innovation', *Organization Science* 2, pp. 40-57.

Bucholtz, M. (1999). "'Why Be Normal?': Language and Identity Practices in a Community of Nerd Girls," *Language in Society* 28(2): 203-223, 1999

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press

Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, B. (2005). Communities of practice: Legitimacy not choice. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9

Eckert, P. (1990a). The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change*, 1.245-67.

Eckert, P. (1990b). Cooperative competition in adolescent girl talk. *Discourse Processes*, 13.92-122.

Eckert, P. (1999). *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Communities of Practice: Where language, gender and power all live. In K. Hall, M. Bucholtz, & B. Moonwomon (Eds), *Locating power: Proceedings of the second Berkeley Women and Language Conference, April 4 and April 5, 1992*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group

Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1999). New generalizations and explanations in language and gender research. *Language in Society* 28: 185-201.

'Thod Party': an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

Labov, W. (1963). The social motivation of a sound change. *Word* 19:273-307

Labov, W. (1966). The effect of social mobility on linguistic behavior. *Sociological Inquiry* 36: 186-203.

Holmes, J. & Meyerhoff, M. (1999). The community of practice: Theories and methodologies in language and gender research. *Language in Society* 28: 173-184

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Milroy, J. (1992). *Linguistic variation and change: On the historical sociolinguistics of English*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Orlikowski, W. J., and Yates, J. (1994). "Genre Repertoire: The Structuring of Communicative Practices in Organizations," *Administrative Science Quarterly* (39:4), pp. 541-574.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press

‘Thod Party’: an analysis of group structure, trajectory, language brokering and linguistic change in a semi-structured community of practice

APPENDIX ONE – a list of lexical items deemed to be a part of the CofP’s shared linguistic repertoire, with approximate definitions. Lexemes raised in the interview are in bold:

Local lexeme	definition
<i>beug</i>	bong, to smoke a bong
<i>beugsman</i>	user of bongs
<i>chief</i>	term of address for ‘tough’ or promiscuous male (current term)
<i>cheeky</i>	marijuana (recently produced more often in falsetto)
<i>degs</i>	cigarette, to smoke a cigarette (current term)
<i>dick</i>	cigarette, to smoke a cigarette (obsolete)
<i>filts</i>	cigarette filter/s
<i>honger</i>	bong
<i>juzz</i>	marijuana
<i>papes</i>	cigarette paper/s
<i>piece</i>	term of address for ‘tough’ or promiscuous male (obsolete)
<i>pocket dragon</i>	cigarette lighter
<i>rizza</i>	<i>Port Royal</i> brand rolling tobacco
<i>riss</i>	the local RSL
<i>showbs</i>	newbie, hack or failure
<i>steeze</i>	a ‘tough’ or rude stance or facial expression

APPENDIX TWO – Non-linguistic practices deemed ‘shared’ and raised in the interview:

Non-linguistic object	Attribute local to the CofP
jeans	blue colour
shoes	<i>Dunlop Volleys</i>
type of guitar	hollow-bodied electric
dress code	‘scummy’ (casual, dirty, ripped or unironed clothes)