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1. Introduction

With a growing number of people’s lives now characterized by transnationalism, multiple cultural affiliations, migration and diasporas, the study of identity has necessarily turned to explore how people establish authentic forms of belonging in this “runaway world” (Giddens 2000). For more than a decade, sociolinguists have addressed how linguistic identities are no longer tied to enduring structures such as nation-states, ethnicities, or social classes, but rather are contingent, as seen in discursive negotiations that take place in everyday conversation, the mass media, social media, and in research interviews (Androutsopoulou 2012; Blommaert, 2010; Bucholtz & Hall, 2004; Coupland, 2001; De Fina, 2003; Higgins 2011). Concurrent with these developments, the notion of authenticity has been replaced by the view that cultural belonging is a process, rather than a product, and that speakers actively produce forms of cultural identification through language (Auer 2007a; Bucholtz, 2011; Coupland, 2003; Rampton, 1995, 2006, 2011). Still, while many studies demonstrate the hybrid nature of global contact zones (Pratt 2002) in which speakers co-construct their identities, challenge conventional social categories, and refashion sociopolitical boundaries, it remains the case that multilinguals must still navigate modernist claims to authenticity and belonging in their daily lives since certain forms of language are often treated as more and less legitimate, both in interactions and in ideological discourses about language, citizenship, social class, and whether a speaker is a ‘bona fide member’ of a community. To examine how multilinguals manage this terrain, this special issue focuses on multilinguals’ use of stylization, “the knowing deployment of culturally familiar styles and identities that are marked as deviating from those predictably associated with the
current speaking context” (Coupland 2001: 245). Stylization owes much to Bakhtin’s work, and to his conceptualization of speech as “filled with others’ words, varying degrees of otherness, or varying degrees of “our-own-ness,” varying degrees of awareness and detachment (1986: 89).

Due to its multi-voiced nature, stylization provides multilinguals with a rich resource to express stances ranging from insulting mockery to taking pride in one’s multilingual repertoire.

As a knowing act of performance, stylization entails the articulation of a voice in a way that is exaggerated or heightened to achieve an interactional effect. An interesting example is found in comedian Margaret Cho’s performance of Mock Asian (Chun 2004), a way of speaking that Cho uses to perform multiple Asian personas in her acts. Though Mock Asian is clearly a racializing discourse that indexes the subordinated status of Asian American immigrants in the U.S., Chun argues that Cho may not be held accountable for the potentially derogatory stylization because her audience understands it as an inauthentic variety of English for Cho, simply put on to entertain. Her status as a second generation Korean American encourages a positive interpretation of her comedy, as does her parodic stance. Moreover, by voicing Mock Asian on stage, she presents this stylized language for metacommentary, thereby decontextualizing it from its more overtly racist contexts and reframing it as entertainment. Instead of merely revoicing racist imitations (i.e., performing insults), Cho is double-voicing, a process whereby the analyzer of the utterance laminates new meanings onto the original utterance and produces multivocality (Bakhtin 1986; Higgins 2009; Woolard 1998). Bakhtin calls this process assimilation, a process in which “our speech that is, all our utterances (including creative works), is filled with others’ words, varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of ‘our-own-ness’, varying degrees of awareness and detachment. These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework and reaccentuate” (1986: 89).

While most research on stylization has examined dialect stylization (Auer 2007a; Bell & Gibson 2011; Chun 2004, 2009; Coupland 2001; Rampton 1995), this special issue considers how multilingual repertoires may afford a wider array of meanings in association with performative language use. Just as codeswitching offers multilinguals another resource in negotiating their interactions, stylization provides them with a means of displaying stances, navigating tensions, and positioning themselves and others. In other words, in combining multilingualism with stylization, speakers have very complex tools at hand for identity work. Little research thus far has examined how multilinguals use such aspects of their linguistic repertoires. Commenting on sociolinguistic analyses of migrants’ languages, Rampton (2013: 376) notes, “[L]inguistics has not always succeeded in providing an adequately rounded, humanized portrait which recognizes that speakers who grew up using a different language abroad can also be local workmates, friends, uncles, brothers, and mothers who themselves make agentive contributions to sociolinguistic processes near at hand.” If we are to understand the full spectrum of multilinguals’ resources, we need to broaden our representation of the language used by multilingual speakers—ranging from emerging bilinguals to people who speak multiple languages with ease—by exploring how they stylize their various languages.

2. Stylization on and off the stage

This collection of papers explores multilingual stylization practices in both mundane and high performance contexts (Coupland 2007). It must be acknowledged that officially staged stylizations such as comedy acts and radio shows do provide an overt interpretive frame for interpretation. They involve more planning, including script writing, and may garner audience
expectations for stylization to occur (Bell & Gibson 2011, Furukawa this issue, Sharma, this issue). As Chun’s (2004) study illustrates, a high performance frame safeguards stylizers from claims of racism, and it authorizes the use of over-the-top performances of language for the sake of amusement. Staged stylization such as stand up comedy can be very serious, as it can act as a form of metacommentary on social life. In fact, the topics of racism, sexism, and intergenerational family struggles are at the heart of Margaret Cho’s comedy. Though they come from both high and mundane performance contexts, the five studies presented here show a remarkable degree of similarity in terms of the ways that stylization is used to provide the same kinds of interpretive frames. Whether in mediated settings or in everyday conversation, stylization allows speakers to knowingly comment on language in their interactions, and to position themselves and others as more and less legitimate, authentic, distinct, and so on.

Another reason for considering both mundane and high performance contexts together is that positioning oneself in discourse increasingly involves the use of language from high performance contexts in the language of everyday life. Coupland (2007) provides the example of Catherine Tate’s stylization of English speech (where ‘bothered’ is pronounced as ‘bovvered’) in her television show on BBC. The stylization became so popular that when Kylie Minogue was diagnosed with cancer, she told a reporter from the newspaper The Sun “I have cancer – am I bovvered?” (2007: 174). The phenomenon spread further, as British youth invented new forms of the expression and stylization itself became stylized, creating a new indexical order. Many other examples in the literature are drawn from youth language. Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) show, for example, how a young adolescent boy participating in a focus group interview with his peers double-voices pop artist Shaggy’s title and lyrics of the song “It wasn’t me” to downplay the idea that he might have romantic interests in girls— something that would clearly lead his peers to mercilessly tease him. Similarly, Sultana, Dovchin & Pennycook (2013) document how lines from Hindi movies have become part of university students’ everyday conversations in Bangladesh, and how fans of Mongolian pop star Amarkhuu compare him to well-known actors from Korean drama in online comments on YouTube to show their admiration and support.

In my own research on language in East Africa, high performance language use has also been showing up in other domains of life, including other high performance contexts. For example, hip hop lyrics have been appropriated by political candidates as campaign slogans (Higgins 2009; Nyairo & Ogude 2005), and they have been used to help battle HIV/AIDS. Well known hip hop artists have been encouraged to align their lyrics with messages about abstinence and anti-stigma currently being promoted by non-governmental organizations, institutions that are often the benefactors of such artists (Higgins 2013). While these campaigns may be seen as an effort to capture the attention of youth voters and youth consumers, stylized language from staged contexts can also be heard among older generations in everyday conversations. One such illustration comes from my study of a newspaper office in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania (Higgins 2007), where stylized language was used by Mbwilo, a journalist in his early fifties. While they were typing stories and waiting for computers to become available, the journalists were discussing the clothing of one of the senior editors, Mr. Baraba, who was known to wear old-fashioned clothing from the 1960s. Like most days, Mr. Baraba was wearing a short-sleeved suit jacket made of stretch polyester, which was quite form fitting. After the comments about his clothes were made, Mbwilo explained that these suits became popular during the presidency of Kenneth Kaunda, first president of Zambia, and by other African politicians in the 1960s, a decade when many African nations became independent from British rule, including Tanzania.
When Noreen, a junior staff member in her twenties, remarked again on the tight fit of the jacket, Mbwilo then made a joke that drew from the mediated, on-stage world of beauty pageants and young women’s concern over maintaining their figures.

(1) Maintaining figure

1 Noreen: Inamaana Mzee Baraba toka enzi hizo mpaka sasa
         It-pres-means elder Baraba since times those until now
         That means that Elder Baraba, from those times until now

2 hajaongezeka kidogo.
       he.neg.yet-gain.stv little
       hasn’t gained (weight), even a little bit.

3 Mbwilo: Baraba () anamaintain sana () figure yake.
          Baraba he-pres-maintain much figure his
          Mr. Baraba really maintains his figure.

4 Noreen: Ha HA [ha ha ha ha ha ha ((body shakes with laughter))

In making the joke in line 5, Mbwilo stylizes himself and Mr. Baraba through the use of
gendered language that comments on ‘maintaining one’s figure’ in a mix of Swahili and English,
a way of speaking that has become enregistered (Agha 2003) as specific to Dar es Salaam within
the wider Tanzanian context (Higgins 2007: 16). Through using the expression maintain figure,
Mbwilo speaks not just in the style of Dar es Salaam, but also in the style of a young,
cosmopolitan woman, as watching one’s weight is not (yet) a discourse widely applied to men
(and when it is, terms other than ‘figure’ is used). Mbwilo’s joke is staged at the level of
everyday conversation, but it also indexes the high performance contexts that produced it in the
first place – Tanzanian beauty pageants. This particular expression has a strong association with
young women referred to as mamiss ‘misses,’ that is, beauty pageant contestants and those
striving to become like Miss Tanzania in terms of body type and lifestyle. In making his joke,
then, Mbwilo not only evokes the image of slender women competing for prizes on stage, but
also the many images of mamiss and stories about their immoral escapades, which are regular
features in Dar es Salaam’s many newspapers, where former and current beauty queens are
shown wearing revealing clothing and caught in a range of disreputable states (cf. Billings 2013).
In speaking this way, Mbwilo thus also stylizes Mr. Baraba as similar to these young women in
an effective use of double voicing, as he creates humor via denaturalization (Bucholtz & Hall
2004). In the act of stylizing himself and Mr. Baraba as people who speak like young,
sometimes ‘immoral’ cosmopolitan fashionistas, Mbwilo actually underscores what he and
Mbwilo share – maleness, maturity, and a concern with more serious issues such as politics and
history—all by making a joke.

Stylization thus provides a frame that allows speakers to take double-edged stances,
whether on or off the stage of high performance. The papers in this volume demonstrate that
stylization affords speakers in mundane and high performance settings with the opportunity to
use the speech of others, and to do so in a way that draws metalinguistic attention to the larger
language ideological setting. For example, stylization often occurs in forms of reported speech,
both in recounting stories in everyday conversation and in performances presented to audiences.
The papers by Sharma (this issue) on Nepalese stand up comedy and Sandhu (this issue) offer good examples of how stylization in reported speech acts as a type of characterization that contributes to the telling of a good story (Bauman 1975). Moreover, stylization also allows the speaker to laminate personality attributes and language ideological associations onto the performance of another person’s voice. In Sharma’s paper, the comedian Manoj Gajurel stylizes Limbuwan dialect speakers’ use of haina, a discourse marker, which corresponds to a form of negation in standard Nepali, and in so doing, characterizes the Limbuwan people as absurdly self-contradictory, at least with reference to the standard variety. At the same time, the performance expresses a critique of larger political questions by mocking the government’s attempt to create a new federalist state by highlighting each of the provinces the government had proposed and characterizing each one—through stylization—for the audience. On the more mundane performance level, Lamb (this issue) demonstrates how a language arts teacher uses stylization in reported speech to create rapport with students by voicing their use of Hawai’i Creole (a.k.a. Pidgin) to illustrate the concept of irony as a literary device. The teacher also stylizes the students in reported speech to assert his authority as their English teacher and to reject their varieties of English, an act which leads to some discord. Nevertheless, by virtue of his stylization, the teacher is relatively insulated from claims of prejudice since, on one level, it is his not voice that he is articulating.

3. Stylization and styling

Stylization is powerful since it allows speakers to position themselves in strategic ways in reference to the speech that they are performing. As Lamb’s example from the classroom context in Hawai’i suggests, stylization in reported speech has the potential to be read as an offensive form of mockery, as the speakers of the language being stylized may be disparaged and even directly insulted. This is more possible if the stylization involves crossing, or the use of a language not normally seen as belonging to the speaker (Rampton 1995). On the other hand, stylized language may afford some multilinguals the opportunity to find solidarity with one another, as was the case with second generation South Asian youth in England who mocked their parents’ ways of speaking (Rampton, 1995), thereby constructing their own identities as distinctly local (and as second generation South Asian immigrant) adolescents. In this regard, stylization can actually lead to speakers styling themselves as certain kinds of people as they reflexively manage their multilingual resources for performing acts of identity. Following Coupland (2001, 2007), the more established notion of style refers to a reflexively managed resource for performing acts of identity, or the symbolic expression through language of affiliations with groups, places, languages, and cultural practices. Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) described acts of identity as uses of language that projected a desire to belong with a group, acts which can also be displayed through projecting a disaffiliation with a group. Building on this, Coupland (2001, 2007) and others such as Auer (2007a) analyze these acts of identity within discourse analytic frameworks, drawing on tools from linguistic anthropology, interactional sociolinguistics, positioning theory, and conversation analysis. A number of other scholars have worked with what might best be called a sociocultural linguistics toolkit (Bucholtz & Hall 2005) to analyze sociolinguistic style as it emerges in interaction.

Style refers to language use in its situated contexts, and, “in the widest sense, style becomes similar to life-style as described by Bourdieu as the surface correlate of habitus (1979
While stylization is seen as making use of linguistic resources that are non-native, inauthentic, exaggerated, or beyond the norm for the current context, style is often considered to represent authentic and regular forms of language. It is important that styles differ from one another in order to create the groundwork for identity formation and to act as a “system of distinction” (Irvine 2001: 22). In the same way, stylization can provide speakers with the opportunity to distinguish themselves from those who they are stylizing, and in the process, to lay claims to certain identities.

In the context of late modernity, these forms of distinction are arguably more complex. Multilingual stylization can be an act of de/reterritorialization in the sense of weakening and rebuilding ties between language and identity. As speakers stylize speech, they create new indexicalities which may not be affirmed even by those whose speech is the object of stylization. Consequently, stylization among multilinguals is “likely to pluralise indexical interpretation, introducing significant limits to negotiability” (Blommaert & Rampton 2011: 15, emphasis in original). An example of such a case is found in Tsiplakou and Ioannidou’s (2012) study of Aigia Fuxia, a Greek Cypriot television sitcom that stylizes ‘peasant’ speech with obsolete forms and invented language which is made to sound extremely basilectal. In addition, the peasant speech is artfully interwoven with Standard Greek and even English, producing a bricolage that is comedic because of the unexpected juxtapositions of extreme versions of the local with contemporary, transnational symbols. As the authors explain, by being so far-fetched, Aigia Fuxia “open[s] up the potential for critical reflection on the Greek Cypriot linguistic/sociocultural imaginary” (2012: 290). Beyond entertaining its audience, the show puts a spotlight on the constructed nature of authenticity, as tied to the concept of the peasant, not just in the show, but also in society. They explain that viewers of the show may come away with very different interpretations of the stylization, however, due to the sociocultural context of Cyprus, where hybrid identities and languages are stigmatized due to the history of the politically and culturally divided country. Similar cases are presented in Furukawa’s paper (this issue) on Mock Native Speaker English in Japanese television shows, where the ‘coolness’ associated with English gets noticeably misattributed to a ‘cool’ celebrity game show contestant, and even motivates some discussion among the other contestants about who is ‘cool’ enough to warrant the attribution. The jimaku, or on-screen text, also draws the audience’s attention to the meanings of language by framing the televised participants’ speech as English or Japanese borrowings of English and coding them accordingly. As Furukawa argues, these stylizations help to style the participants as sophisticated while subtly mocking the power of native speaker English, which in most people’s reality holds a hegemonic status in the country.

It is the goal of this collection to show how multilinguals use stylization as a resource to engage in both straightforward and ambiguous forms of intersubjectivity, and to explore how they navigate the linguistic conditions of late modernity and superdiversity (Blommaert & Rampton 2011). In analyzing stylization as a practice, therefore, we strive to analyze what new meanings and new systems that stylization points to. As Blommaert and Rampton (2011) explain, studying multilingualism within the contexts of superdiversity is worthwhile for two reasons (Blommaert & Rampton 2011: 16):

First, they allow us to observe linguistic norms being manufactured, interrogated or altered, or to see norms that have changed and are new/different in the social networks being studied. We can see, in short, the emergence of structure out of agency. And second, there are likely to be social, cultural and/or political stakes in this, as we know from the principle of indexicality. So when white youngsters...
use bits of other-ethnic speech styles in ways that their other-ethnic friends accept, there are grounds for suggesting that they are learning to ‘live with difference’ (Harris 2006; Hewitt 1986; Rampton 1995), and when people put on exaggerated posh or vernacular accents in mockery or retaliation of authority, it looks as though social class has retained its significance in late modernity (Jaspers 2011; Rampton 2006).

As a result of movement across borders and shuttling between communities and increased contact with linguistic diversity, the multilingual populations under consideration in the papers that follow allow for the authors to examine what new indexicalities are emerging. At the same time, old indexicalities may play a role in forging new meanings, and stylization may act as the lynchpin that allows for this duality.

4. The range of stylization

To introduce the range of ways that speakers make use of and interpret stylized speech, I present examples of multilingual data to show how speakers produce stylized speech and to demonstrate the range of interactional effects it has, from mocking to styling. The examples represent a continuum of stylization (see Figure 1) which places mocking on one end (to refer to stylization that can, but does not necessarily lead to insult) and style on the other (to represent acts of identity, some of which are the result of mockery). On both ends of the continuum, I list a the stylization phenomena discussed in existing literature and indicate whether in-group or out-group members are engaged in these stylization practices. One pattern of interest is that out-group members are more likely to engage in mockery as insult, while in-group members play a central role in stylization as an act of identity. I place each of these phenomena on the continuum spatially to demonstrate that some phenomena may begin as acts of mocking or styling, but may share features with the other end of the spectrum as well.

Insert FIGURE 1 about here

While this continuum focuses on the indexicalities of stylized language use, it is important to acknowledge that the varied meanings of stylization depend centrally on the social relations of the speakers and their interlocutors or audiences. Stylization can carry different meanings if in-group members perform it, or if out-group members engage in forms of crossing and stylization in combination. Moreover, if a speaker is associated with a social status that is higher or lower than that of the language being stylized, this too can influence the meanings produced. Finally, if the stances projected through the stylization are sympathetic to or supportive of the individuals being stylized, it is more likely that the stylization will come off positively, rather than as mockery, even if the stylizer is from the out-group.

4.1 Stylization as Mocking

4.1.1 Mocking as insult

Mock language is a form of stylization that ultimately leads to insult and usually references minority groups, stigmatized varieties, and disenfranchised populations. Linguistically, it
involves partial knowledge of languages and is characterized by invented forms, such as the
Mock Spanish “Muchas Smooches for el con-kiss-tador!”, appearing on a Calvin and Hobbes
comic strip (Hill 1995). Mock Spanish is described by Jane Hill (1995, 1998), as a variety used
by and for Anglo American speakers who have no comprehension of Spanish in an effort to style
themselves as easy going, congenial people. Ostensibly, users of Mock Spanish do not intend
any harm; however, because the ways non-Latinos use Mock Spanish is pejorative and links
Spanish on a second indexical order with negative attributes such as laziness, unreliability,
dirtiness, Hill explains that it is a form of covert racism. Mock Spanish is thus a form of
stylization that styles Anglos as certain kinds of people amongst other non-Latinos, but which
ultimately has damaging effects on the people whose language has been co-opted. Mock
Spanish is indeed a form of multilingual stylization, though due to its very ontological status, it is
inauthentic since its speakers are not legitimate users of the language. Other illustrations of this
kind of stylization include Chun’s (2004: 267) example of Mock Asian on a series of t-shirts
produced by the U.S.-based retailer, Abercrombie & Fitch one of which stated “Wong Brother’s
Laundry Service: Two Wongs can make it white” as joke about the stereotypical associations
between Asians and laundry services and Asian immigrants’ and Asian immigrants’
pronunciation of English.

It is easy to see that the use of stylized speech leads to negative associations, including
the construction of stereotypes and covert forms of racism. As Higgins and Furukawa (2012:
189) demonstrate, stylized speech such as Mock Hawaiian can produce racist stereotypes that
reproduce colonialist discourses. In analyzing the film 50 First Dates, we examine how Ula, a
Hawaiian character, uses stylized and inauthentic Hawaiian comprised of hyperanglicizations, or
absurd mispronunciations used to imitate Hawaiian and to create vulgar puns that are meant to
encourage his friend, Henry, to engage in casual sex. In addition to portraying Hawaiians as
crude, hypersexual people, the use of nonsense Hawaiian here pejoratively constructs Hawaiian
as a simple and repetitive language that can easily be manipulated to make meaning. The
inauthenticity of the portrayal is underscored by the choice of the actor Rob Schneider to play
Ula, an actor with Jewish, Caucasian, and Filipino ancestry who is well known for his roles on
Saturday Night Live and B-movie comedies.

(2) Mock Hawaiian in 50 First Dates

1 Henry: You pimping tourists for me again, Ula?
    Come on, give ha the Waikikiki sneaky between the cheeky.

Comparing these examples with Chun’s (2004) analysis of Margaret Cho’s comedy demonstrates
the importance of who is stylizing whom, and what stances are expressed. Though Margaret
Cho uses an over the top form of immigrant English, her act can in fact be seen as critical in
nature due to Cho’s identity as the daughter of Korean immigrants, which arguably authenticates
her performance and shields her from claims that her act is insulting. In the other cases of mock
language discussed above, however, the stylizers were ethnolinguistically members of the out-
group, which makes it much less possible to see their stylization in a positive light. In the case of
Mock Spanish, the users and their audiences are Anglo Americans; the retail chain Abercrombie
& Fitch (which is strongly associated with Anglo clientele) stylizes Asian immigrants to sell
‘clever’ t-shirts; and in the case of Fifty First Dates, Hollywood writers, directors, and producers
have crafted the film script with no apparent input by anyone knowledgeable about the Hawaiian language.

One rare counterexample that shows how out-group members produce stylization without mocking comes from Coupland (2007: 176), who, analyzes the use of Mock Spanish such as “El Dudarino” in the film The Big Lebowski. He points out that it is also possible to aim for metaparody, or the knowing use of Mock or Junk Spanish as an act of self-targeted mockery. The key in the interpretation is the framing surrounding the stylization, and the keying of the performance. Much depends on the stances taken toward the mocked variety and the degree to which everyone is in on the framing. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that the first indexical order of language mockery – even with parody – is the subordination of a language. This can then be challenged with other indexical orders, which then challenge that very subordination.

4.1.2 Mocking to reject propositional content

Mockery can also be used for direct confrontation and to reject propositional content, as illustrated in the following data taken from an interview with Sharon, a Korean Adoptee (KAD) Returnee who was adopted to the United States as a child and who returned to live in Seoul, Korea as an adult (cf. Higgins & Stoker 2011). In the process of describing the ways that she has been othered by both Koreans and foreigners living in Seoul, she explained how foreign (American) soldiers stationed in Seoul attempt to get her attention by speaking Korean, on the assumption that she is a Korean woman. In her retelling, Sharon mocks the soldiers through directly laughing at them and through false praise for their limited Korean language skills (line 4). According to her narrative, the soldiers do not often recognize that they are being mocked, however, and focus on Sharon’s English ‘proficiency,’ and continue to pursue her romantically through praising her English. Sharon’s mockery of the soldiers is therefore a means of rejecting their romantic advances as well as their understanding of her as a typical Korean woman.

(3) “Your Korean’s really good”

1   Interviewer: But if someone is trying to hit on you in Korean how do you respond?
2   Sharon: Usually I just laugh. Usually when they start saying annyeong haseyo
3     (‘hello’) … I just start laughing I’m like- and then they’ll be like “what’s
4     so funny?” I’ll be like “oh your Korean’s really good.” So I'm basically
5     being really rude and they’ll be like “no your English is so good.”

Sharon also stylized her interactions with who she called “Korean Koreans” in ways that were not flattering. Because she was ethnically Korean but did not speak Korean like someone born and raised in the country, she was often asked about her background, an experience that fatigued her. In recounting one such episode, she stylizes a Korean Korean as overly invested in Korean identity due to his overbearing advice to her about integration, assimilation, and marriage into a Korean Korean family. Sharon’s stylization in (4) constructs Korean Koreans as embracing a monolithic, nationalist vision of Korean identity which has no room for hybrid or in-between Koreans such as herself. After being asked how she responds to questions about her background from relative strangers, she explains in line 1 that she would tell people that she is adopted, which leads them to ask a barrage of questions and give a stream of advice about how
to become Korean. The quick pace of the stylized speech starting on line 3, the latched turns indicating no opportunities given to her to respond to the questions being asked, the repetition of “Korean” in each utterance, and the emphatic advice that she should live in Korea “forever” all contribute to a negative stylization.

(4) Have Korean babies and live in Korea forever

1 Sharon: I’m adopted so I can’t speak Korean. And sometimes they would try to say
2 stuff to me or they would a lot of times they would start speaking to me in
3 English after I would say that. Like “>O:h have you found your Korean
4 parents? Are you studying Korean?= You should study Korean. Do you
5 want to get married to a Korean guy? You should get married to a Korean
6 guy and have Korean babies and live in Korea forever.<”

The next example similarly shows how mocking the speech of another can be used to reject the proposition of the discourse amongst members of the same group. The example comes from the context of peer education about HIV/AIDS in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania (Higgins 2010: 75), and shows how a group of young men react to Hamisi, a Tanzanian volunteer peer educator who is teaching life skills education in his neighborhood. After briefly explaining the life skill of empathy, Hamisi’s audience has a negative reaction, which leads them to mock Hamisi’s naturally deep vocal quality as a way of rejecting his message.

(5) “There’s no empathy here”

1 A: *Nilishiwahi kukuambia Hamisi “nisaidie shilingi mia, mimi sijala.”* Unashindwa.
   I’ve already told you Hamisi, “help me with one hundred shillings – I haven’t eaten,”
   (and) you can’t.

2 D: *Wa kwanza wewe mwenyewe (.) Hamisi.*
   The first person ought to be you yourself (.) Hamisi.

3 A: *Yaani mfano mfupi kwako uko. Tusiwe tunaenda mbali nyumba ya pili.*
   So the easy example is right here. We don’t even have to go one more house over.

4 C: *Viazi huwa hatuli viazi. Tukikuona tukikuambia Hamisi “vipi bwana.”*
   Potatoes, we don’t normally even (have the money) to eat potatoes. When we see you
   Hamisi we say “how’s everything?”

5 Unasema (.) ((low voice, mimicking Hamisi’s voice quality)) “↑bwana (.) hali
6 mbaya.”
   You say, ((low voice, mimicking Hamisi’s voice quality)) “brother, things are
   rough.”

7 D: *Kuna uhirikeli ↑hapo?*
   Is there empathy ↑here?
Though all the young men, including Hamisi, live in poverty, Hamisi is perceived as having more money than the rest since he works for an aid organization. Even though he is poorly paid for this work, it is clear that his peers view him as having money to offer them when times are so tight that not even potatoes can be afforded (line 4). Nevertheless, the young men portray Hamisi as insensitive to their needs, mocking his baritone voice in reported speech (line 5). In the end, they reject the message of empathy and reprimand Hamisi’s lack of generosity through stylizing his speech.

4.2 Styling by stylizing
On the other end of the spectrum, stylizing can produce acts of identity. We see speakers use stylization in mock fashion to challenge the boundaries around who the “authentic” speakers of a language are and to assert their own legitimacy as authentic speakers. In addition, speakers can use stylization to distinguish themselves from others, which in turn allows them to more clearly establish who they are. They can also engage in acts of identity by playing with the ambiguities of stylization. By drawing attention to the boundaries between insult and identity, and manipulating them strategically, speakers who use this form of stylization show a heightened awareness about the role of language as means for identity construction. Finally, stylization can call attention to the sociohistorical values of languages as symbolic markers of places and ways of life. By exaggerating linguistic differences and calling attention to the unique features of certain (often stigmatized) languages, speakers can thereby reaffirm the importance of particular languages.

4.2.1 Mocking as self-styling
Mock language may be used reflexively as a means of styling one’s own identity, particularly in contexts where individuals’ authenticity as members of particular ethnolinguistic groups, are in question. Canagarajah (2012) provides instances of “self-styling” in the Tamil diaspora, where many young people who do not speak Tamil fluently are identified as “not Tamil” in spite of their own identifications with Tamil culture. He found that despite this generation’s lack of Tamil proficiency, they used Tamil ‘insult’ terms such as caniyen (meaning an unlucky or evil person) and paNTi (‘pig’) as playful insults, words which were even used as endearments for one’s own family members and friends of Tamil descent. Though these terms would be insulting in Sri Lanka, in the diaspora, they came to mean quite differently. Canagarajah’s examples demonstrate how stylization can change the meaning of languages through geographic and intergenerational dislocation, and they show the role that flexibility plays in interpreting the meanings of diasporic language – in this case, allowing for inventive and recontextualized meanings to be understood as novel efforts to claim one’s Tamilness.

Another example of self-styling comes from Hiramoto’s (2011) analysis of a television advertisement for cable and internet service aired in Hawai’i in 2008, which involves both mocking and styling through stylization. The ad features a man dressed in a velvet smoking jacket using his laptop while sitting in a chair with a piano and a fireplace in the background – all of which are ill fitting with the tropical and generally quite casual environment of Hawai’i. Though the Road Runner Hawai’i ad is clearly targeting a local Hawai’i audience, the first 6 lines are completely lacking in any linguistic features that might be designed for a Hawai’i audience, notably Hawai’i Creole or Hawai’i English. Moreover, the man’s contributions in
lines 2-6 are carried off in stylized upper class, overly enunciated English which does not exist in Hawai‘i, if anywhere. In her analysis of the ad, Hiramoto (2011: 262) explains that “his mannerisms, including the hyper-enunciated [standard American English], are strategically comedic, because the odd and humorous verse undermines the accompanying sophisticated imagery, despite the impressive vocabulary, rhyming and poetic meter.” These mannerisms are comedic because they succeed in mocking an elite upper class in Hawai‘i, a state with a predominantly working class lifestyle due to its legacy as a plantation-based economy. Here, ‘standard’ English is mocked through overly enunciated pronunciation (e.g., no reduced vowels), poetic rhyme schemes, multisyllabic words, and the upper crust backdrop in which the ad is filmed.

(6) “Ai ste ejumakeited” (Road Runner Hawai‘i/Time Warner Cable)

On line 7, however, the man displays his ‘real’ identity, switching into Hawai‘i Creole to explain himself. Turning directly to the camera, his air of sophistication evaporates as he raises his eyebrows and says “No kaʻi help. Ai ste ejumakeited!” Here again, stylization operates, but this time through Hawai‘i Creole, to exaggerate the features using the most basilectal forms possible. The use of ejumakeited is particularly striking in this regard, as it draws the audience’s attention to the actual socio-economic status of the speaker and ruptures any possible lingering belief that he had been using an authentic speech style in lines 2-6. This stylization results in an act of identity that positions the man, and Road Runner Hawai‘i/Time Warner Cable, as an authentic voice of the people.

Speakers may also stylize forms of speech attributed to themselves by others to exaggerated effect to reject identities and to mark their own membership in particular communities. As Talmy (2008) demonstrates, long-term ESL students in a high school in Hawai‘i often engaged in Mock ESL, an exaggerated form of learner English through which they often expressed their inability to do various academic tasks requested by their teachers. The long-term ESL students who used this variety were generally low-achieving students who were highly proficient in Hawai‘i Creole and who disliked their placement in the ESL class, which they tended to see as remedial. Their use of Mock ESL was then an act of identity through stylization that provided them with both a means of resisting school and of distinguishing themselves from the ‘newcomer’ or FOB (‘fresh off the boat’) English learners who were in their classes.

4.2.2 Stylization as ambiguous mocking
Stylization can also lead to rather ambiguous results, as illustrated in Chun’s (2009) study of mocking among Asian American and Asian immigrant high school students. Through reporting their own forms of speech accommodation toward L2 speakers of English in narrative retellings, the students produced language that reinforced the hierarchy between themselves and the L2 English speaking students who they characterized. On the other hand, they framed these retellings in stories that expressed solidarity and even friendship toward the people they stylized, which makes it difficult to assess these acts of stylization as straightforward occasions of mocking. In the first part of one conversational episode, a student with the pseudonym of Big Dog, a Filipina-American, describes how she changed her usual way of speaking when eating lunch with Luke, an L2 English speaking Korean American friend (Chun 2009: 29).

(7) “Pass ketchup please”

1 Big Dog: Yeah. I felt so uncomfortable
2 eating with them
3 But like
4 then I’d start to speak broken
5 English
6 h so they [could understand me
7 Elaine: [h h h
8 ALL: ((laugh))
9 Big Dog: “Pass ketchup ((reduced tempo, article deletion, direct speech))
10 Please. ((hyper-formality))
11 ALL: ((laughing))

Chun explains that Big Dog’s reference to her own English as “broken” warrants treating this part of the conversation as a retelling without mocking since the frame in which she is telling the story is highlighting her own language production and is contextualized by references to Luke as a good friend. Later in the conversation, however, the participants collaboratively produce stylized mock Asian, and the linguistic features they use to do so are remarkably similar to Big Dog’s earlier verbal performance (e.g., deletion of articles, simplified prosody). This leaves it unclear whether Big Dog’s initial narrative is indeed mocking or an act of speech accommodation to her friend.

Another study of ambiguity in stylization is Jaspers (2011), who examined how Moroccan-Flemish students who were fluent in Dutch sometimes stylized themselves as “illegal refugee” speakers with noticeable L2 accents that were entirely put on. While some occasions of “talking illegal” were clearly attempts to deauthenticate stereotypes about Muslim minorities in Belgium, the repeated mocking of ‘bad’ Dutch actually reified the linguistic hierarchy which placed standard Dutch at the top and migrant varieties of the language far below. As fluent speakers of Dutch who were often racialized themselves, Jaspers (2011: 1277) explains their stylization as a response to the “unavoidable ambiguity, complexity and contradiction involved in being different from or engaging with the hegemonic ideal, and how this involves both altering and maintaining, protesting as well as accommodating.”

4.2.3 Stylizing authenticity
Opposite the extreme forms of mocking which lead to insult are cases of styling one’s identity through stylization. In his analysis of the *Roy Noble Show*, Coupland (2001) demonstrates how announcers exaggerate Welshness on the radio by overdoing Welsh English features and over-romanticizing features of rural Welsh lifestyles, blatantly stylizing Welshness as a point of entertainment. However, in stylizing both the dialect and traditional icons of Welsh identity, Coupland argues that the announcers are in turn establishing an authentic form of Welsh identity, if only indirectly. Without discrediting the cultural value of the Welsh dialect, the announcers put Welsh identity up for scrutiny, and hence reaffirm its importance. Their actions do not involve making fun of Welshness or insulting it.

Similar acts of stylization are found on the west coast of Oahu in Hawai‘i, where Hawai‘i Creole is the language of local identification. In a student-produced film documentary (Higgins et al. 2012), a high school student, Michael Lopez, engages in stylization in an on-camera interview about Hawai‘i Creole. He brings up the use of *da kine*, an iconic Hawai‘i Creole word that means something like ‘whatchamacallit’ or ‘whatscherface’ but which can be used for other pragmatic meanings as well, such as making allusions to being gay, being pregnant, and so forth. *Da kine* is one of the most well known Hawai‘i Creole terms among non-locals and has also been commodified; it is used as a brand name for outdoor gear and many other forms of marketing to local consumers.

In (8), Michael first establishes that Hawai‘i Creole is a language for local people and explains that it is hard for outsiders (*haole*) to understand due specifically to the opaque nature of *da kine*. Here, he speaks in English with some Hawai‘i Creole phonology. Starting on line 5, he explains how local people talk, stylizing Hawai‘i Creole in an over the top manner as he translates English into basilectal forms of the language. The most stylized utterance, though, is his example of his father being able to understand what he means when he uses “*da kine*” three times in one sentence in lines 7-8 to mean that the truck’s transmission broke down. This is a clear case of what Bell and Gibson (2011) describe as *overshooting*, where a feature is produced categorically in performance but demonstrates more variability in off stage language use.

(8) *Da kine*

1 That’s our Ebonics. That’s our ethnic background, that’s where we came from. That’s how we communicate with each *odda* and that’s how *oddas* can communicate with us.
2 When *haole* people come to Hawai‘i they trip out cause “kay, this guy just said the word *da kine* in 10 sentences, 10 times in one sentence. How does how does he talk like that?” […]
3 They *wen tell* somebody to wash the dishes they not *gon* say “wash the dishes” say “*eh, try clean the sink one fast one*” “or wash the dog *eh*?” “*Clean the dog yeah, can wot?”
4 Kay, go home talk to my *fadda* and be like “*eh dad, da kine was da kine and da kine eh li’dat*” he know exactly what I was talking about. He know *dat I trying* to say that the transmission on the truck *wen broke li’dat* (‘broke like that’).

5. Overview of the contributions

1 Bell and Gibson use this term to refer to one aspect of sociophonetic stylization. However, it is usefully applied to lexical and grammatical forms of stylization as well.
The next five additional articles explore the range of stylization from insult to acts of identity, paying special attention to the ways that forms of mocking may in fact become acts of styling. Rather than positing a linear spectrum between mocking and styling, then, the papers investigate whether and to what degree stylization achieves new and different meanings through its framings, rekeyings, and interpretations by others. The collection also pays attention to the role that social status and in-group and out-group memberships plays in stylization.

Three papers explore stylization in mundane performance settings. First, Mónica Vidal examines conversations taking place among her transnational, intergenerational family members to see how stylization creates opportunities for the family to style themselves as a multicultural, multisited family, and to overcome differences. She analyzes mealtime conversations recorded during a summer that she and her U.S. born sisters spent with their grandfather in Spain. Since the data are of naturally occurring conversation, the paper provides examples of stylization that are produced in the least staged context of all the papers. Though some of the stylization occurs in the form of mockery, particularly amongst the granddaughters, Vidal shows that the stylization is often reappropriated to achieve the interactional goals of peacekeeping and demonstrating a sense of family. The grandfather in particular does a lot of interactional work to broker harmony through reframing stylized language in positive terms, and the data show that both he and his granddaughters are quite conscious of the role that language plays in creating difference and dissonance among them.

Next, Gavin Lamb analyzes a classroom in Hawai‘i, where an English language arts teacher from the mainland U.S. instructs local students. The teacher stylizes the students’ languages, Hawai‘i Creole and Hawai‘i English, in an effort to build rapport with them, and he appears successful in creating humorous frames for instruction and for classroom management. In this way, the teacher successfully uses stylization as a resource for managing his institutional role as a teacher. Interviews with the teacher also point to his pride in establishing good relationships with his students through ‘joking around’ and sharing the common experience of having grown up in ‘rough’ neighborhoods. However, when the teacher also engages in stylization to reprimand his students for their ‘non-standard’ English, it is apparent that the framings of stylization are central to their success. The teacher’s stylization for linguistic correction is treated as an act of mocking, or an act of insult. Moreover, when the teacher is asked by his students to perform Hawai‘i Creole, he presents the language in an overly basic manner, thereby portraying its speakers as equally simplified and simplistic. The lesson in Lamb’s paper is that though outsiders may engage in linguistic crossing legitimately, as in the case of the teacher crossing for rapport building, their authenticity as speakers of the language can be easily delegitimized if the frame in which their crossing occurs does symbolic violence to its speakers.

Priti Sandhu’s paper provides us with an analysis of a research interview about the effects of medium of instruction on North Indian women’s lives. Though interviews are usually treated as examples of mundane performance, her data approximate high performance stylization in many ways since the recordings often lead to animated episodes of storytelling in which characters are created and voiced, as if on a stage. In terms of performance, the interviews also reveal how Sandhu herself was complicit—as all researchers are—in the unfolding plot of the stories and in authenticating the meaning of stylized language given to characters in the narratives. As the women narrated examples of language discrimination they experienced for speaking certain kinds of English and Hindi, her reactions and follow up questions helped to
reproduce the often hegemonic language ideologies that the stories revealed. Through interviewing one English-medium educated (EME) woman and two Hindi-medium educated (HME) women, Sandhu’s analysis highlights the radically different subject positions that medium of instruction creates for Indians, even in stylization. The EME woman freely mocks HME speech styles, discursively substantiating the elevated status that EME promises to provide to Indians. On the other hand, HME women present EME speakers in their narratives as having authority over HME people, even in stories that critique their actions.

The last two papers examine stylization on stage, in the context of high performance. While there are certain elements which are obviously preplanned, there is a great deal of room for improvisation, particularly in Gavin Furukawa’s paper on Stylized native speaker English (NSE) as used by Japanese celebrities on television shows. The celebrities move between Japanese, Japanese English (eigo and wasei eigo) and Stylized NSE in their performances, using the latter to draw attention to the differences between the pronunciation of English by Japanese and native speakers, thereby mocking their own varieties. They make explicit commentary about NSE in their comparisons, and they attribute qualities of cosmopolitan cool (sugoi) associated with west-based icons such as Hollywood to NSE. At the same time, in voicing Stylized NSE in simulated English lessons and in providing answers in Stylized NSE on quiz shows, however, the celebrities end up embracing the same ideologies that pit NSE against nativized English/wasei eigo to style themselves as sugoi themselves.

Finally, Bal Sharma explores the stylization of Nepali dialects and English in his analysis of Manoj Gajurel’s stand up comedy performance in the diaspora. The comedian deftly weaves linguistic mockery through his act which, on another level, mocks the government’s recent failed efforts to create a new federal Nepal comprised of provinces based on ethnolinguistic areas. By going one by one through each province and stylizing its speakers, Gajurel seemingly adds insult to injury as he creates a parallel between the ethnolinguistically differentiated areas and the difficulty the nation has had in coming together in a unified fashion. Though the comedy could be interpreted as suggestive of the idea that linguistic diversity is the cause of political problems, Sharma argues that because Gajurel stylizes the regions in an over-the-top manner, he authenticates them in the process. By invoking Limbuwanness or Tamuwanness in stylization, he is simultaneously making fun of them while putting them on the stage as cultural symbols worthy of deeper reflection. Like Coupland’s (2001) study of the stylization of Welsh speakers in the Roy Noble Show, then, performances like this provide opportunities –at least on stage– for historically denigrated dialects to gain symbolic value.

Since stylization seems to offer speakers the freedom to break rules and flout norms, as in the case of Bakhtin’s (1968) carnivalesque humor, it is somewhat surprising that stylization is in fact heavily constrained by language ideologies which create and reproduce hierarchies of language. Just as Rampton (2006) found in his examination of the stylization of posh and Cockney English varieties among high school students, multilingual stylization also reinforces language politics to a large degree. Across the papers analyzing high performance contexts, stylization appears to reproduce these ideologies the most clearly. Perhaps because the performers are quite literally on stage, their contributions are felt to be subject to societal norms and expectations. As papers by Sharma, Furukawa, and Sandhu illustrate, the performers in these contexts bolster hegemonic ideologies that position monolingual, native speaker norms over and above multilingualism that shows evidence of additional linguistic competencies. Of course, it is important to add that these compartmentalist, modernist understandings of multilingualism intersect with class consciousness and help to reproduce class divisions at the level of stylization.
Sandhu’s study of EME and HME women’s narratives clearly demonstrates how social class is created in part through the language of one’s schooling, which has a lifelong legacy on one’s prospects. Similarly, Sharma’s analysis of dialect stylization reinforces the dominance of standard Nepali, a way of speaking attributed to upper class, urban speakers, which includes the preferred pronunciation of English borrowings into Nepali as retaining their Anglo origins, rather than becoming localized through Nepali phonology. More concerned with the issue of native speakerism, Furukawa’s study points to the continuing deference that Japanese speakers feel toward center varieties through their own self-styling as ‘second class’ English speakers.

On the other hand, multilingual stylization in more mundane performance contexts may promise greater opportunity to challenge the status quo. Vidal’s study shows how stylized Spanish, which would be deemed incorrect by any language teacher, is at first sanctioned as incorrect by the granddaughters, but then is accepted and taken up by a loving grandfather in order to broker harmony among the three lively sisters. He also uses his own rather labored form of English, which his granddaughters in turn critique for its pronunciation, in a legitimate manner—even in written form— in an effort to create order in his house. Similarly, in the context of Hawai‘i, a non-local teacher quite literally breaks the rules of the classroom by infusing Hawai‘i Creole into his talk, as English is the official medium of instruction. While some people in Hawai‘i feel that Hawai‘i Creole is a language that non-locals, and particularly whites, cannot use legitimately, the teacher embraces the language as a means of building rapport with his students by making jokes and attempting to build common ground.

Future studies of stylization comparing mundane and high performance contexts will be needed to address the question of whether stylization can overcome language ideologies, at least in the realm of performance. As the papers here demonstrate, stylization is never really about language, but instead a potential avenue for challenging hierarchies of social class, ethnicities, gender, and other social categories often marked for distinction. As such, it is an area of multilingualism with great potential for revealing, but also producing, sociolinguistic change.
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Figure 1. A continuum of stylization

Mocking ← insult (out-group) ← rejection (in-group, out-group) ← parody (in-group, out-group) ← Styling

self-styling (in-group) ← ambiguation (both) ← affirmations of culture (in-group)