

**"MISTA, ARE YOU IN A GOOD MOOD?":  
STYLIZATION AND CROSSING AS AN AFFILIATIVE RESOURCE  
FOR BUILDING RAPPORT IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION**

**GAVIN LAMB**

*University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*

**ABSTRACT**

The transgressive use of language by out-group speakers, or *crossing/mocking*, is used in a variety of ways to achieve both affiliative and disaffiliative ends in interaction and has been well documented in youth culture (Chun, 2007; Rampton 1995, 2006). However, how crossing (Rampton 1995) is used as an affiliative resource in managing rapport in the asymmetrical relations between teachers and students has yet to be fully investigated. Reporting on some findings of a 1.5 year ethnography of an English/ language arts classroom at a multilingual and multiethnic public middle school in an urbanized area of Hawai'i, this paper explores one teacher's use of crossing in building rapport. The teacher's stylization of students' voices through *ventriloquizing* (Tannen 2007) is seen to be an affiliative resource in managing rapport (Günther 2008) when strategically embedded in ritual oppositional frames of interaction. By exploring audio-recordings of naturally occurring interaction of how Hawai'i Creole or Pidgin is used transgressively in reported speech by the teacher, an 'out-group' individual, for negotiating rapport in his English classroom in, instances of crossing emerge as artfully performed rapport building strategies providing a rich site for the construction of affiliative identities. Interestingly, these findings point to the important role that crossing plays in rapport management through reported speech, notably by providing a resource for the negotiation and (re)formulation of both students' and the teacher's moral and epistemic stances in interaction. The performance of crossing within positively valued, jocular oppositional classroom rituals demonstrates the capacity for crossing as a contributing factor to the emergence of a shared sense of community in this classroom. The use of crossing in this liminal stances between offense and respect are tactfully navigated by

individuals and provide a crucial resource for building affiliative classroom cultures through the strategic management of rapport in late modern society.

## INTRODUCTION

This study is first and foremost a contribution to expanding research on social interaction in educational contexts (Chun 2009; Duff 2004; Erickson 2004; Nguyen 2007; Rampton 1995; Talmy 2005, 2009), and in particular to developing a richer understanding of the relationship between ideology and frames of interaction (Goffman 1974, Chun 2009) by examining what teachers and students actually do in classrooms through the use of language. Focusing on the ways in which the stylization of others' words is accomplished through reported speech highlights the symbolic hybridization as well as contested appropriation of language as it used in an increasingly diverse and globalized world. Research on stylization has explored (Alim et al, 2009; Pennycook 2007) this hybridization of symbols as they 'flow' across national borders and perceived cultural barriers, and Hawai'i offers a rich site to explore this 'exchange of symbolic cultural forms' (Higgins, 2011).

Research on youth culture has explored a range of stylization practices (Chun, 2007; Rampton 1995, 2006; Talmy, 2005) revealing the creativity of language use in the formation of youth identities and cultures and how specific types of stylization practices, in particular crossing and mocking, are used for affiliative and disaffiliative ends in social interaction. Following up on this research, the current study aims to provide evidence for how transgressive use of language, or crossing/mockng, by the teacher, an out-group speaker of Hawai'i Creole or Pidgin, is used in managing rapport with students. Through the teacher's use of stylization within reported speech, he strategically manages rapport in classroom interaction. The frames within which stylized utterances of crossing and mocking are embedded are seen to be crucial for understanding how instances of stylization are made intelligible by the interactants in the classroom. These frames provide for the possibility of instances of stylization to be either achieved as crossing or mocking as they emerge from the local culture of this particular classroom. Further, various 'contextualization cues' (Gumperz, 1982) in conversation provide for the framing of these stylization practices to achieve affiliative strategies for building rapport.

In particular, the performance of crossing within a recurrent frame of interaction, or what I refer to in this paper as 'positively valued, jocular oppositional classroom rituals,' where the liminal stances between offense and respect are tactfully navigated by individuals, demonstrates the capacity for crossing to be a contributing factor in the emergence of a shared sense of community, and thus as a crucial resource for building affiliative classroom cultures through the strategic management of rapport in late modern society

### **RAPPORT MANAGEMENT THEORY**

Building on research in the field of Intercultural Communication (ICC), Rapport Management Theory (RMT) (Spencer-Oatey 2008) is a theoretical framework envisioned to broaden the scope of previous research in politeness theory (Brown and Levinson 1987). Politeness theory as originally construed is argued to have too narrowly understood Goffman's notion of *face* in their theoretical model for the "maintenance and/or promotion of harmonious interpersonal relations" (Spencer-Oatey 2008, p. 3).

According to RMT, rapport is managed in interaction through three main aspects of face-to-face communication that are constantly in play in conversation: sociality rights and obligations, face sensitivities and interactional goals. These three aspects of rapport management are seen in (1) the ways in which the speaker's/hearer's rights and obligations are taken up by those involved in the conversation, all features constituting how rapport is managed in face-to-face conversation, (2) how engagement is negotiated through 'facework,' or "the actions taken by a person to make whatever he [sic] is doing consistent with face" (Goffman 1967:12), and (3) the shifts in the immediate interactional goals of the interlocutors involved.

Both situating the use of stylization in the interactional moment by maintaining a sensitivity to these three aspects of rapport management throughout the analysis while keeping in focus the reflexively constituted ethnographic contexts of the interactions is the challenge of analyzing stylization practices. However, it is also the reason stylization, particularly when embedded in constructed dialogue, provides a rich site for exploring various interactional and ideological symbolic processes in a diverse, late modern classroom.

In order to get a handle on the complex, and admittedly fuzzy notion of rapport in classroom interaction, this paper will limit itself to the analysis of two interpretive frames used by Mr. Cal,

the teacher and a 'haole' or white person from the mainland U.S., in constructed dialogue that is prevalent in my corpus of audio-recorded classroom interactions: *crossing* (Rampton 1995) into Hawai'i Creole and *mocking* (Hill, 1995, Chun 2009) both achieved through *ventriloquizing* (Tannen 2007). I will argue in this paper that these types of stylization play an essential role in instances Mr. Cal's strategic management of rapport.

### ***Multivocalic Styling***

My approach to Mr. Cal's use of crossing, mocking and ventriloquizing in classroom interaction derives inspiration from Chun's model of *multivocalic styling* (2007: chapter 9, see appendix B), arguing "that styling practices, and multivocalic practices more generally, can be analyzed in terms of three key dimensions: *context*, *authenticity*, and *value*." Context "refers to a particular cultural or linguistic frame to which a styling event is anchored, placing the styler in a particular relationship with the style she uses" and of which there are "two primary types of contexts: the *ideological* and the *interactional*." Authenticity refers to the proximity a styler has to certain style or language variety in which "[s]uch proximity may be understood in terms of whether she is a 'native' or 'non-native' speaker or whether she is a speaker of the variety at all." Finally, value refers to whether the language being stylized is a "high prestige" or "low prestige" variety (p. 271).

These two dimensions of 'multivocality,' authenticity and value, intersect with the two categories of context, ideology and interaction, in a variety of ways and it is under this framework that the spectrum of stylization practices (Bakhtin 1984; Coupland 2001; Hill 1995; Rampton 1995) find a coherent framework of interrelation, a framework in which I locate the two practices of crossing and mocking.

### ***Crossing and mocking***

In discussing the phenomena of crossing Rampton (1995) writes:

The term 'crossing' has gained some currency in sociolinguistics, and I do think that it was a timely addition to the notion of 'code-switching', reminding us that many people alternate between more than just their national standard language(s) and the home vernacular, and that they also use varieties associated with ethnic outgroups, not just in mockery. (p.9)

In this study, I argue that Mr. Cal achieves crossing and not mocking when initiated in specific frames of interaction. In Chun's model described above, crossing is a type of multivocality in which the speaker engages in either the "positive out-group stylization of a prestige style" or the "positive out-group mocking of a low prestige style" (p. 276). What is notable in Chun's model is how the value or prestige of a language constitutes whether it can be understood as either crossing or mocking. While my analysis involves Mr. Cal's use of Pidgin or Hawai'i Creole, a language conventionally understood as a low prestige variety in educational contexts in Hawai'i, I argue that his stylization of Pidgin leans towards crossing rather than mocking in instances of rapport building. This seems to point to the fact that there are one of two possibilities at play: 1) Mr. Cal is not mocking the students when he style-shifts into Pidgin during constructed dialogue even though Pidgin may be considered a low prestige variety in comparison to Mr. Cal's native language of American English, at least in an educational context or 2) in the instances of rapport building I analyze in my data, Pidgin is discursively constructed as a prestige style or at least a style that is positively aligned to by Mr. Cal in the unfolding interaction. It is the latter that I argue Mr. Cal is accomplishing in the following excerpts and it is precisely in these moments that instances of rapport building occur and the former when it fails to be accomplished. This is to say that the degree of ideological prestige a language has in a particular community is never only the "brought along" ideological notions of the language itself but also a discursive construction "brought about" in the unfolding interaction.

### ***Reported Speech and Constructed Dialogue***

There are a variety of terms that are used to refer to the phenomenon of reported speech, among them *reported dialogue* (Günthner, 2001) *quoted direct speech* (Macauley, 1987) and *constructed dialogue* (Tannen 1986, 1989). In addition, the term reported speech can also include instances of hypothetical utterances of speakers, by speakers (see Irvine, 1996; Mayes, 1990). While the category of reported speech subsumes instances of both direct and indirect reported speech in written discourse as well, my focus in this paper solely examines direct reported speech, and in particular its use as a strategy for rapport management in instances of constructed dialogue. Holt (2009) provides an overview of research on various aspects of reported speech from a variety of analytic perspectives such as syntactic and semantic differences between indirect and direct reported speech (Banfield, 1973; Wierzbicka, 1974).

However, as the focus this paper is concerned with the interactional relevance of its use in verbal discourse, the main influence of thinking on this being derived from the work of Mikhail Bakhtin (1984) and Erving Goffman (1967; 1974).

Researchers examining reported speech in verbal discourse, seeing that the authenticity of a reported utterance is often doubtful, have opted for other terms that point to the new purposes that recontextualized reported speech is put to use for rather than being presented simply as a factual report of a prior utterance. As Sterburg (1982) writes, “tearing a piece of discourse from its original habitat and recontextualizing it within a new network of relations cannot but interfere with its effect” (p. 108). Further, it is seen that this interference of recontextualization and its ambiguities are used as a resource by interlocutors for specific purposes in interaction. This in part was the motivation for Tannen’s (2007) use of the term constructed dialogue to refer to this phenomenon in avoiding connotations the term reported speech may convey as simply (re)presenting ‘authentic reports’ of others’ speech. By analyzing actual instances of the use of reported speech in interaction, the current study aims to shed light on the pervasiveness of reported speech in classroom discourse and its critical function in rapport management.

Mr. Cal's achievement of crossing is accomplished during moments of a specific category of constructed dialogue or what Tannen defines as *ventriloquizing*:

Ventriloquizing is a special case of constructed dialogue in that a ventriloquizing speaker animates another’s voice **in the presence of that other**. It is also a kind of frame-shifting insofar as a speaker who utters dialogue in the voice of another is assuming a new and different footing vis-à-vis the participants and the subject of discourse... In other words, through realizations of pitch, amplitude, intonational contours, voice quality, pronoun choice, and other linguistic markers of point of view, speakers verbally position themselves *as* another speaker... (Tannen, 2007, emphasis mine).

In the majority of instances where crossing occurs, Mr. Cal is quoting or engaging in direct reported speech of a student(s) *in their presence*. By stylizing another's speech in their presence, Mr. Cal positions himself 'as another speaker,' highlighting the interactional work that the discourse strategy of ventriloquizing accomplishes; mainly positive alignment with the stylee within a 'play frame' (Goffman 1974). However, when this play frame is not activated by Mr. Cal, for example in institutional activity-frames (e.g. correcting, grading, taking attendance) the

achievement of crossing through ventriloquizing, or what I will refer to as cross-ventriloquizing, may serve quite different interactional and ideological ends (i.e. blatant mocking).

### *Sensitizing Concepts and Ambiguity in Discursive Practices*

In defining his concept of crossing, Rampton (1995) cites Blumer (1969) in writing, "'crossing' is much more of a 'sensitizing concept' than a 'definitive' one, suggesting 'directions along which to look' rather than 'prescriptions of what to see'" (Rampton 1995:8). Through the analysis of interactional and inferencing practices that build rapport, several sensitizing concepts, are drawn upon to explain how interlocutors' interactional exchanges unfold in building rapport. These include Gumperz's *contextualization cues*, the frame-analytic perspective of Goffman's *participation frameworks*, and Bucholtz and Hall's *tactics of intersubjectivity*. These sensitizing concepts help elucidate instances of stylization (Bakhtin 1984; Coupland 2001), and in particular, instances of crossing and mocking.

In a culturally and linguistically diverse classroom, the range of contextualization cues (Gumperz 1982), may not match up precisely between interlocutors and thus be cause for miscommunication between those sharing different linguistic or cultural backgrounds. However, from my own observations, while miscommunication does occur, my main focus in this paper is on how contextualization cues are used to nudge interlocutors interpretations of stylizations by Mr. Cal, the teacher in this data, towards certain frames (Goffman 1974) of understanding, and how this practice of accommodation and convergence towards mutual intelligibility contributes to building rapport between him and his students through the creative use of specific linguistic resources in this particular setting.

Of crucial importance for understanding the pragmatic force of instances of stylization in the following analysis, it is not simply a matter of whether crossing or ventriloquizing occurs in a particular stretch of talk, but rather how the interpretation of a stylized utterance is dependent on the frame in which it occurs. As Chun writes,

...the distance constructed between a stylizing mocker and the stylized target seemed potentially subverted by constructions of such acts as play (Goffman, 1974), and at the same time, such acts frequently invited interpretations as play. The complex relations of interdependence among these strategies present fertile ground for exploration. (p. 301)

It is this 'fertile ground' mentioned by Chun of subverted distance between the styler and the stylee, or rather the crosser and the crossee as discourse strategies for building rapport through constructed dialogue that I explore in following interactions between Mr. Cal and his students.

Finally, with the aim of providing a more systematic understanding of how symbolic resources, and in particular language, are used for constructing identities, Bucholtz and Hall (2004b) have developed a framework for analyzing the relations between agency, culture and power in interaction. This framework, which they refer to as tactics of intersubjectivity, provides a means for investigating how the semiotic processes of 'practice, indexicality, ideology and performance' (Bucholtz and Hall, 2007, p. 370) come to play a role in the construction of social relations through identity work in interaction. Bucholtz and Hall focus on three pairs of tactics: adequation and distinction, authentication and denaturalization, and authorization and illegitimation which highlight, respectively, three essential concepts in understanding identity work: markedness, essentialism and institutional power.

In adopting these sensitizing concepts as analytical tools to point my analysis in 'directions along which to look,' it seems to be the case that it is precisely the ambiguous quality of stylization that lends these discursive practices their power to make meaning in face-to-face interaction. Highlighting this, Chun (2007) notes the driving-force of ambiguity in light of her analyses of stylized mocking by Asian-American students in a public high school in the US:

I offer the idea that ambiguity may simply be the 'nature of the beast', and, perhaps, ambiguities of social meaning were what ultimately drove practices like stylized mocking, which were sense-making practices that attempted to present a particular social order. (p. 303)

This ambiguity in discursive practices of stylization may serve a central role in an utterance's pragmatic force, and it is in these practices of stylization's relationship, then, to context, authenticity and value, that interactional and ideological work get done.

## METHODOLOGY

Following classroom research that has aimed to explicate both the micro processes of everyday interaction between students and teachers, while maintaining an interest in engaging with the broader macro structures of social structures by drawing on relevant social theory



(Mehan 1998, Rampton 2006, Talmy 2005), I have adopted the methodological frameworks of ethnographic discourse analysis and interactional sociolinguistics (Erickson 2004; Gumperz, 1982; Hill 1995) to explore stylization practices (Bakhtin 1984; Chun 2007; Rampton, 1995) and their relation to rapport management (Günther 2008; Spencer-Oatey 2008) in everyday classroom activity. The following analysis focuses on how rapport is managed in the daily interactions taking place in one classroom consisting of both Hawai'i-born and ESL/generation 1.5 students in Valley Middle School located in an urbanized area of Hawai'i.

The three excerpts in my analysis below are drawn from a corpus of over 18 hours of recorded classroom interaction between the teacher and students. Each excerpt is a moment when the teacher and students are engaged in daily classroom interaction and in which occurrences of the phenomena I am concerned with here come into play: ventriloquizing and crossing. The subsections below highlight the different kinds of frames in which utterances in interaction occur and how the management of rapport is accomplished through these different frames. Just as 'small talk' is part of institutional classroom interaction, informal talk seeping into formal talk, non-institutional talk is shown to be equally susceptible to intrusion by institutionally oriented talk: in this case more general institutional tasks in an English subject classroom, such as arbitrating students' language use, is embedded in off-task conversational storytelling during a recess between class periods.

## DATA ANALYSIS

### *Crossing in Positively Valued, Jocular Oppositional Frames*

The following interaction took place during an "in-between" period or break period between class periods that occurs on a daily basis (eight times total in one day) and lasts about ten minutes when both the teacher and students were free to leave the classroom but would often choose to stay in the room to talk and joke in informal conversation. The following sequence is one instance in which we see the positively valued, ritual oppositional stances that often arise in this classroom. Asked by a student about the broken fan in the classroom, Mr. Cal begins a retelling of the event when he arrives just after one of the students had broken the fan. The playfully framed interaction during these 'in-between' periods which were often constituted by co-narratives collaboratively told by students and the teacher are much like what Ochs et al.

(1996) have called an 'opportunity space' during family dinner time: a "temporal, spatial, and social moment that provides the possibility of joint activity for family members" (p.95). Although talk may take a variety of directions during these opportunity spaces, it is during these times that there is a 'potential forum for generation of both knowledge and social order/disorder...through interaction" (p. 96). In this particular instance, the generation of this knowledge and social order is collaboratively built in the co-narration of a 'detective story' (Ochs et. al.) in this case, solving the problem of "what happened to the fan?" It is also during these co-narratives embedded in 'opportunity spaces' that constructed dialogue and in particular ventriloquizing of others voices tills the soil for Mr. Cal's transgressive use of language, or crossing, in this classroom.

Excerpt 1: Mista, what haepen tu da fan?

- 1        Wil:    *Mista, wat hæpen tu da ↓fæn<sup>1</sup>*
- 2        S1:    Ryan has it [Chris has the other one. ((in the background))
- 3        Wil:    [Mista (1.2) *wat hæpen tu da ↓fæn*
- 4                    (0.6)
- 5        Bea:    Matthew Lupert broke it ((exaggerated pitch))
- 6        Wil:    Matthew hehehehe (    )
- 7        SS:    (                    )
- 8 Mr. Cal:    dude, >you shoulda seen how I don't know
- 9                    he was goofin around when yesterday I came
- 10                    walking in he goes< (0.7)
- 11                    you were standin over there=
- 12                    =who were you with?
- 13                    (0.4)
- 14        Mat:    with Aaron and,
- 15 Mr. Cal:    with Aaron when Aaron goes (0.4) mista(.) are ↑you
- 16                    in a good moo::d
- 17        SS:    Hehehehehe
- 18 Mr. Cal:    I'm like ↑*ye:ah*, I'm like ↓*why*,

---

<sup>1</sup> Although mixing and codeswitching between language varieties (variants of English, Pidgin and other Asian/Pacific languages commonly heard in this classroom) is rampant throughout my data, I use both italics and the orthographic system developed by Carol Odo (1975; 1977) in representing clear instances of Hawai'i Creole or Pidgin usage, a system mainly used by linguists. For a linguistic overview of Pidgin see Sakoda and Siegel (2003).



seen in the other excerpts, as well as often observed in Mr. Cal's teaching style more generally, resulting in a recurrent sarcastic or playful tone in much of his interactions with the students. In lines 8-23 Mr. Cal then interactively co-constructs a narrative with other students about his arrival in the classroom at the aftermath of the broken fan where upon he finds two culpable-looking students, described by Mr. Cal as awaiting a likely rebuke and subsequent punishment by their teacher.

From my ethnographic observations, Mr. Cal often carried a friendly, jocular attitude towards his students but would also take a very serious attitude towards their *performance strikes* (Talmy 2005), i.e. not doing homework or disrupting class during certain activities. In this instance of Mr. Cal's retelling of discovering a broken fan and finding two 'guilty-looking students' at the scene, the common occurrence of the stances taken towards these institutionally accountable events by both the students and Mr. Cal (culpability and reprimanding respectively) are explicitly oriented to in the above excerpt. These performance strikes on the student's part would often be addressed by Mr. Cal in a fairly confrontational manner, making the student's non-compliance with his interactional and institutional goals publicly visible to the other students. In doing this, Mr. Cal had at times a quite intimidating presence towards students in pressuring them to account for perceived breaches of responsibility. He, however, viewed this kind of reprimanding practice as a fully necessary aspect of 'showing you care', building trust and respect and thus rapport with his students. After asking him in an interview what he specifically does in order to build rapport in the classroom, he said that he was only able 'put them on blast' (his expression for reprimanding his students for what he viewed as disruptive or non-compliant behavior) because a solid basis of rapport had been previously established between him and the students and those who didn't have rapport with those students would most likely contribute to a loss of rapport in addition to not achieving the desired interactional goal in the exchange.

The instances of eliciting students' participation in the reconstruction of a past event (i.e. line 12 and line 23,) are sites of interaction where collaboration of narrative is actively engaged by both students and Mr. Cal, evincing the co-ownership of the narrative, changing the activity frame from that of assigning blame to a particular student to the negotiation of moral and epistemic stances of those involved in the event.

With Mr. Cal's use of constructed dialogue in line 15-16, we see how he ventriloquizes the voice of a local Hawai'i student who is currently present in the class by his use of 'mista' in line 15, coupled with expressive prosodic elements such as exaggerated high-to-low pitch contour within a single utterance on '↑you' and '↓moo::d' (lines 15-16).<sup>3</sup> It is here, by quoting a student's prior speech who is present among the addressees of Mr. Cal's story that he can provide his epistemic and moral stance of the students' behavior and thus, through ventriloquizing, Mr. Cal is able to simultaneously construct both his and the student's stance towards the event in question. Interspersed in this co-narrative are moments of shared laughter among the students (lines 17, 20 and 21), providing the contextualization cues crucial for both recognizing and establishing the shared frames of interpretation between the teacher and students. This affiliative uptake by the students with shared laughter is an important resource for building rapport (Bell, 2005, 2007; Jefferson *et al.*, 1987; Norrick, 1993) and by keying the story as 'playful,' Mr. Cal is successful at embedding his ventriloquizing in this co-narrative where his use of 'others' voices' can be positively valued, and thus a resource for tilling the soil for the positive management of rapport. Further, the high degree of emotive involvement on both the part of Mr. Cal through the use of a variety of 'high involvement' strategies and the students through shared laughter shows the maintenance of the playful nature of the ritual oppositional frame of the co-narrative initiated by Mr. Cal in line 8, and further upgraded throughout the sequence.

Since Matthew apparently broke the fan, the following incident could be one in which Matthew is in a position of being reprimanded for his actions. However Mr. Cal takes up this inferred possibility by saying, "did I yell at you" in line 23, showing that he could have yet didn't become angry at Matthew. Mr. Cal's shift in footing (Goffman, 1974) here taking up his institutional role as teacher, yet attempting to display his restraint is a strategy that allows him to reformulate his epistemic and moral stance as both someone who shows his understanding of the event as humorous in addition to being a forgiving teacher to the students.

In summary, this instance of constructed dialogue provides an initial account of how the embedding of ventriloquizing in a positively valued, ritual oppositional frame is an essential resource by means of which Mr. Cal is able to affiliatively juxtapose his and other students

---

<sup>3</sup> 'Mista' (or miss if the teacher is female) is a polite form of address for teachers used by local students in Hawai'i. Although the extent of crossing that occurs in this sequence is minimal, confined to Mr. Cal's deployment of the vocative 'mista,' (with the notable absence of HC prosodic elements usually constituting Mr. Cal's main resource for crossing) it highlights the strategic use of lexical items in constructing local student identities in affiliative ways.

voices through the deployment of constructed dialogue. Because the diverse voices that populate this classroom provide a rich set of both linguistic and cultural resources for constructed dialogue, the transgressive ('out-group') use of different linguistic varieties often occurs. In some ways, this interaction bears some strong similarities to findings from research done on family dinner table conversations (Ochs et. al, 1996) in which co-constructed narratives of 'detective stories,' or stories where understanding a particular event is pursued, provide an opportunity space for the 'sharing of narrative rights' and thus a sharing of power. However, as narrative rights become shared by participants, epistemic and moral stances become susceptible to subsequent reformulations. And it is in these reformulations of stance where Mr. Cal is able to leverage the use of ventriloquizing to achieve successful moments of language transgression or crossing. The playful, positively valued oppositional stances in which we find instances of Mr. Cal's ventriloquizing, interwoven with moments of shared laughter by the students, provide the analytical purchase on seeing these ritual moments as an 'opportunity space' for the positive construction of social and linguistic identities, and thus of the social construction of rapport in this classroom.

***Blending Frames Through Ventriloquizing: 'Relating Experience to Content.'***

The majority of stylized uses of Pidgin by Mr. Cal in my data occurred during institutionally framed sequences of teaching content to the class. This seemed to be a recurrent strategy of relating the content of the lesson to students' daily life and experiences. In the following excerpt, Mr. Cal is engaged in the institutional task of teaching literary devices from examples in the book the students are currently reading, Walter Dean Myers' memoir, *Bad Boy*. The memoir recounts the story of a young Walter Dean Myers, an African-American boy living in the Bronx in New York City, whose daily life consists of a variety of challenging events he must deal with as a teenager, such as gang violence, poverty and racial struggles. The curriculum implemented at the school, being designed by a contracted 'mainland' company, has a fairly thorough range of 'multicultural' components. However, this literature consist entirely of an either Latino immigrant experience or an African-American narrative, which, as the teacher noted on several occasions in interviews I had with him, is somewhat difficult to relate to for a largely Asian and Pacific Islander population the school serves, at least in terms of the broader social categories of race or culture. In this excerpt the students are reading an excerpt that the teacher sees as

exemplifying a specific literary device: sarcasm. During these kinds of activities where specific vocabulary items are being learned, a fairly common discourse strategy is that of building on his and the students shared experience through storytelling in an attempt to both help the students' general comprehension of the text as well as address the specific requirements of the curriculum: knowledge of specific literary devices. Mr. Cal's ventriloquizing comes at line 30 in the excerpt. The interaction begins with Mr. Cal trying to find someone to read the next paragraph in the book:

Excerpt 2: Sarcasm

1 Cal: who'd like to read the next paragraph  
 2 those of you who are shy I suggest you  
 3 raise your hand now  
 4 it's only a three sentence paragraph.  
 5 No not you C  
 6 you're not shy. H don't even try  
 7 H: Cam=  
 8 Cal: =Cam, Jasmine, somebody who doesn't  
 9 normally get involved, Jan, (2.0) Ray,  
 10 Jasmine you just read.  
 11 J: I didn't read[( )]  
 12 H: [( )]  
 13 Cal: somebody volunteer or I'm gonna call on you (3.0)  
 Maile very good  
 14 Mai: <<My business became less ° important °  
 15 as school started as I had other  
 16 things to think about, boys, °other girls gossip, °  
 17 you know, real important stuff >>  
 18 Cal: what does that sound like- there to you (.5)  
 19 "you know real important stuff"  
 20 Mai: °proly sarcastic°  
 21 Cal: thank you, say it nice and loud  
 22 Mai: °sarcastic°  
 23 Cal: sarcastic, the author's being sarcastic,  
 24 so go ahead and label that sarcasm  
 25 S-A-R-C-A-S-M ((spelling out each letter)) sar(.)casm (.2)  
 26 I'm sarcastic with you guys all the time  
 27 >like when you go- when I come back

28           and I obviously just brought back food  
 29           from< Ka-FK Kentucky Fried Chicken and you say to me  
 30           "mista (.) whea yu ↓eat kentucky ↑fried ↓chicken"  
 31           and I go no Burger King.  
 33   SS       hehehehe  
 33   Cal:     I'm being sarcastic

After a fairly extensive selection process in trying to find a 'shy' student to read (lines 2 and 6) who "doesn't normally get involved" (line 9), a student finally volunteers after a slight threat to be called on by Mr. Cal in line 13. After reading the short excerpt from the book, Mr. Cal asks the students to direct their attention to a specific point in the paragraph, the exact point being further clarified through direct reported speech (in this case written speech) in line 19: "you know real important stuff." Maile hesitantly answers in line 20, hedging her 'guess' with an initial 'proly' (probably). Mr. Cal asks her to speak up after acknowledging 'sarcastic' as being the correct answer, and after the student repeats her previous statement minus the hedge, Mr. Cal launches into a storytelling sequence in line 27. Here we see the cluster of prosodic features characterizing Mr. Cal's recurrent high involvement conversational style beginning in line 27: the telling of (inter)personal topics, faster conversational pacing, dramatization rather than lexicalization during the telling of the story to make his point, and expressive paralinguistic features. It is through these features that Mr. Cal accomplishes a shift in footing where in this case an interpersonally oriented frame is embedded within the overall institutional task of learning literary devices, an initial strategy, as we will see, in gearing up for the successful establishment of rapport through the use of crossing. In this now initiated storytelling frame keyed as a 'playful frame,' he begins describing an occasion when he comes back to school after picking up lunch at KFC. The pronoun 'you' in Mr. Cal's utterance in line 29, "...and you say to me" is addressing the entire class in this exchange and his ventriloquizing in line 30, "mista (.) whea yu ↓eat, kentucky ↑fried ↓chicken" is constructed dialogue of what various student in the class may have said to him at one point, rather than what a particular student has just said.

Here a clear shift in footing is initiated by a change in loudness, pitch and tempo of the utterance as well as the insertion and deletion of specific lexical items, indexing the students' 'local' identity in various ways: through the utterance initial "mista," a common form of polite address to male teachers in Hawai'i; through Hawaii Creole or Pidgin intonation where the



falling intonation on both 'eat' and 'chicken' index Mr. Cal's ideological perception of Pidgin intonational pattern when asking questions; through the simplification of tense, '*whea yu eat*,' which is actually grammatically incorrect in Pidgin, the past tense marker 'wen' being necessary as in '*whea yu wen eat?*' (however, this possibly indexes Mr. Cal's perception of Pidgin as a form of simplified English); and finally both a lower pitch and slower tempo in this cross-ventriloquizing of the student's speech. Finally, in line 31 the moral of the story, which is to illustrate an example of sarcasm, is reached, where Mr. Cal says 'no, Burger King' here again shifting footing back to his normal speech register. Mr. Cal's crossing into Pidgin here is positively aligned to by the students within this specific interaction as shared laughter follows his ventriloquizing. In the above excerpt, what is of crucial importance for students to accept Mr. Cal's crossing into Pidgin, is his shift in footing to a 'play frame.' Even during an institutionally oriented task such as the one above, learning literary devices used in a novel, Mr. Cal's cross-ventriloquizing is positively oriented to by the students as it is couched in a story-telling sequence, a recurring discourse strategy used by Mr. Cal for establishing rapport in the classroom.

Although conjectural at this point, Mr. Cal's consistent use of sarcasm as a discourse strategy in his daily teaching practice suggests one possibility to explore in future research. My own experience as well as anecdotal evidence of Caucasian male teachers in the United States teaching to minority ethnic and linguistic students in K-6 contexts suggests that sarcasm may often be used to ease the racial and linguistic tension that may be present in a multilingual/multiethnic classroom where the teacher is categorized as belonging to the dominant language and culture. Further, the discursive deployment of sarcasm and the frames of interaction that constitute its use, may indeed be an emerging aspect of identity construction and rapport management in classroom interaction in late modern society. Following the recent demographic trends of *superdiversity* (Blommaert and Rampton, 2011) "characterized by a tremendous increase in the categories of migrants, not only in terms of nationality, ethnicity, language, and religion, but also in terms of motives, patterns and itineraries of migration..." (p.1), Blommaert and Rampton's call for cumulative comparison in ethnographically grounded linguistic research may help to shed light on just how universal practices such as this are.

***Mocking a Student's Voice to Correct: Changing the Frame***

The following sequence immediately follows the previous interaction. Although the overwhelming majority of instances of stylizing by Mr. Cal are framed in a 'playful' manner that allow for the building of positive rapport in moments of ventriloquizing though crossing, there were instances of mocking by Mr. Cal as well which seemed to have the opposite effect. The shift in frames from humorous storytelling to language/grammar-correction occurs in line 30 initiated by a shift in footing when Mr. Cal takes up Wil's previous utterance in line 26 as linguistically problematic: "Matthew, wai yu ↑brokt ↓it."

Excerpt 3: "Why you broked it?"

- 23 Mr. Cal: did I yell at you
- 24 Mat: °ah no° (.4) but you were gonna do it
- 25 Bea: he was gonna put it ↑ba:ck you ↓know
- 26 Wil: *Matth[ew wai yu ↑brokt ↓it*
- 27 Mr. Cal: [who Mathew
- 28 Bea: Yeah
- 29 (1.2)
- 30 Mr. Cal: Wil (.) >there's no such word as broked<
- 31 Wil: °are ↑yu fo ↓real°
- 32 Mr. Cal: bro[ke it
- 33 Bea: [how did you brok-
- 34 (1.5)
- 35 Mat: *it ↑jrap awn ↓mi*
- 36 Mr. Cal: Matthew ↑wai yu ↓brokt it **((stylized as mock Pidgin))**
- 37 Wil: *hau yu figa it brek den*
- 38 Mat: I don't [know
- 39 S2: [he was jumping [and
- 40 SS: [(XXXXX)
- 41 Wil: [(jumps Several times)
- 42 Bea: I told you guys he was jumping and then he whacked it.
- 43 (4.0)
- 44 S3: Wil jump.
- 45 (0.9)
- 46 SS: hehehehe **((Wil makes way towards fan and bends legs to jump))**

47 (1.3)  
 48 SS: Hehehehe  
 49 Mr. Cal: Wil sit down please.  
 50 Wil: **((exagerated [inhalation])**  
 51 Mr. Cal: [hey Wil man  
 52 SS: **((several students talking))**  
 53 (7.4) ((coughing))

After a short pause, projecting trouble to come in line 2, Mr. Cal takes up his institutional role as teacher, exercising his perceived rights in this English classroom as being a final arbiter of 'proper' language use through the tactic of authorization (Bucholtz & Hall 2004). This is immediately followed by Wil's downgrading of this through the contrary tactic of deligitimization of Mr. Cal's authority, "°are ↑yu fo ↓real°. The negative alignment to Mr. Cal's utterance by Wil in line 31, and the subsequent lack of uptake by students with either shared laughter or direct response beyond Wil's comment shows that this was a clear case of mocking (Hill 1995), where Mr. Cal's immediate interactional goals of the moment and the manifested equity rights of his language arbitration lacked the positive facework evinced in the previous excerpt of successfully building rapport. Further, as can be seen in the above excerpt, when a 'play frame' is not engaged and instead more face-threatening institutional goals such as publicly 'correcting language use' are activated by Mr. Cal, the ideologies indexed by Mr. Cal's use of Pidgin engages both the broader discourses of Pidgin's stigmatized status in Hawai'i and the mocked student's linguistic competency, and this, I argue, results in a failure to build rapport.

This storytelling sequence is an interactional activity where Mr. Cal co-constructs his identity in dialogue with the students in order to be perceived in a certain way (a friendly and understanding teacher), a perception that may have consequences for further interactions in the classroom. Taking into consideration the importance Mr. Cal places on rapport, it is in these moments that the line between 'on-task' and 'off-task' behavior is blurred and building rapport is simultaneously an institutional task as well as a strategy for social involvement. Thus in lines 1-25, Mr. Cal successfully engages in building rapport by shifting footing to activate a 'play frame' in which stylization of students' voices is positively aligned to through shared laughter, whereas beginning in line 30, Mr. Cal's shift in footing breaks the current playful frame of storytelling to correct a student's grammar. It is in this keying of an institutional frame – within what the

students treat as non-institutional interaction— where Mr. Cal's crossing is negatively taken up by the students and is clearly a case of mocking. These are brief and fleeting moments of classroom interaction, but they are vital sites for both the building of interpersonal relationships as well as ideological indexing practices, ultimately either having positive or negative consequences for rapport between teachers and students.

However, as an inherent aspect of these ideological indexing practices, a persistent ambiguity remains between language and identity in instances of stylization. Chun (2007) describes this characteristic of stylization as a "mutually constitutive, but non-deterministic, relationship between ideology and interaction" (p. 282). This ambiguity requires a close examining of both the ideological constructions of identities through stylization practices as well as contextualization practices interactants engage in through framing (Goffman 1974) their utterances in instances of stylization.

## DISCUSSION

The above analysis described the recurrent phenomenon of stylizing I observed in a public middle school classroom in an urbanized area of Hawai'i. Two possible types of stylization: crossing and ventriloquizing (or cross-ventriloquizing with their co-occurrence) I argue are used to build rapport in this particular classroom. As shown in the excerpts above, vital for the successes of cross-ventriloquizing to be able to establish and maintain a positive alignment to build rapport between the teacher, Mr. Cal, and the students is that it is accomplished within a playful ritual oppositional frames of interaction. At moments when the frame was not 'playful,' a clear negative alignment between students and the teacher ensued, usually with no uptake by the students and notably an absence of shared laughter after an instance of stylization, as shown with Mr. Cal's disaffiliative or mocking correction of Wil's grammar usage in excerpt 6. Because stylization is not a thing but a practice (Eckert 2004) the instances of stylization I observed in the data show a sensitivity to the contingencies of the on-going interaction. In order to understand how stylization is used to manage relations between interlocutors, RMT was elicited to retain a constant sensitivity to 1) the 'facework' being negotiated and accomplished at each moment of talk, 2) the sociality rights and obligations and thus the level of autonomy participants hold in both their institutional roles of students and teachers as well as interpersonal roles such as friends

or co-members of some category and finally 3) a constant framing and re-framing of the interactional task at hand (i.e. the shifts we saw occur between institutional and non-institutional tasks and the complex embedding that reframing practices can realize. The notion of *face* I argue for in understanding stylization as a practice embedded in discursive strategies of rapport management is to see it not as something that individuals possess, but rather "something that is diffusely located in the flow of events in the encounter' (Goffman 1967).

This is not to say that people do not have a positive sense of self that they wish others to appreciate and to maintain as a human being. Following Goffman's notion of the interaction ritual, I argue that *face* is an emergent property of the interaction itself and not a property that the individuals bring with them into the interaction. Much is brought into an interaction before people ever come into contact, various identities, ideologies and cultural inferencing practices being some of them (reminiscent of Bourdieu's notion of *habitus*), however *face* only comes into existence in the interaction ritual itself. As Goffman writes, "[w]hen individuals come into one another's immediate presence, territories of the self bring to the scene a vast filigree of wires which individuals are uniquely equipped to trip over" (1971:135-6). It is in the entanglement of these mutually present 'territories of the self' where a constant guarding and negotiation by individuals of the 'filigree of wires' of interaction that *face* emerges and thus where strategies of rapport management in turn emerge.

Further, stylization has been shown to be a key site of engagement between ideological and interactional contexts and where issues of authenticity and value of language use come to the fore. Within these constant interactional sensitivities that interactants engage in, the practice of stylization brought into focus both the ideological metacommentary of stylers as well as the interactional moments in which they occur (i.e. the institutionality of the task at hand and their respective (re)framings). Through the use of stylized Pidgin, ideological metacommentaries come into play and a broader understanding of the social and institutional structures these interactions are embedded in become pertinent in the unfolding interaction. In describing this relationship, Chun (2007) writes,

My interaction-based approach assumes that language practices are not only influenced by ideologies but their cumulative moments can reproduce or create shifts in ideologies. For example, the repeated mocking of a style by framing it as both inauthentic and negative in value, regardless of its more widely understood

ideological value, can lead to a local community's revaluing of the style. (p. 282)

Due to the historically low prestige attributed to Hawai'i Creole in schooling practices in Hawai'i, all instances of Mr. Cal's cross-ventriloquizing could be interpreted as mocking, and thus as fairly controversial utterances in the context of schooling for several reasons. However, I would argue that classroom interaction is not as predictable as we may assume it to be, and while Mr. Cal's crossing into Pidgin may be interpreted in a variety of ways both negatively and positively, the interactional framings in which it occurs show it to be a powerful and spontaneous affiliative tool in managing rapport in the classroom. This is in line with research that has pointed to the positive educational outcomes of valuing stigmatized languages as a resource in classroom interaction (Chun 2007; Cummins 2009; Kamwangamalu 2010; Rubdy 2007; Sato 1989; Talmy 2005).

## CONCLUSION

The ways in which Mr. Cal achieved crossing/mocking through ventriloquizing in initiating certain frames of understanding to establish, negotiate and maintain rapport in the classroom points to the importance that a knowledge of students' language varieties has in building positive relationships and thus engendering successful learning environments. In this respect, I have tried to echo the sentiments of sociolinguistic work that has been done in public schools arguing for more equitable and linguistically aware pedagogical practices in such vitally important sites of both linguistic and cultural (re)production as our public schools. In engaging with this need, Sato (1989) writes,

With respect to classroom practice...teachers need to begin where students are.

Classroom discourse management should facilitate learners' participation in academic tasks rather than set up obstacles that learners must surmount. The use of learners' varieties in the classroom is therefore not ruled out, either at the elementary level or in "remedial English" classes at the secondary and postsecondary levels....the overall objective should be the addition of Standard English, not the replacement of native varieties of English. (p. 276)

There is an ever present need to continue to engage in the task of "designing sociolinguistically appropriate pedagogy for speakers of such varieties" (Sato 1989) and continue to promote and

legitimize this view through research and engagement with the community.

Rapport is a word at our immediate grasp that we use to describe a quality or appearance of positive relations between people, and in this case between teachers and students. Although the nebulous nature of such a term as 'rapport' might seemingly preclude one from gaining any real insight on such an ephemeral phenomenon, by using the analytical resources of ethnographically grounded interactional sociolinguistics, we can begin to see the processes in which rapport is built (or damaged) through the joint interactional activities of students and teachers. The 'communities of practice' (Lave and Wenger, 1991) I observed in this classroom were relatively transient, where students may only spend two, perhaps three years with a teacher, once a day, four to five times a week, amongst a constantly changing group of students. The kinds of 'cultures' that are socially constructed in these classrooms, then, are transitory yet provide sites of intense struggle and negotiation over the formation of identity where discourse is used in surprising ways to build affiliative relations with others.

As diversity continues to become the norm rather than the exception in a continually globalized and multilingual world where people must negotiate the relation between the global and the local in everyday life, and as they "learn to live happily with their own exclusion from groups that they actually like and interact with daily" (Rampton, 1996), stylization, and crossing in particular, offer a symbolically rich site for exploring how language is used to negotiate the interstices of social life as people "learn to live with difference" in their everyday interactions.

## REFERENCES

- Alim, S. (2009). Translocal style communities: Hip hop youth as cultural theorists of style, language, and Globalization. *Pragmatics*, 19(1), 103–127.
- Alim, S., Ibrahim, A., & Pennycook, A. (Eds.) (2009). *Global linguistic flows: Hip hop cultures, youth identities, and the politics of language*. New York: Routledge.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large*. Minneapolis, MI: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bauman, R. (2004). *A world of other's words: cross-cultural perspectives on intertextuality*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Becker, H. S. (1971). Footnote. In M. Wax, S. Diamond, & F. Gearing (Eds.) *Anthropological perspectives on education* (pp. 3–27). New York: Basic Book.
- Bell, N. D. (2005). Exploring L2 language play as an aid to SLL: A case study of humor in NS-NNS interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(2), 192–218.
- Bell, N. D. (2007). How native and non-native English speakers adapt to humor in intercultural interaction. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 20(1), 27–48.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011) Language and superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(9), 1–21.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004a). Theorizing identity in language and sexuality research. *Language in Society*, 33, 469–515.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004b). Language and Identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585–614.



- Castanheira, M., Crawford, T., & Dixon, C. (2000). Interactional ethnography: An approach to studying the social construction of literate practices. *Linguistics and Education, 11*(4), 353–400.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chun, E. (2007). *The meaning of mocking: Stylizations of Asians and preps at a U.S. high school*. Unpublished dissertation. Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin.
- Chun, E. (2009). Speaking like Asian immigrants: Intersections of accommodation and mocking at a U.S. high school. *Pragmatics, 19*(1), 17–38.
- Coupland, N. (2001). Dialect stylization in radio talk. *Language in Society, 30*(3), 345–375.
- Coupland, N. (2010). Introduction: Sociolinguistics in the global era. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cummins, J. (2009). Multilingualism in the English-language classroom: Pedagogical considerations. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(2), 317–321.
- Duff, P. (2004). Intertextuality and hybrid discourses: The infusion of pop culture in educational discourse. *Linguistics and Education, 14*, 231–276.
- Eckert, P. (2004). The meaning of style. In W. F. Chiang, E. Chun, L. Mahalingappa, & S. Mehus (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Symposium about Language and Society, 47*, 41–53.
- Erickson, F. (2004). *Talk and social theory: Ecologies of speaking and of listening in everyday life*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Erickson, F. (2011). From speech as “situated” to speech as “situating”: Insights from John Gumperz on the practical conduct of talk as social action. *Text & Talk, 31*(4), 395–406.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gordon, C. (2008). A(p)parent play: Blending frames and reframing in family talk. *Language in Society, 37*, 319–349.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gumperz, J. J. (1992). Contextualization and understanding. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 229–252). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1996). Relativity of conversational inference. In J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity. Studies in the social and cultural foundations of language 17*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (2003). Interactional sociolinguistics: A personal perspective. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 215–228). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Günther, S. (2008). Negotiating rapport in German-Chinese conversation. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking* (pp. 207–226). London: Continuum.
- Higgins, C. (2011). The formation of L2 selves in a globalizing era. In C. Higgins (Ed.), *Identity formation in globalizing contexts: Language learning in the new millenium*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hill, J. H. (1995). Junk Spanish, covert racism, and the (leaky) boundary between public and private spheres. *Pragmatics*, 5(2), 197–212.
- Holstein, J. A., & J. F. Gubrium (2004). The active interview. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 140–161). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hornberger, N., & McKay, S. (Eds.) (2010). *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Ontario, CA: Multilingual Matters
- Hymes, D. (1996). *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality: Toward an understanding of voice*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Jefferson, G., Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In G. Burton & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 152–205). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kamwangamalu, N. (2010). Multilingualism and codeswitching in education. In N. Hornberger & S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Ontario, CA: Multilingual Matters.
- Kramsch, C. J. (1985). Classroom interaction and discourse options. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7(2), 169–183.

- Macaulay, R. K. S. (1987). Polyphonic monologues: Quoted direct speech in oral narratives. *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics*, 1, 1–34.
- Matsunaga, M. (1995). Pidgin: Unique language seeks to find its place in both classroom, boardroom. *Honolulu Advertiser*, 15, May, B1.
- Mehan, H. (1998). The Study of social interaction in educational settings: Accomplishments and unresolved issues. *Human Development*, 41, 245–269.
- Nguyen, H. T. (2007). Rapport building in language instruction: A microanalysis of the multiple resources in teacher talk. *Language and Education*, 21(4), 284–303.
- Ochs, E., Smith, R., & Taylor, C. (1996). *Detective stories at dinnertime problem solving through co-narration*. In C. Briggs (Ed.). *Disorderly discourse: Narrative, conflict, and inequality*. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.
- Odo, C. (1975). *Phonological processes in the English dialect of Hawaii*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai‘i.
- Odo, C. (1977). Phonological representations in Hawaiian English. *University of Hawai‘i Working Papers in Linguistics*, 9(3), 77–85.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). ‘The rotation gets thick. The constraints get thin’: Creativity, recontextualization, and difference. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(4), 579–596.
- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rampton, B. (1999). Styling the other: Introduction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3(4), 421–427.
- Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macaulay, R. K. S. (1987). Polyphonic monologues and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25–44). London: Sage.
- Rubdy, R. (2007). Singlish in the school: An impediment or a resource? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 28(4), 308–317.
- Sakoda, K., & Siegel, J. (2003). *Pidgin grammar: An introduction to the creole language of Hawai‘i*. Honolulu, HI: Bess Press.
- Sato, C. (1989). A nonstandard approach to standard English author(s). *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(2), 259–282.

- Scott, C. (2008). *A call to restructure: Restructuring lessons from The No Child Left Behind Act in five states*. Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy.
- Sherzer, J. (2002). *Speech play and verbal art*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Silverman, D. (1999). Warrior or collaborators: Reworking methodological controversies in the study of institutional interaction. In S. Sarangi & C. Roberts (Eds.) *Talk, work and institutional order* (pp. 401–425). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Silverstein, M. (1985). Language and the culture of gender. In E. Mertz & R. Parmentier (Eds.) *Semiotic mediation* (pp. 219–259). New York: Academic Press.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (Ed.) (2008). *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication, and politeness theory*. New York: Continuum.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- Tannen, D. (1989/2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Talmy, S. (2005). Lifers and fobs, rocks and resistance: Generation 1.5, identity, and the cultural productions of ESL in a high school. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai‘i at Manoa.
- Talmy, S. (2008). The cultural productions of the ESL student at Tradewinds High: Contingency, multidirectionality, and identity in L2 socialization. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 619–644.
- Talmy, S. (2009). Resisting ESL: Categories and sequence in a critically motivated analysis of classroom interaction. In G. Kasper & H. Nguyen (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Talmy, S. (2011). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 25–42.

## APPENDIX A

## Transcription Conventions and Abbreviations

[	The point where overlapping talk and/or gesture starts
]	The point where overlapping talk and/or gesture ends
(0.0)	length of silence in tenths of a second
(.)	micro-pause less than 2/10 of a second
::	lengthened syllable
-	cut-off; self-interruption
=	'latched' utterances
?/./,	rising/falling/continuing intonation respectively
(xx)	unintelligible stretch, however each x indicating one beat of an utterance
(word)	transcriber's unsure hearings
(( ))	transcriber's descriptions of events
<b>bold</b>	non-vocal conduct
° °	a passage of talk quieter than the surrounding talk
□	point of analytic focus in excerpt
↑↓	rising, falling intonation
<u>word</u>	emphasis of lexical unit underlined

## APPENDIX B

## Elaine Chun's (2007) 12 Types of Stylization (pp. 276-277)

STYLE TYPE	ABBREV	IDEOLOGY		INTERACTION		DESCRIPTION
		MEMBER-SHIP	PRESTIGE	ALIGNMENT	VALUE	
1	IHS+	in	high	self	positive	Prototypical self-styling of a prestige style
2	ILS+	in	low	self	positive	Prototypical self-styling of a low prestige style
3	OHS+	out	high	self	positive	Upward convergent adoption (accommodation, emulation)
4	OLS+	out	low	self	positive	Downward convergent adoption (accommodation, condescension)
	-	in	high	self	negative	-
	-	in	low	self	negative	-
	-	out	high	self	negative	-
	-	out	low	self	negative	-
5	IHN+	in	high	non-self	positive	Positive in-group stylization of a prestige style
6	ILN+	in	low	non-self	positive	Positive in-group stylization of a low prestige style
7	OHN+	out	high	non-self	positive	Positive out-group stylization of a prestige style
8	OLN+	out	low	non-self	positive	Positive out-group mocking of a low prestige style
9	IHN-	in	high	non-self	negative	In-group mocking of a prestige style
10	ILN-	in	low	non-self	negative	In-group mocking of a low prestige style
11	OHN-	out	high	non-self	negative	Out-group mocking of a prestige style
12	OLN-	out	low	non-self	negative	Prototypical out-group mocking of a low prestige style

## Categories of Stylization

TYPES	INTERACTION	IDEOLOGY	DESCRIPTION
1, 2	S	I	Self-styling (style-shifting)
3, 4	S+	O	Convergent adoption (accommodation)
3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12		O	Crossing
8, 12		OL	Mock language (Hill 2005)
5-8	N+		Stylization (Bakhtin 1984, Rampton 1995)
5-12	N		Stylization (as defined here, also Coupland 2001a, 2001b)
8-12	N	OL	Stylized mocking (as defined here)
	N-		