

EH, DAS JUS LIKE DA KINE, AH?:
RESEARCHING THE ROLE OF PIDGIN IN CHURCH

ANDREW CHOY

University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a yearlong sociolinguistic case study that explored how Hawai‘i Creole English, known locally as Pidgin, is used in sermons at one particular church in the Honolulu area on Oahu. Although this study focuses on one localized socio-educational context, it reflects a greater need to understand the role and function of Pidgin in and across various social contexts. While scholars have explored the use of other languages and language varieties in church, to date, there are no existing studies on Pidgin use in church or in sermons. Consequently, this case study represents a first step in understanding language use in this particular socio-educational context. This case study is framed within a Language Policy and Planning approach and particularly emphasizes a move beyond dichotomy-based domain-specific understandings of language use. The data generated in this study through qualitative research methods including participant observation, interviews, focus groups, and personal narratives is framed and interpreted through relevant substantive theory including but not limited to Gee’s (2008) Discourse and Lave and Wenger’s (1991) Legitimate Peripheral Participation. The findings challenge current perceptions of the role and function of Pidgin in society and suggest a move beyond dichotomy-based domain-specific understandings of language use which reiterates the need to better understand: (a) language use in and across different social contexts, (b) Local language policies, (c) and language-in-education practices, in order to better inform Language Policy and Planning. Implications for future research are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

For as much as we speak Pidgin—whether knowingly or unknowingly—the perception among speakers of Hawai‘i Creole English, locally referred to as Pidgin, is that this language is “appropriate” for certain social contexts while “inappropriate” in others. In reflection of this, attitudes toward Pidgin among Pidgin speakers are not necessarily generationally confined (Romaine, 1999) and are simultaneously negative and positive with more positive attitudes toward Pidgin reflecting Local identity and more negative attitudes toward Pidgin suggesting lower socioeconomic status and associated with certain ethnicities (Sato, 1991; Watson-Gegeo, 1994). What is more certain, however, is that Pidgin speakers (and non-Pidgin speakers) tend to evaluate Pidgin higher on characteristics such as dynamism and attractiveness while evaluating Standard English (henceforth SE) higher on characteristics such as quality and superiority (Ohama et al., 2000). In short, speakers tend toward categorical understandings of Pidgin and SE.

This project explores the role and function of Pidgin in sermons at one particular church located in Honolulu. The overall objective of this project is to uncover attitudes, beliefs, and evaluations about the value and role of Pidgin in Hawai‘i with the intent of raising awareness and contributing toward a more comprehensive understanding of the role of Pidgin across social context: by providing insight into the role of Pidgin in one specific socio-educational context through this project, I partner with scholars in my field in recognizing the need for a greater understanding of the role and value of Pidgin across social contexts.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, although scholars have studied African American Vernacular English (AAVE) in sermons (e.g., Wharry, 2003), the role of Pidgin in sermons remains unexplored. Moreover, given that Pidgin marks Local identity (e.g., Sato, 1985, 1989, 1991), an understanding of the role of Pidgin in sermons will have implications for the link between language and identity. In fact, scholars have identified church affiliation among various ethnic groups as a source for ethnic solidarity (e.g., Chong, 1998; Shin, 2010), language socialization (e.g., Watson Gegeo & Gegeo, 1991), identity construction (e.g., Park, 2011), and churches as educational contexts (e.g., Varghese & Johnston, 2007). Churches, in short, serve as potentially rich sites of sociolinguistic interaction, and research on Pidgin in this context is needed. As such, the aim of this paper is twofold: this paper seeks to fill the gap in the current

literature by exploring Pidgin in sermons, and with this understanding, this paper additionally seeks to better inform the Language Policy and Planning field.

Historical Overview of Pidgin

To begin, I will situate this study by providing an historical overview of Pidgin. Reinecke (1969) makes the case that the “character” of creole and pidgin in Hawaii is attributed to three specific factors: the continued influences of Hawaiian and English languages interacting with each other; the “linguistic necessities” and diverse ethnic atmosphere on sugarcane plantations; and standardized education in Hawaii (p. 23). These three factors will frame this historical overview.

Captain Cook’s arrival in Hawai‘i in 1778 marked the Hawaiian’s first contact with outsiders and also solidified Hawai‘i’s development into a crucial port for traders and whalers. Three initial factors, the sandalwood trade (1810~1830), the whaling trade (1820~1880), and the arrival of Protestant missionaries in Hawaii (1822), catalyzed language interactions between Hawaiian and English resulting in “language adjustments” between native Hawaiians and western English-speaking traders which, in turn, resulted in what Reinecke calls *hapa haole* (half white) speech and is defined as “the most common means of communication between Haole¹ residents and Hawaiians and practically the sole means of communication between sailors and Hawaiians” which consisted of a “makeshift” English mixed with Hawaiian (Reinecke, 1969, pp. 25-27, 35). Reinecke (1969) seems to focus on the language interactions occurring after 1810 as the genesis for *hapa haole* speech; however, Day (1987) attributes this *hapa haole* speech to two earlier periods of maritime trade in Hawai‘i from 1784-1805 and 1805-1819 and refers to this form of speech rather as Hawaiian Maritime Pidgin (HMP) (p. 167). In either case, HMP or *hapa haole* speech are the predecessors to Hawai‘i Plantation Pidgin (HPP) (Day, 1987, p. 163) or, synonymously, Hawai‘i Pidgin English (HPE) (Sato, 1985, p. 258), which is known, less technically as “pidgin English”.

With the establishment of the first sugar plantation on Kauai (1835), there was a need for a driving workforce, which only increased through establishment of subsequent plantations on six of the eight Hawaiian Islands between the 1830s through the early part of the twentieth century. Laborers were initially contracted from Portugal and China followed by Japan, Korea, the

¹ Haole—Hawaiian; Literally, “foreigner”, but commonly used to refer to Caucasians.

Philippines, Spain, and Puerto Rico (Reinecke, 1969, pp. 40-43). Therefore, “linguistic necessities” refers to the need of these laborers to communicate across ethnic lines as a result of the diverse ethnic atmosphere on plantations. Moreover, Sato (1985) explains that the “self-contained” nature of each plantation resulted in uniquely distinct varieties of HPE as a “secondary mode of communication” for workers who mainly conversed in their native languages (p. 259). Therefore, HPE has its roots in the pragmatic and utilitarian form of communication amongst plantation laborers.

Standardization of education in Hawai‘i is Reinecke’s (1969) third factor and refers to the movement from Hawaiian as the initial medium of instruction in “common” schools (1828)—reflective of an initially predominant native Hawaiian student population—to the move toward English as a medium of instruction in all schools (1880s), which by that point was reflective of a more heterogeneous mix of students as the children of plantation laborers began entering Hawai‘i schools (pp. 43-50). While HPE was an inherently unstable and dynamic entity, with the acquisition of HPE as a first language by the children of pidgin-speaking immigrants, pidgin stabilized into a creole—an actual language—which is currently referred to as Hawai‘i Creole English (henceforth HCE) (Sato, 1985, pp. 258-261).

Although the term HCE or, simply, Hawai‘i Creole² is the accurate definition of the language, this form is more common in academia. The most common designation among locals in Hawai‘i, however, is Pidgin (from “pidgin English”). Pidgin is deliberately spelled with a capital “P” so as to designate it as an actual language unique to Hawai‘i and separate from other pidgins spoken around the world (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003). I will refer to HCE as Pidgin for the remainder of this paper in reflection of what I am most accustomed to and is most common among Locals.

Language Policy in Hawai‘i: Theorizing Pidgin vs. Standard English

Language policy in Hawai‘i is rooted in a context of hegemony and colonization where Standard English has always been superordinate with minority languages including Pidgin occupying subordinate positions. This ideology existed prior to the overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy (1898) when in 1854 English was “adopted experimentally” (Sato, 1985, p. 263) as the medium of instruction in several public schools in Hawai‘i. By 1894, English was

² The English lexifier designation (e.g. Hawaii Creole *English*) may contribute to the view that Pidgin is not a language. Therefore, some linguists choose to omit the lexifier and opt for Hawaii Creole.

recognized as the language of instruction in Hawai‘i public schools, and in 1896 this English-only policy was ratified with the passing of Act 57 in the Republic of Hawai‘i, which, effectively, banned the Hawaiian language in addition to institutionally subordinating minority languages.

In 1924, the first English standard schools were established which served to actively segregate English proficient students (who attended English standard schools) from non-English proficient students through entrance exams. This resulted in further denigration of minority language and/or Pidgin speaking students. Although English standard schools ended in 1947, segregationist ideologies founded on language discrimination and the institution of the English standard schools persist, resulting in the stigmatic-cycle of Pidgin-speaking students.

Finally, in 1987 the Hawai‘i Board of Education (BOE) attempted to officially ban Pidgin in the classroom by drafting a policy which mandated SE as the mode of communication for students and teachers in the classroom. However, following a public outcry and outpouring of support for Pidgin, the BOE was pressed to revise the policy to “encourage” rather than mandate that SE serve as the mode of communication in the classroom and be modeled by Hawai‘i public school teachers (Sato, 1991).

After over a century of minority language discrimination, attitudes toward Pidgin in and out of academic contexts remain ambiguous (e.g., Watson-Gegeo, 1994). Hawai‘i boasts one of the highest private school enrollment rates in the nation at 18 percent compared with the national average at around 11 percent. All the while, the Hawai‘i public education system becomes increasingly synonymous with low scholastic achievement. Moreover, as Davis (2009) points out, Hawai‘i’s population is not only incredibly ethnically diverse with “20% of Hawai‘i residents age five or older currently [living] in homes in which Tagalog, Japanese, Ilokano, Mandarin Chinese, Hawaiian, Spanish, Korean, Samoan, Vietnamese, and Cantonese are spoken”, but in recent years Hawai‘i has seen increased immigration rates from other countries in the Pacific (p. 3). At the same time, Pidgin continues to be associated with lower socioeconomic status and ‘blue-collar’ jobs (e.g., Romaine, 1999); and SE *vis-à-vis* Pidgin is rated higher on traits of superiority and quality while Pidgin is rated higher on traits of dynamism (Ohama et al., 2000); Pidgin is often blamed either explicitly or implicitly—by both Pidgin-speaking and non-Pidgin speaking individuals—as the impetus for the low scholastic achievement among Hawai‘i’s students (e.g., Wong, 1999b). Despite the comprehensive link between Pidgin and (Local) identity (e.g., Sato, 1985, 1989, 1991; Watson-Gegeo, 1994;

Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo, 1999; Wong, 1999b; Ohama et al. 2000; etc.), it is still not uncommon for self-identified Pidgin speakers to define Pidgin as “broken English”—even with students at the primary and secondary levels. What is more, Pidgin speakers associate Pidgin with performing arts and are hard-pressed to think of Pidgin in academic settings. In short, we currently have a *domain-specific* understanding of Pidgin.

Given this dichotomous understanding of Pidgin coupled with Hawai‘i’s increasing ethnic diversity, and a public education system that falls short of meeting Hawai‘i’s students’ needs, it is critical to move toward an understanding of language use as it is practiced within the community. Such a move begins with recognizing that languages do not, in fact, operate and exist in domain-specific dichotomous relationships (Pennycook, 2004; Lin & Martin, 2006) but that these relationships are much more fluid and, therefore, *need* to be understood as *localized* and *contextual*: “The challenge is to move away from this dichotomy between linguistic imperialism and language rights and to try to understand in more mobile, fluid, and contextual ways how language resources are mobilized for different ends” (Pennycook, 2006, p. 69). Lam (2004) reiterates this same point in tracing how Willis negotiates his transnational identity through the use of “third space” (Bhabha, 1994). Lam recognizes the need to move beyond understanding “binary oppositions”: “instead of understanding group relations simply through binary oppositions (the dominant vs. the dominated, the oppressor vs. the oppressed) it is also important to note that many people belong to more than one social category or cultural group” (2004, p. 3). In addition, a dichotomous understanding of language and group relations is not only misrepresentative of actual language and cultural processes but can propagate hegemonic practices:

Dichotomies can privilege the habits of the dominant society over all others and contribute to the marginalization and erosion of the cultural practices of other groups. In rejecting dichotomies we are taking issue with the tendency to misconstrue and overly formalize differences whose real significance may be in their subtleties rather than in broad representations. (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1999, p. 112)

Furthermore, as Davis (forthcoming) points out, interpretative ethnographic and qualitative researchers in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) recognize that “binary positions” are no longer representative of communities and individuals’ use and appropriation of language, and that trends in SLA are increasingly moving “[toward] acknowledging multiple

epistemologies and methods in exploring the complex and socio-politically situated nature of language acquisition” (p. 12). For example, Pennycook (2003; 2009) and Alim (2004; 2009a; 2009b) have explored the global diffusion of the Hip Hop Culture and Rap music, how different cultures have uniquely appropriated Hip Hop Culture and Rap music, and the implications of such appropriations for identity and world Englishes; Rampton (1999; 2008; 2010) has explored the “crossing”—or “code alteration by people who are not accepted members of the group associated with the second language they are using” (Rampton, 2010, p. 486)—and “stylization”—or “exaggerated performances of different speech styles” (Rampton, 2008, p. 39)—among ethnically mixed groups and its consequences for socialization processes (Rampton, 2010) and the formation of “new ethnicities” (Rampton, 2008, p. 42); and Higgins (2009) has researched how the appropriation of English in East Africa has led to hybridisation and the transformation of English into a local resource occupying multiple domains within society.

The recognition that languages have cross-cultural tendencies and function in more fluid than fixed manners underscores the need to understand languages as localized and contextual. This provokes a stance toward Language Policy and Planning (LPP) which is generated within a community of language users and informs LPP from the ground-up. Such a stance draws largely on ethnography, and as Canagarajah (2006) writes, “While LPP largely works in a top-down fashion to shape the linguistic behavior of the community according to the imperatives of policy-makers, ethnography develops grounded theories about language as it is practiced in localized contexts” (p. 153). And, furthermore, “Developing policies informed by ethnography can counteract the unilateral hold of dominant paradigms and ideologies in LPP” (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 155) and help to uncover “overt or covert” language policies (Ricento, 2006, p. 130)—“overt” referring to language policies based on ideals and “covert” referring to language policies masking ulterior motives (Schiffman, 2003). That is not to say, however, that there is no place for top-down LPP: Davis’s (1994) ethnographic study on multilingualism in Luxembourg exemplifies an integrated ground-up and top-down approach to LPP, which recognized the importance of both community-based and government/nation-level perspectives on language practices and actual language use. As in the case of Davis’s (1994) Luxembourg ethnography, the combined top-down and bottom-up perspectives work to inform LPP on multiple levels by improving understanding of not only the intentions of policies and planning but how policies and planning are then realized in communities and, subsequently, experienced by language users

(Canagarajah, 2006). Nevertheless, those most affected by language policies must have a role in the decision making process regarding LPP (Tollefson, 2006). Also, real research must address real life needs. Given the multitude of questions to which indigenous peoples are seeking answers, it is very clear that one single approach will not suffice. Multiple methodologies are called for—methodologies grounded in indigenous traditions (Maaka, 2004, p. 6).

Therefore, in light of our current domain-specific, dichotomy-based perspective on Pidgin and recalling the need for LPP informed by research that focuses on localized language practices and is generated by its actual users, my goal is to present a localized understanding of language use which challenges the simple binary and dichotomous categories which often separate SE and Pidgin. Although this study focuses on the use of Pidgin in one specific socio-educational context (church and, more specifically, sermons), I believe that a greater understanding of the function and value of Pidgin across social contexts will continue to challenge common dichotomies and associations of Pidgin *vis-à-vis* SE and provoke a revision of current language policies in Hawai‘i.

The Role of Language in Church

Studies on language and religion remain a relatively underrepresented field in both sociolinguistics and second language acquisition. Moreover, little—if any—research has been done on Pidgin in church. While there is a growing body of literature on AAVE in this context, previous studies have focused on discourse functions and, more specifically, the call and response nature of AAVE in church (e.g., Davis, 1987; Hinson, 2000; Pawley, 1992; Pitts, 1989; and Smitherman, 2000). However, Wharry (2003) reexamined the role of the preachers’ use of formulaic expressions in the sermon performance, specifically exploring whether call-response is the sole function of traditional Black preachers’ utterances of specific religious formulaic expressions. She found that the majority of the pastors’ utterances served as textual boundary markers; utterances also served as “spiritual fillers” and maintenance markers, but only one percent of the utterances from the combined six sermons functioned as call-response (pp. 210-222, 223). Wharry concluded that formulaic expressions serve multiple functions and that identification of these roles requires both textual and discourse community knowledge.

By nature, churches are educational contexts and, in some cases, doubly function as vehicles for language teaching (Varghese & Johnston, 2007). This raises concerns whether churches

potentially perpetuate colonization and existing language hegemonies. However, researchers have shown that mother tongues generally dominate SE in the domain of religion (Vaish 2008) and, especially, in religious practices that are less formal and more affirming of identity (Kouega 2008). That is, mother tongues or the vernacular language generally have a fundamental role in religious practices.

Furthermore, not only does the use of the vernacular in church services affirm identity (Kouega 2008; Vaish 2008; Varghese & Johnston, 2007; and Wharry, 2003), but church affiliation also creates solidarity among and within ethnic groups, indexes ethnic identity, and plays an important role identity construction (Chong, 1998; Shin, 2010; Watson Gegeo & Gegeo, 1991; Wharry, 2003; Park, 2011). In his study on code-switching in a Korean church, Shin (2010) points out, “code-switching to Korean from English serves to socialize [Korean] identity ... Korean code-switching plays this essential role at the same time that English is increasingly used at the Sunday school as the medium of instruction” (p. 111). In sum, vernacular languages: (a) serve specific functions in religious services; (b) are not necessarily overshadowed by SE during religious services; (c) are crucial in creating solidarity and indexing and constructing ethnic identity within the church; and (d) can operate in conjunction with SE during religious services through code switching.

In considering actual language use and the greater social or cultural context in which it functions, Gee (2008) distinguishes between “discourse” with a lower-case “d” which refers to language-in-use and the greater context in which discourse functions which he refers to as Discourse with a capital “D”. Within this understanding, Discourse integrates actual language use with ways of “doing—being—valuing—believing” or “identity kits” (pp. 154-155). As Gee (2008) explains, “Being in a Discourse is being able to engage in a particular sort of “dance” with words, deeds, values, feelings, other people, objects...so as to get recognized as a distinctive sort of *who* doing a distinctive sort of *what*. Being able to understand a Discourse is being able to recognize such “dances” (p. 155). Language or discourse in religious services, then, can be understood as operating within a greater cultural and social context or Discourse.

Furthermore, considering the manner in which language functions in church and the resultant or concurrent socialization processes, churches can be understood within the framework of Communities of Practice (CoP) (Wenger, 2008). Broadly defined, CoP refers to the practices which result from “collective learning” within any given “community” where these practices,

then, are the “property of a kind of community created over time by the sustained pursuit of a shared enterprise” (Wenger, 2008, p. 45); therefore, the church as a community engages in certain practices which stem from it and are unique to it. Moreover, practices within these communities constitute meaning, and as Wenger (1998) writes, “*Practice is about meaning as an experience of everyday life...* The negotiation of meaning may involve language, but it is not limited to it” (pp. 52-53). Part of this negotiation of meaning entails *Participation* and *Reification*, where participation is “a complex process that combines doing, talking, thinking, feeling, and belonging” (p. 56) and reification is “the process of giving form to our experience by producing objects that congeal this experience into ‘thingness’” (p. 58). Nevertheless, churches serve as incredibly rich sites of cultural and linguistic interaction, and the remainder of this paper will be dedicated to describing the function of Pidgin in sermons. The preceding theoretical framework is the basis for the research questions addressed in this study and will guide the data analysis and interpretation. The research questions are as follows:

- Why does the pastor choose to use Pidgin in his sermons? What is the strategic value of using Pidgin in sermons?
 - What components factor into the pastor’s use of Pidgin in sermons?
- How does the pastor’s use of Pidgin in sermons foster interaction with the congregation?
- How do Pidgin and non-Pidgin speakers perceive the pastor’s use of Pidgin in sermons?
 - Does the use of Pidgin in sermons create an inclusive or exclusive atmosphere?
 - How do Pidgin and non-Pidgin speakers evaluate the pastor’s use of Pidgin in terms of access?
- How does the interaction between the pastor and congregation through the use of Pidgin construct Local identity?

METHOD

The goal of this sociolinguistic case study is to attain a comprehensive and uniform understanding of how Pidgin is used in sermons at one particular church in the Honolulu area through thick description that employs naturalistic qualitative methods including: participant observation, interviews, and focus groups. This form of triangulation ensures that the data and

interpretations are represented in a credible, dependable, and confirmable manner. Although the church service itself consists of several segments—all of which contribute to an overall understanding of the role of Pidgin in sermons—for the purpose of this paper, I choose to focus specifically on Pidgin use in the sermon portion of the church service.

Context

The site of this study is *Aloha Ministries* (pseudonym) located in the Kaimuki area on Oahu. *Aloha Ministries* self-identifies as non-denominational but is affiliated with another large church on Oahu, and the Senior Pastor of *Aloha Ministries* is Wade. The main services are offered on Sunday mornings at 8:00am and 10:30am³, and I normally attended the 8:00am service.

The congregation is ethnically diverse consisting of Caucasians, Asians, African Americans, Hawaiians, and Latinos, and the ages of the attendees range from infants to elderly. In addition, the attendance of college-aged individuals is pronounced. The typical format of the service is as follows: the service begins with worship through music, which lasts for approximately thirty minutes; following worship, the pastor enters the stage and opens with a communal prayer; after this prayer, the pastor encourages the congregation to greet each other for a few minutes after which time the associate pastor enters the stage and presents the weekly announcements; after the announcements, the associate pastor exits the stage, and the pastor begins his sermon by first asking new visitors to raise their hands so they can be recognized and presented with a shell *lei* (necklace). The pastor's sermons typically last one hour, and the pastor concludes each sermon with an altar call⁴ and a communal prayer. The remaining thirty minutes of the service end in worship through music and Communion. At the end of service, the pastor reenters the stage and briefly summarizes the message; he then asks the band to play an additional song after which the associate pastor reenters and dismisses the congregation.

Participants

A total of twelve adults participated in this project, including the pastor. To begin, it is important to point out that *Aloha Ministries* broadcasts its sermons on iTunes (through Podcasts), on the church's website, and airs sermons daily from Monday through Friday on cable television.

³ Initially, the church offered one service on Sunday mornings. This service was held at 9:30am. However, to accommodate the growing congregation, in December 2010 two services were offered at 8:00am and at 10:30am.

⁴ Offer to congregation for anyone wanting to accept Jesus Christ into their lives.

In line with this and as a form of evangelization, one of the *Aloha Miniseries*' goals is to make sure the "Word is heard" throughout the State of Hawai'i; this is accomplished, in part, through the media broadcasts of their sermons. In consideration of this, *Aloha Ministries* recognizes that their congregation consists of both corporate (that is, the congregation that meets at the church site for the main Sunday service and weekly services) and virtual (that is, the congregation that "attends" *Aloha Ministries*' services via the web or cable television) components. In recognition of *Aloha Ministries*' virtual congregation, each television broadcast begins with a scene of Pastor Wade personally greeting his virtual congregation prior to the actual broadcast of the video-recorded portion of the service:

Hey, *aloha*! Thanks for joining us in our Bible study today! Go get your Bible; get your pencil—a cup of coffee if you need, and let's get ready to study the Word together. I'd love to have you come in person sometime as well, so we meet on Sundays at [the name of the high school], so you can check the website for times, locations, and details. But for now, get your Sword; get your pencils; let's hear from the Holy Spirit.

In this greeting, the statement, "I'd love to have you come in person sometime as well", recognizes the active engagement of the virtual congregation as cohesive to the corporate congregation and is further reinforced through the pastor's use of inclusive language. The extension of the service to the virtual congregation is reinforced after the video-recorded portion of the service concludes through a separate closing scene in which Pastor Wade offers an altar call specifically directed to his virtual congregation and the broadcast closes with an invitation by the pastor to join him in prayer. Therefore, there is no differentiation between corporate and virtual congregation members.

During my preliminary meeting with the pastor, Wade offered to introduce to me congregation members whom he thought would be interesting participants in the project. However, as the project progressed, I was able to generate a pool of participants simply through social networking, most of whom I had prior relationships with. This pool of participants consisted of both corporate congregation members and virtual congregation members. In subsequent meetings with the pastor, we both agreed that this organic form of generating participants—with whom I had existing relationships with—would result in a richer data set: given the sensitive nature of the project in dealing with individuals' identities (for example, as speakers of a marginalized language) and religious practices and beliefs—and from an *ethical*

and practical perspective—I decided that this organic form of generating participants through social networking and drawing on existing relationships was the most appropriate route. In the end, these preexisting relationships created an atmosphere such that the participants' voices were able to dominate the project (Fine, et al., 2002, p. 109).

Although the pool of participants consists of both corporate and virtual members of the congregation, as the project progressed, I observed that certain participants began to increasingly engage with the project on a reflexive level. These participants assumed agency within the project which, on the whole, lead to individual transformations (Davis, 2009). I intentionally decided to focus on these primary participants more as the project progressed. The reports from these primary participants constitute the bulk of the findings section, and examples of individual transformations are provided. These primary participants include: Wade, Neil, Travis, Tanner, Uncle Greg, Freddy, Terry, and Sandy. Profiles of all the participants are provided below and are based upon interviews and observations. All names are pseudonyms.

Primary participants. *Wade* is the senior pastor of *Aloha Ministries*. Pastor Wade is Caucasian, grew up on Oahu and is a native Pidgin speaker. He holds post-baccalaureate degrees from several theological seminaries. He began *Aloha Ministries* in 2004 and has served as its senior pastor since. Prior to starting *Aloha Ministries* on Oahu, Pastor Wade ministered at a church on Moloka'i. During my interviews with Pastor Wade, he often switches between SE and Pidgin

Sandy is a student at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. She was born and raised in Kaneohe, Oahu and currently dorms at the University of Hawai'i where she works as a residential advisor; she is majoring in Business Communications. Sandy is Filipino-Puerto Rican, and she is a native Pidgin speaker. During the interviews, Sandy often switches between SE and Pidgin with me, and she speaks both SE and Pidgin with her friends whenever appropriate.

Freddy works in an automotive business and is a student at a local community college. He was born in Honolulu, raised Kaneohe, and currently lives in Salt Lake, Oahu. Freddy is Filipino-Caucasian, and he is a native Pidgin speaker. Freddy speaks mostly Pidgin to his family and friends, and he often speaks Pidgin with me.

Terry is Freddy's mother. She was born and raised in Kaneohe, Oahu and currently lives in Salt Lake, Oahu where she runs a small business from her home. Although she is a native Pidgin

speaker, Terry admits that she only speaks Pidgin in certain social contexts, and I can only recall her speaking to me in Pidgin on a few occasions. During the interviews, Terry occasionally speaks Pidgin.

Tanner is a student at another local community college and works at a guitar shop. He was born and raised in Kaneohe, Oahu and is Hawaiian-Caucasian. Tanner is a native Pidgin speaker, and I have observed Tanner intentionally and unintentionally switching between SE and Pidgin in causal conversation with other Pidgin speakers. He admits that certain conversational contexts/topics are more conducive to speaking Pidgin than others; he often speaks Pidgin with me and in his home with his brothers and parents.

Travis is Tanner's older brother, and he is a native Pidgin speaker. He is a student at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa and is majoring in Civil Engineering. Unlike Tanner, Travis self-admittedly speaks less Pidgin, although I have often observed him speaking Pidgin to family members and his friends. Occasionally, Travis will speak Pidgin with me, but he seemed to speak more Pidgin during the interviews, especially when the interviews were conducted in focus-group format.

Uncle Greg is Travis and Tanner's father. He is Hawaiian-German and grew up in Honolulu; currently, he lives with his family in Kaneohe, Oahu. Uncle Greg is a native Pidgin speaker. He speaks mostly in Pidgin and rarely switches into SE. He is a retired air force mechanic and currently operates an automotive restoration business from his home.

Neil is originally from California and had been living on Oahu for several months prior to the first round of interviews. He is Caucasian-Hispanic and works as a Barista at a coffee shop in Kailua. Neil self-identifies as a non-local, non-Pidgin speaker, and while he is familiar with common Pidgin words, he neither claims knowledge of Pidgin nor attempts to speak it. However, Neil admits to picking up Pidgin words and phrases through his job, and he expressed that he would like to learn Pidgin to communicate with co-workers and friends.

Additional participants. *Julie* is originally from California and had been living on Oahu for a year prior to the first round of interviews. She is Chinese and works at a Christian organization on Oahu. Julie self-identifies as a non-local, non-Pidgin speaker but expresses interest in learning Pidgin. She is familiar with certain Pidgin words and phrases but is hesitant to speak Pidgin.

Carissa is a student at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa and was born and raised in Waimanalo, Oahu where she also currently lives. She is Chinese-American Indian-Caucasian,

and although she states that her parents speak Pidgin, Carissa does not identify herself as a Pidgin speaker. She explains that it is hard for her to speak Pidgin since she attended a private school from elementary through high school, and, moreover, she is hesitant to identify herself as Local. In my interviews with her, she does not speak Pidgin, although she admits to understanding the pastor's Pidgin references.

Bradley is originally from Ohio, but he lived on Oahu for three years while his father was stationed at a local army base. Bradley self-identifies as a non-local, non-Pidgin speaker, although he claims knowledge of a few common Pidgin words such as, *brah/braddah*, *howzit*, and *da kine*. Occasionally, I speak Pidgin to Bradley, but he is hesitant to speak any Pidgin aside from the common words/phrases mentioned above.

Adrian is Bradley's younger brother. Like Bradley, Adrian self-identifies as a non-local, non-Pidgin speaker and claims knowledge of common Pidgin words. In observing Adrian, I noticed that he occasionally speaks Pidgin with his family, but it is generally in a jovial manner. He is more hesitant in speaking Pidgin with me.

Data Collection

Field work was conducted over a period of one year, and the data collection in this case study primarily consisted of participant observation during the weekly church services and interviews with the participants and the pastor. The participant observations and interviews served as forms of triangulation (Aktinson and Coffey, 2003, p. 119). Participant observation involved weekly attendance at the Sunday morning service, and I would occasionally attend the midweek service, which was held on Wednesday evenings at 7:30 pm at a separate location. Church services lasted approximately two hours. I kept a detailed field journal with sermon notes and observations from each service, and I audio recorded the sermon portion of each service I attended. My field journal consisted of both observations and meta-level analyses of the observations (Richards, 2003, pp. 137-139). Furthermore, *Aloha Ministries* publishes both video and audio recordings of the sermons from every Sunday and Wednesday service on iTunes and on the church's website. These recordings are in a public domain and are free of charge. Sermons from *Aloha Ministries* are also broadcast throughout the workweek and on Sunday evenings on cable television. Occasionally, I would re-watch *Aloha Ministries'* sermons on television.

Interviews were conducted in both focus-groups of up to four participants and individually,

and the interviews generally took place at the participants' homes where they felt most comfortable; however, the pastor and I would meet at a coffee shop in the Kaimuki area. The interviews were conducted over eight of the twelve months of the study, and the primary participants and the pastor were interviewed four times each with the fourth interview serving as an exit interview in which we focused on member checking (Richards, 2003, p. 128); in addition, personal communications with the participants outside of the interviews added to the richness of the data set. Interview protocols consisted of broader topics rather than explicit questions and were covered organically as the interview progressed. This facilitated active interviews with the participants (Holstein and Gubrium, 2004, pp. 141, 151).

During all of the interviews, participants were shown video clips of the sermons in which Pidgin was used and asked to comment on the pastor's use of Pidgin in each clip, describing their impressions. The participants were all shown the same video clips of the sermons which yielded broader and more in-depth perspectives on the pastor's use of Pidgin in each instance. Furthermore, video clips used in the interviews were gathered from the videotaped sermons published online on the church's website. Typically, interviews lasted an hour and thirty minutes.

Analysis

Interview transcripts were analyzed through a process of coding and memo writing. Hatch (2002) suggests interpreting interview data through a type of typological analysis which includes, in brief, identifying topics to be analyzed and looking for categories and patterns within these topics, coding data according to patterns, identifying relationships between patterns, and subsequently, generalizing from these patterns (pp. 56-57). Charmaz's (2002) elaborates on interview data analysis through her constructivist grounded theory approach. According to Charmaz, the constructivist grounded theory approach "places priority on the phenomena of study and sees both data analysis as created from the shared experiences of researcher and participants and the researcher's relationship with participants" (p. 677). This is distinct from the traditional postpositive objectivist grounded theory approach (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) which assumes that reality exists and can be approximated and, therefore, the (objectivist) grounded theorist discovers this knowledge as derived directly from the data: "the conceptual sense the grounded theorist makes of the data derives from the data: Meaning inheres in the data and the grounded theorist discovers it" (Charmaz, 2002, p. 677). Moreover, while the objectivist

grounded theory approach *discovers* what is happening in the data, the constructivist grounded theory approach *defines* what is happening in the data (Charmaz, 2002, p. 684). Therefore, a constructivist grounded theory approach involves initial coding of data followed by selective coding of data. In selective coding, the data set is organized by the initial codes which are most common. As the researcher continues to engage in this reflexive process, identified patterns are applied to successive data gathering. This level of engagement allows researchers to “describe and dissect” interview data (Charmaz, 2002, p. 684).

After the interview data has been coded and synthesized, memo writing serves to expound on existing codes and categories: “Through memo writing, researchers take these codes apart analytically and, by doing so, “fracture” the data (Charmaz, 2002, p. 687). As such, memo writing dually serves as an additional step in interpreting data and as an initial step in writing up findings.

In addition to coding and memo writing generated through a constructivist grounded theory approach, I employed member checks, in which data generated through the project was submitted to the participants of the project for evaluation and analysis. In short, data generated in the participants’ (congregation members) interviews was compared with data generated in the pastor’s interviews; this data was resubmitted to all of the participants for further evaluation. Subsequently, interview data was then compared with my participant observations as both a researcher and insider, and my interpretations were, once again, resubmitted to the participants for final evaluation. This serves to ensure credibility, dependability, and confirmability in the representation of the findings.

Researcher Positionality

While churches are often synonymous for openness and acceptance, churches are simultaneously guarded institutions that are sensitive to the presence of newcomers and outsiders. This is immediately apparent to anyone visiting a church for the first time. Prior to attending *Aloha Ministries*, I had been involved with the youth group at a separate local church for a number of years. Prior to beginning this study, I came across several sermons from *Aloha Ministries* broadcast on cable television. Not only was I impressed by the message but I was attracted to the pastor’s switching between Pidgin and English. After watching several

broadcasts, I decided to visit the church and soon found myself regularly attending as a member of the church.

Obviously, my active membership in this church takes precedence over *any* research. Consequently, I realize that my biographical profile will influence the interpretation of the data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 21). My goal as a member of this church first and as researcher second is to partner with fellow congregation members (the participants) to help narrate and make sense of the data through my reflexivity: “through active reflexivity we should recognize that we are part of the social events and processes we observe *and* help to narrate... To deny our being “there” misunderstands the inherent qualities of both methods—in terms of documenting and making sense of social worlds of which we are a part” (Atkinson & Coffey, 2003, p. 120).

Notwithstanding, from a researcher’s perspective, my membership in this church allowed for ease of access to participants and the pastor, and I was able to reconcile ethical issues with regard to “researching” individuals’ religious practices in the very fact that I am member myself. Furthermore, being a native Pidgin speaker helped to facilitate the co-construction of knowledge between my participants and me. I recognize the potential of my reflexivity to silence the participants’ voices (Fine et al., 2000) and, as such, endeavor to balance my subjectivities that stem from my multiple identities with the perspectives and identities of the participants. Obviously, this is a challenge in light of my emic and etic perspectives, but given the ethical considerations of research in the church context and on Pidgin—both potentially sensitive topics, especially with regard to individuals’ identities—my positionality as church member, Pidgin speaker, and researcher is unavoidable, and I am confident that it will, in fact, yield richer findings.

FINDINGS

This section will be organized around the three major themes generated in the data. These themes include: (a) establishment of legitimacy and reference to Local epistemology; (b) inclusive nature of Pidgin in sermons; and (c) Pidgin in conjunction with English. The participants’ personal application of the Pidgin in sermons and their resulting transformative experiences were additional themes in the data but will be discussed in the following section.

Data from the congregation members' interviews are compared with the pastor's responses and my observations as a researcher to provide a thorough description of each theme.

I. Establishment of Legitimacy and Reference to Local Epistemology

Epistemology refers to 'ways of knowing' or 'seeing' the world. To begin, Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo (1999) assume that epistemology is linked to language in that language and discursive practices "encode a group's cultural knowledge and indigenous epistemology" (p. 103). Indigenous epistemology, then, refers to the ways in which an ethnic group comes to know and understand the world through creating and recreating knowledge through their cultural lens (Gegeo, 1994). It is linked to language and is enacted through group practices at meta, pragmatic, discursive, and social levels. Indigenous epistemology or, for the purpose of this paper, Local⁵ epistemology, is *owned* and *operated* by a particular indigenous, ethnic or cultural group, and it is this group that determines what counts as authentic (and inauthentic) epistemology (Wong, 1999a). Nevertheless, given that Local epistemology *is* a group's cultural knowledge, it is not surprising that it is difficult to categorize the constituents of authentic Local epistemology. Moreover, Wong (1999a) writes, "Authenticity can thus be thought of as a construction of society, its very existence depending on whether or not it is a psychological reality for the community...An absolute reality cannot be assessed, but a psychological reality can be negotiated" (p. 104). Wong's treatise on authenticity and indigenous epistemology helps to clarify what counts as an epistemologically-based exchange: Local epistemology, therefore, exists as both an 'absolute reality' and a 'psychological reality'. Local epistemology as an absolute reality consists of group practices on a meta, discursive, pragmatic, and social level, which exist independently, are owned and operated by Locals and, as such, deemed as intrinsically Local. By nature, Local epistemology as an absolute reality is exclusive to Locals because it is the group's knowledge. For example, Bradley commented in one interview that when Pastor Wade switched into Pidgin it was like he was "opening a door, stepping out, and speaking to another crowd." Because Local Epistemology as an absolute reality is the group's knowledge, in one sense, it is exclusive to outsiders. Bradley's response affirms this. However, Bradley follows up, "It's not like I felt excluded, though; it made sense, but it's like it just wasn't for me, at first." In Bradley's follow up response, we see the effect of the contextualization of

⁵ Spelled with a capital L in specific reference to the 'Local' culture of Hawai'i.

the reference to Local epistemology: as a psychological and cultural reality, Local epistemology is contextually-situated and negotiated within the community of Locals (and non-Locals). Two consequences follow: first, as contextually-situated and negotiated within the community, Local epistemology on meta, discursive, pragmatic, and social levels can be approximated. Secondly, Local epistemology as contextualized encourages inclusivity. In short, the pastor's use of Pidgin in sermons references Local epistemology as an absolute reality; however, given that this reference occurs within a larger Discourse of the church and sermon, the reference is contextualized and negotiated. Local epistemology, then, transitions from an absolute reality to a psychological and cultural reality; the use of Pidgin and reference to Local epistemology is contextualized by the sermon, thereby, preserving inclusivity (to be discussed in the following section). The remainder of this section will be dedicated to describing how Local epistemology is negotiated within this community at meta, pragmatic, discursive and social levels.

To begin, Local epistemology is negotiated at a meta-level through reference to the notion of a *shared knowledge* among Pidgin speakers in Pastor Wade's use of Pidgin in sermons. The reliance on shared knowledge is meta-level practice typically employed among Pidgin speakers as a way of creating in-group solidarity. One such example of a Pidgin feature that draws on shared knowledge is 'false reference'. Wong (1999b) defines 'false reference' as "a claim on the part of the speaker that the interlocutor shares some kind of relationship with a third party that is not otherwise true" (p. 209). Therefore, the ability to define the referent in a false reference expression requires an interlocutor to draw on Local epistemology that includes, namely, a "wide range of shared norms and expectations" (p. 209) from the wider context surrounding the immediate talk.

Consider the following example of a false reference in a conversation that Wong (A) had with a secretary (B) in which he asked about the availability of computers in the faculty workroom (p. 213):

A: Get plenny people using da computahs?

B: Well, your braddah was dea.

A: Which braddah?

B: You know, Doodoo Boy.

Wong explains that the secretary’s initial response is an example of false reference in that he (Wong) has no reason to believe that either of his two actual brothers are in the workroom: the ability to draw on language norms and the context surrounding the immediate talk allow Wong to interpret the “otherwise derogatory remark as a sign of friendship” (pp. 213-214) in which the secretary teases Wong and creates solidarity with him through claiming that he shares a brotherly or “braddah” relationship with “Doodoo Boy”. Wong (1999b) concludes that a Pidgin speaker must utilize a full repertoire of the “resources available in Pidgin” (p. 217) in order to make sense of and communicate effectively in the context of a false reference.

Given the intimate nature of false reference and its extensive reliance on a shared knowledge, by nature, false reference is typically initiated by one speaker and is specifically directed at another speaker: false reference is more characteristic of conversations among two individuals rather than across groups, and while a false reference may be directed at a group, the ensuing response will generally be directed at one individual (e.g., Wong, 1999b, p. 216)—all seven examples of false reference that Wong (1999b) provides attest to this. As such, it is unlikely that Pastor Wade will directly employ false reference in his sermons⁶. Nevertheless, the notion of a shared knowledge among Pidgin speakers remains characteristic of meta-level Local epistemology, and Sandy elaborates on this further in responding to Pastor Wade’s use of Pidgin in a sermon on John 1:35-51 (see Appendix II). In her response, Sandy focuses on the way in which shared knowledge is referenced through the combination of a specific head movement with a specific tone and volume of Pidgin which together expresses a “set in stone” or definitive Pidgin statement:

A = Andrew

S = Sandy

A: What’s your impression of that (Pastor Wade switching into Pidgin in John 1:35-51)?

S: Very typical of an angry Pidgin speaker. [laugh] Um, very defensive and proud, I guess. It’s funny ‘cause when he was imitating the guy who got angry and was saying, [Pidgin] “*Oh, I not gon come hea anymore*”, like he turned his head down, and that was an indicator of like, “*nevamind*”, “*pau*”, “done”, “finished” [slight laugh].

A: That’s really good...

⁶ I have not found a clear example of false reference in my data from Pastor Wade’s sermons.

S: It seems that when, not just in the language, but in the culture of communicating Pidgin, it's very set in stone.

A: What does that mean?

S: Like, um, like "*pau already*", like, "done", you know, like, it's an established, it's an agreed upon, um, it's agreed that things are done, set in stone, finished. Um [slight pause]...

A: It's um, what do you, like its definitive?

S: Yah, yah.

A: Pidgin is definitive?

S: Mhmm.

A: Um, what does that mean?

S: There's like no room for indecisiveness when it comes to Pidgin, and I'm not sure if it's just because of the language or the culture, but it seems like most Pidgin speakers that I know, like when they decide something, it's unmoving, you know?

A: Why is that? And can you give me an example?

S: Uh, [pause]. Oh, so like when I was growing up, like me and my sisters when we used to fight, like going to the store, my dad you be like, [Pidgin] "*oh bra, we go home already*", like, "*nuff, nuff*"...

A: [laugh].

S: ... *nuff*, it means, it means, "you better stop or we're going home" an den we're literally going home. You know? Like there's no room for, like, "oh, if you guys, if you guys behave we'll take you out for ice cream", like there's no negotiating when it comes to Pidgin speaking or the behaviors associated with it. [slight laugh] There're very strict, but I don't know; there's, I don't know why that exists, but I know there's a lot of jokes made with it with local people and the differences between the way we were raised here and the way our *haole*, quote-unquote, friends were raised in the mainland. Like, um, there's this, me and my [...] friends were watching this comedian on Comedy Central, and, this guy, I mean, he's not from Hawai'i, but he's, I guess he's talking more about minority groups and how minority children were punished or physically disciplined by their parents growing up, you know? And he made a joke about how white people were and how they'd get sent to their room, and we're like [slight laugh]; like for minority kids, it's like, "you have a room?" [laugh]. It's just, it's just odd that there's that difference in discipline, like one, on one end, they're negotiated,

they're talked with, and, like, they're reasoned out of discussing their bad behavior, but on the local end it's like, "here, this is what you did wrong; this is the punishment", like "said and done", you know?

The idea of Pidgin as set in stone draws on Local epistemology in its reliance on the assumption among interlocutors of a shared knowledge: Sandy knows that "*oh bra, we go home already...nuff, nuff*" is not a suggestion but an imperative; there is no room for negotiation, and there is an assumption between Sandy, her sister, and her father—a shared knowledge—that such a statement means, "we're literally going home". In short, Sandy cues onto the pastor's reference to a shared knowledge in his use of Pidgin in John 1:35-51, and she reinforces it with a personal example.

Moreover, Sandy's response in the transcript above initially focuses on pragmatics. In Sandy's response, we see that Local epistemology is negotiated at a pragmatic level through the pastor's specific body language in conjunction with his use of Pidgin. Pastor Wade responded to the importance of physical 'Local markers' in negotiating Local epistemology when asked to comment on his use of Pidgin in one of his sermons:

A = Andrew

W = Wade (pastor)

W: Well that's why I think we talked about last time, you know, that's one of the local markers.

A local tell-tale, you know, if you meet somebody in Connecticut, you see the way he's walking, you can tell he's local....

A: Yah...

W: ... *'cause da way he's walkin, da way he throws his slippahs around...the way he kicks his leg forward when he walks, you go up to him, and you go, "eh, wassup" an den you say "wassup, oh bah, whea you from?"*, you know *"stay oahu"*, *"oh bah me too! Wat school you grad?"*

...

A: How do you get the markers right? Does that make sense?

W: Yah. I don't think there's any other way to say it but just being *keiki o ka 'aina*...I honestly,

because it's "monkey see; monkey do"...so, I mean, I myself because...when I'm around un, *da uncles, brah you won't even recognize me—'cause it's jus tik li'dat*. You know? But the hard part, listening to myself, is when I'm using proper English and speaking in vernacular and dialect and trying to use four syllable words in there for the few PhDs that are out there in the audience, and so on and so forth—that's the hard part because there is a tone, an intonation, so I've heard myself say things, like if I was listening to somebody else, I would say, you know, that oh *mainland Pidgin* or, you know, somebody that wasn't...you know, because it isn't...there's a dialect, there a def, definite dialect...and I think what you're talking about is true as far as all those [...] is because it's not just what is said and, and even how it's said, but it's the tone and the volume. 'Cause there's the [falsetto tone of Pidgin], "*e, bu we go race car ah...*"...

A: Yah, the falsetto kind of Pidgin.

W: ...yah exactly, "*e, no make li'dat*", so that guy is totally funny, an den [deeper/authoritative tone of Pidgin] *da fadda, "eh, boy!"*...

A: Yah, the raspy kind of Pidgin...

W: ...yah, yah, [deeper/authoritative tone of Pidgin] "*I goin down dea!*", and so that's that more authority, and so there's all that different, so there's the difference in, in, in the voice, and so it's like [Falsetto Pidgin], "*ah? Hah?*", you know, so all of that needs to be intentional because it conveys a very different meaning of the same word.

As Pastor Wade points out, Local epistemology consists of the way one carries himself or herself physically (e.g., "*'cause da way he's walkin, da way he throws his slippahs around*"), the interlanguage pragmatics, and the delivery of the speech act (e.g., "it's not just what is said and, and even how it's said, but it's the tone and the volume"). In addition, as we see in Pastor Wade's comment, the meaning of this speech act is dependent on: what is said, how it is said, the tone in which it is said, and the volume in which it is said. To evidence this point, Pastor Wade differentiates between a comedic register of Pidgin which is characterized by a higher/falsetto

tone and an authoritative and respectful register of Pidgin which is characterized by a deeper/lower tone⁷.

Consequently, the way in which Local epistemology is negotiated at a pragmatic level is directly related to the way Local epistemology negotiated at a discursive level through the pastor's specific body language in conjunction with his use of Pidgin: Local epistemology is negotiated at a discursive level not only through Pastor Wade's fluency in Pidgin but his accuracy of Pidgin features in sermons. Regarding discursive practice, Watson-Gegeo (1994) explains that, "Fluency in HCE is one important way that speakers identify themselves as 'local,' as sharing island values and culture...It is not enough to know HCE as a linguistic code, however. A speaker must also demonstrate competence in discourse forms...and interpretive schemata special to communication in Hawai'i Creole English" (pp. 5-6).

The idea that it is *not enough* to speak Pidgin but that a Pidgin speaker must *demonstrate competence* or establish *legitimacy* is a point that Travis reiterates after watching a video clip of the pastor's use of Pidgin in his sermon on John 1:6-14 (see Appendix I):

A = Andrew

TR = Travis

A: [Is] speaking Pidgin enough to make someone local?

TR: [slight pause]. Uh, that's tough. You have to think about it one way too, like if, let's say [Neil] had everything down, he had the whole body language and the speaking and everything, that must have taken him awhile because it's not very easy to learn...

A: Yah, it's not.

TR: ...to, to learn like a whole new inflection of talking, it's like...you have to drag your vowels a lot of the time, don't know how to do that, so, I mean, if you went through all that effort to learn it, you'd have to be in tune with da 'aina [slight laugh].

A: [laugh]. Would he be a legitimate Pidgin speaker, a legitimate local person in your eyes?

TR: Uh, language, yes; local, no.

A: So then the question is, what makes a local person?...and that's kinda what this is leading up to...

⁷ Pastor Wade also commented on the difference between a falsetto comedic register of Pidgin and an authoritative deeper-toned register of Pidgin in an earlier interview on 9/30/2010. In this interview he comments on a radio spot that he held on Moloka'i where he would enact these two registers for specific purposes. See Appendix III.

TR: You grew up here.

A: You grew up here?

TR: You grew up over here.

A: So I could have moved when I was ten—does that make me local?

TR: If you were here for a while, I guess, and you adapted to the culture, and to the way, to the way you developed. I, I mean, I could move to China and learn Chinese, but I wouldn't be Chinese.

In his response, Travis comments that the Local is not synonymous with Pidgin proficiency although it is constituted by it in part. Yet for legitimacy to be established, a Pidgin speaker must demonstrate both fluency in Pidgin and facility in discursive forms unique to Pidgin (Watson-Gegeo, 1994). As an example of Pastor Wade's facility in Pidgin discursive forms, consider his use of Pidgin in his sermon on John 1:29-34 (14:42-16:28min):

I think we need to look at a phrase in verse thirty-two that I think needs some, uh, explanation. John says here, "I did not recognize him". You see that? Now is there anyone out here, seriously, is there anyone out here who is going, "but wait, I thought they were cousins?"...Now, okay, listen: John did not know Jesus by face, why?—because they did not get the annual Christmas card with his picture on it [audience laughs]. Just because folks have family...[Pidgin] *how many you folks got family, you know you got family, but you neva see dat family long time* [raises his hand]? *Kay*...I mean on Moloka'i I have been, literally, I have been at baby luaus where people, where people across the tables realized they were related to each other and never knew it until that moment. [Pidgin] "*da-da-da is my aunty*"; "*oh, da-da-da, that's my great aunty*"; "*ho, you my cousin den!*" [audience laughs]. It's so funny, on Moloka'i, when say, "*wassup, cuz?*", *dey mean it!* [audience laughs]. It's true. [Pidgin] *Gotta be careful who you date ova dea.* [audience laughs] Now, um, so, he is just six months older just in the family and relation, but they, obviously did not see and know one another, but here's the thing, John recognized him, not because he recognized him, as I said, by familiarity, "oh, there he is"; he recognized the presence and the Spirit of God upon him. Are you with me? He recognized God's Spirit and God's power, if you're taking notes.

From a discursive point of view, Pastor Wade’s phrasing also references Local epistemology in his use of an elaborated topic and comment (Sato and Watson-Gegeo, 1992). Consider his statement, “*how many you folks got family, you know you got family, but you neva see dat family long time*”. According to Sato and Watson-Gegeo (1992) this type of elaborated topic and comment is typical of Local speech patterns. In elaborated topics and comments a speaker posits a topic or comment and elaborates on that particular topic or comment before continuing on with the greater narrative or explanation, as a way of establishing and drawing on Local epistemology. As an additional example of an elaborated topic with comment, consider the following statement: “*Da food was junk. Nah, looked mean, tho, and da kine, he like go. Had plenty people stay inside too. I neva like finish da food was so junk!*”. In my example, I posit a topic—that the food at this particular restaurant is bad—and elaborate on the topic by commenting that: (a) the food appeared to be appetizing, (b) my friend thought that we should eat at the restaurant, and (c) there were a lot of people eating in the restaurant, all before finally returning to the initial topic: the food was so bad that I lost my appetite. According to Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo (1999), elaborated topics and comments are representative of the ‘talk-story’ nature of discourse in Hawai‘i, which seeks to establish and reinforce familial ties (p. 106), and, when produced in concert with fluent Pidgin, mark Local identity (p. 110).

Finally, as a consequence of the pastor’s discursive practice in his sermon on John 1:29-34, we see that Local epistemology is negotiated at a social level through Pastor Wade’s reference to Local practice of social networking. Recall the pastor’s use of Pidgin in John 1:29-34:

how many you folks got family, you know you got family, but you neva see dat family long time [raises his hand]? *Kay*...I mean on Moloka’i I have been, literally, I have been at baby luaus where people, where people across the tables realized they were related to each other and never knew it until that moment. [Pidgin] “*da-da-da is my aunty*”; “*oh, da-da-da, that’s my great aunty*”; “*ho, you my cousin den!*”

In this example, Pastor Wade is referencing the drive for Locals to social-network and establish the ways in which we are related to each other. This is nowhere better exemplified than in the question, “*Eh, what school you went?*”. For example, Lum (2008) discusses the complex implications of the simple question, “*Eh, what school you went?*” pointing out that “[t]his impulse to establish how we are related is critical to understanding local culture and local

literature” (p. 7). Therefore, the question, “*Eh, what school you went?*” is not a request for a transcript; rather, it is “fundamentally an effort to understand the context of one another: your name, your family, your district, and your teacher” (p. 7). Pastor Wade elaborates on this drive for Locals to determine our degree of relatedness as he comments on his use of Pidgin in the above sermon:

A = Andrew

W = Wade (pastor)

W: Because I have cousins that I haven’t seen in, you know, I know I got a cousin, but I could be sitting at this table, and I have to, ten minutes go, “oh wait a minute, yah, Uncle Russell’s your grandfather...oh, we’re cousins.”

A: How is that related to, you know, when people ask each other, “*eh, wat school you wen grad?*”

W: Mhmm. Same. Well that’s why I think we talked about last time, you know, that’s one of the local markers. A local tell-tale, you know, if you meet somebody in Connecticut, you see the way he’s walking, you can tell he’s local....

A: Yah...

W: ... *‘cause da way he’s walkin, da way he throws his slippahs around...* the way he kicks his leg forward when he walks, you go up to him, and you go, “*eh, wassup*” an den you say “*wassup, oh bah, whea you from?*”, you know “*stay oahu*”, “*oh bah me too! Wat school you grad?*”

Gee’s (2008) notion of Discourse is a functional lens to interpret Pastor Wade’s response. As we recall, Discourse refers to speech acts and literacy acts “*coupled* with distinctive ways of acting, interacting, valuing, feeling, dressing, thinking, believing with other people...so as to enact specific socially recognizable activities...Discourses are all about how people “get their acts together” to get recognized as a given kind of person at a specific time and place” (p. 155). Thus, we can interpret Pastor Wade’s reference to Local epistemology or “markers”, as he puts it, within the lens of Discourse.

In sum, Pastor Wade is aware of the epistemological value of Pidgin in sermons, and he references it intentionally. Moreover, the pastor references Local epistemology as an absolute

reality, yet the larger Discourse of the church and sermon in which the references occur serve to contextualize the reference thereby translating the reference from an absolute reality to a psychological reality: the use of Pidgin and reference to Local epistemology is contextualized by the sermon, consequently, preserving inclusivity.

II. Inclusive Nature of Pidgin in Sermons

There may be a tendency to think that the pastor switching between SE and Pidgin in sermons propagates dichotomous inclusive-exclusive categories in which non-Pidgin speakers are excluded from participation in the sermon while Pidgin speakers are inducted into fuller participation. Similar dichotomous categories exist between SE *vis-à-vis* Pidgin. For example, in a study investigating common associations or evaluations of SE and Pidgin among students at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Ohama et al (2000) found that while Pidgin was rated higher on traits of dynamism (e.g., active, confident, and talkative), SE was rated higher on traits of superiority (e.g., education, intelligence, upper class, etc.) and quality (e.g., appropriateness, grammaticality, etc.). However, this dichotomous relationship between SE and Pidgin is not reflective of participants’ responses regarding the pastor’s use of Pidgin in sermons, and, moreover, both Pidgin and non-Pidgin congregation members responded that the use of Pidgin in sermons was inclusive rather than exclusive: all members, to some degree, felt invited to participate in the pastor’s use of Pidgin during the sermons.

As a non-Pidgin speaker responding to the pastor’s use of Pidgin in John 1:6-14 (Appendix I), Neil comments that, on the whole, he feels included in the pastor’s use of Pidgin; however, he makes a distinction between the pastor simply *talking* in Pidgin (John 1:6-14) and the pastor’s use of an epistemologically-based Pidgin *example* (John 1:14). Neil comments that while Pidgin examples are, perhaps, “more personal” for Pidgin speakers and a form of “comic relief” for non Pidgin speakers—both of which are inclusive—the pastor simply talking in Pidgin is more inclusive. Compare the pastor’s use of Pidgin in the previous sermon on John 1:6-14 with his use of an epistemologically-based Pidgin example in John 1:14:

When in Genesis, when Adam first fell, when he and Eve partook of the fruit, and they ate, they recognized that they were naked, and God comes and says, “Adam, where are you?”

Now we have it in print, but we don’t have the tone. The tone is not there for us, and you so often, that is what people put in in their own mind, and so I hear, so often, people’s attitude

of when God sees Adam falling, or maybe you today are one who's heard that mindset in your own as Adam had fallen and recognized he was naked, you heard more of the voice of a cop who's trying to bust a robber like, "Put your hands down! Stop right there!". Maybe you heard more of *da local fadda*, "Eh boy, get ova hea! Wat you did? Hah?" [audience laughs]. And you have the idea of God as *da braddah ready fo' crack*. But you see, what's missing in the Word is the tone, and that is why, dear Christian, that is why you need to read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation. Because when you read from Genesis to Revelation, you begin to learn the character of God. And folks, I am convinced, as I have read the whole revelation of God, that rather than the bark of an arresting officer or some angry ready to throw blows father, rather, what we hear is the heart of a heartbroken father; one that actually says, "Adam, Adam, what have you done... where are you?"

There is a clear difference in the pastor's use of Pidgin in John 1:14: whereas in his sermon on John 1:6-14, the pastor simply stumbles over his word choice in SE and switches into Pidgin to save face, in the pastor's sermon on John 1:14, he switches into Pidgin in referencing a Pidgin example, *da local fadda* (further explained in a subsequent section), which is illustrative and integral to the message.

In response to the pastor's use of Pidgin in John 1:14, Sandy remarks that, as both a SE and Pidgin speaker, she feels that simply *talking* in Pidgin and Pidgin *examples* which draw on Local epistemology serve to "conform" and "[familiarize]" non-Local non-Pidgin speakers to Local culture. Furthermore, Sandy acknowledges that, in her experience, most people from the mainland *want* to learn more about Local culture, which, she adds, should promote "compassion" and improve the relationship between non-Local/non-Pidgin speakers and Local/Pidgin speakers:

A = Andrew

S = Sandy

A: What about, let's say you don't speak Pidgin, you're from the mainland, do you think his use of Pidgin creates an inclusive atmosphere or an exclusive atmosphere?

S: Um, I think it's inclusive because, for the most part, he's very clear, like, whether, I mean, like me being a native English speaker and a Pidgin speaker, I can resonate with both, you know, and I, I, for me it makes it more inclusive because he is trying to conform more to the culture and more to the people who already live here but, yet, I think he's familiarizing a lot

with the audience who's not, you know, like he...I know that [Wade] knows that he gets a lot of UH students, um, a lot of campus people, a lot of people in Manoa, and so it's a huge mix of people who aren't from here and who are, and so, I think, being aware of that, he, I guess, organizes the way that he speaks as a way to cater to the people who aren't local to Hawai'i and the people who are. I think it's completely opposite to exclusiveness because I know a lot of people from the mainland want to understand more about the culture here, and it generates compassion, um, and I think it helps locals to see that too because I know, I still know people [who] are very hostile towards *haoles* or, you know, people from the mainland who aren't even white, like it's just a bitter thing that has happened and has still kinda passed down and wrapped around our culture, so I think it helps them to see, "well, they're trying to understand what our culture is like", simply, through [Wade] using Pidgin.

Neil's response to the different ways in which the pastor uses Pidgin in John 1:6-14 and John 1:14 complement rather than contradict Sandy's response: Neil expresses no feeling of exclusion in either sermon. Obviously, Neil's access to Local epistemology is restricted in having recently arrived in Hawai'i, so it follows that a Pidgin example drawing on Local epistemology (John 1:14) would be unfamiliar, though nonetheless comical and purposeful. In a sense, Neil is differentiating between unfamiliarity and inaccessibility, the latter of which is certainly not the case. Moreover, Neil reports that the pastor talking in Pidgin (John 1:6-14) not only helps improve his understanding and, perhaps, acquisition of Pidgin but helps him to feel "incorporated" and "more [L]ocal", which is exactly Sandy's point:

A = Andrew

N = Neil

A: So in the first instance [referring to sermon on John 1:14], you said that a non-local person would say it's "comic relief"...

N: Yah.

A: ...for one reason, and a local person would say it's more personal...

N: Yah.

A: What would that contrast be in this instance [referring to sermon on John 1:6-14], so what would a non-Pidgin speaker say to that, and what would a Pidgin speaker say to that?

N: I feel like in this one he's like, it's more incorporating everyone, you know what I mean?

Like if I was there, like, I would feel that, like, I'm kinda at a Hope, I don't know, like he's not using a Hawaiian way of talking, like as an example, like he's just talking Hawaiian, you know what I mean? Or it's not using Pidgin and talking locally, so I feel like, um, like I'm more part of it, you know what I mean? It's not...

A: How so?

N: Like you know the first one it's kinda like an example? Like he's kinda like talking normal, and then he kinda does this like example, you know? In this one, it's just like, this one is kinda flowing more. It's not like an aside. You know what I mean? So like, as someone who's not from here, like I kinda just feel like I'm picking stuff up, you know what I mean, like, he's like, like I feel more incorporated into, like, like it makes you feel more local, you know what I mean, like I'm at a local Hawaiian church or something, you know?

Lave and Wenger's (1991) notion of *situated learning* helps to illumine the inclusive nature of Pidgin in sermons from a non-Local/non-Pidgin speaking perspective. Lave and Wenger (1991) distinguish between full participation which, for the purpose of this illustration, can be likened to the participation of Locals/Pidgin-speaking members in this church, and peripheral participation, which can be likened to non-Locals'/non-Pidgin speakers' participation in this church. As Lave and Wenger (1991) write, "In our usage, *peripherality* is also a *positive* term, whose most salient conceptual antonyms are *unrelatedness* or *irrelevance* to ongoing activity. The partial participation of newcomers is by no means "disconnected" from the practice of interest...In this sense, peripherality, when it is enabled, suggests an opening, a way of gaining access to sources for understanding through growing involvement" (p. 37). This is characteristic of Neil's response which reveals that he, in fact, feels *related* and *relevant* to the sermon and church in the pastor's use of Pidgin and, through increasing involvement, has greater "access to sources for understanding".

III. Pidgin in Conjunction with Standard English

Pidgin in conjunction with SE refers to the pastor's juxtaposition of both formulaic and non-formulaic Pidgin phrases and references with SE during his sermon. While the majority of the sermon is given in SE, the pastor's *switch* into Pidgin is clearly distinguishable. There are,

however, times when the pastor *shifts* into Hawai‘i English (HE). HE is a dialect of SE and is primarily characterized by marked intonation patterns and pronunciation but follows SE grammar. As such, HE is distinct from HCE or Pidgin which has a grammar separate from SE. These shifts between SE and HE may be subtle or pronounced and often occur as the pastor is transitioning between SE and Pidgin.

Recalling the example of John 1:29-34 mentioned above (section I), Pastor Wade begins his statement in Pidgin, “*how many you folks got family... but you neva see dat family long time?*”, and shifts to HE, “*Kay...I mean on Moloka’i*” before switching into SE, “I have been, literally, I have been at baby luaus...never knew it until that moment.”; subsequently, he shifts to HE, “*“da-da-da is my aunty”*”, and ends the statement in Pidgin, “*“ho, you my cousin den!”*”. Pastor Wade explained in an interview that, at times, it is actually difficult for him to switch into Pidgin after speaking SE for an extended period of time: as he was watching one of his sermons he commented at one point that his pronunciation of Pidgin made him cringe because it sounded *haole*.

Although this shift to HE as the pastor switches between Pidgin and SE is, nonetheless, interesting, such a discussion exceeds the scope of this paper. While I do not neglect this distinction between SE, HE, and Pidgin in the sermons, I choose to focus specifically on the pastor’s switch between Pidgin and SE. Consider the following example from Pastor Wade’s sermon on Genesis 22 where his switch into Pidgin is more distinct:

[Reading from the Bible] “And Isaac spoke to Abraham his father and said, [exaggerated pronunciation] “*my father*””. [slight laugh], “*father*”. You know my dad’s here with us, and it’s just, you know, I love my dad, but, you know, he’s pops to me. Pops...[audience laughs]. And I love the answer; what does he say? [exaggerated pronunciation], “*here I am, my son*”. [audience laughs]. Here’s the second, “I am”: In the beginning God says, “Abraham”, and he says, “here I am”; now his son says, “Abraham”, and he says, “here I am”, but watch this as we go on: ““Here I am my son”, and he said, “Behold, the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for the burnt offering?””. [Pidgin] *Braddah’s pretty smat, ah?* Translation: *eh, pops, how come we got dis an dat, but we no get da da kine?* [audience laughs]. *We need da main ting, ah? Sacrifice, sacrifice da main ting—we got da fire, we got da wood, but wat about, you know, da lamb? You getting’ kinda old, hundred something years old, ah, dad?*[audience laughs]. *Happens sometimes, remember last week you forgot your pants, yah? So wat now?*

[audience laughs]. *You forgot da lamb? Wat?* That's what he's doing...he's like, "dad, um, are we missing something here? Of course, they put it a whole lot more poetic...I want you to jot something down. What is he saying? He's saying, we have all the stuff but not the main sustenance. We have all the stuff for worship, but we don't have the main thing. You know, sadly, that might be some here tonight; sadly, that might be a lot of churches.

In this example, there is a clear and distinct switch from SE, "'Here I am my son...the burnt offering?'"', and Pidgin, "*Braddah's pretty smat, ah?*". It is important to note that the pastor's use of Pidgin in the example above is neither meant to denigrate nor does it, in fact, denigrate Pidgin or Pidgin speakers. On the contrary, the pastor elevates the status of Pidgin in this example: in this example, Pastor Wade uses SE in a jocular manner, in effect, *marginalizing* SE through an interjectory Pidgin translation. Furthermore, as the participants report (and is evident in this sermon), the pastor sets up the scene in SE then uses Pidgin for the exegesis of the scripture. Consider Freddy and Terry's response to the pastor's use of Pidgin in this sermon:

A = Andrew

F = Freddy

T = Terry

A: When does he introduce Pidgin? Like at what point does he use it, like he switches into Pidgin, but what's the context in your perception?

T: He's trying to paint a picture where when he's talking about [pause]. [aside] [...]

F: About the sacrifice.

A: About the sacrifice...

T: ...oh yah, he's trying to paint a picture about what he's talking about, kinda like a parable.

A: Yah, like a parable? Yah, that's a good way to put it.

T: Pidgin parable...

A: Anything else on this clip that you see?

F: Uh, like, he reads the Bible verse, an den he analyzes da Bible verse, an den, he throws down the scenario in Pidgin, and it's totally the same context as da Bible said...

T: ...and drives it home...

A: Yah. [slight pause]. He drives it home...?

T: ...with his Pidgin story.

By using Pidgin as the medium for exegesis, I argue that, the pastor is actually elevating the status of Pidgin and thereby engaging in the process of challenging the domain-specific dichotomy-based understanding of Pidgin. However, others may argue that the pastor's use of Pidgin in this instance, for example, is used to make the message more accessible. I concede that that is true. However, as I will demonstrate in the next section on the personal application of Pidgin in sermons, it is *not* the case that the pastor is “dumbing” down the message *nor* is it the case that Pidgin-speaking members of the congregation do not understand the biblical reference *prior* to the juxtaposition of Pidgin in the message. Tanner touches on this point in his response to the pastor's use of Pidgin in another sermon:

A = Andrew

TA = Tanner

A: Has the pastor's use of Pidgin affected your understanding of the message—not, not the use of Pidgin, but the message he's delivering?

TA: The message...Yah, I mean, well, it kinda, the message is about giving up yourself for other people, being a servant, and, I mean, I understood it, but up until the point like where he started speaking Pidgin, like then, like after that, like I could relate it to, like, my life because the Pidgin, kinda takes you, like it takes me back home to, like, my life. And it makes me think about it in a different way than just like seeing it and saying, “oh, like, I need to give up myself”. But then when he goes into Pidgin, it's like, “*oh, that's*”...[audio cuts out]. Yah, yah, so when he started speaking Pidgin, it kinda made me think of home life and just the people that's around in my life that speak Pidgin like my cousin...He's kind of a selfish guy, so I thought about him, and he speaks Pidgin just so it happens, so, I mean, it really made it like a connection of him saying the words.

One approach to interpret the pastor's use of SE and Pidgin in his sermons is through the literature on code-switching. For example, Gumperz (1982) defines code-switching as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (p. 59)—this, obviously, holds true regarding the pastor's

use of Pidgin and SE in sermons. In addition, Gumperz (1982) differentiates between, on the one hand, ‘metaphorical code-switching’, which is used as a conversational strategy to affect certain acts within conversation such as topic-shifts, elaborations, and clarifications; and on the other hand, ‘conversational code-switching’ in which situational factors, such as the addition of another participant to the conversation, affects a code-switch. Furthermore, other scholars (e.g., De Bot & Clyne, 1994; Meisel, 1989) differentiate between code-switching and code-mixing. In the cases where there is a differentiation between code-switching and code-mixing, code-switching, then, is used to refer to a bilingual or multilingual’s ability to switch between languages depending on the needs of the conversational setting. Code-mixing, however, occurs when speakers are unable to differentiate between separate languages and, as a result, combine morphosyntactic structures from multiple languages into a singular speech act (De Bot & Clyne, 1994). In light of this, Pastor Wade’s code-switching can be interpreted (at least in the examples provided thus far) as a metaphorical code-switching with certain instances more indicative of code-mixing, especially when there is a shift to HE in switching from SE to Pidgin or vice versa.

However, the pastor’s use of Pidgin and switch between Pidgin and SE functions within a larger Discourse and is a social construction situated within a social interaction. As Gee (2008) writes, “Discourses are not units or tight boxes with neat boundaries. Rather they are *ways of recognizing and getting recognized* as certain sorts of *whos* doing certain sorts of *whats*... Discourses are matters of enactment and recognition, then” (p. 156). Furthermore, the pastor’s juxtaposition of SE and Pidgin texts can be interpreted more accurately through the notion of intertextuality. Bloome and Egan-Robertson (1993) move beyond the intertextuality as a simple juxtaposition of texts and locate it within social interaction: “We view intertextuality as a social construction, located in the social interactions that people have with each other...juxtaposing texts, at whatever level...is not in itself sufficient to establish intertextuality. A juxtaposition must be proposed, be interactionally recognized, be acknowledged, and have social significance” (p. 308). Intertextuality can be viewed as a lens to interpret the pastor’s use of SE and Pidgin for three reasons: first, the pastor’s sermon *is* a social interaction; second, sermons are a type of text in and of themselves and are grounded in a text (the Bible); and third, in his use of Pidgin and SE, the pastor juxtaposes multiple layers of text through *textualizing* experience (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993, p. 311) and, ultimately, engaging in *intertextual processes*. Intertextual processes refer to how intertextual meanings are established, which, in itself does not

“[constitute] the cultural ideology. Part of the *in situ* cultural ideology is formed by how texts are juxtaposed: by register used in signaling an intertextual relationship, by where in a sequence of turns-at-talk the intertextual relationship is inserted, by how the intertextual relationship’s coherence with the topic being discussed and genre of ongoing conversation is established” (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993, p. 312).

Therefore, the pastor’s use of Pidgin in conjunction with SE can be interpreted as a form of intertextuality in which the pastor and congregation engage in joint intertextual processes. Moreover, given that the use of Pidgin and SE is situated within a greater Discourse, the emphasis shifts to “*ways of recognizing and getting recognized*” which relies on enactment and recognition (Gee, 2008, p. 156). Pastor Wade elaborates on this point in an interview commenting on his use of Pidgin in a separate sermon on John 1:35-51 (see Appendix II):

A = Andrew

W = Wade

W: Obviously, that was a specific direct connect, like I’ve talked about—direct connect application. It’s like, when I’m going to try to talk about something where the, “rubber meets the road” is the phrase is used, is the idiom, when I need “rubber meets the road”, I’ll always go Pidgin. You know why...?

A: Why is that?

W: ...So I can get a “spoon full of sugar helps the medicine go down”.

A: Yah, I see, I see.

W: And so it brings levity to a hard subject. If I would have said, “You know those people they sit there and they say, “Man, how come you were talking about me; that’s rude. You shouldn’t have done that””, the room will sit there and, maybe, agree with my point, but maybe even feel convicted or da-da-da-da, but yah, I’ve heard about that, but when I say, [Pidgin] “*Brah! How cam yous talking li’dat about me?*”, you know, it brings the person to say, “yah, das how we are; das how we are!” And that’s what I love because when growing up as a kid, that’s a phrase I used to hear all the time. People would go, “*eh, das how he is, ah? Das how he is, Bertrum*” or “*he li’dat, ah?*” You know? And so, we, we like that; we identify with that, and so if you can, if you can give yourselves laughing at yourselves you’re always going to receive more. Because if the room gets too heavy, your guard starts to go up.

Um, you know, someone starts to talk about rape, you know, dis and dat, you know, “oh I was, I was molested as a child” and so then every, everyone’s like, “*ho bah...das heavy...*”...

A: Yah, yah...

W: ...and so, but there’s times when I need to talk like, “hey, I know some bad stuffs went down...”, you know, and that still doesn’t give you—and this is last night I’m talking about—so that doesn’t give you the right to just turn around and say, “*what?! ‘Cause dey did dis to me, I can do dis to da people.*” An den that can get you to [...] it’s a way to take a little *psssshhh* off the pressure cooker, and so I will do that because that direct connect helps us laugh and learn and identify and apply—all at the same time—laugh and learn, identify and apply. I get all that in one point.

In this response, Pastor Wade comments that the juxtaposition of Pidgin and SE or, rather, the use of Pidgin in conjunction with SE is used to make a “direct connect” with his audience. In expanding on this idea of Pidgin as direct connect, Pastor Wade draws on Local epistemology by referencing the drive for Locals to establish how we relate to one another (Lum, 2008) and remarks that his use of Pidgin also helps to relieve the pressure of the message by making it more personal. This is precisely what Gee (2008) refers to in characterizing Discourse as “*ways of recognizing and getting recognized*” (p. 156). Pastor Wade sums up his use of Pidgin in conjunction with English: “that direct connect helps us laugh and learn and identify and apply—all at the same time—laugh and learn, identify and apply. I get all that in one point”.

DISCUSSION:

PERSONAL APPLICATION AND TRANSFORMATION

In sum, Pastor Wade’s use of Pidgin: (a) references Local epistemology, (b) creates an overall inclusive atmosphere, and (c) functions in conjunction with SE. This use of Pidgin in sermons relies on a process of “enacting” Pidgin and having that enactment of Pidgin be “recognized” by the congregation (Gee, 2008). It follows, logically, that the congregation’s recognition of the pastor’s use of Pidgin results in personal application and, subsequently reflection and transformation. In this section I will deal with the ways in which the participants

personally applied the pastor's use of Pidgin in his sermons, and their ensuing reflexive and transformative experiences.

According to Gee (2008), “Discourses allow ample room for individual style and human agency... This is so because of the way they work: if you pull off a performance and it gets ‘recognized’ as meaningful and appropriate in the Discourse, then it ‘counts’”(p. 195). In this sense, Pastor Wade ‘attempts’ a performance which is comprised of several components including: references to Local epistemology, proficiency or fluency in Pidgin, and the accompaniment of Pidgin pragmatics. This performance is, in fact, recognized, and as a result, it “counts”—that is, Pidgin and non-Pidgin speakers are able to apply the message to their lives on a personal level. Consider the following participants’ responses:

Example 1: Interview with Sandy (S):

S: Um, as far as good Pidgin, you can tell like he probably grew up here. I don't know, I don't know [Wade's] history, but I know that he probably grew up here. Um, it sounded like, um, I think his use of it is really effective because he understands his audience and the people that he wants to reach, and I feel like that he believes like that's, um, God's call for him, to be able to preach the gospel and not like water down the gospel so that people will like be, “oh, okay, you know, that sounds nice and fancy, and I'll believe that for myself”, but rather, like, this is, this is what it means; like, you know, ‘cause there's a different kind of English spoken in the Bible, so it's a little hard for people to fully understand the Pidgin here and the English and whatever, and so I think it's really effective, his use of it and just the way he takes scripture, like, basically this is what it means in Pidgin, you know, and it, like for me, I appreciate it because I grew up, like, speaking Pidgin, speaking proper English so for me, when I hear Pidgin, it makes me feel like I'm more at home, you know? Like, “oh, that's what it means, okay”, so I think that's heavy.

In her response, Sandy recognizes Pastor Wade's legitimacy as a Pidgin speaker and his attempt to present a relevant message to his congregation: “I think his use of it is really effective because he understands his audience and the people that he wants to reach”. Furthermore, we can conclude that the pastor's use of Pidgin “counts” given Sandy's final evaluation: “I appreciate it

because I grew up, like, speaking Pidgin, speaking proper English so for me, when I hear Pidgin, it makes me feel like I'm more at home".

This connection between the pastor's use of Pidgin and the home was suggested in a focus group with Neil, Tanner, Travis, and Uncle Greg in their responses to the pastor's use of Pidgin in John 1:14. As they discuss Pastor Wade's reference to the *local fadda*, Uncle Greg reenacts the reference to the *local fadda* and positions himself within the role as he says, "I like da pat wen he, "get ova hea! Wat you did?!"". The way Uncle Greg relates to this message through reenactment points to the personal application for him, and it is confirmed by Travis's (Uncle Greg's son) response: Travis responds, "Sounds like you"; Uncle Greg reaffirms his position as *that local fadda* in responding again, ""Yah...""Get ova hea, wat did you do?"". Moreover, as another indication of the inclusive and accessible nature of the pastor's use of Pidgin (section II), Neil comments that Travis's response is normative and is intentionally provoked by the pastor in this particular reference. Finally, Tanner extends the application beyond his father to the way in which his grandmother would discipline him. Interestingly, this is triggered by his switch into Pidgin as he remarks, "Drive it home. *Da personal connection*". Tanner's switch into Pidgin is additional evidence of the degree to which the pastor's use of Pidgin evokes personal application for congregation members.

Example 2: Interview with Uncle Greg, Travis, Tanner, and Neil:

A = Andrew

G = Greg

TR = Travis

TA = Tanner

N = Neil

TA: This one was a little bit more serious.

A: ...yah [...]....

TR: Yah, it gave it a lighter touch.

A: ...but you notice that people stopped laughing after awhile—they started laughing, but it trickled off.

TR: Yah...al, also, yah, he was using it for comic relief, but that one was a heavy message, and...

G: Yah.

N: But I think in the earlier ones you're right, like comic relief and...

G: I like da pat wen he, "*get ova hea! Wat you did?!?*"

A: [laugh].

TA: Yah.

TR: Sounds like you!

G: Yah... "*Get ova hea, wat did you do?*"

TA: Yep.

N: I bet a lot of people think that too when they hear that, like that reminds them of their parents...

TR: Yah.

N: ...which is probably what he wants to do.

A: Yah, yah.

TA: Drive it home. *Da personal connection.*

TR: Yah, that was good.

TA: ...*wen your grama grabs you by da neck...*[everyone laughs] [asides].

We can return to Gee’s description of Discourse to interpret the way the participants’ personally apply the pastor’s use of Pidgin in sermons: “Discourses are constituted by specific actions (performances) carried out by specific individuals, performances which are an amalgam of words, values, thoughts, attitudes, gestures, props” (Gee, 2008, p. 196). As we see in this example, the “amalgam of words, values, thoughts, attitudes, gestures, props” in the Discourse of this church are synonymous to Local epistemology: the pastor draws on these items; they are recognized by the congregation as “meaningful and appropriate”, and it, therefore, “counts”—the congregation is able to personally apply the pastor’s use of Pidgin in the sermons to their lives. It is important to remember, however, that it is not simply the pastor’s use of Pidgin but the way in which he *appropriates* it (and SE) in his sermons. This appropriation in collaboration, then, with his overall enactment, which draws on Local epistemology, gives meaning to his performance. According to Wenger (1998), “*Practice is about meaning as an experience of everyday life...Our engagement in practice may have patterns, but it is the production of such patterns anew that gives rise to an experience of meaning...The negotiation of meaning may involve language, but it is not limited to it*” (pp. 52-53). In sum, Pastor Wade “gets it right”, and, as a consequence, *Da personal connection* (Tanner) is made, which results in reflexivity and individual transformation.

Perhaps one of the most valuable aspects of this project was the self-reported reflexivity and transformativity which all of the participants experienced through the pastor’s use of Pidgin in sermons and engagement in this project. As the participants increasingly engaged with the project, they began to reflect on their identities as Pidgin (or non-Pidgin speakers) and the ways in which these identities interacted with other their other identities (e.g., as English speaker, student, Filipino vs. Puerto Rican, Hawaiian vs. Caucasian, etc.). And as the participants dialogued and critically reflected about their hybrid identities (Bhabha, 1994) in relation to the world around them, they began to experience personal transformations: the participants critically reflect on their subjectivities as Pidgin speakers vis-à-vis SE as the dominant discourse in sermons⁸. Members acknowledge the importance of the dominant discourse and actively socialize with it through continued participation in church as *congregation members*—that is, the

⁸ SE serves as the dominant discourse *insofar* as the majority of the pastor’s sermons are in SE. As I have already demonstrated, Pidgin does not occupy a subordinate position in this context (see section III).

fact that these individuals choose to participate as congregation members implies, consequently, their acknowledgement of the importance of SE as the dominant discourse in this church's sermons. In short, it is through this process that the participants experienced individual transformations in the way of greater meta-linguistic and self/identity awareness. In the following three examples of transformation, Travis and Pastor Wade experienced greater meta-linguistic awareness while Sandy experienced greater self/identity awareness.

To begin, consider Pastor Wade's use of two Pidgin phrases, *nat* and *I like see*, in reference to the apostle Thomas in his sermon on 2 Peter 1:16-21:

Verse three notice, he repeats, "What we have seen and heard we proclaim to you also, that you also might have fellowship with us; and indeed our fellowship is with the father, and with his son Jesus Christ". You think John was trying to make a point there? What we've seen, what we've heard, what we handled, we make known to you. He was clearly coming out and saying, "these events happened." What is my point? The phrase, "nah-uh" is nothing new. There were people in the days of John and Peter and the disciples saying, "nah-uh", or Hawaiian, [Pidgin] "*nat*": "Brah, Jesus came alive"; "*naaf*". In a sense, isn't that what Thomas did? "We saw him; he came alive; he was walking with us" and da-da-da-da... "*naaf*". What was Thomas really saying? He was saying, "I don't want to believe it just because you guys think you believe it. I need to know." And I thank God for Thomas who said, "Unless I touch his hands and see the very scars where he was pierced for me, unless I do that, I'm not going to know that I know for sure", and so, to me, when I look back at the authority of the Bible, not only do I have all these wonderful eyewitness accounts, but I got an apologist by the name of Thomas who said, [Pidgin] "*I like see*". "*I like see for myself*". And so, the Lord puts Thomas in the scriptures, and, unfortunately, we call him "doubting Thomas" when I think he should be called "the student Thomas", "the apologist Thomas". You see, the point is this: it's good, it's okay, hear me church, it's good, it's okay to be a skeptic. What's not good, what, in fact, is bad, is to be a stubborn fool. You see, a skeptic will ask questions—is this true? Is this relevant? But a stubborn fool says, "don't confuse me with the evidence".

Responding to the pastor's use of Pidgin in this sermon, Travis reflects on the way in which Pidgin speakers use the two phrases, *nat* and *I like see*, compared with their SE definitions. Neil

joins the discussion pointing out that he is unfamiliar with the Pidgin definitions of the two phrases and the ways in which Pidgin speakers use them, and he compares *nat* and *I like see* with the SE equivalents that are familiar to him. As Travis reflects on these and other Pidgin phrases through comparative analysis with SE, he experiences transformation in gaining greater meta-linguistic awareness of Pidgin and SE forms:

A = Andrew

TR = Travis

N = Neil

TR: Is that, is that really only a Hawai‘i thing when we say, “*nat*”?

N: Yah.

TR: Is that a Pidgin thing?

N: Sorry...

A: No, no [Neil] is it...?

N: ...I’ve never heard that, like I’ve never used that...

A: *Nat* [laugh].

TR: [laugh]. *Nat*.

N: *Nat*. Like, “no way”, like I would say, “no way dude”, you know what I mean?

TR: I just thought that was a normal English thing to say...? [laugh]

A: [To Neil] Have you ever heard or said, “*I like see*”?

N: Nope. [laugh].

TR: I thought that was another thing that everybody said [laugh]...

A: Seriously..?

TR: ...yah, *I like see*.

N: Like, it’s like you’re saying that...

A: ...that a standard speaker on the mainland would say...? *I like see*?

TR: I thought someone might say that [laugh]...I, I assumed, that, that’s a phrase, now that I think about it, that I assumed a lot of people would say! [laugh].

N: Like, it’s like you’re saying it, the word’s like more vague, like, “I like see”, like I wouldn’t say that, I’d be like, “yah, I want to see that”.

TR: Yah.

N: Or like, “hey, let me check that out”, you know what I mean?

TR: Like, “what do you have there?”, “I like see”...

N: Yah, like “what is that?”, and you’re [...] like...

TR: It’s just that, it’s just that it’s really normal to me, so I am, uh, yah. And another one is “I like try”.

N: Yah [slight laugh].

A: Yah, that’s like a doubly Pidgin one ‘cause the “try”.

TR: [laugh].

A: [To Travis] What about “get”? Do you think that’s Pidgin, or do you think that’s...?

TR: Oh, like, “*oh, wat, get waves today?*”

A: Yah, is that something most people would say?

TR: No, no, not...

A: That one is Pidgin...?

TR: ...that one really, yah, that one like stands out. I wouldn’t expect anybody to say that from the mainland.

Similarly, Pastor Wade expresses meta-linguistic transformation as he reflects on his use of Pidgin in sermons. In his response, Pastor Wade comes to the realization that in his attempt to be relevant to his audience through speaking Pidgin—“it’s something that I do so intentional”—his use of it in sermons has become “unintentional”—it just happens.

A = Andrew

W = Wade

W: It, it’s something that I do so intentional that it’s no longer intentional; it’s unintentional because it’s intentional. [...] Um, I know it’s the key to relate, um, so I, it’s kinda, it’s interesting for me when you guys ask me these questions because I don’t plan on it; I don’t go, “now here’s the point when I’m going to win them over with this” you know? No. It, it’s not there, but I know enough in just the conversation, in one conversation with somebody, you make that one comment, that one *crack*...like this morning I paddled out, you know, so I paddled out, I got in the water, you got *da kanaks* all looking, you know, Jason paddles up, you know, what’d he say? Um, “*how you doing today*”. Jason, “*how you doing today*”, you

know? All da guys go [Wade cocks his head upward while squinting indexing an angry Local expression]. So I was like twenty yards back; I paddled ova dea, and I look ova dea and [Wade cocks his head upward while raising his eyebrows indexing a Local expression of acknowledgement]

A: [laugh] Just with the eyebrows...yah, yah.

W: ...an, an den everybody's...after we did that first, I go "*howzit*", you know... and he's all "*hey braddah*".

As further indication of his increased meta-linguistic awareness, Pastor Wade admits that he has really not previously thought about his use of Pidgin in his sermons. In addition, after briefly reflecting on his use of Pidgin, he makes a connection to an experience that he had while surfing with a friend: he reflects on the importance of getting his point across in sermons or making that "one *crack*" and relates it to an experience while surfing where he was able to establish solidarity with other surfers in the area through the simple Local gesture of cocking his head upward in a form of acknowledgement thereby making that all important "*crack*". As Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo (1999) write, "Discourse practices are the nexus of the formation, transformation, and use of cultural knowledge and indigenous epistemology, and for speakers' positioning of themselves vis-à-vis cultural identity. Discourse is action with social and cultural consequences" (p. 104).

While Travis and Pastor Wade experienced transformation on the level of greater meta-linguistic awareness, Sandy's transformative experience involved greater self-awareness. As we have already seen above, Sandy comments that the pastor's use of Pidgin makes her feel more at home; however, as evidence of transformation in the form of greater self/identity awareness, she adds that hearing Pidgin in sermons helps to reconcile her multiple identities as university student, Filipino, Puerto Rican, SE speaker, Pidgin speaker, and Local. Sandy admits that as she was growing up it was difficult for her to balance her ethnic identities, so it was generally "safer" for her to identify as Local which she defines as speaking SE and Pidgin whenever most applicable. And, as Sandy points out, this is also characteristic of Pastor Wade's use of Pidgin and SE.

A = Andrew

S = Sandy

A: It makes you feel more at home?

S: Yah, yah...yah, like it identifies a lot with who I am, and that's something that's something I've noticed [...] more a lot in college, just like not being so ashamed of, um, my ethnic identity, what I've decided to identify myself as, like growing up, I didn't fully think I was Filipino—or care to be identified as Filipino or Puerto Rican—and so I think the safe route was to identify myself more as a local person and...

A: Mhmm...local person is a safe route?

S: ...yah, yah, and what that meant was speaking English, speaking Pidgin like whenever it was applicable that's what I did. You know, like some people come out of it eventually, um, but yah, yah, so now when I hear it at church because I go there, it's just, like there's a warmth that I feel, and it's like, "oh, it's right at home". As far as the message, it's pretty powerful.

In short, Sandy experiences transformation on the level of self-awareness through reflecting on her multiple identities which are reconciled through Pastor Wade's use of Pidgin in his sermons. As Wenger (1998) writes, "More generally, each participant in a community of practice finds a unique place and gains a unique identity, which is both further integrated and both further defined in the course of engagement in practice" (pp. 75-76). In Travis's, Sandy's, and Pastor Wade's responses we see that their engagement with Pidgin use in sermons affirms their individual identities and leads to personal transformations.

Moreover, Davis (2005, 2009) has reported on the individual and collective transformations which students at secondary and tertiary levels experienced as they assumed agency in their education. According to Davis, agency is a "student-oriented emancipatory discourse approach [that] places youth at the forefront of critical analyses of power relations endemic to media and academic texts while recognizing that [students] will be unable to enter the mainstream society without learning to express themselves in Standard English" (Davis, 2009, p. 2). Similarly, Skarin (2011) reports on the effects of agency in her work with young Latina women through her program, *Youthworks*. *Youthworks* is an alternative media-centered program incorporating technology, critical literacy, research skills, and media literacy into its curriculum and is designed for redesignated Fully English Proficient students who struggle in content-area classes (pp. 9-11). Through participation in *Youthworks*' alternative agency-centered curriculum, students were able to thrive academically, socially, and emotionally. In addition, Kim and Caet

(2011) explore the relationship between agency and academic success in a narrative inquiry which tracked the educational trajectory of an Indonesian student from his education in East Timor through the completion on a university degree. In short, agency was central to this student's ability to progress through his university education. Therefore, we can summarize agency as follows: on the one hand, agency places students at the center of their learning and provides an academic forum for them to draw on their linguistic and cultural resources in researching and presenting critical issues relevant to them. On the other hand, agency also recognizes the importance of socializing language minority students into academic discourses. Both of these are critical facets of agency, and, similar to the participants' experiences reflected above, it is through engagement in critical analysis and reflection of existing power relations local to these students' lives *and* socialization into dominant discourses that students experienced transformation.

CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS FOR LANGUAGE POLICY

In conclusion, we see that Pastor Wade's use of Pidgin in sermons is highly complex. From the pastor's perspective, his use of Pidgin in sermons, on a general level, allows him to be relevant and present applicable messages to his Local congregation. More specifically, he uses Pidgin to emphasize certain key points in his message and ground difficult theological points in more accessible Local references. According to Pastor Wade, Pidgin also helps to bring levity to serious or difficult subjects and directly connect points in his sermons to congregation members' daily lives. Moreover, the pastor's perspective on Pidgin coincides with the participants', and they add that the pastor's use of Pidgin in sermons helps to establish connections between the message and the home, in fact, allowing for a more relevant application of the message. In some cases, Pidgin helps to clarify messages while in others it provides comic relief. Participants were able to personally apply the messages in Pidgin to their lives, which led them to reflect on their multiple identities. This was not limited to Pidgin speakers, as the non-Pidgin speaking participants felt equally included in the sermon when the pastor switched between SE and Pidgin and were even able to relate to the pastor's Pidgin references on some level. Moreover, participants agreed that Pidgin helped to induct non-Locals into Local culture; in this sense, Pidgin did not contribute to an inclusive-exclusive atmosphere during the church services.

Interaction between the pastor and congregation entails enactment and recognition. Pastor Wade's use of Pidgin extends beyond the language use itself and draws on Local epistemology. In drawing on Local epistemology, the pastor, in effect, enacts Pidgin; he is perceived as a legitimate Pidgin speaker, and, in getting the "cues" correct, his enactment is recognized by the congregation; thus, his enactment "counts".

Furthermore, the pastor's enactment of Pidgin "counting" helps to construct and reaffirm Local identity: Local identity is constructed as the pastor draws on a *mutually recognized* Local epistemology—what is and what is not accepted as Local—this very act constitutes Local identity anew; Local identity is reaffirmed as individuals continue to participate in this church and engage with the pastor and his sermons through personal application and transformation. Moreover, we see that Pidgin functions *in conjunction with* rather than *in opposition to* SE, where the relationship between these languages is far more "porous" (Lin and Martin, 2006) than previously recognized. My contention throughout this paper has been that the use of Pidgin in sermons in this particular context challenges domain-specific dichotomy-based understandings of Pidgin vis-à-vis SE in society.

Such a move is imperative and has tremendous implications for LPP. As the boundaries between SE and Pidgin (and other languages) become evermore porous, generalized understandings of language use across social contexts will not suffice; rather, language must be understood in contextual ways. This understanding of how language-in-use differs across social contexts is, ultimately, needed to better inform LPP. Once again, "The challenge is to move away from this dichotomy between linguistic imperialism and language rights and to try to understand in more mobile, fluid, and contextual ways how language resources are mobilized for different ends" (Pennycook, 2006, p. 69).

As this study has shown, a comprehensive understanding of language-in-use at this church reveals the benefits of incorporating Pidgin into an educational context: *members within this CoP benefit from Pastor Wade's use of Pidgin*. Furthermore, in light of the participants' personal applications of the pastor's messages through his use of Pidgin in his sermons and the transformations they experienced as a result, we can more specifically conclude that the use of Pidgin in educational contexts creates a *familial* and *inclusive* environment and, as such, is in fact *beneficial* for learning in general and even for learning SE in particular. As McGroarty and Calderon (2005) write, "YES, there are reasons to allow, even promote, use of the native

language during cooperative interaction, depending on tasks to be done; and NO, use of native language, where it is appropriate to the task and serves as a link to curricular mastery, will not impede second language mastery” (p. 186). It should come as no surprise that the use of Pidgin in educational contexts *can* facilitate learning: scholars have proved the benefits of incorporating the vernacular language into classroom instruction (e.g., Rickford, 1999, 2005; Siegel, 1997, 1999), or as Rickford (2005) puts it, “Using the vernacular to teach the standard”. Moreover, in addition to incorporating the vernacular language into classroom instruction in the standard language, students’ abilities to draw on heritage languages and cultures in their education has also proved to be a critical factor in determining the educational success of students whose first language is other than English. Nieto (2002) explains that in her research, by and large, students were most successful when they were allowed to maintain their heritage languages and cultures: “I found that maintaining language and culture were essential in supporting and sustaining academic achievement. In a series of in-depth interviews with linguistically and culturally diverse students, one of the salient features that accounted for school success was a strong-willed determination to hold onto their culture and native language” (p. 143). As we have already seen, Davis’s work (2005, 2009) also highlights the role that heritage language and culture plays in students’ academic success at multiple levels of education: Hawai‘i based *Studies of Heritage and Academic Languages and Literacies (SHALL)* community-school-university partnership program at Farrington High School, Community College Generation 1.5 Project, and narrative research among graduate students at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.

In the *SHALL* program, for example, Samoan and Ilokano students “reflected on their hybrid heritage, local, and school identities and developed metalinguistic skills through analyses of interviews conducted in their heritage languages. They further gained awareness of locally situated multimodality (e.g. oratory, gestural dance, storytelling, talk story) and transformed these into school sanctioned performances (e.g speeches, plays, and debates)” (Davis, 2009, p. 6). Students were given a forum to incorporate their heritage languages and cultures into their learning while, simultaneously, being socialized into academic discourses. As a result, not only did the program grow in size, but it also resulted in higher college enrollment among students participating in the program.

Similarly, the Community College Generation 1.5 (G1.5) Project addressed the needs of immigrants enrolled in a particular community college on Oahu whose education had been split

between home and host countries. Educators reported that common among these G1.5 students were high drop-out rates, poor academic performance, apathy, and resistance (Davis, 2009, p. 10). In an attempt to moderate the struggles of these students, the notion of agency was applied to their curriculum: “Course research projects focused on developing cultural, textual, and academic discourse awareness...Students investigated social context in terms of social relationships, geographic place, and unspoken or implicit rules about how to talk in particular social contexts” (Davis, 2009, p. 10). The effect of incorporating students’ heritage languages and culture into their education in the G1.5 project had similar results to the *SHALL* program: “These critical language awareness and research approaches helped students self-identify language strengths and needs by examining language learning experiences and possible academic and career goals” (Davis, 2009, p. 11).

My intention has been to provide insight into Pidgin-in-use in a socio-educational context where, for all intents and purposes, the pastor is the teacher, the congregation members are students, and the students benefit from the teacher’s use of Pidgin. Therefore, I reiterate the need to understand language-in-use across various social contexts and for this newly gained understanding to then work to inform and reform Language Policy and Planning. Simply put, we do not understand enough about the use and appropriation of Pidgin in society such that challenges dichotomy-based domain-specific understandings of language use. Future research on Pidgin should continue to seek to reconcile Pidgin and educational policies and practices in Hawai‘i.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is the product of the graduate program in Department of Second Language Studies at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. To begin, I’d like to express my warmest gratitude to Pastor Wade, the other participants in this project, and the congregation of *Aloha Ministries*, without whom, this project would have been impossible. I am also sincerely thankful for the encouragement and advice from Kathryn Davis who largely advised the work on this project. In addition, I would like also like to extend my gratitude to Christina Higgins, Kent Sakoda, Richard Schmidt, and the other graduate students in the Department of Second Language Studies for the individual and invaluable roles they each played in the development of this project.

REFERENCES

- Alim, H. S. (2004). *You know my steez: An ethnographic and sociolinguistic study of styleshifting in a Black American speech community*. Durham, NC: Duke University.
- Alim, H.S. (2009a). Introduction. In Alim, H. S., A Ibrahim, & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Global linguistic flows: Hip hop cultures, youth identities, and the politics of language*. New York: Routledge.
- Alim, H.S. (2009b). Translocal style communities: Hip hop as cultural theorists of style, language, and globalization. *International Pragmatics Association*, 19, 103-127.
- Atkinson, P., & Coffey, A. (2003) Revisiting the relationship between participant observation and interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holsteing (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 801-814). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bloome, D., & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28, 305-333.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). Ethnographic methods in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Charmaz, K. (2002). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chong, K. (1998). What it means to be Christian: The role of religion in the construction of ethnic identity and boundary among second generation Korean Americans. *Sociology of Religion*, 59, 259-286.
- Davis, G. (1987). *I got the word in me and I can sing it, you know*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Davis, K. (1994). *Language planning in multilingual contexts: Policies, communities, and schools in Luxembourg*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Davis, K., Cho, H., Ishida, M., Soria, J., & Bazzi, S. (2005). “It’s our *kuleana*”: A critical participatory approach to language minority education. In L. Pease-Alvarez & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Learning, teaching, and community* (pp. 3-25). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Davis, K. (2009). Agentive youth research: Towards individual, collective, and policy transformations. In T. G. Wiley, J. S. Lee, & R. Rumberger (Eds.), *The education of language minority immigrants in the USA*. London: Multilingual Matters.
- Davis, K. (Forthcoming). Ethnographic approaches to second language acquisition. In A. Snyder Ohta (Ed.), *Social interaction and complexity theory approaches to SLA division*. In C. Chapelle (General Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Day, R. (1987). Early pidginization in Hawaii. In G. Gilbert (Ed.), *Pidgin and creole languages: Essays in memory of John E. Reinecke* (pp. 163-175). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i.
- De Bot, K., & Clyne, M. (1994). A 16-year longitudinal study of language attrition in Dutch immigrants in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 15, 17-28.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen, S., & Wong, L. (2000). For whom? Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 107–131). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Gee, J. (2008). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourse* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). Deciding to do a qualitative study. *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Higgins, C. (2009). *English as a local language: Post-colonial identities and multilingual practices*. New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Hinson, G. (2000). *Fire in my bones: Transcendence and the Holy Spirit in African American gospel*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2004). The active interview. In Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice* (pp. 140-161). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Honolulu Advertiser Staff. (2008). Hawaii private schools raising tuition fees. *Honolulu Advertiser*.

- Kim, Y. S., & Caet, A. (2011). From East Timor to transnational dialogic interaction: Agus' language and literacy journey. In Davis, K. (Ed.), *Critical qualitative research in second language studies: Agency and advocacy*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Kouega, J. (2008). Language, religion, and cosmopolitanism: Language use in the Catholic Church in Yaounde, Cameroon. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(2), 140-153.
- Lam, W. S. E. (2004). Border discourses and identities in transnational youth culture. In J. Mahiri (Ed.), *What they don't learn in school: Literacy in the lives of urban youth*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Lin, A., & Martin, P. (2005). From a critical deconstruction paradigm to a critical construction paradigm. In A. Lin & P. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lum, D. (2008). What school you went? Local culture, local identity, and local language: Stories of schooling in Hawai'i. *Educational Perspectives*, 40, 6-16.
- Maaka, M. J. (2004). E kua takoto te manuka tutahi: Decolonization, self-determination, and education. *Educational Perspectives*, 37(1), 3-13.
- McGoarty, M., & Calderon, M. (2005). Cooperative learning for second language learners: Models, applications and challenges (pp. 174-194). In P. Richard-Amato & M. Snow (Eds.), *Academic success for English language learners: Strategies for K-12 mainstream teachers*. New York: Pearson.
- Meisel, J. (1989). Early differentiation of languages in bilingual children. In K. Hyltenstam & L. Obler (Eds.), *Bilingualism across the lifespan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Nieto, S. (2002). We speak many tongues: Language diversity and multicultural education. *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ohama, M. L. F., Gotay, C. C., Pagano, I. S., Boles, L., & Craven, D. D. (2000). Evaluations of Hawaii Creole English and standard English. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 19, 357-377.

- Park, M. (2011). Identity and agency among heritage language learners. In K. Davis (Ed.), *Critical qualitative research in second language studies: Agency and advocacy*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Pawley, A. (1992). Formulaic speech. In W. Bright (Ed.), *Oxford international encyclopedia of linguistics*, 2, 22-25. New York: Oxford University.
- Pennycook, A. (2003). Global Englishes, rip slyme, and performativity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7, 513-553.
- Pennycook, A. (2006). Postmodernism in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Pitts, W. (1989). West African poetics in the black preaching style. *American Speech*, 64, 137-149.
- Rampton, B. (1999). Styling the other: Introduction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4, 421-427.
- Rampton, B. (2008). Observing students sharing language. In M. Pollock (Ed.), *Everyday antiracism: Getting real about race in school*. New York: The New Press.
- Rampton, B. (2010). Language crossing and the problematisation of ethnicity and socialization. *International Pragmatics Association*, 5, 485-513.
- Reinecke, J. (1969). *Language and dialect in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i.
- Ricento, T. (2006). Methodological perspectives in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL*. New York: Palgrave.
- Rickford, J. (1999). *African American vernacular English*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Rickford, J. (2005). Using the vernacular to teach the standard. In J. D. Ramirez, T. G. Wiley, G. deKlerk, E. Lee, & W. E. Wright (Eds.), *Ebonics: The urban education debate* (2nd ed.) (pp. 18-40). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Romaine, S. (1999). Changing attitudes to Hawai'i Creole English: Fo' find one good job, you gotta know how fo' talk like one haole. In J. Rickford & S. Romaine (Eds.), *Creole genesis, attitudes and discourse* (pp. 287-301). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Sakoda, K., & Siegel, J. (2003). *Pidgin grammar: An introduction to the creole language of Hawai'i*. Honolulu, Hawai'i: Bess Press.
- Sato, C. (1985). Linguistic inequality in Hawaii: The post-creole dilemma. In N. Wolfson & J. Manes (Eds.), *Language of inequality* (pp. 255-271). Berlin: Mouton.

- Sato, C. (1989). A nonstandard approach to standard English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 259-282.
- Sato, C. (1991). Sociolinguistic variation and language attitudes in Hawaii. In J. Cheshire (Ed.), *English around the world: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 647-663). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Sato, C., & Watson-Gegeo, K. (1992). Information structure in Hawai'i Creole English. Paper presented at the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.
- Schiffman, H. (2003). Tongue-tied in Singapore: A language policy for Tamil? *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2, 105-126.
- Shin, S. Y. (2010). The functions of code-switching in a Korean sunday school. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7(1), 91-115.
- Siegel, J. (1997). Using a Pidgin language in education: Help or hindrance? *Applied Linguistics*, 18, 86-100.
- Siegel, J. (1999). Stigmatized and standardized varieties in the classroom: Interference or separation? *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 701-728.
- Skarin, R. (2011). Using student-as-researcher models as a mode of resistance and agency: Creative maladjustment in an urban high school. In Davis, K. (Ed.) *Critical qualitative research in second language studies: Agency and advocacy*. Greenwich, CN: Information Age.
- Smitherman, G. (1986). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Tollefson, J. (2006). Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Vaish, V. (2008). Mother tongues, English, and religion in Singapore. *World Englishes*, 27, 450-464.
- Varghese, M., & Johnston, B. (2007). Evangelical Christians and English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 5-31.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. (1994). Language and education in Hawaii: Socio-political and economic Implications of Hawaii Creole English. In M. Morgan (Ed.), *Language and the social construction of identity in creole language situations* (pp. 1-32). Los Angeles: UCLA Center for African American Studies.

- Watson-Gegeo, K., & Watson-Gegeo, D. (1991). The impact of church affiliation on language use in Kwara'ae (Solomon Islands). *Language in Society*, 20, 533-555.
- Watson-Gegeo, K., & Gegeo, D. (1999). Culture, discourse, and indigenous epistemology: Transcending current models in language planning and policy. In T. Huebner & K. Davis (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA* (pp. 99-116). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Language, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Wharry, C. (2003). Amen and hallelujah preaching: Discourse functions in African American sermons. *Language in Society*, 32, 203-225.
- Wong, L. (1999a). Authenticity and the revitalization of Hawaiian. In R. Henze & K. A. Davis (Eds.), *Authenticity and identity: Lessons from indigenous language education. Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 30(1), 94-115.
- Wong, L. (1999b). Language varieties and language policy: The Appreciation of Pidgin. In T. Huebner & K. Davis (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA* (pp. 205-222). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Appendix I

Aloha Ministries Video Clip Transcript: John 1:6-14 From 36:27min (W=Wade (pastor))

Italicized font: Change in intonation/marked pronunciation

1. W: And yet, for us, it's like, [nerdy, stuck-up voice] "*well I don't really want to wear a Christian T-shirt or something like that, 'cause I don't want to be, you know, oppose my faith on people, I mean, oppose. You know at church, you know, [raises his hands] I mean, I don't want to get overzealous here*". [audience laughs].
Remember that season when our football team was winless. I mean lossless, lose [audience laughs], without loss! [slight pause] [Pidgin]. *I tell you, it's hard talking da English language. I try my bess [slight pause] but sometime da besses isn't gud* [audience laughs]. When UH was victorious!, and they had a no loss season. How's that one? Okay [audience laughs].

(37:09min)

Appendix II

Aloha Ministries Video Clip Transcript: John 1:35-51 from 14:48min (W=Wade (pastor))

Italicized font: Change in intonation/marked pronunciation

1. W: [Reading Bible Verse] “And Jesus turned and say them following, and he said to them, what do you seek? And they said to him, Rabbi, which translated means teacher, where are you staying?” Now, I love this that Jesus saw them following. If you want to just put somewhere in your mar, in your Bible, I’m going to talk about it for a bit, but God knows. God knows. Believe it or not, the only sermon you really need to know is, God knows. He knows. And you see it’s important that we recognize that Jesus was not following all of a sudden going, “wait a second, is someone following me?” [audience laugh]. Then you say to me, “well then why did he ask them what did they seek?”—God knows; the question is, do you know? What do you seek? You see, Jesus is the one that begins the dialogue, my point, he’s the one that reaches out with the interaction; it is he who is speaking to you this morning through this individual. It cracks me up how many times folks will come up to me after church [pauses to drink some water] and say, “wow! It was like you were speaking only to me, like there was no one else in the room. You were speaking exactly about me!”. Those are the good ones. I love those ones, and I say, “well, you know, that was the Holy Spirit”. But I have literally had people, hear me church, I have literally had people come up to me angry after church, looking at me like waiting [puff out his chest, flares arms, raises his eyebrows, perks his lips, bounces in his steps—typical of an angry local person] [audience laughs] an den they come up to me and go, [angry, deeper Pidgin] “*Brah! Who told?*” [audience laughs], “who told what?”, “*Brah! No ack li’dat! Who told? Yous talkin’ jus about me in da church—I no like dat kine, brah!*” [audience laughs] “*das why I no go church, you guys gossip li’dat!*” [audience laughs] [pastor makes another aggressive gesture in character then switches out]. I’m like, [waves both of his hands] “brah...”. [switches back into character] “*I not coming back hea, you guys gossip li’dat!*” ...Aye, aye, that was the Holy Spirit. I don’t have illustrations written in my notes, [snobby/dorky voice] “*now talk about about this*”. No. The Holy Spirit speaks things, and as He speaks things, He’s speaking about illustrations, and this brother was so convicted on what was being said because point for

point in my illustrations he was getting all [makes impression: contorts his face, lifts his eyebrows, and puffs out his chest] [audience laughs]. So I want to encourage you today, don't beat me up [slight pause] [audience laughs], "look up, for your redeemer is nigh"...and He is speaking to you and wants you to know that He has a heart for you this morning.

(17:15min)

Appendix III

Interview 9/30/2010 Time: 3:40min Video Clip: John 1:14

Italicized font: Change in intonation/marked pronunciation

A = Andrew

W = Wade (pastor)

1. W: ...yah, but, yah, not just the voice, but, I mean, not just the words, but the voice, you know? [...] and you know so it's like [Falsetto Pidgin] "*e, bu!*?"
2. A: [laugh]
3. W: It's kinda that "e, bu" mentality, and that's the humorous side of Pidgin. There's an anger side of Pidgin, [Guttural Pidgin] "*Eh, boy!*?" an den there's the humor, [Falsetto Pidgin] "*e, bu!*?", you know? And those two are very well known. As soon as you talk that, everybody knows what tone you mean. Everybody. You know? I, I used to do a radio spot in Moloka'i, I did two different guys, get [Guttural Pidgin] *Uncle Kanaka*, you know, "*Dis ish Uncle Kanaka. I like you folks come down to da...*" you know, "*to da Halloween [...] gon' have pleny gud stuffs fo' da keiki*" you know, I would do that and "*oh my dentchas kinda gettin loose, ah?*" you know? And so, I would do Uncle Kanaka an den I'd do *bu*; he called him "braddah" and it's like, [Falsetto Pidgin] "*e, boy, dis da braddah, ah? I goin down to da Halloween ting—You coming o wat?*", you know? And so, in the dialogue, and so everybody, but as soon as you know that tone, everybody knows the same [...]...
4. A: This is, uh, radio, radio announcements?
5. W: Yah, radio announcements. Eh, I lived on Moloka'i for eight years; nobody there knew it was me.
6. A: Yah?
7. W: They neva knew I did radio spots. I neva told anybody.
8. A: Wow.
9. W: Yah. [Pidgin] "Oh yah, Uncle Kanaka? You know? Eh, who is dat!? Who do dat Uncle Kanaka? Who was dat?" / "Oh, I tink it's da kine [...] so and so", you know.