

Bros, Boys and Guys: address term function and communities of practice in a New Zealand rugby team¹

Nick Wilson
Victoria University of Wellington

Abstract

This paper is a preliminary study of address terms based on a small corpus of talk by members of a New Zealand rugby team collected using ethnographic fieldwork. The paper first looks at how address terms are used by different Communities of Practice within the rugby team then goes on to analyse the range of discourse functions of the speech acts that contain the address terms. A comparison of the frequency of Māori and Pākehā address terms indicates that in the match day discourse of the rugby club it is Pākehā norms of address that dominate.

1. Introduction

Whilst there has been a sizeable amount of research carried out on forms of address using various combinations of honorific, first name and last name, not to mention kinship terms (Ervin-Tripp 1976, 1996, 1967; Johnston and Robertson 1993; Lakoff 1973), it appears to be only recently that sociolinguists have taken an interest in other address terms, particularly address terms of familiarity such as *mate* (Rendle-Short 2009, 2010) or *bro*. This paper is a preliminary study based on a corpus of rugby team discourse that has been collected through ethnographic fieldwork. It uses a corpus-based approach combined with an Interactional Sociolinguistic stance to explore how address terms function within a New Zealand rugby team.

Address Terms

In Australia, there has been some interest in the use of the address term *mate*, on how it relates to Australian identity, its masculine connotations and its function in interaction (Rendle-Short 2009, 2010). While *mate* may be used by a growing number of Australian women (Rendle-Short 2009), it is just one of a range of what Leech (1999) terms “familiarizers” [sic], used predominantly between men. In addition to *mate* these include *guys*, *man* and *bro*. According to Leech, familiarisers fulfil three

¹ Thank you to Janet Holmes and Meredith Marra for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper, as well as to the two anonymous reviewers for their comments.

functions: to attract attention², to select an addressee, and to enhance the solidarity of the relationship between speaker and hearer. However, unlike Rendle-Short, Leech attributes *mate* to British English rather than Australian English, perhaps indicating that it is more widely used term than either Rendle-Short or Leech have recognised. This is also shown by the use of *mate* to “imply a sense of companionship” as in Ghanaian English (Afful 2007: 4). *Mate* is also popular in New Zealand, as shown in this paper; however, there are other address terms that fulfil a similar function. Of particular interest are terms such as *bro* and *cuz* used to non-relations, considered characteristic of Māori English, also referred to by Bell (2000, 2007) as Māori Vernacular English, or colloquially as “bro talk” (King 1999). These address terms are said to reflect the importance of the kinship dimension of Māori language address terms (Johnston and Robertson 1993: 125). Like other familiarisers these serve to engender solidarity between speaker and hearer and can also function as ethnicity markers, constructing a Māori identity for the speaker (Holmes 2005a; Stubbe and Holmes 2000). However, there is also some evidence that suggests that features such as these that are emblematic of Māori English (notably *eh*) are growing in usage among younger Pākehā, indicating a change from below (Meyerhoff 1994; Stubbe and Holmes 1995, 2000; Stubbe 1999). However King (1999: 24) suggests that it may be considered inappropriate for a Pākehā to use Māori English, although this appears to mean the “more Māori” end of the Māori English continuum referred to by Holmes (2005a). It may then be the case, as Bell (2007) suggests, that the use of discourse features like *eh* can be considered a stylistic feature when employed by Pākehā, used as a means of engendering solidarity with Māori without offending, as King suggests a more wholesale adoption of Māori English might. This may also be the case for *bro* however there has been little research to confirm or deny this, despite a widely held belief that *bro* has been fully adopted from Māori English into the general New Zealand English of younger Pākehā speakers³.

This paper focuses on the use of familiarisers in sports team discourse. Aside from Koenraad Kuiper’s work on formulaic language in the locker room insults of rugby players and the in-game compliments of volleyball (1991), there is little in the way of sociolinguistic research on sports teams in New Zealand. Such research has, however, been carried out on basketball and baseball teams in the United States (Heath and Langman 1994; Masterson et al. 2006), and on football teams in the UK (Clayton and Humberstone 2006; Corder 2004; Meân 2001). Although rugby in New Zealand has received little sociolinguistic coverage, it has been intensively researched in other disciplines, particularly sociology and sports studies (e.g. Grainger 2009; MacLean 2004; McConnell 1996; Melnick and Loy 1996; Ryan 2005). Drawing on these, the research presented in this paper is intended to add to the

² An *attention-getter* as Ervin-Tripp (1976) terms it.

³ Thanks to one of the anonymous reviewers for drawing my attention to this.

sociolinguistic knowledge of sport teams in New Zealand as well as the function of familiarisers in group discourse.

The familiarisers examined in this paper are the singular address terms *bro*, *cuz(zy)* and *mate*, and the plural terms *bros*, *cuzzies*, *boys* and *guys*⁴. By investigating how the different address terms pattern by speaker and by discourse function, it is shown that the Community of Practice to which the speaker belongs plays an important part in address term choice, as does the discourse function of the speech act containing the address term.

Communities of Practice

The Communities of Practice (CofP) model is now widely used by sociolinguists to group individuals by what they do rather than who they are (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Eckert and Wenger 2005; Holmes and Meyerhoff 1999). It has been especially useful in studies of workplace discourse where it can sometimes be difficult to draw distinctions by other means of stratification such as ethnicity or gender. That is not to say however, that these factors cannot be addressed within the CofP model, in fact they are often, highly successfully, examined in conjunction with a CofP approach (e.g. Daly et al. 2004; Holmes 2005b; Holmes and Marra 2002; Schnurr et al. 2007; Vine et al. 2008). The CofP model simply allows for a further level of analysis that is interaction focused. The three dimensions that are used to define a CofP are listed below, exemplified by the rugby team as a whole.

- Mutual Engagement – the team members interact at every training session and match.
- Jointly Negotiated Enterprise – they are all there to play rugby, and ultimately to win.
- Shared Repertoire – they share a common rugby terminology (e.g. rucks, mauls, scrums etc.)

This is a somewhat simplified version of what is actually going on however, in fact the rugby club might be better viewed as a *constellation of practice* (Wenger 1998: 127) consisting of several configurations of CofPs which each has its own linguistic repertoire, to a certain extent, and a slightly different jointly negotiated enterprise. This idea has been further developed to describe nested, overlapping CofPs within a larger CofP (Brannan 2007; Rock 2005) and this is how the concept is used in this paper to describe the rugby club in which the CofPs do overlap to a certain extent, especially when we look at the different configurations possible. For instance, the coaches and other team management constitute a CofP on the basis of their shared role to provide coaching instruction and support to the team, yet as one works

⁴ Other terms, such as *man* and *dude*, were searched for in the corpus but were not found.

predominantly with the forwards and the other with the backs they could also be considered members of these CofPs. If using the former configuration, they form a separate CofP to the players, who can also be split into at least two further CofPs, as will be detailed later on.

The CofP model is often used in conjunction with discourse analysis, particularly of the workplace (e.g. Daly et al. 2004; Schnurr 2008; Schnurr et al. 2007). This paper makes use of a functional approach to discourse analysis; precisely how these discourse functions are defined is explained later. Vine's (2004) elaboration of the concept of Control Acts (Ervin-Tripp et al. 1990) provides a valuable starting point in considering these endemic speech acts. Other functions that are investigated in this paper are compliments (Golato 2003; Herbert and Straight 1989; Holmes 1986, 1998) and criticism.

Research Site

The rugby team that participated in this research are an amateur club team, playing Premier rugby in the Wellington region. Over the course of the season thirty-one players played for the team. They ranged in age from 18 to 36 and of the thirty-one; fifteen were Māori, eleven Pākehā, four Pasifika and one English. In addition to the players there were several support staff comprising the head coach, assistant coach, squad managers and the physio, all of whom were Pākehā. Of these the head coach was the youngest and had only finished a semi-professional playing career some two years previously. The assistant coach on the other hand had been a professional coach for over twenty years. The team was studied over the course of a full season (six months) at training sessions and matches. This paper focuses on interactions taking place on match days, interpreted using the contextual information gathered through ethnographic observation, which was a result of extended contact between researcher and team and invaluable in gaining a full understanding of the social meanings encoded in the discourse of the team. In contrast to my previous ethnographical work on rugby which I conducted as a full participant (Wilson 2009), this contact began as a purely observational role, as the access point to the team was through a friend-of-a-friend (cf. Milroy and Gordon 2003) and I had no prior contact with the team before embarking on this research. Therefore, it was only by extended contact as an observer that I gained the trust of the team and began to participate more fully with them, for example, helping the squad managers fill water bottles and carry training equipment. Thus, as suggested by ethnographic practice literature (Agar 1996; Atkinson and Hammersley 1994; Hammersley and Atkinson 1983; Walsh 2004), I moved from complete observer to observer as participant.

Initially, in order for the team to more readily accept my presence, match days and training sessions were observed without recording. However, it was always the intention to make audio recordings. So once the players were comfortable with the presence of both me and a recording device, I prepared to record match days. The main challenge was that, from start to finish, the match day lasts around five hours,

most of which is not recordable. It was decided for logistical reasons that the actual matches themselves would not be recorded; it was not possible to safely attach microphones to players during matches (although this was achieved in training sessions). Moreover, after a trial run, it was discovered that during the match the coaches mostly engaged in small talk with spectators. The only point during the match at which there was significant player-coach interaction was at halftime. In addition, there was a somewhat ritualistic build-up to each match which consisted of a team meeting, led by the head-coach, followed by the warm-up session. After this, and immediately before the start of the match, was the pre-match huddle, led by the team captain. At the end of each match the players and coaches would form a huddle for a post-match analysis. It is these four discourse events, summarised in Table 1, that form the Match Corpus used in this paper. These were chosen as they were the events that proved suitable for recording and contained the most player-coach interaction on match days.

Table 1: Summary of discourse events

Discourse Event	Dominant Speaker	Additional Speakers	Location
Team Meeting	Head Coach	None	Team Room
Pre-match Huddle	Captain	None	Team Room
Half-time Huddle	Both coaches	Captains, other players	On Pitch
Post-match Huddle	Both coaches	Captains	On Pitch

The recording and full transcription of these events has resulted in a corpus of 13558 words with 21 unique speakers, from here on referred to as the Match Corpus. The other corpus resulting from this period of fieldwork, the Training Corpus, is currently under construction and it is hoped that it will overcome some of the limitations of the Match Corpus, which are as follows. Firstly, the match day events are dominated by the leaders in the team, namely the coaches and captains. Secondly, there are multiple addressees in all of these events, resulting in a lack of instances of one-to-one interaction within the corpus. Finally, there is an element of scripting present. While the captain stated in interview that he did not prepare what he said in the pre-match huddles, the coaches clearly do prepare the team meeting and to a certain extent the half-time huddle. This is evident in statements such as “the other thing I have written down here is...” which the head-coach often used to introduce a new topic. Both corpora will be used, ultimately, to build a picture of how leadership and team identity are constructed in the rugby club. In this paper I focus on address terms in the Match Corpus.

Address Terms in the Match Corpus

The address terms identified in the Match Corpus are presented in Table 2. Analysis has been restricted to direct address terms: i.e. where the address term refers to the addressee rather than a third party.

Table 2: Address Terms found in the Match Corpus

Singular	Tokens	Plural	Tokens
Bro	4	Boys	146
Cuzzy	1	Bros	1
Mate	9	Fellas	14
		Guys	40

It is immediately apparent that there are very few singular address terms contained within the Match Corpus. The simple explanation for this is that in all the discourse events that make up the Match Corpus the speaker addresses multiple addressees. Thus, it is only when the speaker singles out a particular addressee within the group, reassigning the rest of the audience to the role of auditors (Bell 1984), that the singular terms are used. Interestingly, the use of the singular address term and the change in addressee is often used as a stylistic feature to exemplify the good work of an individual player and set this as goal for the rest of the team, as shown in Example 1.

Example 1: Team Meeting

Tommo: *Rangi where are you?*
another step on last week mate
outstanding match last week
want to see more of that today
guys we've got to be assertive at the set piece
so scrums and lineouts we've got to assert our dominance straight away

Note that the coach, Tommo, both singles out Rangi by name to locate him within the team room and addresses him as *mate*. This makes it clear that the compliment is being directed at Rangi and enhances the compliment, and has the additional effect of lessening the potential face-threat of the following directive (Rendle-Short 2010: 1207). The use of *guys* soon after this further mitigates any negative effects of the directive as it is not clear whether Tommo wants to see more of Rangi improving in his performance or more of players improving in general. Thus the change in perceived audience using both singular and plural familiarisers serves as a means of

reducing the face-threat of the directive. In the section on discourse functions, below, compliments and directives are dealt with in greater depth.

The paucity of singular address terms within the Match Corpus means that it is not possible to draw any conclusions from this data about how they pattern within the usage of the team. One point that should be made, however, is that all instances of *bro* and *cuzziy* were spoken by players, and all instances of *mate* were spoken by coaches. Furthermore, all of these singular address terms were directed at individuals of equal or lower status than the speaker. If this were to be replicated in the Training Corpus in greater numbers, it could suggest that the players' use of the address terms associated with Māori English is indicative of a strong Māori identity among them. If however, these terms do not occur frequently in the Training Corpus, it may be that, despite there being more Māori than Pākehā players, the cultural norms of the rugby club are Pākehā ones (Schnurr et al. 2007: 721). On the other hand, as it is only the players that use them, it may be that *bro* and *cuzziy* do not function as markers of ethnicity, but of age. Parallels may be drawn with the use of *eh* which has been shown to be "characteristic of Māori speech communities" but "is now being adopted by young Pākehā speakers" (Meyerhoff 1994). As no further comments can be made about the use of singular terms of address at this point, the analysis below concentrates on plural address terms, although for the sake of completeness frequency tables show the results for both singular and plural terms.

Plural Address Terms

The only plural address form that has a singular equivalent present in the Match Corpus is *bro*s although it occurs only once⁵. However *bro*s and *cuzzies* were frequently heard from the players during the fieldwork so it remains to be seen whether or not they show up in the Training Corpus in any significant number. *Mates* does occur in the Match Corpus, however not as a direct address term, it is always used in the third person, for instance "grab your mates".

That the two plural address terms associated with Māori English, *bro*s and *cuzzies*, do not appear in the Match Corpus could be a further indication that in the match day discourse events, the cultural and linguistic norms tend to be predominantly Pākehā. Interestingly however, there is a formulaic speech act at the end of each huddle in which the players all place their hands together in the air and shout "brothers", so the underlying idea of kinship terms being used to engender solidarity is certainly apparent in the team, if only in this ritualised manner.

Of the remaining address terms, *boys*, *fellas* and *guys*, *fellas* is the least frequent and is used by only one person, Tommo, the head coach. It may be a unique identity marker for him as the highest status person within the team hierarchy. By contrast,

⁵ Furthermore, is not a certain transcription due to the presence of overlapping speech, it could easily be *boys*; therefore it was removed from the corpus.

boys is by far the most frequently used address term within the rugby team, and it is worth considering some possible reasons for this.

The plural address term *boys* may be interpreted as infantilising the addressee, thus emphasising the power difference between them and the speaker (Ervin-Tripp 1967). This is also a charge that has been levelled at the use of “girls” when referring to female athletes. My analysis suggests, however, that this is not the case for *boys*. Rather, *boys* conveys a sense of solidarity, much like “bro(s)” but without being marked for ethnicity. As shown in the following section, *boys* is used predominantly by the players while the coaches opt mainly for *guys*. It could be that while the use of *boys* by players to players enhances solidarity among them, the use of it by the coaches has the potential to be interpreted as highlighting the difference in status that is caused both by the club hierarchy and the age difference between players and coaches. It is also possible, although speculative, that as the players all began playing rugby while still at school (when they actually were *boys*); they have come to associate this term with rugby and team membership.

Table 3: Second Person Plural Pronouns

Second Person Plural Pronoun	Count	Percentage
You	78	72%
You guys	19	18%
You + other specifier (e.g. forwards)	11	10%

Guys often occurred as part of a phrase with the second person plural pronoun, *you guys*, with half of the tokens occurring in this form, implying that the use of *guys* in this instance may simply be to mark the second person pronoun as plural. However, as Table 3 shows; in the match corpus as a whole, *you guys* only accounted for 18% of the total plural forms of the second person pronoun suggesting that even in this usage, *guys* may be fulfilling some function other than simply marked for plurality. My analysis is that it is a familiariser, but of a lesser degree than *boys*; while it conveys familiarity, it retains an idea of a status difference when used by the coaches. The following section shows exactly how the usage of these terms patterns with regard to the different communities of practice within the team.

Address Terms by Community of Practice

As stated above, the rugby team may be regarded as a constellation of practice containing multiple configurations of overlapping or nested CofPs, much like Belten

High in Eckert's seminal CofP work (2000) or, more recently, Rock's police interviews (2005) or Brannan's call centre and its teams (2007). All rugby teams, by the positional nature of the sport, are divided into two distinct player CofPs: forwards and backs (Melnick and Loy 1996). This is just one of many possible configurations possible; the forwards and backs contain the nested CofPs of tight forwards, loose forwards, inside backs and outside backs, a configuration reified in the team discourse. Alternatively, the captain, co-captain and vice-captain together form a CofP based on the practice of the leadership duties they carry out. However, this paper deals with just the configuration which splits the players into forwards and backs, primarily for reasons of space⁶. Looking at one dimension of the CofP, the joint enterprise, it may be seen that all players congregate around the enterprise of playing rugby or winning games, however, examining the practices of these two CofPs more closely shows some differences. The forwards' joint enterprise might be regarded as winning the ball in rucks, scrums and lineouts, while the backs' aim to carry out pre-planned running and passing moves successfully, with the aim of penetrating the opposition's defence and ultimately scoring tries. These enterprises are reified in discourse in team meetings and pre-match huddles as shown in Example 2, below.

Example 2: Team Meeting

Tommo: want to see unity out there

we get unity when our forwards are doing their jobs up front

going forward

being a menace at breakdowns attacking set pieces

and when our backs

our backs are using width

taking good options and having a crack

unity is when we do things together and we're tight like a fist

As well as reifying the forwards' enterprise of winning the ball (by attacking set pieces) and the backs' enterprise of *taking good options*, the coach's mention of both the CofPs emphasises that they also have a joint enterprise as a team to win. The CofPs of forwards and backs also differ in terms of their level of mutual engagement, with each CofP training separately; with one coach taking the forwards and the other

⁶ Although all of these configurations were explored in the course of analysing the data, the configuration featured has been chosen as it is the best candidate for a CofP following the argument laid out by Wenger (1998: 123-124).

taking the backs. In this team the head coach always takes responsibility for the forwards, as he was a forward in his playing days, while the assistant coach takes the backs, as he was a back. There is a degree of competition between the two CofPs, with the forwards regarding the backs as getting all the glory of scoring while they, the forwards, did all the hard work of scrummaging, rucking and generally winning the ball from the other team. The backs on the other hand regard the forwards as lacking in ball skills and finesse, and being a bit on the slow side. This attitude is highlighted in the assistant coach's reaction to my preliminary finding that the forwards seem to talk to each other more than the backs do: he commented (jokingly) that this would most likely be in the form of grunts.

Not only do the two CofPs define themselves in opposition to each other, they also have a slightly different shared linguistic repertoire and perform some very different activities during a match. At most huddles the players divide into their positional CofPs, both to engender solidarity in these groups and to discuss specific aspects of their positional play. They then come together as a team for one last motivational speech by coach or captain before beginning/resuming the match. Having established that the positional CofPs are an important classification within the team, it is worth seeing how the use of address terms pattern with regard to them. This is shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Address term by CofP

Address Term	Forwards	Backs	Non-playing CofP
Bro	4	0	0
Cuzzie	1	0	0
Mate	0	0	10
Boys	99	31	12
Fellas	0	0	14
Guys	2	0	38

On the surface, it appears that the forwards make greater use of address terms than the backs, and both favour *boys* over the other options. However, it must be noted that forwards account for 2694 tokens in the Match Corpus, whereas backs account for only 894. Thus the forwards' use of *boys* is 3.7% of their total contribution while the backs' is 3.4%. I return to this point when examining the function of the speech acts that contain the address terms.

In addition to the players' CofPs, there is the non-playing CofP, although in the match corpus the only speakers that were recorded were the two coaches. It can

clearly be seen from Table 4 that the way in which the coaches⁷ use address terms is very different from the players. Firstly, despite the fact that non-player speech accounts for nearly three quarters of the entire Match Corpus, there are far fewer familiarisers used. Of these, as discussed above, *guys* is by far the preferred option. Although *boys* is used, it is important to point out that eleven of the thirteen tokens are produced by Tommo, the head coach (as shown in Table 5). He is younger than any of the other non-playing CofP and was a player until two years previously, when he became a coach. This may well account for his closeness to the players; indeed he contributes sixty-three of the seventy-four uses of familiarisers produced by non-players.

Table 5: Non-playing CofP

Address Term	Head Coach	Assistant Coach
	Tommo (forwards)	Parky (backs)
Bro	0	0
Cuzzie	0	0
Mate	9	1
Boys	10	2
Fellas	14	0
Guys	30	8
Total	63	11

It is not entirely surprising that the players use a greater proportion of familiarisers than the coaches. After all, they are all closer in terms of age, status and common purpose, and the use of the familiarisers among them is likely to be evidence of solidarity building. However, in order to examine how the players accomplish this it is useful to examine the discourse function of the utterances in which the address terms occur and consider how this relates to the CofP of the speaker. The following section deals with how the Match Corpus was coded for discourse function.

Discourse Functions

In coding the Match Corpus several discourse functions were identified. They can be grouped into three general functions: Control Acts, Feedback Requests and Evaluative Statements. Each of these discourse functions is defined below and examples are given. Following this, the way in which the address terms pattern with regard to both discourse function and CofP is addressed.

⁷ Out of the non-playing CofP, only the coaches were recorded using familiarisers during the match days.

Control Acts

As detailed in Vine (2004) control acts are defined as a request/demand that the addressee do something other than give a verbal response. There are three types of control act: directives, requests and advice. The type is not determined by form, but by the power relationship between speaker and hearer, as shown in Table 6. Applying this definition to the rugby team, the captain cannot issue a directive to a coach; however he can make a request or offer advice. He can however issue a directive to the players. Similarly, the coaches can issue directives and offer advice to the players, but as they have higher status they do not make requests.

Table 6 Types of Control Act (reproduced from Vine 2006: 31)

Control acts		Speaker higher status	Hearer has right of refusal	Benefit to speaker
Directing	Directive	Yes	No	Yes
	Request	No	Yes	Yes
Suggesting	Advice	Maybe	Yes	No

Control Acts need not be simple orders explicitly demanding that the addressee perform a specific action, they also include what Ervin-Tripp (1976) terms *attention-getters* like “hey boys” or the more direct “listen up”. Ervin-Tripp (1976) classifies these attention-getters as imperatives, which would place them as directing control acts according to Vine’s definition, and this seems appropriate as they direct the addressee to pay attention to the speaker. Example 3 shows an extended attention-getter, where the captain, Jon, is trying to get the players’ attention at the start of a half time huddle and it can be seen that in this case, he has to reinforce the indirect attention-grabbing of “hey boys” with much more explicit directives to pay attention, which clarifies the original intended function of “hey boys”.

Example 3: Attention-getter

Jon: *hey boys worst thing we could do-
 come in here come in here
 everyone just fucking give me an ear*

In classifying utterances as advice, it is crucial to consider who is speaking. In general, players gave other players advice. The main deciding factor was whether or not the addressees could disregard the advice. In Example 4, Tommy, a forward, suggests that the best way of looking at the defeat that the team has just suffered is to learn from what was done wrong. There is no obligation for the players to do this, and there is no benefit to Tommy in saying this (except perhaps to cheer himself up),

so this has been classed as advice rather than a request. Notably, there were only two requests in the Match Corpus and neither of these contained a familiariser.

Example 4: Advice

Tommy: *only thing we take from this game **boys**
 is we fucking learn from it eh?
 that's all we take from it
 fucking mistakes*

In the rugby team, unsurprisingly, the majority of directives come from the members of the non-playing CofP, mainly the coaches (151 out of 200 directives). Familiarisers tend to be used by the coaches to mitigate the force of directives, with *guys* often occurring with general directives to try hard, as shown in Example 5.

Example 5: Directive

Tommo: *so let's go out there today **guys**
 put everything out on- on the deck eh
 don't leave anything for questioning later on*

Also of note in Example 5 is Tommo's use of *let's*, which is used in 16.5% of directives in the team both from players and coaches. Like using *we*, *let's* signals inclusivity and solidarity in the directive, as does the use of the familiariser *guys*. However, the semantics are clearly exclusive; as Tommo is hardly directing himself to *put everything on the deck*. In fact, directives from coaches are unlikely to be inclusive at all, which makes it all the more interesting that they use inclusive pronouns and familiarisers to not only mitigate the force of a directive, but also to continue to build solidarity in a situation which emphasises the power difference between coach and player.

As Control Acts are a potential face-threat to the addressee, and familiarisers can be used as a form of mitigation, one might expect that Control Acts would contain address terms relatively frequently. However, as discussed later, this is not the case despite the control act function being by far the most frequent in the Match Corpus. This may be because the plural personal pronoun fulfils this function equally well, as pointed out above. As one of the directive's defining features is that it is concerned with getting the addressee to do, not say, something another type of function had to be classified in order to deal with utterances that necessitated a response, I label these Feedback Requests and Feedback Responses.

Feedback Requests and Responses

The function category of Feedback Request encompasses any request/demand that necessitates a verbal response from the addressee. This could be a request for information or advice, or a comprehension check. It could even be a prompt for formulaic verbal interaction, such as at the end of every huddle when the captain says, “brothers on three, one, two, three” and the players respond by shouting “brothers”. This formulaic prompt and response pattern occurs quite often in the players’ discourse and is generally used to engender solidarity.

This brief description of feedback request functions will suffice for now because they contained very few address terms and thus have little bearing on this paper, other than for the sake of completeness. This lack of familiarisers may be because these functions mostly occurred during the half-time huddle, where time is short and swift, concise communication is needed. Concerns of face or solidarity are therefore sidelined during these speech acts. Furthermore, there are also other speech acts with a greater degree for solidarity creation present such as encouragement and compliments. These, along with those that function in conveying the speaker’s opinions or beliefs will now be introduced.

Evaluative Acts

Evaluative Acts are the category into which all other discourse functions found in the Match Corpus fall. They all convey the speaker’s judgement about something; whether it be a person’s actions, words or personal characteristics. Like Control Acts, there are different features to each type of Evaluative Act and these are summarised in Table 7.

Table 7: Types of Evaluative Act

Evaluative Act	Positive	Focus	Time
Compliment	Yes	Addressee	Past
Encouragement	Yes	Addressee or speaker	Present/Future
Self-evaluation	Maybe	Speaker	Past
Criticism	No	Addressee	Past
Positive Evaluation	Yes	Third party (not present)	Any
Negative Evaluation	No	Third party (not present)	Any

As Table 7 shows, compliments and encouragement differ in that a compliment references an action or statement that has already taken place, such as a player’s performance during a match whereas encouragement expresses a belief that the speaker or addressee (or both) can perform an action such as scoring tries (future) or

has an inherent ability such as being strong (present). Also included in the encouragement function are expletive statements that occur in match build-up and have been interpreted as players trying to get into the correct frame of mind for the match. Holmes (1986: 486) classifies compliments as being directed at the addressee; however in the case of the rugby team I would expand this to include anybody present, such as auditors or overhearers (Bell 1984). This is demonstrated in Example 6, which was addressed to the players with Jon present.

Example 6: Compliment

Tommo: *Jonny's doing a fine job of leading **you guys**
 *he's got the refs
 they're listening to him and that's all we need
 the rest of us
 we just get on with our simple jobs**

In this example the coach is talking to the players about the captain, Jon. He is using him as an example of someone who is doing his job well. Jon, however, is present as an auditor so this functions as a compliment to him. In this case the compliment functions as a means of engendering solidarity between coach and captain as well as providing an example for the coach to then use in directing the players to do their own jobs as effectively.

Self-evaluation can be either positive or negative but is usually concerning what the speaker has just said. It may have the effect of softening any directives that may have been previously issued. An example of this would be "I know that's a lot to take in". Criticism on the other hand, is much simpler to define. It is effectively the opposite of a compliment, a negative statement made about anyone present other than the speaker, as in Example 7 where Tommo, the head coach criticises the whole team's lack of observation about what is happening around them during the match.

Example 7: Criticism

Tommo: *but we've got to have our heads up **fellas** to see tha-
 *we shouldn't-
 Parky and I shouldn't be picking this up
 you guys should be picking it up**

Following Holmes (1986) and Daly et al. (2004), any evaluation of a third party that is not present is described as a positive evaluation or negative evaluation rather than

a compliment or criticism. For instance, a comment about the performance of the opposition or decisions made by the referee would fall into these types of evaluative acts. It is the encouragement function, however, that most frequently contains an address term and the reasons behind this will be discussed in the following section in which the way the address terms pattern in relation to both CofP of speaker and discourse function.

The Nexus of CofP, Function and Address Term

As discussed above, the only address terms that occur in the Match Corpus in significant numbers are *boys* and *guys* and they are therefore the focus of the analysis in this section⁸.

As Table 8 shows, it appears that the function in which *boys* most frequently occurs is encouragement spoken by forwards. It has already been mentioned that the forwards contribute far more than the backs in terms of tokens to the Match Corpus and that as a percentage of their contribution the backs actually use slightly more familiarisers. However, if we take the number of speech acts from each CofP and analyse the results proportionally, it is clear that the forwards are only slightly ahead of the backs in terms of their usage of *boys*, and both far outstrip the non-players in this usage. Across all three CofPs the most frequent function for *boys* was as a component of an encouraging speech act. As encouragement is a positive act, a key part of motivation, and *boys* conveys solidarity, it may be inferred that the players use this to strengthen the illocutionary force of the encouragement (Holmes 1984). In other words, by addressing the other players as *boys* the speaker equates himself with them, thus any statement of encouragement applies as much to himself as to them.

Table 8: Speech acts containing *boys* by function and CofP

CofP	Forwards		Backs		Non-players	
	Number of speech acts containing <i>boys</i>	Percentage of speech act contribution (208)	Number of speech acts containing <i>boys</i>	Percentage of speech act contribution (83)	Number of speech acts containing <i>boys</i>	Percentage of speech act contribution (462)
Function						

⁸ However, it is also worth noting that the five instances of “bro(s)”, which were all from forwards, patterned as follows: two directives, one piece of advice and two statements of encouragement. Little can be drawn from this, but what might be predicted from the analysis of the Training Corpus in due course (based on ethnographic experience) is that *bro* might occur most frequently as a compliment in “shot bro”, a phrase equivalent to “well done” and one which seemed during ethnography to be quite popular among the players, especially the forwards.

Attention-getter	12	5.77%	3	3.61%	2	0.43%
Advice	11	5.29%	5	6.02%	1	0.22%
Directive	8	3.85%	5	6.02%	3	0.65%
Information Request	0	0.00%	1	1.20%	0	0.00%
Formulaic Request	5	2.40%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Compliment	3	1.44%	2	2.41%	0	0.00%
Criticism	5	2.40%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Encouragement	41	19.71%	12	14.46%	6	1.30%
Negative Evaluation	3	1.44%	0	0.00%	1	0.22%
Positive Evaluation	1	0.48%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Self Evaluation	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.22%
Total	89	42.79%	28	33.73%	14	3.03%

Guys, analysed in the same manner does not yield quite such clear results, as presented in Table 9. We already know that the non-players are the main users of this address term so the only result of any interest is that it is used most commonly in directives, although given that almost a third of the non-players' speech acts are directives (151 to be precise), the fact that only 11 of these contain address terms suggests that it is less appropriate for the coaches to use familiarisers than players, perhaps due to the difference in status.

Table 9: Speech acts containing *guys* by function and CofP

Function	Forwards		Backs		Non-players	
	Number of speech acts containing <i>guys</i>	Percentage of speech act contribution (208)	Number of speech acts containing <i>guys</i>	Percentage of speech act contribution (83)	Number of speech acts containing <i>guys</i>	Percentage of speech act contribution (462)
Attention-getter	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.43%
Advice	1	0.48%	0	0.00%	3	0.65%
Directive	2	0.96%	0	0.00%	11	2.38%
Information	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.43%

Request						
Formulaic Request	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Compliment	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6	1.30%
Criticism	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	0.65%
Encouragement	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	0.65%
Negative Evaluation	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Positive Evaluation	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Self Evaluation	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.22%
Total	3	1.44%	0	0.00%	31	6.71%

One might make the distinction, based on the usage patterns, that the main difference between *boys* and *guys* is one of inclusivity, that by using *boys* the speaker includes himself as one of “the boys”. *Guys*, on the other hand, can be used to address multiple addressees without including oneself, and so may appropriately be used more freely when there is a difference in status.

The analysis presented above shows that the players use many more address terms than the coaches, while the forwards use slightly more than the backs. One interpretation of this is that the forwards have greater levels of solidarity; not only do they favour *boys* as an address term, but they also exhibit the only uses of the “Māori English” address terms. As these are, in effect, kinship terms they could be viewed as salient markers of solidarity. Additionally, ethnographic observations of the behaviour by forwards and backs during training sessions show that the forwards are constantly in close contact static formations such as scrums and lineouts enabling them to talk constantly and thus promoting solidarity. The backs, on the other hand, are spaced far apart and perform running and passing moves; limiting the amount of speech to each other. This gives the impression of a greater degree of solidarity present among the forwards than the backs, which is reflected in the analysis of their match day discourse, both through amount of speech and the relative frequencies of address term usage. To return to the definition of the CofP, the different degrees to which the forwards and backs interact (their *mutual engagement*) and the way that they perform their different *joint enterprises*, is reflected in their use of address terms, which constitute part of their *shared repertoire*.

Conclusions

The coding of the Match Corpus by discourse function and the categorisation of the team members by CofP shows that *boys* is by far the most frequent familiariser used in the rugby club. It is overwhelmingly used by players, particularly forwards, mostly to provide encouragement to their team mates. *Guys* is the only other

familiariser that occurs with much frequency, and it is used almost exclusively by the coaches when issuing directives.

Due to the paucity of singular address terms in the Match Corpus, little can be said about the unexpected infrequency of the address terms *bro* and *cuz*. It will be interesting to see whether this pattern will also characterise the Training Corpus. One would expect to see these terms in more frequent use, either as a marker of age or ethnicity, as the players are young men and at least half of them can lay claim to some form of Māori identity. If not, then perhaps the predominant linguistic norms in this rugby team are older, Pākehā ones.

The next stage in this research is clearly to carry out similar coding and analyses on the Training Corpus. As it is expected to be larger than the Match Corpus it should give more reliable results, and once complete the two corpora can be analysed together to build a fuller picture of how address terms function within the rugby team.

This paper has shown that in this New Zealand rugby team familiarisers have a range of functions. The most frequent however, is as encouragement, demonstrating solidarity between players. In addition to fulfilling different functions, the patterns of address term usage differ between the CofPs that comprise the rugby team. These patterns, which are part of each CofP's *shared repertoire*, are determined both by the *mutual engagement* and the *joint enterprise* around which the CofP is formed. This demonstrates the suitability of the CofP model for the sociolinguistic analysis of team sports.

References

- Afful, Joseph Benjamin Archibald 2007. Address terms among university students in Ghana: The case of descriptive phrases. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*, 20.
- Agar, Michael 1996. *The Professional Stranger : An Informal Introduction to Ethnography*. (2nd ed.) San Diego: Academic Press.
- Atkinson, Paul, and Martyn Hammersley 1994. Ethnography and participant observation. In Norma. K. Denzin & Yvonne S. Lincoln (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London; Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 248-261.
- Bell, Allan 1984. Language Style as Audience Design. *Language in Society*, 13: 145-204.
- Bell, Allan 2000. Maori and Pakeha English: a case study. In Allan Bell & Koenraad Kuiper (eds), *New Zealand English*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 221-248.
- Bell, Allan 2007. Style in dialogue: Bakhtin and sociolinguistic theory. In Robert Bayley & Ceil Lucas (eds), *Sociolinguistic Variation: Theories, Methods, and Applications*. Cambridge: CUP, 90–109.
- Brannan, Matthew J. 2007. Sexuality, gender and legitimate peripheral participation. In Jason Hughes, Nick Jewson, & Lorna Unwin (eds), *Communities of Practice: Critical Perspectives*, London: Routledge, 120-130.
- Clayton, Ben, and Barbara Humberstone 2006. Men's talk: A (pro)feminist analysis of male university

- football players' discourse. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 41: 295-316.
- Corder, Saskia 2004. *Negotiating and Performing Gender Role Expectations Through Discourse: A Study of the Community of Practice of a Female Football Team*. Unpublished MA dissertation: University of Edinburgh.
- Daly, Nicola, Holmes, Janet, Newton, Jonathan, and Stubbe, Maria 2004. Expletives as solidarity signals in FTAs on the factory floor. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36: 945-964.
- Eckert, Penelope 2000. *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice: The Linguistic Construction of Identity in Belten High*. Malden, Massachusetts; Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.
- Eckert, Penelope, and Sally McConnell-Ginet 1992. Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 461-488.
- Eckert, Penelope, and Etienne Wenger 2005. Communities of practice in sociolinguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9: 582-589.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan 1967. *Sociolinguistics*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan 1976. Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society* 5: 25-66.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan 1996. Context in language. In Dan I. Slobin, Julie Gerhardt, Amy Kyratzis, & Jiansheng Guo (eds), *Social Interactions, Social Context, and Language*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 21-36.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan, Jiansheng Guo, and Martin Lampert 1990. Politeness and persuasion in children's control acts. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 307-331.
- Golato, Andrea 2003. Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics* 24: 90-121.
- Grainger, Andrew 2009. Rugby, Pacific peoples, and the cultural politics of national identity in New Zealand. *International Journal of the History of Sport* 26: 2335-2357.
- Hammersley, Martyn, and Paul Atkinson 1983. *Ethnography, Principles in Practice*. London; New York: Tavistock.
- Heath, Shirley Brice, and Juliet Langman 1994. Shared thinking and the register of coaching. In Douglas Biber & Edward Finegan (eds), *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*. New York: Oxford University Press US, 82-105.
- Herbert, Robert K., and H. Stephen Straight 1989. Compliment-rejection versus compliment-avoidance: Listener-based versus speaker-based pragmatic strategies. *Language & Communication* 9: 35-47.
- Holmes, Janet 1984. Modifying illocutionary force. *Journal of Pragmatics* 8: 345-365.
- Holmes, Janet 1986. Compliments and compliment responses in New Zealand English. *Anthropological Linguistics* 28: 485-508.
- Holmes, Janet 1998. Complimenting - a positive politeness strategy. Oxford: Blackwell, 100-120.
- Holmes, Janet 2005a. Using Maori English in New Zealand. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 172: 91-115.
- Holmes, Janet 2005b. Leadership talk: How do leaders 'do mentoring', and is gender relevant? *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 1779-1800.
- Holmes, Janet, and Meredith Marra 2002. Having a laugh at work: how humour contributes to workplace culture. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1683-1710.
- Holmes, Janet, and Miriam Meyerhoff 1999. The community of practice: Theories and methodologies in language and gender research. *Language in Society* 28: 173-183.
- Johnston, Lorraine, and Shelley Robertson 1993. "Hey yous!" the Maori-NZE interface in sociolinguistic rules of address. *Te Reo* 36: 115-127.
- King, Jeanette 1999. Talking bro: Maori English in the university setting. *Te Reo* 42: 20-38.
- Kuiper, Koenraad 1991. Sporting formulae in New Zealand English: two models of male solidarity. In Jenny Cheshire (ed), *English Around the World: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 200-212.
- Lakoff, Robin 1973. Language and woman's place. *Language in Society* 2: 45-80.

- Leech, Geoffrey 1999. The distribution and function of vocatives in American and British English conversation. In *Out of Corpora: Studies in Honour of Stig Johansson*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 107-118.
- MacLean, Malcolm 2004. The routine rituals of run-of-the-mill rugby: sport, identities and everyday life. Paper presented at Educational and Sociological Issues in Sports And Physical Recreation Conference. University of Århus, December 2004.
- Masterson, Julie J, Lisa K Davies, and Gerald L Masterson 2006. Coach talk: Linguistic demands inherent in youth sports. *Language* 37: 39-49.
- McConnell, Robin. 1996. *Sport Team Leadership: Coaching and Captaincy in Elite Level Rugby Union Football*. Unpublished PhD Thesis: University of Waikato.
- Meân, Lindsey 2001. Identity and discursive practice: doing gender on the football pitch. *Discourse and Society* 12: 789-815.
- Melnick, Merrill J., and John W. Loy 1996. The effects of formal structure on leadership recruitment: An analysis of team captaincy among New Zealand provincial rugby teams. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 31: 91-105.
- Meyerhoff, Miriam 1994. Sounds pretty ethnic, eh?: A pragmatic particle in New Zealand English. *Language in Society* 23: 367-388.
- Milroy, Lesley, and Matthew Gordon 2003. *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Rendle-Short, Johanna 2009. The address term 'mate' in Australian English: Is it still a masculine term? *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 29: 245-268.
- Rendle-Short, Johanna 2010. 'Mate' as a term of address in ordinary interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 1201-1218.
- Rock, Frances 2005. "I've picked some up from a colleague": Language, sharing and communities of practice in an institutional setting. In David Barton & Karin Tusting (eds), *Beyond Communities of Practice: Language, Power, and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 77-104.
- Ryan, Greg (ed) 2005. *Tackling Rugby Myths: Rugby and New Zealand Society, 1854-2004*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Schnurr, Stephanie 2008. Constructing leader identities through teasing at work. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41: 1125-1138.
- Schnurr, Stephanie, Meredith Marra, and Janet Holmes 2007. Being (im)polite in New Zealand workplaces: Maori and Pakeha leaders. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 712-729.
- Stubbe, Maria 1999. Research report: Maori and Pakeha use of selected pragmatic devices in a sample of New Zealand English. *Te Reo* 42: 39-53.
- Stubbe, Maria, and Janet Holmes 1995. You know, eh and other 'exasperating expressions': An analysis of social and stylistic variation in the use of pragmatic devices in a sample of New Zealand English. *Language and Communication* 15: 63-88.
- Stubbe, Maria, and Janet Holmes 2000. Talking Maori or Pakeha in English: Signalling identity in discourse. In Allan Bell & Koenraad Kuiper (eds), *New Zealand English*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 249-278.
- Vine, Bernadette 2004. *Getting Things Done at Work: The Discourse of Power in Workplace Interaction*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Pub.
- Vine, Bernadette, Janet Holmes, Meredith Marra, Dale Pfeifer, and Brad Jackson 2008. Exploring co-leadership talk through interactional sociolinguistics. *Leadership* 4: 339-360.
- Walsh, David 2004. Doing ethnography. In Clive Seale (ed), *Researching Society and Culture*. London; Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 225-237.
- Wenger, Etienne 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, Nick 2009. The discourse of deputies: communicating co-leadership in a rugby club. *Te Reo* 52: 73-98.

