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ABSTRACT

This dissertation takes a discursive approach to Hawai‘i stand-up comedy, which is a highly dramaturgical genre, and it examines the cultural specificity of Hawai‘i comedy in an explicitly interactional context. This culturally-specific performative genre is a discursive site where comedians and their audiences jointly construct multivocal humor through a body of shared knowledge and ideology about linguistic forms, styles, and identities. The dissertation conceptualizes how language, interaction, and social structure are ideologically mediated by one another, and it examines how the comedians use various codes, such as Pidgin and English, and other historically loaded semiotic resources, such as place names, in the moment-by-moment development of performance. Using these inferentially rich semiotic resources, the Local comedians—Frank DeLima, Andy Bumatai, Augie T, Bo Irvine, and others—build interpersonal relationships with their Local and non-Local audiences, invoke intertextual links with past and relevant texts about Hawai‘i and its relation to the continental United States, and successfully draw laughter from their audiences. My data collection included obtaining not only performance but also meta-performance data to demonstrate the way the comedians and their audiences conduct multilingual categorial work to make sense of the cultural specificity of Hawai‘i humor. Based on meta-performance data taken from interviews and focus groups, the dissertation also investigates the reception of Hawai‘i comedy in order to expand this relatively underdeveloped area in sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. A claim is made that multilingual, multiracial, multicultural Hawai‘i comedy constitutes an ideological niche and complicates our understanding of sociolinguistic and discourse analytic ideas such as performativity, multivocality, and stylization.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

One definition of ‘to humor’ is to give in to another party’s desire. In this dissertation, I expand the meaning of humor-ing in order to provide a theoretical frame for this study. Humor-ing the Local in Hawai‘i is more than just complying with the desires of Local people and putting them in a good mood.¹ Local humor is a practice; thus, ‘humor-ing the Local’ means engaging in the practices of Local humor to constitute Localness. Furthermore, humor-ing the Local cannot be detached from its context; such humor is not only about Local people, but is also about their social space. In short, through being hyphenated, ‘humor-ing’ highlights humor as a performative action that constitutes a sense of togetherness and locality; I argue that one of the potential achievements of humor-ing the Local, or doing Local humor, is constructing who Local people are.

Doing Local humor is a located practice in social life. The locatedness of humor-ing tells us that nothing is intrinsically funny; thus, the practice of humor-ing means using semiotic resources and ideologies in a course of actions and jointly making them into humor as an interactional achievement, thereby managing the relational constitutionality of categories and category-bound actions and attributes. Locality, identity, and humor are all interactional achievements within the realm of performance, ideology, and the moral universe.

¹ I make a distinction between a “little l” local and a “big L” Local throughout this chapter to distinguish Local residents from long-term local residents who are not from Hawai‘i. A stereotypical Local is a descendant of plantation laborers and must be born and raised in Hawai‘i.
To illustrate the complex multivocal practices that this dissertation examines, I begin this dissertation with an example from a performance by the comedian Andy Bumatai.\(^2\) In the excerpt, Andy Bumatai (AB) topicalizes a controversy caused by a parody song that was produced by another comedian, Frank DeLima (FD).\(^3\) After some introductory comments, Bumatai re-enacts a conversation between DeLima and himself. Utilizing different voices through reported speech and mock language, he re-enacts a scenario in which DeLima plays his answering machine messages for Bumatai, thus revealing that many of the messages are angry responses to DeLima’s comedy. In this narrated event, Bumatai voices multiple characters: (1) DeLima, who is telling Bumatai about this incident; (2) Bumatai, who is responding to DeLima; and (3) one of the Filipino complainants (F) who left a message on DeLima’s answering machine (See appendix for transcription conventions).

Excerpt 1

01 AB you know * put a lot of heat (. ) frank delima.
02 filipinos ** are leaving <threatening messages>
03 on his ( . ) answering ma(chine).
04 Aud [((laughter))]
05 AB yeah (. ) he played the machine for me.
06 ((FD)) “andy listen to this ((weeping)) listen to this.”
07 ((F)) “you stop telling daet filipino joke (. )
08 I’m going to poke you wit de knife.”=
09 Aud =((laughter))

\(^2\) Andy Bumatai started his career as a stand-up comedian in 1977 and played the breaks for Frank DeLima. He was also a member of Booga Booga, a popular comic trio, for about a year. He won a Hōkū award for the Most Promising Artist in 1979 and won three more Hōkū awards for the Comedy Album of the Year. The Nā Hōkū Hanohano Awards are the most prestigious awards in the entertainment industry in Hawai‘i. Bumatai also did TV specials including School Daze and All in the Ohana. He ‘gave the mainland a shot’ in the mid 1980s and lived outside of L.A. for ten years. He came back to Hawai‘i to perform at comedy clubs in Waikīkī in the 1990s.

\(^3\) Frank DeLima has had the longest career among the comedians whose performances I discuss in the dissertation. He has been one of Hawai‘i’s most popular comedians for more than thirty years. He has won numerous awards that include nine Hōkū awards for the Comedy Album of the Year (1982-83, 1987-90, 1992, 1996-97, 2000).
Here, Bumatai builds a scene by voicing DeLima, who plays a message for Bumatai.

Next, Bumatai voices a Filipino character by using ‘Filipino accented’ English and, in so doing, criticizes DeLima’s parody song (lines 7-8). In other words, Bumatai presents a Filipino character who is critical about Filipino jokes, deploying reported speech as a critique of ethnic humor that mocks Filipinos. The reported speech is also an enactment of ethnic humor that mocks Filipinos, and hence, is a fascinating example of how language use in comedy can have several layers of meanings. In the last line of the excerpt, Bumatai continues with his act, voicing the Filipino character who now sings a part of DeLima’s offending song. In other words, Bumatai imitates a Filipino character who imitates Frank DeLima, who originally imitates a Filipino, to which the audience responds with laughter.

This dissertation examines many such instances of multivocality in and around contexts of comedic performances in Hawai‘i. Specifically, I examine the language used in stand-up comedy routines to explore the identities and indexicalities that are produced through combining English, Hawai‘i Creole, and other semiotic resources. This

---

4 Line 13 seems nonsense, but might be considered to have three parts. The third part, [bakadɑŋpɑŋ], might remind one of an Ilokano last name used in Hawai‘i (i.e., Makadangdang).

5 The dissertation also discusses other comedians; for instance, Augie T is one of the most popular comedians/entertainers in Hawai‘i and performs in the mainland U.S., too. He has won several awards that include two Hōkū awards for the Comedy Album of the Year (1999 and 2003). In 2002, he was also named the Comedian of the Year by two local newspapers, the Midweek and the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. Jose Dynamite and Timmy Mattos often perform in Augie T’s show.

Another comedian I focus attention on in the dissertation is Bo Irvine. He has been performing for mainland and local audiences since 1987. He is the winner of NBC’s Last Comic Standing 2008 Hawai‘i Showcase. He has worked with numerous national comedians. His colleagues in Comedy Polynesia include Kento, Chief Sielu, and Michael Staats.
dissertation has three goals: (1) to unpack the notion of language as a code; (2) to anchor code in relation to ethnicity, place, and performance; and (3) to uncover how code relates to the notions of comedic performance and performativity. This dissertation examines the linguistic and interactional structure of comedic performances by examining the kinds of language alternation that are used, specifically focusing on participant orientations as a guide for determining what is constituted, displayed, and made relevant in interaction.

Because comedy is a strongly dialogic, performative genre that produces multiple readings, the dissertation also explores how these performances are interpreted among hearers. This aspect of the dissertation is particularly important to the field of sociolinguistics due to the multilingual and multiethnic context of Hawai‘i, where a great deal of the humor draws on ethnic and linguistic stereotypes, and hence, may be interpreted in various ways. Hawai‘i’s demographics make a clear contrast to those of the continental U.S. The discursive examination of multilingual, multicultural, and multiracial Hawai‘i complicates our understanding about sociolinguistic issues, models, and theories. Hawai‘i is an interesting site because it is connected with the other Polynesian islands through the oceans and because politically speaking, it is part of the United States while geographically separated from the continental U.S. Casual observation tells us that many Hawai‘i residents refer to themselves as Local; in addition, they do not use hyphenated references such as Japanese-American; instead, they describe their ethnicity by referring only to their ethnic heritage, such as Japanese.

---

[6] Sai (2008) argues that the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1893 was illegal according to international laws and that since then, the United States has continued the illegal occupation of Hawai‘i.
According to the dominant racial ideology in the United States, however, the majority of Hawai‘i residents are Asian-Americans that are considered ‘minorities’ in this nation-state; for instance, the literary tradition of Hawai‘i was marginalized (Sumida, 1991) and still is. Discussing the meaning of the term Asian-American among Hawai‘i residents, Okamura (1994) claims that “[t]here is essentially an unfamiliarity with the political significance of the concept rather than a conscious disapproval of it” (p. 161). To put this differently, the majority of Hawai‘i residents are Locals (Okamura, 1994), but at the same time they are being marginalized as minorities in the national context of the United States. My goal is to identify and demonstrate the ways people show sensitivity to these linguistic, cultural, and racial ideologies and their effects in the contexts of performance and meta-performance. The ideologies that link code, performance, and social relations in Hawai‘i are multilayered and multifaceted; they are the basis of crosscultural humor, parody, and mockery and resist ahistorical reductionism.

In order to capture the complexity of social life in the genre of comedy, I draw on theoretical frameworks and analytical tools from linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics, and discourse and conversation analytic research, to which I attempt to make contributions. First, at the level of theory, I analyze how comedians produce humor by exploiting Hawai‘i’s linguistic resources. Drawing on the work on performance by Bauman and Briggs (1990), I describe these comedic performances as *performances-in-interaction* because the comedians’ verbal actions are produced dialogically with the audiences and are shaped by audience responses such as laughter. My analysis of the linguistic aspects of these performances-in-interaction focuses on the sociolinguistic phenomenon of mockery (Hill, 2001) in multilingual and multicultural contexts. This
dissertation also explores the crucial role of culturally-specific knowledge in analyzing performances-in-interaction. Shared knowledge constitutes, and is constituted by, interaction in situ or in a specific context. To analyze this reflexive process, I examine the construction of intertextual knowledge in an explicitly interactional context.

In the remainder of this chapter, I discuss the key components of my dissertation. Section 2 presents research questions. In Section 3, these questions lead to a literature review of sociolinguistic research on performance and multivocal humor; that is, this section identifies what we know in sociolinguistics about these topics. Section 4 discusses how Hawai‘i complicates our sociolinguistic knowledge, and to aid readers in interpreting the performance data, it presents background information on the history of Hawai‘i Creole as well as the context of Hawai‘i comedy.

1.2 Research questions

Because studies of code and mockery through language (i.e., ethnic labeling and linguistic stereotyping) depend on the locatedness of talk, I take an emic approach to the study of Hawai‘i comedy. At the same time, because the codes employed in stand-up comedy have become meaningful over time in Hawai‘i’s complex linguistic landscape, it is important to also pay due attention to linguistic and sociological aspects of code in order to fully understand how mockery operates on multiple levels. I address three main research questions:

1. How do comedians use codes to build interpersonal relationships with their audiences in comedy shows?
2. What other social accomplishments do the participants achieve with semiotic resources in Hawai‘i comedy?
3. What does meta-performance talk tell us about the reception of codes as part of the performance in Hawai‘i comedy? In other words, why is Hawai‘i comedy ‘funny’?

With a growing recognition of the centrality of performance in everyday uses of language, studies of performance in popular culture have drawn renewed attention in discourse analytic studies (e.g., Chun, 2004; Furukawa, 2007, 2009, 2010; Jaffe, 2000; Labrador, 2004; Pennycook, 2003; Woolard, 1987, 1999). These studies have shown that highly performative data can be useful in examining many issues of language practices and identities because comedic performances “depend on the same ideologies of community membership and language practice that speakers depend on in their everyday contexts” (Chun, 2004, p. 265). This is the rationale for conducting research on voicing of ‘Locals’ through comedic performances in Hawai‘i. I conceptualize linguistic ideology as a link that connects language, interaction, and society, as shown in the two figures below. In the next section, I discuss the two main strands of the theoretical framework for the dissertation that deal with multivocal humor in comedic performance. I also discuss a mediating strand that connects the two main strands.
1.3 Theoretical framework

1.3.1 Performance and performativity

The term performance has both everyday and technical meanings. In everyday use, performance is (1) deliberate play-acting that is believed to be highly intentional. On the
other hand, in technical use, performance is (2) artful ways of speaking (Bauman, 1986; Hymes, 1974) or (3) doing, practicing, and achieving actions. In the third sense of the term, whether ‘doing’ is a conscious act does not matter, as Butler (1990) conceptualizes the notion of performativity as tied to iterability (i.e., repeating and changing conventional actions). The dissertation examines performativity in a highly play-acting genre, taking issue with the deep-rooted belief that comedians do things deliberately on stage and exaggerate them for humorous effects. The dissertation does not deal with the issue of intentionality; audience members may think that the comedians do things deliberately, but what is relevant to my analysis of performance is when and how the comedians perform actions (e.g., exaggeration) and bring various categories into being along with social meanings within and across interactional contexts.

I draw on the concepts of performance and performativity because they enable me to see how comedy calls various characters into being; these characters are constituted through comedic routines. Performance, or what language does, rather than what language encodes, emerged as a key notion in linguistic anthropology and folklore in the 1970s. Performance is conceptualized as a missing link between language and culture, and it was required to provide adequate theories of language in social life (Hymes, 1974). It is also the enactment of the poetic function of language, and it sets up a special interpretative frame (Bauman & Briggs, 1990). Performativity is not the expression of a pre-formed identity; however, it highlights ongoing acts of identity that occur within a “highly rigid regulatory frame” (Pennycook, 2004, p. 8). These acts of identity are rarely restricted to a single context; they are shaped through framing and entextualization and appear across different contexts.
1.3.1.1 The performance frame

The sociologist Erving Goffman uses three types of metaphor for social life: (1) social life as drama, (2) social life as ritual, and (3) social life as play. The ritual metaphor highlights the moral aspects of social life, and the play metaphor relates to the manipulative aspects of social life. The drama metaphor incorporates the moral and manipulative aspects (Branaman, 1997). The dramaturgical metaphor in Goffman (1959, 1974) is most relevant to my data and allows me to conceptualize the moral and manipulative aspects of comedic talk.

Goffman (1959), however, advises us that we should not take too seriously one of the most quoted of Shakespearean clichés, that “all the world’s a stage,” because a staged character faces no real consequences. Goffman’s goal is not to examine “aspects of theater that creep into everyday life” (p. 254) but to investigate the structure of social interaction. Nevertheless, he asserts that “the successful staging of either of these types of false figures involves use of real techniques—the same techniques by which everyday persons sustain their real social situations” (pp. 254-255). This is the impression management of self in daily life.

In this impression business, interactants project, respond to, negotiate, and sustain a definition of a situation. We live in a moral world, and “any projected definition of the situation also has a distinctive moral character” (Goffman, 1959, p. 13). To put this moral demand differently, when an interactant projects a definition of the situation, s/he makes a claim to be a member of a certain category, thereby demanding that the other interactants treat her/him in the way that persons of that category should be treated and making implications about the way that such persons should not be treated. However, this
act of morality does not come without any risks, because whenever the performer does her/his routine, the legitimacy of her/his social belonging is tested and is at stake.

Goffman (1959) regards the self as a product or “a dramatic effect” (p. 253) of a scene that is projected in the moral process among the dwellers of a moral world; and what is crucial is whether it is credited or discredited in the process of situated moment-by-moment interaction. It should also be noted that Goffman implies that this interactional achievement has its historicity when he states that the self “in all its parts bears the marks of this genesis” (p. 253).

Goffman (1974) re-conceptualizes the dramaturgical metaphor as a frame, referring to it as the theatrical frame (Goffman, 1974, pp. 10-11):

I assume that definitions of a situation are built up in accordance with principles of organization which govern events—at least social ones—and our subjective involvement in them; frame is the word I use to refer to such of these basic elements as I am able to identify.

I argue that the frame of comedy is constituted in an explicitly interactional context. Interactants display their understanding of the previous and relevant utterances and other actions, developing a moment-by-moment flow of interaction as context and achieving intersubjectivity about definitions of interactional events. Following Goffman, Ensink (2003) develops multiple frames for the analysis of race talk; Ensink’s conceptualization suggests a kind of frame that focuses on the organization of experience in comedy, or the performance frame.
1.3.1.2 Performance-in-interaction

I draw on Schegloff’s (1980) term ‘talk-in-interaction’ to investigate the multiplicity of meaning-making in Local comedy—a highly culturally-specific and performative practice. My data has multiple layers of performance and performativity, which requires some explanation. First, in the most ostensive sense, the emic label ‘show’ is deployed when comedians announce that “this is a comedy show”; that is, my data is clearly marked as performance data. Second, a comedy show is designed to be humorous and is recipient designed for a certain group of people. However, Norrick (1993) argues that much previous research on humor has made general claims without investigating any real conversation. Third, performance is an artful way of achieving actions (Bauman, 1986). Fourth, performance is a constitutive action that indexes, defines, and redefines situations in the moment-by-moment flow of interaction; that is, to study performance is to study social action and interaction. Thus, I propose the term ‘performance-in-interaction’ to conceptualize the nature of discursive practices in my data (i.e., performance) and to bring the interactional, dynamic, and emergent nature of these practices to the foreground (i.e., in interaction).

I take a discursive approach in the sense that Bucholtz and Hall (2005) theorize it as a sociocultural linguistic approach, or in the sense that Buttyn (2004) labels it as a discursive constructionist approach. This approach allows me to acknowledge the potential significance of the ‘brought along’ (Giddens, 1984; Roberts, 1996) context, or the historicity of context (Blommaert, 2001). Historicity is crucial to examining many semiotic resources, including the Hawai‘i Creole that is found in my data and is a highly historicized language. Norrick (1993) also discusses what counts as context while
examining humor in interaction. Dealing with conversational joking between two strangers who can exchange jokes in the context of the United States, he makes the following statement:

[T]hey share a wealth of background information about their respective habits as well as assumptions about who jokes with whom, where, when, and about what. All this must count as context in the wide sense of how participants in an interaction perceive their situation, goals, and interrelations. [...] This points up the function of joking as a means of presenting a self—in the sense of Goffman (1955)—and eliciting social information about others, all of which, in turn, becomes a part of the dynamic context. (Norrick, 1993, pp. 4-5, my emphasis)

Norrick and Chiaro (2009) and Norrick (2010) situate humor studies in interaction. Reviewing different approaches to joking, Norrick (2010) associates his earlier work on joking (e.g., Norrick, 1993) with the tradition of framing and interactional sociolinguistics and also discusses his more recent work on collaborative narrative telling that makes old (or familiar) funny stories about shared experiences tellable. In the next sections, I discuss the notions of entextualization and indexicality that are closely connected with a sociocultural linguistic approach in discourse analytic research.

1.3.1.3 Indexicality

Indexicality is the context-bound nature of language use (Garfinkel, 1967) and is “what constitutes language as an essentially context-bound, interactively organized phenomenon” (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992, p. 44). As interactants are participating in talk-in-interaction, the indexical framework starts to change. These changes are reflected referentially and non-referentially in patterns of usage of semiotic resources such as shifters (e.g., deictics), prosodic features, and language choice and alternation (Hanks,
Indexicality is also a mediating factor (Ochs, 1992); the relation of language to a social category such as gender “is constituted and mediated by the relation of language to stances, social acts, social activities, and other social constructs” (Ochs, 1992, p. 337).

These properties of indexicality suggest ways to analyze acts of identity in Hawai‘i stand-up comedy where the comedians constitute racial and ethnic identities through linguistic mockery, ethnic references, and place names. I examine the interactional process in which these acts of identity are mediated by the relation of referential and non-referential resources to stances, social acts, social activities, and other social constructs. The context-bound and mediating properties of language use lead to a discursive practice that generates multilayered meaning-making. An act of stereotyping, or ‘doing’ linguistic forms and ethnic references, is contextualized in performance-in-interaction. There is no simple relationship between ethnic labels and linguistic forms that index them, and indexicality serves a fundamental role in organizing, re-organizing, and even interpreting (Silverstein, 2003) various categories in Hawai‘i comedy where linguistic mockery, ethnic references, and place names create and re-create social meanings. I am particularly interested in the indexical properties of Hawai‘i comedy because they constitute the core of the culturally-specific knowledge that is circulating in Hawai‘i society. Such shared knowledge consists of a bundle of semiotic resources that are also indispensible both for the production and reception of multivocal humor.

1.3.1.4 Entextualization

The discursive construction of humor in performance-in-interaction is inseparable from, and is intertwined with, the process of entextualization (Bauman & Briggs, 1990; Briggs
& Bauman, 1992; Mehan, 1996). In the dissertation, I engage with this concept to analyze how comedians make use of previous performances and shared knowledge to produce humorous meanings in their talk. Comedic performances are entextualized, de-entextualized, and re-entextualized “within and across speech events—referred to, cited, evaluated, reported, looked back upon, replayed, and otherwise transformed in the production and reproduction of social life” (Bauman & Briggs, 1990, p. 80). Bauman and Briggs (1990) argue that the investigation of entextualization opens up ways of revealing (1) histories of performance, (2) the social structures where performances play a constitutive role, and (3) performances in relation to other modes of language use. The examination of entextualization in Hawai‘i comedy reveals the historicity and multiplicity of meaning-making that characterizes this highly performative genre where linguistic features are ideologically associated with ways of speaking as well as with identities.

1.3.2 Language ideology

Language ideology refers to beliefs about language and society and the effects of such beliefs. This concept serves as a mediating link between linguistic forms/use and social structure in the sense that people make sense of social reality through ideological interpretations of linguistic forms in use, and in the sense that they formulate linguistic reality by means of ideological interpretations of social structure. Woolard (1998) states that language ideology is not ideas “so much as construed practice” (p. 10) and conceptualizes it as mediating links that create the interface between language and society; in other words, language ideology, linguistic forms, and social forms are
mutually constitutive. This construed practice can be consequential and generate effects in linguistic, interactional, and social processes of meaning-making; that is, language ideology is performative.

Language ideology, therefore, is a semiotic mediation through which we account for, constitute, and re-constitute reality. This semiotic mediation can be analyzed on one level by means of the Peircean notion of indexicality that Silverstein (2003) appropriates as a theory of the indexical order. According to Silverstein’s theory, individual (linguistic, bodily, etc.) characteristics are ideologized and typified into collective ones; in other words, first-order indexicality is transformed into second-order indexicality (Woolard, 1998). The theory of the indexical order is also a theory of linguistic and ethnic stereotyping.

Given linguistic and ethnic stereotyping as construed semiotic practice, comedic performance is not just execution of pre-formed, written, or rehearsed descriptions/lines about a social world, but it acts in and creates a social life, social relations, and linguistic styles. Comedic performance performatively constitutes reality; the type of comedic performance I examine, Hawai‘i stand-up comedy, is an ideological, mediating, and constitutive practice, and it creates a social world for people of Hawai‘i.

Comedic performance often involves the use of various ‘accents’ that are believed to be in use in everyday settings. As she discusses language ideology about accents in the United States, Lippi-Green (1997) defines accents as “loose bundles of prosodic and segmental features distributed over geographic and/or social space” (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 42). She makes a general comment about stereotypical accents in the United States:
Each of us would group the accents we come across in different configurations. For the majority of Americans, French accents are positive ones, but not for all of us. Many have strong pejorative reactions to Asian accents, or to African American Vernacular English, but certainly not everyone does. The accents we hear must go through our language ideology filters. (p. 72)

Lippi-Green raises three important points here. First, we categorize speech into different accents: for instance, French accents, Asian accents, and African American Vernacular English. Second, we attribute different social meanings to these accents. Third, there is individual variation in the perception of these different kinds of accents. I have to add that these categories of accents emerge in talk-in-interaction, and individual perceptual variation is negotiated among the interactants. Accents are also ideologically deployed in comedic performance and are negotiated between comedian and audience.

Performance is what language does, and it serves as a link in theories of language in social life; that is, performance is ongoing acts of identity. Performance-in-interaction is a moment-by-moment flow that is context-bound but can signal multiple contexts through entextualization and re-entextualization. Linguistic ideology is also a link between language and society, thereby providing the basis of culturally-specific multivocal humor.

1.3.3 Code

My examination of stylized multivocal humor involves analyzing the concept of code in performance-in-interaction. I also re-visit the origins of the term code in linguistics, and then continue on to review the dialogic development of this notion in sociolinguistic studies on multilingualism. This entails examining instances of codeswitching (i.e., the juxtaposition of more than one language within and across speech events, in Gumperz,
1982), *crossing* (i.e., the use of a second language that is not considered as belonging to the speaker, in Rampton, 1998), and *mock language* (i.e., a subcategory of crossing used in jocular or humorously insulting interaction, in Hill, 2005) and how such usages contribute to the construction of multivocal and multilingual humor.

1.3.3.1 *Multivocality*

Thus far, I have discussed the notion of performance as one of the main strands of ideas with which this dissertation engages and have also illustrated the notion of language ideology as a mediating force between the main strands of ideas. The next strand is *multivocality* (Bakhtin, 1981), which refers to the ‘centripetal’ and ‘centrifugal’ forces at play in language that produce two or more meanings in multilingual language use; for instance, Higgins (2009a) adopts this Bakhtinian concept as a framework to show the coexistence of various forms of imperialism and subversive practices by members of multilingual societies, thereby exploring the linguistic heterogeneity and multiplicity of meaning-making in those societies. Higgins uses the term multivocality to refer to “the several simultaneities that English can index in post-colonial and multilingual societies” (Higgins, 2009a, p. 6); this notion is useful to conceptualize the duality of not only English but Hawai‘i Creole and other semiotic resources that surround a highly performative genre in multilingual Hawai‘i society. I use the notion of voice to refer to a point of view that is interrelated with other individual and collective voices, and argue that this multivocal nature of language characterizes both mundane and creative language use that constitutes double-voiced discursive practices.
1.3.3.1.1 Codeswitching

The term code has been used not only in linguistics but in other disciplines such as information science. Re-visiting the term, Álvarez-Cáccamo (1998) explains that, in the 1950s, Roman Jakobson integrated the fundamental elements of information theory into linguistics. Information theory treated a code as “a mechanism for the unambiguous transduction of signals between systems” (Álvarez-Cáccamo, 1998, p. 30). What is crucial in Jakobson’s conceptualization is that “each language style has a code, not that it is a code” (Álvarez-Cáccamo, 1998, p. 31). Jakobson regarded switching codes as the process that a monolingual or bilingual speaker must go through to decipher another speaker’s system or code. His definition became the basis for the concept of codeswitching as the alternation not only of languages, but of dialects, styles, and prosodic registers. However, the strict application of the code model to interaction is limited because it leaves pragmatic meanings unexplained (Álvarez-Cáccamo, 2001).

This dissertation unpacks the dialogic notion of code in comedic performance, using members’ orientations as an analytical guide in combination with ethnographic information about codes and their associated speakers in the history of Hawai‘i. Sociolinguists have examined codeswitching to redefine the notion of code from members’ perspectives and from ethnographic perspectives (Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Gumperz, 1982; Hill & Hill, 1986; Rampton, 1995). Codeswitching is the juxtaposition of more than one language within a speech event; it is one of the contextualization cues that language users deploy to indicate how their utterances should be interpreted by other language users (Gumperz, 1982). While some interactional sociolinguists such as Gumperz examine how language users generate misunderstanding in interethnic
communication, other interactional sociolinguists such as Holmes (2007), Rampton (1995), and Bucholtz (2004) examine how contextualization works in talk. Scholars such as Auer (1988) and his followers such as Li (1998) take a conversation analytic approach to multilingual data to investigate how interactants manage interaction in a jointly well-coordinated course of actions. Similar to the latter scholars, Gafaranga (1999) relies on ethnomethodological principles (Garfinkel, 1967) to study multilingual talk. I illustrate this analytical principle in detail in Chapter 2.

1.3.3.1.2 Crossing

Studies on crossing show that language use is not always constrained by one’s ethnic identity. Crossing is the use of a second language that is not considered as belonging to the speaker (Rampton, 1995, 1998). This discursive practice allows language learners to establish their own multiethnic self. Rampton shows how British-born adolescents in Ashmead, relying on linguistic resources from Creole, Panjabi, and stylized Asian English, resort to this discursive practice in recreational interaction among peers where “the constraints of ordinary social order were relaxed and normal social relations couldn’t be taken for granted” (Rampton, 1998, p. 291). Meanwhile, Hill (2005) contends that a similar discursive practice, i.e., the use of mock language, is a form of racism.

1.3.3.1.3 Mockery

In Hill’s (2005) discussion, she describes how Mock Spanish is used by monolingual English speakers who are not of Latino descent (e.g., “Hasta la vista, baby!”). The use of Mock Spanish not only indexes the positive, easygoing, relaxed persona of the speaker,
but also reproduces negative racist stereotypes of Spanish speakers through negative second order indexicalities. Hill (2005) argues that such indexicalities are accessible because of the role speakers’ knowledge about intertextual links plays in the “processes that constrain inferences within a range of potentially available possibilities” (p. 113). Similarly, Chun (2004) discusses the use of Mock Asian based on the performance of a Korean American comedian, Margaret Cho. However, the use of Mock Asian is not a straightforward instance of either crossing or mockery because Cho is ‘Asian,’ according to racial ideologies in the United States.

It is difficult to draw a clear line between crossing and the use of mock language. Therefore, I argue that it is more fruitful to re-conceptualize these discursive practices as stylization and investigate how these acts of stylization are achieved in performance-in-interaction. It follows that participants of Hawai‘i comedy also rely on their knowledge about intertextual links so that it constrains their inferences properly.

1.3.3.1.4 Stylization

*Style* is a system of distinction (Irvine, 2001) or distinctive ways of speaking. Auer (2007) regards style in modern sociolinguistic theory as a notion that “mediates between linguistic variability and practices of social categorization of self or other” (Auer, 2007, p. 13). Semiotic resources carry social meaning that is deployed, changed, adapted, and subverted in stylization. It is through style management, or stylization, that individuals and groups conduct identity work (Auer, 2007; De Fina, 2007). In other words, stylization is how social actors enact the reflexive/indexical relationship between linguistic features and identity to convey social meanings mediated through styles,
thereby expressing their belonging or non-belonging to social categories. Coupland (2001) comments on stylized shifts as part of stylization:

Single utterances can be stylized when speakers are being studiedly ‘artificial’ or ‘putting on a voice.’ Stylized utterances have a performed character and index a speaker’s identity switch of some kind, in the sense that he/she makes clear to other interactants that the identity taken up is not the one that would be expected of him/her in that context. (Coupland, 2001, p. 346)

Stylization is an interactional achievement for which interactants, explicitly or implicitly, project, negotiate, and re-define not only their affiliations and disaffiliations but their voices. Studies of style management—conducted under various labels including language choice, language alternation, code switching, crossing, and mocking—have revealed that there is no one-to-one correspondence between language varieties and identities (e.g., Rampton, 1995). As De Fina (2007) argues, “[t]he relationship between the choice of language varieties and identity needs therefore to be investigated within specific interactional contexts” (p. 65); that is, language choice and language use may or may not have explicit discursive functions; or rather, they may or may not be interactionally relevant and consequential. One of the goals of this dissertation is therefore to foreground the interactional meanings of stylized shifts.

1.3.3.2 Multivocal humor

I must discuss the multivocal and multilingual aspects of humor to illustrate carnivalesque practice in comedic performance. The key manner in which carnivalesque

7 In her work on the interactional management of style among Italian American males in a card-playing club, De Fina (2007, p. 70) also draws our attention to Coupland’s statement about a voicing/performative aspect of stylization.
humor is achieved in stand-up comedy in Hawai‘i is through mockery, which is always multivoiced, invokes the contrast between a ‘real-life’ voice and an ‘imaginary’ voice, and differentiates a ‘serious’ key from a ‘non-serious’ key (Kotthorff, 2009; Norrick & Bubel, 2009). My examination of Hawai‘i comedy involves analyzing the concepts of dialogism, carnival laughter, and multilingual humor.

1.3.3.2.1 Dialogism
In this study, I pay particular attention to multivocal categorial work in constructed dialogues and reported speech to analyze the reception and transformation of talk for the purpose of creating humor. Bakhtin’s (1981) discussion of heteroglossia is relevant to the concept of performance because a great deal of performative comedic talk is comprised of reported speech and constructed dialogue (Tannen, 1989). Though much comedy is dominated by the voice of the comedian, this kind of performance is not monologic. Reported speech and constructed dialogues provide us with a place where the entextualization of another individual’s or group’s speech and thought can be examined systematically. I adopt notions such as voice (Bakhtin, 1981), footing (Goffman, 1979), reported speech, and constructed dialogue and consider changes within turns. These notions help identify switches that occur within turns in addition to across turns of talk. I also argue for intertextuality (i.e., a property of texts that links multiple texts together) as discursive practice. I am interested in mockery due to the prevalence of this action in stand-up comedy.

---
8 Reported speech and constructed dialogue refer to the same discursive practice. Tannen’s term, constructed dialogue, highlights the constructive property of representing speech.
Bakhtin (1981) highlighted the tug-of-war between monologic forces and dialogic (or heterologic) forces. Hill (1986) argues that most important to the Bakhtinian approach to language is its moral goal “to interpret and analyze the multiple words of the voices of a speaking community” (p. 92). Heteroglossia is particularly important to the notions of reported speech and voice (and relationships between voices). The voice is “a point of view on the world, and its words are its tools of dialogic engagement with other voices” (Hill, 1986, p. 96). Goodwin (2007) claims that the notion of voice led to the development of the notion of footing (Goffman, 1979), and he has re-conceptualized the latter notion as interactive footing (Goodwin, 2007). These dialogic notions (i.e., reported speech, voice, footing) are highly relevant to my data and will be deployed for analysis of ‘double-voiced’ comedic performance. Hill summarizes the implication of polyphonic linguistics or translinguistics by saying that it shows how the investigation of language—whether in the highest art or in the lowest vulgate of the marketplace—is fundamental to an understanding of the individuality and consciousness of human beings, and of their social nature. (Hill, 1986, p. 101)

1.3.3.2.2 Carnival laughter

My dissertation examines many instances of carnivalesque humor, a concept Bakhtin (1984) used to discuss the language of the Renaissance marketplace and with reference to the sixteenth century novelistic works of François Rabelais. In addition to Rabelais, Bakhtin saw heteroglossia in the works of other writers such as Cervantes and Dostoevsky (Hill, 1986). All fiction, drama, and poetry are of necessity heteroglossic. Tracing the ‘influence’ of previous writers on a work, or examining how it affirms, bends, or invents a new genre have always been key concerns of literary scholarship.
His World as his dissertation and defended it in 1940. Carnivalesque humor is invention and intervention that require a sense of newness; in other words, it is authorial unmasking through ‘double-voiced’ speech and it deconstructs attempts at stabilizing social systems by being playfully and non-violently subversive (Bhabha, 1997; Young, 1995). Bauman (1982) claims that Bakhtin’s work on Rabelais is ethnographic by nature because Bakhtin explains “the cultural context in which Rabelais’s works were rooted, much as an anthropologist would do in order to render an exotic tribal myth intelligible to a western audience” (Bauman, 1982, p. 9). Rabelais’s works are embedded within the sixteenth century folk culture of the marketplace, and what characterizes Bakhtin’s work on Rabelais is its description of the folk culture of the marketplace as a semiotic system (Bauman, 1982). This semiotic system is defined primarily with respect to locality (i.e., the marketplace); moreover, the marketplace is marked by social relations (e.g., frank and free) that are constituted by a carnivalesque marketplace style of expression (e.g., curses, parodies, street cries) and a code of imagery (e.g., food and body) that illustrate the fundamental aspects of humanity (Bauman, 1982).

In this cultural system, context, social relations, genres, and imagery are reflexively connected (Bauman, 1982). One of the principal registers of the marketplace is comedy, and it is in the service of folk laughter. Exploring the semiotics of the carnivalesque marketplace, Bakhtin (1984) depicts the folk culture of humor and laughter in Rabelais’s world, arguing that there is a qualitative gap in the meaning of images of bodily life between pre-Renaissance and post-Renaissance Europe. Not considering the

---

François Rabelais (c. 1483–1553) was a French writer in the time of the Renaissance; his works include *Gargantua* and *Pantagruel*. 
laughing people of the pre-Renaissance ages “distorts the picture of European culture’s historic development” (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 6).

In Rabelais’s work, the fundamental aspects of human existence (i.e., food, drink, defecation, sexual life, etc.) are exaggerated and excessively parodied. This ‘low brow’ humor produces carnival laughter when it degrades and materializes “all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract” (p. 19). In other words, carnival laughter is the embodiment of folk culture that is in opposition to the official culture of the dominant. Using the dramaturgical metaphor, Bakhtin highlights the subversive nature of carnivalesque humor and the significance of the folk culture of laughter for an academic endeavor, referencing the importance of the chorus in classical Greek plays:

All the acts of the drama of world history were performed before a chorus of the laughing people. Without hearing this chorus we cannot understand the drama as a whole. [...] In all periods of the past there was the marketplace with its laughing people. (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 474)

Adopting and applying Bakhtin’s (1984) insights to Local comedy as a culturally-specific activity, I argue that to explore the laughing community of Hawai‘i comedy is about social order in Hawai‘i’s multilingual and multicultural world. In the next section, I review the works on multilingual humor to illustrate the local production of multivocality for building interpersonal relationships.

1.3.3.2.3 Multilingual humor

There are three vital notions in humor studies that take various approaches from linguistics, pragmatics, conversation analysis, and interactional sociolinguistics (Norrick,
The first notion is *frame* (Bateson, 1972), which describes how one frames social actions as ‘serious,’ ‘play,’ etc. When two different interpretations are applicable to a situation but only one of them is meant to apply, “some tension and joking would there be found” (Goffman, 1974, p. 77). This kind of tension can be explained by means of the second set of notions: *keys* and *keying*, which are a basic way through which a series of activities is transformed (Goffman, 1974). Moreover, keying can generate humorous effects due to past and relevant texts or due to *intertextuality* (Norrick, 1989), which is the third vital notion. Other studies illustrate the sequential and collaborative aspects of joking (Sacks, 1973, 1974, 1978) and discuss functions of joking, such as enhancing intimacy and controlling a conversation (Norrick, 1993; Tannen, 1989). Multilingual users not only display these functions of joking but possess rich semiotic resources, so their discursive practices need to be reviewed, too.

Emerging is a body of discourse analytic research about the use of multilingual humor in institutional settings; for instance, Higgins (2007a, 2010a) discusses the use of Swahinglish in workplaces; De Bres, Holmes, Marra, and Vine (2010) also report the creative use of Māori English in workplaces in New Zealand, where multilingual humor is deployed, explicitly and implicitly, to transform a strip of activity through keying and subtle style-shifting, to invoke intertextually connected linguistic and racial ideologies, and to create in-groups and out-groups. Comedy is another institutional domain where multilingual humor is deployed more explicitly to constitute and enhance intimate social relations between performer and audience (Chun, 2004; Jaffe, 2000; Woolard, 1987).

The vital notions of humor and multilingual joking are applicable to Hawai‘i. Wong (1998) illustrates Hawai‘i Creole speakers’ creative use of discursive resources
and pragmatic strategies in daily life. Analyzing a bestselling joke book in Hawai‘i, Romaine (1999) and Inoue (2007) discuss contrastive translation humor between Hawai‘i Creole and English and highlight two competing voices—Local and Haole—that these languages represent respectively.\(^\text{11}\) Fontanilla (1998) analyzes the discursive practice of the super-Local character Bu La‘ia, and Furukawa (2007, 2009, 2010) examines multilingual humor in interaction in stand-up comedy shows, thereby dealing with interactive intertextuality in this highly performative genre. In the next section, I contextualize Hawai‘i Creole and Hawai‘i comedy to illustrate how this dissertation on comedic performance contributes to our understanding of sociolinguistic phenomena.

1.4 How does Hawai‘i complexify what we know?

The study of multivocal performance in Hawai‘i comedy calls for a historical account of Hawai‘i Creole because it serves as one of the most salient semiotic resources on stage. In this section, I also describe a recent controversy about Hawai‘i comedy to further contextualize the dissertation. Based on these accounts, I discuss how Hawai‘i complicates our understanding of sociolinguistics and discourse analysis and necessitates the use of ethnographic and historical information about language in performance-in-interaction.

1.4.1 A history of Hawai‘i Creole

Following contact with Europeans in 1778, Hawai‘i became a stopover for whaling and trading between China and the West Coast of North America. At this time no pidgin

\(^{11}\) For research on the notion of haole, see Rohrer (2010).
language had developed, but features of other English pidgins were used in communication (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003, p. 4).

The establishment of the first sugarcane plantation in 1835 and the expansion of the sugar industry in the last quarter of the century brought many laborers from various countries and areas, which included: China, Pacific islands (e.g., Samoa), Portugal, Norway, Germany, Japan, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Korea, Russia, and Spain (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003). It was Hawaiian and Pidgin Hawaiian that were initially used as common languages among these immigrants (Da Pidgin Coup, 1999, Section 3). By the turn of the century, Hawai‘i Pidgin English began to emerge, becoming the primary language of many, including children acquiring it as their first language (Da Pidgin Coup, 1999). This marked the beginning of Hawai‘i Creole, which is locally referred to as Pidgin.

According to Sakoda and Siegel (2003, p. 20), “there is no general agreement about what really constitutes Pidgin [i.e., Hawai‘i Creole] in Hawai‘i” because it means for some people the basilectal variety with its grammar distinct from that of English, while for others it refers to English with the local accent and vocabulary. This variation, therefore, seems to form a continuum ranging from basilectal through mesolectal toacrolectal varieties. The population of speakers is assumed to be approximately 600,000, half the population of Hawai‘i State (Gordon, 2005).

Generally speaking, Hawai‘i Creole is used among families and friends in informal settings. It is often considered as a marker of Local identity. Reinecke (1969, p. 194) states that as “a local dialect and to a great extent a class dialect, it has a two-fold emotional basis.” In other words, Hawai‘i Creole has covert prestige among Local people,
and it has been mostly used in social domains such as at home, on the playground, and so forth. However, who is ‘Local’ is a highly controversial issue. Some people may regard both Native Hawaiians and descendants of plantation laborers as Local, excluding other ethnic groups and newer arrivals from the category. Others may not want to include Native Hawaiians within the same category as descendants of plantation laborers.

Many people still look down on Hawai‘i Creole, as seen in some recent public disputes (e.g., Kua, 1999; Marlow & Giles, 2008); however, advocacy for this stigmatized variety has also emerged. In 1978, Bamboo Ridge Press launched literary activism in Hawai‘i, encouraging Hawai‘i authors to create work related to Hawai‘i themes and at the same time encouraging them to write in Hawai‘i Creole. Since 1998, Da Pidgin Coup, a group of people mainly from the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, has been discussing linguistic, social, and educational issues regarding Hawai‘i Creole in order to raise public awareness. Due to considerations of space, it is impossible to offer a thorough sociolinguistic history of Hawai‘i Creole here. Detailed accounts can be found in the following sources: Da Pidgin Coup (1999), Reinecke (1969), Romaine (1994, 1999), Sakoda and Siegel (2003), and Sato (1989, 1991).

Because English and Hawai‘i Creole are closely connected, switching between them is not the same as switching from one code to another. Switching or shifting between English and Hawai‘i Creole in performance-in-interaction can be either very subtle or mockingly exaggerated, oftentimes introducing diachronically and synchronically relevant texts and talk about these varieties and indexing familiarity and solidarity; that is, Hawai‘i Creole is a historically stigmatized language that is associated

---

12 In contrast to this view on the domains of Hawai‘i Creole, Marlow and Giles (2008) report that it is indeed used in work contexts.
with covert prestige in contrast to English, which is associated with overt prestige in Hawai‘i society. In many contexts, however, Hawai‘i Creole is the unmarked language.

1.4.2 Local comedy

One example of commentary on Local comedy illustrates that ethnic humor is a sensitive topic and can be interpreted in different ways. The writer, Honolulu Advertiser columnist Lee Cataluna, criticized ethnic humor and, in particular, Portuguese jokes. Her article—titled ‘Portagee’ jokes born of cruelty—starts as follows:

I hate Portuguese jokes. It’s not because they’re not funny—some of them make me laugh. It’s not because I don’t have a sense of humor, because on a good day, with lots of snacks, I can sometimes approach delightful. It’s not even because I’m almost pure-blooded Portuguese, though that certainly adds to my distaste. (Cataluna, 2000)

As seen from Cataluna’s remarks, ethnic humor is a touchy subject in Local comedy. She makes reference to one of the most well known comedians, Frank DeLima, who tours public schools as a motivational speaker:

Why does the Department of Education allow Frank DeLima to tour nearly every school in the state, inflicting his insults on children? Isn’t it harmful for kids of any racial background to be exposed to race-based, school-sanctioned humor? I’ve heard his routines and they sure make “Portagees” sound dumb. DeLima’s defense is that he’s teaching kids the value of diversity and teaching them to laugh at themselves. In reality, he’s teaching kids to laugh while others insult them. How empowering. (Cataluna, 2000)

Six months after Cataluna’s article, Sodetani (2001) responded to it with an article in the Honolulu Weekly that began: “Watch your tongue. Ethnic jokes—the heart and soul of
local humor—are now politically incorrect. ‘I hate Portuguese jokes,’ groused Honolulu Advertiser columnist Lee Cataluna recently” (Sodetani, 2001, p. 6). Sodetani went on to treat Cataluna’s interpretation of ethnic humor as exceptional:

The columnist’s stance felt out of sync with how most locals perceive ethnic jokes. Mostly, we love and laugh at them—even though in recent years, like Spam or malasadas, it has become un-PC to ingest them without guilt, to admit they resonate deep in our mixed-plate psyche like comfort food for the soul. (Sodetani, 2001, p. 6)

A similar debate over the issue of political correctness within the context of Hawai‘i is found in Peetz (1998).13 These radically different interpretations of ethnic humor attest the dialogic nature of creative discursive practice that is driven by centrifugal and centripetal forces.

The cultural anthropologist Blake (1996) conceptualizes humor in Hawai‘i as interethnic because each ethnic group takes its turn to become the butt of a joke; he states that it is “in-group (local)” (p. 7) humor that creates “a local culture” (p. 7). He regards violence and ethnic joking as two forms of conflict resolution, and the space separating these two forms is “broad and mirthful” in the tradition of ethnic joking in Hawai‘i.

Quoting Frank DeLima’s defensive utterance (i.e., “I do not make fun of the people or the cultures but of the stereotypes”), Blake develops this point as follows:

---

13 Peetz (1998) is one of many local newspaper and magazine articles that were published in the past thirty years between 1981 and 2009 (e.g., Honolulu Advertiser, Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Honolulu Weekly, Honolulu Magazine, etc.). These articles featured various comedians, and reviewing these articles provides a glimpse of which comedians were and still are in the entertainment industry, which includes, but is not limited to: Augie T (e.g., Mossman, 2000), James Grant Benton (e.g., Sinnex, 1988), Booga-Booga (e.g., Spence, 1982), Kent Bowman (e.g., Markrich, 1987), Andy Bumatai (e.g., Lipman, 1981), Ray Bumatai (e.g., Harada, 1996), Mel Cabang (e.g., Doyle, 1990), Kathy Collins (e.g., Nitta, 2004), Frank DeLima (e.g., Harada, 1985), Lippy Espinda (Whatever happened, 1996), Bo Irvine (e.g., Dixon-Stong, 1992), Bu La‘ia (e.g., Buckley, 1994), Lucky Luck (Memminger, 2009), Sterling Mossman (Memminger, 2009), Paul Ogata (e.g., Choi, 2004), Rap Reiplinger (e.g., Katahara, 1991), Tremaine Tamayose (e.g., Memminger, 1994).
All ethnic and racial jokes play on stereotypes, of course, but in Hawai‘i the stereotypes seem almost epiphenomenal, that is detached from our knowledge of real groups and actual people. No one can reside long in Hawai‘i without having colleagues, friends, indeed family connections in the different ethnic groups. In this context the ethnic stereotypes seem ridiculous. They seem to have a life of their own (in the jokelore). Each ethnic group is stereotyped with one or another of the human foibles and mind-body modalities which is then applicable to anyone who so comports him or herself. (Blake, 1996, p. 7)

Blake gives two examples: first, an Asian-looking person who is a Punahou School graduate is referred to as Haole; second, the radio show host Larry Price who is Caucasian/Portuguese jokingly behaves like a “local boy” (p. 7) while making fun of his Caucasian co-host Michael W. Perry. Blake paraphrases his claim as follows: “the ‘Portagee’ is in effect nowhere and yet everywhere! The ‘Portagee’ is a mirror image of our own ethnic selves” (p. 7). He also makes reference to multiracial individuals:

In effect, we in Hawai‘i buck the common-sense [of ethnic and racial differentiation] when we celebrate those among us whose ethnicity, contrary to common-sense appearances and claims, is not clear. This cherished paradox is reflected in the widespread intermarriage and the total lack of stigma attached to the ethnic or racial in-betweens, the “hapas” as they are called. (Blake, 1996, p. 8)

Blake acknowledges that “[t]he real test of local jokelore is its ability to transform ‘Caucasian’ into ‘dumb haole,’ a process that strains the local funny bone to very near its breaking point” (p. 8). In short, Blake sets his argument apart from the political correctness argument and conceptualizes interethnic humor/joking as “a popular grassroots method for including rather than excluding peoples of different racial and ethnic backgrounds” (p. 8). Because interethnic humor could be interpreted as a method for excluding peoples of different backgrounds, the question must be addressed of what groups are included through interethnic joking. Nevertheless, the act of including a
member in an in-group is inseparable from the act of excluding another from the in-group, thereby creating an out-group.

I have suggested that it is analytically richer to presume that categories have a life of their own, and maintained that Local comedians make use, explicitly and implicitly, of these historically loaded categorial resources in their interactional business of affiliation and disaffiliation management. These categories in use relate to creating in-groups and out-groups because some categories are stereotypically subcategories of Local and others are those of non-Local.

1.4.3 Humor-ing the Local

This study examines one of the performative genres in the contemporary entertainment industry. Stand-up comedy may have its roots in other genres such as sermons and minstrel shows, and it has been popular in the United States since at least the early twentieth century. Local comedy is a form of stand-up comedy that is a culturally-specific activity in Hawai‘i, so it generates, and is constrained by, its own linguistic, cultural, and racial ideologies. I refer to this genre as Local comedy because it is the most widely accepted term among its audience. The goal of this study is to account for the discursive construction of Localness in Hawai‘i stand-up comedy in public and for the public; that is, what is funny about being Local? Localness is a discursive product of performance-in-interaction between comedians and their audiences. Localness is constructed in a particular locality or a comedy club. However, Localness also constitutes a comedy club as a social space; in other words, a comedy club as a locality is a discursive product of performance-in-interaction. The comedians and their audiences
jointly construct Localness in performance-in-interaction, and both of them see humor in the discursive construction of Localness. Meanwhile, they also find, negotiate, and re-define Localness through the moment-by-moment discursive flow of humor. In summary, this study locates and demonstrates the multiplicity of meaning-making in Local comedy, or the humor-ing of the Local.

1.5 Overview of the dissertation

In the next chapter, I discuss data collection and data analysis methods as well as theoretical and practical issues of transcription. Chapters 3-6 present data analyses from comedy shows, interviews with comedians, and focus group interviews. Chapter 3 is an analysis of live stand-up comedy shows, focusing on the discursive construction of participation frameworks. Chapter 4 also examines live stand-up comedy shows and deals with active voicing in Hawai‘i Creole and ‘haolefied’ English. Chapter 5 takes a sequential approach to illustrate how the comedians deploy other stylized languages in their performances-in-interaction. Chapter 6 investigates interpretive frameworks of Local comedy shows, based on interviews with comedians and on focus groups with their audiences. Finally, in Chapter 7, I discuss the findings, limitations, and implications of the dissertation, and I conclude with suggestions for directions for future research.
CHAPTER 2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Introduction

This dissertation investigates a culturally-specific highly dramaturgical genre in which comedians use various codes to build interpersonal relationships with their audiences and entextualize and re-entextualize other semiotic resources to invoke intertextual links and to draw laughter from their audiences.\textsuperscript{14} The dissertation also investigates the reception of this culturally-specific genre to expand this relatively underdeveloped area in sociolinguistics. Therefore, my data collection includes obtaining performance and meta-performance data, and bringing them into an explicitly interactional context to demonstrate the way the comedians and their audiences build their interpersonal relationships in the turn-by-turn flow of comedy, in addition to analyzing how audience members make sense of this comedic genre that includes multilingual categorial work. This methodological stance also requires me to describe the transcription process to represent the multilingual data that include Hawai‘i Creole.

One of the goals of the dissertation is to illustrate the dynamism of stylization in a highly performative genre. In order to explore such dynamism, I need analytical tools that allow me to deal with the spontaneity of the performative genre and with the meanings of various codes in Hawai‘i; therefore, I collect data from live stand-up comedy shows and from other multimedia resources such as comedy CDs and DVDs to analyze these performances-in-interaction. I conceptualize the performances as forms of social

\textsuperscript{14} Laughter is a feature of interaction; however, its sequential implications are beyond the scope of the dissertation.
organization in which participants take actions and manage a performance context. I also see these performances as contexts in which the semiotics of codes are performed and re-entextualized.

Another goal is to investigate the categorial work that is related to the management of actions, context, and intersubjectivity in Local comedy shows; I adopt membership categorization analysis (Sacks, 1979) for examining a shared sense of the participants’ world. Furthermore, because indexicality and categorization in Local comedy involve linguistic heterogeneity, I need to justify how I represent language variation, including mock varieties. I utilize conventions from descriptive linguistics to adopt and modify the transcription conventions of conversation analysis (Jefferson, 2004a) to mark nuanced style-shifting in the data.

In contrast to the above goals, another goal is to investigate how Local comedy is talked about and interpreted among in-group members. I collect meta-performance data by interviewing comedians and by conducting focus group sessions with audience members to interweave their categorial work with the live performance data and to interactionally illuminate a system of indexicals, or the properties of shared knowledge.

In the remainder of this chapter, I explain how I proceeded to answer my research questions through detailing the data collection (2.2.1) and data analysis methods (2.2.2). My research questions motivated a particular methodological direction that would allow me to explore the indexicality of code and the meaning-making processes among audience members. The chapter also discusses transcription (2.3) procedures at length as this dissertation seeks to offer new perspectives on the transcription of multiple codes in discourse analytic work.
2.2 Data

I have collected approximately 20 hours of audio and video recording: live performances (13 hours), CDs/DVDs (10 hours), interviews (4 hours), and reception studies (4 hours).

2.2.1 Data collection

I have collected data from four different sources linked to the larger context of comedy in Hawai‘i, principally on the island of O‘ahu (Sections 2.2.1.1-2.2.1.4). Although the four data sources have different features, they share commonalities, too, because they are based on the same social and cultural order that speakers depend on in their everyday contexts. Regardless of who tells ethnic jokes in Hawai‘i, Local audiences are likely to interpret them as the ‘same’ type of ethnic jokes (about, for instance, Portuguese, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, etc.) that have been circulating as members’ knowledge in society. In other words, such knowledge and other linguistic resources are available as a shared cultural asset across different sources.

2.2.1.1 Live performances

I have attended and audio recorded 10 live comedy shows, each of which is 70-90 minutes long. The reasons that I have chosen audio recording rather than video recording are (1) that some comedians and their agents are unwilling to have their performances video recorded and (2) that audio data provides information rich enough to deal with my research questions, particularly as most of the data involves one comedian speaking for the majority of the time.
Stand-up comedy shows are offered at various venues on weekends throughout the year. I recorded comedy shows by three different groups from April to August in 2008. The first group (Comedy Polynesia) performs twice a week at a hotel in Waikīkī, where the largest portion of the audience is tourists from the mainland U.S., Canada, or European countries. The second group (Augie T’s “Island Style Comedy Show”) had a regular show on Friday at a hotel in Ala Moana where the audience is mostly comprised of Local residents. This group also performed for a bigger audience of the same type at a large theater in August in 2008, part of which was televised and video recorded. The last comedian (Frank DeLima) did not perform on a regular basis during my data collection, but I have recorded his performances at three different locations: Waikīkī, Ala Moana (Mother’s Day show), and Wahiawā (Father’s Day show). The bulk of my data was collected in these live performances.

2.2.1.2 CDs/DVDs
Approximately 10 hours of data were collected from CDs and DVDs produced by Local comedians such as Andy Bumatai, Augie T, Frank DeLima, and Rap Reiplinger. Some products are edited recordings of live stand-up comedy performances. Others are recordings of situational comedy performances. Although stand-up comedy performances are essential for my research, I also use situational comedy performances as part of my data because some of them, especially those by Reiplinger, were extremely popular and have been circulating as linguistic and cultural resources within Hawai‘i at the level of
everyday knowledge and as a way to identify as Local. Reiplinger’s comedic work is reproduced in different media that include a play, YouTube, everyday conversation, etc.\textsuperscript{15}

2.2.1.3 Interviews with comedians

I also conducted semi-structured or informal interviews with a total of eight comedians backstage before or after their performances in 2008. These interviews ranged from fifteen minutes to one hour, and they were audio recorded and transcribed for further analysis. Four of these comedians were born and raised in Hawai‘i (Frank DeLima, Bo Irvine, Timmy Mattos, Augie T); one was born outside of Hawai‘i but came to Hawai‘i at the age of ten (Andy Bumatai); and the other three came to Hawai‘i much later in their lives (Jose Dynamite, Kento, Michael Staats).\textsuperscript{16} In Chapter 6, I will focus on the first five comedians because they stylize themselves as Local comedians on stage and because I am interested primarily in their views and ideologies.

My goal was to elicit the norms or the points of reference that the interviewees use to account for comic performance and their interpretation of it. This is related to the larger goal of the dissertation that is to explore the discursive management of shared

\textsuperscript{15} Local comedy has been recognized as a genre since the 1950s and 1960s. One of the landmarks in the history of Local comedy was when Rap Reiplinger won an Emmy Award in 1982 for a TV special, \textit{Rap’s Hawai‘i}, that was released as a video and, later, as a DVD. Reiplinger has achieved legendary status in Hawai‘i since his untimely death in 1984; for instance, some of the clips from his show were uploaded to YouTube, and as of July 2010, the most popular clip, “Aunty Marialani’s Cooking Show,” had been watched over 93,000 times in less than three years. Other comedians who became popular in the late 1970s and 1980s include Frank DeLima, Andy Bumatai, and Mel Cabang. They still perform at comedy shows, host TV programs, or appear in TV commercials, bringing back good memories to many people. Shawn Kaui Hill is another well-known comedian who performed the Hawai‘i Creole speaking character Bu La‘ia. His fame or infamy reached its peak when he ran for governor of Hawai‘i in the 1990s and received 5,761 votes in the Democratic gubernatorial primary (Yuen, 1998). Popular among younger audiences are Da Braddahs—whose TV show \textit{Da Braddahs & Friends} is aired on OC16—and Augie T. The popularity of these comedians is partly attested by the fact that their CDs and DVDs are readily available in retail stores.

\textsuperscript{16} All the comedians chose to be identified by their stage names.
knowledge about social relations in multilingual, multicultural, and multiracial Hawai‘i. I approached the comedians by introducing myself as an international graduate student from Japan who is pursuing a Ph.D. in linguistics at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Adopting this kind of self description was a logical choice for me because I do not pass as Local in a face-to-face interview. It is clear that my self-description has influenced the comedians’ responses; however, I believe that this worked to my advantage because the comedians treated me as an interviewer who needed to be educated about their culture, and they had to do more work to account explicitly for the social meaning of indexical signs.

2.2.1.4 Reception study

The last data source is a series of focus group interviews. I designed a focus group study following the guidelines in Krueger and Casey (2009), and I conducted four focus group interviews in November 2008 at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa campus. These one-shot focus group interviews were semi-structured and lasted for one hour each. I set two requirements for participants: (1) to be born and raised in Hawai‘i and (2) to have been to Local comedy shows or have watched Local comedy TV programs, videos, DVDs, etc. Nineteen participants (13 females and 6 males in their 20s-50s) were recruited on a friend-of-a-friend basis, as well as through advertising on the university campus. Each group consisted of four to six participants plus a research assistant and myself. The research assistant, who also met the above criteria, took notes during each session in order to provide a brief, two-to-three-minute-long summary of the discussion to the group at the end of the session. All the groups contained a pre-existing group of friends, but no
group consisted only of such a group. In addition, three out of the four focus groups included at least one participant who already knew the researcher (as a friend, a student, etc.) prior to the focus group session. Each session was audio recorded, and the four hours of recordings were transcribed for further analysis according to Jeffersonian CA conventions.

Each session started with my self-introduction and explanation of the research. I served as the moderator and introduced myself as an international graduate student from Japan. This was followed by my confirmation of the requirements. I emphasized that the participants were the ‘specialists’ on Local comedy. When this was done, the participants were asked to introduce themselves by telling the group their names and the last time they had gone to a Local comedy show. When the introductions ended, I announced that they were free to comment in any order, and the participants were encouraged to respond to each other. I then asked the following open questions: (1) What is the first thing that comes to mind when you hear the phrase ‘Local comedy’? and (2) Who is your favorite Local comedian? Each question was discussed for a few minutes. Following this, a DVD clip and three audio clips were played.\footnote{The first clip is a pseudo-skit titled Room Service in Rap Reiplinger’s DVD Rap’s Hawai’i. Reiplinger plays two roles in this clip: a Local telephone operator at a hotel, possibly in Waikīkī, and a white tourist who asks for room service; however, this interaction generates a great deal of miscommunication between the two characters, which is the basis for the humor. The second clip is a parody song by Frank DeLima, Christmas Carol (Filipino Christmas). It is a medley of Christmas songs in which many linguistic and cultural stereotypes about Filipinos are incorporated. The third clip is a track, Non Ethnic Joke, from Andy Bumatai’s CD that was recorded at his live stand-up comedy show in Waikīkī. In this clip, Bumatai describes three characters at a bar each of whom shows stereotypical behaviors of specific ethnicities, but Bumatai does not refer to the ethnic categories—Filipino, Portuguese, and Chinese—that his jokes are about. The fourth and last clip is taken from Augie T’s live stand-up comedy show. In this clip, he talks about some people who are offended by his jokes, which leads to another joke.}

After each clip, I asked the group “What do you think about this clip?” Usually there would be discussion for several minutes, and then the next clip would be played.
After all four clips had been played and briefly discussed, the participants were asked to respond to the following three open, more focused questions: (1) Who do you think would not be able to understand this kind of comedy? (2) Who do you think would dislike this kind of comedy? and (3) What would you say to somebody who may claim that this kind of comedy is not politically correct? Finally, I asked one more question: If you had to name one thing, what allows you to enjoy Local comedy the most? A brief oral summary of the discussion was provided at the end by the research assistant to allow for feedback from the participants. After the session, each participant was asked to fill out a basic demographic survey.

2.2.2 Data analysis

In this section, I explain my methodological stance and I discuss the multiple tools I use to analyze the data. As I explain in more detail below, I take the stance that making use of ethnographic information in conjunction with sequential analysis is the most productive way forward (Bilmes, 1996; Bucholtz, 2004; Higgins, 2007a, b; Levinson, 2005; Maynard, 2003; Moerman, 1988; Nelson, 1994; Rampton, 1995). Because comedy in particular has the potential to index multiple meanings, both historical and contemporary, both said and implied, I find that ethnographic and historical information is crucial to developing an understanding of comedic performances and to making sense of the meanings that are indexed and intertextually referenced in the process.

I use the label performance-in-interaction to examine the deployment of indexicalities and membership categories by Local comedians. They not only align with (or disalign from) their audiences but align with (or disalign from) larger social groups.
Moreover, my study departs from an EM study in the sense that it deals with multilingual categorial work in a highly performative site; thus, I subscribe to a discursive approach that deals with such multilingual data and is informed by both sequence organization (e.g., Schegloff, 2007a) and interactional sociolinguistics (e.g., Blommaert, 2001; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). In the next section, I describe how I draw on both of these traditions in my analysis.

2.2.2.1 Sequence organization

Interaction is a form of social organization or a social institution with the interaction order, and interactants use shared methods of practical reasoning (i.e., ethno-methods) to build a shared sense of their common context of action, and of the social world (Heritage, 2001). Participants address themselves to the preceding talk, create a context for the next person’s talk by projecting that some action should be taken, and show an understanding of a prior action by producing their next actions (Heritage, 2004). CA analyses are “simultaneously analyses of action, context management, and intersubjectivity” (Heritage, 2004, p. 224). Heritage (2004) also illustrates the properties of institutional talk in which mundane interaction is constrained by prescribed roles (e.g., doctor/patient); he suggests six elements as points of departure for a CA analysis of institutional talk: (1) turn-taking organization, (2) overall structural organization of the interaction, (3) sequence organization, (4) turn design, (5) lexical choice, and (6) epistemological and other forms of asymmetry.

In order to analyze the data in its situated context of use, I transcribe audio data based on conversation analysis conventions (Jefferson, 2004) and adopt a sequential
approach to analyzing the use of code and the co-construction of humor in talk. By taking a sequential approach, I focus my attention on how the meanings of utterances or actions in the performance-in-interaction are responded to, negotiated, and interpreted by co-participants. In this view, comedians and their audiences assume situated identities, and their actions are constrained and shaped according to such identities/roles. Another important analytical tool is membership categorization, which allows me to explore the use of the different dimensions of context in meaning-making.

2.2.2.2 Membership categories as interfaces
I follow Levinson (2005), whose framework is useful to me because it is comprised of a three-level model of analysis: social, interactional, and linguistic. The linguistic details of code and stylization are central in my dissertation, and hence, Levinson’s framework provides a useful conceptual framing of my analytical approach. These three different systems—which according to Levinson, one could treat as analytical fictions—are interlocked in various ways. He maintains that the Durkheimian approach of finding “crucial intermediate variables” (Levinson, 2005, p. 449) helps us think of the interplay between these systems. He further claims that social relations carry interactional expectations and constraints, and each social relation has “linguistic reflexes in terminology and linguistic etiquette” (p. 449). I suggest linking Levinson’s notion of crucial intermediate variables with the discussion of membership categories.

I use membership categorization analysis (Sacks, 1979) to examine the meanings in Local comedy. More specifically, I deploy a sequential analysis of members’ knowledge to examine how Local comedians align with or disalign from their audiences.
when they construct ethnic identities and index societal phenomena using stylized codes. Membership categories (e.g., man, woman, husband, wife, etc.) are neither exclusive nor neutral descriptions; they are “culturally available resources which allow us to describe, identify or make reference to other people or to ourselves” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 35). These categories carry many properties, which include category-bound activities and attributes, rules of application, and standardized relational pairs (Have, 2007). Hester and Eglin (1997) suggest that “both the sequential and categorial aspects of social interaction inform each other” (p. 2); that is, membership categorization is a locally and temporarily contingent action that can serve as an interface in multiple levels of analysis.

Conversation analysts aim at revealing the interactional properties of talk. The first generation of conversation analysts, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, examined talk as a social institution (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), and in this universal endeavor, they took their own culture—white space (Hill, 2001)—for granted. Following this, the second generation of conversation analysts—Goodwin, Heritage, Hutchby, Pomerantz, Wooffitt, and Zimmerman, among others—examined not only talk as an institution but social institutions as a space in which interactional management operates in a restricted manner and through which the researcher can observe the emergence of social structure (e.g., Boden & Zimmerman, 1991; Hutchby, 2006; Wooffitt, 1992, 2001). Another group of CA scholars took an important step forward by adopting a CA approach to ‘exotic’ languages (e.g., Bilmes, 1996; Moerman, 1988; Sidnell, 2001) or L2 interaction (e.g., Mori, 2003); however, their primary goal was to investigate the applicability of CA to non-English/non-L1 English monolingual data such as Thai, Caribbean English Creole, and L2 English.
Kasper (2009) addresses the issue of how to take a multilingual perspective in conversation analytic research, especially with respect to membership categorization. Membership categorization is closely connected with the production of social relations, and linguistic resources play an important role in the process of assembling membership categorization devices. This leads to the CA question of “how multilingual practices may figure in categorial work” (Kasper, 2009, p. 9). The question has been explored mainly in CA-minded research on codeswitching or language alternation (e.g., Auer, 1988, 1998; Gafaranga, 1999, 2000; Higgins, 2009b; Li, 1998; Talmy, 2009). Gafaranga (1999) asserts, however, that a sequential analysis and a membership categorization analysis are two separate endeavors (See Schegloff, 2007b) while others (e.g., Hester & Eglin, 1997; Kasper, 2009) regard them as two sides of the same endeavor because the ‘how’ and the ‘what’ aspects of talk-in-interaction cannot be demarcated unless one is engaged in a purely theoretical argument. Aligning with the latter, I argue that the two analytical strands need to be brought together, and I attempt to expand this body of research in the context of multilingual interaction in Hawai‘i.

CA tools allow me to argue ‘how’ performance-in-interaction unfolds while the interactional sociolinguistics and discourse analysis tools allow me to add ‘what’ features to the interactional approach of contextualization cues (e.g., code, prosody, etc.). Wooffitt (2005) discusses CA and DA (discourse analysis) and summarizes their similarities and differences; both CA and DA focus on language in use as a topic in its own right while they are different in terms of the range of questions that are addressed. DA analyzes (1) the construction of factuality, (2) reports of mental states, and (3) ideologies that reflect societal inequalities (Wooffitt, 2005, p. 89). Blommaert (2005) proposes a wider
approach to discourse as any form of “meaningful semiotic conduct” (p. 236) and as
“characterized by layered simultaneity” (p. 237); such a view reduces the comfort of
clarity, but offers opportunities to eclectically combine insights from various approaches
to language in society. Gumperz investigated multilingual crosscultural talk-in-
interaction (Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Gumperz, 1982), and using other tools of
interactional sociolinguistics and discourse analysis, he adopted a wider definition of
course. Over the past three decades, interactional sociolinguists, discourse analysts,
and linguistic anthropologists have examined interaction, and have produced a range of
research on stylization, crossing, and mockery (e.g., Besnier, 2003; Blommaert, 2001;

Rampton’s (1995, 1998) ethnographic and interactional sociolinguistic studies
examine four dimensions of sociocultural organization: language, the interactional order,
institutional organization, and social knowledge. His research informs my approach to
indexicality and the interpretation of code in Hawai‘i comedy. Rampton’s analytical
interest lies in the urban multilingual communities at the intersection of global and local,
and he argues that the notion of conversation as routine is too restricted to investigate
code-switching that is not only a contextualization cue but the focal point of interaction.
Furthermore, code changes are inseparable from multilingual categorial work, and these
semiotic practices in artful public performances such as comedy are brought to “a
reflexive arena” (Bauman & Briggs, 1990) where they are examined. In addition to code
changes and categorial work, prosody is also part of artful public performances.
2.2.2.3 Prosody in performance-in-interaction

The representation of prosodic features is crucial for my study because English and Hawai‘i Creole—the two languages that most frequently appear in my transcripts—are closely related, and it sometimes becomes necessary to indicate their difference in prosodic features in order not only to conduct a sequential analysis but to conduct a detailed analysis of voice and to capture the intricacy of comedic performance. Moreover, mock languages such as Mock Filipino and ‘haolefied’ English are indexed largely through prosodic and phonetic cues. I draw on Gumperz’s (1982) interactional sociolinguistics as a resource for analyzing prosody in interaction.\(^\text{18}\)

Comparing and contrasting American and British English with Indian English, Gumperz (1982, Ch 5) argues for the pragmatics of prosody. His definition of prosody includes (1) intonation, (2) loudness, (3) stress, (4) other variations in vowel length, (5) phrasing, and (6) overall shifts in speech register. He also illustrates the cohesive function of “tone grouping, accent placement and paralinguistic signs” (Gumperz, 1982, p. 128) and points out that these features interact with “focus, perspective, point of view, topicalization and the like” (p. 128). Interactants make inferences, based on their understanding of interaction of these features.

Gumperz (1982, Ch 9) also discusses standard and dialect forms as contrastive devices that are mediated by linguistic ideologies about phonological and prosodic features; that is, meaning is produced by juxtaposing standard and dialect forms “in relation to the interpretive presuppositions associated with the activity enacted” (p. 202).

\(^{18}\) For a more formal analysis, see interactional linguistic studies (e.g., Selting & Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.) (2001)).
Gumperz (1982) shows how a Black minister deploys two ways of speaking as contrastive devices. Local comedians also deploy similar contrastive devices to create humorous effects.

2.2.2.4 Stake inoculation

*Stake inoculation* (Potter, 1996) is a special case of entextualization that is dialogic and interactive. Potter (1996) uses stake and interest as a cover term for various considerations (e.g., competences, projects, allegiances, motives, and values) that people use to manage their state of affairs. Using a medical analogy, Potter refers to one of the stake management strategies as stake inoculation. The function of stake inoculation is to head off the danger of being considered as having certain interests and to rework the nature of an action. A display of disinterestedness can be a powerful rhetorical device. For instance, to show the subtlety of stake inoculation, Potter (1996, p. 131) uses the following utterance from a relationship counseling session where Jimmy complains about his partner, Connie, who Jimmy implies flirts with other men:

7 Jimmy: Connie had a short skirt on *I don’t know*

Potter focuses attention on Jimmy’s subtle display of his disinterestedness “precisely at a point where it could be a particular issue” (p. 132). Jimmy is dealing with the criticism that he is exceedingly jealous and sees his partner’s sociability as sexual suggestion; thus, the use of *I don’t know* displays uncertainty and heads off the implication that he is the kind of person who is unreasonably jealous and inspects his partner’s clothing.
Hawai‘i comedy participants are not disinterested, either, and they would make a disinterested account of interest when necessary. I will demonstrate how, as part of a larger process of entextualization, Local comedians construct imaginary characters with various linguistic resources and deliver ethnic jokes with a series of stake inoculations in order to manage the danger of being seen as a racist and to serve as an entertainer. The meaningfulness of such discursive practices is demonstrable through a sequential analysis of comedic performance, and it can also be interpreted through a reception study.

2.2.2.5 Research interviews and focus groups

Focus group interviews have been widely used for various purposes (Krueger & Casey, 2009; Morgan, 2002), from market research (Puchta & Potter, 2004) and public opinion polling (Myers, 2007) to social science studies. The goal of a focus group is “to collect data that is of interest to the researcher—typically to find the range of opinions of people across several groups” (Krueger & Casey, 2009, p. 7). However, in focus group research, CA approaches have not been much used (e.g., Peek & Fothergill, 2009; Pösö et al., 2008).

The focus group interview is a site for the production of meaning, not simply a site for the collection of data. It is an occasion for participants “to construct versions of reality interactionally rather than merely purvey data” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2002, p. 14, emphasis in original). The discursive analyst’s goal is not to reveal the truthfulness of what the participants say but to examine the construction of “believability” (Potter, 1996). Moreover, the interview is reflexive in the sense that it develops “as each participant looks at the world through the other’s eyes, incorporating both self and other into the
process of interpretation” (Warren, 2002, p. 98). I investigate the construction of such versions of reality through my research of interviews as talk-in-interaction. Furthermore, I do not isolate what is constructed from how it is constructed, as both are components of meaning-making (Baker, 2003; Edwards, 1991; Gubrium & Holstein, 2002; Roulston, 2006).

Many qualitative researchers have pointed out that interviewing frequently deletes the interviewer or that interviews are interactional; for instance, Holstein and Gubrium (2004) uses the term ‘active interviewing’ to refer to the fact that the interviewer is a crucial participant in the data; Mishler (1984) examines medical interviews or doctor-patient interaction from the same perspective and criticizes context-stripping as a feature of the positivist approach to scientific research. Following these studies, Potter and Hepburn (2005) also identify two similar sets of problems with qualitative interviewing from a conversation analytically influenced perspective of discursive psychology: the first deals with contingent problems in the design, conduct, and presentation of interviews; and the second has to do with necessary, or unavoidable, problems in the analysis of interviews. These problems are summarized in Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1. Problems in the design, conduct, presentation, and analysis of qualitative interviews (Potter & Hepburn, 2005, p. 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingent problems</th>
<th>Necessary problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) the deletion of the interviewer</td>
<td>(1) the flooding of the interview with social science agendas and categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) the conventions of representation of interaction</td>
<td>(2) the complex and varying footing positions of interviewer and interviewee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) the specificity of observations</td>
<td>(3) the possible stake and interest of interviewer and interviewee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) the unavailability of the interview set-up</td>
<td>(4) the reproduction of cognitivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) the failure to consider interviews as interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using CA-informed transcription and analytic conventions, I attempt to resolve all of these five contingent problems. On the other hand, none of the four necessary problems can be dealt with entirely satisfactorily (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). I attend closely to participants’ orientations in order to minimize these latter, necessary analytic problems. Moreover, I do not dismiss Wortham’s (2000) notion of interactional positioning or Wetherell’s (2003) discursive approach that deals with the second and third necessary problems of qualitative interviews. Based on her interview data on race talk and in alignment with my use of ethnographic knowledge in analyzing performance data, Wetherell (2003) argues that the discourse analyst needs to go beyond the immediate data (i.e., conversations in interviews) to conduct a complete analysis of race talk because participants draw on historicized cultural resources; the repetition of these semiotic resources has important social consequences that the discourse analyst must study. I focally attend to the cultural knowledge that participants visibly draw on, and the stances they take up towards cultural objects and topics.

2.2.2.6 Summary of data analysis

Performance-in-interaction is a sociolinguistic notion that draws on the analysis of code and stylization in sequences of talk. I use MCA to investigate the interactional aspects of culturally-specific shared knowledge. My analysis is also heavily sociolinguistic as it pays due attention to multilingual and prosodic features to explore how indexicality is accomplished and how intersubjectivity is achieved. I have also conceptualized linguistic ideology as an interface that mediates language, interaction, and society.
2.3 Transcription

An analysis of multilingual categorial work in performative data requires one to become reflective of transcription. In this section, I discuss transcription in general to identify the difficulty of representing non-standard languages (2.3.1) and discuss the representation of Hawai‘i Creole in particular to acknowledge how previous scholars have attempted to represent Hawai‘i Creole in their transcripts (2.3.2). I also illustrate how I transcribe this language that is part of my multilingual data (2.3.3).

2.3.1 Transcription as theory

Transcription is a complex process through which transcribers ‘entextualize’ (Bauman & Briggs, 1990) verbal and non-verbal information into written forms that obtain “new textual forms as well as new contextual meanings” (Bucholtz, 2007, p. 785). Transcribers select either what is salient to themselves as researchers or what is relevant to interactants as members. Ochs (1979) boils down transcription into three fundamental points: (1) transcripts are the researcher’s data, (2) transcripts are the products of the transcription process that is selective and reflects theoretical assumptions, and (3) transcripts constrain the generalizations the researcher makes. I explore these points further with respect to selectivity, politics, and translation.

Ochs (1979) does not discourage selectivity in the process. What should be discouraged, she argues, is selectivity that is based on inconsistent and implicit decision-making. In other words, selectivity is not an option (Cook, 1990). Ochs encourages the use of a selective transcript as long as the transcriber is “conscious of the filtering process” (Ochs, 1979, p. 44). Although non-standard spellings tend to be inconsistent,
Bucholtz (2007) suspends judgment about whether representational differences are ‘errors’ and considers them ‘variation’ in orthography in order to examine the motivations and effects of such variation. She suggests that “increased attention to the relationship between phonology and interaction has the potential to enrich a number of fields” (Bucholtz, 2007, p. 800). Selectivity leads to issues of power and ownership.

I refer to Green, Franquiz, and Dixon (1997) because they pose a series of questions that are relevant to any discourse analytic research, and particularly to my multilingual performative data. Green, Franquiz, and Dixon (1997) claim that there is no objective transcript because transcribing is a political act; that is, what is represented (an interpretive process) and how it is represented (a representational process) are not completely separable. We must pose the following questions to become reflective of the transcription process (Green, Franquiz, & Dixon, 1997, p. 174):

- Who will be involved in constructing the transcript?
- How will talk be selected, in what ways, and for what purposes?
- What level of contextual information will be provided, so that readers may hear or see the researcher’s interpretive processes?
- How will persons and their talk and related actions be represented in the transcript?
- What is invisible within the transcript that needs to be articulated in the narrative?

These questions become even more important in two cases: (1) when the transcriber belongs to a different language group from the speaker(s) in the data or (2) when multiple languages are involved (Green, Franquiz, & Dixon, 1997); these cases are inseparable from another question (p. 174) that is particularly relevant to discussion of stigmatized vs. non-stigmatized languages in multilingual data:
Whose language is being represented and whose language counts, when language counts?

Researchers need to answer these questions because as stated above, there is no objective transcript and because transcription has political effects. Our goal is not to achieve neutrality but to assume responsibility (Bucholtz, 2000). Similarly, Jaffe (2006) maintains that non-standard spellings in transcripts have communicative potential while they have inherent representational risks in the sense that they are indexically associated with sociolinguistic difference or stigma. Jaffe (2006) implies that eye dialect (e.g., “wuz” for “was”) should not be used in transcripts unless used for subversive purposes as an act of self representation, because it has no information value, thereby simply perpetuating the stigma of the speaker(s) whose variety is represented. On the other hand, she implies that respellings are acceptable for casual or informal speech such as “kinda” for “kind of” as well as those for phonological features of a variety such as “dis” for “this” because these respellings have corresponding varieties and, thus, have information value. Selectivity and power issues are intertwined in the transcription process; thus, being reflective of this process and making consistent practical decisions help us to deconstruct our ideologies about discourse.

The last point I would like to address before dealing with Hawai‘i Creole is translation in the transcription process. Bucholtz (2007) argues that “the process of discourse transcription is also a process of social ascription” (Bucholtz, 2007, p. 801); for instance, she re-examines Moerman’s (1988) data on Thai interaction by focusing on his translation of the word “lăj,” claiming that Moerman has translated the lawyer’s token

---

19 Celia Roberts (1997) and Deborah Cameron (2001) also note these inherent risks in respelling.
into formal speech (i.e., “many”) and the witness’s token into casual speech (i.e., “a lot of”). Bucholtz’s analysis seems untenable, but her point is that transcription, like translation, is not a neutral act and is a political act.

Interaction is loaded with social, cultural, and political meanings, and the process of transcription as recontextualization leads to an intertextual gap (Bucholtz, 2007). This leads to a challenging task that I must deal with in transcribing, representing, and translating the multiple languages and varieties that Local comedians use on stage. My data contain not only the use of multiple varieties but the switching and mixing of these varieties. Most of these languages and varieties are not part of my linguistic heritage and repertoire; thus, I need to pay due attention to the transcription process that could influence and constrain what I find relevant in my data. I demonstrate the difficulty of this process by drawing on previous scholars’ attempts to represent Hawai‘i Creole in the next section, which leads to the rationale for representing Hawai‘i Creole in my data.

2.3.2 Hawai‘i Creole in transcripts

In this section, I review existing studies on Hawai‘i Creole in order to investigate how they represented it in relation to English. Most Hawai‘i Creole scholars use both eye-dialect and non-standard respellings, but I avoid using these types of respellings in my transcripts because of three reasons: first, I do not share an intuition for the effective use of these kinds of respellings, but I can bring the reader’s attention to parts of discourse by

---

20 It should be noted that Moerman (1988, pp. 149-150) shows that W (witness) uses “lāj” in a declarative clause (l. 7) and L (lawyer) uses “lāj” in an interrogative (l. 12). Translated into standard spoken English, Moerman’s choices are according to the book. There is no such thing as a direct association of “many” with formal and “a lot of” with casual; that is, Bucholtz’s (2007) analysis is an ironic decontextualization mistake.
other means if necessary; second, these respellings have inherent representational risks; and finally, the Odo orthography is best suited for this purpose. I adopt the Odo orthography to represent Hawai‘i Creole features and to highlight style-shifting between Hawai‘i Creole and English. I also suggest that not only differentiating Hawai‘i Creole from English but making finer distinctions within Hawai‘i Creole may have some analytical value for multilingual discourse analysis. In other words, not only a clean switching between English and Hawai‘i Creole but a more subtle shifting within Hawai‘i Creole is oriented to as relevant at Local comedy shows.

In order to discuss the issues of transcription, representation, and translation in studies on Hawai‘i Creole, I start with a study by Forman, Kakalia, Lau, and Tomita (1973) that is one of the earliest studies to show awareness of these complex issues:

We are not happy about the form of our spellings and hope no one, Kauai children especially, will be offended that our transcription—with all its respellings and apostrophes—relies basically on English orthography. In the absence of a full phonological study and the scientific development of a standard orthography for their variety of speech, we must be content with this manner of presentation. (Forman et al., 1973, p. 19)

This comment demonstrates that transcribing a non-standard variety such as Hawai‘i Creole involves selectivity and power. It is also implied that English is a lexifier language of Hawai‘i Creole; the latter is often represented in modified English orthography that includes the use of eye dialect and non-standard respellings.
2.3.2.1 *Eye dialect or vowel quality?*

In their study of a clinical encounter between a white male physician and an older female part-Hawaiian patient, White and Robillard (1989) briefly describe the transcription process as follows:

The audio portion of the videotape was transferred to an audio cassette which was used to make a transcription of the conversation. The transcript was prepared using a notational system similar to that developed by Sacks et al. (1974) to document the temporal sequencing of utterances by noting gaps and overlaps in speech, as well as features of pronunciation and intonation. The resulting transcript of the conversation is the primary basis for our analysis. (White & Robillard, 1989, p. 199)

I examine how Hawai‘i Creole is represented in their transcript of the interaction between the patient (P) and the doctor (D).

**Excerpt 1** (White & Robillard, 1989, p. 201, my emphasis)

53 D: okay (.). ankles ever swell up? (.)
54 P: no=
55 D: =no trouble (.). and you’re takin’ the rest of your medicines? (.)
56 P: yah (.)
57 D: okay=
58 P: =only today I didn’t take becuz (.). uh:::=
59 D: =because of the blood sugar (.)
60 P: ah:: yah yah becuz I didn’ eat breakfast dis morning before I came stay here (.)
61 but da nurse tol’ me I should have brought wid me (.). I said well I didn’ tink
62 about dat (.). dat’s okay on my way home I kin haf ta take da pills

I have highlighted three tokens of “because” (ll. 58, 59, and 60) in bold. While D’s utterance is spelled as “because” (l. 59), P’s utterances are spelled as “becuz” (ll. 58 and 60), which indicates an apparent non-standard pronunciation. However, it seems that P
does not always use non-standard pronunciation, as her utterance is spelled as below in the next excerpt:

Excerpt 2 (White & Robillard, 1989, p. 200, my emphasis)

26 D: no fast heartbeats? (.) uh::
27 P: no because ((laughs)) I walk a lot ((laughs))

It seems that style-shifting in P’s speech is represented in White and Robillard (1989); however, it is hard to know what the qualitative difference is between “because” and “becuz” in P’s utterances as the ‘standard’ pronunciation of “because” would also be phonetically realized with a /z/. There are other Hawai’i Creole features represented in their transcript such as despirantization (e.g., “dis” in lines 60-61; “da” in lines 61-62; “wid” in line 61; “tink” in line 61; “dat” and “dat’s” in line 62), consonant deletion (e.g., “tol’” in line 61), and other phonological processes (e.g., “kin” for “kind of” in line 62 and “haft a” for “have to” in line 62). One example of eye-dialect respelling appears in line 15:

Excerpt 3 (White & Robillard, 1989, p. 200, my emphasis)

09 D: how’ve they been running? (.)
10 P: oh: good (ery) uh:: I don’t know why uhm (. ) morning time is (. ) one plus (. )
11 early in da mornin=  
12 D: =uhuh
13 P: ((laughs)) but when come noon time (. ) two plus (. )
14 D: an’nie time? (. )
15 P: nite time two plus=  
16 D: two plus

P’s utterance (i.e., “nite time two plus” in line 15) can be respelled in standard orthography (i.e., “night time two plus”). Compared to the respellings discussed above, it
seems that "nite" may graphically add a non-standard 'flavor' to the transcript, but it does not have any analytical value, at least from a phonetic perspective.

However, whether eye-dialect respelling has no analytical value is debatable, especially when a transcriber is an L1 Hawai‘i Creole speaker. Wong (1999) explains that he has opted to use "an ad hoc orthography" (p. 210) in his representation of Hawai‘i Creole speech:

K: Howzis, Leinani dem waz planning one trip to da zoo eh ... and your ipo wen jus tell Leinani dat she waz going join dem .... I'n ask Leilani how she wen say em ... she to’ me she wen try explain em in Hawaiian but Leinani neva understand ... so she jus said, "Yeah, whatevah" ... she said em li’ dat, “Yeah, whatevah.” (Wong, 1999, p. 210, my emphasis)

Wong (1999) uses non-standard respelling for Hawai‘i Creole features except two tokens of "waz," which seems to be eye-dialect respelling of "was." Because there is no difference in their phonetic value (i.e., "waz" vs. "was"), the re-spelt form "waz" is only to add a 'flavor' to the transcript, which may highlight the fact that the above discourse is in Hawai‘i Creole.21 It might be relevant to ask who decides whether to use eye-dialect respelling; in other words, White and Robillard (1989) are L2 Hawai‘i Creole users while Wong (1999) is an L1 Hawai‘i Creole user, which could give different meaning to their use of eye-dialect respelling (i.e., "nite" for "night" and "waz" for "was" respectively). I argue that L1 users may be more competent to use eye-dialect respelling for subversive purposes as an act of self representation.

---

21 One point about using "waz" is that the vowel may indeed have a different quality from that of "was."
2.3.2.2 Non-standard respelling

Some Hawai‘i Creole scholars use their own non-standard respelling (e.g., Forman et al., 1973; Iwamura, 1977; Purcell, 1979; Rynkofs, 1993; Watson-Gegeo & Boggs, 1977).

Below is an excerpt from Watson-Gegeo and Boggs (1977) that shows an interaction between two Hawaiian children, Ahi (A) and Palani (P):

Excerpt 4 (Watson-Gegeo & Boggs, 1977, p. 79, line numbers and emphasis are added)

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 01 | A: | You know ova deh? | Formal opening phrase, orientation, request for confirmation. |
| 02 | My dad was walkin op da mountain (ӕ?). | Challenge (P knows who). |
| 03 | P: | Who! | Continues story. |
| 04 | A: | He saw one mountain lion. | Repeats challenge, more explicitly. |
| 05 | A: | A followin him climb op da mountain, eh? He seen one mountain. | Answers, alleges fact. |
| 06 | P: | [Who] climb da mountain!? | Contradicts A. |
| 07 | A: | My fa’er, he cotchin one mountain lion. | Contradicts P, suggests trial by wager (note overlapping indicating anticipation). |
| 08 | P: | [Oh, cannot. | Contradicts A. |
| 09 | A: | [Yes he] [did! I betchu dolla. | Contradicts A. |
| 10 | P: | [He cannot. (interaction ends) |

Watson-Gegeo and Boggs (1977) use respellings to capture Hawai‘i Creole features. Respellings include: “ova” for “over,” “deh” for “there,” “walkin” for “walking” (also “followin” and “cotchin”), “op” for “up,” “da” for “the,” “mountin” for “mountain,” “fa’er” for “father,” “cotchin” for “catching,” “betchu” for “bet you,” and “dolla” for “dollar.” Other Hawai‘i Creole features are “one” (ll. 5 and 8), “seen” (l. 7), “cannot” (l. 12), and sentence final particles such as “ӕ?” (l. 3) and “eh?” (l. 7).

The non-standard respellings and the other Hawai‘i Creole features in standard (English) orthography indicate the informality of the above interaction even though some
of the respellings are still vague and there are some inconsistencies. For instance, “deh” (l. 1) is respelled differently from other tokens of the same phonological process (i.e., r-deletion) such as “dolla” (l. 14). In addition, even though A, who is one of the participants in the above excerpt, drops r’s in lines 1 (“deh”) and 14 (“dolla), the sound remains in “My fa’er” (l. 10). Moreover, it is likely that “You know” (l. 1) shows a trace of monophthongization, and it is also probable that “him” (l. 6) is pronounced as “om.” Non-standard respelling can easily become inconsistent, so I illustrate in the next section a more consistent system that is designed to treat Hawai‘i Creole as an autonomous language.

2.3.2.3 The Odo orthography

Roberts (2005) highlights three important events in the study of Hawai‘i Creole, one of which is Carol Odo’s invention of “a non-etymological phonetic orthography for Hawai‘i Creole” (Roberts, 2005, p. 27). Odo created a writing system for Hawai‘i Creole to deal with a great amount of recording data, but her intent was not to transform Hawai‘i Creole into a literary language; later in the 1990s, the sociolinguist Charlene Sato adopted Odo’s system as an orthography in her academic and political quest to legitimize Hawai‘i Creole. Following is a summary of this orthography taken from Sakoda and Siegel’s (2003) work on the grammar of Hawai‘i Creole.

---

Note that Roberts refers to Odo’s work as “non-etymological phonetic orthography.” Odo’s product is undoubtedly non-etymological, but (1) whether it is orthography and (2) whether it is phonetic is debatable (Kent Sakoda, personal communication, 2009). The Odo orthography is not strictly phonetic; rather, it is phonemic because it does not allow one to discriminate between the differences in vowel quality of the same phoneme, a problem which can be overcome through the use of International Phonetic Alphabet symbols. Odo did not name her system the Odo orthography, although it is popularly known as such in academic circles. She regarded Hawai‘i Creole as a constellation of features that Hawai‘i English speakers adopt in style-shifting, and she did not believe that there is a Hawai‘i Creole speech community.
Figure 2.2. Vowels in the Odo orthography (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003, p. 24, IPA added)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>symbol</th>
<th>sound</th>
<th>Odo spelling</th>
<th>other examples</th>
<th>IPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>fun or father</td>
<td>f'an/fa'ada</td>
<td>ap (up), mada (mother), pam (palm)</td>
<td>ʌ, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>fake</td>
<td>fek</td>
<td>red, mek (make), tude (today)</td>
<td>e, ɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>feet</td>
<td>f'it</td>
<td>bit (beat/bit), mi (me), priti (pretty)</td>
<td>i, ɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>foam</td>
<td>f'om</td>
<td>brok (broke), oke (okay), ol (old)</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>f'ud</td>
<td>but (boot), gud (good), yu (you)</td>
<td>u, ʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ae (or æ)</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fa'et</td>
<td>raep (wrap), laet (let), aek (act)</td>
<td>e, æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aw</td>
<td>fall</td>
<td>fa'wl</td>
<td>law, awn (on), tawk (talk)</td>
<td>ə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai</td>
<td>file</td>
<td>fa'il</td>
<td>laik (like), ai (I), krai (cry)</td>
<td>aɪ, aj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au</td>
<td>foul</td>
<td>fa'ul</td>
<td>hau (how), laud (loud), kau (cow)</td>
<td>əɛ, aw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td>fail</td>
<td>fe'il</td>
<td>eit (eight), meid (maid), ei (age)</td>
<td>eɪ, ej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oi</td>
<td>foil</td>
<td>fo'il</td>
<td>boil, toi (toy), chois (choice)</td>
<td>oɪ, oj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ou</td>
<td>fold</td>
<td>fould</td>
<td>vout (vote), toad (toad), gout (goat)</td>
<td>oʊ, ow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>fur</td>
<td>f'ur</td>
<td>wrd (word), hr (her), brd (bird)</td>
<td>ɹ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3. Consonants in the Odo orthography (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003, p. 25, IPA added)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>symbol</th>
<th>examples</th>
<th>IPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>bawl (ball), rib</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>dawg (dog), baed (bad)</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>fani (funny), inaf (enough)</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>go, baeg (bag)</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>haed (had), hou (how)</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>jank (junk), baej (badge)</td>
<td>dʒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>kil (kill), kik (kick)</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>ple (play), pul (pull)</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>mai (my), him</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>nais (nice), pin</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>pau ‘finished’, gruq (group)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>raet (rat), krai (cry)</td>
<td>ɹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>sel (sell), mas (mus', must)</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>tel (tell), fait (fight)</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>vaen (van), neva (never)</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>wid (weed), wea (where)</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>yu (you), yelo (yellow)</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>zu (zoo), izi (easy)</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>chek (check), kaech (catch)</td>
<td>ʃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh</td>
<td>shel (shell), fish</td>
<td>ʃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zh</td>
<td>mezha (measure), yuzholi (usually)</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>kaDai ‘spicy hot’, kaDate (karate)</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘a’</td>
<td>ali’i ‘chief’, Hawai’i</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 Representing my data

Finally, I discuss what is represented and how it is represented in my data. As a non-L1 Hawai’i Creole speaker, I avoid using eye-dialect and non-standard respellings because I
do not share an intuition for the effective use of these kinds of respellings and because I can bring the reader’s attention to parts of discourse by other means (e.g., arrows, fonts); thus, I adopt the Odo orthography to represent Hawai‘i Creole features and style-shifting between Hawai‘i Creole and English. I also pursue a Gumperzian approach to discourse and prosody. Hawai‘i Creole is often indicated through phonological and intonational features, and these need to be marked in transcripts. Discourse analysts have attempted to incorporate some of these features, such as intonational contours, into transcripts (e.g., Gumperz, 1982), but this remains an underdeveloped area in discourse and conversation analytic research.  

Hawai‘i Creole scholars hypothesize that Hawai‘i Creole and English form a continuum, rather than that Hawai‘i Creole and English are two separate codes (e.g., Perlman, 1973; Purcell, 1979). This is partly why some scholars prefer using ‘style-shifting’ to ‘code-switching.’ The term style-shifting indicates that Hawai‘i Creole speakers ‘shift’ from one style to another while the term code-switching indicates that Hawai‘i Creole speakers make a clear ‘switch’ from one code to another. Local comedians’ discursive practice is performative and seems to involve both ‘subtle’ shifting and ‘abrupt’ switching to create humorous effects. I adopt the Odo orthography to mark Hawai‘i Creole features. I make a distinction between Hawai‘i Creole and Hawai‘i Creole ‘features’ because I need to focus on intricate shifting in my data. Seemingly English utterances often include Hawai‘i Creole features. Although it is challenging to determine whether these utterances are English or Hawai‘i Creole, marking Hawai‘i Creole features in these utterances allows me to examine the intersubjectivity that Local

---

23 Interactional linguistics may be an exception.
comedians and their audiences achieve with respect to the relevance of nuanced
discursive contrasts in a continuum between English and Hawai‘i Creole.

Style-shifting between English and Hawai‘i Creole was studied most extensively
in the 1970s; these studies referred to phonological and prosodic features. For instance,
Purcell (1979) stated that the most frequent Hawai‘i English (HE) features are
“phonological and prosodic” (p. 187). Such phonological and prosodic features
demonstrate style-shifting between General English (GE) and Hawai‘i English: that is,
“from GE to low-gear HE, to high-gear HE, to low-gear HE, and back to GE” (p. 187).
Similarly, Perlman (1973) showed that there are distinctive grammatical, phonological,
and prosodic features that set apart Hawai‘i English (HE) from English (or “Mainland
speech” in his term). Perlman redefined Hawai‘i Creole as “a set of features that is
available to HE speakers as style markers of great or little subtlety” (p. 241). He also
mentioned a “stage-dialect” that is a highly performative social dialect or style that is
associated with comedic characters and TV personalities. In order to describe style-
shifting, Purcell (1979) combined four representational systems: the International
Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), a special notation system, standard English orthography, and
dialectal respellings (e.g., “firs” for first); she also used a hybrid form (e.g., “grada” for
grade).

I adopt the Odo orthography to mark Hawai‘i Creole features in my data because
it is a legitimate representational system for Hawai‘i Creole.24 Although I highlight
Hawai‘i Creole features in sentences/clauses, I rarely transcribe a whole sentence/clause

---

24 For more information about Hawai i Creole features, see Purcell (1979), Sakoda and Siegel (2003),
Simon (1984), and Vanderslice and Pierson (1967), among others.
in the Odo orthography unless it is undoubtedly Hawai‘i Creole. Making such judgments for each utterance is not within the scope of the dissertation, but the highlighted Hawai‘i Creole features do allow the reader to make a judgment. Another reason I avoid representing a whole sentence in the Odo orthography is that Hawai‘i Creole and English constitute a continuum; for instance, a single phonological feature may or may not be enough to represent an utterance as Hawai‘i Creole. Similarly, a single syntactic feature may or may not be enough to represent an utterance as Hawai‘i Creole.

The Odo orthography also allows me to be consistent in representing Hawai‘i Creole features. In contrast to the previous studies discussed above, I do not use either eye-dialect respellings (e.g., “nite” for “night”) or non-standard respellings (e.g., “braddah” for “brother,” “t’ink” for “think”) because they cause more problems and have variation among Hawai‘i Creole speakers/writers. While these eye-dialect and non-standard respellings are conventionalized to some extent, they have inherent representational risks and are always subject to becoming inconsistent. When I discuss mock languages (i.e., stylized languages other than English and accented English) in Chapter 5, I use IPA to avoid representing them as part of Hawai‘i Creole and to avoid any excessive stigmatization.

I present an excerpt from Andy Bumatai’s comedy CD to illustrate what is represented and how it is represented. Bumatai is telling a joke in a stand-up comedy show for his predominantly Local audience. He uses English as a medium of narration,

---

25 Some linguistic features belong to more than one language; Woolard (1999) refers to this property as bivalency.
and he style-shifts into Hawai‘i Creole. He indicates the beginning of style-shifting when he uses an address term for his audience (i.e., “bra” in line 8). His reference to a place name, Nānākuli, also projects style-shifting into Hawai‘i Creole. Bumatai’s utterances also show Hawai‘i Creole features such as despirantization (e.g., “daet,” “braDaz,” and “da”) and postvocalic r-deletion (e.g., “braDaz”).

I represent another feature, a rising-falling intonation, because it is a crucial prosodic feature that marks Hawai‘i Creole interrogative utterances (e.g., “↑wen yu statid smok|ing ais ((ice))” in line 17).26 The intonational contour characterizes this utterance as Hawai‘i Creole. It is only one of the Hawai‘i Creole features, but it strongly marks it as Hawai‘i Creole. Many of these Hawai‘i Creole features appear in reported speech that is marked by double quotation marks (ll. 3, 14, 16-17), which is the topic of Chapter 4.

In addition to discursive contrasts between Hawai‘i Creole and English, this transcript highlights the spontaneity of performance-in-interaction. For instance, this excerpt shows that the audience responds collectively to Bumatai even before he completes his utterances (ll. 5, 13, 15).

Excerpt 5
01 AB one thing always drives me nuts
02 if you ever go these (.) tourist shows
03 they start with “ALO:::HA::.”
04 ((a vowel in the last syllable of aloha is nasalized))
05 Aud (((laugh)))
06 AB tourists think that’s how we greet each other.
07 Aud ((laugh))
08 AB bra, imagine that you (in) nanaikuli
09 ↑you know (what I mean)↑

26 One might say that the General American English interrogative sentence (e.g., “When did you start smoking ice?”) has an intonational pattern similar to Hawai‘i Creole that goes from high to low; however, the Hawai‘i Creole interrogative sentence has a sharper contour from high to low and also has a little ‘scoop’ at the end of the sentence.
I have depended upon Hawai‘i Creole speakers’ perspectives in producing the transcripts that I analyze in the dissertation. I produced transcripts by myself first, and I had Gavin Furukawa—a bidialectal speaker of Hawai‘i Creole and English—review these transcripts with audio recordings. I also presented some of the transcripts in Pidgin Coup meetings, CA Data sessions, and graduate seminars at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa where I got feedback on the Hawai‘i Creole in the transcripts.

In summary, transcription is a representation of verbal and non-verbal information. It is also a process of entextualization that inevitably leads to an intertextual gap. It is necessary to be reflective of this intertextual process when one investigates the multilingual use of non-standard varieties such as Hawai‘i Creole. This stigmatized language variety has been represented through eye-dialect, the Odo orthography, and other means that were designed to capture the heterogeneity of speech data in Hawai‘i. In this chapter, I have illustrated my transcription policy that I adopt in the subsequent data analysis chapters (Chapters 3-6).
CHAPTER 3. STYLIZING THE AUDIENCE

3.1 Introduction

This chapter is the first of four data analysis chapters. This chapter and the following one examine language use in comedy shows. I focus on three comedians (i.e., Frank DeLima, Augie T, and Bo Irvine), who had live stand-up comedy performances in Hawai‘i in 2008. The goal of this chapter is to demonstrate how these comedians discursively construct their audiences through stylization in talk. The relationship between the comedians and their audiences is jointly constituted in comedic performances-in-interaction. In order to compare the comedy shows of these comedians, I extract the introductory sequences of each show (approximately 3-10 minutes) and analyze how the comedians use various semiotic resources not only to create humorous effects but to generate a relationship between themselves and their audiences. This chapter, thus, highlights the generation of a sense of community in the institutional setting of live stand-up comedy shows.

The data in this chapter show that a sense of community is generated through style. Style is “a social semiosis of distinctiveness” (Irvine, 2001, p. 23). Bell (2001) states that one of the most important questions in sociolinguistic studies of style is the “why this now” question; that is, why does this person say it this way here and now? In other words, this stylistic question is about the notions of context, communicative competence, and appropriateness. Bell (2001) also states that one of the biggest factors that determines style is audience. Audience design is a theory of identity construction through style; that is, stylization. As discussed in Chapter 1, style mediates between linguistic variability and categorization; thus, stylization is individual or collective
identity work (Auer, 2007). Bell (2001) makes the following three points with respect to stylization through audience design:

1. Style is what an individual speaker does with a language in relation to other people.
2. Speakers design their style primarily for and in response to their audience.
3. Speakers have a fine-grained ability to design their style for a range of different addressees, as well as for other audience members.

Individual speakers, according to Bell (2001), design and modify their style according to different types of audience. To put this differently, the audience determines or influences style decision-making. Should this conceptualization be applied to the context of comedy, it could lead to the assumption that comedians design their performance for a particular type of audience. I argue, however, that this illuminates only one side of the coin; that is, comedians not only design their performance style for a particular type of audience but constitute their audience by means of performance style. Hence, this chapter poses the following two questions: (1) What kinds of audiences do the comedians construct? and (2) How do the comedians use code and other means to stylize those audiences? In order to deal with these questions, I use two analytical tools: membership categorization devices (Sacks, 1979) and stake inoculation (Potter, 1996). I analyze membership categorization in relation to code selection because selecting a certain code is a category-bound activity. One of the discursive environments of membership categorization is reported speech where multiple perspectives intersect. Membership categorization also co-occurs with stake inoculation that builds up carnivalesque humor. I demonstrate how the three comedians stylize their Local and non-Local audiences through the use of membership categorization devices and stake inoculation.
3.2 Stylizing the audience as Local

This section examines the way two comedians—Frank DeLima and Augie T—stylize their audiences as Local by means of membership categorization devices (3.2.1) and stake inoculation (3.2.2).

3.2.1 Membership categorization devices

3.2.1.1 Frank DeLima

I present excerpts from three sets of data: one of the data sets was recorded at a free show in a hotel in the Waikīkī area; another data set was recorded at a Mother’s Day show in a hotel in the Ala Moana area, and the other data set was recorded at a Father’s Day show in a restaurant in the Wahiawā district.

The first excerpt is taken from the Mother’s Day show. In line 1, Frank DeLima (FD) has not yet appeared on stage, so his audience can only hear his voice. (DeLima appears in the back of the room in line 42 and starts to walk towards the stage.) DeLima specifies the kind of humor he will perform while explaining what is going to happen. He states that Local style humor involves “cutting down every ethnic group present hia” (ll. 2-3), stylizing his audience by providing a list of ethnic groups that are present at this site.

Excerpt 1 (Mother’s Day Show 3a)
01 FD dis afternoon, we are going to be (1.0) performing (.2)
02 FD Local style humor. (1.2) so: we’ll be cutting down every
03 FD ethnic group present [hia.
04 Aud (((laughter))
05 FD japānese, chiːnese, filipinos, portuːguese, filipinos,
06 FD koːreans, filipinos=, haːwaiians, filipinos,
07 Aud =((laughter))
08 FD an fo you haole white people you’ll be cut down throughout
When DeLima refers to Filipinos for the third time (l. 6), the audience starts to laugh (l. 7). This repeated reference to one ethnic group is accountable and implies its ‘exceptional’ status among these ethnic groups. Following this, DeLima introduces “haole” as an additional group and treats them as separate from, and less competent in understanding “Local style humor” than, the other ethnic groups (ll. 8-9). This utterance draws laughter (l. 10).

It should be noted here that DeLima categorizes his audience into several ethnic groups that include Japanese, Chinese, Portuguese, Koreans, Hawaiians, and Filipinos, treating “cutting down” the last group as accountable; moreover, DeLima highlights “haole white people” as an ‘incompetent’ group with respect to understanding Local style humor. DeLima’s formulation indicates that his audience consists of both non-whites and whites and that Local style humor is designed primarily for the former group. It does not matter whether or not “haole white people” are present at the show because DeLima’s rhetoric is designed to create humorous effects.

The next excerpt is taken from the Father’s Day show in the Wahiawā area. DeLima states that he wants to introduce himself formally to his audience even though he also indicates that it might not be necessary. What he means by formal self-introduction is to refer to his full name and ethnic heritage, which constitutes carnivalesque humor because it subverts the ordinary introduction ritual.

---

27 The Odo orthography is used here to indicate the vowel is a monophthong.

28 The implied ‘exceptional’ status of Filipinos in Hawai‘i is due to their category-bound activity of dog-eating. This stereotypical activity is alluded to in one of DeLima’s most famous parody songs, too.
DeLima tells his full name, and the audience responds with laughter (l. 101) while he is still disclosing his Hawaiian name. He treats his full name as an unexpected one for his audience by posing a question and making a request (l. 103), which is responded to with a laugh token (l. 104) and with the raising of a hand. DeLima introduces a category of family (i.e., “aunty”) to account for why one person in his audience knows his full name, thereby implying that knowing his full name is a category-bound attribute of being a family member. Referring to the family category, he also designs the audience as people who understand about family connections on the island. DeLima accounts for the act of telling his full name again (ll. 113-115), following this up with a description of his ethnicity. Finally, he emphasizes his Hawaiian heritage and starts a mock Hawaiian language chant.

29 An asterisk is approximately equivalent to a syllable.
DeLima’s performance constructs, and is designed for, a predominantly Local audience. How DeLima designs the audience as Local depends on the act of stating one’s full name to ‘show off’ one’s ethnic heritage. Telling his audience his whole name gives him a chance to claim a ‘truly Local’ identity because he is multiethnic. Being multiethnic is also part of his act of stake inoculation that the audience is designed to appreciate, too.

The next excerpt goes back to the Mother’s Day show again. One of the stylistic characteristics of DeLima’s show is that he interacts with individual members of his audience, which constitutes an important part of his show. Having interacted with a few Local Japanese persons, DeLima talks to another person and starts to stylize him as a Local Japanese, too.

Excerpt 3 (Mother’s Day Show 3h)

126 FD isn’t it? (.4) oh some mo: ova hia.
127 [w(h)o(h)w.
128 Aud (((laughter))
129 FD it goes on and o:n ma:n. o dis braDa look like
130 he’s ready fo da .h fo da (.). bonsan,30 fyaf?
131 Aud (((laughter))
132 FD look at dis. look at dis (.). right ova hia ma:n.
133 <!ni:ce hea;ka: t> bra. ((haircut))
134 Aud (((mock Buddhist prayer))
136 Aud (((laughter))
138 (.)
139 FD ![trn] (((imitating the sound of a bell used in rituals))
140 Aud “[ga:jo:do:ni-]”
141 FD (2.0)
142 FD o: what’s- what happened. you had ![u][ku:s]32

---

30 The word bonsan means a Buddhist monk.

31 DeLima deploys a low tone of voice and elongation to imply that he is delivering a mock Buddhist prayer. This prayer is linguistically nonsense except for the morpheme [d3i], which might remind one of a word for temple in Japanese.
DeLima spots a person, addresses him as “braDa,” and characterizes him as a Japanese monk (ll. 129-130). DeLima accounts for why he refers to this person as a Japanese monk by describing his haircut, and he closes his utterance with the Local address term bra (ll. 132-133). Note that DeLima’s utterance (i.e., “<niːce haircut> bra.”) is produced in Hawai‘i Creole. DeLima’s reference to a Japanese monk leads to reciting a mock Buddhist prayer (ll. 135, 137, 139, and 141). He formulates an account about his interactant’s haircut as a question that ends with a Hawai‘i Creole word (i.e., uku) and is produced with a Hawai‘i Creole intonation (i.e., “o:h what’s- what happened. you had ↑u↓kus”), which draws laughter from the audience.

DeLima translates neither “bonsan” (l. 130) nor “uku” (l. 143) into English, thereby indicating that they can be understood by the audience. The word “uku” is a culturally-specific term—which might even invoke a collective memory about the past—and serves to manage the stylization of a Local audience. The lack of translation for both words constitutes the audience as Local and maybe majority Local Japanese. It should also be noted that being a Local braDa is associated with a category-bound action of understanding Hawai‘i Creole as well as with a category-bound attribute of being familiar with the good old days in Hawai‘i.33

32 The word uku means a lice or flea in Hawaiian. This is part of Pidgin vocabulary. DeLima is treating “dis braDa”’s very short hair as accountable and is implying that he must have had to shave his hair to get rid of head lice. The reference to uku might remind people, especially, of the past when many people had to deal with this hygienic problem. Andy Bumatai also treats this word as an indication of affect in Chapter 6.

33 Ukus are still around, but are indeed linked with school-aged children.
In the next excerpt, DeLima interacts with another audience member, and he stylizes his interactant as a ‘typical Portuguese woman’ through multiple discursive means. DeLima spots one woman, but she does not meet his expectations, and he implies that he is looking for a ‘pure’ Portuguese; he then announces that he might have found one (i.e., A9) that meets his expectations and makes an assessment about her Portugueseness.

Excerpt 4 (Mother’s Day Show 3n)

269  FD  "do we have any portuguese people in here? I don see any.
270  ?   [↑yeah.
271  Aud  [↑(laughter))
272  FD  <you look portuguese>= ma’am.
273  Aud  =((laughter))
274  Band  (music))
275  FD  yeah but you mixed. I tingk we have a mixed one over here
276  but (. I don see da <pure blood bossy> ones.
277  Aud  ((laughter))
278  FD  o: wait wait wait<. maybe dis one ova hia.
279  Aud  ((laughter))
280  FD  o: yeah. look at daet. ma:n I tell fyouf. you a: bossy.
281  look at daet.
282  Aud  ((laughter))
283  FD  like dis already [ladies an gen-
284  Aud  [[[laughing]]
285  FD  so: punchbow:l, kalihika:i, uhm ***** or: uhm let’s
286  see. .h saint ann’s kaneohe:. where are you from?
287  A9  kaneo*he*.
288  FD  kaneo:he:
289  Aud  (((laughter))
290  FD  [nice to see you.
291  Band  (music))
292  FD  a: oke:. and uh what is your name?
293  (.6)
294  A9  julia
295  FD  julia? an last name? (.8) o: what’s your maiden name.
296  A9  fereira.
297  FD  [ffereira:f.
298  Aud  (((laughter))
299  FD  <te:rrific> ma:n. (.) well nice to mizhu. ((meet you))
300  Band  ((music))
DeLima lists stereotypical place names where many Portuguese live and asks A9 where she lives (ll. 285-286). A9 responds with one of the place names that DeLima has listed (i.e., “kaneoʻheʻeʻe”), and DeLima repeats this place name. He, then, asks A9’s name, and she responds with her first name. DeLima repeats it with an emphasis and asks her maiden name. A9’s response (i.e., Fereira) is treated as a typical Portuguese name by DeLima who responds with a sign of excitement. Finally, DeLima assesses his encounter with A9 and closes this sequence.

DeLima’s stylization of his interactant as Portuguese is achieved through the deployment of category-bound attributes such as being “bossy.” He also presents a list of place names, treating them as stereotypical residential areas for Local Portuguese. He jointly achieves doing being Portuguese with his interactant who responds with one of these place names that he has already presented; he also constructs Local perspectives about places and history of Hawai‘i. The fact that place names are used is another means of stylizing the audience and enacting Local knowledge. Furthermore, he asks his interactant’s name. Even though he does not provide a list of typical Portuguese last names, he responds to his interactant’s response by treating it as expected. What DeLima co-constructs with his audience is the display of excitement through successfully matching an ethnic category with its category-bound activities and attributes.

In the next excerpt, DeLima applies the same strategy of membership categorization to another ethnic category, Filipino; however, this excerpt also shows how he deals with a deviant case. DeLima identifies another group, greets them, and specifies their ethnicity, thereby reinforcing the aforementioned stylization of the audience as predominantly Japanese and treating the Filipino group as a minority in this venue.
DeLima delivers a phrase in a mock Filipino language (i.e., “a: nagaing bagamalingmo:?” in line 152)\textsuperscript{34} and asks A4 a yes/no question to narrow down her ethnicity (i.e., “are you ilokano ma’am?” in line 154), to which she responds with an affirmative answer. DeLima asks her about the authenticity of his mock Filipino, treating her as someone who is entitled to making such an assessment. A4 makes an assessment, thereby jointly setting up a frame that she is unmistakably a Filipino. Although DeLima stylizes A4 as a Filipino, more specifically, Ilokano, he encounters a problem when she

\textsuperscript{34} DeLima’s use of this phrase will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.
discloses a place name that does not meet his expectations. Because both DeLima and his audience are acquainted with the association between being a Local Filipino and its category-bound attribute of living in any of the stereotypical Filipino places (e.g., Waipahu), this mismatching between ethnicity and its residential area must be accountable. DeLima starts to account for the reality that a Filipino lives in ‘Aiea, which is not a stereotypical Filipino town, and the ethnographic knowledge that ‘Aiea is one of the Japanese towns leads to DeLima’s reference to Japanese and its category-bound attribute; thus, he asks A4 whether she married a Japanese. This example shows that a seemingly deviant case can be explained by means of the same body of ethnographic knowledge about ethnic categories and their category-bound activities and attributes in Hawai‘i, part of which DeLima has displayed in the previous few excerpts, albeit A4 gives an unaffirmative answer and DeLima gives up.35

The next excerpt is another deviant case in which DeLima problematizes a mismatch between portable identity and its category-bound attributes. DeLima spots another person (i.e., A8), characterizes him as “brownie,” and treats him as a minority in the predominantly Japanese audience. DeLima asks A8 about his ethnicity and gives three probable answers as subcategories of “brownie.”

Excerpt 6 (Mother’s Day Show 3l)
238 FD  fo:ke:f. (.) uh dis is looks like a uh: brownie ova hia.
239 Aud  not too many of you in [hia too.
240 FD  ((laughter))
241 Aud  now (.) ↑what ↓you
242 FD  ha:walian or you are sa:mo:an [or ton:ga:n or (.6)
243 Aud  ((laughter))

35 It is likely that O‘ahu’s demographics have shifted over the past few decades, as there has been rising immigration from the Philippines. DeLima’s comedy may capitalize on the demographics of post-plantation life and statehood more than the very recent past.
DeLima treats A8’s response (l. 246) as impossible. Moreover, he deploys his own ethnicity and its category-bound attribute (i.e., being ‘dumb’), thereby humorously emphasizing that no one would think A8 is a Local Japanese because even he—who is Portuguese—can tell that A8 is not Japanese. He asserts that A8 cannot be of Japanese descent due to his portable identity. Building up his assumption that A8 must have a non-Japanese name, DeLima asks A8’s last name. A8’s response (i.e., “ina:ba”) receives a denial from DeLima and laughter from the audience. This interaction shows that both DeLima and his audience display their understanding of the last name in A8’s response as a Japanese last name; that is, A8’s response is treated as an act of crossing. The above interaction also shows that A8 successfully provides an authentic Japanese last name and that crossing is well accepted should the potential crosser demonstrate that s/he is knowledgeable about the ethnicity into which s/he attempts to cross.

Although DeLima treats A8 as a Polynesian while refusing to treat him as a Japanese, DeLima keeps constituting A8 as a Local. When he talks to A8, he uses Hawai‘i Creole as the language of interaction; for instance, he formulates a question
about A8’s ethnic identity in the Hawai‘i Creole syntax with a rising and falling intonation (“↑what ↓you”). He also addresses his interactant as braDa. When he ethnicizes himself, he refers to himself as Portuguese and even uses a contracted form (i.e., PoDagi), but he provides no explanation about what it means.

In summary, DeLima stylizes his audience—individually and collectively—as Local. He achieves this by means of constituting a matching between portable ethnic identity and its category-bound predicates. Even when he encounters a deviant case where his interactants respond with contradictory categories, he manages and accounts for this deviation by deploying the same body of knowledge that consists of ethnicity, place names, and last names. Other semiotic resources DeLima uses for stylization include address terms (e.g., braDa), Hawai‘i Creole, and a collection of family categories (e.g., aunty).

3.2.1.2 Augie T

The second comedian is Augie Tulba, who is popularly known as Augie T. I examine two sets of data for Augie T: one taken from a televised live stand-up comedy show at Hawai‘i Theatre and the other from a weekly show at a hotel in the Ala Moana area (“Island Style Comedy”). The live comedy show at Hawai‘i Theatre was broadcast live on a local television station, K5. Although two comedians performed prior to Augie T, their segments were not televised. Following their performances, the televised segment started, and a contemporary Hawaiian musician, Willie K, performed a few songs. When this was over, Augie T (AT) appeared from the back of the theater, walked through the
audience, and went up on stage. After telling a few opening jokes, he talks about his family, starting with his mother.

Excerpt 7 (Hawai‘i Theatre 4g)
149 AT  what e:else what- let me tell what else happened. .h
150 >you know< after we did da first hawaii tiaDa sho?: .h
151 my family who’s sitting all in a front row right ↑hia .h
152 dei got all embarrassed.
153 Aud ((laughter))
154 AT  ”t.o why you tok about like- why you tok about daet like (.)
155 why you tok about awa family laiDaet augie?”
156 Aud ((laughter))
157 AT  “ho mek she:m ((make shame)) now everybody no: about awa
158 family. I don like nobody no about awa ↑family”
159 Aud ((laughter))
160 AT  you no what’s happening right now? huh?
161 weeks bifo doing dis sho?: .h de: all wanted to know
162 what I gon tok about you no like
163 Aud ((laughter))
164 AT  .h ”↑>so watchu gon tok about me o ↑what. toking about me?
165 [watchu gon tok about ↑me<”
166 Aud (((laughter continues until line 167)))
167 AT  you saw my mom? I saw my mom
168 (my) portuguese mom (daet) came an gave me a le:? ((lei)) .h
169 (she sta-) stand up ma. .h dea you go.
170 [as my mom.
171 [((cheers & applause continue until line 173))
172 ma (.). de: cannot see you. stand up on top of da chea.
173 (chair)) sta- stand up on da che- h (1.4)
174 ↑see ↑↓my mom. ha- bo- u: big ya? poDogi okole ya?
175 Aud ((laughter))
176 AT  she taking up two seats (.) what’s wrong wizhu.
177 Aud ((laughter))

Augie T continues a frame in which he updates his audience—as if he is catching up with his friends—about what happened since his first show at Hawai‘i Theatre some years ago (ll. 149-150). He talks about his family’s reaction to the first show (l. 151), animates his mother (e.g., “ho mek she:m” in line 157), and ethnicizes his mother as Portuguese (l. 168). He addresses his audience in Hawai‘i Creole (i.e., “↑see ↓my mom” in line 174) and also refers to his mother’s bodily feature (i.e., okole ‘buttocks’) as her
Portugueseness (ll. 174 and 176). The humorous effects are also achieved by switching from “portuguese” (l. 168) to “poDogi” (l. 174) while describing her physical features.

As Frank DeLima categorized his audience members to generate humorous effects, Augie T categorizes his family members, highlighting the correspondences between portable ethnic identities and their category-bound activities and attributes. The fact that Augie T does not elaborate on the meaning of Hawai‘i Creole phrases (e.g., mek she:m) and ethnic references (e.g., PoDogi) shows that he stylizes his audience as Local. In the next excerpt, he describes his childhood while still talking about his mother. This excerpt shows that the stylization of the audience is jointly achieved.

Excerpt 8 (Hawai‘i Theatre 4i)

203 AT  my mō:m (.)  oke I grew up
204   in kaem fo ((kam four)) hou↑sing36 (.)  oke:?  
205 ?  ↘a:
206 AT  my mom (.2) used to leave
207   yeah go ↑o: (.) [↑o:
208 ?  [↑o:
209 ?  ↑o:
210 AT  get kaem fo housing people in hia?
211 ?  [↑o:
212 Aud  (((cheers))
213 AT  right on. speak da zhurim. ((dream))
214 Aud  (((laughter))
215 AT  it’s awesome. ei (. ) e (. ) let me make you feel at home.
216 ((l.6) <you have da right to remain "silent">.
217 Aud  (((laughter continues until line 219))

When Augie T reworks the context (i.e., “oke I grew up in kaem fo ((kam four)) hou↑sing (.) oke:?”) in lines 203-204), a new subcategory of his audience starts to emerge because a member of this new group responds to Augie T’s utterance with a cheer (i.e., “↑a:” in line 205). Augie T acknowledges and responds to the cheer (l. 207). His cheer overlaps with

36 Kamehameha IV Housing is affordable public housing in Kalihi, Honolulu.
another, which is followed by yet another. This series of cheers indicates that Augie T’s utterance in line 203 is accountable. Augie T poses a yes/no question to account for the meaning of the cheers, orienting to the relevance of growing up in Kam Four Housing (l. 210), to which audience members respond (ll. 211-212) to acknowledge the relevance of this belonging. Augie T indicates that he has identified a type of his audience and makes a comment (i.e., “speak da zhurim”), to which his audience responds with laughter to display their understanding of the irony (l. 214).  

Following this, Augie T makes an assessment about having the Kam Four Housing people in his audience (l. 215), addresses them in Hawai‘i Creole (i.e., “ei (.) e (.)”), and makes an ‘inside’ joke to further align with them (i.e., “let me make you feel at home. (1.6) <you have da right to remain °silent°>” in lines 215-216). The joke is responded to with laughter (l. 217). Although Augie T presents this joke as an ‘inside’ joke, it is understood by outsiders in the audience, too, because of shared knowledge about the association of the public housing projects with crime. In other words, this is a mock inside joke that is designed to be comprehensible for non-residents of the public housing, which heightens the humorous effects.

After delivering several anecdotes about his mother, Augie T starts to talk about his Filipino father, explains that he is at the beginning stage of dementia, and makes a joke about it.  

In the next excerpt, Augie T starts another dementia joke that is also a directional joke. In a constructed dialogue, Augie T asks his father for directions to his

---

37 Note that AT has a charitable foundation called the Speak The Dream Foundation. It was announced prior to the show that several high school graduates in Hawai‘i would be awarded scholarships from the foundation at the end of the show.

38 Augie T often says that he does not make jokes—he makes observations.
Aunty Margaret’s house. There is nothing intrinsically Local in the dementia story, but Augie T adds a Local ‘flavor’ to it by assembling various semiotic resources such as place names, his relatives, and Hawai’i Creole features. The fact that these semiotic resources receive no elaboration tells us that Augie T stylizes his audience as Local.

Excerpt 9 (Hawai’i Theatre 4m)
291 AT (.6) you know, (. ) I go “dad wea daet kain aunty margaret’s
292 house in ↑waia↑nae” ((Dad’s voice)) “aunty margaret? (.8) a:
293 yeah yeah yeah yeah [yeah aunty margaret.”
294 Aud [((laughter))
295 AT ha. (1.2)
296 ((Dad’s voice)) “waianaε ya? waianaε augie (. ) waianaε ya?”
297 Aud ((laughter))
298 AT hahaha “s(h)o s(h)o. .h w(h)ea .h ↑wea aunty margaret house
299 ↓ste:” ((Dad)) “o ya ya ya you go down for– (or) farrington
300 high way”↑boy .h you go farrington high we: .h you gon take
301 on right (. ) by lualualei ro:d ((road)) ova ↑dea”
302 (1.0)
303 Aud [((laughter))
304 AT haha I know he fogetting already a?
305 (.)
306 Aud [((laughter))
307 AT ((Dad’s voice)) “getchu all at yua aunty margaret’s ↑house
308 ova dea.”
309 Aud [((laughter))

Augie T starts a constructed dialogue in Hawai’i Creole between him and his father, in which he asks the father for directions (l. 291). He changes footing and voices his father’s response (ll. 292-293 and 296), and he delivers his own response (ll. 298-299). He has already repeated “Waianae” three times, but he does not explain where it is because it is simply taken for granted. In addition, Hawai’i Creole features can be found in both Augie T’s and his father’s speech in the constructed dialogue, which indicates that Augie T stylizes his audience as Local. Augie T changes footing again and gives directions in the

---

39 The Farrington Highway runs along the western coastline of O‘ahu. Running from south to north, it leads from ‘Ewa Beach through Nānākuli, Waianae, and Mākaha to Ka‘ena Point.
father’s voice (ll. 299-301), which shows that Augie T has elaborated Local geographic
knowledge of going (from ‘Ewa Beach where he lives) to Wai‘anae by referring to two
roads leading to the destination (i.e., Farrington Highway and Lualualei Road). After
accounting for a relatively long pause (l. 302), he goes back to his father’s voice (l. 307)
and finishes giving the directions rather abruptly (i.e., “getchu all at yua aunty margaret’s
↑house ova dea” in lines 307-308), humorously constructing the irrationality of being in
the state of dementia.

The next excerpt is taken from a weekly show in the Ala Moana area. The first
and second acts—Timmy and Jose Dynamite—have already performed, and the MC
introduces the headliner, Augie T, to the audience. Augie T initiates his performance by
referring to one of Jose Dynamite’s jokes. Implying its low quality, he makes a reference
to Aloha Airlines, which had gone bankrupt a few days before. Augie T’s reference to
companies, public figures, and place names in Hawai‘i constitutes the context of this kind
of comedy because he presents them within the frame that they require no explanation. In
addition, the audience members stylize themselves as Local through displaying their
understanding in response to the images and parody that Augie T generates.

Excerpt 10 (Island Style Comedy 5b)

40  AT  ** (1.0) <go:d>. (1.2) <shoot> * I thought (it wow). god. is
41  Aud  this the end? (.). like aloha airlines tonight?
42  AT  o no:////:. o(h) hohohohoho.
43  (1.2)
44  Aud  ((laughter))
45  AT  pya ting ((poor thing)) ya? aloha(h)a airlines ya? .h I was
47  toking ((talking)) to mu:fi last night cause you no on the
48  night before he had dis big .h five hundred dalla: ((dollar))
49  a plate. (.6) ("how much?") .h five hundred dalla:z
50  people’s buying. like ova (there’re) like (.). fifteen hundred
51  people came (away). yeah def got a five hundred dalla plate.
52  Aud  ((laughter))
Augie T’s reference to the airline company draws laughter from the audience (l. 42), which shows that Jose Dynamite’s joke and the bankruptcy of the company get connected intertextually by the audience in terms of their problematic nature. Augie T makes an assessment about the predicament of the company (l. 46) to align with his audience. He continues to talk about the company and states that he had a conversation with the mayor Mufi Hannemann (l. 47) at some kind of fundraising party. Hannemann was then mayor of Honolulu City and County, but Augie T does not explain who Mufi is right away, and it is taken for granted that Mufi is the mayor who can host a party where the attendees pay five hundred dollars a plate. Augie T voices himself talking to Mufi (l. 56), and a constructed dialogue between them kicks off.
The parody character introduces “dis transit ting” and “aloha airlines” as topics (ll. 57-58). It was widely known at the time that the mayor Mufi Hannemann supported a construction project for a new transit system on the island of O‘ahu; however, the character that Augie T depicts here makes a much more radical proposal that the city and county of Honolulu should purchase the bankrupt airline company and rename it as “da ↑plane” (l. 63), which draws laughter from the audience (l. 64) because this plan is unlikely, to say the least, and because the city and county already has a public transit system with a similar name (i.e., TheBus). In addition, the parody character refers to a place name (i.e., Mā‘ili Beach) as a potential construction site for a runway, and gives an imaginary scenario in which Mufi serves as a pilot. Furthermore, the pilot makes an announcement (ll. 76-77) to make a request (l. 79) in a culturally-specific way and to refer to a social issue (i.e., high gasoline prices), thereby drawing laughter from the audience.

In summary, Augie T talks about his family members including his mother, his father, and his aunt, and he tells anecdotes about them by deploying various semiotic resources such as companies, place names, public figures, and Hawai‘i Creole within a frame that requires no explanation. He constitutes his family members as Local, thereby stylizing his audience as Local, too, in the sense that they can understand the interaction between Augie T and his family members. In response, the audience stylizes themselves as Local through displaying their understanding of the images and parody that Augie T generates. On a different note, Augie T’s interaction with his audience is relatively limited, which is partly because this performance took place at a huge venue, the Hawai‘i Theatre (Excerpts 7-9). Nevertheless, his interaction with the audience is no more
interactive at a smaller comedy club (Excerpt 10), which seems to be the standard stand-up comedy practice. Instead of dealing with individual audience members to a great extent, Augie T deploys reported speech and constructed dialogues to make his performance interactive and to stylize his family members as Local. One of the advantages of using represented speech and thought is to give elasticity to his performance; that is, he can even use Hawai‘i Creole for the voice of the mayor to make exaggerated humorous effects. As Frank DeLima did in the excerpts in the previous section, Augie T also makes full use of the relationship between membership categories (e.g., Portuguese, Hawai‘i Creole speaker, public housing resident, etc.) and their category-bound activities and attributes.

### 3.2.2 Stake inoculation

Membership categorization devices often co-occur with stake inoculation through which the comedians rework the nature of humor. I examine the use of stake inoculation in this section in order to argue further that the kind of audience does not pre-determine the comedians’ performance and that these performers constitute their audiences and stylize them as Local in the ongoing development of performance-in-interaction. At the same time, the emerging construction of the Local audience re-constitutes the comedians’ performance style.

#### 3.2.2.1 Frank DeLima

Membership categorization and stake inoculation co-occur when DeLima looks for a Native Hawaiian audience member. In the next excerpt, DeLima implies that he is part
Hawaiian. He starts to treat an audience member (A10) as Native Hawaiian, too, but soon finds it necessary to re-categorize him. This is a clear example of how DeLima stylizes his audience in the moment-by-moment performance he is engaged in. Throughout the following interaction in which DeLima attempts to ethnicize A10 as Native Hawaiian, he keeps stylizing A10 as Local by accounting for his behavior and by addressing him with Local address terms such as *bra* and *braDa*, thereby orienting to Local-normativity.

Because DeLima is a comic performer, he has a stake in maintaining control of his audience and what they think of him and if they find him believable and funny. His ‘advice giving’ allows DeLima to stay in control of how the discourse is being constructed. Even though A10 causes some trouble, DeLima stays in control of it by finding ways to deal with the trouble.

**Excerpt 11 (Mother’s Day Show 3o)**

301 FD  *oke:* (.2) but *aekchli* I’m irish scotch english spanish  
302 FD  *french* portuguese chinese *<an hawaiian>*. that’s my my (.2) my  
303 FD  (.2) total (.6) ethnic *oke:*? (.2) uhm ↑an people *dei* tell me  
304 FD  yo you so luck’y to have a hawaiian name. (.6) cause not  
305 FD  everyone get hawaiian name. an we got any people in hia with-  
306 FD  ((cough)) ↑how about ↑you ↑you ↑ha↓waiian  
307 FD  (.6)  
308 FD  ↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑…..
At this point in his act, DeLima has introduced himself to his audience and is now disclosing his multiethnic identity (ll. 301-302); he seeks acknowledgement from the audience (ll. 302-303). He follows this up with an assessment about having a Hawaiian name (ll. 303-305). It should be noted that Native Hawaiian identity as a rare and cherished thing is very ‘modern.’

Following this, DeLima starts to look for Native Hawaiians in his audience (l. 305), spots a male audience member (A10), and asks him if he is Hawaiian with a Hawai‘i Creole intonation (“↑how about ↓you ↑you ↑ha↓waiian” in line 306), which is
followed by a relatively long pause (l. 6), and A10 finally responds to DeLima with a confirmation question (“↑↓me” in line 308). Responding to A10, DeLima asks him a rhetorical question to imply that he is unmistakably Hawaiian (i.e., “* who ELSE look like you [hawaiian (in there)?” in line 309). DeLima describes the other audience members around A10 and continues to imply that he is unmistakably Hawaiian (l. 311). DeLima re-enacts his question and answer routine with A10 to stylize him as Local and to seek alignment from the audience (i.e., “typical dou ((though)) ya? Local”).

Although DeLima treated A10 as Native Hawaiian, he now re-categorizes him as Local when A10 asks an obvious question, which DeLima treats as a category-bound activity of being Local. While DeLima suspends the categorization of A10 as Native Hawaiian, he stylizes him as Local. DeLima orients to Local-normativity under which anyone in his audience, first and foremost, is a Local who belongs to one or more ethnicities. Having accounted for A10’s behavior by referring to Localness, DeLima restarts the categorization of A10 as Native Hawaiian (l. 315), thus revealing that it can be considered quite possible to belong to more than one category. In so doing, he brings together the category of Local (through his use of a Local address term, braDa) with multiple ethnicities.

DeLima asks A10 about his name (ll. 315-316). After a side-sequence (ll. 318-320), DeLima asks his name again and gives one probable answer (i.e., “honey bo:y or:”). An audience member gives another probable answer (i.e., “junia” in line 323), and DeLima takes it up and repeats the question (l. 324). A10 gives his first name (i.e., Robert), and DeLima repeats it and asks his last name (l. 327). When A10 answers (i.e., Wong), the audience responds to his answer with laughter (l. 330) because this name
challenges the premise of DeLima’s act, namely, his ability to guess his audience members’ ethnicities. DeLima initiates a repair sequence (l. 331), thereby treating the audience’s displayed interpretation of A10’s response as a misunderstanding. Although the audience treats A10’s last name as a non-Hawaiian name that creates a ‘mismatch’ between A10’s portable ethnic identity (i.e., Hawaiian) and his name (i.e., Wong as a Chinese name), DeLima challenges this interpretation.

DeLima uses the action of stake inoculation as a repair sequence by telling a story about the history of Chinese immigrants (ll. 331-333) and by delivering its consequence (l. 335). This is an example of stake inoculation because his ability to guess his audience members’ ethnicity was at stake. DeLima indicates the end of the story and seeks alignment from his audience (l. 337). He tries to persuade his audience about his historical account for the mismatch and closes a repair sequence (l. 337). What is at stake here is twofold: first, DeLima has to guess his audience members’ ethnicity correctly; and second, perhaps more importantly, he has to show sensitivity to the multiraciality of Native Hawaiians. DeLima’s formulation shows that one is primarily Hawaiian even if s/he is multiethnic because according to racial ideologies in Hawai‘i, being (part) Hawaiian is ‘cooler’ than, for instance, being (part) Chinese (Price, 2001). This is partly why DeLima describes a historical consequence from the Native Hawaiian perspective (i.e., “so a lot of hawaiians get (. ) pat (. ) chinese insjde” in line 335, my emphasis). He also indicates that this is a sensitive topic, but does not talk about it explicitly, thereby doing a disinterested account of interest (i.e., “so: (no) worry about daet” in line 337, my emphasis). In other words, DeLima’s stake is that as a professional entertainer, he must create a context where his audience appreciates the authentic Native Hawaiian identity of
an audience member who is also of Chinese descent. In this sense, DeLima has as a precaution treated the laughter in line 330 that follows A10’s response (i.e., Wong) as a potential threat or lack of respect to those who have stereotypical Chinese last names but are unmistakably Hawaiian. It should be noted that DeLima does these actions of stake inoculation on behalf of A10. It should also be noted that DeLima is required to become very cautious because his well-known Portugueseness gets in the way of him claiming Native Hawaiian identity.

Following this, DeLima finishes his history lesson and returns to his interaction with A10. He asks A10 a question about his ethnicity to rebuild the frame that A10 is a Native Hawaiian (ll. 337-338). A10 confirms his ethnicity (l. 339), and DeLima acknowledges it (l. 340). Following this, DeLima paraphrases his original question (l. 340). This paraphrased question, however, becomes a trouble source again and is followed by another long pause (l. 341). DeLima, then, accounts for the pause by asking a question with a Hawai‘i Creole intonation (i.e., “↑you ↓don ↓no” in line 342). DeLima stylizes A10 as Local again and suggests to him that he should “look da roots” (ll. 344, 346, 347). DeLima makes reference to Papakōlea—a Hawaiian homestead—and gives advice to A10 as a fellow (part) Hawaiian. He closes this sequence of advice-giving (l. 349).

DeLima paraphrases the original question once again to stylize A10 as Hawaiian (l. 349), displaying his knowledge that many people who are part-Hawaiian have a Hawaiian middle name. DeLima’s formulation is significant because he is orienting to the trouble that A10 has given him thus far in his ethnic identification game (i.e., “do you have a hawaiian:: middle name dou?” in line 349). DeLima urges A10 to respond (l. 354),
and A10 responds without a delay (i.e., “hanakahī” in line 356), and no laughter follows this time, which displays that the audience sees the name as unmistakably Hawaiian. DeLima poses a confirmation question (l. 357) and makes a positive assessment (i.e., “o:ke. daes a nice name” in line 357), thereby treating A10’s middle name as an authentic Hawaiian name and stylizing him as Hawaiian. Finally, DeLima compares A10’s middle name with his own Hawaiian name. It should be noted that having a Hawaiian name is a matter of Native Hawaiian pride, and that DeLima humorously treats having a long Hawaiian name as an even stronger basis for Native Hawaiian pride.

The next excerpt shows that membership categorization devices co-occur with stake inoculation in Augie T’s performance-in-interaction, too. This point is significant because the deployment of membership categorization devices is both interactionally and morally constrained in a highly performative genre. Moreover, the comedy show is a context in which the participants assert being politically correct should not matter, thereby paradoxically orienting to the relevance of being politically correct. To put this differently, the show itself provides the comedians with the necessary means to inoculate themselves against critique.

3.2.2.2 Augie T

After telling a joke about Campbell High School, Augie T initiates stake inoculation to rework the nature of his joke in which he depicted some students as intellectually challenged.

---

40 It seems that DeLima is displaying sensitivity to, or respect for, Native Hawaiians in a way that would not be necessary for other ethnicities in Hawai‘i.
Excerpt 12 (Island Style Comedy 5g)

199  AT  you ↓see a lot of us get uncomfortable: when I do stuff
200    laiDaet (.). don get (.). this is a <comedy> sho:. .h you’re
201    supposed to like let go everyting. let go. don get offended.
202    that’s one of (the reasons) why we get. you know why?
203    cause dis week has been a fraschreiting week. .h
204    people on molokai losing their jo:b,
205    " a:haha
206  AT  aloha airlines losing their jobs, and ** some of ↑us maybe on
207    the verge of losing our job.
208    " a:haahaha
209  AT  [da last ting we like to tingk about is .h
210    ((change in voice)) "<o: look how offensive he i:s>. he
211    teasing handicapped people.”
212    " a:
213  AT  [that’s all. we do daet ova hia.

Augie T describes the reaction of his audience to the previous joke, making a generalized
comment (i.e., “you ↓see a lot of us get uncomfortable: when I do stuff laiDaet” in line
199). He initiates and redirects stake inoculation (i.e., “this is a <comedy> sho:”),
reminds his audience of the context (i.e., “you’re supposed to like let go everyting. let
go.” in lines 200-201), and goes back to the original formulation (i.e., “don get
offended”). He accounts for his reasoning that the audience should let go everything (l.
203). Augie T refers to “a fraschreiting week” (l. 203) and gives three examples,
illustrating an economic slump. In referring to the economic downturn that the state is
experiencing, he presents criticism of his humor as undesirable (l. 209) during these
difficult times. He voices a negative comment in reported speech (i.e., “<o: look how
offensive he i:s>. he teasing handicapped people” in lines 210-211). Rather than denying
it, he acknowledges the negative comment (“that’s all. we do daet ova hia.” in line 213),
thereby arguing that such teasing is part and parcel of being “ova hia” in Hawai‘i.

This stake inoculation continues into the next excerpt where Augie T introduces
his handicapped relatives as a topic. Augie T is telling his version of reality here;
however, when he asserts that he is “a reflection of society,” the implication is that what he says is not limited to his own individual reality, but it is in fact a collective one that every member shares in Hawai‘i society. Augie T urges his audience to align with him; the audience responds with laughter to align with him. This reciprocal relationship reflexively stylizes both the performer and his audience as Local because they achieve intersubjectivity regarding Augie T’s version of reality that he is generating in a collective voice of Local people.

Excerpt 13 (Island Style Comedy 5h)

214  ? [ahaha
215  AT  [we do_. I have handicapped relatives.
216  ?  **
217  AT  you know what? an *** ironical (. ) * I don pity om. I tease
218  om. I laugh at om.
219  Aud  ((laughter))
220  AT  I laugh at om an you know what? deí like daet.
221  ((mock “handicapped” speech))
222  you do: yo joke augie do: yo joke.41
223  Aud  ((laughter))
224  AT  an (. ) uh everybody joking with (th(h)em). uhm (. ) I have a
225  handicapped aunty.
226  ?  ↑yeah
227  AT  like . h my aunty like (. ) she has a mu:mu: hand. right?42
228  ((to a woman in front seat))
229  you know my aunty?
230  ?  ↑yeah.
231  AT  [when I did daet jok people got (. )
232  ((change in voice)) “<o: (. ) augie> (. ) you should~” my aunty
233  penny daes right you know my whole family ya?
234  Aud  ((laughter))
235  AT  no. my aunty penny (. ) has a mu:mu: she has a mumu hand
236  right? okei. . h when I was growing ♪ u:p (. ) right? my aunty
237  pennys was like my bodyga:d. da last ting you laik to get hit
238  from (. ) is (someone) handicapped person right?
239  Aud  ((laughter))
240  AT  alright. so when I did daet joke in hawaii theater people got
241  offended. people’re like ((change in voice)) “o you making
242  fun.” I go ((his voice)) ↑no:. daets my relative. what are

41 Augie T changes his facial expression and generates unclear speech here, which indicates that he has initiated mocking.

42 Augie T is referring to a physiologically ill-formed hand.
Augie T announces that he has handicapped relatives (l. 215) as part of his attempt at stake inoculation. He describes what he does with those relatives (ll. 217-218). He asserts that they like how he treats them (l. 220), reinforcing his assertion through reported speech (l. 222). Augie T refers to his aunt (ll. 224-225), and an audience member in a front row responds to this (i.e., “↑yeah” in line 226). Augie T continues to give a description of his aunt’s physical feature (l. 227), and then changes his footing to ask the audience member whether she knows his aunt (i.e., “you know my aunty?” in line 229), which this audience member acknowledges (i.e., “yeah.” in line 230). Augie T continues his performance, and voices criticism (ll. 231-232), taking on the voice of the criticizers. However, he suspends animating the criticism and gets into a side-sequence, responding to the audience member’s utterance (i.e., “my aunty penny daes right” in lines 232-233). He accounts for why she knows his aunt’s name (i.e., “you know my whole family ya?” in 233).

The scale of abstraction shifts from “handicapped relatives” (l. 215) to “a handicapped aunty” (ll. 224-225) to “my aunty penny” (ll. 232-233). This is jointly achieved due particularly to an audience member who co-constructs a story about Augie T’s relative and which shows how the performer and audience roles emerge and are transformed in the course of performance-in-interaction. Based on the audience member’s contribution, AT describes his aunt’s physical feature again and delivers a joke about her (ll. 235-238). He talks about, and animates, the criticism he got (ll. 240-241).
He describes his response to the criticism in a constructed dialogue where he shows further stake inoculation work by deploying figurative speech and by shifting to abstract formal style (i.e., “I’m a reflection of society” in line 245). Note that his account (i.e., “da tings you like say, but you scared say” in line 246) points directly to the fact that he is doing a performance. He gives a final defiant statement (i.e., “I don kea.” in line 248) and closes it by seeking alignment from the audience (i.e., “right?”).

In summary, the performers use stake inoculation alongside membership categorization devices when the latter becomes a trouble source in performances-in-interaction. DeLima (Excerpt 11) reworks the stylization of an audience member (A10) as Native Hawaiian by delivering a historical account of the interaction between Chinese and Hawaiian people and accounting for the mismatch between the audience member’s portable ethnic identity and his last name. While re-constituting A10’s Hawaianness, DeLima treats him as Local by referring to him as bra or braDa. In addition, DeLima deploys Hawai‘i Creole and refers to Hawaiian middle names to present one conceptualization of being Local. Similarly, Augie T highlights the performance aspect of his categorization routines in order to have a successful comedy show (Excerpts 12 and 13). His strategy of stake inoculation is to introduce his family members as a topic. He re-constitutes the meaning of his joke by referring to his aunt, and he also jointly stylizes his audience as Local while interacting with an audience member who claims she knows his aunt.

---

43 Even though Augie T is claiming that teasing may be a Local thing to do, many Local people would be afraid to do it so publicly.
3.3 Stylizing the audience as non-Local

The previous section (3.2) showed how comedians stylize audiences as Local. As a point of contrast, this section examines the way three comedians—Frank DeLima, Augie T, and Bo Irvine—stylize their audience as non-Local by means of membership categorization devices (3.3.1) and stake inoculation (3.3.2). The purpose of comparing these two stylizations is to show how being Local emerges in relation to being non-Local, and vice versa. DeLima and Augie T’s data are taken from the same data sets that the previous section draws on, and Irvine’s data is taken from a show at a comedy club in Waikīkī (Comedy Polynesia).

3.3.1 Membership categorization devices

3.3.1.1 Frank DeLima

In a comedy show in Waikīkī, DeLima identifies two groups in his audience and categorizes them as non-Local. He refers to their category-bound activities and attributes to stylize them as non-Local tourists and residents respectively.

Excerpt 14 (Waikīkī 1c)

27 FD how many tourists in the audience.
28 please raise your hand.
29 tourists. tee o ju r a i es tee. tourist.
30 ? ((laughter))
31 FD yes: kei daet many. (.2)
32 oṣːe: so all the rest of you: live in waikiki: den a?
33 ? (no:)
34 FD you look like tourists but you stayed.
35 (does that) how it <goes>?

DeLima starts to identify a particular group of people in his audience (i.e., “how many tourists in the audience.” in line 27), makes a request to them (l. 28), and highlights the
non-Local category (l. 29). He acknowledges their response (l. 31) and makes an assessment about the number of the tourists (i.e., “kei daet many”). He then displays his understanding of the other audience members as residents of Waikīkī. The implication here is that the tourists and residents of Waikīkī are the same in terms of their portable ethnic identity. DeLima accounts for the second group that is similar to, but is different from, the previous group of tourists (i.e., “you look like tourists but you stayed.” in line 34). Note that DeLima refers to category-bound activities and attributes of tourists (i.e., going on a trip to Waikīkī, living in Waikīkī, looking like a tourist, staying in Waikīkī) to stylize one constituency of his audience as non-Local. Meanwhile, the other group is described specifically as not tourists and as long-term residents in Waikīkī; however, they are also not Locals.

DeLima treats his audience’s ethnic identities as a rationale for introducing himself, which provides him with the opportunity to highlight his own multiethnic identity. His interpretation of his audience’s ethnicities and presumed non-Local status also leads to very particular membership categorizations related to ethnic humor. DeLima asks a yes/no question (l. 35), which leads to the next excerpt where he gives two analogies for being Portuguese and treats his audience as non-Local.

**Excerpt 15 (Waikīkī 1d)**

| FD  | okei well (.2) I don take fo granted (that) everybody knows who I am. so I’m gonna introduce myself () in a ↑formal we:. ((way)) (.2) dei did a nice introduction but (. ) I wanna tell you my full name. my name is <frank (.) wilcox (. )> napuakekaulike (. ) delima (. ) junior>. daets my full name. (.4) okei? I’m irish (. ) scotch (. ) english (. ) spanish (. ) french (. ) portuguese (. ) chinese (. ) an hawaiian. (no:) |
and uh: (.) a lot of people (though) think I’m pure Portuguese. because I tell a lot of poDagi: jokes. if you’re not from hawaii: a poDagi: joke is like a polack (.) joke.44

or if you’re (from) canada (.) a newfie joke.45

DeLima provides his full name and implicates his multiethnicity (ll. 39-40). He makes a statement to emphasize that his full name is not simply Frank DeLima, contrary to people’s beliefs. He becomes more specific about his multiethnicity, presenting eight ethnicities (ll. 41-42). He describes people’s beliefs (i.e., “and uh: (.) a lot of people (though) think I’m pure Portuguese.” in line 44) and accounts for it (i.e., “because I tell a lot of poDagi: jokes” in line 45), re-presenting his multiethnicity as a surprise. What DeLima means by “a lot of people” (l. 44) is not tourists but Locals and, possibly, long-term residents in Waikīkī who are supposedly familiar with his comedic performance.

After referring to “poDagi” jokes (l. 45), DeLima explains what this means for those who are not from Hawai‘i (i.e., “if you’re not from hawaii:” in lines 45-46), thereby treating tourists (and possibly long-term residents) as non-Local again. He gives two analogies: one for, possibly, mainlanders (i.e., “a poDagi: joke is like a polack (.) joke.” in line 46) and the other for Canadians (i.e., “or if you’re (from) canada (.) a newfie joke.” in line 48); both analogies draw laughter from the audience (ll. 47 and 49), thereby potentially constructing the audience as non-Local. Their laughter could index that they find the comparison humorous (thus revealing their knowledge of Local comedy), and/or it could index that they only recognize mainland North America humor that pokes fun at Polish people and people from Newfoundland.

44 Polack jokes are Polish jokes.

45 Newfie is a term for people of Newfoundland.
In the next excerpt from a Father’s Day show in the Wahiawā area, DeLima introduces a culturally-specific term for whites when two audience members respond to his request to raise their hand if they are “brand new to the islands.” DeLima and his audience give a welcome to the couple, thereby stylizing this haole couple as non-Local because Local people cannot be welcomed to the islands.

Excerpt 16 (Father’s Day Show 2c)

42 FD ain den there’s two haole people ova hia
43 [raised dea ha:nd.
44 Aud (((laughter)))
45 FD what are you doing here:£ man?
46 Aud (((laughter)))
47 FD dis is (.2) wa:hiwa: ((Wahiawā)).
48 how do (.) da haole people no(h):(h):
49 [wea ((where)) wa:heowa:
50 Aud (((laughter)))
51 FD how [long hav-.
52 A2 [he retired here.
53 FD uh- uh he retired here. (.2) <I> see.
54 FD brand new to the islands (though) you say.
55 A2 uh huh
56 FD okei how long?
57 [up (.2)
58 A2 [eleven months.
59 FD how many?
60 A2 [eleven months].=
61 FD =eleven months.
62 FD well that’s (.). good to have you here:
63 FD [welcome to (.2) to how (.). and uh do you live in wa:heowa?:
64 Aud (((applause)))

DeLima refers to a couple in his audience (i.e., “two haole people” in lines 42-43) who have responded to DeLima’s request. The audience responds to DeLima’s reference with laughter (l. 44) that makes his reference accountable. The audience is orienting to the relevance of haole people in this situation. DeLima begins to account for his reference by posing a rhetorical question designed not only for the couple but for the whole audience (i.e., “£what are you doing here:£ man?” in line 45). This rhetorical question also
indicates the discrepancies between being a haole and being “here” (l. 45). This discrepancy of belonging is treated as something humorous because DeLima delivers the above question in a laughing voice, and his audience responds to it with laughter (l. 46). While continuing to account for the discrepancies of a membership category and its category-bound attribute, DeLima reinforces the humorous effects by specifying what he means by “here” or highlighting the obvious fact (i.e., “dis is (.2) wa:hiwa:” in line 47). He accounts further for this discrepancy of belonging by paraphrasing the previous rhetorical question (i.e., “how do (.da haole people no(h):((where)) wa:heowa:” in lines 48-49), which draws laughter once again from the audience (l. 50). DeLima and his audience achieve intersubjectivity about the situation where haole people are in Wahiawā; that is, their understanding of this situation is based on the collective memory that Wahiawā is historically a Japanese town, to which non-Locals do not belong.

Following this, DeLima and the female member of the haole couple (A2) reach an understanding about why the couple came to Wahiawā and how long they have been there (ll. 51-61). DeLima initiates giving a welcome to the couple (i.e., “good to have you here:”). The audience responds to DeLima’s welcome (l. 62) with applause. Note that DeLima and his audience give a welcome to the couple, thereby stylizing the haole couple as non-Local because Local people cannot be welcomed to the islands. In the next excerpt, Augie T also identifies the members of an out-group and stylizes them as non-Local.
3.3.1.2 Augie T

In a show in the Ala Moana area, Augie T talks explicitly to a group of U.S. mainlanders in his audience. This shows that Augie T’s reference to his “friends” is embedded as a side-sequence within a larger sequence designed as a joke for his predominantly Local audience.

Excerpt 17 (Island Style Comedy 5d)

134  AT  I * gon say “yeah yeah what? (. ) wha(h)t? . every↑body meking
135  Aud  shii shii in the ↑ocean”
136  AT  ((laughter))
137  AT  y- you can tell you can tell: especially my .h my friends ova
138  Aud  hia from the ma- you can tell: go waikiki: with some time in
139  AT  the next couple days .h you can tell when guys making shii
140  Aud  shii in the ↑ocean.
141  AT  (hahahaha
142  AT  ↑o ↑girls. you know why? we all <float da same>.
143  AT  hahahahaha
144  AT  we all look like dis. ((act out floating))
145  Aud  ((laughter))

After talking about a sewer problem (not shown), Augie T introduces another story (ll. 134-135) and treats it as relevant to the previous story. He continues to tell a story, but cuts it off to get into a side-sequence where he addresses a segment of his audience (i.e., “my .h my friends ova hia from the ma-” in lines 137-138). Although his utterance is cut off, it is evident that he is referring to those from the mainland because he uses the same reference later in the show (Excerpt 20, line 43). He even gives an instruction to this group should they want to observe what he is talking about (i.e., “you can tell: go waikiki: with some time in the next couple days” in lines 138-139). He orients to the non-Localness of this group by including “with some time in the next couple days” (ll. 138-139) in his instruction because this phrase indicates further that his “friends” (l. 137) are
visiting Hawai‘i, which is a category-bound activity of being a non-Local. Augie T gets out of the side-sequence and continues to tell a joke (ll. 139-140, 142, and 144).

In contrast to the previous excerpts, the next excerpt shows how Bo Irvine deploys membership categorization devices to stylize his audience as predominantly non-Local.

3.3.1.3 Bo Irvine

I examine one set of data for Bo Irvine, who performed in Waikīkī in a weekly show titled “Comedy Polynesia.” This show had four performers: Michael Staats, Kento, Bo Irvine, and Chief Sielu. I analyze the introduction of the third performer, Bo Irvine, because he is introduced as “the king of hawaii comedy” (l. 4) while the other performers are categorized rather differently (e.g., Kento as “japan’s premier comedian, the emperor of asian comedy”). In Comedy Polynesia, Irvine is designed to talk about things about Hawai‘i, not about Japan or about Samoa, which are covered by Kento and Chief Sielu respectively. When Kento finishes his performance, the MC introduces Irvine (BI) as below. The implication made in the following excerpt is that Locals are outnumbered by non-Locals; the audience is predominantly non-Local.

Excerpt 18 (Comedy Polynesia 6a)
01 MC comedy polynesia is proud to present our next performer
02 (.8) who has opened for george carlin. (.4) howie mandel,
03 george wallace an was the winner of the last comic standing.
04 hawaii showcase season six. (.6) he is the king of hawaii
05 comedy: please welcome (.2) bo: (. ) irvine.
06 Aud ((applause))
07 BI yeah sit you guys so now I know where you’re at. h:h
08 Aud ((laughter))
09 BI it’s a little *** club. ¿what do I s(h)ay¿. .h aloha.
10 Aud aloha.
11 BI how many people visiting from ‚America by applause.
The MC’s introduction of Irvine (ll. 1-5) leads to a round of applause (l. 6). This introduction includes references to several mainland comedians (e.g., George Carlin) who might not be mentioned in a comedy show designed for a Local audience. Moreover, the phrase “The King of Hawai‘i Comedy” is designed as part of the introductory announcement for a non-Local audience that starts to emerge through Irvine’s performance-in-interaction. Irvine makes a request to his audience (l. 7), and he makes a comment about the size of the comedy club (l. 9) to account for his preceding request (i.e., the room is so small that he cannot even see his audience if they stand). He exchanges greetings with his audience (ll. 9-10).

Following this, Irvine starts membership categorization that isolates people of Hawai‘i from those of the continental United States; he refers to the former as Locals and implies that the latter are Americans, meaning, in this context, non-Locals. He poses a question (i.e., “how many people visiting from America” in line 11) and adds a request to it (i.e., “by applause.”), constituting a non-Local subgroup of his audience. This subgroup responds to his request (l. 12), thereby stylizing themselves as a group of visitors “from America.” Irvine does not acknowledges this group’s response, and asks a similar question to another subgroup in his audience (i.e., “how many Locals” in line 13), implying that there must be few (i.e., “any Locals?”), to which only a couple of people
respond (l. 14). Irvine acknowledges their response, treats their presence as a laughable
(i.e., “a(h)l(h)r(h)igh(h)t.”), orients to non-Local normativity by specifying the small
number of Locals, even when he himself is included in the number (i.e., “it’s (. ) three of
us.”), and laughs, to which his audience responds with laughter (l. 16). Irvine continues to
laugh and closes up this sequence (l. 17). That the audience is predominantly non-Local
is reinforced by Irvine’s next question addressed to another non-Local group (i.e., “how
many canadians” in line 19). This subgroup responds (l. 20), and Irvine makes a
comment about their presence, highlighting that he is dealing with a predominantly non-
Local audience.

In summary, the three comedians stylize their audiences as non-Local through
membership categorization devices. DeLima refers to tourists and long-term residents in
Waikīkī, treating them as a non-Local group distinctive from a Local group in his
audience (Excerpts 14 and 15). He also uses the culturally-specific term “haole” and
indicates its category-bound activities and attributes to stylize his audience as non-Local
(Excerpt 16). Augie T identifies a non-Local group in his predominantly Local audience
by referring to the group as his “friends” from the mainland (Excerpt 17). The same
distinction between Locals and people from the continental United States is constituted in
Irvine’s performance-in-interaction for his predominantly non-Local audience in Waikīkī
(Excerpt 18). In the next section, I present the co-occurrence of membership
categorization devices and stake inoculation in the construction of non-Local audiences
by these comedians.
3.3.2 Stake inoculation

The comedians also stylize their audience as non-Local through stake inoculation that co-occurs with the deployment of membership categorization devices. The three comedians rework their membership categorization of their audience as non-Locals through stake inoculation.

3.3.2.1 Frank DeLima

DeLima singles out a member of one of the ethnic groups in his audience. While DeLima is talking to him (A6), they are also joined by another audience member sitting next to A6 (A7). However, A7 eventually displays her unwillingness to interact with DeLima. Note that DeLima stylizes A6 as non-Local through stake inoculation; in other words, he takes a step further to find out where A6 is from.

Excerpt 19 (Mother’s Day Show 3k)

197 FD o::::
198 Aud ((laughter))
199 FD not too many of you you today ma:n.
200 Aud ((laughter))
201 FD haole bo:y
202 Aud [((laughter))
203 FD [how you doing man? (1.2) te:rrific.
204 ↑you from ↑hi:a
205 A7? (ya.)
206 A6 no.
207 Aud [((laughter))
208 FD [no? where- where are you from
texas.
209 A6 (.)
210 ↑
211 FD texas.
212 ↑
213 FD well welcome to hawaii. * and uh: * (.)
214 ↑how did- what brought you here
215 A7? I met you here:.
216 A6 her,=
217 FD =her.
218 Aud ((laughter))
219 FD you’re Local girl?
DeLima indicates that he has identified a new interactant in his audience (i.e., “o:-----” in line 197). DeLima treats him (A6) as a member of a minority at his show (l. 199), thereby highlighting a predominantly Local Japanese audience once again. The audience responds to this description with laughter (l. 206). DeLima, then, refers to A6 as “haole boy,” thereby ethnicizing A6 and specifying his gender and, figuratively, his age (l. 201), to which the audience responds with laughter (l. 202), aligning with DeLima in terms of the comedic frame that a “haole” is in the predominantly Local Japanese audience. DeLima greets him (l. 203) and makes an assessment about his presence (i.e., “te:rrific”). Note that DeLima has referred to A6 as “man” twice (ll. 199 and 203), not as, for instance, braDa. DeLima’s next question indicates his presupposition that a haole may be from Hawai‘i, especially at a comedy show outside of the Waikīkī area (i.e., “↑↑you from ↑hia” in line 204). It should also be noted that DeLima does not pose this question while interacting with other audience members (e.g., Excerpts 3-6 in which he asks where in O‘ahu they live or he gives a list of ethnically defined place names). Although DeLima discursively creates a comic situation where a non-Local haole boy is in the middle of a Local Japanese audience, he is subtly managing and reworking the ethnicization of A6 so that he can avoid being disrespectful of A6 and other audience members of this group; that is, he is conducting a disinterested account of interest by alluding with great delicacy to the possibility that some haoles are born and raised in Hawai‘i and could claim Local,
or Local haole, identity. Nevertheless, DeLima and his audience are orienting to Local normativity in this kind of comedy show.

DeLima poses a probing question to A6 (i.e., “where- where are you from” in line 208). A6 specifies where he is from by state (i.e., “texas” in line 209), and DeLima repeats it (l. 211) and gives a welcome to him (i.e., “well welcome to hawaii” in line 213), thereby stylizing him as non-Local. DeLima asks A6 another probing question (i.e., “how did- what brought you here” in line 214). A6’s company, A7, cuts in here and takes the voice of A6 (l. 215), implying that, for instance, A6 came to the show because he was invited by A7 or that he moved to Hawai‘i because of her. At the same time, A6 responds to DeLima’s question by referring to A7, to which DeLima responds by repeating the pronoun, and the audience responds with laughter.

A6’s reference to A7 leads to DeLima’s question directed to her (i.e., “you’re Local girl?” in line 219). A7 gives an affirmative response (l. 220); however, when DeLima follows this up with another question, there is a delayed disaffirmative response. Note that DeLima’s question to A7 makes a sharp contrast to the previous questions to A6 (as in line 204) because DeLima does not start his interaction with A7 by asking her whether she is from “here.” DeLima is orienting to Local normativity and is stylizing A7 as Local and A6 as non-Local.

3.3.2.2 Augie T

Augie T deploys stake inoculation while talking about Filipino characters who are offended by his jokes. He asserts that his jokes are just jokes and they should be interpreted accordingly. Following this, in the next excerpt, he accounts for the nature of
his jokes by referring to the meaning of living in Hawai‘i. His account includes stake
inoculation designed for a non-Local audience, but it is embedded within a larger joke
constructed for a Local audience.

Excerpt 20 (Island Style Comedy)

29 AT you know what?
30 and we <so: numb> to it, you know, we so: numb (.)
31 we live in hawaii.
32 guess what. (.)
33 we gon talk about ethnic things (.)
34 all right? (.)
35 and you know,
36 uh it’s funny how (. the news chraiz ((tries)) to be (. pee
37 see. but ha:d ((hard)) when you live in hawaii. and when you
38 get (um) dog (. ) getting eaten at the golf course.
39 Aud hahahahahahaha
40 AT *** (. ) *** (1.5) ((To a group of people from the mainland
41 who are sitting to his left))
42 my friends from the mainland (.)
43 <a do:g (. ) was taken from a golf cours(h)e (. ) and eaten>
44 (. )
45 that’s right (. ) ya ya ya
46 o: lunch (. ) right dea (.)
47 Aud hahahahaha
48 AT but (.5) correct me if I’im wrong. (.5)
49 okei? (.5)
50 took the news three weeks before they (even) identify (. ) who
51 did um.
52 Aud hahahahaha
53 AT £you know why£? huh?
54 because that’s “very sensitive”. (.5)
55 Aud hahahahaha

Augie T marks the beginning of stake inoculation or his account for his use of ethnic
humor (l. 29). He states that Locals are used to ethnic humor (i.e., “and we <so: numb>
to it, you know, we so: numb” in line 30). He accounts for this by referring to living in
Hawai‘i (i.e., “we live in hawaii. guess what? (. we gon talk about ethnic things (. ) all
right?” in lines 31-34), implying that talking about “ethnic things” is an inevitable part of
living in Hawai‘i. To put this differently, talking about this topic is a category-bound
activity of being a Local. Based on this, Augie T introduces a potential problem that
living in Hawai‘i makes it difficult to be politically correct (ll. 36-37). He becomes more specific by referring to a kind of news story (l. 38), to which the audience responds with laughter (l. 39).

Augie T starts a side-sequence by addressing a group in his audience (i.e., “my friends from the mainland” in line 43), slows down, and emphatically explains the news for them (i.e., “<a dog (.) was taken from a golf course(h)e (.) and eaten>” in line 44), thereby re-presenting this news as Local news and stylizing his “friends” from the mainland as non-Local. He constructs a dialogue with his audience (i.e., “that’s right” in line 45) and presents a nuanced interpretation of this incident (i.e., “ya ya ya o: lunch (.) right dea” in lines 45-46), to which the audience responds with laughter.

Going back to the original sequence of the joke, Augie T makes a request to his predominantly Local audience and implies that he is objectively reporting how the incident was reported in the media (l. 48). He treats as accountable the fact that it took a long time to find out who was responsible for the incident (ll. 50-51), to which the audience responds with laughter (l. 52). He indicates that the reason for the delay, that is, political correctness, is unthinkable for Locals and, thus, is humorous (l. 53). He discloses the reason (l. 54), and the audience responds to it with laughter (l. 55). In the next excerpt, Irvine also explains Local norms, but constructs a predominantly non-Local audience.

3.3.2.3 Bo Irvine

Irvine starts to describe traffic in Hawai‘i for his audience. As several researchers have shown, style is a way to create in-groups and out-groups (e.g., Coupland, 2001, 2007; De Fina, 2007; Higgins, 2007b; Rampton, 1995). This is demonstrated in this excerpt, as
Irvine stylizes his audience as predominantly non-Local through the use of stake inoculation and other discursive strategies; he contrastively orients to his audience by checking their understanding about Local topics and portrays some of his audience as clearly non-Local.

Excerpt 21 (Comedy Polynesia 6h)

213 BI a:. (.4) an our traffic here have you guys noticed? (.4)
214 shortest distance between two ↑points (. ) on our ↑island (. )
215 on the road ↑ways (. ) is under construction.
216 Aud ((laughter))
217 BI you not(h)i- so I hate that when you guys £laugh at
218 that↑£ .h cause it makes it so chru. ((true)) ha
219 Aud ((light laughter))
220 BI an about eight thirty in the morning when the traffic ↑starts
221 (. ) moving real ↑smoothly .h there’s like a little guy brown
222 guy when traffic on kamahamahama highway .h is moving much
223 too smoothly. .h “let’s cone it off, an dig a hole.” h:hh
224 Aud ((laughter))
225 BI h h I don’t know if you even notice they put that big
226 hawaiian <↑cop^b> (.4) with the orange vest? h his only jo:bi
227 is to look in the ho(h)le.
228 Aud ((laughter))

When Irvine starts to talk about a Local issue (i.e., “our traffic” in line 213), he orients immediately to a non-Local audience (e.g., “have you guys noticed?”). He continues to talk about this traffic problem (ll. 214-215). He re-orient to his non-Local audience with a cut off (i.e., “you not(h)i-” in line 217), makes an assessment about the audience’s laughter (i.e., “so I hate that when you guys £laugh at that↑£.”), and treats it as a display of their acknowledgement of the traffic problem (i.e., “cause it makes it so chru” in line 218). The implication here is that this Local traffic issue is so problematic that even non-Locals can notice.

Irvine starts to provide more details about this problem (ll. 220-221). He, then, refers to “a little guy brown guy” (ll. 221-222) and describes the morning traffic with the
implication that it is, unusually, moving so smoothly that something bad is going to happen (ll. 220-221). Following this, he presents a problem by voicing the aforementioned character whose action indicates that he may be a construction worker (i.e., “let’s cone it off, an dig a hole.” in line 223). Irvine re-orient to his non-Local audience (i.e., “h h I don’t know if you even notice” in line 225), ethnicizes another character as Hawaiian, and re-categorizes this character as a police officer (i.e., “they put that big hawaiian <↑cop^h> (.4) with the orange vest?” in line 225-226). Finally, Irvine describes his action (i.e., “his only job is to look in the ho(h)le.” in lines 226-227).

Note that Irvine achieves the stylization of his audience as predominantly non-Local in several ways in the above excerpt. First, he constitutes a Local issue through the use of the first person pronoun (i.e., “our traffic” in line 213). Second, he contrastively orients to his audience as non-Local by checking their understanding (i.e., “have you guys noticed?” in line 213; “you not(h)i-” in line 217; “I don know if you even notice” in line 225). I argue that these are ‘performed’ acts of stake inoculation because Irvine must rework his joke to accommodate his non-Local audience, but provides a disinterested account (i.e., “I don’t know”) of their understanding about Local issues. In other words, Irvine starts to construct his joke as something that might not be familiar to his audience, and he re-constructs it as an interesting cross-cultural fact that is in fact familiar to his audience, thereby upgrading the tellability of his joke. Third, he implies that even non-Locals would notice how terrible Local traffic is. Fourth, he presents a construction worker as “a little guy brown guy” first (ll. 221-222) and reformulates him as “that big hawaiian <↑cop^h>” later (ll. 225-226), both of which are unlikely descriptions for a predominantly Local audience. Furthermore, he transforms the Kamehameha highway
into “kamahamahama” (l. 222) to align with his non-Local audience who would potentially pronounce the unfamiliar Hawaiian name as such. In the next excerpt, Irvine talks about a Local driving practice.

Excerpt 22 (Excerpt 6i)

240 BI . h an turn signals are if you ↑notice (.4)
241 they sh- they should take (off) that. they should take apart
242 our cars here in hawaii. (.6) you put a turn signal on this
243 island (there’re) like eight hundred idiots uh-uh: . h
244 you’re not chasing ↑like tod(h) a:y h it’s gonna sno:w in
245 waianae (. ) before you ↑get in he(h)ref.
246 Aud ((laughter))
247 BI ↑visitors< this is the ↑L ocal (.2) turnsignal. it’s the ha: nd
248 out the window. with the hang loose [s(h) i gn.
249 ? [(y(h) ep)
250 Aud ((laughter))

Irvine initiates talk about a Local driving practice (i.e., “turn signals” in line 240), orients to his non-Local audience again (i.e., “if you ↑notice”), and continues to describe Local traffic as humorously problematic (ll. 241-245). Irvine starts to demonstrate a Local driving practice (i.e., “this is the hawaiian” in line 247), orients to his non-Local audience through stake inoculation (i.e., “>I’m not sure this is if for you guys ↑visitors<” in lines 247-248), and repeats the demonstration (i.e., “this is the ↑Local (.2) turnsignal.” in line 248). Note that he paraphrases his own description of the turn signal from “hawaiian” (l. 247) to “Local” (l. 248). He completes the demonstration (ll. 248-249).

In the next excerpt, Irvine identifies people from England, another subgroup in his non-Local audience. He then stylizes his audience as non-Local and ethnicizes himself as a Native Hawaiian. It seems that Irvine is always looking for connections. By joking about a pre-existing historical fact, Irvine is creating a relationship to align with his British audience members.
Excerpt 23 (Comedy Polynesia 6j)

276 BI let’s see now (from where) everybody you folks visiting?
277 (1.0)
278 BI fro[m?]
279 ? [*.
280 english.
281 BI eng- wow.
282 ? wow.
283 BI ha. let’s let’s hear it for the:m. that’s a big commute.
284 Aud ((cheers & applause))
285 BI I jas (realized) england (.). england. I * wanna let you know
286 the haw(h)aiians did not eat captain cook. (.). h:
287 Aud ((laughter))
288 BI well (.4) we boiled him. [h:hh
289 Aud (((laughter))
290 BI we jas (.). didn (.). have enough po:i. hahahahaha.
291 Aud o:......
292 ? hahahaha aha
293 BI how many judges *(h)*. hahahaha. a: h: “(we’re) ;russia(ns)”
294 (.). hahahaha. russians are fjas like thaf:. (.). yeah.46

Irvine re-categorizes his audience as visitors and indicates that he will interact with individual audience members (ll. 276). He poses a question to one of the audience members (ll. 278), and this person responds with a place name (i.e., England). Irvine treats this response as accountable (i.e., “eng- wow.” in line 281). Irvine makes a request to his audience (i.e., “let’s let’s hear it for the:m.” in line 283) and accounts for this action (i.e., “that’s a big commute”), thereby orienting to his non-Local audience that does not include visitors from England.

Following this, Irvine initiates a joke about England (ll. 285), categorizes his interactants as members of England (i.e., “I * wanna let you know”), and delivers a three-part joke (ll. 286, 288, and 290). While Irvine is categorizing himself and Native Hawaiians in the past as one group, he categorizes his interactants and Captain Cook as another group. The deployment of this joke, therefore, shows that Irvine is orienting to

46 In a follow-up interview after the show, Irvine stated that “russians are just like that” (ll. 294) because some audience members were not laughing, so he implied that they should stop behaving like Russian judges who in his view, would not understand any humor.
the relevance of ethnic belonging and membership categories. Finally, Irvine introduces two more categories (i.e., “judges” and “russians” in lines 293-294) and stylizes them as non-Local by invoking their category-bound attribute; that is, Irvine asserts that they do not laugh because they would not appreciate humor.

3.4 Discussion

The term audience design refers to a particular type of relationship between interactants; that is, the speaker/performer and the listener(s)/audience. The central idea of audience design is that language use is constrained by the type of audience. As shown above, however, audience designing is a multidimensional act in performances-in-interaction because it involves more than participants. In Waikīkī (e.g., Excerpt 14), Frank DeLima embodied three subgroups in his audience: Locals, tourists, and non-Local Waikīkī residents. We saw that DeLima discursively distinguished a group of Locals from a group of non-Locals who are not tourists but local residents in Waikīkī. In other words, Locals and locals are different membership categories that were being constructed in his performances-in-interaction. DeLima made this distinction in Wahiawā and Ala Moana as well. In Wahiawā (e.g., Excerpt 16), DeLima singled out those who are “brand new to the islands” and welcomed them, which constituted the Local vs. non-Local dichotomy. He also introduced the term haole when he humorously questioned why a non-Local couple in his audience was in Wahiawā. The reference to them as haole generated more humorous effects in the predominantly Local audience in which haoles are a small minority. Similarly, in Ala Moana, DeLima made a routine announcement at the beginning, thereby excluding haoles from Locals and treating them as non-Locals (i.e.,
“an fo you haole white people you’ll be cut down throughout the sho: but will not no it” in Excerpt 1); however, when DeLima spotted a “haole boy” (Excerpt 19), DeLima modified his footing by asking him if he is from Hawai‘i. (i.e., “↑you from ↑↓hia?”). Although DeLima and his audience jointly achieved the social meaning of being haole in Hawai‘i, he also revealed a norm in terms of talking to haoles because his formulation indicated his awareness of two types of haoles in Hawai‘i: Local haoles and non-Local haoles. It was safer for DeLima to ask his interactant if he is from Hawai‘i than to ask him where he is from. It is implied that it would be rude to ask a Local haole where s/he is from because this creates a presupposition that haoles cannot be from Hawai‘i.

Augie T also oriented to his audience as mixed, but he constituted a predominantly Local audience to a great extent. In a televised show at Hawai‘i Theatre (e.g., Excerpt 7), his performance was designed as interaction between close friends who are catching up with each other. Close friends do not have to explain everything to each other, especially when they are from the same place. Augie T did not explain many culturally-specific terms that he introduced in his show. Furthermore, he constituted a closely knit Local community by introducing family as a relevant category when he was interrupted by one member of the audience (Excerpt 13); family as a relevant category was also deployed by DeLima (Excerpt 2). Almost identical to DeLima’s opening with respect to the Local vs. non-Local dichotomy was Bo Irvine’s opening (Excerpt 18). Irvine’s formulation indicated, however, that he treats the Locals in his audience as a very small minority and that he works most extensively with a non-Local audience. Irvine presented himself as a Local cultural expert to the non-Local group of people. In order to entertain the predominantly non-Local audience, Irvine transformed his footing between
being Local and being American, which showed that his performance involved multiple centering institutions (Blommaert, 2005), more frequently than the other comedians.

The three comedians, however, relied on the same set of indexicalities to create the Local vs. non-Local dichotomy. One of the most powerful resources was discursive geography; in other words, the comedians referred to place names that are part of multiple bundles of indexicals or “geographies of discourse” (Scollon, 2008). Drew (1978) analyzes a tribunal in Northern Ireland and shows that references to place names are intertwined with identity work. Blommaert (2005) also discusses the importance of space in understanding identities. Interaction is situated and it occurs in “densely semiotised spaces” (Blommaert, 2005, pp. 221-222). Blommaert (2005) suggests how discourse analysts can incorporate such aspects in their analyses; for instance, spatial anchoring (i.e., telling where one is from) is crucial to identity work because being from that particular place is “an ingredient of a semiotic matrix by means of which ‘members’ and ‘non-members’ can be identified and granted various kinds of attributive qualities” (Blommaert, 2005, p. 222). He then draws our attention to the fact that such qualities are based on center-periphery models.

In the context of stand-up comedy shows, DeLima, Augie T, and Irvine did discursive cartography of the Local space by referring to various locales in Hawai‘i. Augie T presented his materials from the suburb/country Local perspective when he sought an alignment from the audience (i.e., “you like get into town fa:st a?” in Excerpt 9). He also voiced his father and gave directions to his aunt’s place in Wai‘anae (Excerpt 9), drawing an image of the leeward side of the island of O‘ahu. In addition, when he referred to the “Kam Four Housing” (Excerpt 8) where he grew up, the audience
responded to it with cheers, generating intersubjectivity regarding the social meaning of
growing up in the public housing in Kalihi. This is what I mean by doing discursive
geography. It is in a sense using geographical metaphors that index not only ethnicity but
social class. Augie T introduced place names with little explicit explanation, thereby
constituting Local space and doing being Local as part of telling Local jokes. Similarly,
DeLima also cut out Local space, but his societal geography was intertwined with
ethnicization to a greater extent. He gave a list of place names according to portable
identities and last names of his audience members, and he and his audience members
achieved intersubjectivity regarding the latter’s residential areas. This interactional
process looked almost effortless due to the nature of shared knowledge among Locals.
Meanwhile, Irvine did not refer to many Local place names. When he did, however, he
delivered the name of a highway in mock form (i.e., “kamahamahama” in Excerpt 21),
which told us that Irvine stylized his audience as predominantly non-Local. The three
comedians relied on geographical semiotic resources to situate town vs. country Locals,
Local vs. non-Local members, and Locals vs. mainland people in the interdiscursive
space.

Although both DeLima and Augie T treated their audience as predominantly
Local, DeLima explored the heritage and ethnic background and the multiraciality of his
audience to a greater extent. In Augie T’s performance, his audience’s multiraciality was
not verbalized because it was simply taken for granted. He did not work directly on his
audience’s ethnic background, but ethnicized his family members (e.g., his Portuguese
mother, his Filipino father, and his multiracial self) and other individuals and characters.
On the other hand, DeLima talked about his audience’s ethnicity because interacting
closely with individuals in the audience provided him with semiotic resources, which was part of his performative style. As part of his routine, however, DeLima often took a monoracial approach to his audience’s ethnic backgrounds, thereby stylizing his audience members as Japanese, Filipino, Haole, Brownie, Portuguese, or Hawaiian. When he faced difficulty in taking this approach, he oriented to the multiraciality of the audience as he spotted a “mixed” Portuguese woman (Excerpt 4) and as he accounted for the discrepancy between A10’s apparent ethnicity and his Chinese last name (Excerpt 11). It would be safe to argue that taking a monoracial approach is more effective in generating humorous effects, especially when everyone knows that there are many multiracial people in the audience.

In contrast to how they treated others, the three comedians constituted their own multiraciality. DeLima created the necessity for redoing an introduction, presented his full name, and disclosed his multiethnic heritage. Based on shared knowledge about his comedic career, he referred to his ethnicity as unmistakably Portuguese because of his telling many Portuguese jokes. His full name and ethnic background were presented as unexpected facts to his audience. In Waikīkī, DeLima presented his multiraciality right away; on the other hand, in Wahiawā and Ala Moana, he did it in three distinctive parts while dealing with his audience’s multiraciality. Augie T also presented himself as mixed by talking about his parents’ ethnicity as Portuguese and Filipino; he oriented to his portable identity as somewhat obscure and stated that he may look Mexican. Similarly, Irvine categorized himself as the racial other in the terms of mainland racial politics while presenting himself as a Local and Native Hawaiian cultural expert to his non-Local audience (Excerpts 22 and 23). In short, multiraciality was one of the most important
resources that the three comedians could use regardless of their audience. They constituted their multiraciality in performances-in-interaction, thereby achieving being a stereotypical Local. Doing being stereotypically Local is doing being mixed, too.

Audience designing is, thus, a two-fold process. The three comedians worked and reworked the nature of their audience as well as the nature of their own multiraciality. The audience also constituted themselves as multiracial and Local by responding to the comedians with applause, laughter, and verbal responses. DeLima and Augie T, in particular, constituted themselves as ‘mixed’ and Local and their audiences as predominantly Local, creating a Local community around the stage and beyond.

The three comedians constituted their Local audience through other discursive resources in addition to place names and ethnic categories. As mentioned earlier, the lack of translation of certain Hawai‘i Creole vocabulary items helped stylize a Local audience because understanding these vocabulary items is interpreted as a category-bound attribute of being Local. In addition, the comedians created their Local audience members through addressing them with Local address terms such as bra and braDa. These terms invoked the category of being Local, and they also reflexively constituted the comedians themselves as Local because using these address terms is a category-bound activity of being Local. Furthermore, most importantly, the comedians stylized their Local audience through deploying Hawai‘i Creole; for instance, DeLima questioned an audience member (A8) about his ethnicity with Hawai‘i Creole syntax coupled with a distinctively Hawai‘i Creole intonation (i.e., “↑what ↓you”), thereby stylizing his audience—individually and collectively—as Local. Similarly, Augie T did not elaborate on the meaning of Hawai‘i Creole phrases and ethnic references, and thus stylized his audience as Local. He also
deployed Hawai‘i Creole and added a Local ‘flavor’ to stories that seemed to have nothing intrinsically Local about them. In his performance-in-interaction, Augie T deployed Hawai‘i Creole in reported speech and constructed dialogues, giving elasticity to his performance.

To stylize their audience as non-Local, the three comedians deployed discursive resources contrastive to those used for the stylization of a Local audience. For instance, DeLima referred to tourists and long-term residents in Waikīkī, treating them as non-Local. He also used the term haole and implied its category-bound activities and attributes. Augie T generated similar effects by identifying a non-Local group in his predominantly Local audience and addressing them as his “friends” from the mainland. It should be noted that he clearly slowed down, switched into stylized English, and provided a re-formulated account of dog-eating to this group. Irvine also demonstrated his finesse in illustrating in-group knowledge about Local topics such as cultural practices, making the same distinction between Locals and non-Locals from the continental United States. In the next chapter, Irvine shows his ability to deploy Hawai‘i Creole to create and enhance humorous effects.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter examined performances-in-interaction between comedians and their audiences, focusing on six shows by three comedians, Frank DeLima (FD), Augie T (AT), and Bo Irvine (BI). I presented excerpts from shows that these comedians, except Irvine, performed in more than one site. They were engaged in audience designing through which they achieved two things; first, DeLima and Augie T stylized their audience as
Local; second, they stylized themselves as Local, too, by means of treating their audience as Local. Audience designing generated not only an audience but the performers’ identity. Meanwhile, the audiences reflexively constituted themselves as Local by responding to the comedians with laughter, applause, etc. Through the performances-in-interaction emerged a Local comedy community.

The three comedians also stylized their audience as non-Local through membership categorization and stake inoculation. The comedians re-formulated accounts of Local issues either to constitute non-Local audience members in a predominantly Local audience or to constitute a predominantly non-Local audience. Again, the discursive practice of audience designing generated not only an audience but the performers’ identity because Local performers are responsible for welcoming non-Local audience members and explaining Local issues for them. These audience members responded accordingly, thereby constituting themselves as non-Local.

The stylization of Local and non-Local audiences co-occurred with the deployment of two contrastive stylized languages, Hawai‘i Creole and English. Comedians often constituted their audience as Local by invoking its category-bound activity of speaking and understanding Hawai‘i Creole. On the other hand, the comedians stylized their audience as non-Local by talking to them in stylized English, and they also constructed non-Local characters through voicing them in certain discursive environments such as reported speech and constructed dialogues. The next chapter pays close attention to the relationship between membership categorization and the use of mixed codes in performances-in-interaction. The interaction of these acts constitutes the style of Local comedy that is a culturally-specific activity.
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CHAPTER 4. PIDGIN AS A STYLIZED LANGUAGE

4.1 Introduction

This chapter investigates the situated use of codes or stylized languages in Local comedy. Stylized speech is a *contextualization cue* (Gumperz, 1982) and is designed to be interpreted in a certain way (Auer, 2007; Coupland, 2001, 2007; Hill, 1999; Rampton, 1995, 1998). As discussed in the previous chapter, Pidgin (Hawai‘i Creole) and English are two main semiotic resources with which Local comedians construct their Local/non-Local audiences, and these ideologically contrastive semiotic resources also constitute performance-in-interaction as a culturally-specific performative genre. As several scholars (e.g., Álvarez-Cáccamo, 1998; Auer, 1998; Meeuwis & Blommaert, 1998) have recently attempted, I examine the use of *stylized languages* to revisit the notion of codes and to show that stylized Pidgin can be redefined as mixed speech. My goal in this chapter is to illustrate the deployment and effects of these semiotic resources in terms of membership categorization and language alternation.

Stylized speech is designed to be interpreted in a certain way, but alternation within and across stylized languages is not always relevant to the on-going development of performance-in-interaction. When the comedians orient to the relevance of stylized languages, they deliver them with laughing voice, account for their laughability through constructing translation humor, or treat speaking stylized languages as a category-bound attribute either of being Local or being non-Local. At the same time, the audience members display their orientation to the relevance of stylized languages, primarily through laughter and applause. The lack of these actions is accountable, and it is
responded to accordingly. The deployment of stylized languages becomes interactionally consequential when it leads to intersubjectivity about membership categorization; that is, when the comedy participants jointly build an understanding about who is Local and who is not.

I take a discursive approach and adopt the notions of interactional relevance and consequentiality; however, I use them somewhat flexibly for the sake of discourse analytic and interactional sociolinguistic research, to which I attempt to make contributions. I argue that the deployment of stylized languages is performatively relevant and consequential for the Local comedy participants. To put this differently, discursive actions in Local comedy are ideologically mediated by and intertextually connected with past and relevant texts and talk, and the comedy participants bring these intertextual links into performance-in-interaction. I claim that discourse analysts should analyze intertextuality in a more explicitly interactional context; therefore, I propose the notion of interactive intertextuality. This respecification of intertextuality is parallel to Goodwin’s (2007) respecification of footing as interactive footing. In the following section, I present the discursive environments of stylized languages that play a role in constituting a comedy club as an ideologically-mediated and culturally-specific performative site for the Localization of the participants.

4.2 Discursive contexts for examining stylization

One of the contexts where stylized languages appears is reported speech. Doing stylized languages in reported speech is recontextualizing (Bauman & Briggs, 1990) what someone says from one space to another for performative effects. It highlights the
rhetorical deployment of footing (Goffman, 1979) or speaking positions. The reporting subject achieves various functions through doing reported speech (e.g., suspending one’s interpretation, making an assessment, etc. [Buttny, 2003]). In his analysis of racial talk, Buttny (2003) proposes two types of reported speech: (1) direct reported speech for representing ‘actual’ speech and (2) prototypical reported speech for representing the stereotypical (racial) other. Similar to the latter type of reported speech is active voicing (Wooffitt, 1992), which brings “into being separate corroborating actors who, like ventriloquist’s dummies, seem to have life, opinions and personality of their own” (Potter, 1996, p. 161). This practice implies that quotes are not simply quotes and that they are actively voiced; that is, “the speakers are designing certain utterances to be heard as if they were said at the time” (Wooffitt, 1992, p. 161, emphasis in original). Thus, both direct reported speech and prototypical reported speech are in fact instances of active voicing.

Another interactional context crucial for my exploration of linguistic heterogeneity in Local comedy is constructed dialogue (Tannen, 1989). Building on her discussion of reported speech, Tannen claims that “casting ideas as dialogue rather than statements is a discourse strategy for framing information in a way that communicates effectively and creates involvement” (1989, p. 110). It should be emphasized that both reported speech and constructed dialogues are the discursive constructions of the reporting subject. They may not in fact be actual reports because they are assembled for stylization. The reporting subject manages the factuality of reported events through

---

47 As Tannen (1989, p. 110) states that “[r]eported speech is constructed dialogue,” she does not propose that the two notions are distinct but that what is commonly called reported speech would be better understood as constructed dialogue. Clift and Holt (2007) also discuss these notions.
reported speech and constructed dialogues. In Hawai‘i comedy, factuality is constructed by two contrastive stylized languages that are ideologically mediated with social structure.

In the following sections, I examine these contexts of ideologically-mediated and culturally-specific stylized languages to show membership categorization in relation to language alternation. A traditional view on language alternation or code-switching assumes that (1) languages are systems/codes and that (2) code-switching between two languages is an indication of being a ‘perfect’ bilingual who is capable of using each language. Meeuwis and Blommaert (1998) propose layered code-switching or code-switching within code-switching; for instance, mixed speech such as Swahili/French does not consist of two distinctive codes, but it is a code on its own; thus, this is a monolectal view of code-switching. Within one mixed code occurs style-shifting that is indexed through qualitative changes that involve phonological, lexical, and syntactic features. Furthermore, speakers may switch from one mixed code to another. I argue that layered code-switching is applicable to the illustration of Local comedic speech as a sociolect.

4.3 Pidgin in stylization

This section shows how Local comedians use Pidgin as stylization in otherwise English talk. In order to examine the linguistic heterogeneity of Local comedy, I present several excerpts that include (1) Pidgin in reported speech and constructed dialogues and (2) Pidgin as a medium of narration. Making use of a Local linguistic ideology, the comedians constitute multivocal humor by style-shifting within a stylized language or by switching between stylized languages. These comedians also introduce an ideological and intertextual nexus of categories and their category-bound predicates through language
alternation, thereby stylizing themselves, their audiences, and their characters either as Local or non-Local. To put this differently, speaking Pidgin is a historically and ideologically loaded activity that implies various social relations and images.

There are two types of Local comedians with respect to the use of Pidgin. While some comedians limit their use of Pidgin to reported speech and constructed dialogues, others extend their use to narrating. These discursive strategies are tied into the construction of different kinds of audience, Local and non-Local. Using Pidgin in any discursive context must contribute to the Localization of both comedians and their audience. The first group of comedians includes Bo Irvine (Excerpts 1 and 2) and Andy Bumatai (Excerpt 3); both comedians restrict their use of Pidgin to reported speech and constructed dialogues, using English as a medium of narration. This type of discursive practice indicates the existence of a strong ideological demarcation between Pidgin and English as well as the existence of a historically stigmatized divide between Pidgin speakers and English speakers. Rap Reiplinger’s Room Service (Excerpt 4) is a skit that consists only of a constructed dialogue, primarily, between a Pidgin-speaking Local telephone operator and an English-speaking hotel guest, and these characters represent a Local voice and a haole tourist voice respectively. This association between the stylized languages and the voices is ideologically mediated.

The second group includes Augie T (Excerpts 6 and 7) and Timmy Mattos (Excerpt 5) who use Pidgin not only in reported speech and constructed dialogues but use it as a medium of narration mixed with English, thereby constructing a context where they stylize themselves as Local comedians who are talking to their Local audience. Both Augie T and Mattos design their performances-in-interaction so that they can constitute
humorous effects through a Local linguistic ideology about a Pidgin/Local voice vs. an English/haole voice. In other words, ideologically speaking, there is no way that the comedians can animate Local characters in Pidgin without invoking the other contrastive language/voice; this inseparably intertwined ideological association is the intertextual basis of multivocal Hawai‘i humor that the comedians interactionally and performatively materialize on stage.

4.3.1 Pidgin in reported speech and constructed dialogues

In the first excerpt, Bo Irvine (BI) is performing in front of a predominantly non-Local audience in Waikīkī. While talking about local roads that are always under construction, he refers to a police officer as a “cop” and ethnicizes him (Excerpt 23 in Chapter 3). Following this, Irvine initiates a constructed dialogue between a driver and the Hawaiian police officer (l. 229).

Excerpt 1 (Primarily non-Local audience)

225  BI  h h I don’t know if you even notice they put that big Hawaiian <>cop<. (.4) with the orange vest? h his only job is to look in the hole.
228  Aud  ((laughter))
229  BI  “sir the traffic is backing up.”
230  “don boDa me. I’m gonna watch (dis) smo: ho:.” ((small hole))
231  Aud  ((light laughter))
232  BI  do you know that special duty for our police officers here in hawai‘i? (.2) they get like thirty dollars an hour to watch that hole. (.6) yeah serious. no wonder they’re carrying guns.
235  Aud  ((light laughter))
236  BI  “it’s my bra.” h:h
238  Aud  ((laughter))
239  BI  “don come by dis ho:. I’ll shoot somebod.” (l.0)
Irvine ethnicizes a police officer and downgrades his duty on a highway (ll. 225-227), which is followed by laughter from the audience (l. 228). Irvine voices a driver who is talking to the officer (l. 229). The second part of this fictional constructed dialogue occurs when Irvine voices the officer who responds to the driver in Pidgin (i.e., “*don boDa* me. I’m gonna watch (dis) smo: ho:.” in line 230), thereby stylizing the officer as a Pidgin speaker or a stereotypical Local. Note that the Localization of the officer co-occurs with the ethnicization as Hawaiian and the downgrading of his duty. In other words, Irvine constructs the category Local by assembling its category-bound activities and attributes (i.e., being big, being Native Hawaiian, doing a simple-minded job, and speaking Pidgin). The audience responds with light laughter (l. 231).

Irvine goes back to narration, continues to talk about the special duty of police officers, and downgrades the duty of police officers (ll. 232-235), which is followed by light laughter (l. 236). He takes the voice of the police officer again (i.e., “it’s my *ho: bra*” in line 237; “*don come by dis ho:*. I’ll shoot someb:dy” in line 239), further stylizing the officer as a Local. The Local/Pidgin voice is indexed through the use of an address term “*bra*” (l. 237) and the phonological (e.g., “*ho:*”) and prosodic (e.g., “someb:dy”) features. In the next excerpt, from the same show, Irvine demonstrates the Local turn signal (Excerpt 24 in Chapter 3) and follows this up with a constructed dialogue in Pidgin between two drivers (l. 252).

**Excerpt 2 (Primarily non-Local audience)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>BI this is the hawaiian &gt;I’m not sure this is if for you guys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>↑visitors&lt; this is the ↑Local (.2) turnsignal. it’s the ha:nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 Here, Native Hawaiians are included in the category ‘Local.’ Note, however, that outside of the context of comedy, ethnic Hawaiians can be excluded from Local.
Irvine stylizes his audience as non-Local (ll. 247-249) and initiates a constructed dialogue between two drivers who communicate by means of the “Local turnsignal” and Pidgin (i.e., “↑ca:n ↓bra” in line 252). He makes a comment with laughing voice (i.e., “£gotta use [(a) pidgin£” in line 253), implying that using this turn signal co-occurs with Pidgin. In other words, both using this turn signal and speaking Pidgin are category-bound activities of being Local. Making this kind of metalinguistic commentary is an act of audience design. Irvine continues to take the voice of the same driver (i.e., “↑↓ca:n” in line 255) and indicates that his attempt to cut in line has failed (i.e., “what? no ↑↓ca:n”). Irvine, then, voices the other driver to complete a constructed dialogue in Pidgin (i.e., “↓yeah you baga”). Note that Irvine constitutes these characters as Locals by means of Pidgin as a stylized language as well as by means of membership categorization devices. His use of Pidgin is restricted to reported speech and constructed dialogues and is not found in narration.

This type of stylization through Pidgin in constructed dialogues is seen in Andy Bumatai’s (AB) performance, too. The next excerpt is taken from his CD, Brain Child, recorded at a live stand-up comedy show. He introduces accents as a topic (l. 1), takes the voice of a Midwesterner (l. 7), and contrasts Midwestern English with Pidgin.
Excerpt 3 (Primarily Local audience)

01 AB (wherever) everybody got accents.
02 you know they tease us about our pidgin.
03 but (.) man if you go to the mid↑west (.4)
04 there they speak in complete sentences.
05 this guy says to me .h
06 ((monophthongization in e.g., I, ice, like))
07 “andy (.)
08 I just think(ing) about goin on into the kitchen (.4)
09 get myself (a) ice cold coca cola (.)
10 while I was in the ↑kitchen I just wonder(ing) (.)
11 maybe you like for ↑me to bring you
12 [back an ice cold coca cola for yourself.”
13 Aud (((Laughter and scattered applause)))
14 Woman really long ↑ae
15 AB £I- I serious50 you feel real guilty going£ (.4) “na,”
16 Aud (((Laughter and scattered applause)))
17 AB £e(h)v(h)e(h)n in pidgin£ that whole sentence would be
18 (.4) “↑↓ s↓oda<”
19 Aud (((Laughter and applause)))
20 AB o(h)h yeah a big difference.

Bumatai asserts that Local people are not the only people who have a unique linguistic code (ll. 1-2). He then refers to the Midwest (l. 3) and presents “speaking in complete sentences” as a category-bound attribute of Midwesterners (l. 4). His use of pronouns shows that he aligns with Local people while disaligning from Midwesterners.

Bumatai marks the beginning of a constructed dialogue (l. 5) and takes the voice of a Midwesterner whose speech goes on and on, and he also shows monophthongization (e.g., in “I,” “ice,” and “like”). Bumatai switches into this stylized Midwestern English (l. 7), and before he completes a question in this stylized language (l. 12), his audience responds to him (ll. 13 and 14), treating the question as a laughable and accounting for its meaning (i.e., it is too long). Following this, Bumatai switches back to his own voice for

---

49 Bumatai’s utterance could be interpreted as Mock Southern English; however, he treats it as Mock Midwestern English.

50 Although Bumatai’s utterance (i.e., “I serious” in line 15) might be considered Pidgin in narration, his use of Pidgin is far more restricted than Augie T’s use of Pidgin, as seen below.
narration and contextualizes his performance (i.e., “I- I serious you feel real guilty going" in line 15) and completes a constructed dialogue by constituting his response in Pidgin (i.e., “na”). This rather short reply in Pidgin to a long question in stylized Midwestern English is followed by laughter and applause (l. 16).

The contrast between Midwestern English and Pidgin is reinforced when Bumatai paraphrases the lengthy Midwestern English question into a one-word Pidgin question (i.e., “>↑↓soda<” (1.18), to which his audience responds with laughter and applause (1.19). Finally, he switches back into his narration voice and makes a comment about Midwestern English and Pidgin (l. 20). Bumatai achieves stylizing his audience as Local and aligning with them through translation humor between English and Pidgin.

Irvine and Bumatai’s excerpts show that the use of Pidgin is restricted to reported speech and constructed dialogues in which Local characters talk, and Irvine and Bumatai are overtly commenting on language. Meanwhile, English serves as the medium of narration, and both Irvine and Bumatai build up contextual information through the use of English. In the above excerpts, these comedians construct a frame in English and insert Pidgin into reported speech and constructed dialogues that would make sense only within the larger frame. In short, Irvine and Bumatai’s performances are based on a linguistic ideology in Hawai‘i that English serves as the single medium of narration while Pidgin adds a Local flavor. In other words, it is believed that being able to make a sharp distinction between English and Pidgin is a clear indication of a level of sophistication as a performer who can use these semiotic resources that are at his/her disposal. Furthermore, being able to make such a distinction is also a clear indication of understanding his/her audience’s comedic taste or sense of humor.
English emerges as ‘haolefied’ English when it represents a haole voice. Similar to Excerpt 3, the next excerpts (Excerpts 4a-c), taken from Rap Reiplinger’s *Room Service*, show a contrast between an English/haole voice and a Pidgin/Local voice. *Room Service* is a skit between a Local telephone operator (O) and a white tourist (Mr. Fogarty or F); Reiplinger performs both characters. There is one more character, Russell (R), who is a chef and is joking around with the telephone operator. This skit has no narration, and it consists only of a constructed dialogue that is a discursive site for constituting a Pidgin/Local voice and an English/haole voice. The constructed dialogue starts when Mr. Fogarty makes a phone call, and the telephone operator answers his call. My goal here is to highlight a Local linguistic ideology that there is a sharp contrast between a Local/Pidgin voice and a haole/English voice that is constituted through stylized languages and membership categorization devices.

**Excerpt 4a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>((Ringing tone))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>F uh room service please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>O ((Laughter)) ((To R)) go sit on o(h)ne air hose russell. haha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>((To F)) house keeping? (.). o: no no (.). chrai {{try}} wait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>chrai wait. ((To Russell)) you punk chrow {{throw}} me o:ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>((Russell is speaking behind the scene.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>ha: ((To F)) room service? can I help you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>((Whispering to Russell in lines 9-10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>F this is mister fogarty. room twelve twenty five.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>O I’d like to order some dinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>O hae?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F uh this is mister fogarty. I’d like to have my dinner sent up to my room twelve twenty ;fi:ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>O and now (.). what was your room namba:?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F twelve (.). twenty (.). five.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>O ((checking the room number)) uh (.). one moa time, please?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F twelve (.). twenty (.). five.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>O twelve twenty five, daes uh mista (.). frogchri:?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>F fogarty. fogarty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>O &lt;can I help you:&gt; mista frogchri:?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F ((Russell passes by and interrupts O.))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen above, there are two sets of constructed dialogues: one between the telephone operator and Mr. Fogarty and the other between the telephone operator and Russell. The first constructed dialogue shows that F asks for room service (l. 2), and O responds to him (i.e., “room service? can I help you?” in line 7), which is followed by F’s request (i.e., “this is mister fogarty. room twelve twenty five. I’d like to order some dinner” in lines 9-10). However, O responds in Pidgin (i.e., “haeh?” in line 11), and F reformulates his requests (ll. 12-13). Based on his room number, O figures out F’s name (ll. 14-18) and pronounces it as Mr. “frogchri” (l. 18). This is a phonological and semantic reanalysis of Fogarty into a humorously Pidgin form. F treats O’s utterance as mispronunciation and initiates a repair by repeating his name twice (i.e., “Fogarty” in line 19). O continues to mispronounce his name (i.e., “can I help you: mista frogchri?” in line 20), but there is no further repair. Before F responds, there is a disruption (ll. 21-25), and because O indicates that she has lost track of F’s request (l. 26), F repeats his request (ll. 27-28), assuming that the room number is understood. However, O asks for his room number (l. 29), and F starts all over again (ll. 30-31).

51 *Ganfanit* seems to have derived from “God confound it.”

52 “Cool it cool it” was interpreted as *kulikuli* by one of the focus group participants (Sarah). *Kulikuli* means noisy in Hawaiian and is part of the Pidgin vocabulary.
The other constructed dialogue is a side-sequence between the telephone operator and Russell. While O is talking with Mr. Fogarty over the phone, O jokes around with Russell (ll. 3, 5, 8, 22-25). O uses an informal register for him; for instance, she addresses him as “punk” (l. 5) and swears (i.e., “ganfanit” in line 22). Although O uses a more formal register for Mr. Fogarty (e.g., “room service? can I help you?” in line 7), her speech shows many Pidgin features (e.g., “chrai wait chrai wait” in line 4), which could generate humorous effects because of a Local linguistic ideology about the different registers for Pidgin and English.

The rhetoric of Room Service is centered in a sequence of constructed miscommunications between the telephone operator and Mr. Fogarty that occurs due to their different communication styles, and this is interwoven with the joking around between O and Russell who have the same communication style because both of them are Local. The two different communication styles are equated to two stylized languages, namely, Pidgin and English. In the next excerpt, O starts to take Mr. Fogarty’s order (l. 32), but the latter has to repeat his order again and again. When he displays his frustration (i.e., “NO” in line 67), O describes him as “uptight” (l. 71), which is a category-bound attribute of being (non-Local) haole.

Excerpt 4b

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>ʻo ʻki ʻdo ʻki. and (.) what would you like?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I’d like (a) cheese burger deluxe,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>french fries,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>and a chocolate malt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>o:kei. ((taking notes)) so daes a cheese brga ʻdeluxe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>french ʻfries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>and a cho- (.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>chrai wait ya?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>((to Russell)) e russell. ʻyou get ʻpen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>what?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
O acknowledges F’s request and begins to take his order (l. 32). F orders three items (ll. 33-35). O acknowledges this and takes notes while repeating the order. However, she stops taking notes (l. 38) and asks F to wait in Pidgin (i.e., “chrai wait ya?” in line 39). O initiates a side-sequence and asks R for a pen in Pidgin (i.e., “e russell. ↑you get ↓pen” in line 40), and this side-sequence continues until O swears to close it (i.e., “ganfanit” in line 47).

O again starts to take F’s order (l. 48), and F repeats his order (ll. 49-51). O repeats and takes notes of the first food item (l. 52), but starts to ask what F means by cheese burger deluxe (l. 53). This negotiation of meaning leads to miscommunication (i.e.,
“one (. ) side oda ((order)) cheese?” in line 66), and F displays his frustration (i.e., “NO” in line 67). O responds to this by displaying her surprise (i.e., “o, wow” in line 68), which leads to another side-sequence where O changes footing to talk to R (i.e., “e russell. dis baga giving me heat” in line 69), to which R responds (i.e., “e, go slap his head” in line 70). O and R exchange utterances in Pidgin, thereby stylizing themselves as Local and aligning with each other. After this side-sequence, O makes a request to F in Pidgin and stylizes him as haole by referring to its category-bound attribute while using a formal address term (i.e., “no get uptight sir” in line 71); O accounts for her previous action in Pidgin (i.e., “I was jas chraïng fo take yo oda” in line 72).

Following this, O recommends that F order today’s special, but F prefers his original order (ll. 73-118 omitted). Finally, O repeats his order for the last time in the next excerpt.

Excerpt 4c

((ll. 73-118 omitted))

119 O so let me repeat daet oda one moa time ya? (. ) hello?
120 F (I wish you wouldn’t.)
121 O daet was (. ) one cheesebrga deluxe,
122 wid a side oda cheese,
123 french fries,
124 and a chocolate malt.
125 is daet right? hello-
126 ((Russell sneaks up from behind O and tickles her.))
127 a:haha. oh russell. (ganfanit).
128 ahaaha. oh russell. (ganfanit).
129 stop daet russell.
130 ganfanit.
131 you do daet again (I gon) karang yo alas.53 ahaahaaha.
132 F ((Sobbing))
133 O ((To F)) Lo: o: my o: hoho where were we?
134 Lo: oke oke. o:.
135 daet guy was russell. wh(h)at a pest. ha. ha
136 ((To Russell)) “pest”. hahaha.

53 (I gon) karang yo alas means “I’ll hurt you” or even worse.
O states that she is going to repeat F’s order (l. 119). Not taking up F’s utterance (l. 120), O starts to repeat his order, completes it, and double checks with him (l. 125). However, O is interrupted by R again (ll. 126-131), and when she restarts interacting with F (l. 133), F is already sobbing (l. 132). When O asks for clarification again (l. 137), F hangs up the phone (l. 138). Finally, O sighs and refers to F as a tourist.

Situational identities are apparent; O is a telephone operator and F is a hotel guest. For instance, O says “room service? can I help you?” (l. 7) while F identifies himself and asks for room service (i.e., “this is mister fogarty. room twelve twenty five. I’d like to order some dinner” in lines 9-10). In addition, O refers to F as “mista” frogchri (ll. 18 and 20) and “sir” (ll. 71, 95, and 104). O also uses several expressions that are connected with a service provider, which include: “what would you like?” (l. 32), “excuse me” (l. 53), and “let me repeat daet oda one moa time ya?” (l. 119).

O’s speech also shows many Pidgin features in terms of phonology (e.g., “chrow,” “namba,” “daet,” “tingk,” (I get) “om”), morphology (e.g., “daes”), syntax (e.g., “neva” (say), “no” (get uptight), (chraiing) “fo take” (yo oda), “gon” (cook)), and semantics/vocabulary (e.g., “ganfanit,” “dis baga,” “mento:,” “ono,” “pest,” “karang yo alas”), and pragmatics (e.g., “chrai,” “haeh?,” “ya?,” “e,” “yu shua yu shua?”). It is noteworthy in terms of stylization that O does not switch off these features while interacting with F.
Meanwhile, there are some phrases that O uses only when she addresses Russell, which include: “you punk” (l. 5), “ganfanit” (l. 22), “e” (l. 40), “dis baga” (l. 69), “mento.” (l. 94 not shown), “karang yo alas” (l. 131), and “pest” (l. 136). The use of these expressions indicates that O/Russell interaction is a type of interaction between insiders while O/Mr. Fogarty interaction is between an insider and an outsider.

O stylizes Mr. Fogarty as haole by referring to its category-bound activities and attributes (e.g., “dis baga giving me heat” in line 69; “no get uptight sir” in lines 71-72; and “no go so frikin faes. cool yo jets. what you tingk (. dis is automation?” in lines 76-78 not shown). Giving someone heat, getting uptight, and going fricking fast are all connected with the category haole or white, which is one of the two roles Rap Reiplinger performs in Room Service and which O looks down on as being a tourist (l. 141). It should be noted that stylization in the above excerpt is done only by the Local telephone operator. While she stylizes Mr. Fogarty through membership categorization devices, Mr. Fogarty is not engaged in any stylization of the telephone operator. This may suggest that Room Service is designed for those who would laugh at the stereotypical haole who is usually considered in the position of power but is being silenced in the skit. It would be reasonable to argue that the rhetorical structure of Room Service indicates the importance of Local identity and Pidgin in the face of tourism; thus, this is an example of doublevoicing or subversion (Bakhtin, 1981). However, this does not necessarily mean that Local viewers align only with the telephone operator (and Russell) because they may also align with poor Mr. Fogarty, disaligning from O and R who do not fulfill their institutional roles.
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The above excerpts show that a Pidgin/Local voice is found in reported speech and constructed dialogues. However, these are not the only sites where such a voice is heard. Unlike the previous excerpts, Excerpt 5 shows that the comedians deploy a Pidgin/Local voice not only in reported speech and constructed dialogues but also in narrating.

4.3.2 Pidgin as a medium of narration

Some Local comedians deploy Pidgin as a medium of narration to create a context unique to Local comedy. In the next excerpt, Timmy Mattos (TM) performs as a first act in Augie T’s comedy show, and he uses Pidgin as part of a medium of narration (l. 23); thus, the functional discrepancy between Pidgin and English becomes not as clear as in Irvine and Bumatai’s performances-in-interaction (Excerpts 1, 2, and 3). Nevertheless, it should be noted that Mattos accomplishes creating multivocal humor because speaking Pidgin is ideologically mediated with speaking English. Mattos ethnicizes his wife as haole and refers to her category-bound attributes of being haole (l. 1).

Excerpt 5 (Primarily Local audience)

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>TM</td>
<td>my wife’s haole. blond hair blue eyes. .h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 02 | Aud | I mean she so haole we get bad service at zippy’s.  
| 03 | Aud | ((laughter)) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 04 | TM | and she’s (. ) pale (. ) too. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 05 | TM | 1(h)i(h)ke (. ) try to have a baby |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 06 | Aud | it’s gonna come out |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 07 | Aud | like transparent or some[thing. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 08 | Aud | c((laughter)) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 09 | TM | and worst of all she’s polish. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10 | Aud | (. ) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11 | Aud | ((light laughter)) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12 | TM | Local people (. ) polish is like special ed poDagiz. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

54 Zippy’s is a restaurant chain in Hawai‘i.
Mattos talks about getting bad service at a restaurant as a consequence of having a haole wife (l. 2). He treats Zippy’s as a Local place where Locals are treated well. Not getting good service at this restaurant is a category-bound attribute of being a haole. He continues to describe his wife’s portable identity to add another category-bound attribute (l. 3). Based on this, he makes a joke about their baby (ll. 5-7). He ethnicizes his wife again and presents a subcategory of haole (l. 9), which is followed by a micro pause and light laughter (ll. 10-11). Mattos addresses his audience, treating his audience’s response as a lack of understanding about being Polish by recontextualizing being Polish within the Local context (i.e., “Local people (. ) polish is like special ed poDagiz” in line 12), to which his audience responds with laughter (l. 13). He ethnicizes himself as “half poDagi”
(l. 14) and accounts for a category-bound attribute of a child who has Polish and PoDagi parents (i.e., “oh please don’t be retarded please= don’t be retarded” in lines 16-17).

Mattos discloses new information about his wife in English (i.e., “my wife was in labor for twenty six hours” in line 21), and deploying a Pidgin element, he refers to a medical treatment that his wife received (i.e., “she had three epupuduroz” in line 23), to which his audience responds with laughter (l. 24). Continuing to speak in Pidgin, Mattos treats the laughter as ridicule upon his speech (i.e., “e I’m from waia↑naː↓e epupu[duroz is close enough” in lines 26-27). The implication here is that people in Wai‘anae are Pidgin speakers, and hence struggle with ‘hybolic’55 English words such as “epidural anesthesia.” Mattos treats the word “epidural anesthesia” as a hyperbolic word by transforming it through Pidgin, thereby stylizing himself as a Pidgin speaker.

Following this, Mattos tells his audience what he did while his wife was in labor and had three doses of epidural anesthesia (l. 29). Finally, he reports how he reacted to the birth of his daughter, using Pidgin in reported speech (i.e., “e ha ((how)) come so dak?”) as well as in narration (i.e., “then I heard my daughter fat”).

The above excerpt shows that Mattos’s use of Pidgin does not necessarily lead to laughter from his audience. One explanation for this is that in the face of a predominantly Local audience, a comedic sociolect is mixed speech in the sense that it consists of semiotic resources from English and Pidgin. The comedians deploy this sociolect to constitute stylized languages such as stylized Pidgin and stylized/‘haolefied’ English. It is unnecessary for my own goals to determine whether a certain utterance is English or

55 The English word, hyperbolic, means ‘wildly exaggerated’ and does not have the sense of ‘overly intellectual’ or ‘overly educated’ that is the main meaning in the Hawai‘i Creole word, hybolic.
Pidgin because I am analyzing members’ categories and because layered code-switching or style-shifting involves more than one linguistic domain (e.g., phonology, prosody, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, etc.); in other words, even when I highlight Pidgin features in an utterance through the Odo orthography, this utterance could be classified either as Pidgin or English.\(^{56}\) From a perspective similar to Meeuwis and Blommaert’s (1998) monolectal view of code-switching, Gafaranga proposes the notion of medium, according to which Pidgin and English constitute a single medium; that is, they are not two mediums, they are taken for granted by the comedians and their primarily Local audiences, and language alternation between them may not automatically lead to humorous effects.

On the other hand, the audience orients to the relevance of Pidgin twice (ll. 24 and 28) when Mattos constitutes “epidural anesthesia” as a ‘hybolic’ word (i.e., “she had three *epupuduroz*” in line 23) and when he accounts for this stylized linguistic struggle by referring to a Local place name associated with Pidgin speakers in a Local linguistic ideology (i.e., “*e I’m from waia↑na↓e epupuduroz* is close enough” in lines 26-27). It should also be noted that this excerpt shows many Pidgin features in narration (ll. 2, 12, 14, 23, 26-27). As Mattos uses a vocative (i.e., “Local people” in line 12) that leads to instruction to his audience (i.e., “polish is like special ed *poDagiz*”), he stylizes his audience as Local and constitutes Pidgin as his normal voice to address his Local audience members who are also stylized as Pidgin speakers.

This practice of using Pidgin in narration is adopted by Augie T, too, who interacts with his audience in Pidgin as his normal voice (Excerpts 6a-d). He also orients

\(^{56}\) Marlow and Giles (2008) also point out the mix of Pidgin and English as a common code.
to the relevance of the functional discrepancy between a Pidgin/Local voice and an English/haole voice. In the context of Hawai‘i comedy, these voices are ideologically connected; thus, if one voice is invoked, the other is also invoked. Based on the information that the first and second acts elicited from a couple sitting in a front row, Augie T (AT) poses a confirmation question to the couple.

Excerpt 6a (Primarily Local audience)

01 AT hu (your) anniversary tonight ae? (.)
02 so how (much) years?
03 (.)
04 Man ten.
05 AT ten. hu:.
06 ? ((clapping))
07 AT that’s <a lo:t bra.> (.)

Augie T talks to the couple and reminds his audience of their anniversary (i.e., “hu (your) anniversary tonight ae?” in line 1), using a Pidgin interactional particle and stylizing himself as a Pidgin speaker. He poses another question (i.e., “so how (much) years?” in line 2). The husband responds, and Augie T repeats his response (i.e., “ten”). Following this, Augie T displays that he is impressed (i.e., “hu:” in line 5) and makes an assessment about their ten-year marriage (i.e., “that’s <a lo:t bra.>” in line 7), adding a Pidgin address term and stylizing the husband as Local. Augie T starts to account for why he is impressed and talks about his own marriage in the next excerpt.

Excerpt 6b

08 AT cause I’m working on my< second divo[rce (right now).} [((laughter))
09 Aud ha.
10 AT hey give me your number [later.
11 Man [o:kay hey.
12 AT give me your [number later.
13 Man [*****
15 I’m trying to figure out *.
16 I’m glad that you got far. (.)
17 cause <I> () I’m stupid.
18 Aud {{laughter}}
19 AT no: I’m trying I’m learning man
20 it’s hard ae? understand. () ae? ()
21 hu: my wife () she speaks in complete sentence.
22 Aud {{laughter}}
23 AT and I’m from kali:hi.
24 Aud {{laughter}}
25 AT and I moved to waiana:e,
26 darling and beautiful () ewa beach,
27 an ** I’m a moke, ()
28 Aud {{laughter}}
29 AT I’m full blooded () Local boy hundred-
30 and my wife () speaks in complete sentences.
31 you no how off dis is? ()

Augie T’s reference to the state of his marriage draws laughter (l. 9). An audience
member talks to Augie T, but there is no uptake, and Augie T restarts his account (ll. 14-
17). He implies his efforts (i.e., “no: I’m trying I’m learning man” in line 19) and seeks
alignment from his audience with Pidgin interactional particles (i.e., “it’s hard ae?
understand. () ae?” in line 20).

In line 21, Augie T initiates an explanation of why he has difficulty in his second
marriage, referring to his wife and introducing a category-bound attribute she has (i.e.,
“hu: my wife () she speaks in complete sentence”), treating this attribute as a trouble
source for their relationship. Speaking in complete sentences is a category-bound
attribute of haole, which was also deployed in Andy Bumatai’s performance (Excerpt 3,
line 4). This stylization of his wife as haole is responded to with laughter (l. 22).

Following this, Augie T makes a contrast by describing his life history as a
category-bound attribute of being Local (i.e., “and I’m from kali:hi” in line 23), to which

57 A moke /mouk/ is a tough Local braDa. A female version is a tita /tita/ who is a tough Local sister.
his audience responds with laughter (l. 24). He continues to describe his life history by referring to two more place names (i.e., “and I moved to waiana:e, darling and beautiful (.) ewa beach” in lines 25-26; note that ‘Ewa Beach is preceded by a modifier “darling and beautiful,” which sets it apart from Kalihi and Wai‘anae); however, his audience does not respond to them with laughter. Augie T, then, introduces a relevant category “moke” that is likely to be found in Kalihi and Wai‘anae (i.e., “an ** I’m a moke,” in line 27), highlighting further the contrast in his and his wife’s category-bound attributes that could jeopardize their marriage. The audience responds with laughter to the further stylization of Augie T as a Local braDa (l. 28). Augie T paraphrases being a moke (i.e., “I’m full blooded (. Local boy hundred-” in line 29); although his utterance is cut off, it shows a combination of a modifier “full blooded” with a noun phrase “Local boy.” This is an interesting phrase because “Local boy” is not a racial category, but it is modified by “full blooded,” which is used for racial identity. In other words, being Local is being born and raised in Hawai‘i, so it cannot be measured by blood quantum; however, Augie T adopts this rhetoric to upgrade his Localness while contrasting it with his wife’s alleged non-Localness. He refers to his wife’s category-bound attribute again (i.e., “and my wife (. speaks in complete sentences” in line 30) and treats her attribute as a ‘trouble’ (i.e., “you no how off dis is?” in line 31).

Later, Augie T delivers a constructed dialogue between him and his wife in which he voices himself in Pidgin to stylize himself as a Local braDa, and he generates miscommunication while interacting with his ‘haolefied’ English-speaking wife. He starts an anecdote in the next excerpt, which is about the Rainbow Warriors, the University of Hawai‘i football team, who were invited to play against Georgia Tech in the Sugar Bowl
match in January in 2008. In a narrated event of Excerpt 6, he is reporting to his wife about going to buy Sugar Bowl tickets with Timmy (i.e., Timmy Mattos, the first act; see Excerpt 5). Augie T stylizes himself as a Pidgin speaker (i.e., “e (.) uh me an timmy (.) we gon go u:h (.) gon buy tickets fo da shuga bowl” in lines 35-36), and his wife corrects his use of pronouns (i.e., “no augie. it’s timmy and <I>. timmy and <I> are going” in lines 54 and 56). In this joke, Augie T misinterprets his wife’s correction as a statement that she, not Augie T, is going to watch the game with Timmy.

Excerpt 6c

32 AT when da yu aitch (((UH\(^{58}\))) won, (.)
33 da ho ho .h shuga bowl (((Sugar Bowl))
34 right (here) I came home.
35 “e (.) uh me an timmy (.)
36 we gon go u:h (.) gon buy tickets fo da shuga bowl
37 when (.) * was standing around (getting) tickets. (.)
38 then me timmy gon go uh:”
39 Aud ((light laughter))
40 AT “go stand in line fo da supa (.) s- shuga bowl tickets.”
41 Aud ((laughter))
42 AT ((frowns to describe his wife’s reaction))
43 Aud ((laughter))
44 AT ((wife’s voice)) “excuse me?”
45 Aud ((laughter))
46 AT “me and timmy was gon go (.) uh yu aitch”
47 Aud [((laughter))
48 AT [”gon buy tickets (.) fo da shuga bowl.”
49 (.)
50 AT ((wife’s voice)) “you and timmy (.) was going go:”
51 Aud ((laughter))
52 AT ((wife’s voice)) “you and timmy was going go”
53 Aud ((laughter))
54 AT ((wife’s voice)) “no augie. it’s timmy and <I>.”
55 Aud ((laughter))
56 AT ((wife’s voice)) “timmy and <I> are going.”
57 Aud ((laughter))
58 AT “timmy is not even your friend.
59 how come [you gon go with timmy?”
60 Aud [((laughter))
61 AT “timmy is m(h)y f-” (.)

\(^{58}\) The University of Hawai‘i
Augie T reminds his audience of the 2007 football season (l. 32) and displays his excitement (ll. 32-34). Switching into Pidgin, he voices himself talking to his wife (i.e., “e (. ) uh me an timmy (. ) we gon go u:h (. ) gon buy tickets fo da shuga bowl” in lines 35-38 and 40), to which the audience responds with laughter (ll. 39 and 41).

Augie T frowns (l. 42) to perform his wife’s frustration and voices her as she responds in English (i.e., “excuse ↑me” in line 44), implying that she is having difficulty in understanding him. The audience responds with laughter (ll. 43 and 45) to this stylized miscommunication in a constructed dialogue between Augie T and his wife.

The constructed dialogue continues, as Augie T responds to his wife in Pidgin (i.e., “me and timmy was gon go (. ) uh yu aitch gon buy tickets (. ) fo da shuga bowl” in lines 46 and 48). Making an other-initiated request for repair, his wife repeats and correctively recasts Augie T’s Pidgin utterance into English (ll. 50, 52, 54, and 56). Note that the wife’s paraphrasing of Augie T’s utterance becomes translation and miscommunication humor between Pidgin and English speakers. Augie T responds to his wife (ll. 58-59, 61), creating doubly humorous effects (Bakhtin, 1981) through constituting (1) the wife’s prescriptive attitude towards his speech and (2) the miscommunication that involves the wife’s grammar correction and his interpretation of her action. This type of miscommunication intertextually stylizes Augie T as a moke or Local braDa, drawing laughter from the audience (l. 60); however, because he is the one to doublevoice it, he has the last laugh.

In the next excerpt, Augie T states that misunderstanding between him and his wife is not as bad as it may sound after all, asserting that marriage needs “daet kind of balance” (l. 64). He initiates making a contrast between his first (l. 65) and second (l. 80)
wives in terms of their category-bound activities and attributes. What Augie T means here by “daet kind of balance” is having two different sets of category-bound activities and attributes; that is, he is building a ‘theory’ that difference is good for marriage.

Excerpt 6d

62 AT we don’t understand each oth-
63 you know and that’s good.
64 you need you need (..) you need daet kind of balance.
65 (you no) my first wife (..) was from housing.
66 jas like me.
67 Aud (((light laughter)))
68 AT [when you come home
69 uh (..) ((boxing)) “wasap? (..) wa? wa?”
70 £you * [(go)f
71 Aud (((laughter))
72 AT “£he:y£. hey rela:x relax.
73 you faka ((fucker)) rela:[x rela:x.”
74 Aud (((laughter))
75 AT I came out of divorce. I had a cauliflower ear.
76 Aud (((laughter))
77 AT [((that’s) *****.
78 Aud (((laughter))
79 AT ha. (..) (that’s why) **-
80 my wife now (..) she speaks in complete sentence,
81 you †no she talks in good english,
82 and it’s lasted.
83 “o: look augie. there’s a plethora of pipo.” ((people))
84 ? ((laughter))
85 AT “†wa †that (..) †french”
86 Aud (((laughter))

Augie T reworks the nature of his second marriage (ll. 62-64), and he introduces an anecdote about his first wife to stylize her as a certain type of Local (i.e., “(you no) my first wife (..) was from housing” in line 65). He also implies that he and his first wife belonged to the same category (i.e., “jas like me” in line 66). AT gives an example (i.e., “when you come home” in line 68) and voices his first wife in Pidgin while performing

59 Pidgin *faka* is very different semantically from English *fucker.*
boxing actions (i.e., “wasap? (.) wa? wa?” in line 69). He responds to his wife to complete a constructed dialogue (i.e., “£he:y£. hey rela:x relax. you faka ((fucker)) rela:[x rela:x” in lines 72-73). Stylizing his wife as a tita or Local sista, he presents a consequence of having such a wife (i.e., “I came out of divorce. I had a cauliflower ear” in line 75), implying that his first marriage was so tough that he was beaten up and the marriage was like going through martial arts training.

Following this, Augie T goes back to the previous topic, highlights his second and current wife’s category-bound attribute (i.e., “my wife now (.) she speaks in complete sentence” in line 80), and paraphrases this attribute, based on a Local linguistic ideology (i.e., “you ↑no she talks in good english” in line 81). After telling about his current marital status (l. 82), Augie T demonstrates how his second wife speaks through overly formed Mock Haole English (i.e., “o: look augie. there’s a plethora of pipo” in line 83), which is done through vocabulary choice (i.e., “plethora”) but interestingly, Augie T emphasizes the hyperbolic nature of her speech through word-final consonant deletion (i.e., “pipo”). He switches into Pidgin to respond to his wife (i.e., “↑wa ↓that” in line 85), alludes to a linguistic ideology about French (i.e., “↑↓french”), and stylizes her discursive practice as hyperbolic.

It should be noted that speaking in complete sentences (l.80), speaking in good English (l.81), and speaking French (l.85) are connected through an intertextual nexus of linguistic ideologies. Augie T treats these attributes as category-bound attributes of being non-Local because according to Local linguistic ideologies, they represent an English/haole voice and are in contrast to being from Kalihi, being a moke, being a full-blooded Local boy, and above all, speaking Pidgin.
Augie T changes the topic from his wife, who speaks in complete sentences, to people in the mainland, who also speak in complete sentences. He then makes a contrast between people in the mainland and Local people who he asserts cut everything in half.

Note that his use of comparisons with the mainland relate to his code selection because he voices the mainlanders through ‘haolefied’ English. In addition, whether the audience is deemed primarily Local is another factor that is crucial to analyzing his uses of stylized language in the narrating frame. In Excerpts 7a-e, which follow Excerpt 6 in the performance, he delivers translation humor between stylized English and Pidgin.

Excerpt 7a (Primarily Local audience)

((ll. 87-97 omitted))
098 AT you like people in the mainland say .h
099 ((soft high-pitched voice)) "hey (.) frank (.)"well" (.)
100 el I’ll see you on monday "you guys" (.)
101 “well” have a good weekend okay (.) ↑frank”
102 Aud ((laughter))
103 AT Local guys we jas go (.) “ke:.” ((okay))
104 Aud [((laughter))
105 AT [we are r(h)ight?
106 it’s jas simple. * * *
107 people (tra:sh). (tra:sh).
108 we gotta drive in (.) traffic da whole [da:y.
109 Aud [((laughter))
110 AT we gotta [(. pay fo dalaz ((four dollars))
111 Man ((that’s right) braDa.
112 AT like gallon of the [ga:s (we no mo capital).
113 Aud [((laughter))
114 AT ((off mic)) “hey you have a great weekend (buddy).
115 I’ll see you on monday.”
116 Aud [((laughter))
117 AT you jas (.) “ke:.”
118 Aud [((laughter))
119 AT ****.
120 Aud [((laughter))
121 AT and uh that’s why you gotta love hawaii.
122 we so: unique right? you no we unique.
123 I- you no

---

60 Pidgin also has complete sentences. But Pidgin is constructed as opposite to English, and Augie T’s performance is based on the linguistic ideology that Pidgin does not have complete sentences.
Generalizing how people in the mainland speak (i.e., l. 98), Augie T voices them in reported speech that is delivered in a high pitched, quiet, and somewhat smooth voice (i.e., “hey (.) frank (.)°well° (.) ei I’ll see you on monday °you guys° (.) °well° have a good weekend okay (.) ↑frank” in lines 99-101). This is done in a stylized English/haole voice, and it shows that more than speaking in complete sentences is at stake here.

Following this, Augie T presents a contrastive Local practice in Pidgin to complete the translation humor (i.e., “Local guys we jas go (.) “ke:.”” in line 103). This translation humor shows Pidgin features, which include: (1) pronoun copying (i.e., “Local guys we”), (2) a quotative verb (i.e., “go”), and (3) reported speech in a lower and louder voice (i.e., “ke:”). While the audience responds with laughter (l. 104), Augie T seeks alignment (l. 105). He makes another comment about the Local way of communication (i.e., “it’s jas simple. * * *” in line 106). He refers to the more stressful life in Hawai‘i (l. 109-110 and 112).

Augie T constructs translation humor again by delivering stylized mainland speech (ll. 114-115) and following it up with Pidgin speech (l. 117). He seems to be implying that due to the more difficult living context in Hawai‘i, people do not have time for chatting or they do not pretend that life is wonderful. The dichotomic discourse about Pidgin and English leads somewhat abruptly to the discourse of preference of Hawai‘i to the mainland (i.e., “and uh that’s why you gotta love hawaii” in line 121) and leads to a claim about its uniqueness. Augie T seeks alignment from his audience in Pidgin, making ironic sequence-closing assessments (i.e., “we so: unique right? you no we unique. I- you no” in lines 122-123).
Note that Augie T continues to construct the Local vs. the mainland dichotomy by discursively oscillating between these geographical areas. He goes back to talking about the mainland, referring specifically to mainland comedians in the next excerpt. This is another bit of translation humor between English and Pidgin that is based on a directional joke. He starts to talk about mainland comedians who conduct this kind of joke in English.

Excerpt 7b

124  AT  and (. ) every comic in the mainland
125  dei do directional jokes.
126  I- I traveled .h all da wa:y to (da)
127  you no like towards da i:s kous, ((east coast)) (.)
128  and even in da midwes ((midwest))
129  and every .h
130  like every comic does da directional joke.
131  like we have somebody, .h in u:h you no: indiana.
132  "uh where is uh: (. ) the walmart, in **ville"
133  and you only see you no
134  you ask uh (. ) a red neck guy.
135  (de) gotta go .h
136  "o you jas go down there turn that way (.)
137  you’ll see a house,”
138  Aud  {{{light laughter)}}
139  AT  ["next to the mailbox, (.)
140  there’s a s(h)ign."
141  you no you guys (no) right? .h

Augie T refers to mainland comedians (l. 124) and makes a generalization (i.e., “dei do directional jokes” in line 125). Note that these two lines are delivered in Pidgin (e.g., pronoun copying [Purcell, 1979]). Opening up a new sequence in Pidgin indicates that Augie T keeps constructing his audience as Local here. Talking about his experience (ll. 126-128), he repeats the generalization about mainland comics (ll. 129-130).

Following this, he initiates a directional joke by specifying a situation (i.e., Indiana in line 131). He poses a question in reported speech (i.e., “uh where is uh: (. ) the walmart, in **ville?” in line 132) and follows this up by building up a situation in which
one asks a “red neck guy” (l. 134) for directions. Prefacing the red neck guy’s response (i.e., “(de) gotta go” in line 135), Augie T takes the voice of this character who gives directions (i.e., “o you jas go down there turn that way (. ) you’ll see a house” in lines 136-137; “next to the mailbox, (. ) there’s a s(h)ign” in lines 139-140). Augie T marks the completion of the joke by seeking alignment from his audience (l. 141). He then starts the second half of this example of translation humor, presenting a Hawai‘i version of, supposedly, the same directional joke in the next excerpt.

Excerpt 7c

142 AT and in hawaii,
143 (alright) you ask a Local guy,
144 dei go (. )
145 "ke ts ((it’s)) you jas go down the road,
146 *** mango chri, get one abandoned car,"
147 Aud [((laughter))]
148 AT ["(pass da abandoned car,)
149 get da sign,” boom.
150 da house right dea.
151 Aud [((laughter))]

Augie T specifies a geographical area (l. 142), sets up a situation (l. 143), and without asking for directions to Walmart, prefaces a generalized response (l. 144). The response in reported speech follows (ll. 145-146, 148-150). The Hawai‘i version is constructed with reference to culturally-specific semiotic resources such as a mango tree and an abandoned car; moreover, directions are given with phonological (e.g., go, chri, da, dea) and syntactic (e.g., get, one) Pidgin features.

These two versions of a directional joke (Excerpts 7b and 7c) are another example of translation humor between English and Pidgin. In the next excerpt, Augie T develops the Hawai‘i version of this directional joke further by introducing a hypothetical scenario.
He states that he had never come across anyone who gives directions as in the previous excerpt (e.g., mentioning a mango tree as a landmark) until he finally came across a Local *braDa* in a mountainous area of Waimea on the Big Island (the island of Hawai‘i).

When Augie T (AT) says he has to go up Waimea, this Local *braDa* (LB) gives directions in Pidgin, which refer to Local semiotic signs that include even roadside election placards for two politicians (Daniel) Akaka and (Ed) Case, who competed for a U.S. Senate seat in the Democratic primary in 2006.

---

Excerpt 7d

152 AT    okei so (.)
153    I neva bump into anybody like daet in my life.
154 ?   ((laughter))
155 AT    honestly.
156  maybe because I was the guy
157  that was (.) doing the directions right?
158  [you no but (.)
159 Aud  [((laughter))
160 AT    I neva bump into (.)
161  until I went to da big island.
162  blew me away.
163 Aud  ((light laughter))
164 AT    ble- I had to go up to waimea: (.) right?\(^{61}\)
165 Local *braDa* no mo shirt (.) like you no (we)
166  ((LB)) “HEY wasap augie tee?
167  he he: y. whoa what you doing. (help me).” (.)
168  “o: I go down I jaes came check out you no da ↑scenery
169  I gotta go up waimea.”
170  ((LB)) “↑o ↑yeah.”
171  “e ↑you no da kain house ↑ste:”
172  promise to god.
173  *dis* is what (you-) no mo shirt, (.) no: shirt.\(^{62}\)
174  ((LB)) “jas gotta go up da hill.”
175 Aud  ((laughter))
176 AT    ((LB)) “go up da hill. gon get one fork in da road.”
177 Aud  ((laughter))
178 AT    ((LB)) “you gon see chok akaka sign.\(^{63} \)^{64}

---

\(^{61}\) Waimea is a district in Waipi‘o on the island of Hawai‘i.

\(^{62}\) *No mo* (no more) is a Pidgin modifier. Wearing no shirt is probably a category-bound attribute of being a Local *braDa*.

\(^{63}\) *Chok* means a lot in Pidgin.
When Augie T marks the end of the previous directional joke (i.e., “okei so” in line 152), he states in Pidgin that nothing like the directional joke had happened to him (i.e., “I neva bump into anybody like daet in my life” in line 153), emphasizes that statement’s believability (i.e., “honestly” in line 155), and guesses why that is the case (i.e., “maybe because I was the guy that was (. ) doing the directions right?” in lines 156-157), thereby implying that he is Local. He initiates a reformulation of his statement (l. 158), repeats his experience in Pidgin (l. 160), and reformulates it and reveals that he came across that kind of person (i.e., “until I went to da big island” in line 161). He describes his surprise

64 Daniel Akaka served as a U.S. Congressman from 1976 to 1990, and he has been an incumbent U.S. Senator since 1990 (as of December 2010).

65 Ed Case is an attorney in Honolulu. He is from the Big Island and served as a U.S. Congressman from 2002 to 2007. In 2006, he challenged Senator Akaka for his seat and lost in the Democratic primary. Augie T’s joke mentions “Case” only once (l. 188), which indicates that Case could garner much less support than Akaka. It may also be relevant to point out shared knowledge about their racial identity that Case is white and Akaka is Native Hawaiian.

66 Augie T displays his excitement through a song-like utterance (i.e., “papapapa: papa:papa:”).

67 Note that “daet person” refers to the kind of person who gives directions as in Excerpt 7c. Augie T’s statement here projects back to his previous utterance (i.e., “I neva bump into anybody like daet in my life” in line 153).
Following this, Augie T introduces a Local character in line 165 (i.e., “Local braDa no mo shirt (.) like you no (we)”), highlighting the Localness of this character by describing his appearance (i.e., wearing no shirt) as a category-bound attribute of being a Local braDa. Augie T initiates a constructed dialogue in Pidgin between this Big Island braDa as ‘super Local’ and himself (l. 166). The Local braDa starts (i.e., “HEY wasap augie tee? he he he:y. whoa what you doing? (help me),” in line 167), and Augie T responds (i.e., “o: I go down I jaes came check out you no da ↑scenery I gotta go up waimea” in lines 168-169). The braDa acknowledges this (i.e., “↑o ↓yeah” in line 170), and Augie T asks for directions (i.e., “e ↑you no da kain house ↓ste:” in line 171). Augie T makes a comment to his audience (i.e., “promise to god. dis is what (you-) no mo shirt, (.) no: shirt” in lines 172-173), prefacing the braDa’s response. The braDa gives simple directions (i.e., “jas gotta go up da hill” in line 174), which draws laughter from the audience (l. 175). Augie T continues to take the voice of the braDa who gives more detailed directions, including mention of the numerous roadside election placards for Senator Akaka (i.e., “go up da hill. gon get one fork in da road. you gon see chok akaka sign. akaka [akaka akaka akaka akaka akaka akaka akaka you gon get (ticks). across da schrit ((street)) (.) is da house” in lines 176, 178-179, 182, and 184).

Note that the constructed dialogue between Augie T and the Local braDa shows many Pidgin features. In fact, the Local braDa’s utterance shows slightly more complex syntactic structure than other Pidgin utterances in the data (i.e., “gon get one fork in da
road” in line 176). He also uses a Pidgin lexical item “chok” (l. 178) to refer to many roadside signs. These features are designed to reinforce the Localness of the character.

Augie T narrates in English how he followed the braDa’s directions (i.e., “so I’m-
I’m driving up h I’(h)m driving up w(h)aim(h)ea,” in line 186-187), reads roadside signs
to intertextually highlight the huge margin of support Senator Akaka had against
Congressman Ed Case in the 2006 Democratic primary (i.e., “akaka akaka akaka case” in
line 188), and indicates that he has arrived at the destination (i.e., “båŋg” in line 188). He
describes his astonishment at arriving at the destination by following the Local braDa’s
directions (i.e., “[wa: ****. (papapapa: papa:papa:) I was like- I was like u:” in lines
190-191); finally, he accounts for his excitement by referring to the Local braDa who
gives very Local directions (i.e., “it’s so funny (.) because I (.) finally bumped into daet
person” in line 192-193).

In the next and last excerpt, Augie T modifies the directional joke he has just told
to his audience, presenting another imaginary situation in which a Local braDa, similar
to the one in the previous excerpt, interacts with an injured person who asks for directions
to a hospital. Augie T performs this Local braDa who occasionally asks his wife for help.
Augie T presents a constructed dialogue between this braDa and his wife, but the wife’s
response is inferred only through the braDa’s utterance. (It should be noted that Augie T
theatrically creates their dialogue by looking at and speaking off the mic towards the back
stage.) Augie T narrates and constructs all the dialogues in Pidgin, thereby highlighting
the category-bound activities and attributes of being Local and stylizing himself and his
audience as Local.

162
Augie T sets up an imaginary situation and emphasizes that it is a hypothetical situation (i.e., “an I started tripping out like what if (.) you was like you no in emergency” in lines 163
He exaggerates this situation by suggesting a stab wound inflicted by a third grader (ll. 196-199) and follows this up with an account (ll. 201-202).

Following this, Augie T initiates a modified directional joke, describing the emergency (i.e., “one day maybe you get a stab wound” in lines 203-204). He, then, takes the voice of an injured character (i.e., “a:” you bleeding, “a: a(h): ↓a: ↑where da hospital ↓ste””). Another character, a Local braDa, responds to create a constructed dialogue (i.e., “o: ↓o: you got (. ) gotta go up da hill” in lines 206 and 208), intertextually reminding the audience of the Local braDa in the previous excerpt and drawing laughter from the audience (l. 209).

Continuing to perform the Local braDa, Augie T looks back towards the back stage and, off the mic, he delivers another constructed dialogue between that character and his wife (i.e., “(what?) °↑where hospital ↓ste °he ste all bleeding like he ste bleeding. ° wa? (. ) let- let me ask him what happened.” in lines 212, 214, 216, 218, and 219). The couple’s lack of a sense of emergency is attested by the audience’s laughter (l. 220). Augie T accounts partly for this attitude by making a comment about how Local people would respond to this kind of situation (i.e., “as you know Local people we like go” in line 221) and by taking the voice of the Local braDa (i.e., “o wasap? what happened. ↑ha kam you ste bleeding ↓laiDaet what happened. what happened ae?” in lines 222-223 and 225). Note that making the comment in his own voice in line 221 helps Augie T achieve intertextually linking his characters with Local people in off-stage reality.

Implying that the Local braDa got a response from the injured character and was surprised (i.e., “na:” in line 226), Augie T performs the Local braDa who is talking to his
wife (i.e., “he got stab:bed honey. he got stab:bed in his ches. ((chest)) he’s bleed:ing ple:ni. ((plenty)) yeah” in lines 226, 228, 230, and 232). He changes footing once again to take the voice of the braDa giving directions to the injured character (i.e., “how you got stab:bed in £your£ ch(h)es. o bra you gotta hurry up. go up da hill” in lines 233-235), and he follows this up with more details by referring to roadside signs (i.e., “you make a left you’ll see akaka [akaka akaka akaka case” in lines 236-237). Finally, he makes a comment to close up this sequence (i.e., “it’s a funny ting” in line 239).

4.4 Discussion

The comedians conducted their performances-in-interaction neither solely in English nor in Pidgin because they used a comedic sociolect that is mixed speech based on semiotic resources of both English and Pidgin. Within this stage dialect occurred style-shifting, indexed by qualitative changes in phonological, prosodic, lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic features. English and Pidgin were part of a Local linguistic repertoire, and the comedians deployed this sociolect for stylizing themselves and their audiences as Local as well as for generating multivocal humorous effects.

It was not my goal, however, to identify every occurrence of code-switching or style-shifting between English and Pidgin. Nor is it productive to set linguistic criteria for classifying Pidgin utterances (e.g., basilectal, mesolectal, acrolectal) unless they are interactionally relevant and consequential. I argue, however, that even if style-shifting seems to show no interactional relevance and consequence in the immediately following context, shifting into high gear Pidgin may still become performatively meaningful in a larger context should it display salient Pidgin features or should Pidgin be used as a
medium of narration, because it sets the performance frame exclusively for a Local audience who are stylized as Pidgin speakers through the deployment of Pidgin. My argument is based on the fact that Pidgin is a historically stigmatized language and that whenever a Pidgin/Local voice is invoked, its counterpart, an English/haole voice, is invoked, too, because these stylized languages are ideologically intertwined.

Rap Reiplinger (Excerpt 4) played two characters in Room Service where an unnamed telephone operator (O) showed style-shifting in stylized Pidgin while interacting with Mr. Fogarty (F), a haole visitor who was animated through stylized English. Because Room Service was a skit, it had no narration, in contrast to the performances-in-interaction in the stand-up comedy shows that built a more explicit context through narration; however, it should be noted that in both discursive contexts, language ideology about Pidgin and English is being constructed.

The stand-up comedians, Andy Bumatai (AB in Excerpt 3) and Bo Irvine, (BI in Excerpts 1 and 2) used English as a medium of narration, and they switched into stylized Pidgin in reported speech and constructed dialogues to stylize themselves, their audiences, and their characters as Local and to generate humorous effects. Meanwhile, Augie T (AT in Excerpts 6 and 7) and Timmy Mattos (TM in Excerpt 5) used stylized Pidgin to a much greater extent, adopting it not only for reported speech and constructed dialogues but also for narration. These comedians constituted translation and miscommunication humor through a Local linguistic ideology about the functional discrepancy between a Pidgin/Local voice and an English/haole voice.

English and Pidgin were the main semiotic resources in these examples of multivocal Local comedy, and they were stylized to various degrees, playing a significant
role in constituting translation and miscommunication humor. Mattos accounted for his ‘speech error’ (i.e., “epupuduroz”) by referring to where he is from and by treating epidural anesthesia as a ‘hybolic’ word that Pidgin speakers would have difficulty in articulating. Similarly, Augie T stylized his wife by referring to a category-bound attribute of being haole and describing the way she speaks (i.e., speaking in complete sentences) in contrast to the way he speaks because of his belonging to stereotypically Local places such as Kalihi and Wai‘anae and of his being a moke. He deployed stylized Pidgin to give voice to Local characters while deploying stylized English to take the voices of either white or ‘haolefied’ characters, thereby making a functional contrast through translation humor. I have also argued that one voice—either Pidgin or English—inevitably invokes the other because these stylized languages are ideologically mediated with social structure.

4.5 Conclusion
This chapter examined the use of stylized languages in Local comedy as an ideologically-mediated and culturally-specific performative genre. The Local comedians used a sociolect or stage dialect that consisted of stylized languages such as stylized Pidgin and ‘haolefied’ English. The comedians deployed these stylized languages as contrastive rhetorical devices and used them in two discursive contexts: (1) reported speech and constructed dialogues and (2) narration. I showed that while some comedians limited their use of stylized Pidgin to reported speech and constructed dialogues, adopting English as a medium of narration, other comedians extended their use of Pidgin to narration that constituted a performance frame.
The deployment of stylized languages was based on a Local linguistic ideology about the functional discrepancy between a Pidgin/Local voice and an English/haole voice; in other words, speaking Pidgin is a category-bound attribute of being Local while speaking ‘good English’ is a category-bound attribute of being haole. The comedians referred to these contrastive attributes and deployed stylized Pidgin and English to constitute multivocal translation and miscommunication humor, thereby stylizing themselves, their audiences, and their characters as Local or non-Local. Creating Local characters such as a Local braDa was achieved through deploying Pidgin features; moreover, assembling a Local braDa re-constituted Pidgin as a stylized Local voice.

When the comedians deployed English as a medium of narration, they treated their show as a highly performative genre in which English and Pidgin had clearer functional discrepancies; English set an overall performance frame, and Pidgin only added a Local flavor. This discursive choice is designed to indicate the level of professional sophistication of the comedians. On the other hand, when the comedians deployed Pidgin in narration, they bridged such functional gaps between these stylized languages. The comedians stylized themselves as Local and set a performance frame exclusively for a Local audience; that is, they constituted a comedy club as a site parallel to off-stage society where Local people interact in their own language, namely, Pidgin.68

---

68 Interviews with Local comedians provide some insights into this Local linguistic ideology because in response to my question about the role of Pidgin, Bo Irvine said that he can perform both in Pidgin and English. Similarly, Andy Bumatai maintained that he does not do “Pidgin stuff” anymore except performing characters to please his Local audience, implying that stylizing himself as a Local braDa belongs to the past, at least for him, and that speaking only English throughout the whole show, however, is unacceptable. Meanwhile, Timmy Mattos described performing in front of his primarily Local audience as performing in front of his family members; he explained that if he speaks Pidgin, people would recognize him as a “Local guy,” not some “haole dude.” Furthermore, Augie T stylized himself as Local by applying its various relevant categories to himself (e.g., full-blooded Local boy, moke, blue collar guy, a reflection of society, like everybody else, etc.). I discuss these interviews along with focus group data in Chapter 6.
It was meaningfully contrasted with English and was chosen to portray characters and to convey ideologies that mediate a nexus of language, interaction, and society.

I also argued that a comedic sociolect is often mixed speech that is subject to layered code-switching or style-shifting. Alternation between low gear and high gear Pidgin co-occurred with membership categorization as well as with other discursive actions (e.g., building a context, changing footing, making an assessment about a ‘hybolic’ word, etc.). Hence, deploying stylized Pidgin was a multifunctional act. However, creating the linguistic criteria for classifying utterances either as English or Pidgin was not in the scope of this chapter. Based on the discussion about stylization in Pidgin and English, the next chapter analyzes the deployment of other stylized languages, further exploring interactive intertextuality that centers on membership categorization and language alternation in a culturally-specific performative genre of multivocal humor.
CHAPTER 5. MOCKERY AS STYLIZATION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter investigates the use of stylized languages other than Pidgin and English in Hawai‘i comedy. Local comedians often use semiotic resources that do not correspond ideologically to their ethnic identity. My goal is to unpack this kind of multivocal discursive practice or ‘mockery’ that is one of the salient aspects of stylization in Local comedy. In other words, mockery defines this ideologically-mediated and culturally-specific performative genre. In order to highlight this property of multivocal Local comedy, I pose the following research questions: (1) How do the participants reach an agreement about whether they are doing mockery? (2) What kinds of categorization co-occur with mockery? and (3) What is mockery used for?

5.2 Discursive contexts for examining stylization

Studies on mockery show that language use is not always constrained by one’s ethnic identity (e.g., Chun, 2004; Hill, 2005; Rampton, 1998). In Hawai‘i, Local comedians deploy semiotic resources in order not only to voice themselves but to voice other people. As Pidgin and ‘haolefied’ English (or ‘mainland U.S. English,’ discussed in Chapter 4) appear in reported speech and constructed dialogues, mockery also occurs in these discursive contexts. I will illustrate these multivocal discursive contexts in detail, examining the way the participants jointly initiate, sustain, and terminate mockery; I will also discuss what the participants achieve through mockery.
5.3 Analysis

5.3.1 Mockery in reported speech and constructed dialogues

Excerpt 1 shows a brief mockery sequence in which Augie T deploys a stylized language.

While telling one of his earliest jokes about the popular music diva, Mariah Carey, he says that Mariah Carey has a high octave range, so whenever he plays her CD, the neighborhood dogs come around his house (because the dogs like high pitched sounds).

Augie T (AT) then starts a sequence (l. 111) that leads to a punch line (l. 115).

Excerpt 1 (Primarily Local audience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>AT so one day I was sleeping, (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>and then a- all of a sudden I hear ((knock knock knock))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>it’s my filipino uncle. *** (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>”&gt;okei (.) aug(h)ie&lt; (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>↑can I borrow you:r: mariah carey ↑see ↓dee“ ((CD))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Aud hahahahahahaha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Augie T sets up a storytelling frame (l. 111) and indicates that someone knocked on the door of the house (l. 112). Following this, Augie T introduces his uncle as a topic while ethnicizing him (i.e., “it’s my filipino uncle” in line 113). Augie T takes the voice of his uncle who is addressing Augie T (l. 114). Note that he stylizes mockery through the stress pattern (i.e., “okei”), laughing voice (i.e., “aug(h)ie”), and fast pace (i.e., “>okei (.) aug(h)ie<”). He continues to voice his uncle in reported speech (i.e., “↑can I borrow you:r: mariah carey ↑see ↓dee” in lines 114-115), rolling an /r/ (i.e., “you:r:”) and indexing that his uncle has an ‘accent.’ Note that this ‘accent’ is stylized as a phonological feature of Filipinos because Augie T has ethnicized his uncle as Filipino (l. 113). The voicing of his uncle leads to laughter (l. 116) because it implies a joke about eating dogs.
Similar to Excerpt 1, Excerpt 2 shows a brief mockery sequence in which Augie T deploys ethnicization and reported speech. Augie T (AT) is talking about those who were offended by his Filipino jokes.

Excerpt 2 (Primarily Local audience)
127 AT and filipino guys (went)
128 "come here man (. ) what (. ) this isn’t punny.”
129 Aud hahahahaha

Augie T refers to those who were offended by his jokes while specifying their ethnicity (i.e., “filipino”) and prefacing reported speech (i.e., “and filipino guys (went)” in line 127). Augie T takes the voice of these people who address Augie T (i.e., “come here man” in line 128) and make an assessment about Augie T’s Filipino joke (i.e., “this isn’t punny”). It should be noted that Augie T indicates that this assessment was delivered in English with an ‘accent’ through f/p alternation (i.e., funny/punny). Because Augie T has ethnicized these people as Filipino (l. 127), he constitutes the reported speech as a stylized Filipino ‘accent.’ The mockery sequence comes to an end when the audience responds with laughter (l. 129).

Excerpt 3 shows a similar mockery sequence that deals with another ethnicity, Chinese. In one of his jokes, Andy Bumatai (AB) talks about three ethnic stereotypes without referring to the ethnicities. Their ethnicities, however, are implied through their category-bound activities and attributes. In the next excerpt, Bumatai starts to ethnicize the third character who is a stereotypical Chinese (l. 61).

Excerpt 3 (Primarily Local audience)
61 AB th(h)e £third gentleman£
Bumatai initiates the last part of his three-part joke (l. 61), assembling a list of category-bound activities and attributes (i.e., having two middle names, living in a house behind the red door, having a big mole with a hair, being a landlord), thereby indicating that he is talking about a Chinese stereotype. Bumatai then reintroduces a problem to which each of his characters responds differently (i.e., “he sees the fly in the beverage” in line 69). He starts to describe the reaction of this third character (i.e., “grabs it by the wings and >he says<” in lines 69-70).

Having prefaced the reported speech (i.e., “>he says<”), Bumatai takes the voice of the third character (i.e., “YOU NO STEAL FROM ME (.) SPIT IT OUT= (.) <SPIT IT OUT>” in lines 71-72). Note that this mockery has two parts: the first part is a command with a non-standard negation in English (i.e., “you no steal from me”), and the second part is the repetition of another command (i.e., “spit it out”) that is co-occurring with another category-bound attribute of a Chinese stereotype (i.e., ‘stingy’). This is why laughter does not come right after the first part of the mockery; instead, the first token of

69 “YOU NO STEAL” could be seen as Pidgin, but because it comes along with the other category-bound attributes, it seems to be English as a second language.
“SPIT IT OUT” (l. 72) is immediately followed by laughter (l. 73). In other words, the audience is orienting not to the use of mockery itself but to the relevance of a category-bound attribute that co-occurs with mockery. Bumatai closes his joke with a commentary (ll. 74-75).

Excerpt 4 shows the same kind of mockery sequence as Excerpt 3, but it also shows what follows this first sequence of ethnicization, mockery, and laughter. After interacting with audience members of Japanese descent, Frank DeLima (FD) indicates that he has spotted a group of people who belong to another ethnic group (i.e., “uh oh” in line 145).

Excerpt 4 (Excerpt 5 in Chapter 3, primarily Local audience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>Aud</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>Aud</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>Aud</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>Aud</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>Aud</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>Aud</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>Aud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>↑fo:kei. uh oh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>((laughter))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td><a href="">hi:f</a>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>((laughter))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>filipinos right in da middle of om all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>((laughter))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>((mock filipino)) “[ɑː nagɑɪm bagɑmɑlɪmɔː?]”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>((laughter))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>are you ilokano ma’am?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>you are. “[nɑɪm bɑgɑmɑlɪmɔː:]” is that correct?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DeLima identifies an audience member (A4) (l. 145), which is followed by a long pause (l. 146) and laughter (l. 147). He greets A4 with laughing voice (l. 148), which is followed by laughter (l. 149). Following this, DeLima initiates a mockery sequence by

---

70 Lines 152 and 156 look close to a genuine Ilokano phrase, *naimbag a malem-mo*, which is a commonplace greeting, ‘Good day’ or ‘Good afternoon.’

71 Ilokano is an ethnic group name from the northern Philippines, and their language is also referred to as Ilokano. Ilokano people are a dominant Filipino group in Hawai‘i.
ethnicizing A4’s group (i.e., “filipinos” in line 150), which leads to laughter (l. 151). He then produces an utterance (i.e., “[ɑː nɑɪm bɑɡɑmɑlɪmɔː?]” in line 152) to which his audience responds with laughter (l. 153). DeLima asks A4 a specific yes/no question about her ethnicity (i.e., “are you ilokano ma’am?” in line 154), and A4 gives an affirmative response to this question (l. 155). DeLima acknowledges her response (l. 156), repeats the previous utterance (i.e., “[nɑɪm bɑɡɑmɑlɪmɔː?]”), and asks A4 whether his supposedly Ilokano utterance is correct (i.e., “is that correct?”), thereby treating A4 as an Ilokano speaker. Note that the audience does not respond to DeLima’s second mockery utterance (l. 156), and A4 confirms DeLima’s utterance (i.e., “right” in line 157); the mockery sequence comes to an end.

The above excerpt shows that the stylized Filipino/Ilokano utterances are situated in a particular context, and they generate humorous effects even though DeLima does not translate them into any language. DeLima constitutes his utterances in lines 152 and 156 as stylized Filipino because he deploys these utterances to address a group of people that he has ethnicized as Filipino. His audience displays their understanding of these utterances as stylized Filipino by responding with laughter. These stylized Filipino utterances are re-constituted as stylized Ilokano when A4 responds to DeLima’s more specific ethnicization.

Similar to Excerpt 4, Excerpt 5 presents a longer mockery sequence in which a comedian continues mockery after his audience responds with laughter. In the next excerpt, Frank DeLima (FD) delivers a stylized Buddhist prayer while interacting with one of the audience members who responds to DeLima only non-verbally.
After interacting with a few Local Japanese audience members, DeLima states that there are still more of them (ll. 126-127 and 129). He spots another audience member (i.e., “dis braDa” in line 129) and ethnicizes him as Japanese by deploying a Japanese cultural category (i.e., “bonsan” ‘Buddhist monk’) to describe his appearance (i.e., “look like he’s ready fo da .h fo da (.). bonsan, £ya£?” in lines 129-130). DeLima continues to ethnicize him by referring to his haircut that meets a category-bound attribute of a monk (i.e., shaven or short haircut in lines 132-133), which leads to a stylized Buddhist prayer or another category-bound activity of being a Buddhist monk.

DeLima initiates a stylized Buddhist prayer (l. 135), which overlaps with laughter from his audience (l. 136). DeLima continues this prayer (l. 137), and after a micro pause (l. 138), he imitates the bell sound to demonstrate his further cultural knowledge (l. 139). While his audience responds to the bell sound with laughter (l. 140), DeLima resumes the prayer, but he stops chanting rather abruptly (l. 141), which is followed by a long pause (l.
Note that DeLima’s prayer (ll. 137 and 141) is not followed by laughter; that is, after a laugh token in line 136, there are no laugh tokens except when the audience responds to the bell sound that is not part of the mock language. He accounts for his audience member’s haircut and closes this interaction.

In Excerpt 6, Andy Bumatai takes the voice of various characters and complicates his mockery sequences. Bumatai introduces a topic or a ‘controversy’ over the political correctness of Frank DeLima’s song, Christmas Carol (Filipino Christmas).\footnote{\textit{Christmas Carol} (also known as \textit{Filipino Christmas}) is Frank DeLima’s well-known parody song. DeLima is unique among Local comedians in Hawai‘i in the sense that singing parody songs defines his style of comedy. \textit{Christmas Carol} (Filipino Christmas) is a medley that consists of four Christmas songs: (1) \textit{O Christmas Tree}, (2) \textit{Frosty the Snowman}, (3) \textit{Chestnuts Roasting on an Open Fire}, and (4) \textit{Oh Come, All Ye Faithful}. This medley parody song includes various semiotic resources such as stylized Filipino, food names, and place names. Note, however, that (a) visual information may be indispensable in producing the song’s humorous effects; for instance, DeLima used to dress like a Christmas tree while singing it, and (b) parody itself may create a context where people see things through a parody lens and feel it is safe to laugh.}

\begin{verbatim}
O: Christmas chrii, ((tree))
O: Christmas chrii,
A Filipino Christmas chrii

Makadangdang soyuderigo dangaragara (bukbuk) ((chorus: bukbuk))
Garagara ((chorus: aius)) birigottarariboi ((hui)) susara siritoitu
Makadangdang soyuderigo ((rolling r)) dangaragara (bukbuk) ((chorus: bukbuk))
Garagara ((chorus: aius)) birigottarabiriboi susara siritoitu
Balut balut balut dittoo ittarumungai ((ai:hu:)) yossoi
ba[r]adanddittoe ((?))
Bagaong bagaong bagaong dittoo ittarumungai ((hui))
otto takkan takadan barabanbanditto
Makadandan soyuderigo ((rolling r)) dangaragara (bukbuk) ((chorus: bukbuk))
Garagara ((chorus: aius)) birigottarabiriboi susara siritoitu

Black dog [r]oasting on an open fire
Bagaong boiling on di stove
He[r]e da dog in da valley ((wow wow wow, wow wow wow, wow wow wow wow wow))
And da chicken in Kalihi ((kwa kwa kwa, kwa kwa kwa, kwa kwa kwa kwa))
Little do they know they’re going to be adobo
Dinner (po[r]uda) Pilipino klam pam pam
\end{verbatim}
states that Filipinos were upset by DeLima’s song and had left threatening messages on his answering machine. Bumatai, then, takes the voice of three characters: (1) DeLima who is reporting to Bumatai about this incident, (2) the Filipino character that left the message, and (3) Bumatai himself in this narrated event.

Excerpt 6 (Primarily Local audience)

01 AB you know * put a lot of heat (. ) frank delima.
02 filipinos ** are leaving threat_ening messages>
03 on his (. ) answering machine.
04 Aud [ (laughter)]
05 AB yea:h (. ) he played the machine for me.
06 ((FD)) “randy listen to this ((weeping)) listen to this.”
07 (F)) “you stop telling daet filipino joke (. )
08 I’m going to poke you wit de knife.”=
09 Aud =((laughter])
10 AB (F)) “I know but listen to di:s.”
11 and the guy went o:n. ( (F)) “and you do not stop telling
daet joke I’m going to kill you:. “ o: me:n. you know I love
12 frank but he’s a little pansy right?
13 Aud ((laughter])
14 AB * I tell frank. “bra: it’s a good bit” (. ) you know?
15 Aud ((laughter])
16 AB ((FD)) “I know but listen to di:s.”
17 and the guy went o:n. ( (F)) “and you do not stop telling
18 daet joke I’m going to kill you:. “ o: me:n. you know I love
19 frank but he’s a little pansy right?
20 Aud ((laughter])
21 AB ((FD weeping)) “I look andy (. ) look (. )
22 that guy said he gon kill me.
23 you heard om. he gon kill me:. ”
24 Aud ((laughter])
25 AB “I’d tell you never grow up in country bra *.
26 I’ll tell you s(h)ometh(h)ing right now.
27 people who kill you (. ) don call you up first.”
28 Aud ((laughter])
29 AB “they jas kill you frank.”

O: come all yu pipol
Joypul an torayampant
O: come yo!
O: come ye!
To Eva Beach
Come to Wailua and Kalihi-Uka
You’ll pind us in Waipahu
You’ll pind us in Waipahu
You’ll pind us in Waipahu
(and) Eva Beach
Amene
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Bumatai specifies the ethnicity of the caller (i.e., “filipinos”). He builds up a situation in which DeLima plays a message for Bumatai (l. 5), and in which he voices DeLima (l. 6). Following this, Bumatai takes the voice of a Filipino character in stylized English with a Filipino ‘accent’ (i.e., “↑you stop telling daet filipino joke (. ) I’m going to poke you wit de knife” ll. 7-8), which is followed by laughter (l. 9).

Bumatai continues to give voice to the Filipino character that implies s/he is criticizing DeLima’s parody song (i.e., “↑you know (what) joke I’m talking about? (. ) daet one” in line 10). Note that there is no laughter following this mockery in reported speech. Bumatai then voices the Filipino character recontextualizing a phrase from DeLima’s song. In other words, Bumatai’s utterance in line 12 is designed as multivocal humor because Bumatai imitates a Filipino who imitates Frank DeLima who originally imitates a Filipino. The audience responds to this stylized Filipino (not stylized English with an ‘accent’) with laughter (l. 13). It should be noted that laughter attests that Bumatai does not have to translate stylized Filipino into English.

The above excerpt includes two mockery sequences: one centering on the use of stylized Filipino ‘accent’ and the other centering on the use of stylized Filipino. The first one starts with ethnicization (l. 2), leads to mockery (ll. 7-8), and closes with laughter (l. 9). On the other hand, the second one has no initial ethnicization, delivers mockery (l. 12), and closes with laughter (l. 13). Bumatai does not develop the mockery in stylized Filipino further, and he takes the voice of the Filipino character in a stylized Filipino ‘accent’ again (i.e., “and you do not stop telling daet joke I’m going to kill you:” in line 18). Note that no laugh token follows this second attempt at stylization. After the
mockery sequences, Bumatai makes a comment about DeLima’s personality (l. 19) and delivers a constructed dialogue between him and DeLima (ll. 21-29).

In summary, the comedians deploy mockery in reported speech and constructed dialogues. A mockery sequence starts with ethnicization (e.g., Filipino), is followed by stylized languages/‘accents,’ and leads to laughter. This sequence can be followed by the comedians’ further deployment of stylized languages/‘accents,’ but it does not lead to a second laugh token. Moreover, stylized languages in the mockery sequence serve as a supplementary membership categorization device because they are deployed after the initial ethnicization (e.g., Filipino) is achieved. These stylized languages are not translated into English, but the comedians and their audiences achieve intersubjectivity about their rhetorical effects due to the initial ethnicization. When the comedians and their audiences reach an agreement about the humorous effects of mockery, they jointly constitute themselves as an in-group that possesses a shared body of cultural knowledge about their multiethnic background.

In contrast with the preceding section, the next section presents cases in which the comedians and their audiences do not necessarily follow the mockery sequence discussed above; however, these deviant cases indicate that there is in fact a general pattern.

5.3.2 Deviant cases

This section illustrates three types of deviant cases: (1) delayed laughter, (2) second laugh, and (3) translation.
5.3.2.1 Delayed laughter

In the next example, Frank DeLima (FD) has just talked about his Hawaiian middle name (i.e., Napuakekauilike), and he makes an assessment about its length (l. 361). He generalizes naming practice among Native Hawaiians (ll. 362-363) and prefices an example (i.e., “names like” in line 363). He then starts to deliver a Hawaiian name as if he is chanting (l. 364).

Excerpt 7 (Primarily Local audience)

```plaintext
361 FD    but even that is not lo:ng. (.)
362 DAT   ;you no ;hawaiians when de'i get people daet tings name
363 DAT   de'i give names a mile long. names like (.)
364 DAT   me_ ke aloha maika'i pumehana no ho'i
365 DAT   with the aloha good' warm emphasis
366 DAT   'with the good, warm aloha'
367 DAT   waiana 'ole kēia lā 'oukou puka lani
368 DAT   waiana not this day you(dual) rise sky
369 DAT   '?
370 DAT   iā iā iā iā iā ;'o:e
371 DAT    DAT DAT DAT DAT DAT    you(sg)
372 DAT    'to you'
373 DAT   (.4)
374 DAT   <hula hāla:u.>
375 DAT   hula school
376 DAT   'hula school'
377 DAT   ((laughter))
```

He delivers a long utterance without being interrupted by his audience’s laughter (ll. 364-366). This stylized Hawaiian name is followed by a pause (l. 367), and DeLima restarts and closes his utterance with a Hawaiian phrase (i.e., “<hula hāla:u.>” in line 368), to which his audience responds with delayed laughter (l. 369).

While DeLima is using stylized Hawaiian, his audience does not respond to him (ll. 364-366). When he delivers the first part of the stylized Hawaiian, his audience does
not respond again, and there is a pause (l. 367). When he delivers a more stylized Hawaiian phrase, his audience responds with laughter (l. 369), which closes this mockery sequence. It should be noted that the audience treats DeLima’s action in lines 364-366 as giving an example while the audience is constituting his action in line 368 (i.e., “<hula hāla:u.”) as mockery. This Hawaiian phrase, which means “hula school,” is likely to be semantically more transparent to the audience than what precedes it, and it is unlikely to be part of someone’s name; thus, the audience displays their understanding that DeLima is simply mocking Hawaiian through uttering many Hawaiian words in a chanting style. He highlights the mockery frame by ending with this semantically more transparent Hawaiian phrase. Laughter does not occur right away, but this excerpt still meets the general sequence of mockery discussed in the previous section because it starts with ethnicization, is followed by a stylized language, and leads to laughter. Furthermore, DeLima does not translate stylized Hawaiian into English, but his audience eventually interprets it as mockery, which leads to humorous effects.

Local comedians also make use of stylized English with a Samoan ‘accent’ for effects similar to those achieved with the other stylized languages. Bo Irvine (BI) is talking about the Local turn signal, and he advises his non-Local audience that when they drive a car, they should not reject another driver’s attempt to cut in line if the driver is Samoan (l. 257).

Excerpt 8 (Primarily non-Local audience)

257 BI  do not do that to a samoan guy. [ha:].
258 Aud  [((laughter))]

Note that very few people may be conversant enough with Hawaiian to see that DeLima is doing mockery.
Irvine talks about the consequences of ignoring a turn signal by a Samoan driver (l. 259). Following this, Irvine takes the voice of this Samoan driver in stylized English with a Samoan ‘accent’ (i.e., “†a kona kaet yu” in line 261), which leads to a pause (l. 262) and draws scattered light laugh tokens from two audience members (ll. 263-264). Note that a predominantly non-Local audience does not respond collectively to Irvine’s stylized Samoan ‘accent’ that includes monophthongization (e.g., a < I), devoicing (e.g., kona < gonna), and word-final consonant fortition (e.g., kaet < catch).

Irvine continues to give voice to the same Samoan character (i.e., “you guys beta come au” in line 265), which indicates an ‘accent’ through word-final consonant deletion (i.e., “au”) but which also indicates a style-shift from a ‘heavy Samoan accent’ to a ‘light’ one that shows no g/k devoicing (i.e., “guys”). His audience, then, responds collectively to this with laughter (l. 266). Irvine continues to give voice to the Samoan

---

75 Irvine is referring to San Francisco by “the bay area,” making connections with his previous jokes about this area. Some of his audience members are from there.

76 “un-Asia”
character (i.e., “I gonna take you home.” haha. .h “honey look. I got a family from the bay area” in lines 267-268), to which the audience responds with a second collective laugh token (l. 269). Irvine deploys no more stylized Samoan English and there is no third laugh token. He talks about ‘un-Asianness’ in Hawai‘i (ll. 270-271), reinforcing a category-bound attribute of a Samoan stereotype and introducing relevant attributes (ll. 273 and 275).

Similar to Excerpt 8, Excerpt 9 shows Bo Irvine’s (BI) performance for his non-Local audience. Irvine (BI) categorizes one of the audience subgroups as Canadian. In the following excerpt, mockery develops into a much longer sequence before Irvine gets a first collective laugh token (l. 46).

Excerpt 9 (ll. 19-21 in Excerpt 20 in Chapter 3, primarily non-Local audience)

19 BI *** how many canadians?
20 Aud ((clapping))
21 BI oh. (.8) there’s a chunk of you over there. hahaha.
22 ? hahahaha
23 BI what part of canadian?
24 (.6)
25 BI canada.
26 Aud ((laughter))
27 BI £I went to public school. I’m s(h)orry£. ****. I know you are in north hahahaha. (. ) *way north*. hahaha.
29 ? ((laughter))
30 ? ontario.
31 BI ontario. (. ) alright. (.4) you folks?
32 M victoria british columbia.
33 BI BC alright. (.4) ha he’s proud of that. I lo- I love (ca-) when you guys say “eh” more than I do. (.4) ha:haha “eh?”
35 (1.4)
36 BI “it’s okay eh?”
37 M (we don’t eh).
38 BI you don’t eh? ha:haha. oh everybody every place I go in canada it’s eh. .h you you’re gonna be (great)?
39 M no. I’m gonna be bee.
41 Aud ((laughter))
42 BI “I go ;eh” ha:haha
43 ? a:haha.
44 BI “eh.”
Irvine poses a question to highlight one of the subgroups (i.e., “*** how many canadians?” in line 19), and he follows this up with a probing question about where in Canada they are from (ll. 23, 25, 27-28, 31, 33). Irvine makes an assessment about one of the audience member’s attitude (l. 33).

Following this, Irvine introduces a stereotypical pragmatic feature in stylized Canadian English (i.e., “I lo- I love (ca-) when you guys say eh more than I do” in lines 33-34) and closes his utterance by deploying this pragmatic particle to stylize his audience as Canadian (i.e., “eh?” in line 34). The mockery is not followed by laughter, but it leads to a rather long 1.4 second pause (l. 35). Irvine continues mockery as a second attempt, using this stylized pragmatic particle again (i.e., “it’s okay eh?” in line 36); however, there is no laughter, and an audience member (M) responds to Irvine with a rebuttal, asserting that people from Victoria British Columbia do not use the particle (l. 37). Irvine responds to M with an extreme case formulation, highlighting the stylized particle once again (i.e., “oh everybody every place I go in canada it’s eh” in lines 38-39).

Irvine, then, creates a word play to mock Canadian English for the third time (i.e., “you you’re gonna be (great)?” in line 39); however, there is no laugh token again, and the same audience member (M) responds with a denial (l. 40), which draws laughter from the audience (l. 41). Irvine’s fourth attempt of using the particle follows (i.e., “°I go ↑eh° ha:haha” in line 42), to which only one audience member responds (l. 43). Irvine’s fifth attempt follows (i.e., “eh.” in line 44); there is no laughter again. Irvine makes an
assertion, closing it with Mock Canadian English (i.e., “↑well, I don care how many *-doing * you guys laugh eh?”). His sixth attempt finally succeeds in drawing collective laughter from his audience (l. 46). He accounts for the many attempts he has made (i.e., “£°I’m just teasing y(h)ou£” in line 47).

The next section presents a second type of deviant case for a mockery sequence. Mockery usually leads to a single laugh token and comes to an end; however, it is sometimes followed by a second laugh token and develops into a slightly or much longer sequence.

5.3.2.2 Second laugh

The next excerpt is taken from a live stand-up comedy show by Augie T. Augie T (AT) is talking about people who get mad at him, and he ethnicizes them as Filipino. He initiates taking the voice of these people (l. 18).

Excerpt 10 (Primarily Local audience)

17  AT  but I used to like when we going eat food,
18     “come here (.). come here (.). come here (1.0) come here.
19  Aud  what do you mean (fricking) pilipino jo.” ((joke))
20  AT  “you stupid (if) pu:nny you got pilipino (jok).”
21  Aud  hahahahaha
22  AT  “it’s not pu:nny.
23  Aud  hahahahaha
24  AT  what do you mean that ** pilipino jok.
25     (if) you stupid. you STU:PID.
26  AT  it’s not punny.” ((AT’s own voice)) (and “this is) funny (.).
27     it’s funny. why are you all get mad.”
28  Aud  hahahahaha

Augie T explains a situation (i.e., he went to eat out somewhere) in line 17 and gives voice to a Filipino character in stylized English with an ‘accent’ (e.g., “come here (.)
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come here (. ) come here (1.0) come here. what do you mean (fricking) pilipino jo.” in lines 18-19). His audience responds to this mockery with laughter (l. 20). Augie T continues to voice the same Filipino character (i.e., “you stupid (if) puːnny you got pilipino (jok.”). His audience responds with a second laugh token (l. 22). It should be noted, however, that even though he continues to voice the Filipino character (ll. 23-26), no third laugh token follows, and the mockery sequence comes to an end. Interestingly, when Augie T switches back from the mockery voice to his own voice to respond to the Filipino character (i.e., “(and “this is) funny (. ) it’s funny. why are you all get mad.” in lines 26-27, switching is indicated by the f/p alternation), his audience responds with laughter (l. 28), which indicates that his audience is orienting to the relevance of the statement or the content (i.e., “Why are you all get mad?”), not to the relevance of mockery.

In the next excerpt, Augie T (AT) is catching up with his audience, asking them what they had been doing. He reminds his audience of a Samoan joke and retells it, which leads to a long mockery sequence with a second laugh token (l. 55). Augie T voices two characters: Sunga and her gymnastics coach. The coach addresses Sunga (l. 51), and Sunga responds to her coach later (l. 57).

Excerpt 11 (Primarily Local audience)

39  AT  .h aːn six years ago: .h you know what was happening (at) the same time?
40  ( .8)
41  AT  da oːlympics.
42  Aud  ((laughter))
43  AT  an stːill (. ) noː samoan gymnastic team. wasap? ((what’s up))
44  Aud  ((laughter))
45  AT  wher(h)e .h where’s the samoan gymnastic team? I wanted to do the samoan gymnastics team. come oːn give me a samoan girl on a pole vault. daes what I wanna see.
Augie T prefaces a Samoan joke (i.e., “an st↑ill (. ) no: samoan gymnastic team. wasap?” in line 44). His audience responds to him with laughter to display their understanding that this is some of his old material, and that Samoans are stereotypically one of the last ethnic groups that would become gymnasts (l. 45). He continues ethnicization by referring to one of the characters that appear in his joke (i.e., “wher(h)e .h where’s the samoan gymnastic team? I wanted to do the samoan gymnastics team. come o:n give me a samoan girl on a pole vault. daets what I wanna see” in lines 46-48).

Following this, Augie T initiates taking the voice of a Samoan gymnastics coach instructing a Samoan girl (Sunga) in stylized English with a Samoan ‘accent’ (i.e., “sunga (. ) sunga (1.0) graef ((grab)) da pole” in line 51), to which his audience responds with laughter (i.e., first laugh token in line 52). He repeats the same line (i.e., “sunga graef da pole” in line 53) and gives more instructions (i.e., “an den chop all da pole. jas chop all da oda pole” in lines 53-54), which is followed by a second laugh token (l. 55). Augie T
then follows this up with further instructions (i.e., “an den you fly an duck yua bāck ova dea. okei? sunga. (.4) take da pole” in lines 56-57); however, there is no third laugh token.

Augie T changes footing and starts a constructed dialogue to take the voice of another character, Sunga, who responds to her coach in stylized English with an ‘accent’ (i.e., “oke (.2) oke: (.2) I don like da pole. it’s kainda ha:;” in lines 57-58), which is followed by laughter (i.e., third laugh token in line 59). Augie T’s stylization receives a rare third laugh token because he expands the mockery sequence by changing footing and delivering a constructed dialogue in stylized Samoan English between Sunga and her coach. Augie T continues to voice Sunga (i.e., “I’m so: sked to go to .h I (tawt) ****** ouke°. I was supposed to get to da” in lines 60-61), but he receives no laugh token. When Augie T performs Sunga who started her gymnastics performance in panic (l. 61), his audience responds with laughter (l. 62); however, this is not a laugh token in response to Stylized Samoan English.

It is implied that Sunga falls on the ground (i.e., “PA. [oḷa]” in line 63), which is constituted partly through stylized Samoan (i.e., “[oḷa]”). The audience displays their non-understanding of this stylization because after a micro pause (l. 64), they respond with light laughter (l. 65). Note that the stylized Samoan word is not translated into English even after the audience displays their non-understanding, as a mockery sequence does not usually involve translation.

Finally, Augie T voices Sunga in Hawai‘i Creole (i.e., “da stick wen brok”). Note, however, that this is constituted as stylized Samoan English, which is responded to with laughter (l. 67). He laughs, makes a comment about his performance, and closes the sequence of mockery (ll. 68-69).
Stylized English with a Samoan ‘accent’ is constituted through various semiotic devices: the f/b alternation (e.g., graef < grab), monophthongization (e.g., ova < over), despirantization (e.g., da < the), the alternation of /r/ into a low back vowel (e.g., yua < your), the /rl deletion (e.g., sked < scared), a Hawai‘i Creole auxiliary verb (e.g., wen), and the fortition of a diphthong (e.g., haːi < high). Many of these devices could also be interpreted as Pidgin features, thereby constituting the characters in the above excerpt as second language speakers of Samoan descent. Local comedians often assemble Pidgin features into a ‘Hyper Pidgin’ that is a highly stylized language. Augie T voices Sunga through this extremely performative language, just as I showed in the previous chapter that he voiced his Pidgin personality (Excerpt 6c), a braDa on the Big Island (Excerpt 7d), and a collective voice (Excerpt 7a). ‘Hyper Pidgin’ indicates not only that Augie T is not speaking in his regular voice but that he is producing the collective Local voice.

Second laughs are rare in mockery sequences, and they appear only when the comedians expand the mockery, for instance, by means of constructed dialogue; a rare third laugh token can be found in an expanded mockery sequence. The next section presents another deviant case that involves translation, which does not usually co-occur with mockery sequences.

5.3.2.3 Translation

In the next excerpt, Augie T (AT) changes his topic from the transit system (ll. 156-157) to public education in Hawai‘i (l. 159). He implies that Hawai‘i students complain about poor facilities in public schools (i.e., air conditioning), and he also implies that their complaint is unreasonable because children in Africa live under even more severe
conditions. Augie T mocks both students in Hawai‘i and children in Africa, but my focus is on the latter who are ethnicized through ‘stylized African.’

Excerpt 12 (Primarily Local audience)

156 AT unbelievable a? ! a? five point six billion dollars. (.) put om. let’s go. (.4) give im a £chr(h)ein£. ((train))
158 (.)
159 AT when da ki:ds in awa ((our)) (. public education system need ea ((air)) condition. (. (students)) “hot hot. (. I cannot stu:dy. (. I need ea co:n. I’m hot.” eva beach like ka-
162 campbell high school .h “we cannot tingk. hot.” (.4) you tingk daet kids in africa are tingking about daet?
163 Aud ((laughter))
164 AT £(they’re not) t(h)ingking about daet£. (dea going)
165 “teach me how fo read.” .h “[rrrrrrrr]”
166 Aud ((laughter))
167 AT “I want to learn how fo read. [rrrrrrrr]”
168 now we got “(we’re) ho:t (. we’re ho:t.”
169 Aud ((laughter))
170 AT holy smoke. (.2) we came in tent. ((tenth)) tent. .h ;listen (. we had a top ten with high school kids graduating. h
172 ? ((laughter))
173 AT how can it be we we like da <forty seventh state> (. onna bottom.
174 Aud ((light laughter))
175 AT as far as education what is it like ** sixth from the bottom?
176 what is it like sixth?
177 Aud ((light laughter))
178 AT ¡onli fifty states. we gotta see.
179 Aud ((light laughter))

Augie T jokingly states that people in the city and county of Honolulu should support the mayor (Muﬁ Hannemann; see Excerpt 10 in Chapter 4) who proposes a new public transit system (ll. 156-157). Augie T then changes the topic, implying the irrationality of financing the new transit system while public schools lack air conditioning (ll. 159-160). He takes the voice of students in Hawai‘i (i.e., “hot hot. (. I cannot stu:dy. (. I need ea co:n. I’m hot”). He introduces a place name and a school name, makes a comment about these students (ll. 161-162), and gives voice to these students again (l. 162).
Following this, Augie T initiates a new mockery sequence by posing a rhetorical question in which he introduces another category (i.e., “you tingk daet kids in africa are tingking about daet?” in lines 162-163), to which his audience responds with laughter (l. 164). Augie T answers his own question with laughing voice (l. 165) and deploys stylized ‘African English’ that is in fact in Pidgin (i.e., “teach me how fo read” in line 166), and follows this up with trilled r’s or stylized ‘African’ (i.e., “[rrrrrrrr]” in line 166), which is followed by laughter (l. 167). Augie T repeats the stylized ‘African English’ and stylized ‘African’ to further ethnicize these students (l. 168), but he receives no second laugh; the mockery sequence comes to an end. Augie T goes back to describe Hawai‘i students (ll.169). Augie T refers to the results of a nation-wide examination and jocularly implies that Hawai‘i students do not deserve air conditioning.

Note that the sequence of stylized ‘African English’ and stylized ‘African’ is constituted as translation humor because the latter (i.e., [rrrrrrrr]) is unintelligible by itself. Stylized ‘African’ is semantically more transparent in the sense that it is preceded by stylized ‘African English.’ However, as discussed earlier, the comedians and their audiences achieve intersubjectivity about mockery without translation. Translation humor becomes funny because it translates the obvious. Augie T constructs a sequence of these stylized languages to further ethnicize children in Africa, and he does this by deploying stylized ‘African English’ prior to ‘African,’ or a semiotic resource that is not part of a Local indexical system for stylizing ethnic groups in Hawai‘i.

77 Using Pidgin to represent stylized African English is not conventional mockery because Pidgin is not used here to voice a prototypical Pidgin speaker. Mock languages usually describe their respective ethnic groups; for instance, Mock Spanish is used to mock Latinos. Auer (1998) points out that it is not always the language ideology behind the language but the switch that matters. It is also interesting that a switch from English to Pidgin is used for Samoans and Africans, but not Filipinos or Japanese.
In summary, mockery has three types of deviant cases that are delayed laughter, second laugh, and translation. Two of three excerpts on delayed laughter are from a comedy show for a predominantly non-Local audience. Bo Irvine’s use of stylized Samoan English receives delayed laughter (Excerpt 8) while his use of stylized Canadian English receives much more delayed laughter (Excerpt 9). Performing in front of his predominantly Local audience, Frank DeLima uses stylized Hawaiian; the delayed laughter shows that his audience modifies their interpretation of his stylized Hawaiian from being an act of giving an example to being an act of mockery (Excerpt 7).

The second type of deviation is a rare second laugh with which an audience responds to mockery. Augie T’s use of stylized Filipino English receives a second laugh; however, even when mockery is followed by a second laugh token, it is unlikely to be followed by a third laugh token (Excerpt 10). Against this observation, Excerpt 11 shows that Augie T’s stylized Samoan English is followed by a third laugh token, but this is because he has expanded a mockery sequence through a constructed dialogue in stylized Samoan English. Even his expanded mockery receives no fourth laugh.

The third and last type of deviant mockery is the translation of stylized languages. Translation rarely precedes or follows mockery, but Augie T constructs translation humor by using stylized ‘African English’ before stylized ‘African’ (Excerpt 12) even though the mockery is interpretable without translation.

5.4 Discussion
Stylized languages other than Pidgin and English contributed to generating linguistic heterogeneity in Local comedy. These stylized languages or ‘accents’ appeared in
reported speech and constructed dialogues as a membership categorization device for
ethnicization of comedians, audience members, and comedy characters. A mockery
sequence started with initial ethnicization, was followed by the deployment of stylized
languages/accents, and led to laughter to close. The first sequence was sometimes
followed by another mockery sequence, developing into a longer sequence that involved
more stylized languages/‘accents.’ I showed that Local comedians and their audiences
achieved intersubjectivity about these stylized languages; based on this, I argued that they
were designed not to be translated into English. This leads to the following discussion
about the classification of stylizing practices.

The previous research on stylized languages has assumed two kinds of stylization:
‘mockery’ (e.g., Hill, 2005) and ‘crossing’ (e.g., Rampton, 1998). Mockery such as mock
Spanish is a form of racism while crossing is subversive linguistic practice among the
youth. These terms become confusing, for instance, when a British youth of Pakistani
descent deploys stylized English with a Hindi ‘accent’ (Rampton, 1998) or when a
Korean American comedian, Margaret Cho, uses stylized English with a Korean ‘accent’
(Chun, 2004) because there is a sociolinguistic correspondence between a stylized
language/‘accent’ and ethnicity. It becomes a theoretical muddle to determine whether
one is engaged in mockery or crossing; pursuing this distinction is not productive. 78
Moreover, one might make a distinction between stylized English with an ‘accent’ and
stylized languages.

78 There is an ideological level that may justify having two terms, if one term describes a subversive act as
empowering and the other term an act of stereotyping as derogatory.
The analyses of mockery sequences in this chapter demonstrated (1) that there was no difference between ‘mockery’ and ‘crossing’ and (2) that there was no difference between stylized English with an ‘accent’ and stylized languages, either, in terms of their interactional achievement; that is, this chapter’s excerpts indicated a general pattern in a mockery sequence in which the use of stylized languages co-occurred with initial ethnicization, a first laugh token, and a closing without translation into English. The deviant cases also showed that they followed this pattern. The observation of this general mockery pattern brings us to the next point.

Why do Local comedians deploy mockery in their performances-in-interaction if it assures them of only one laugh token? In other words, if mockery leads to a single laugh token, it seems an inefficient interactional resource because the comedians’ institutional goal is to make people laugh (at least more than once). As seen above, mockery rarely led to a second laugh token unless the comedians deployed additional performative strategies such as constructed dialogues. I argue, however, that mockery is a powerful performative tool for the comedians because it assures them of laughter. I showed some deviant cases where the comedians received delayed laughter, but however delayed it was, the comedians always received laughter; there was no case where the comedians ended up receiving no laughter. The comedians recycled these short mockery sequences to draw more laughter from their audience before initiating another topic.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter examined the deployment of mockery in Local comedy, focusing on its interactional sequence. Mockery followed a general pattern, and it demonstrated that
assuming a distinction between mockery and crossing or assuming a distinction between stylized languages and stylized ‘accents’ was interactionally irrelevant. Mockery co-occurred with ethnicization and laughter, but it did not involve English translation because it was situated, and the audience displayed their understanding of the stylized languages other than Pidgin and English and of stylized English with an ‘accent.’ Because mockery assured the comedians of laughter, it became a powerful performative tool. Furthermore, it served as a membership categorization device because it constituted a Local comedy community when the participants displayed their understanding of stylized languages/‘accents.’

The next chapter examines interpretive frames of Local comedy, based on the data generated through interviews with Local comedians and through focus group sessions with Local comedy audience members.
CHAPTER 6. INTERPRETIVE FRAMES

6.1 Introduction

This chapter is about how Local people make sense of Local comedy, getting into their accounting practice. In other words, this chapter investigates people’s meta-performance talk and extends studies on intertextuality into a more explicitly interactional context. Both comedy shows and the meta-performance talk constitute a site where, I argue, the participants share a common orientation to cultural signs and become connected to one another—and even to other members that they may not know. Because the interview and focus group participants talk about their interpretation of Local humor, this activity inevitably involves intertextuality (i.e., every text, including any statement or utterance, displays links with previous as well as synchronic texts [Blommaert, 2005]). For instance, there are many occasions on which the comedians and the focus group participants display a retrospective orientation that helps them to manage their talk. The retrospective orientation is a type of projection (i.e., making normative connections) that interactants display. I argue that interactants resort to the act of projection flexibly to manage their talk and jointly achieve intersubjectivity.

In her discussion of the social circulation of media discourse in popular culture, Spitulnik rightly points out that “we learn little about the practices of consumption and even less about what people are saying to each other about their experiences of consumption” (Spitulnik, 2001, p. 97), and claims that the recycling of media discourse serves as a crucial component in the formation of community.79 I take a membership

---

79 Spitulnik’s insight is applicable to the consumption of Room Service.
categorization analysis approach (Sacks, 1979) as my chief analytical tool and examine the emergence of membership categories in interviews and focus groups as talk-in-interaction. In addition, based on Zimmerman (1998), I distinguish three kinds of identity: portable (e.g., Asian), situational (e.g., interviewer), and discursive (e.g., white-washed Asian).

Reception research often uses interviews or focus groups as a data generating method. My use of this method is less systematic than Gumperz’s (1982, pp. 136-140) elicitation on particular exchanges such as question-answer pairs in interethnic communication; it focuses more on entire passages and is designed to generate explicit references to or implicit projections of a network of categories and normative expectations that constitutes culturally-specific knowledge about Hawai‘i comedy. In this sense, my procedure is closer to an approach described by Rampton (1995, p. 352), but it has a stronger orientation to generating a network of categories and normative expectations that would be deployed across everyday and highly performative contexts.

As I mentioned in the data analysis section of Chapter 2, I argue that the ‘what’ and ‘how’ aspects are components of meaning-making and cannot be separated (Baker, 2003; Edwards, 1991; Gubrium & Holstein, 2002; Roulston, 2006). Taking a sequential analysis approach to interview and focus group data (Edwards & Stokoe, 2004; Wilkinson, 2004, 2008) will reveal that categories are not “preformed” but “performed” in situ (Puchta & Potter, 2004, p. 21). I argue that when the participants construct their versions of reality, they orient to the relevance of social structures, for instance, among themselves and even other members of the same category. To illustrate these points, I examine the interpretive process of membership categories (Sacks, 1979) among Local
comedians and comedy audiences, interweaving interpretive meta-performance talk of these two groups.

Hawai‘i comedy constitutes a multilingual, multicultural, and multiracial niche of identity management within broader political-economic dimensions of media circulation; therefore, this study also contributes to the discussion of crosscultural membership categorization in mass mediation. This chapter is about how media products such as comedians and comedy clips can effectively be ‘stance objects’ (Du Bois, 2007) towards which interviewees and focus group participants orient and which they deploy to construct personal and collective identities. The object of stance is “what the evaluation is about” (Du Bois, 2007, p. 149); and it can be knowledge, emotion, or membership categories.

This chapter poses three research questions: (1) How do the interview and focus group participants make sense of Local comedy? (2) How do the participants talk about multivocality and code in Local comedy? and (3) How do the participants show sensitivity to intertextual links with previous or relevant media discourses? My objective is not to generalize about what Local people think about Local comedy; rather, I consider focus group participants as members of a community who understand a certain type of comedy in Hawai‘i. They may not only understand, but even enjoy this type of comedy partly because I recruited them under the two conditions stated earlier. Nevertheless, I investigate how they construct their attitudes—positive, negative, or both—in focus groups as talk-in-interaction. My goal is to illuminate the actual process of intertextuality through analyzing the interaction in focus groups and interviews and identifying how the participants performatively make ideological connections between different contexts. The
participants make intertextual connections by deploying various membership categories or bundles of semiotic signs with historically and culturally-specific meanings. A summary of the focus group participants’ backgrounds is given below.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Excerpts</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6, 13</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H-Mom</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hawaiian, Native American, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaimana</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Filipino, Hawaiian, Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michi</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Okinawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hawaiian, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>Angel</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese, Hawaiian, Portuguese, White, Spanish, Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2, 11</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kekoa</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chinese, Hawaiian, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristy</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese, Hawaiian, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1, 3, 12</td>
<td>Akemi</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese, Hawaiian, Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese, Okinawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judee</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese, Filipino, Portuguese, White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Interpretive frames

This section provides a shared interpretive repertoire (Wetherell, 1998) to show the interpretive processes at work. I have carried out CA/MCA analysis and found the

---

80 All names are pseudonyms.

81 The survey listed the following ethnic categories: Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Okinawan, Portuguese, White (i.e., European/Haole), and Other. Based on ethnographic knowledge, Portuguese was listed as an independent category from White, as Portuguese are often treated separately in Hawai‘i because they served as lunas (foremen) in the plantation era.

82 H-Mom provided two specific categories for Other and wrote “Native American” and “Spanish.”

83 T provided no specific category for Other.

84 Katie provided two specific categories for Other and wrote “Spanish” and “Native American.”
following results that helped me see how participants performatively materialize linguistic and racial ideologies through shared orientations to Local humor: shared roots and multiraciality as culturally-specific repertoires (6.2.1); stereotypes as unharmful topics (6.2.2); affective comedy (6.2.3); and Pidgin as the Local voice (6.2.4).

A repertoire of interpretive frames is a system of values and categories that members of a community use to achieve their ideological reality. This system of meaning-making emerges in talk-in-interaction when the participants of focus groups and interviews discuss their interpretations. These participants also introduce relevant categories and values and performatively develop them further through interaction. The data in this chapter only represent a portion of the data I recorded, but I selected these excerpts because they show the interactional construction of a collection of membership categories and because they also show ideological and intertextual links of such membership categories and category-bound predicates that emerge in interviews and focus groups. I combine focus groups with interviews with comedians because both kinds of data constitute the actual process of interpretation in which highly performative Hawai‘i comedy is discussed, decontextualized, and recontextualized. In other words, interviews and focus groups are sites where codes and membership categories in Hawai‘i comedy become interpretable and are re-interpreted through being interwoven with ideological webs of connection with past, current, and future texts and talk. These ideological webs mediate the body of a shared interpretive repertoire about multivocal humor that involves language, interaction, and social structure.
6.2.1 Shared roots and multiraciality as shared repertoires

Excerpt 1 (ll. 1-57) is taken from a focus group that has four participants: Akemi, Jill, Judee, and Mary. After the discussion of the fourth clip, an excerpt from Augie T’s stand-up comedy show (See Chapter 2), I (TF) asked the participants, “Who do you think would not be able to understand this kind of comedy?” The participants discussed this question, and when their discussion was over, I asked, “Who do you think would dislike this kind of comedy?” Instead of answering this question, the participants went back to the previous question. The excerpt starts when Judee responds to my question by posing her own question to Mary.

Of interest in this excerpt is how the participants make sense of the humor by drawing on knowledge about ethnic relations in Hawai‘i. The participants engineer Barack Obama as belonging to a social category of Local who can appreciate a certain type of humor, thereby also treating themselves as such because they share the same attributes.

Excerpt 1a “He is a Local boy”

01 Judee you think <“blacks would understand it”>?
02 Mary m::: I- * <bla:cks>,
03 I get- I don’t (.) <have many black friends>
04 and [I just don’t knoW
05 Judee [yeah me too
06 Mary what they find (.) [humorous?
07 Judee [funny. fu- funny or,
08 (.2)
09 Mary although my (.) husband did °go to school
10 with Barack Obama:°.
11 TF uh huh.
12 All ((laughter))
Judee introduces a new membership category (i.e., “blacks”) that has not been mentioned by anyone in the group, including me. Her question about this category turns out to be a trouble source because Mary initiates her response with great difficulty in line 2. Rather than answering Judee’s question right away, Mary states that she does not have many Black friends. She disqualifies herself from providing an answer for Judee’s question in line 4. Judee aligns with Mary in line 5 by revealing that she does not have many Black friends, either. A short pause in line 8 is followed by Mary’s utterance in line 9, where she provides an anecdote that even though she does not have many Black friends, her husband is acquainted with someone who belongs to this category. I produce a minimal response in line 11, and the laughter of all the participants except me in line 12 treats Mary’s utterance that is closed with the introduction of the proper noun (i.e., “Barack Obama”) as accountable. Mary treats this proper noun as referring to someone who went to school with her husband and who is classified into a group of “blacks” or “black friends.” Thus, she creates the possibility that her utterance about them (e.g., “and [I just don’t know what they find (.) [humorous?’]”) may not be ‘true,’ given what the participants would know about Barack Obama as a public figure who became president-elect a few weeks before this focus group session. In the next excerpt, Mary accounts for the introduction of “Barack Obama” in her telling.

Excerpt 1b

13 Mary uhm (.4) but even him (.)
14 TF uh huh.
15 Mary being you know,
16 well he’s like you know white and black,

85 Note that Local ethnic humor seems to lack mockery of Blacks. This might be because of political reasons or it might be because of the low profile of Blacks in Hawai‘i.
Mary restarts her telling about “him” (i.e., “Barack Obama”) in line 13. She treats him as someone distant from her by saying “even him.” She modifies her interpretation of the ethnicity of “Barack Obama” in line 16, re-categorizing him as “white and black.” Mary briefly describes his life history (i.e., “being raised here”) in a way that enables her to say that “we have so much in common.” She refers to herself as “we,” thereby identifying herself as a member of a group of people who are from “here” and “can understand him.” Producing a series of hedges towards the end of line 17, Mary accounts for what is “so much in common” (l. 18) by stating that even Barack Obama “has the ties to Hawaii” in line 26 and that people in Hawai‘i “just feel so connected to him.” Mary specifies category-bound activities (i.e., “going to the beach” and “smoking paka”) in lines 31 and

86 Paka or pakalōlō is a term for marijuana used in Hawai‘i.

87 Mary’s utterance in lines 23-24 (i.e., “not to bring this into a political (.4) kind of situation”) orients to the politicized debates about Obama’s racial identity during the presidential campaign, and so is evidence that at least Mary sees the ongoing talk as linked with such prior media discourses. However, this could also be her orienting to a norm that political discussions are inappropriate for a discussion on Local humor, which is how the focus group was framed.
32, all of which she claims Barack Obama did in the past. She asserts in line 34 that he is “a Local boy,” a category to which the preceding activities are connected. By making Obama a Local, and claiming common ground with Obama, Mary achieves categorizing herself as a Local, too, because she mentions repeatedly that “we” have so much in common with him. The next sequence begins with a question that I ask to the participants.

Excerpt 1c
36 TF do you think uh (.8) Barack Obama
37 would understand this kind of (.) kind of (.) comedy?
38 Mary yeah.
39 Akemi yes.
40 Judee yeah he would.
41 Jill I do.

Building upon Mary’s categorization of Barack Obama as a Local boy, I pose a closed question about his ability to understand Local comedy in lines 36 and 37. All the participants respond to this question one after another with affirmative answers in lines 38-41.

Excerpt 1d
42 (.4)
43 Mary he was here long enough you know?
44 he, he, you know? (.6)
45 he did all these things. you know,
46 hanging out with his buddies,
47 and every[thing going surfing and doing whatevers,
48 TF [uh huh.
49 (.6)
50 Mary so; yeah. (.4) he can relate?
51 TF uh huh.
52 Mary you know?

After a 0.4 second pause, Mary takes the floor in line 43 and starts to account for her response in the previous excerpt. She states that Barack Obama lived in Hawai’i long
enough (to become a Local boy), and that he did the category-bound activities for being a Local. She closes this sequence in Hawai‘i Creole (i.e., “whatevers” in line 47). After a 0.6 second pause in line 49, Mary restarts a closing sequence in line 50 (i.e., “so,”) and concludes that “he can relate” with a rising intonation, finishing her assertion of why Obama should be able to appreciate the jokes. In the next excerpt, I ask a confirmation question about Mary’s interpretation.

Excerpt 1e

| 53 | TF | does everybody agree? |
| 54 | Akemi | [uh huh. |
| 55 | Judee | [yeah. [because he came from here he would know. |
| 56 | Jill | [uh huh. |
| 57 | Mary | uh huh. |

In line 53, I ask a closed, confirmation question to all the participants as ratified listeners. Everyone except Judee provides only a minimal response. Judee provides a minimal response in line 55 and continues on to account for her response. She highlights Obama’s being from Hawai‘i by saying “because he came from here,” which is followed by her paraphrasing of Mary’s formulation (l. 50) as “he would know” (l. 55). In the end, Judee has answered her own question posed to Mary in line 1.

Excerpt 1 showed that categories are reflexively connected with one another. First, “blacks,” a category that was introduced by one of the participants as a response to my question, led to a series of categories and proper nouns that included “black friends,” “Barack Obama,” “white and black,” and “a Local boy.” Second, “being raised here,” a category-bound attribute, also led to a series of category-bound predicates that included “have so much in common,” “has the ties to Hawai‘i,” “did all those things,” “going to the beach and smoking paka,” “was here long enough,” “hanging out with his buddies
and everything,” “going surfing and doing whatevers,” and finally “came from here.”

I would like to make four points here; first, four participants (Akemi, Jill, Judee, Mary) discursively constructed the meaning of being Local by assembling a series of category-bound predicates among which “being raised here” (l. 17) turned out to be the most crucial. This can be clearly seen when Judee answered her own question initially posed to Mary by responding to my last question, reformulating Mary’s account about Barack Obama, and associating place with epistemic authority (i.e., “yeah. because he came from here he would know” in line 55). The participants constructed an unlikely stance object into a Local, thereby showing that Localness is not static and pre-given, but it is situated and per-formed in the particular context of a focus group session.

Second, Obama’s racial heritage is part of a larger media discourse that emerged prior to and during the presidential campaign; for instance, a newspaper headline reads that “Obama’s Appeal to Blacks Remains an Open Question” (Fletcher, 2007). Media stories such as this one include semiotic resources that circulate in society and are readily available for the focus group participants. These stories were invoked when Mary attempted to make sense of categories such as “black” or “Local” as well as of Local humor. This illustrates how interpretation of media discourses takes place in the context of other such discourses, pointing to the significance of intertextuality. 88

The four participants (Akemi, Jill, Judee, Mary) jointly constructed the meaning of being Local by assembling a series of category-bound predicates among which “being raised here” (l. 17) turned out to be the most crucial attribute. The participants treated

88 Another analysis would be that Mary referred to Obama’s multiethnicity because of the awareness that people in Hawai‘i have towards the hapa identity. Many mainlanders would overlook his multiethnic status and simply refer to him as Black. But in Hawai‘i the prevalence of hapa people and multiethnic groups likely makes it more relevant.
locality, rather than ethnicity, as a defining factor for being Local, thereby jointly 
engineering Barack Obama as a self or a social category. It should be noted that they did 
not construct Obama as an individual but they treated him as a social category of Local 
by assembling its category-bound actions and attributes.

Moreover, when the participants depicted Obama’s Localness, Judee indexed a 
sense of removal, too, with respect to Obama, by stating “he came from here” (l. 55). In 
other words, Judee could have said “he is from here” instead. Both formulations imply 
that he has a tie with Hawai‘i; however, the alternative formulation would have indicated 
that he is still in close proximity to the islands while the original formulation indicated 
that their relationship is more distant; that is, Judee’s formulation invoked another layer 
of the social norm about locality that being Local also demands remaining in close 
proximity to the islands.

In the next excerpt, focus group participants (Craig, Kekoa, Kristy, Sarah) 
introduce multiracial stance as a shared repertoire in the discursive construction of 
Localness or doing being Local.

Excerpt 2 “We get a little bit of everything”

049 TF  so: given that (. ) who do you think (. 2)
050     would not be able to: understand (.)
051     this (. ) kind of comedy?
052 Craig easy. for non Local.
053 Sarah non [Local.]
054 Kristy [yeah.
055 Kekoa non Local.
056 Craig immigrant or mainland.
057 Kekoa [yeah yeah.
058 Kristy [people that just uh ado- adopt to
059 our: uhm (. 4) our culture.
060 TF uh huh. o[kay.
061 Kekoa [and we have
062 Kristy so many cultures here= that (. 2)
063 =uh huh.
Craig responds with an evaluation of my question (i.e., “easy. for non Local.” in line 52).

While Sarah and Kekoa repeat the category that Craig has introduced (ll. 53 and 55),
Kristy aligns with Craig (l. 54). Craig provides a subcategory of the first one (i.e.,
“immigrant or mainland” in line 56). Kekoa aligns with Craig (l. 57), and Kristy accounts
for the subcategory (ll. 58-59). Responding to Kristy, Kekoa starts the taxonomy within
“our culture” (l. 61). He shows an orientation to a past reference (i.e., “like (.) we said earlier” in line 64) and characterizes Hawai‘i as “a melting po:t” (l. 65). Kekoa accounts for this category (i.e., “we get a little bit of everything.” in line 69), and upgrades this attribution into “what’s great about (.) living here” (l. 70). Kekoa keeps accounting for the idea of having multiple ethnic heritages (ll. 72-74 and 77). Sarah continues to describe Hawai‘i (l. 80), referring to a way of negotiation and its uniqueness (i.e., “we have a unique (.) wa:y of negotiat-ing each other.”). She accounts for this unique way of negotiation by referring back to multiraciality (ll. 83, 84, and 86). She presents this practice as a ‘norm’ (ll. 88-91, 93, 94, 96, 98) and concludes that it will not be understood by outsiders (ll. 99-100). Both Kekoa and Craig align with her (ll. 101-102).

The next excerpt is taken from another focus group (Akemi, Jill, Judee, Mary).

The participants jointly construct the ethnoscape of the continental United States.

Excerpt 3a “I have so many nationalities in me”
123 Judee [but on the mainland it’s mostly .h
124  TF  uh huh.
125 Judee what (.) black (.) white (.) [a:nd
126 Mary [yeah.
127 (.5)
128 Judee **
129 Mary [lati:no:,
130 ?  *****
131 Judee yeah you’re just (.) you[’re just-  
132 Mary [red neck?

Judee contrasts the ethnic diversity in Hawai‘i with that on the mainland (i.e., “but on the mainland it’s mostly .h what (.) black (.) white”). Although Mary adds two more categories on the mainland (i.e., “lati:no:” and “red neck”), this potential challenge to Judee’s formulation is not taken up. Mary and Judee do not have to confront each other
as long as it is agreed that Hawai‘i is different from the mainland, whether that is due to ethnic diversity or to ethnic demographics. In other words, the participants can resort to various semiotic resources as long as they can accomplish intersubjectivity about the differences between the two areas. Following is Mary’s account for her multiraciality; she asserts that her multiraciality allows her to see humor in Local comedy.

Excerpt 3b

((ll. 133-139 are omitted))

140 Mary [and also you know what?
141 TF we’re more uhm (.2) we’re all (. ) basically:
142 well (. ) >for the most part interracial<.
143 Mary uh huh.
144 TF we have so many
145 Mary I have so many nationalities _ in me.
146 TF [you know?
147 Mary [uh huh.
148 Mary it’s it’s hard just to you know:
149 Mary I- I can see the humor in every: you know the filipi:no side, the portuguese side, you know the
150 TF [uh huh.
151 Mary [.h yeah. (. ) so (. ) I think we’re more: ;open
152 TF because we are
153 Mary uh huh.
154 Mary like (. ) international people.

Mary adds one more difference between Hawai‘i and the mainland, and begins to formulate a shared attribution among people in Hawai‘i (ll. 141, 142, and 144). She does not really take an assertive stance here, which is shown in her use of pauses and reformulations. Following this, she switches from the first person plural pronoun “we” to the first person singular pronoun “I” (l. 145) and implies that she can find humor in every ethnic joke that deals with her ethnic heritage (ll. 145, 146, and 148-150). She switches back into “we” (l. 152), generalizing and transforming her individual experience into a collective one. When Mary has trouble figuring out the ‘right’ epistemological stance
towards ethnic diversity in Hawai‘i, she switches into “I” to describe an assured case, and then switches back into “we” to rhetorically present a generalized case based on the individual experience.

Thus far, I have discussed how the focus group participants deployed Localness and multiraciality as topics to account for the issue of entitlement of producing and consuming Local comedy (Excerpts 2 and 3). They also talked about Local comedy to make sense of their Local and multiracial identities. Next, I analyze excerpts where the comedians make comments about Local comedy. Augie T asserts that non-Locals have little knowledge about Hawai‘i, thereby reclaiming the entitlement to define what Local comedy is (Excerpt 4). Meanwhile, Andy Bumatai makes a meta-performance comment about the nature of Local comedy as an exclusive club (Excerpt 5). Augie T talks about his experience of going to an audition in the mainland where he was mistreated as “not Hawaii enough.” He recontextualizes this experience in the interview and attempts the reinterpretation and reentitlement of being Local.

Excerpt 4a: Augie T “How can I not be Hawaii enough?”

01 AT what happened was I got graded.
02 TF (.3)
03 AT uh huh
04 TF half of da judges were like “I love your energy”.
05 (.h
06 TF [uh huh
07 AT da oda ((other)) half was like (.3)
08 “why don’t you do don ho tings”.
09 TF uh huh
10 AT “you’re from hawaii”.
11 TF hm
12 (.1.2)
13 AT ;you ;see (.2) diz people

---

89 Don Ho was an iconic Hawai‘i singer and entertainer (1930-2007). His most famous songs include *Tiny Bubbles, Pearly Shells*, and *I’ll Remember You*. 
While narrating his story, Augie T describes contrastive assessments made by two groups of judges at the audition. One group of judges gave him a positive evaluation while the other critiqued him for not doing what they thought represents Hawai‘i (ll. 4, 7, 8, 10).

Augie T criticizes the latter group of judges because, according to Augie T, they told him what to do even though they know nothing about Hawai‘i. Following this, he reformulates it and treats doing “Don Ho tings” (l. 8) as something that is very limited in terms of talking about Hawai‘i; that is, due to his fame, a Don Ho reference is a very non-Local way of seeing Hawai‘i. Augie T and I jointly assemble relevant categories (i.e., hula, surfing). Augie T gives voice to the judges in reported speech and highlights their limited knowledge. He makes reference to the other group of judges who gave a positive evaluation again (l. 23), making a contrast once again. Following is a description of the same event that is constructed from a slightly different perspective. Augie T talks about two contradictory assessments of his performance in this excerpt.

Excerpt 4b

25  TF  uh huh
26  AT  so: (.6) I went back to my room (.5) I went (1.1)
27  TF  “I will neva eva win in dis situation”.
28  TF  uh huh
29  AT  “so I would do: (.)
30  TF  what augie tingk (.5) is best fo augie”.

213
Augie T delivers a reported thought, asserting that if he is being put in an unfairly difficult position, he should do what works best for himself because that will benefit his performance (ll. 26, 27, 29, 30). He reiterates the criticism he received (i.e., “because I got criticized being da Local guy”), and reformulates part of it into “being too hawaii” (l. 48). The word Hawai‘i is used here to mean being Local. Following this, he uses the same word for a different meaning (i.e., “and I got criticized (.4) fo uhm not being hawaii enough”). He treats this phrase as an equivalent of doing “Don Ho tings” (l. 8), thereby generating an irony about his situation and implicitly criticizing the judges for their lack of members’ knowledge. He continues his criticism against the judges by posing a rhetorical question (i.e., “how can I- I not be hawaii enough”) and reproducing what he
was told in reported speech (i.e., “you should do more hawaii stuff”). Augie T discursively creates an ironic situation where he has two contradictory attributions; that is, being too Hawai‘i and being not Hawai‘i enough. Because these contradictory attributions are accountable, Augie T starts to account for them by responding to a series of the aforementioned suggestions from the judges.

Excerpt 4c

58  AT  *** like slap judges’ head. (1.6)
59  TF  I said “have you (ever) been to hawaii?”
60  TF  haha
61  TF  (.4)
62  AT  “evriting you see:.h outside o:f uh waikiki: (2.1)
63  TF  waikiki: is a six mile fantasy”. (.)
64  AT  daes what I told om.
65  TF  uh huh
66  AT  but daes samting portrayed
67  TF  daes samting sell you know what I mean?
68  TF  and (.6) da sad ting is daet
69  AT  dei don’t realize da reason why people stayed
70  TF  and lived in ↑hawaii
71  TF  [uh huh
72  AT  [.h is because of people like me.
73  AT  my mom and my dad. my grandma and my grandpa. .h
74  AT  dei went (.3) “e ↑you from ↓japan”.
75  TF  [uh huh
76  AT  [“how you”.
77  TF  and you go (.3) “e o:” I like dis place”.
78  TF  yeah.
79  AT  you know? (.6)
80  TF  and not because (.3) we have blue ski:es
81  TF  uh huh
82  AT  we have h- (.3) hula dance [** don ho.
83  TF  [uh huh
84  AT  daes bull crap.
85  TF  so (.4) I just gave up. (.2) and tingking
86  TF  uh huh
87  AT  daet “I got to go to da mainland
88  AT  and be somebody else”.

Augie T describes his desire to slap the judges’ heads, and responds to the judges’ suggestions with a question (i.e., “have you (ever) been to hawaii”), challenging the judges’ assessment and implying his authenticity as a Local. He continues to reproduce
his utterances in reported speech and accounts for the nature of Waikīkī (ll. 62-63). He maintains that Waikīkī (or doing Don Ho things) sells. He suggests, however, that the reason Hawai‘i sells is in fact because of people like him (l. 72). In addition, he refers to his family or genealogy (l. 73) and delivers a constructed dialogue between those in the tourism industry and tourists (ll. 76-77). He downplays the images of tourism and refers to them as “bull crap” (l. 84). Finally, he states that he gave up making inroads into the mainland market, suggesting that he does not want to do Don Ho things because it means that he has to become “somebody else” (l. 88).

If Local comedians do not conform to the desires of non-Locals, they must aim at another group as their primary audience. Andy Bumatai (AB) shows that Local comedians are, first and foremost, Locals, so they are not allowed to ignore other Locals in the audience. Bumatai constructs Local humor as a group of Local people who desire to hear their language—Hawai‘i Creole (i.e., Pidgin)—and to feel included; thus, not talking to them in Pidgin means an exclusion, or maybe even an insult. Local comedians are already part of this community, and this sense of belonging binds their performance.

Excerpt 5: Andy Bumatai “Local humor is a club”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>TF/AB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>do you think it- it- it kind of happened to: uh: Local humor? (.7) uh: (.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>so people are so used to: uh: hearing (.4) you know many: kinds of ethnic jokes so: (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Lo- Lo- Lo- Local humor’s different. (.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Local humor (.4) is a- is a club. (.7) Local humor is a bunch of people, (.3) who wanna feel included. (.4) if I go in there and I don’t speak pidgin (.4) right? there are certain amount of people (.2) who go: (.3) “¡ho so what ¡bra ¡you not in (awa) club ¡aenimoa”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>uh huh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>“¡ho ¡you too good fo ¡awa club (.4) ¡o ¡what ¡pidgin is too low bra ¡fo you ¡now ¡bra (.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bumatai differentiates Local humor from ethnic humor in general. He uses a simile (i.e., “Local humor (.4) is a- is a club” in line 6) and reformulates it (ll. 7-8). He suggests that if he does not use Pidgin in the club, some people would react to it in a certain way (ll. 8-10). Switching to Pidgin, he gives voice to them (ll. 11, 12, 14-18). The represented speech is constituted by means of interjections (e.g., “ho”), address terms (e.g., “bra”), lexical items (e.g., “laiDaet”), syntactic features (e.g., “no like”), interactional particles (e.g., “ya”), and the repetition of these linguistic resources. A sense of community is constituted through the use of plural pronouns (i.e., “awa” (our), “us,” “they”). The collective voice of Local people also criticizes the idea of Pidgin as “too low” (l. 15), which makes a contrast with being successful or being “too good” (l. 14). Pidgin is a means of communication with Locals (i.e., “you no like talk to u:s ya”). Bumatai switches back into English and accounts for the feelings of Local people in the prior represented speech (l. 23).

The comedians constructed their ideological reality through reported speech. Augie T talked about his experience of going to an audition to make sense of a type of comedy he does that was unexpected for the judges (Excerpt 4). He treated “Don Ho things”—which was generated as the judges’ comment—as a non-Local stance object, making sense of social categories such as Locals, non-Locals, tourists, etc. He also posed a rhetorical question (i.e., “How can I not be Hawai‘i enough?”) to imply that his
Localness can not be contested by anyone, let alone by non-Local judges. Andy Bumatai also asserted that Local comedy is for Locals by categorizing Local comedy as a club where Locals can feel included while non-Locals would feel out of place (Excerpt 5). Using Pidgin allows one to remain—not to become, because you already are—a member of this club, which Bumatai skillfully implied through reported speech.

6.2.2 Stereotypes as unharmful topics

This section presents another shared orientation to Local humor. The participants refer to various stereotypes as unharmful topics, thereby treating the ability to embrace these topics as a category-bound attribute of being Local. At the same time, they treat the inability to embrace them as a category-bound attribute of being non-Local. Excerpt 6 (ll. 1-53) is taken from another focus group that consists of six participants: Andy, H-Mom, J, Kaimana, Michi, T. The discursive deployment of emotionally charged actions leads to the assertion that non-Locals lack a Local sense of humor; moreover, a Local sense of humor is implied to be an indication of genuine humanity. As in Excerpt 1, after discussing the fourth clip, I pose a question to the group in line 1.

Excerpt 6a “White washed people”

01 TF who do you think (.) would dislike (.)
02 this kind of comedy.
03 (1.0)
04 Andy m::[:::
05 H-Mom anyone who doesn’t understand it?
06 J probably.
07 Kaimana [yeah.
08 Andy [uh huh.
09 J [like-
10 Michi [people who’s !not from ;here<.
11 (.4)
12 Andy n. maybe:, like (.6) uhm (.4)
the ethnic people they ((comedians)) are talking about that aren’t (.) from here? yeah [maybe. [yeah. 

My question is followed by a long 1.0 second pause in line 3. Andy produces a hedging sound in line 4, and H-Mom takes up the floor by providing an answer in line 5 with a rising intonation. J, Kaimana, and Andy align with her in lines 6-8. J initiates talk but immediately discontinues his utterance in line 9 when it overlaps with Michi’s utterance in line 10 where she provides another possible answer to my question, which leads to a 0.4 second pause in line 11. Andy takes up the floor in line 12 and, after a series of hedging utterances, he provides another possible answer with a rising intonation, which is built upon Michi’s answer (l. 10) but is more specifically about ethnicity. An indexical “here” appears twice in this excerpt, in lines 10 and 14. Its referent (i.e., “Hawai‘i”) is understood and is taken for granted by Michi and Andy as well as by the other participants. Both Michi and Kaimana align with Andy in lines 15 and 16, which leads to Andy’s next utterance.

Excerpt 6b

that are, yeah (.) maybe like if Filipinos (.) come:me and [then they hear that it’s- [<FOB>]
[t]hey could be insulted. [HAHAHAhahaha ha.
[f]yeah.
like the FB[I:]
sort of white [washed people, [like
[eh]ehe.
[yeah. [yeah.
Andy shows a false start and hedging, finally introducing a new category (i.e., “Filipinos”) in line 17 that serves as a subcategory to a category he brought up previously (l. 13). While Andy keeps giving his hypothesized scenario in line 18, H-Mom provides a relevant category (i.e., “FOBs,” which stands for “fresh off the boat” and is a pejorative term for the new immigrant population) in line 19, orienting to Andy’s identification of Filipinos as a group of people who “would dislike this kind of comedy.” Andy states a possible consequence in line 20, which overlaps with both H-Mom’s and Kaimana’s utterances in lines 21 and 22. H-Mom’s laughter in line 21 follows her own utterance in line 19. Kaimana’s acknowledgment token in line 22 is a response to the relevance of FOBs, so she introduces another subcategory in line 23 (i.e., “FBI,” which stands for “full-blooded Ilokano” and is a term for both immigrants and the second generation children of the immigrants from the Philippines), thereby co-constructing a collection of categories about Filipinos. The last part of Kaimana’s utterance overlaps with Michi’s utterance in line 24 where she brings up another category (i.e., “sort of white washed people”). Even though there is an overlap, it is to Michi’s utterance that Andy, Kaimana, and H-Mom respond in lines 26-28, acknowledging the relevance of the category to the ongoing discussion. In the next excerpt, Michi already starts to explain her use of the category, showing an orientation to the effect of the strong language and becoming more explicit about who she considers white washed. In other words, she moves the scale of abstraction from general (i.e., “sort of white washed”) to more specific (“white washed”) with respect to her categorial work.

Excerpt 6c

29 Michi  I mean I don’t wanna use the term but .h
Andy [uh huh.
Michi [they get they’re like (.)
Filipino or Asian from the mainland,
like they’re white washed.
Andy [uh huh.
Michi [ən ((and)) they don’t understand the same <reference>. the ethnic jokes that we have here. .h
TF uh huh.
Michi because with this one (.)
I guess it’s closer to their home culture?
rather than (.2) having (.) been (.) assimilated to the American one?
Kaimana uh huh.
Andy n:

Michi talks about the term “white washed” while other participants such as Andy, myself, and Kaimana provide minimal responses. First of all, Michi implies the effectiveness of using the term as part of a response to my question although she says she does not necessarily want to use it (l. 29). She continues to talk about those who would dislike Local comedy by identifying their ethnicity and locality and re-using the term “white washed” in line 33. She makes reference to a category-bound activity in line 35; that is, if they do not understand Local comedy, they are not Local. Michi paraphrases “the same <reference>” as “the ethnic jokes that we have here.” Her use of pronouns contributes to showing the interpretive difference between non-Local and Local. She starts to account for this contrast in line 38 by referring to the kind of jokes that “we” have (l. 36). She marks the following utterance with modality (l. 39), stating that the kind of jokes under discussion are “closer to their home culture” than mainland American culture. Michi’s utterance in lines 38-41 creates two implications: (1) there is a cultural assimilation process from the home culture of immigrants to the American one and (2) Hawai‘i’s Local culture is somewhere in between the two points in this process. The situated meaning of being “white washed” is treated as the same as being assimilated to the
mainstream culture. H-Mom continues to talk about how non-Locals would interpret local humor.

**Excerpt 6d**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>H-Mom</td>
<td>they would probably feel offended, and,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Kaimana</td>
<td>yeah.=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Michi</td>
<td>=“that’s [not PC:]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>H-Mom</td>
<td>[kick up a ruckus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>[Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>H-Mom</td>
<td>[HAHAAHahahaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Michi</td>
<td>“I’m ne ((gonna)) throw a riot now.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>H-Mom?</td>
<td>.h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Michi?</td>
<td>n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H-Mom describes the first part of a series of actions by those who would dislike the comedy under investigation in line 44. This is followed by an acknowledgement from Kaimana in line 45, which is latched with Michi’s utterance in line 46 in which she gives voice to those who would feel offended, as formulated by H-Mom in line 44. Michi’s utterance overlaps with H-Mom’s utterance (l. 47) in which she continues to describe the second part of a series of actions by the same group of people. Andy acknowledges this in line 48, which overlaps with H-Mom’s laughter that marks the end of her utterance in line 49. Michi continues to give voice to the same group of people in line 50, but there is no uptake of her utterance.

Note that H-Mom (ll. 44 and 47) and Michi (ll. 46 and 50) resort to different strategies in describing the same group of people about whom I posed a question. Both of them describe category-bound activities, but while H-Mom uses the third person pronoun (l. 44), Michi uses the first person pronoun (l. 50). In addition, H-Mom’s utterances are responded to by Kaimana in line 45 and by Andy in line 48 while Michi’s utterances are
not. This leads to an interpretation that Michi’s utterances (along with Kaimana’s and Andy’s) are also designed as responses to H-Mom’s utterances (l. 44). In other words, Michi acknowledges H-Mom’s utterances by reformulating category-bound actions (ll. 44 and 47) with a different voice and footing (ll. 46 and 50). This is how Michi aligns with H-Mom; and compared to Kaimana and Andy, Michi shows a more dialogically complex alignment. Both Michi and H-Mom jointly construct a self or a social category of those who would dislike Local humor. Being non-Local is also not pre-given, but is situated in the particular context of a focus group session.

The meaning of being non-Local emerged in Excerpt 6 where six participants (Andy, Hawaiian Mom, J, Kaimana, Michi, T) also jointly generated category-bound activities and attributes one after another as a response to my question. The specific reference to Filipinos (e.g., “Filipinos” in line 17, “FOBs” in line 19, “FBI” in line 23, and “Filipino” in line 32) can be attributed to the participants’ orientation to the content of the fourth clip in which comedian Augie T talks about Filipino jokes. In addition to these labels, Michi generated another category (i.e., “sort of white washed people” in line 24 and “white washed” in line 33) that contributed to creating the non-Localness.

The next excerpt is taken from another of the focus groups (Angel, Chris, Clara, Jessica, Katie). While the participants of this group are talking about racism, one of the participants, Jessica, shows an intricate epistemological orientation to ‘racism’ and formulates her response (i.e., “kind of racism” in line 15).

Excerpt 7 “I have to say it’s kind of racism in a sense?”

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I ask one of the introductory questions (ll. 1-2). There is a long pause (l. 3), which makes me reformulate my question (ll. 4-5). Both Katie and Angel respond (ll. 6-7) with the same answer (i.e., “pidgin?”), which is followed by their laughter (ll. 8-9) due to an overlap. I repeat the answer (l. 10) and Angel confirms it (l. 11). I ask for more responses (l. 12), which overlaps with Jessica’s utterance (l. 13). After a pause (l. 14), she provides another response (i.e., “I have to say it’s kind of racism in a sense?” in line 15). Angel responds to this with laughter (l. 16) while Chris acknowledges it (l. 17). Jessica accounts for her response by summarizing what Local comedians do (i.e., “they tease each other’s own ethnicity?” in line 18).

It is important to examine how the participants position themselves in relation to what they say. Jessica shows the most intricate epistemological work because she formulates her response (i.e., “I have to say it’s kind of racism in a sense?”) very carefully in many ways: Jessica (1) starts with a hedging marker followed by a long pause (ll. 13-14), (2) clearly displays her stance to her statement about racism (i.e., “I have to say” in line 15), (3) adds a modifier “kind of” (l. 15) prior to the word racism, (4)
adds a prepositional phrase “in a sense” (l. 15), and (5) ends with a rising intonation (l. 18). The reason that she refers to the notion of racism is because comedians “tease each other’s own ethnicity” (l. 18), which is, however, not racism itself but “kind of racism in a sense” (my emphasis). Jessica’s epistemological stance (i.e., “I have to say”) indicates further that Local people would not usually describe Local comedy as a kind of racism. This point is attested by the way Jessica is responded to by other participants; for instance, Angel treats Jessica’s utterance as accountable (i.e., “ha” in line 16).

This topic resurfaces when the participants are engaged in a post-viewing discussion of their interpretation of an audio clip by Frank DeLima. The reference to “racist” (l. 5) is treated as accountable, and Angel does three things here: she (1) identifies herself as Filipino by using the first person pronoun “we,” (2) chooses one of the themes from the song (i.e., dog eating), and (3) denies the implication of the song that Filipinos eat (black) dogs.

Excerpt 8a “Racist”

01 TF so what did you think about (.) this clip?
02 (3.0)
03 TF anyone?
04 (1.0)
05 Angel racist.
06 A, J, C, ((laughter))
   etc.
07 TF **?
08 (2.0)
09 Angel cause we don’t eat black dogs? haha.
10 TF uh huh.
11 Angel well I (.)
12 Clara? haha[ha.

In line 1, I refer to an audio clip, *Filipino Christmas Carol* by Frank DeLima, that I have just played and ask for responses from the participants. After a long pause, Angel
responds by introducing a category “racist” (l. 5), which is immediately responded to by laughter (l. 6). Angel takes up the floor again (l. 9) and accounts for her response (i.e., “cause we don’t eat black dogs?”). She also treats her explanation as accountable. Angel starts to continue her account (l. 11), which is followed by (presumably) Clara’s laughter (l. 12). Following this, Clara takes up the floor (l. 14), taking over an account from Angel (l. 16).

Excerpt 8b
14 Clara yeah, uh:m
15 TF uh huh.
16 Clara there’s this uhm stereotype (. ) that=
17 TF =right.
18 Clara filipinos (. ) all filipinos eat dogs.
19 TF uh huh uh huh.
20 Clara well, some do?= (ye:s) *.
21 TF =uh huh.
22 ? h
23 Jessica but not everyone.
24 Clara but (. ) not everyone does?
25 TF uh huh.
26 Clara a:nd (. ) well it’s (. ) I I still find it funny?
27 [because (. ) uh
28 TF [uh huh.
29 Clara some of the characters take that (. )
30 he (. ) he sang (. )
31 [was like (. ) filipino’s naming, (. )
32 TF [uh huh
33 Clara a:nd * * basically in kali:hi, [or waipa:hu:,
34 TF [uh huh
35 Jessica? ewa beach.
36 Clara a:nd (. ) ewa beach, ye:s. ha.
37 TF uh huh
38 Clara so, all those are ** (. ) it- it’s true though?
39 TF uh huh uh huh.
40 Clara so there’s like sarcasm in there,
41 TF [right.
42 ? [n:.
43 Clara [but (.4)
44 yeah it still makes you l(h)a(h)u(h)g(h)h.
45 TF uh huh uh huh.
46 (. )
Clara starts to downgrade the stereotype about Filipinos (i.e., “well, some do? (ye:s)”) in line 20, the second part of which is contributed by Jessica (i.e., “but not everyone” in line 23). Clara aligns with Jessica (i.e., “but (.) not everyone does?” in line 24). Clara starts to explain why she still finds the clip funny (l. 27), pointing out that the song includes “filipino naming” (l. 31) and place names (i.e., Kalihi, Waipahu, ‘Ewa Beach). Clara states that these things are “true” (l. 38). The use of “though” (l. 38) shows that Clara has designed her statement so that it indicates that these things are all stereotypes but are intertwined with some ‘truthfulness’ about Filipinos. Clara describes this state of affairs as “sarcasm” (l. 40) and closes her turn by reformulating her own interpretation with the generic “you” (for Filipinos) (l. 44).

Excerpt 8c

((to Jessica)) you wanna respond to uh,

no, I think [(it’s) just comedy,

* like (.) you know,

I think that’s how they make it funny?

yeah, I think that’s how they make it funny?

they tease, (.) other, (.) ethnicity?

uh huh.

^nd I think it’s all individual difference.

if you’re gonna, take it seriously,

that’s your problem?

basically “laugh about it” ***,

“it’s good for you.” [you know but (.)]

uh huh.

yeah, it is an individuality thing and (.)

uh huh.

*** the places were filipino:s

******* “yes there are (our) people there” (.)

=“yeah (that is [our] places?”

[uh huh.

but (.) then again (.) there is (.)

“what about the other (.) places” you know?

uh huh.

***** “or something” you know?

uh huh.

so (.) but (.) for me it’s (.)
Jessica describes the audio clip as “just comedy” (l. 48) and talks about what comedians do in general (ll. 51-52). Jessica continues to explain about an “individual difference” or “individuality thing” in interpretation (ll. 54-58 and 60). Following this, she refers to “the places” where many Filipinos live (l. 62), challenging this stereotype (ll. 63, 65, 67-68, and 70), during which she identifies herself as Filipino (ll. 63 and 65). Jessica talks about her interpretation of the audio clip (ll. 72-73 and 75), and closes this sequence (l. 77).

The above excerpt shows the process in which Angel’s description “racist” is unpacked by the participants. Angel, Clara, and Jessica, all of whom identify themselves as Filipino, are more extensively involved in this process than the other participants, Chris and Katie. The category “racist” is responded to with laughter first, and it is accounted for by referring to stereotypes such as (black) dog eating, naming, and place names. It should also be noted that Clara and Jessica describe their interpretation of the audio clip with some implication of having reservations about it (e.g., “I still find it funny?” in line 26 by Clara; “but (.4) yeah it still makes you laugh” in line 44 by Clara; “I find it actually funny” in line 75 by Jessica; my emphasis). To put it differently, the participants have achieved downgrading the referential meaning of the word “racist.”

Political correctness is one of the interpretive frames in which the interviews and the focus groups operated. One of the focus groups (Angel, Chris, Clara, Jessica, Katie) that had three Filipino participants (Angel, Clara, Jessica) responded to Frank DeLima’s
song (i.e., Filipino Christmas Carol) by jokingly describing it as “racist” (Excerpts 7 and 8). A closer examination of their talk-in-interaction, however, revealed that adopting various semiotic resources, the three interactants of Filipino descent designed their utterances carefully enough not to assert that Local comedy is racism. For instance, when Jessica explained what she thought of Local comedy, she stated that “I have to say it’s kind of racism in a sense?” (Excerpt 9, my emphasis). Furthermore, when Angel asserted that Frank DeLima’s parody song was “racist” (Excerpt 10), the interactants including Angel responded to it with laughter. Both Clara and Jessica also accounted for their understanding afterwards (i.e., “yeah it still makes you l(h)a(h)u(h)g(h)h” in line 44 and “I find it actually funny” in line 75, respectively).

Not only the focus group participants but the comedians make reference to the stereotypes as unharmful topics in response to probing questions. Responses to probing questions are different from those to introductory questions, but I examine both types of data in this chapter because they shed light on different aspects of the culturally-specific knowledge that otherwise does not emerge as a topic. I present two excerpts below in which the comedians show their sensitivity to intertextual links. I ask Frank DeLima (FD) in a post-performance interview about one of the audience members that DeLima interacted with at his show in Ala Moana. He had identified that person as “a haole boy” (See Chapter 3, Excerpt 19) and found out that he was from Texas. DeLima also told his audience that the word haole is not a racist word, and added that it becomes such only if it is preceded by a derogatory adjective. Based on this, I ask whether he used to make such comments before.
Excerpt 9a: Frank DeLima “It’s a politically correct joke”

01 TF when you are talking to a guy from texas?
02 FD yes.
03 TF you: sort of (. ) uh touched upon the (issues)?
04 and saying “this is not-”
05 you [know,
06 FD [uh fraci|st yeahf.
07 TF [do you- do you think
08 this is uh ra[cist *?
09 FD [uh well because
10 [.h *-
11 TF [but do you- di-
12 did you do that uhm (.4) before? (.3) or=

DeLima starts to account for his act (l. 9), but he stops because he overlaps with me. I keep talking and ask DeLima (l. 11) whether talking about the word haole and its adjective was part of his routine performance. In the next excerpt, DeLima acknowledges that he did the aforementioned act in a certain situation. He also implies that Local people do not have to consider whether the word haole is derogatory, because they already know it is not.

Excerpt 9b

13 FD =o every so often
14 if it’s all uh Local people
15 and if it’s uhm [.h
16 TF [uh huh
17 FD and if it’s uh
18 one or two (. ) haole people in da audience,
19 cause (some-) (. ) because you know how dei are.
20 TF uh huh
21 FD dei- dei (. ) consider evriting (. ) you know
22 TF racism and all [daet kind of stuff so:
23 TF [yeah
24 FD .h uh:m corr- political correct. but [(. )
25 TF [yeah.
26 FD in hawaii we don’t (. ) even worry about [daet.
27 TF [uh huh
28 FD because we don’t feel daet way.
29 TF right.
30 FD .h and so:
31 but it’s funny (. ) to da Local people to hear
32 TF uh huh
when I see: ((say)) (.2) “diz are not racist terms”.

[“it’s da adjective bifo in front of om.
daet changes da whole ting”.

[uh huh
[and so daet makes it really funny.
so [it leads up to a joke.
[uh huh
[uh huh uh huh
[it’s- [it’s just a joke (.)
[o:kay.
daet *- (.) daet- (.3) daet (.) ties into .h
politically correct.

[uh huh
[it’s a politically correct (.2) joke.
(.5)
[that-
[making fun of (.) politically correct.
even that makes a humorous e[ffect.
[yes. it can.
(.5)
[it all depends.

DeLima states that he made a comment about the word haole (l. 13). Following this, he describes a situation where he performs for a predominantly Local audience with a few haole audience members (ll. 14-15 and 17-18). He starts to account for the reason for his act and orients to the assumed intersubjectivity (i.e., “cause (some-) (. because you know how they are” in line 19). It should be noted that DeLima is referring to “haole people” here. He explains how they are (ll. 21-22, and 24), and starts to make a contrast (l. 24). He describes how Local people would react and why (ll. 26 and 28). Note that DeLima makes a clear contrast with respect to the state of mind of haole people (e.g., “dei (. consider evriting (. you know racism”) and Local people (e.g., “we don’t (. even worry about [daet. because we don’t feel daet way”).

Based on the difference between the two groups of people, DeLima starts to account for the humorous effects that are generated by making a meta-comment on the
word haole (ll. 30-31 and 33). He delivers a line from his material in reported speech (ll. 33, 35-36), and reiterates the effects (ll. 38-39 and 41). He continues to account for the kind of joke that emerges from talking about the word haole (ll. 43, 45, and 46). He reformulates the preceding utterance as a politically correct joke that makes fun of political correctness (ll. 48 and 51).

When another comedian, Augie T, responds to my probing question about political correctness, he makes an assessment that political correctness is the “most stupidest” (l. 5) thing. He implies that being politically correct, however, is not a difficult thing to achieve. Note that the performance aspect of comedy is treated as significant here.

Excerpt 10a: Augie T “People that come to a comedy show come for laugh”

01 TF so what do you think about uh (.2) uh
02 AT political (.2) correctness [in general.]
03 AT I don’t- (.7) I think
04 TF it’s like da most stupidest ting,
05 TF ho- honestly because (.4) we see it.
06 AT you know what I mean?
07 TF uh [huh
08 AT [and we turn a blind eye to a lot of tings (.)
09 TF you know uh
10 TF uh huh
11 AT society wouldn’t be::: so exciting.
12 (.2)
13 TF uh huh
14 AT you know what I mean?
15 AT

In response to my general question (ll. 1-2), Augie T dismisses the idea of political correctness (ll. 4-5). He accounts for his response by implying that turning a blind eye to many things and not talking about them is not only deceptive (ll. 6-7) but boring (i.e., “society wouldn’t be::: so exciting”). Augie T implies that everyone is politically correct
or overly sensitive; nevertheless, he maintains that he can understand the issues of political correctness and that he has been successful in making the right decisions about the political correctness of his materials.

Excerpt 10b

((ll. 16-93 omitted))

094 AT  uh: (.5) da (.) most people daet attach (.)
095 DA people daet attack me at a comedy show
096 TF  uh huh
097 (.3)
098 AT  are da people daet are getting invited (.)
099 daet (.) don’t wanna be hia.
100 TF  [uh huh]
101 AT  [see people daet come to a comedy show,]
102 TF  uh huh
103 (.5)
104 AT  come fo laugh. dei come fo hear (da) stereotype.
105 it’s [a place daets uh: (2.4)
106 TF  [uh huh]
107 AT  exposed to evriting.
108 TF  uh huh
109 AT  you know you- you- you- (.4)
110 it’s a place wea ((where)) you know you can let
111 your- your- your- your craziness run f- run wild.
112 so ae- aeswai I always se: at da beginning .h
113 “if you come hia: tingking” (.) y-
114 TF  yeah.
115 AT  you know: uh: o: “i- if you come hia (.8) *- *-
116 you know you come hia (.5) being critical”
117 TF  uh huh
118 (.8)
119 AT  “you’re not gonna have fun”.
120 TF  uh [huh
121 AT  “[“because (.) you know dis is a comedy club”.
122 TF  right.

Augie T categorizes his audience that consists of those who were invited and those who came voluntarily (ll. 94-95, 98-99). He maintains that only the latter is the ‘true’ comedy audience (ll. 101 and 104). He describes a comedy club as a place (ll. 105 and 107) and repeats the description (ll. 109-111). Based on this, he explains what he says to his audience at the beginning (ll. 113, 115-116 and 119). Finally, he tautologically explains
why that is the case (i.e., “because (.) you know dis is a comedy club” in line 121), highlighting the culturally-specific normative expectations of being at a comedy club.

Augie T focuses on the properties of a comedy club as a site for the construction of community. He describes those who are critical about Local comedy, and claims that they have no sense of humor, which I argue serves as a powerful rhetorical device for questioning, or even denying, their humanity.

Excerpt 10c
123 AT  see, a lot of people
124 TF daet complain about comedians
125 TF uh huh
126 (.)
127 AT dei don’t like comedy.
128 AT dei [don’t even have a sense of humor.
129 TF [uh huh
130 AT so what happens is:
131 TF uh huh
132 AT instead of being open minded about tings
133 AT de[i: you know
134 TF [uh huh
135 AT dei get critical.
136 TF uh [huh
137 AT [“o: who is he fo talk about my race”.
138 AT o “who is sh-” you know,
139 TF uh huh
140 (.2)
141 AT * (.5) daets part of a society. a mirror.
142 TF we- you [know we’re a mirror.
143 TF [yeah.
144 AT we mirror off (a) people.
145 TF [you know what I mean?
146 TF [uh huh
147 AT daes (.3) daets what people laugh at
148 TF [uh huh
149 (.4)
150 AT you know it’s funny
151 AT to see somebody: impersonate somebody else.

Augie T refers to those who criticize comedians (ll. 123-124), and accounts for the reason (l. 127). He upgrades a counter-argument (i.e., “dei don’t even have a sense of humor” in
line 128). He describes the consequence of the lack of this attribute (ll. 130, 132-133 and 135) and presents such a voice in reported speech (i.e., “o who is he fo talk about my race? o who is sh-” in lines 137 and 138). It is implied here that those who are offended are usually those whose race or ethnicity is talked about. In other words, the member’s knowledge is that you would not be offended if your race or ethnicity is not a butt of a joke; should you be offended, your motivation must be irrational from, at least, the member’s perspective. Using a mirror metaphor, Augie T characterizes what comedians do (i.e., impersonation) and makes another generalization that people enjoy watching impersonators (ll. 141-152).

The comedians talked about their stance towards the entitlement issue. Responding to my question, Frank DeLima referred to one of his jokes as a politically correct joke that makes fun of the idea of political correctness (Excerpt 9). DeLima and I jointly treated the notion of political correctness as a stance object, talked about it, and constituted Locals and haoles as social types. He also talked about these two social types and, by so doing, created two versions of political correctness, illustrating its multiplicity. Nevertheless, he highlighted the Local interpretation of political correctness to dismiss the other/haole version.\(^90\) The Local sense of humor is naturalized and treated as a de facto norm. Meanwhile, Augie T made an explicit statement that political correctness is the “most stupidest” thing (Excerpt 10). However, he did not account for his statement by making a contrast between Locals and non-Locals in terms of their attitudes towards political correctness. He focused more on the nature of a comedy club as a site for the

\(^{90}\) DeLima’s comment in Excerpt 9b (i.e., “in hawaii we don’t (.) even worry about daet. because we don’t feel daet way” in lines 26-28) is intertextually linked with Bumatai’s comment in lines 61-63 in Excerpt 14, below (i.e., a Local guy does not even know why he finds humor in a Local joke).
construction of community, and stated that people come to a comedy show to laugh or to hear stereotypes that are unharmful. According to Augie T, this is a place where you are exposed to everything and can let your craziness run wild. He asserted that those who get offended there have no sense of humor, constituting a sharp contrast between those with and those without a sense of humor. I argue that claiming that someone has no sense of humor is a powerful rhetorical device for questioning, or even denying, his/her humanity. Augie T categorized his performance as impersonation, treated it as the source of humor, and implied that it cannot be regarded as a violation of political correctness.

These non-Local categories were also engineered as selves that are ideologically contrastive with being Local. Being non-Local makes a sharp contrast with being Local because the former was treated as not being from Hawai‘i; as seen above, being from Hawai‘i is a defining component of being Local. The participants also treated a non-Local as a social type who not only dislikes a certain kind of humor but responds emotionally by means of feeling offended and criticizing the alleged violation of political correctness.

6.2.3 Affective comedy

The next excerpt (ll. 1-83) is taken from a group of four: Craig, Kekoa, Kristy, and Sarah. The participants dialogically constitute themselves as a Local comedy audience through talking about Local and non-Local comedians as stance objects. The interaction below occurred very early in the focus group session. The participants had finished self introductions and discussed the first question (i.e., What is the first thing that comes to mind when you hear “Local comedy?”). Following this, they were asked about their
favorite comedians. After all the participants except Craig provided their responses to the question, I urged him to contribute to the ongoing discussion in line 1.

Excerpt 11a “It’s a different kind of humor”

01 TF how about you [Craig?  
02 Craig [(I know)  
03 TF: my favorite’s Frank DeLima too.  
04 Craig uh huh.  
05 TF what makes him special for you.  
06 Craig I think it’s a quality that all these Local, (. ) comedians have I think.  
07 TF they are all endearing.  
08 Craig none of them ever come off uh,  
09 TF [uh huh.  
10 Craig no,  
11 Craig .h <as (. ) rough (. ) and (. ) uh>=,  
12 Kekoa =no,  
13 Craig offensive or in any way.=  
14 Sarah =or vicious,  
15 Craig (. ) (harsh).  
16 Craig yeah like um (. )

Craig names Frank DeLima as his favorite comedian in line 3, followed by my question in line 5. He responds to this question by introducing the idea of a “quality that all these Local, (. ) comedians have” in lines 6-7 and specifying this quality or attribute as “endearing” in line 8. He starts to describe what Local comedians are not, by bringing in contrastive attributes (ll. 12 and 14). These attributes are co-constructed by Kekoa (l. 13) and Sarah (ll. 15 and 16), which is acknowledged by Craig (l. 17). These contrastive attributes are category-bound attributes that are associated with non-Local comedians, which becomes evident when Craig makes reference to “one guy that (. ) Italian gu:y” in the next excerpt.

Excerpt 11b

18 Craig remember that one guy that (. )
Craig makes reference to a contrastive category in lines 18-19 and throws in various pieces of relevant information including “some of these like the mainland.” in line 26.

The participants jointly achieve recollecting the comedian’s name in lines 27-30, adding two more category-bound attributes (ll. 31-32 and 33). Craig acknowledges Sarah’s contribution in lines 34 and 35 while Kristy generates a laugh token in line 36. Craig initiates another sequence of joint name recollection acts in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 11c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>what’s his name uhm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Kristy</td>
<td>heh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kekoa</td>
<td>the other one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>the Irish guy [I love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Kekoa</td>
<td>[yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>he swears all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>[what was his name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Kekoa</td>
<td>[yeah (ya ya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>uhm he’s at Fireman Show now,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Kekoa</td>
<td>yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>[Denis Leary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>[n:.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>[uh huh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>.h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
none of the Local comedians ever come off like abrasive.

[uh huh.]

[uh huh.]

they are very endearing.

[uh huh.]

"so".

Craig initiates a new sequence in line 37, brings in an ethnic category (l. 41) and a category-bound activity (l. 43), and completes the recollection process in line 48 when acknowledged by Sarah (l. 49) and by myself (l. 50). Craig opens up a closing sequence in line 52, further describes what Local comedians are not like by bringing in another attribute (l. 53), repeats the quality he raised earlier (l. 56), and finally closes his sequence (l. 58). Kekoa initiates discussion of another comedian in the next excerpt.

Excerpt 11d

and wasn’t there one like with a Parisian beret, (.2)

used to- (. ) be really= mean,

=oh Sam Kinison.

Sam [Kinison.]

[that’s right.]

[that’s right.]

yeah we don’t have [that.

[yeah.]

daet kain.

;I mean

they’re funny probably on HB1O, ((Home Box Office))

but locally I don’t think

<;they’ll work>.

>it’s a different kind of humor<.=

=>it’s a

different kind of humor<.

n:. okay. (.4)

good. (.2)

so, uhm anything to add? (.2)

before we move on?

(1.0)

no. I think we did great.

((laughter))
Kekoa starts a new sequence about a third and last non-Local comedian in line 59. The participants jointly recollect Sam Kinison in lines 62-66. Finally, Sarah makes a generalization in lines 67 and 69, and Kekoa accounts for her generalization in lines 70-73 by specifying two domains. His account is reformulated and concluded by Craig in line 74, acknowledged and repeated by Kekoa in lines 75 and 76. In short, the participants have collaboratively contrasted attributes of one type of comedian (i.e., “endearing”) with those of another type of comedian (i.e., “rough,” “offensive,” “vicious,” “harsh,” “mean,” “rude,” and “abrasive”), thereby discursively constructing two kinds of humor (i.e., Local and non-Local) that are consumed and interpreted differently in two domains (e.g., locally vs. HBO).

Excerpt 11 was about comedians as stance objects, and four participants (Craig, Kekoa, Kristy, Sarah) displayed an orientation to broader political-economic dimensions of media circulation (i.e., local performances vs. global mediascapes), aligning with one another through jointly constructing an attribute that Local comedians have. Craig introduced the psychological attribute (i.e., “endearing”) in line 8. He also described what they are not, by bringing in contrastive attributes (e.g., “rough” in line 12), which was immediately responded to by Kekoa and Sarah. These three participants discussed three comedians (i.e., Andrew Dice Clay, Dennis Leary, Sam Kinison), co-constructing their attributes and adding even more attributes (e.g., “vicious”). These non-Local and mainland comedians were also identified by their alleged ethnicity, although it seems that they are not usually identified through this kind of ethnic labeling in the mainland. The use of these ethnic labels suggests that the participants were talking about the mainland
comedians within a crossgenre interpretive frame of Local comedy for which ethnic stereotyping plays a bigger role.

Assembling two contrastive sets of attributes as social types of Local and non-Local comedians, the participants achieved discursive co-construction of two kinds of humor—Local and mainland—asserting that either of them can be funny in their own right, but they are different kinds of humor. By so doing, the participants not only aligned successfully with one another but were mass mediated with Local comedy audiences in general. This does not mean, however, that the participants disaligned completely from mainland audiences because they took a stance that they can still appreciate both kinds of humor. The constructed factuality is that Local comedy audiences can enjoy not only mainland comedy but also Local comedy—a type of comedy that is dear to them—while non-Local audiences do not have that privilege.

Both interview and focus group participants generated social categories that constitute the difference between Local and non-Local comedy. The participants made sense of Local comedy in relation to non-Local comedy. When the participants made these contrasts, they also assembled a set of metaphors, thereby constructing an affective frame in which the participants talk about happy events or experiences from the past to make sense of Local comedy. In the next excerpt, another focus group (Akemi, Jill, Judee, Mary) introduces a food metaphor (i.e., Local comedy as comfort food) to illustrate the meaning of one of the clips,91 Frank DeLima’s parody song, which includes various cultural signs such as speech, food names, and place names. Following this, the

---

91 This is the second of the four clips I played for focus group participants, as I explained in Chapter 2.
participants create a new category (i.e., “comfort comedy”) to further account for and highlight the affective aspect of Local comedy.

Excerpt 12a “Comfort comedy”
01  TF  so what did you think about this clip?
02  (1.0)
03  Mary  I think it’s hysterical.
04  TF  I’m filipi:no?
05  Mary  uh huh.
06  TF  and everything,
07  Mary  you know what’s funny?:
08  TF  funniest
09  Judee  [(for me:?)
10  Mary  it’s when he can mimic (.2) the dialect.
11  TF  uh huh.
12  Mary  and it’s the way
13  TF  he: (.6) “pronounces (his) name,
14  Mary  from the rhythm and like” (.)
15  Judee  “:(co:me) YO.”
16  TF  uh huh.
17  Mary  you know,
18  TF  and then rolling of the tongue,
19  Mary  and all of that?
20  TF  uh huh.
21  Mary  that’s (.6)
22  Judee  [my grandparents.
23  Mary  [that’s typical filipi:no.
24  Judee  [ha ha
25  Mary  [ye:[s?
26  Akemi  [ha
27  Judee  it’s ev- (.4) Locals,
28  Judee  £consider that£ (.4)
29  Mary  typical filipi:no.
30  TF  uh [huh.
31  Mary  [yeah. yeah.
32  Judee  and it’s= f:
33  Judee  =”yeah”.
34  Mary  funny
35  Judee  I just find (.) so much humor in that.
36  Judee  cause when you hear them talk;
37  TF  uh huh.
38  Judee  that’s exactly how they talk.
39  TF  uh huh.
40  Judee  [that’s how filipino-
41  Mary  [it’s like being around the dinner table.
42  Judee  h.
43  TF  uh huh.
44  Mary  you know?
I ask an open question about an audio clip (i.e., *Filipino Christmas Carol* by Frank DeLima) to a group of four participants (l. 1). After a pause, Mary makes a positive assessment about the clip (l. 3), positioning herself (i.e., “I’m filipino” in line 4). Mary continues her utterance (ll. 6-9), announcing that she is going to describe what she finds funny about the audio clip. In the following lines, up to line 19, Mary lists what she finds funny, and she sums up her list (l. 20).

Mary initiates a new sequence (l. 22), and after a pause, she makes reference to her grandparents (l. 23), which overlaps with Judee’s utterance about “typical filipi:no” (l. 24). The contrastive orientation between Mary (i.e., “my grandparents”) and Judee (i.e., “typical filipi:no”) leads to laughter by Mary. Judee seeks agreement from the other
participants (l. 26), which induces laughter from Akemi (l. 27). Judee assesses a list Mary provided from a Local point of view (ll. 28-30), repeating “typical filipino” again (l. 30). Mary aligns with Judee (l. 32) and goes back to talk about what is funny (ll. 33, 35-36). Judee explains that Locals find DeLima’s performance funny because “that’s exactly how they talk” (l. 39), namely, claiming that it is a reflection of reality. Judee’s othering of Filipinos continues into line 41, but ends halfway through her utterance. It overlaps with Mary’s utterance in which she introduces a simile (i.e., “like being around the dinner table”), which causes a small laugh token from Judee (l. 43). Mary seeks alignment from the other participants (l. 45), which induces laughter from Akemi (l. 46). Mary provides another simile (i.e., “eating adobo” in line 47), which leads to a minimal response from me (l. 48) and laughter from Akemi (l. 49).

Following Mary’s introduction of a Filipino food term (i.e., “adobo”), Judee makes reference to “black dogs” (l. 52) and, with a smiley voice, explains that this gastronomical practice by Filipinos is implied in the lyrics (ll. 54-55). She goes on to deny the relevance of “adobo” to the lyrics (ll. 57 and 59). Mary responds with laughter (l. 56) to Judee’s reference to dog eating; however, Mary denies the relevance of dog eating to a group of people she refers to as “we” (ll. 58, 61-62). Mary implies that she still finds DeLima’s performance funny. In line 66, Judee responds to Mary’s denial by explaining that her reference to dog eating is based on a “stereotypical scenario” (l. 70), thereby orienting to the delicacy of this topic. Mary quickly states, with a smiley voice, that she understands Judee’s intention (l. 67). She also produces a series of “uh huh” (l. 73), aligning further with Judy.
Excerpt 12b

074  TF   so that makes you: (.) laugh.
075      [that’s what makes you laugh.
076  Mary  it makes me:  it’s
077       it’s comforting.
078      it’s almost like eating <comfort “food”>? 
079  TF    uh huh.
080  Mary  there’s
081      there’s so much I can identify ;with
082      it just makes me <really comfortable>. 
083  TF    uh huh.
084  Mary  kind ((kind of))
085      takes me back to my <childhood>
086      you know
087      like all the growing up
088      and it’s .h
089  TF    [huh.
090  Mary  [it’s funny.
091  TF:   uh [huh.
092  Mary  [“I just think
093      it’s hysterically funny”. 
094  Judee  and that’s how exactly they talk.
095      (.2)
096  Mary  yes.
097      °°
098  Mary  yes.
099  Judee  HA hahaha
100  Mary   [so I don’t (.)
101      I don’t (.)
102      I don’t get offended by any of that. 
103  TF    [uh huh.
104  Mary  [because it’s (.)
105      it’s done <very> .h (.4)
106      there’s no:; (.2)
107      [malice in any of it? [you know?
108  TF    [uh huh.
109  Mary  [there is-
110  Akemi  [it’s done tastefully.=
111  Mary   =it’s [tasteful.
112  TF     [uh huh.
113  Mary   you know?
114  TF     [uh huh.
115  Mary   [and it’s (.)
116      and it’s “funny”.
117  TF     [uh huh.
118  Mary   [“it makes me laugh”. °so°.

I ask a confirmation question (ll. 74-75). Mary initiates her response (l. 76) by adopting the answering framework I have offered, but she reformulates her response right away
and says “it’s comforting” (l. 77), which is followed by another simile (i.e., “it’s almost like eating comfort food” in line 78). She continues to explain about this figure of speech (ll. 80-82 and 84-87). She summarizes her explanation (ll. 88, 90, 92-93), making a positive assessment again (i.e., “it’s hysterically funny” in line 93). Judee reintroduces a perspective different from Mary’s (l. 94), repeating her utterance (i.e., “that’s exactly how they talk” in line 39). Mary aligns with Judee (ll. 96 and 98), which is followed by Judee’s laughter (l. 99).

Mary initiates a new sequence (l. 100) and makes a statement that “I don’t get offended by any of that” (l. 102). As she is not asked if she gets offended in the previous lines, her statement requires an account. Mary accounts for her reasoning (ll. 104-107). Akemi completes Mary’s previous utterance (i.e., “it’s done very .h” in line 105) by saying “it’s done tastefully,” which is immediately followed by Mary’s acknowledgment (i.e., “it’s tasteful” in line 111). Finally, Mary returns to the first topic (ll. 115-116), and she closes this sequence by making another assessment (i.e., “it makes me laugh. so.” in line 118).

Following this, I urge the participants to provide more comments, and Mary states that Local comedians have a certain rhythm in their speech, talking specifically about Frank DeLima’s performance style (ll. 119-254, not shown). In the next excerpt, I take the floor, inviting the participants to talk.

Excerpt 12c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>(ll. 119–254 are omitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>[okay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>and you find (. ) this kind of comedy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>something like (. ) food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>that you are [very *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[yeah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I ask a probing question (ll. 256-258) about Mary’s simile of comedy as comfort food (l. 78). Mary confirms it (l. 259) and creates a new category (i.e., “comfort comedy” in line 260). She accounts for this category (ll. 263, 265-266, and 268), as something affective and favorable. I ask a confirmation question (l. 269), and Mary gives an affirmative response and states that it is her take (l. 270). This focus group showed that Local comedy is talked about as being comforting, like comfort food, and that it is talked about affectionately.

Meanwhile, the next focus group constitutes the same attribute, the comfortable familiarity of Local comedy, and unpacks its meaning further. If Local comedy is ordinary and boring, how is it that it can entertain its audience? This is what the next focus group (Andy, H-Mom, J, Kaimana, Michi, T) talks about. I pose a question to T, who has not spoken up yet. T assesses the state of Local comedy as “kind of boring,” and another participant, Kaimana, reformulates this negative attribute as “second nature,” thereby implying that the comedy routine cannot be boring.

Excerpt 13a “Actually sometimes it gets kind of boring”

66 TF ((to T)) what- what would you add, (3.0)
67 T I don’t know. same?
69 TF accent? memory?
I ask a probing question (l. 66) and ask T, who has not taken the floor, what he would add to the foregoing list of attributes. There is a long pause (l. 67), and T still does not talk extensively (l. 68). I give examples from the prior discussion (l. 69). With assistance from J, I add “stereotypes” to the list (l. 75). T makes a comment (i.e., “actually sometimes it gets kind of boring” in line 79), accounts for it (l. 82), and closes up his turn (l. 84). I open up the floor for the other participants in the next excerpt.

Excerpt 13b

085 TF do you (. ) does anyone think differently?
086 Andy n:.?
087 Kaimana I think it’s like
088 it’s almost when you hear it?
089 like ol ( (old)) filipino:
090 and then you can already ** in your head
091 “okay he’s gonna have a joke about
092 <mismatching color clo:thes>,”
093 a dog (. ) <you already kno:w> what it leads up to?
094 but I think ( . ) yeah ( is it the) acce:nt,
095 or his mannerism to spatial expressions,
096 his tone of voice, .h
097 then it’ll just be funny
098 cause it’s like second nature
099 that is al[ways here.
100 H-Mom? [***
101 Michi [yeah.
102 Andy [uh huh.
I invite the other participants to respond (l. 85). Kaimana takes the floor (l. 87) and aligns with T (ll. 87-93), but she starts to disagree with T (l. 94). Kaimana’s formulation (i.e., “second nature”) indicates her stance towards factuality about people’s readiness for accepting the stereotypes. Michi acknowledges this (l. 101), starts her account (l. 103), and gives an example of “ol filipino moms” (ll. 106-107). Kaimana follows Michi (l. 108) and repeats her own previous point (i.e., “you already know it, but it’s still funny,”). While Michi acknowledges this, Kaimana implies that there is no other explanation (l. 114).

The category-bound attribute, “endearing,” as a quality of Local comedians (Excerpt 3) is intertextually linked with another interpretive frame—the affective frame—that involves the categorization of Local comedy as being like comfort food (Excerpt 12). Meanwhile, according to T (Excerpt 13), Local comedy can be “boring” because one already knows what the comedians will say. His statement, however, was responded to by another participant, Kaimana, who described Local comedy as “second nature” for Local people. In other words, if you are Local, you do not even think why you find a certain Local joke funny; rather, when you think that you can anticipate what is
going to happen, and when this anticipation is confirmed, it leads to a shared appreciation of Local humor as a communicative genre and re-establishes a sense of community.

A view that Local comedy and non-Local comedy are different kinds of humor is intertextually connected with another view generated by one of the comedians. In the next excerpt, Andy Bumatai (AB) asserts that Local jokes are not the same as ethnic jokes. Using the same semiotic chains as in the above excerpts, Bumatai constructs two types of comedy. He constitutes Local humor as “endearing” while constituting non-Local humor as “mean.”

Excerpt 14a: Andy Bumatai “An ethnic joke and a Local joke”

01 TF so: (.5) given that (.8) uh: in your opinion
02 how similar: or different
03 are: (.4) Local comedy in- in hawaii:
04 and (.6) * mainland comedy.
05 AB well (.6) Local (.3) Local comedy he- here (1.0)
06 what I call Local comedy (.)
07 well a lot of people (.2) from the outside
08 (they) call ethnic humor. (.7)
09 uh: (.4) we do: Local comedy
10 and it’s (.2) very different and very subtle. (.5)
11 in a sense that (.6) uhm (.6)
12 Local comedy here: (.3) has insight into the culture.
13 (.7) okay that’s what- (.4) that’s (.2)
14 the difference between (.2) an ethnic joke (.3)
15 and (.4) a Local joke. (.7) (if) you will. (.4)
16 it’s my definition by the way so. (.7)
17 take it with a grain of salt. (.4)
18 but take for instance you know (.2)
19 (you’re) japanese right?
20 if someone said (.5)
21 you know here’s an ethnic (.) joke. (.6)
22 “hey how come japanese make good secretar(ies). (.5)
23 cause they could check the mail good. (.2)
24 (mockingly) a:::::” (.4) right? (.6)
25 okay. (1.2) it’s uh it’s basically uh white gu:ys
26 “they are not like u:s
27 let’s point out the physical differen[ces].
28 TF [right.
29 (.3)
30 AB “that make them different (.5) among us”. (.5)
31 * that’s an ethnic joke.
Bumatai states (ll. 5-8) that what he refers to as Local comedy is usually referred to as ethnic humor by many outsiders. He reinforces the authenticity of his definition (ll. 9-12). It is implied that the subtlety of Local comedy as well as the insight that Local comedy has into the culture is at best misunderstood or cannot be understood by the outsiders. He closes this sequence by summarizing the previous statement and announcing that what he has just said is his own definition that may not be shared by other people (ll. 13-17).

Following this, Bumatai starts to deliver a pre-sequence for giving an example of an ethnic joke (ll. 18-21) while making it relevant to me. He delivers an example in a constructed dialogue (ll. 22 and 23). He acts a slant-eyed character that checks the mail. Moreover, Bumatai voices the audience at the end (i.e., “a:::::”) and that he delivers the laughter mockingly, indexing that he has a critical attitude towards both who makes this kind of joke and who finds it funny. He seeks my alignment at the end of the joke (l. 24), projects a forthcoming account (i.e., “okay”), and explains why the joke is an ethnic joke (ll. 25-27 and 30). The use of pronouns shows that Bumatai is animating “white guys” here. Finally, he announces that he has accounted for an ethnic joke (l. 31). Bumatai continues to explain the difference between ethnic jokes and Local jokes in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 14b

33 AB ((cough)) here’s a Local joke (.9) about Japanese. (.6)
34 ((cough)) “e bra (.5)
35 ha kam (.9) sharks like to eat Japanese pipoc”.
36 TF ha (.3) **
37 (.2)
Bumatai initiates a Local joke (l. 33), and delivers the joke in reported speech (ll. 34, 35, and 38). He indicates that he has finished the joke (l. 41). I show an alignment (ll. 36 and 39) during the telling of the joke. Bumatai seeks my alignment (i.e., “↓see” in line 44) and starts to account for the prerequisite to understand the joke (ll. 44-46). I agree with him and point out the Japanese word *ume* (pickled Japanese plum) as a trouble source (l. 48), and after a pause (l. 49), Bumatai acknowledges this (l. 50). Bumatai takes up the floor (l. 53) and slightly modifies my interpretation by introducing another borrowed Japanese word (i.e., “the musub(h)i: thing” in lines 54-56). It should be noted here that

---

92 *Ume* is Japanese plum. It is put in a rice ball, which Bumatai refers to as *musubi* (l. 34). Both *ume* and *musubi* are loan words from Japanese.
Bumatai does a series of pieces of discursive work to seek my alignment (i.e., “you know it’s in the midd(h)le of you know you know what I mean, or: (.2) £you know,” my emphasis) and finally constructs shared Local knowledge (i.e., “the musubi thing,” my emphasis). The musubi “thing” represents a category (Gavin Furukawa, personal communication, 2009) that comes with an ideological bundle of culturally-specific knowledge that one eats a rice ball with, for instance, a pickled red plum inside and that this is a Local Japanese cultural practice. I align with Bumatai, and he seeks further alignment from me (l. 59). Finally, Bumatai asserts that Local people do not even ponder why it is funny (ll. 60-63); that is, cultural knowledge is discursively naturalized here.

In the following excerpt, Bumatai and I co-construct the nature of Local comedy.

Excerpt 14c
066 TF right.
067 (.3)
068 AB so. (.8) and there’s filipino jokes like that,
069 there’s (.6) uh korean, there’s (.4) all kind.
070 and that’s what (.7)
071 what kind of jokes you make about each other. (.8)
072 it’s inclusive. (.2)
073 when I tell a joke (like that)
074 if you’re in an audience and I told daet ume joke
075 TF uh huh
076 (.3)
077 AB you would go (.) “o(h)h”
078 (.7)
079 TF [*
080 AB [you wouldn’t feel (.4) you know (.2)
081 being teased about being different or (different)
082 to me at least (.5) right?
083 (.3)
084 TF uh huh
085 AB and that’s why you have noticed no white jokes?
086 TF uh huh
087 AB how come there’s no (. ) how many white guys
088 does it take to do this or that.
089 TF uh [huh
090 AB “hey you are two white guys driving in a car”. (.4)
091 you you never hear those kind of jokes.
Bumatai states that there are similar jokes about other ethnic groups (ll. 68-71). He characterizes those jokes as inclusive (l. 72). He refers back to the previous *ume* joke and describes how one would react to it in an imaginary situation (ll. 73-74 and 76-77). He suggests that feeling included is the same as not feeling teased about being different, carefully avoiding making a generalization (i.e., “to me at least (.5) right?”). Following this, Bumatai rhetorically asks me whether I have noticed that there are no white jokes, through which Bumatai reinforces his assertion that ethnic jokes are constructed from the white guys’ perspective. I summarize Bumatai’s assertion (ll. 95-99). Bumatai acknowledges my summary (l. 101), but he takes back his previous assessment (i.e., “no no not not more”) and modifies my interpretation (i.e., “it requires”), through which Bumatai asserts that Local humor requires cultural knowledge while ethnic humor requires no such knowledge. When I repeat Bumatai’s assertion (l. 102), Bumatai closes my utterance with a rhetorical device (i.e., “period”) and repeats his assertion once again.

Andy Bumatai claimed that Local comedy has insight into the culture while non-Local comedy does not. He referred to a non-Local joke as an ethnic joke, demonstrating it and asserting that it describes non-white physical features from the white perspective.
He also demonstrated a Local joke and stated that a Local guy does not even know the reason why he finds humor in that joke. Moreover, Bumatai described the properties of a Local joke as inclusive and makes a contrast to a non-Local joke that makes Locals feel excluded. He constituted ideological factuality that from a Local’s perspective, an inclusive type of comedy can be interpreted as endearing while an exclusive type of comedy can be mean, vicious, etc.

6.2.4 Pidgin as the Local voice

Local comedians have a certain stake in sounding like everyone else, which was also expressed by the focus groups. The last shared orientation to Local humor emerges when I pose a probing question to comedians about Hawai‘i Creole (i.e., Pidgin) in relation to Local comedy. A general comment about Hawai‘i Creole is found in an interview with Augie T (AT). Following this, he and his wife (M) jointly introduce a contrastive category “haole girl,” thereby treating Pidgin as a category-bound attribute of being a ‘true’ Local.

Excerpt 15a: Augie T “That separates us from everybody else”

01 TF to- to what extent (.). do- do- do you- you think (.).
02 pidgin is an important part of Local comedy.
03 (.7)
04 AT I tingk that what separates everybody:
05 I tingk that separates us from
06 every uh- from- (.6) from everybody else.
07 TF uh huh
08 AT [uniqueness.
09 TF [different from the (.). mainland?=
10 AT =right. it’s the uniqueness.
11 TF [uh huh
12 AT [*** (.3) * (.5)
13 it’s uh (.8) (or it was just) *
14 because my wife (.4) uh
15 my wife (.3) you know doesn’t [speak pidgin. (.6)
I ask Augie T about the meaning of Pidgin for Local comedy (ll. 1-2). Augie T’s response is not specifically about the meaning of Pidgin for Local comedy, but it is a general comment about speaking Pidgin as a category-bound activity for being Local people. Augie T’s paraphrasing of his statement (“uniqueness” in line 8) overlaps with my clarification question (l. 9) that indicates my understanding of the distinction Augie T has made between Locals and the mainlanders. Augie T introduces his wife (M) as a new topic and states that she does not speak Pidgin (ll. 14-15). M and Augie T co-construct a category-bound attribute of being haole or a “haole girl” (ll. 16-17). Augie T reiterates that his wife does not speak Pidgin (l. 18), but he indicates that she is not an outsider (i.e., “but”) and provides a category-bound attribute of being Local (i.e., growing up in Hawai‘i), thereby implying the layered nature of being Local (l. 19). However, he orients again to the relevance of Pidgin as a unique identity marker for Local people (ll. 20-23).

While still orienting to my question in the previous excerpt, Augie T refers to the category haole again in relation to the act of speaking Pidgin in the following excerpt. Augie T and his wife (M) jointly construct Pidgin as a way of becoming like everyone else.93

---

93 M came backstage where Augie T and I were talking, and made a comment about one of the songs being played as background music for an audience waiting for the opening of the show. M joined the interview for a short while.
Augie T’s situated identity is jointly constructed by Augie T and M (ll. 39 and 41-44). It is also suggested that speaking ‘good English’ leads to impressing other people, which would not be achieved by speaking Pidgin. Augie T asserts that his goal is to make people laugh (l. 46) and it can be achieved through “connecting” (l. 49) as well as through “being like everybody else” (l. 50). He paraphrases this as “everybody else that’s around me” (ll. 51), and follows it up with a set of three actions; that is, “act like me (.) talk like me (.) sound like me” (l. 52), thereby presenting his rhetoric that he can achieve his goal by being no one but himself.

Another comedian also talks about Hawai‘i Creole (i.e., Pidgin) and Local comedy when I ask him a probing question. Andy Bumatai (AB) states that he does not do a lot of Pidgin humor anymore, thereby implying that there is a socialization process that Local comedians may go through. Although he presents a slightly different take on Pidgin, he, too, sees Pidgin as a way of connecting with the Local audience. He refers explicitly to Pidgin not only as the language of comedy but as the language of Locals.
Pidgin is part of semiotic chains that constitute a Local as a social type; in other words, Pidgin defines Local humor.

Excerpt 16: Andy Bumatai “We are all here we all understand”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>Excerpt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>so how about (1.0) pidgin. (.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>is it (.6) uh: (1.2) uh:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>is pidgin (.4) important part of (.2) Local comedy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>and (1.2) to what extent (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>is pidgin (.) also important to your style of comedy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>well you know (.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>uh I don’t really do a lot of (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t really do a lot of pidgin (.6) humor anymore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>you know? (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>when I do pidgin (.5) and you know (.3) i:s I (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>primarily depending on your audience (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>I do it (.7) in character. (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>because there’re certain thing(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>(that you can) say in pidgin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>uh huh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>that you can’t get away with saying (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>it’s just not (.3) funny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>uh huh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>like (.2) I used to do this joke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>“e: braDa: o: you get bolo head ae? (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>o: aes good you know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>cause if (you) bolo head (.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>that way your uku:s can break dance”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>hahahaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>well. (.6) if you said it in good English (.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>“hey pal *** (you) got bald head. (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>oh that’s good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>that way your- (.3) your head lice can (.3) break dance”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>see? it’s kind of mean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>because uku: is a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>is a friendly kind of almost childish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>uh [huh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>[way of saying head lice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>uh huh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I ask about the meaning of Pidgin for Local comedy in general as well as for Bumatai’s style of comedy (ll. 1-5), to which Bumatai responds by stating that he does not do a lot of Pidgin humor anymore (ll. 7-10). He also states that whether he uses Pidgin primarily depends on the audience (ll. 11-12). Furthermore, he maintains that he uses Pidgin to represent characters, showing his meta-awareness of the use of represented speech, because there are certain things for which one cannot generate humor without Pidgin (ll. 13-15 and 18-19). Bumatai initiates a translation joke (l. 21). He animates a Pidgin-speaking character in reported speech (ll. 22-25), to which I respond with laughter (l. 27),
and Bumatai seeks my alignment (l. 28). Bumatai starts the second half of this joke (l. 32) and voices a stylized English-speaking character that produces an utterance of the same semantic content (ll. 33-35).

Bumatai makes an assessment about the second utterance and states that “see? its kind of mean” (l. 37). It is implied here that Pidgin humor is funny by itself, but if it is uttered in English, it becomes not only “not funny” but even “mean.” Bumatai points out one of the components in the joke (i.e., uku) and unpacks its culturally-specific collection of indexical meanings (ll. 41-42, 44, 46-47, and 49). Bumatai closes up his account with a jocular note (ll. 50, 52, and 54).

After a pause (l. 55), Bumatai takes the floor again and asserts that the primary indexical meaning of Pidgin is familiarity (ll. 56-57 and 59). He continues to account for this indexical meaning and states that the audience feels included while listening to Pidgin humor (ll. 60-63). He makes an analytical comment about the audience who understands Pidgin humor (ll. 64-67). Finally, he voices the audience in reported speech (“they are saying (. ) e we are all here we all understand and guess what. (. ) the people who no understand (. ) they must be haole ah::[:” in lines 68-73). Bumatai checks my understanding (l. 76).

The comedians illustrated the last shared orientation to Local comedy by referring more explicitly to Pidgin not only as the language of comedy but as the language of Locals. Even though I asked Augie T about the relationship between Pidgin and Local comedy, he started to respond to me by describing the meaning of Pidgin for Locals in general, referring to it as the uniqueness and claiming that it separates Locals from non-Locals (Excerpt 15). Augie T also asserted that his goal is not to impress, but to make
people laugh, which he achieves by means of connecting with them. Pidgin is the primary means that enables him to act, talk, and sound like everyone else (Excerpt 15).

Furthermore, when Andy Bumatai explained the difference between an ethnic joke and a Local joke in Excerpt 14, he performatively constructed the ideological difference between Pidgin humor and “good English” humor (Excerpt 16). When he demonstrated a Pidgin joke in “good English,” he accounted for it by deploying the category-bound attribute (i.e., mean) that the focus group members of Excerpt 11 used. In his meta-performance talk, Bumatai accounted for the meaning of the word *uku* by introducing semiotic resources such as “hanabata days” and reinforcing the affective frame. Bumatai reintroduced “inclusive” as one of the properties of Pidgin humor, as he did in his account of Local humor.

6.3 Discussion

The previous section presented sequential analyses and also examined an orientation among the participants of focus groups and interviews. Based on the above results, this section focuses more on the latter—stancetaking towards factuality—and explores the implications of joint construction, alignment, and disalignment.

As seen above, the interviewees as well as the focus group participants often took matters into their own hands; for instance, Excerpt 1 showed that Judee initiated a question (l. 1) that led to a course of categorial work regarding the Localness of Barack Obama; Excerpt 6 demonstrated how the participants talked about non-Local membership categories without any interruption from me, who only posed a question (ll. 1-2) and generated a minimal response once (l. 37); and Excerpt 11 showed that Craig, Kekoa, and
Sarah jointly generated contrastive properties of Local and non-Local comedians; furthermore, Kekoa made an evaluative comment to close up the discussion (l. 82), thereby skillfully transforming a focus group session on humor into a humorous interaction. It was evident, however, that situational identities such as moderator and participant contributed to creating an asymmetrical participation framework because I moderated each group by means of minimal responses as acknowledgment tokens, posed semi-structured questions, and nominated the next respondent. Nevertheless, such situational identities were subject to change and became emerging discursive identities because various respondents took things into their own hands and out of mine; the focus groups and the interviews showed both asymmetry and interactional dynamics as their properties.

Even though the comedians occasioned ‘teaching moments’ within a speech event that was designed as an interview, the act of ‘teaching’ was not one-sided at all because both the comedians and I brought our own agendas and ideologies into the interactions.\(^\text{94}\) When the comedians ‘taught’ me how to understand something about Local comedy, they formulated their ‘lecture’ by introducing certain categories, and I responded to the ‘teaching’ with relevant categories that came with my own ideological orientation, and following this, the comedians assessed my response. Nevertheless, even if there seems to be a discrepancy between the categories of the interactants, they still achieved agreement, and the ‘teaching’ continued.

For instance, Andy Bumatai (Excerpt 14) demonstrated a Local joke about Japanese (i.e., “ha kam sharks like to eat Japanese pipo”), and he stated that this joke

\(^{94}\) Matthew Prior (personal communication, 2009)
would not be funny for a person who did not have some knowledge of the Local Japanese culture. I aligned with him by accounting that the mainland audience would not understand the word *ume* used in the punch line, which the Local audience would. Although after a pause, Bumatai agreed with me twice and continued his account; then he re-started (i.e., “or:”) and checked my knowledge of food in Hawai‘i (“that (.2) you know it’s in the midd(h)le of you know what I mean, or: (.2) £you know the musub(h)i: thing and£”), to which I responded with an acknowledgment token (i.e., “yeah”). It seems that the interactants achieved agreement here. Retrospectively speaking, however, my interpretation of the joke was that it was doubly funny because it is based on a metonymy of a rice ball with a red pickled plum inside—which implies blood—and a Japanese person and because the noun *ume* (pickled plum) and the adjective *ume*: (it’s darn good/tasty!) are near homonyms. The latter interpretation, however, is unlikely among Local people or, more specifically, among Local Japanese who might be familiar with the adjective *oishii* or *umai* (delicious) but would not be familiar with the more casual, phonologically reduced, form *ume*.

Thus, Bumatai’s reference to “the musubi thing” was designed to invoke shared knowledge and to rework my displayed interpretation of the joke (i.e., “yeah” in line 57), which was shown in his orientation to the relevance to the word *ume*.

The interactants also did the groundwork for understanding. When the comedians occasioned ‘teaching moments’ in talk-in-interaction with me, they often made generalizations (e.g., about haoles) to display assumed understanding between the interactants prior to achieving agreement for on-going interaction. For instance, Frank
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95 Gavin Furukawa (personal communication, 2009)
DeLima (Excerpt 9) made a comment about how haoles react to his act (i.e., “because you know how dei are”). The groundwork for agreement also included the comedians’ past references (e.g., “you know what I mean?”).

The ‘moments of teaching’ showed that the comedians treated being Local as pre-given. In other words, being Local for them as well as for those who were born and raised ‘here’ is something natural, obvious, immediately recognizable, and salient; that is, it is not what one tries to become because s/he already is. The underlying ideology of being Local is that being Local is not under conscious control and thus is effortless and unhidable. This is at least how the comedians and focus group participants talked about being Local and doing Local comedy. It is interesting, however, that they were always engaged in doing being Local. This was most clearly displayed in their references to the category haole. According to the dominant ethnic ideology in Hawai‘i, being haole means being not Local. The literal meaning of Local is based on geography and makes no indication of race, but its racial aspect is identifiable, especially in relation to the word haole. Furthermore, the Local vs. haole binary is inseparably intertwined with another relational pair that the comedians introduced; that is, Hawai‘i and the mainland or ‘home’ and ‘foreign land.’ The act of claiming Local identity sometimes co-occurred with an extreme case formulation, which served as stake inoculation; for instance, Augie T (Excerpt 15) stated that he makes people laugh by being “like everybody else” that is around him, following this up with a trilogy of actions (i.e., act like him, talk like him, sound like him).

In summary, the excerpts in this chapter highlighted that categories are not pre-formed but per-formed in the particular context of each interview or focus group session.
Nevertheless, some of my data point to pre-existing ideologies of Localness. Using various semiotic resources and their intertextual links with previous and relevant texts, the participants interactionally engineered Localness, non-Localness, and two kinds of humor as social types. The participants also achieved dialogically constituting themselves as Locals through assembling these categories in the moment-by-moment on-going talk.

6.4 Conclusion
There is little reception research on media discourse, and the previous reception studies have had a methodological problem because they did not examine the interactional aspect of interpretive acts. I have tried to overcome this problem by taking a discursive approach to interview and focus group data. In the above excerpts, there were many examples that showed that the participants took things into their own hands and that their stancetaking varied, all of which would have passed unnoticed in purely content-based research.

My goal is to extend studies on intertextuality into an interactional context and contribute to recent work that examines semiotic encounters in meta-discursive talk. Hawai‘i comedy makes an intriguing case study because this culturally-specific activity is an ideologically unique site for interethnic membership categorization. I showed that the interviewees and the focus group participants interactionally built a collection of categories in order to interpret Local comedy while they also talked about mediatized performances in order to make sense of socially circulating categories of persons. Selves or social types assembled in the specific context included a Local, a non-Local, and Local/non-Local comedians. The participants also talked about two kinds of humor—Local and mainland—and constructed the Local state of mind that can appreciate both
kinds of humor; nonetheless, Local comedy remained dear to their hearts. I highlighted that these categories are not fixed and pre-formed but are situated and per-formed. I also emphasized that interactants jointly create versions of reality in the moment-by-moment development of talk, so my concern was about factuality.

Moreover, I have shown that pre-formedness exists to some extent because the participants displayed an orientation to ideological and intertextual links with past or relevant media discourses when they discussed Barack Obama’s racial identity as well as when they contrasted Local with mainland humor by referring to a major cable network and invoking broader political-economic dimensions of media circulation. In all the excerpts, the participants’ meta-performance talk contributed both to their interpretation of the performances and to reinforcing images and stereotypes that they have about different social groups in the formation of Local community and humor.

Finally, there are cases where it is difficult to determine what position a particular individual has ended up taking. Video recording might have helped me better analyze the way relatively inactive participants reacted to the on-going discussion through gaze and nodding. Nevertheless, I believe the study presented in this chapter contributes to the body of sociolinguistic and discourse analytic research that takes a critical and reflexive stance by redefining the interview and the focus group as sites for interactants’ active construction of identity, rather than dismissing them as inauthentic data.

The next chapter discusses the findings, implications, and limitations of all the data analysis chapters (Chapter 3-6), and suggests some directions for future research.
CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION

7.1 Overview of chapters and summary of findings

Chapter 1 discussed the notion of performance, which has different everyday and technical meanings. In everyday use, performance is (1) action that is believed to be highly intentional. On the other hand, in technical use, performance is (2) artful ways of speaking (Bauman, 1986; Hymes, 1974) or (3) doing, practicing, and achieving actions. Whether doing is a conscious act does not matter, according to Butler (1990), who conceptualizes the notion of performativity as tied with iterability (i.e., repeating and changing conventional actions). This chapter also dealt with the notions of language ideology and code and claimed that the research on Hawai‘i comedy that this dissertation presents could deepen our understanding of these sociolinguistic ideas.

In order to examine stylization or performativity in a highly playful genre, Chapter 2 took issue with the deep-rooted belief that comedians do things deliberately on stage and exaggerate them for humorous effects. The dissertation does not deal with the issue of intentionality; audience members may think that the comedians do things deliberately, but what is relevant to discursive analysis is when and how the comedians bring various categories into being and perform actions such as exaggeration. Based on discursive analysis of live stand-up comedy shows, I demonstrated that the comedians draw on shared knowledge and indexicalities to stylize (or performatively materialize) various culturally-specific membership categories such as Locals and non-Locals. Another important issue that I discussed in this chapter was transcription of Hawai‘i Creole, which is a historically stigmatized language.
Chapter 3 examined participation frameworks or the way comedians stylize their audiences into two distinctive categories: Local and non-Local. The comedians deployed membership categorization devices and stake inoculation to performatively construct these different kinds of comedy audiences. Frank DeLima and Augie T called a Local audience into being by referring to membership categories and their category-bound predicates as well as by reworking the nature of their jokes. These comedians also stylized non-Local audience members within the larger audience through membership categorization devices and stake inoculation. Meanwhile, Bo Irvine stylized his audience as predominantly non-Local, giving explicit instructions about social life in Hawai‘i to his mostly tourist audience. Stylizing their audiences, these comedians deployed semiotic resources that include ethnicity, middle/family names, and place names, all of which are indexicals ideologically mediated with historical and conventional meanings.

Chapter 4 continued to examine stylization, focusing on the use of Hawai‘i Creole (popularly known as Pidgin) and English in live stand-up comedy shows. I examined two discursive contexts: (1) reported speech and constructed dialogues and (2) narration. Comedians such as Andy Bumatai and Bo Irvine demonstrated their linguistic ideology by deploying Hawai‘i Creole in reported speech and constructed dialogues and by deploying English in narration. Hawai‘i Creole was often stylized as the Local voice, and English as the non-Local/haole voice. In contrast to these comedians, Augie T and Timmy Mattos dissolved this contrastive linguistic ideology between Hawai‘i Creole and English by deploying Hawai‘i Creole not only in reported speech and constructed dialogues but in narration. In other words, Augie T and Mattos deployed Hawai‘i Creole
as the code of narration, thereby stylizing themselves and their audiences as Locals who address and are addressed in that language.

Chapter 5 investigated the use of other codes in Hawai‘i comedy. These codes other than Hawai‘i Creole and English were deployed for mockery or linguistic and racial stereotyping. I took a more explicitly sequential approach to these multivocal semiotic resources to illustrate how the comedians use them in performances-in-interaction. I demonstrated that the comedians initiated a mockery sequence with ethnicization of their audience and deployed a stylized language, which was followed by laughter from the audience. I also showed deviant cases in which ethnicization is absent or in which a mockery sequence is followed by delayed laughter, second laugh, or translation. Despite these deviant cases, the comedians successfully deployed mockery as stylization because it is a powerful multivocal discursive tool that assures them laughter. However, Local comedians were not the only ones to use language performatively. The audience members or focus group participants did the same thing as these comedians when they were engaged in meta-performance talk.

Chapter 6, the last data analysis chapter, took a discursive approach to Hawai‘i comedy, but it dealt with reception or meta-performance of Hawai‘i comedy, based on interview and focus group data. I investigated the construction of interpretive frames to illustrate the cultural specificity of Hawai‘i comedy. Shared cultural knowledge is required to interpret Hawai‘i comedy, and such knowledge is inevitably indexical and intertextual. I demonstrated the local production of such intertextual knowledge in an explicitly interactional context. Focus group participants constructed socio-dramaturgical characters such as Locals, for instance, by stylizing Barack Obama as Local while
accounting for who would or would not be able to understand Hawai‘i comedy. In contrast to this, “white washed” emerged as a category-bound attribute of being non-Local. This ideological contrast between Local and non-Local became even clearer when the focus group participants discussed different kinds of multivocal humor. The participants also stylized Hawai‘i comedy as affective comedy, talking about the cultural specificity of Hawai‘i comedy and orienting to Local normativity. The comedians also generated meta-performance talk to treat being Local as ‘natural,’ ‘fixed,’ or ‘expected.’ In other words, both the focus group participants and the comedians constructed who non-Locals are by talking about how Locals would interpret Hawai‘i comedy.

7.2 Implications of the study
The dissertation highlighted the interactional function of stylistic variation in Hawai‘i comedy. The comedians and their audiences are not only respondents to context, but they are makers of context. They jointly deploy various indexicalities linked to languages through language ideology and achieve the definition of situations and relationships through style-shifting between English and Hawai‘i Creole in the moment-by-moment flow of performance-in-interaction. The dissertation, therefore, supports a multidimensional view of context, performance, and stylization (Coupland, 2001) in sociolinguistic studies; situational factors do not determine style in a correlational way.

The data analysis chapters showed that performativity in Hawai‘i comedy is about doing being Local as well as doing being subcategories of Local such as “PoDagi” and “Japani.” At the same time, they showed that Hawai‘i comedy is about doing not being non-Local because treating being Local as the norm means treating being non-Local as
deviant. Local can only be defined in relation to what is not Local, and vice versa. These categories were referred to and were highlighted through category-bound predicates and intertextuality in use. The comedians and their audiences jointly built this ideologically contrastive relationship between being Local and being non-Local, and this relationship between these categories is the primary source of multivocal humor in Hawai‘i comedy. The Local/non-Local relationship is highly conventional or ‘expected,’ but when the comedians bring this relational conventionality to the fore, it does not make their audiences bored; rather, they respond to it with laughter. Conventionality and creativity in performance-in-interaction are two sides of the same coin.

Not only what is Local but what is ‘humorous’ is relationally defined in Hawai‘i comedy. Billig (2005) takes issue with traditional humor research that only examines the good-naturedness of humor, and asserts that mockery (or what he refers to as ridicule) has disciplinary and rebellious functions. These functions of humor must be considered in relation to each other because being ‘humorous’ is possible in relation to being ‘serious.’ In other words, people are socialized into the meaning of laughter while being socialized into the meaning of non-laughter. Thus, humor research is not about humor, but is about the social order, as Billig (2005) claims: “humour and seriousness remain inextricably linked. Neither can abolish the other without abolishing itself—or without threatening the social order” (p. 243).

This dissertation, therefore, was not only about comedy but about the social order that was called into being through multivocal discursive practices in this fundamentally creative genre. Local comedians were skillful language users, context makers, and shrewd observers and performers of the social order, and they achieved intersubjectivity
with their audiences, performatively materializing a laughing community. They also
stylized themselves as, and invoked, various socio-dramaturgical characters and
manipulated the interpretive frames of their performance. Doing Hawai‘i comedy was
defining what is humorous (and what is not); at the same time, doing the definition of
humor was stylizing who is Local (and who is not). Hawai‘i comedy is a place where
linguistic, cultural, and racial line crossing is sanctioned, and in fact, line crossing is the
norm but it co-occurs with line drawing and re-drawing that may reinforce and/or subvert
the social order. The social order must be discussed in relation to agency/creativity
because Hawai‘i comedy is a stereotypically creative genre within culturally-specific
constraints. Creativity is situated “in the border line zone of existing hegemonies”
(Blommaert, 2005, p. 106, emphasis in original), and the driving force of creative
practice is the individual agent. Blommaert conceptualizes two kinds of creativity: local
and translocal (i.e., innovation); the first type of creativity is assessed and understandable
against normative hegemonic standards “because it creates understandable contrasts with
such standards” (Blommaert, 2005, p. 106, emphasis in original).

7.3 Limitations of the study

I collected audio data to analyze multivocal discursive practice in Hawai‘i comedy
(Chapters 3-5); the audio data were so rich that I had to focus on certain aspects of
performance-in-interaction. Video recording of live stand-up comedy shows provides
even richer data, and it is best suited for multimodal analysis. Such an analysis that
examined comedians’ gaze, posture, facial expression, and other visual data would shed
light on the multimodality of performance-in-interaction.
The comedians’ (multimodal) performance drew laughter from their audience. I treated and transcribed their laughter collectively unless an individual audience member generated isolated laughter. The audience’s laughter could have been transcribed in more detail if I had used multiple recorders to audio record small audience groups in a live stand-up comedy show. Such data would be complicated but could advance the type of reception research that I have attempted to pursue through the analysis of the focus group interviews in Chapter 6.

Because I was interested in in-group shared knowledge, I recruited as focus group members those who were born and raised in Hawai‘i and who had been exposed to Local comedy shows; however, I did not organize focus groups of, for instance, mainlanders who had not been to Hawai‘i comedy and who might have used a different set of interpretive frames. Such focus group data would have cast clearer light on the nature of in-group shared knowledge. My goal was not to conduct a comprehensive reception study, but it would be possible to form various focus groups by systematically recruiting participants in terms of their gender, social class, residential area, and so forth.

As for genders of performers, I did not have any female performers in my data because no female comedian performed while I was collecting data in 2008. Hawai‘i comedy has been a predominantly male industry, and I could elicit the names of only a few female comedians from the male comedians I interviewed. Therefore, any implications of the dissertation should be interpreted within the scope of such limitations.
7.4 Directions for future research

The dissertation focused on Hawai‘i comedy, but it could be expanded by conducting crosscultural investigation of multivocal humor in highly performative genres outside of Hawai‘i. The continental United States has many comedy clubs, and various comedy shows are broadcast on the major cable networks. Many comedians perform in more than one place, and they travel throughout the United States; American comedians also perform outside of the continental United States, including at U.S. military bases around the world. Stand-up comedy is not an exclusively American practice, and it is part of the global entertainment industry that arches across many countries and areas. In addition, other forms of comedy are found in countries such as Japan, where the most popular comedic shows include *manzai* (i.e., constructed dialogues between two performers), *mandan* (i.e., monologues), and more traditional *rakugo* storytelling (i.e., a stock of traditional and new monologues); these performances could be studied from an interactional perspective.

Reception research is another direction I could take for future projects. Reception research of popular culture and mass media remains one of the underdeveloped but promising areas in sociolinguistics. Focus group interviewing is a powerful tool to investigate culturally-specific shared knowledge when it is combined with other methodological means such as (individual) interviewing and an interactionally minded analytic approach to discursive data. To expand Hawai‘i comedy research, I could design a reception study for which I recruit both Local and non-Local members as moderators and focus group participants to examine their interpretive process. I could also follow up on the focus groups with individual interviews to examine the participants’ accounts in
two different contexts. A carefully designed reception study combined with a CA-informed approach would offer insights into the deployment of culturally-specific knowledge or ethno-methods. Another project would examine when and how individuals deploy membership categories such as Local and non-Local in mundane everyday talk where these categories may not be as salient as in a highly performative genre, which could lead to another investigation of whether there is anything unique about the comedians’ stylization.

I took a discursive approach to sociological topics such as ethnicity in multilingual comedic performances in Hawai‘i. I could also take a methodologically minded sociolinguistic approach to psychological topics such as “affect” (Besnier, 1990). Discursive Psychology (DP) engages with psychological matters such as emotions and respecifies them as social practices that are constituted, displayed, and made relevant by participants on specific occasions in their interactions (Edwards & Potter, 1992). Previous studies have examined how people invoke emotion in everyday mundane talk as well as institutional settings such as counseling sessions (Hepburn & Potter, 2007) and employment interviews (Glenn, 2010). Thus far, DP’s program has restricted itself to the examination of how monolingual speakers construct emotions. Further research could start to extend DP’s program by looking at highly performative institutional talk or comedic performances. It would be interesting to investigate the strategic use of affective states and stances in multilingual and multicultural Local stand-up comedy performances in Hawai‘i. Local comedians deploy mockery to jointly create affective stances with their audiences. Local comedians make discursive contrasts by deploying Hawai‘i Creole to voice Locals and by deploying English to voice non-Locals or ‘white people.’ Hawai‘i
Creole is indexically and ideologically connected to ‘positive’ emotions and affects (e.g., Hawai‘i Creole-speaking Local boys are endearing) while mock English (i.e., parodied white people’s English) is related to ‘negative’ emotions and attitudes (e.g., English-speaking white people are uptight). Local comedians and their audiences display their understandings of these culturally-specific indexicals to create multivocal humor and affective stances. Mockery is a powerful multivocal tool with which the comedians and their audiences display affects and jointly constitute a Local comedy community. As I have already shown, the comedians present culturally-specific semiotic resources as laughables, and their audiences respond to them accordingly without receiving explicit accounts of such semiotic resources. In other words, Local comedy audiences know when to laugh, and laughter is a marker of socially constituted affects. Taking a DP approach, I would pursue the cultural specificity of humor and affect in Local stand-up comedy that constitutes and is constituted by a shared sense of in-group knowledge.
**APPENDIX: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Falling intonation</td>
<td>_ Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Continuing contour</td>
<td>: Sound stretching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Questioning intonation</td>
<td>CAPS Louder than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑↓</td>
<td>Prominent rising or falling intonation</td>
<td>&lt; &gt; Slower than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>Pause of about 1 second</td>
<td>&gt; &lt; Quicker than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.2)</td>
<td>Pause of about 0.2 second</td>
<td>£ £ Laughing voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Micro pause</td>
<td>° ° Quieter than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h / .h</td>
<td>Breathing (out breath / in breath)</td>
<td>= Latching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>* Unable to transcribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ ”</td>
<td>Reported speech</td>
<td>( ) Unsure transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Abrupt cut-off</td>
<td>(( )) Other details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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