"Songs of our own": The Deadhead cultural communication code.

Chapter · January 2010

CITATION
1

READS
16

1 author:

Natalie Dollar
Oregon State University-Cascadesa
19 PUBLICATIONS **59** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Works Cited

Alvin, Juliette. *Music Therapy*. New York: Basic Books, 1974.

Bowart, Walter H., "Interview with Alan Watts," in *Our Time: An Anthology of Interviews from the East Village Other*, ed. Allan Katzman. New York: The Dial Press, 1972.

Bubelis, Wally, "Home," at *The Annotated Grateful Dead Lyrics*, ed. David Dodd online at: <http://arts.ucsc.edu/GDead/AGD/home.html>. Last accessed Mar. 21, 2005.

Campbell, Joseph, et al. "Ritual and Rapture: From Dionysus to the Grateful Dead." Symposium held at Palace of Fine Arts, San Francisco, 1 November 1986.

—. *The Power of Myth*. New York: Doubleday, 1988.

Cooper, J.C., ed. *Illustrated Encyclopedia of Traditional Symbols*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1978.

Cousineau, Phil, and Stuart Brown, eds. *The Hero's Journey: The World of Joseph Campbell*. New York: Harper & Row, 1990.

Eliade, Mircea, "Mystery and Spiritual Regeneration in Extra-European Religions," in *Man and Transformation*, ed. Joseph Campbell (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp??

—. *Rites and Symbols of Initiation: The Mysteries of Birth and Rebirth*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Grof, Stanislav. *The Adventure of Self-Discovery*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1988.

Hunter, Robert. *A Box of Rain*. New York: Viking, 1990.

Jung, Carl G. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, trans. R.F.C. Hull. Bollingen Series XX, 2d Edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Mahdi, Louise Carus. *Betwixt and Between: Patterns of Masculine and Feminine Initiation*. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 1987.

Schechner, Richard, "Selective Inattention," in *Essays on Performance Theory*. New York: Drama Book Specialists, 1977.

Shankar, Ravi. *My Music, My Life*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968.

Small, Christopher, "Performance as Ritual" in *Lost in Music: Culture, Style and the Musical Event*, ed. Avron White. London and New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.

Wasson, Gordon, Albert Hofmann, and Carl Ruck, *The Road to Eleusis: Unveiling the Mysteries*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1978.

Zoja, Luigi. *Drugs, Addiction and Initiation: The Modern Search for Ritual*, trans. Marc E. Romano and Robert Mercurio. Boston: Sigo Press, 1989.

In N. Meriwether (Ed.). All graceful instruments: The context of the Grateful Dead phenomenon. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press.

CHAPTER TEN

'SONGS OF OUR OWN': THE DEADHEAD CULTURAL COMMUNICATION CODE

NATALIE DOLLAR

(2007)

In the last few decades, scholars from a diverse range of disciplines have contributed to the study of the Grateful Dead and Deadheads, the community of fans around the band.[1] My interest in studying Deadheads focuses on these interlocutors' ways of communicating. Although the intersection of communication and culture interests me, communication rather than culture is my primary focus. I am most concerned with how members of a community use communication as a resource for creating, enacting, and negotiating a shared identity, what Philipsen refers to as the communal or cultural function of communication (Philipsen, 1987). Scholars have drawn from the ethnography of communication, cultural communication theory, and speech code theory to explore the relationship between communication and culture.[2] Such studies advance our understanding of both local and general theories for communicating as members of a community. Cumulatively, these studies posit three important tenets: first, communication is a powerful resource for constructing, enacting, and negotiating communal life; communication also varies in function and form across speech communities and their cultures. Last, communication is locally and culturally situated, the competent interpretation and performance of which depends on access to the community's speech code and related folk logics. By focusing on a specific community, one organized by its passion for the music of the Grateful Dead, this article contributes to this area of inquiry by furthering our understanding of the communication resources members employ when they are communicating like a Deadhead, what Philipsen called "membering," or communicating in ways heard by the speaker and other members as Deadhead speech (Philipsen, 1992).

From a cultural communication perspective, these questions are best engaged at the level of a speech community, or a group of communicators sharing a common language, or linguistic variety in communication terms—English, for most

Deadheads—and a set of rules informing the use and interpretation of that linguistic variety in social situations, such as engaging in "show talk."[3] The level of analysis here is social, in other words, rather than linguistic. The unit of analysis is the speech community's cultural communication code, which refers to a socially constructed and historically transmitted system of symbols and their meanings, rules and premises, about communication (Philipsen, 1992). The chapter begins with a discussion of cultural communication before synthesizing previous research to advance a description of the Deadhead speech code in terms of the ideal person, social relations, and strategic action implied when Deadheads communicate culturally. The last section addresses recent research relevant to the study of how Deadheads employ location formulations for referencing shows, helping us understand the local and general systems members of speech communities use when communicating as members.

As Carbaugh explains, communication that is deeply felt, commonly intelligible, and widely accessible may be viewed as cultural (Carbaugh, 1988a). Consider Deadheads' use of the phrase "on the bus." When Deadheads hear other Deadheads refer to being "on the bus," they experience the expression as highly emotive, calling forth happiness, love of the Grateful Dead's music, and other emotions associated with living the life of a Deadhead.[4] These interlocutors experience what one Deadhead described as "the bonds of the family, the soothing comfort of knowing I'm connected to all these other Deadheads."[5] When Deadheads realize they are talking to someone who is "on the bus," they share what another described as "an intense connection found no where else."[6] Clearly, the phrase is deeply felt. Despite its origins, the phrase is commonly intelligible as a reference to a line in a particular Grateful Dead song, "The Other One:" "The bus came by and I got on / That's when it all began". Metaphorically, the expression refers to what critic Steve Silberman calls "a particular insight, a knowledge transmitted through the music, the experience of shows, psychedelics, and the community," or more generally, a "psychic/spiritual awakening."[7] As such, the expression is commonly intelligible to Deadheads on two levels, the first referring to a song within the Grateful Dead repertoire and the second to the perspective of life rendered meaningful through membership and participation in the community. Finally, the expression is widely accessible in that it is readily available to Deadheads as an expression of membership, a means of identifying oneself as a Deadhead without announcing, "I am a Deadhead."[8]

Since the August 9, 1995 death of Jerry Garcia, the Deadhead speech community has changed. Nevertheless, music has remained the focus. In the early development of this speech community, Deadheads were dependent on face-to-face speech situations, primarily shows. In 1971, with the Grateful Dead's initiation of the Deadhead mailing list, the speech community incorporated a new channel for communicating, namely print: "Dead Freaks unite!" was the message printed in the

band's 1971 eponymous live album. "Who are you? Where are you? Send us your name and we'll keep you informed."[9] Soon there was a growing body of publications Deadheads embraced as what communication theorists would term cultural communication resources within their speech community.[10] As the community expanded to include new channels for communicating it also incorporated more and more members. The most recent growth paralleled the development of the Internet, a channel in whose development some believe Deadheads to have played a pioneering role (Rheingold, 1993). Many of the Deadheads I interviewed reported that the Internet was critical to their expression of cultural identity. For these fans, the Internet provided a "space" where Deadheads could interact on a daily basis. Some Deadheads claimed that this interaction has gained greater importance since the death of Jerry Garcia and the demise of Grateful Dead shows as the preferred community gathering place.

Two places for speaking like a Deadhead are the "pre-show" and "show" speech situations.[11] In these situations Deadheads rely on their communication code to render the particular situations culturally meaningful. These interlocutors engage in cultural speech events within these speech situations, such as "show talk" and "calling the opener," further displaying their shared identity. Building on this research, we can describe the ideal person, social relations, and strategic action implied when Deadheads use their communication code in these specific ways.

Speech situations are classified by members as falling in one of two categories: places for speaking and places marked by the absence of speech (Hymes, 1962, 1972, 1974). As Deadheads adhere to community-specific norms governing speech situations, these interlocutors hear themselves and are heard by other Deadheads as communicating as members (Dollar, 1999b, 2000, 2001, 2002). By communicating in that fashion, these interlocutors display, to themselves and other Deadheads, their competence in applying their shared code to naturally emerging communication contingencies, such as planning for a show or even responding to the death of Jerry Garcia. One speech situation that lends itself to speaking like a Deadhead is the pre-show situation. The Grateful Dead followed seasonal touring schedules, recognized by Deadheads as "summer tour," "fall tour," and so on. Before the development of the Internet, members anxiously called official Grateful Dead hotlines to check for tour announcements. Even today, Deadheads seeking information about ex-Dead members' touring schedules or new archival Dead recordings visit the official web site, subscribe to an email announcement list, call the hotline, or hear from another family member that a show or tour has been announced.[12] Once news of a desired show, set of shows, or tour is received, Deadheads engage in what many fans fondly call the community ritual of "planning the show," which can be thought of as a specific, culturally meaningful communication. After an announcement, emails and conversations begin: Which shows will we do? Who is mail ordering for us? Who is driving to the shows or will

we fly? Will we camp, stay at a friend's house, or hotel? Who else is coming? These communication acts—checking the hotline or web site, mail ordering tickets, and planning the trip to shows—are part of the pre-show speech situation. Non-Deadheads may have difficulty appreciating the deeply-felt ethos conveyed by members communicating in this very particular—and uniquely emblematic—cultural manner. Although access to these communicative resources (e.g., hotline, web site) are not restricted solely to the community, non-members obviously do not use them to participate in this pre-show speech situation, nor are they communicative resources for planning "to see shows," which has more than forty years of history as a Deadhead activity. Non-members can translate the words, even understand the content of the statements, but they cannot hear them communicated within the historically grounded system available to Deadheads. To fans, this pre-show communication is heard as cultural, as instances of communication in which participants hear themselves and others as communicating like Deadheads.

Participation in the pre-show speech situation implies a view of the speakers as members of a community, considered by many to be a family, which privileges participation in a cultural ritual: the show.[13] Members activate this participation through their adept use of cultural communication resources, such as the web site, email list, and family networks. Communication is used to link members together to coordinate action (e.g., planning for the shows). Membership identity is established or reconfirmed by recognizing the speech situation and employing available resources to facilitate participation in this celebrated ritual. Competent performance in this speech situation indicates, and relies on, three interlinked perspectives: a view of the performer as a member, a Deadhead within "the family;" which is itself an expression of a particular view of social relations being facilitated by and celebrated in a community ritual; and a view of communication as fundamental to the creation and maintenance of Deadhead identity, the strategic agent in planning members' participation in the defining group ritual.

A second culturally meaningful speech situation is the show itself, which for many Deadheads includes the experience of "hanging out in the lot" before and after the concert. My earlier research identified three norms of interaction Deadheads employ when speaking like a Deadhead, which demonstrate their understanding of the show as a Deadhead speech situation (Dollar, 1999b). While this is not to say that these are the only three norms of interaction Deadheads use within this speech situation, these norms are central instances of cultural communication used by Deadheads at shows.

First, Deadheads expect one another to be emotionally expressive. Many Deadheads fulfill this expectation through dancing, an expression non-Deadheads reported as producing discomfort by its marking of insiders and outsiders. Deadheads also engage in exaggerated emotional expression with total strangers, such as enthusiastically embracing each other in total body hugs when leaving a

show, another communicative behavior non-members report as discomfiting.

Second, Deadheads adhere to a norm of interaction limiting talk during the musical performance. At a Dead or family-related show, interlocutors are expected to limit their talk while the musicians are playing. During the music, dancing and some oral responses, such as group cheers following a favorite line or a particularly "sweet" solo, are appropriate and acceptable. Deadheads recognize that this communication norm does not necessarily apply to other concerts as speech situations.

Finally, unlike the engagement between participants in another entertainment context, the television talk show, Deadheads assert transindividual standards for speaking, sometimes restricting the expression of personal opinions; that is, Deadheads restrict individual expression by verbally enforcing group standards for communicating.[14] When interlocutors express opinions contradictory to being "on the bus," outside the Deadhead world view, Deadheads negatively sanction the utterance. Members expect one another to enforce this norm as a means of maintaining their community world view. In numerous interviews, Deadheads stressed the oral tradition of the community, a tradition that values the elders and vests them with the responsibility for verbally passing on the culture.

In adhering to these norms for interacting at a show, Deadheads hear themselves and others to be speaking like a Deadhead—"membering self." In so doing, Deadheads imply and rely on a view of identity, or "personhood," as well as social relations and communicative action deemed appropriate for a show. In this milieu, the ideal person understands that this speech situation establishes times when nonverbal communication is preferable to verbal. The ideal person expresses their emotions, sometimes through embracing others and other times through dancing.[15] Finally, the ideal person is a member, respectful of the norms for communication that characterize the show as a Deadhead speech situation. Deadheads are linked to one another through their competent enactment of these communication norms. The preferred social relationship between members is that of family, including bonds extending beyond those one knows personally. Members are accountable to the family and other family members. As such, members are bound by transindividual standards for speaking, standards reflecting the world view of an interlocutor who is "on the bus." Speech is used strategically to regulate others' speech in the case of the third norm, and, at times, to enforce the second norm. During the musical performance, nonverbal communication is the preferred means for expressing identity.

Speech events are carefully defined episodes with clearly recognized boundaries, characterized by a set of rules and norms for interacting and interpreting the event (Hymes, 1962, 1972, 1974). Speech events are situated within speech situations and are comprised of speech acts, which are employed using the rules and norms for particular speech events. Earlier studies on "show talk" and

"calling the opener" discussed these two community-specific speech events in the context of the Deadhead speech community.[16] Here I wish to extend that analysis to create a broader view of how these forms of Deadhead communication imply individual and group identities, or personhood, as well as social relations and strategic action.

Show talk focuses on shows and related experiences (Dollar, 1991, 1999a). Participation in show talk does not require a previously established relationship, though it does require competence with regard to a set of culturally loaded vocabulary, phrases, and norms of interaction, as described below. Further, talk is loosely organized in three phases: the opening/recognition of opening phase, the discussion of community-relevant themes phase, and the wrapping-up phase. Show talk occurs in many places, the most important characteristic of context being the presence of Deadheads who can competently engage in show talk. These members rely on show talk to tell their individualized accounts of communal myths, such as when one got on the bus, first and favorite shows, even stories of birthday shows. All are ways that Deadheads link themselves to their community.

Deadheads use three norms when engaging in show talk: first, the interlocutors rely on a set of culturally loaded vocabulary terms and phrases; second, they use venue names and the term "show," rather than "concert" or "Grateful Dead concert," to locate the topic of the interaction, the concert.[17] Third, they employ these location formulations in combination with other culturally loaded vocabulary in a way that renders the communication cultural (Dollar, 1999a). Interlocutors' competent display of these norms establishes one's identity as a member of the Deadhead community, to oneself and to others. The communication reveals a view of Deadhead identity that combines a focus on community with an individual perspective toward it. The ideal Deadhead recognizes the power and validity of the communal form as a vehicle for expressing individual perspective. When speaking this way, the implied social relations emphasize membership without ignoring individuality. Communication is the means by which members negotiate how to express individuality within the community, the means through which they link themselves to other members and to the community as a whole.

In addition to show talk, some Deadheads engage in another cultural communication ritual known as "calling the opener" (Dollar, 1999b). Enacted correctly, this pays homage to culturally meaningful symbols, such as "show" and what one critic has aptly called "the world according to shows."[18] Four communicative phases comprise this ritual. The initiation phase begins when a Deadhead asks, "What do you think they'll open with?" or asserts, "They'll open with 'Shakedown,'" or the name of another song. Next is the calling phase, which consists of other participants offering their best guesses of the opener. This phase may be completed without interruptions, in a matter of minutes, or continue until phase three is enacted. The third phase is the opener, which occurs as the band

plays the first few notes of the opening song and participants make a mental note of it. The closing phase occurs when participants reconvene, either during or after the show. This phase may be enacted many times and occurs the first time each participant encounters every other participant following the opener phase. If any wager was set, it is collected during this phase.

By displaying their competence at participating in these cultural communication rituals, Deadheads confirm their status and identity as members of the community—they "member self." In so doing, they imply a view of social life that places primacy on a particular view of that group identity, its social relations, and the strategic action it requires. That identity is conceived in terms of membership, of shared yet unique experiences which become communication resources for participating in these community rituals. These shared experiences are expressed using culturally loaded vocabulary, phrases, and norms. Deadheads rely on show talk generally to tell their personal accounts of community themes, and specifically to call the opener, offering their personal interpretation of the community-recognized pattern of song rotations.[19] Members do not need to know one another to engage in meaningful show talk or instances of calling the opener. As such, knowledge of the culturally meaningful speech events, and competence in enacting them, allows Deadheads to meet other Deadheads (Dollar, 2002). In addition, many Deadheads reported a maintenance function served by participating in these speech events. Family bonds are created, renewed, maintained, and expressed as Deadheads engage show talk and calling the opener.

The speech code implied by Deadheads as they engage in these speech situations and events allows for their identities as Deadheads to be expressed in both individual and community-wide terms. As interlocutors employ the communal forms of show talk and calling the opener to tell their individualized versions of communal themes, so too do they evoke the spirit of, and refer to, the community, as they call upon their understanding of speech situations and events which celebrate their family bonds. The social relations implicated in these ways of speaking emphasize membership in a family that includes extended family one has possibly not met. Communication, both verbal and nonverbal, is the means through which these relationships are created, maintained, negotiated, and celebrated. In addition, communication facilitates the expression of individuality within communally recognized forms. This code of membership requires a further exploration of show talk, a speech event that continues to be a hallmark of Deadhead communication.

To better understand show talk, a useful question to ask is, "when Deadheads locate a particular show or set of shows as the topic of their talk, what folk logics do they employ to render this communication commonly intelligible, deeply felt, and widely accessible?" My earlier analyses of show talk suggested that Deadheads call upon a their shared experiences of "seeing shows" as a resource for rendering

this communication cultural (Dollar, 1991, 1999a). Deadheads use what Schegloff calls a "common-sense geography" in formulating and interpreting show talk. Although this geography has been described in terms of the existence of the three norms of interaction outlined above, the specifics of how these norms are employed remains an empirical concern. Pursuing this permits a better understanding of the qualitative dimensions of these norms. A brief discussion of the theoretical and interpretative framework behind my question will help here.

In 1972, Schegloff argued that interlocutors rely on common-sense geographies, or shared folk logics regarding geography, to formulate place in conversations. Place can be formulated to reference geographical location (e.g., "710 Ashbury Street"), location in relation to member (e.g., "Jerry side" and "Phil Zone"), and location identified by the action taking place there (e.g., "Warfield [show]").[20] Interlocutors rely on their common-sense geographies to choose the "right" reference for locating place, those "not producing questions, or further questions, requiring reformulations" (Schegloff, 1972, p. 114). As Schegloff explains, "in the selection and adequate hearing of a locational formulation, at least three orders of consideration are relevant—a location analysis, a membership analysis, and a topic analysis" (Schegloff , 1972, p. 106). The specifics of these common-sense geographies and members' use of them are "cultural fact[s] to be discovered" (Schegloff , 1972, p. 85). Schegloff's research is part of a larger line pursuing "conversational sequencing" or the study of how interlocutors "assemble" structures that "influence the interpretation of conversational action" (Nofsinger, 1999, pp. 50-51). When interlocutors engage in competent conversational sequencing, their interactions are heard to be coherent, each utterance heard as hanging together with previous and future utterances (McLaughlin, 1984).

The data examined for this section include field notes and naturally occurring conversations collected at eight shows, six Grateful Dead and two Jerry Garcia Band; twelve interviews, ranging from 45 minutes to two hours, conducted the four months following Garcia's death; and 25 responses to open-ended surveys collected electronically.[21] Using Carbaugh's framework for analyzing cultural communication and previous conceptualizations of show talk, I reviewed these materials to locate instances of show talk and meta-show talk, or communication about show talk, creating a more focused data set.[22] The interpretive framework that best explains this data set is grounded in Carbaugh's and Philipsen's cultural communication theories and Schegloff's conceptualization of location formulations (Carbaugh, 1988a; Philipsen, 1992; and Schegloff, 1972). Using this framework I assessed the data in the light of my research question, formulating a set of working interpretations. Last, I employed a discursive test to triangulate my findings.[23] This analysis suggested that Deadheads rely on a locational folk logic which I have named "place and time" to guide their production and hearing of location formulations, which Deadheads interpret as referring to a particular show, a

location for an activity.

Deadheads' common-sense geography embodies a spatial orientation based on places—venues—played and a temporal orientation based on the Grateful Dead's touring schedule and history. The data show that the right location formulation for referencing a particular show depends on Deadheads' consideration of the membership, topic, location, and temporal aspects of their communication. As such, Deadheads' common-sense geography, and their use of it to locate a show, differs from that described by Schegloff. Not only do Deadheads make an additional consideration in formulating place, namely temporal, but the organization of their geography differs from that suggested by Schegloff's "layman's geography." One example from my research provides an apt illustration:

Ex. 10-1.
1. DH1: Good show huh?
2. DH2: Yeah, that second set cooked and I really needed that.
3. DH1: The Fantasy > Wharf Rat did it for me. Between Brent and Jerry I
4. really took off tonight. So when are we hookin' up again? *Park West*?
5. DH2: Can't make it to *Park West* or *Calaveras* either. Guess that means
6. this is it for us until *Shoreline* in early October.
7. DH1: Didn't you say you'd be in *New York* mid-September? I may have
8. extras for the *Garden* run. I'm doing *MSG* and the *Spectrum*. Call me
9. either the last week this month or second week in September and let me
10. know if you'd like to do the *Garden* run with me. I'll be in *Boston* the
11. week between.
12. DH2: Working? You still have a job between all these shows?
13. DH1: Gotta fund these shows somehow.[24]

This example contains ten place formulations, noted in italics: two city names and eight venue names. The two interlocutors have engaged in a smooth flowing, *coherent* conversation in that successive utterances maintain relevance and hang together. For example, the interlocutors responded to each other's questions with answers that satisfied the questioner—answers that did not initiate further questions. Topic shifts (e.g., from the show just heard, lines 1-4, to plans for attending future shows, lines 4-10, to work, lines 10-13) are coordinated in that no speaker attempts to direct the talk back to the previous topic or to change the topic, but extends the newly initiated topic. In addition, the segment contains no overlaps or attempts to take the floor. Such talk is considered coherent (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1978).

One consistent theme in my research field notes and interviews is the exclusivity of these conversations: Deadheads reported how conversations such as these were incoherent and confusing to non-Deadheads, particularly in terms of show references. My own experience confirmed this as well. Non-members asked questions such as, "How does DH2 know DH1 is referring to work when he uses

the term 'Boston' (line 10)?" In Schegloff's terms, these non-members were asking, how was DH1 able to use "Boston" to locate a place for work? In Gumperz' terms, what "culturally shared [but unstated] knowledge" did these Deadheads use to render this talk commonly intelligible? (Gumperz, 1984) Another common question focused on how the second speaker knew that the "Garden" being referenced was the one in New York, not Boston? Each of these questions directs attention to the formal structures for locating place, and for rendering the communication coherent and cultural.

One possible response to these questions is that the two Deadheads know each other well enough to know one another's work schedules. For this to be the case, these interlocutors' talk should reflect a co-presence to close friends as the membership category; that is, their communication should display the vernacular of two close friends. If that were true, DH2 would likely know the answer to his own questions—"Working? You still have a job after all these shows?" (line 12)—and therefore not ask them. Conversationalists tend to abide by the maxims of strength and parsimony, saying no less and no more than is needed (Grice, 1975). Considering this feature of conversation, one would conclude that the questions were necessary, indicating consideration of some membership category other than close friends. The interlocutors in Example 10-1 display a recognized co-presence to the Deadhead membership category. This co-presence is manifested in their ability to successfully engage in show talk and to use location formulations that have recognizability within the Deadhead speech community.[25] Of the ten location formulations in Example 10-1, none are questioned such that they require reformulation. The one that is followed by a question—"Boston," line 10—does not require reformulation. The question is a request for information that assumes the correct referent for Boston is work, not a show. As such, each location formulation is heard by these Deadheads to be the right formulation. In order to determine what considerations are relevant for selecting and hearing these formulations, I asked Deadheads to interpret some instances of show talk, including Example 10-1.

My questions were, "Can you interpret this conversation? Who are the speakers and what are they talking about?" All responded with some variant of, "That's a couple of Deadheads talking about some shows." When asked if they could explain the references to shows, their responses noted membership, topic, location, and temporal considerations. Membership was a central aspect all respondents commented on: "You have to be a Deadhead to understand this." More specifically, these Deadheads explained that the example contains words, phrases, and venue names that require an understanding of "Dead shows" and "the world according to shows." In other words, for these Deadheads, the use of these types of culturally loaded vocabulary, in these ways, point to the interlocutors' membership category, Deadheads, and their understanding of the topic, namely shows.

When asked the question posed by non-members, "How do the interlocutors know Boston is a reference to work?", many Deadheads reported that if DH1 was going to shows in Boston he would have used the venue name, "Schaefer Stadium," as he did with "MSG [Madison Square Garden]" and "the Spectrum." Every reference to a show in Example 10-1 employs a venue name —"the Spectrum"—or an abbreviated venue name: "Park West" [Ski Resort], "Calaveras" [County Fairgrounds], "MSG" or "the Garden" [Madison Square Garden]. Established co-presence to the Deadhead membership category appears to invoke the norm for locating show noted earlier: Deadheads use venue names to reference shows. This finding is consistent with Schegloff 's claim that, on occasion, successfully establishing co-presence to one consideration, such as membership category, determines the right location formulation (Schegloff, 1972).

Although agreeing that this norm can be used to explain the show references in Example 10-1, some Deadheads claimed that in addition to membership and topic, location and temporal considerations are sometimes necessary for choosing the right place formulation. These Deadheads noted that DH1 asked DH2 if he is going to be in New York and not Boston when talking about a particular tour, a fall tour. In other words, Deadheads reported that the interlocutors in Example 10-1 established a co-presence to location (i.e., New York) and temporal considerations (i.e., being on fall tour) which facilitated their successful use of place formulations. But the interlocutors never mention the phrase "fall tour," so how did these Deadheads hear this talk to be about shows in the fall? According to these Deadheads, members who go to shows tend to know entire tour schedules. The Deadheads in Example 10-1 clearly attend shows as is evidenced in the site at which the example was collected, a Compton Terrace show, and their talk of other culturally meaningful venues. Interviewees noted that Boston was not part of the fall tour, a fact intrinsic to these two interlocutors' culturally shared, but unstated, knowledge. Deadheads also reported that these Deadheads were able to use "the Garden" to locate Madison Square Garden rather than the Boston Garden because "it's common knowledge the Dead didn't play the Boston Garden between 1983 and 1990." This reasoning displays the importance of temporal considerations in formulating place for a particular show. It is worth mentioning that these respondents were correct: *DeadBase*, the standard reference work on the band's performance history, notes that Schaefer Stadium was not part of Fall Tour '87 but was a stop during Summer Tour '87, on July 4.[26]

Deadheads rely on membership, topic, location, and temporal considerations to determine the right location formulation for referencing a particular show. These data also reveal that on some occasions, Deadheads rely on a spatial orientation, grounded in the places the Grateful Dead and family bands have played, in formulating place. This spatial orientation is displayed in Deadheads' use of venue names to reference particular shows. However, in some instances, venue name is not enough to successfully locate particular shows; for these times, Deadheads add

a date to the venue name. As one Deadhead explained:

> Ex. 10-2.
> When we talk of a run of shows we imply both place and time. Since the shows are a series of points in space/time, we can describe them in whatever coordinates are simplest to communicate and understand. If a venue is only played once, it's easiest to use space—since the Dead have been playing for 30 years, time is more difficult. For example, it is easier to say/understand "Telluride" than "August 15, 1987." When we need more information to disambiguate, we'll use a combination of space and time, such as "Red Rocks '79".[27]

According to this Deadhead, when the Grateful Dead played a venue more than once, using venue name alone to locate specific shows becomes problematic. In such instances, Deadheads combine venue with the date or year of the particular shows, implying a place and time orientation to their common-sense geography.

DeadBase shows that of the five venues referenced in Examples 10-1 and 10-2, two—Telluride and Calaveras—have hosted only one run of shows and three—Park West, MSG or the Garden, and the Spectrum—have hosted at least two runs of shows. At first glance, this information seems to contradict the norm for speaking articulated in Example 10-2. Thus the location formulations in Example 10-1 such as "MSG" and "the Spectrum" would seem to produce confusion as to which show is being referenced. Why, then, did the Deadheads interviewed hear the location formulations in Example 10-1 as correct, even though these venues have been played numerous times? The answer lies in the temporal considerations Deadheads view as relevant when formulating place, which were not factors in Schegloff's 1972 work on place formulation.

This temporal consideration, noted by the Deadhead speaking in Example 10-2, serves to frame the communication. According to Deadheads, this temporal consideration takes on two possibilities: a particular tour, or a date, whether complete or only a year. In other words, every show is situated in the history of the Grateful Dead's touring. If Deadheads make particular tours their focus of co-orientation, then venue name alone is considered the right formulation, as is the case in Example 10-1. If no tour in particular is being discussed and Deadheads want to reference a particular show, then the temporal consideration is manifest in a location formulation noting both venue name and date, such as "Red Rocks '79."

Deadheads note membership, topic, location, and temporal considerations when determining the right location formulation. In addition, Deadheads call upon a common-sense geography that implies an orientation to place and time to determine whether venue name alone or venue name and date is required for the correct formulation. These formulations imply that Deadheads' orientation to particular spaces in place and time within the Grateful Dead's touring schedule, are an organizing feature in their common-sense geography. That the Deadheads in my

study all employed these communicative strategies to locate particular shows demonstrates their wide accessibility. That these Deadheads can successfully select and hear venue names and dates as referencing particular shows is evidence of the common intelligibility of this form for locating place. The emotional responses Deadheads reported when reading and discussing these instances of show talk are evidence that these formulations are deeply felt by members who understand the "world according to shows."

Communicating like a Deadhead sets forth a claim for the ideologies of identity, society, and communicative action implied as Deadheads communicate in these ways. Identity, or personhood, is expressed in terms of individuality and community membership. Membership in the Grateful Dead family—a family that includes members yet to meet one another—defines the terms of the social relations of the society. Communication is a means for expressing individuality, linking individuals to the community, enacting both personhood and shared identity, enforcing communication norms, and getting to know other members of the family. The speech code described here can be best understood as a code of membership. This code is further enacted as members continue to engage in show talk. In my research, place and time emerged as two important considerations in formulating reference to a particular show. Deadheads rely on their shared understanding of "the world according to shows," or their common-sense geography, to determine the correct formulation when referencing show. In so doing, Deadheads display their localized theory for formulating place, a theory that can be distinguished from Schegloff's "layman's geography" as used by some U.S. speakers for formulating place.

To academics, perhaps the most interesting aspect of this is the necessity of considering time, a temporal aspect of place, when Deadheads formulate place for a particular show, a consideration that is not included in the layman's geography. Clearly, this indicates a rich area for additional work. To Deadheads, it validates the uniqueness of their colorful and expressive vernacular, and helps explain a part of this vibrant subculture. For both groups, this is a reflection of the appeal that this unique community holds for students of American culture generally, and for communication theorists in particular.

Notes

1. See Adams & Sardiello, 2000; Dodd & Spaulding, 2000; Dodd & Weiner, 1997; Dollar, 1989, 1999a, 1999b; Meriwether, 2001; Pearson, 1987; and Weiner, 1999. An earlier version of this article was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest/Texas Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association, Albuquerque, NM, March 7-10, 2001.
2. For ethnography of communication, see Hymes, 1962, 1972, 1974; Bauman & Sherzer, 1989; Philipsen & Carbaugh, 1986. For cultural communication theory, see Braithwaite, 1990, 1997; Carbaugh, 1985, 1990, 1995; Fitch, 1998; Katriel, 1986, 1991; Philipsen, 1987, 1992, 2001. For speech code theory, see Coutu, 2000; Philipsen, 1992, 1997.
3. When used in combination with other culturally-loaded vocabulary, phrases, and speech events, Deadheads use "show" to refer to Grateful Dead concerts, concerts by surviving Grateful Dead members' current bands, and "family band" concerts, such as Bob Dylan and the Steve Kimock Band. For a guide to Deadhead speech, see David Shenk and Steve Silberman, *Skeleton Key: A Dictionary for Deadheads* (New York: Doubleday, 1994).
4. For the etymology and more on the meaning and use of the phrase by Deadheads, see Shenk and Silberman, *Skeleton Key*, pp.210-11.
5. Deadhead, interviewed by author, 10/96. "The family" when referenced here and through this chapter refers to Deadheads, the Grateful Dead, family bands, and other persons united by their connection to the Grateful Dead, its music, and the Deadhead lifestyle. These references are not to be confused with members of the Church of Unlimited Devotion, formerly the Spinners and the Family (see Hartley, 2000, for a discussion of this particular spiritual community within the larger Grateful Dead family).
6. Deadhead, interviewed by author, 9/96.
7. Shenk & Silberman, p. 210; Alan Mande, quoted in Shenk & Silberman, pp. 210-211.
8. In fifteen years of research, I met no experienced Deadheads who were not familiar with this expression in all its deeply felt, commonly intelligible, and widely accessible aspects.
9. *Grateful Dead*, Warner Bros. 1935 (1971). For more on the Dead Heads list, see Shenk and Silberman, pp.56-7.
10. See Dodd and Weiner, 1997, for a comprehensive bibliography.
11. For a more extensive discussion, see Dollar, 1989, 1991, 1999a, 1999b, 2001, 2002.
12. The band's official website is www.dead.net. The email subscription announcement list is GDTS [GD Ticket Sales]-TOO. Most Deadheads know the acronym of the hotline, 415-457-6388, as 1-800-CAL-DEAD.
13. See Goodenough, 1999; Pearson, 1987; Reist, 1997, 1999; Sardiello, 1994 for more detailed discussions of the ritualistic features of a Grateful Dead show.
14. For participant engagement in a television talk show, see Carbaugh, 1987, 1988b.
15. See Goodenough, 1999, for a discussion of other functions dancing served in the show ritual.
16. For show talk, see Dollar, 1991, 1999a, 1999b; Dollar, Morgan, & Crabtree, 1997. For calling the opener, see Dollar, 1999b.
17. This is true even for fans unwilling to refer to themselves as Deadheads; see Pelovitz, "'No, But I've Been To Shows:' Accepting the Dead and Rejecting the Deadheads," in Weiner, pp.55-66.
18. A phrase first coined by noted Deadhead writer and critic Steve Silberman; see Shenk & Silberman, pp.332-33.
19. For more on this, see personal accounts of community themes in Dollar, 1999a.
20. Each of these references to place are culturally meaningful location formulations within the Deadhead speech community. The Ashbury Street address was the home of the Grateful Dead in San Francisco's Haight-Ashbury neighborhood from 1966-67. The "Jerry side" and "Phil zone" refer to areas of the audience that were located directly in front of each of these band members. The Warfield Theater, for many Deadheads, is a favorite San Francisco venue.
21. This survey was distributed and collected in September 1995 to triangulate interpretations formulated in my readings of field and observation notes and naturally occurring conversations collected at shows. The survey focused on shows and was posted on a private Deadhead email group.
22. Carbaugh's (1985, 1986) framework consists of five phases: (1) discovering recurring symbols; (2) locating symbols associated with those recurring symbols; (3) describing opposing symbols, when relevant; (4) exploring the data for sequential use of terms and systematically recurring if/then patterns of expression; and (5) organizing the symbols in order of the speaker's assessment of their moral weight. For the application of his framework to show talk, see Dollar, 1999b; Dollar, Morgan, & Crabtree, 1997.
23. Carbaugh (1988b) described a process in which he scans data for themes then checks his reading of the data by using the pattern while talking with members of the speech community. He called this a *performance test*. He then solicited feedback from the workers which supported or challenged his interpretations. I used this strategy of performance testing in interviews and informal interactions with Deadheads, triangulating observations, interviews, and developing interpretations.
24. Field notes, taken in the parking lot after the Compton Terrace show, 8/18/87, Phoenix, AZ.
25. Schegloff (1972) defines recognition as "the ability to bring knowledge to bear on them [location formulations], to categorize, see the relevant significance, to see 'in what capacity' the name [location formulation] is used." (pp. 91-92)
26. John Scott, Stu Nixon, and Mike Dolgushkin, *DeadBase: The Complete Guide to Grateful Dead Song Lists XI* (Cornish, NH: DeadBase, 1999), p.69. See Ritzer (2000) for a more complete discussion of how Deadheads use *DeadBase* and other resources for constructing a culture that is diverse and "somewhat subversive." (p. 244)
27. Deadhead response to an email survey, 9/6/95.

Works Cited

Adams, R.G., and Sardiello, R., eds. (2000). Deadhead Social Science: You Ain't Gonna Learn What You Don't Want to Know. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Bauman, R., and Sherzer, J., eds. (1989). Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking, 2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braithwaite, C. (1990), "Communicative silence: A Cross-Cultural Study of Basso's Hypothesis," in D. Carbaugh, ed., Cultural Communication and Intercultural Contact (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum), pp. 321-327.

—. (1997), "Were YOU there?": A Ritual of Legitimacy Among Vietnam Veterans," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 61, 423-447.

Carbaugh, D. (1985), "Cultural communication and organizing," in W.B. Gudykunst, L.P. Stewart, and S. Ting-Toomey, eds., Communication, Culture, and Organizational Processes (Beverly Hills: Sage), pp. 30-47.

—. (1988a), "Comments on "Culture" in communication inquiry," Communication Reports, 1, 38-41.

—. (1988b). Cultural terms and tensions in the speech at a television station. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 52, 216-237.

—. (Ed.). (1990). Cultural communication and intercultural contact. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

—. (1995). The ethnographic communication theory of Philipsen and associates. In D. Cushman & B. Kovacic (Eds.), Watershed research traditions in human communication theory (pp. 269-298). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Coutü, L. (2000). Communication codes of rationality and spirituality in the discourse of and about Robert S. McNamara's In Respect. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33, 179-212.

Dodd, D.G., & Spaulding, D. (2000). The Grateful Dead reader. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dodd, D.G. & Weiner, R.G. (1997). The Grateful Dead and the Deadheads: An annotated bibliography. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Dollar, N.J. (1989, April). On tour with the Dead: A look into the lives of Deadheads. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Anthropology Association, Memphis, TN.

—. (1991, February). The cultural function of Deadheads' ways of speaking. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Phoenix, AZ.

—. (1999a). Show talk: Cultural communication within one U.S. American speech community, Deadheads. Journal of the Northwest Communication Association, 27, 101-120.

—. (1999b). Understanding "show" as a Deadhead speech situation. In R. Weiner (Ed.), Perspectives on the Grateful Dead: Critical Writings (pp. 116-129). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

—. (2000, Feb). Deadheads and the loss of Jerry Garcia: Communicating identity during community transition. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western States Communication Association, Sacramento, CA.

—. (2001, March). Place, space, and Deadheads' communication code: An extension of previous studies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest/Texas Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association, Albuquerque, NM.

—. (2002). "Communicating Deadhead identity: Exploring identity from a cultural communication perspective," in M. Fong & R. Chueling, eds. Communicating Cultural and Ethnic Identity (pp.). Rowland & Little.

Dollar, N.J., Morgan, E., & Crabtree, R.D. (1997, February). Communicating like a Deadhead: A cultural analysis of place formulations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Monterey, CA.

Fitch, K.L. (1998). Speaking relationally: Culture, communication, and interpersonal connection. New York: The Guilford Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays. New York: Basic Books.

Goodenough, M.. (1999). Grateful Dead: Manifestations from the collective unconscious. Perspectives on the Grateful Dead: Critical Writings (pp. 175-182). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts (pp. 113-128). New York: Academic Press.

Hartley, J.A. (2000). "We were given this dance": Music and meaning in the early Unlimited Devotion Family. In R.G. Adams & R. Sardiello (Eds.), Deadhead social science: You ain't gonna learn what you don't want to know (pp. 129-154). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. Sturtevant (Eds.), Anthropology and human behavior (pp. 13-53). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.

—. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication (pp. 35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

—. (1974). Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Katriel, T. (1986). Talking straight: Dugri speech in Israeli Sabra culture. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. (1991). Communal web: Communication and culture in contemporary Israel. Albany: State University of New York.
McLaughlin, M. (1984). Conversation: How talk is organized. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Meriwether, N. (Ed.). (2001). Dead Letters, Volume I. Oakland, CA: Dead Letters Press.
Nofsinger, R.E. (1999). Everyday conversation. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
Pearson, A. (1987) The Grateful Dead phenomenon: An ethnomethodological approach. Youth and Society, 18, 418-432.
Philipsen, G. (1987). Prospects for cultural communication. In L. Kincaid (Ed.) Communication theory from eastern and western perspectives. New York: Academic Press.
—. (1989). Speech and the communal function in four cultures. In S.Ting-Toomey & F. Korzenny (Eds.), Language, communication, and culture: Current directions (pp. 79-92). Newbury Park: Sage.
—. (1992). Speaking culturally: Explorations in social communication. Albany, State University of New York Press.
—. (1997). A theory of speech codes. In G. Philipsen & T. L. Albrecht (Eds.), Developing communication theories (pp. 119-156). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
—. (2001, February). Cultural communication. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Communication Association, Couer D'Alene, ID.
Philipsen, G. & Carbaugh, D. (1986). A bibliography of fieldwork in the ethnography of communication. Language in Society, 15, 387-398.
Reist, N. (1997). Counting stars by candlelight: An analysis of the mythic appeal of the Grateful Dead. Journal of Popular Culture, 30, 183-209.
—. (1999). Clinging to the edge of magic: Shamanic aspects of the Grateful Dead. Perspectives on the Grateful Dead: Critical Writings (pp. 183-189). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
Rheingold, H. (1993). The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier. NY: Addison Wesley.
Ritzer, J. (2000). Deadheads and dichotomies: Mediated and negotiated readings. In R.G. Adams & R. Sardiello (Eds.), Deadhead social science: You ain't gonna learn what you don't want to know (pp. 241-263). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., & Jefferson, G. (1978). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), Studies in the organization of conversational interaction (pp. 7-55). New York: Academic Press.
Sardiello, R. (1994). Secular rituals in popular culture: A case for Grateful Dead

concerts and Dead Head identity. In J. Epstein (Ed.), Adolescents and their music: If it's too loud, you're too old (pp. 115-139). New York: Garland.
Schegloff, E. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), Studies in social interaction (pp. 75-118). NY: The Free Press.
Scott, J.A., Dolgushkin, M., & Nixon, S. (1987 through 1994). DeadBase: The complete guide to Grateful Dead Songlists. Hanover, NH: DeadBase.
Scott, J.A., Nixon, S., & Dolgushkin, M. (1988 through 1995). DeadBase: The annual edition of the complete guide to Grateful Dead Songlists. Hanover, NH: DeadBase.
Shenk, D., & Silberman, S. (1994). Skeleton key: Dictionary for Deadheads. New York: Doubleday.
Weiner, R. (Ed.). (1999). Perspectives on the Grateful Dead: Critical Writings. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.