Journal of Multicultural Discourses

MULTILINGUAL MATTERS

Who You Tink You, Talkin Propah? Hawaiian Pidgin Demarginalised

Mikaela L. Marlow and Howard Giles
University of California, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

Communication accommodation, ethnolinguistic vitality and markedness model assumptions are applied to language ideologies and practices among Standard English and Hawai'i Creole English (Pidgin) speakers in Hawai'i. Respondents reported that Standard English should be spoken in most employment or scholastic interactions with tourists, teachers or mainlanders ('Haoles'). However, Pidgin maintains widespread covert prestige and has resisted marginalisation in social, workplace and educational exchanges. Narrative accounts verified that language enhances group solidarity and shapes routine interactions, providing further support for the models that frame this research.

doi:10.2167/md060.0

Keywords: Hawaiian Pidgin language, ethnolinguistic vitality, communication accommodation

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Speakers strategically modify language to establish identity, express ingroup solidarity and exercise power (Zilles & King, 2005). Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 5) suggested that people locally construct identity based on 'the social positioning of self and other'. The relationship between language attitudes and codeswitching has been established (Ryan & Giles, 1982) through discursive description and explanation (Williams *et al*., 1999). Language ideologies are 'beliefs about language that are articulated by users as a rationalisation or justification of perceived language structure and use' (Silverstein, 1979: 193). Drawing from such research, this study investigates language ideologies, attitudes and code choice practices among Locals in Hawai'i.

Marlow and Giles (2006) applied ethnolinguistic vitality theory to media, political and institutional language representation in Hawai'i. However, until now research has nominally assessed the widespread utilisation of Hawai'i Creole English (Pidgin) amidst formal opposition by educators, schools and businesses (Ryan, 1979). Considering that bilingual perceptions, attitudes and interactions are influenced by distinct (often localised) cultural, socioeconomic and political contexts (Ritchie & Bhatia, 2004), it seems important to investigate language practices and the social consequences arising from such behaviour among individuals in Hawai'i.

Language demographics are discussed here, with regards to Pidgin as a communicative norm in the Islands. Communication accommodation theory (CAT) (Giles *et al*., 1991), ethnolinguistic vitality theory (Giles *et al*., 1977) and the markedness model of codeswitching (Myers-Scotton, 1998) are applied to

1744-7143/07/02 001-17 $20.00/0
Journal of Multicultural Discourses
© 2007 M.L. Marlow & H. Giles
Vol. 2, No. 2, 2007

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

individuals who routinely employ Standard English and Pidgin to enhance communicative outcomes, reify group memberships, and access social and economic advantage.

Hawaiian Language and Ethnic Demographics

The first Hawaiian plantation was founded in 1835 on the island of Kauai to initiate the imposed sugar industry, which became a major source of economic trade in the Islands (Beechert, 1985). Labour immigration rapidly expanded to support increasing demands of agricultural commercial investments. In 1853, the vast majority of people in Hawaiʻi were ethnically Hawaiian (71,019), yet between 1852 and 1913 immigrants from 'China (56,700, 1852–1897), Portugal (17,000, 1872–1887), Japan (70,000, 1885–1917), Puerto Rico (2,600, 1900–1901), Korea (3,500, 1904–1930), Spain (1,500, 1907–1913), and the Philippines (63,000, 1907–1930)' (Masuda, 2000: 11) relocated to Hawaiian plantations. Prior to the US annexation of the Islands in 1898, Pidgin evolved based upon English, Hawaiian, Japanese, Chinese, Portuguese and Filipino languages (Bickerton, 1983; Reineke, 1969). Consequently, Pidgin greatly assisted communication among linguistically and culturally diverse plantation workers and is still widely utilised.

Despite compromised prestige when compared to Standard English (see Ohama *et al*., 2000) approximately 600,000 of 1.2 million Hawaiʻi residents and 100,000 US mainlanders speak Pidgin (Grimes, 1996). Out of nearly 200,000 Native Hawaiians in the Islands, roughly 9000 speak Hawaiian, while 26% of the population reports speaking non-English languages at home, compared to 18% of the US population (Kamana & Wilson, 1996). In the year 2000, 9.4% of people in the Islands reported Hawaiian, 41% Asian, 25% European (Haole) and 21.3% multiethnic ancestry (US Census Bureau, 2000). Malone and Corry (2004) contended that 300,000–400,000 individuals identify as Hawaiian, while two-thirds are affiliated with several ethnicities

In multiethnic societies, speakers utilise language to affiliate with desired group memberships (Fishman, 1977). Rohrer (2005) suggested that three racial categories exist in Hawaiʻi. These are Hawaiians, Locals (immigrated ethnic groups) and Haoles (those who are White and/or unassimilated). The word 'Haole', literally defined, refers to a foreigner and may be used to castigate and distance oneself from the cultural context that 'Haole' represents. Many people in Hawaiʻi assume that Locals and Hawaiians speak Pidgin, while people of European descent speak Standard English (Velupillai, 2003). Thus, in the Islands language depicts and determines group membership and reifies a social hierarchy where Hawaiians are foremost because of their nativity and Haoles are often derogated because of the colonial economic superstructure they represent. Considering the role of language in personal and group identity processes (see Edwards, 1994; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1982), this study employs language, identity and group categorisation themes to speech communities that utilise multiple language conventions.

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

Theoretical Frameworks

Intergroup (Giles, 1977; Harwood & Giles, 2005) and CAT have been influential in social psychology, language and communication inquiry (e.g. Gallois *et al*., 2005; Tracy & Haspel, 2004). CAT suggests that people convey attitudes and establish social distance by converging (adopting a similar style), diverging (adopting a different style) or maintaining linguistic (language, speech rate, accent), paralinguistic (pauses, utterance length) and nonverbal (eye movement, smiling, gazing) features.

Individuals diverge speech to enhance ingroup solidarity and language and elevate ethnic esteem (Simard *et al*., 1976). However, those who are in subordinate positions are typically expected to converge to dominant language norms (Kim, 2001). For example, Sachdev and Giles (2004) reported that Latino migrants in the US and Turkish immigrants in Germany are expected to converge to dominant language norms. Those who adopt language norms may access opportunity, yet also encounter identity confusion, resistance or alienation by the ingroup (Hogg *et al*., 1989). In fact, Gibbons (1987) suggested that students in Hong Kong perceived Chinese–English codeswitching as vexing, while Moroccans view French–Arabic alternation as indicative of the colonisation mentality (Lawson & Sachdev, 2000).

Ethnolinguistic identity theory (ELIT) articulates the ways in which objective and subjective vitality influence marginalised language communities to maintain, emphasise and revitalise distinct varieties (Giles & Johnson, 1981, 1987). The vitality framework has informed considerable exploration across different continents and contexts (see Giles, 2001). ELIT maintains that the more vitality a group has – or rather individual members believe it has relative to a comparative outgroup – the more likely members will invest significant energies into identifying with the ingroup and engage in collective actions on its behalf.

The ethnolinguistic vitality model was originally developed to measure the combined influence of three factors, namely, status (e.g. economic and historical conditions), demography (e.g. numbers of in- and outgroup speakers, birthrates) and institutional support (e.g. media and educational representation of the group) across various cultural, intergroup and multilingual contexts (Giles *et al*., 1977). *Objective vitality* may be investigated, for example, by measuring the amount of newsprint and television representation marginalised groups maintain relative to dominant groups. However, *subjective vitality* explores how members of ethnic collectives themselves judge the societal conditions impinging on their own and relevant outgroups (Bourhis *et al*., 1981).

The survival of indigenous and minority languages depend upon prevalence of use, speaker status and perceived vitality levels (e.g. Cenoz & Valencia, 1993). Group members may demonstrate '... visible vitality ... interaction networks (and) ... employ them ... for one or more vital functions' (Fishman, 1972: 21). Groups that are low in vitality may compromise native languages and assimilate, while high vitality groups often maintain unique characteristics (Bourhis & Sachdev, 1984). Furthermore, high ingroup vitality predicts several *non*-language outcomes, such as personal family

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

satisfaction, educational achievement and occupational aspirations (Currie & Hogg, 1994). Hence, language identification and utilisation may significantly influence social cohesion, esteem and language survival among diverse indigenous groups.

Myers-Scotton (e.g. 1998) proposed the markedness model to address the ways in which psychological and social dynamics motivate (and shape) language choice and utilisation. More specifically, the model suggests that whenever possible, people strive to speak unmarked languages to reduce costs and maximise communicative rewards. Those who employ marked language varieties may encounter social stigma or alienation.

Until now, nominal research has explicated code choice (and switching) practices in the Hawaiian Islands. As such, this research sought to determine whether accommodation, vitality and markedness constructs were interpretively useful in understanding language ideologies and discourse practices with Standard English and Hawaiian Pidgin. Moreover, inquiry sought to understand the ways in which participants, themselves, make sense of language norms, practices and group-based affiliations.

Methodology

This qualitative investigation was 'multimethod in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter . . . attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them' (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994: 2). Creswell (1998: 15) suggested, 'the researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting'. Correspondingly, our own data collection utilised interviews and a focus group to understand ideologies of Standard English and Pidgin, accommodation behaviour and group-based communication interactions.

Given that such an approach privileges human agency, it is an appropriate method with which to study subjectivity, identity and communication, especially among language communities that have endured social, economic and political marginalisation. Furthermore, narrative analysis establishes a context with which to 'examine gender inequalities, racial oppression, and other practices of power that may be taken for granted by individual speakers' (Riessman, 1993: 5). In fact, 'Stories act as a vehicle through which members can offer definitions and explanations . . . (and) are a powerful communication form' (Brown & Kreps, 2001: 75), enabling voice to those who are often silenced.

In order to situate the cultural and contextual climate characterising interviews and the focus group, the demographic and cultural background of the primary investigator will be briefly reviewed. The first author was born and raised in the Hawaiian Islands (would be considered 'Local' by most) and is of multiethnic European descent (a.k.a. Haole). Having attended both public and private educational institutions on the Big Island and having earned a Bachelors degree from a local university has imparted on this individual a unique understanding of the complex language, racial, social and economic issues that influence communication interactions in the Islands.

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Respondents were referred through the professional and social networks of the first author, participated voluntarily and were selected based on the relative variation in their demographic backgrounds. Men and women between the ages of 20 and 55 participated, representing a variety of professions, including students, educators, hotel staff, clinical professionals and other service positions. All participants were multiethnic, reported competence in both Standard English and Pidgin, and were from diverse education levels (high school to graduate degrees) and socioeconomic categories (lower to middle class).

Individuals reported affiliation with numerous ethnicities including Chinese, English, German, Hawaiian, Indian, Irish, Italian, Japanese, Jewish, Native American, Nigerian, Palauan, Portuguese, Puerto Rican and Scottish descent (see Tables 1 and 2). All participants were residents of Hawai'i (the Big Island) at the time of research,[1] had been born and raised in the Islands, or had been residents for at least 20 years. Given the range of respondent's ethnic, gender, age and professional orientations, it is probable that the sample represents views and experiences among multiethnic Locals in the Islands.

Interview questions assessed participants' place of birth, length of time in the Islands, ethnicity, language attitudes, and Standard English and Pidgin code choices. The principal investigator encouraged speakers to share narrative accounts of experiences, impressions, and conclusions regarding each language. Focus group discussion expanded upon specific issues reported during the initial interviews. Topics included language preference and expectations, contexts of language use, and responses to language violations and criticism.

Interviews were conducted with 10 individuals (5 men, 5 women), each lasting 2 hours in duration, at a location chosen by respondents. Questions inquired about place of origin, language choices, impressions and practices. Also, we sought to understand the ways in which interviewees identify with Pidgin and Standard English norms during familial, social and professional interactions. Based on the themes that emerged from interviews, a focus group with five additional participants (two men, three women) was conducted to facilitate group discussion regarding salient issues associated with language

Table 1

Ethnicity	*Ethnicity*	*Ethnicity*	*Language*
1 = Chinese	7 = Italian	13 = Puerto Rican	19 = Standard English
2 = English	8 = Japanese	14 = Portuguese	20 = Hawaiian Pidgin
3 = German	9 = Jewish	15 = Scottish	21 = Hawaiian
4 = Hawaiian	10 = Native American	16 = Spanish	22 = Palauan
5 = Indian	11 = Nigerian	17 = Thai	23 = Thai
6 = Irish	12 = Palauan	18 = Tongan	24 = Tongan

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

Table 2 Participants

N = *15*	*Age*	*Ethnicities*	*Place of origin*	*Gender*	*Profession*	*Economic standing*	*Language of origin*	*Languages employed*
P1	27	3, 2, 4	Hawai'i	Female	Teacher	Middle	19, 20	19, 20
P2	25	1, 3, 4, 6, 13, 16	Hawai'i	Female	Counsellor	Middle	19, 20, 21	19, 20, 21
P3	55	3, 6, 10	Wisconsin	Female	Counsellor	Middle	19	19, 20
P4	24	3, 6	Hawai'i	Female	Teacher	Middle	19	19, 20
P5	53	6, 9, 10	South Carolina	Female	Student	Lower	19	19, 20
P6	42	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 15	Hawai'i	Male	Military	Middle	19	19
P7	29	1, 5, 16, 17	Nevada	Male	Police Officer	Middle	19	19, 20, 23
P8	24	3, 8, 14	Hawai'i	Male	Teacher	Middle	20	19, 20
P9	30	7, 9	Hawai'i	Male	Service	Middle	19	19, 20
P10	27	1, 4, 8	Hawai'i	Male	Service	Middle	20	19, 20
P11	24	4, 14	Hawai'i	Female	Student, service	Lower	20	19, 20
P12	20	8, 12	Pilau	Female	Student, service	Middle	19	19, 20, 22
P13	23	1, 8	Hawai'i	Female	Medical assistant	Middle	20	19, 20
P14	21	4, 14	Hawai'i	Male	Student, service	Lower	20	19, 20
P15	27	4, 11, 18	Hawai'i	Male	Teacher	Middle	20	19, 20, 24

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

ideologies and practices. These topics primarily addressed Standard English and Pidgin code choice, and sought to more thoroughly understand the ways in which criticism (both of the self and others) shaped language impressions, evaluations and practices.

Data were recorded through digital taping devices (along with written notes) and the principal researcher completed interview and focus group transcripts (totalling over 200 single spaced pages). Interview and focus group transcripts were coded for consistent themes across interviews and the focus group, and were organised into primary content themes about language ideologies, social expectations and communication practices. Our procedures were consistent with Creswell's (1998) conceptions about ethnographic data analysis and representation. As such, we read through text transcripts and coded narratives about language practices, actors, social settings and events in order to explicate reoccurring themes and consistent regularities.

Given that the transcripts yielded a wealth of information, length requirements preclude us from including all statements about each topic, yet, presented here are selected excerpts we contend represent generalised attitudes and practices among the group. As such, the following section discusses retrospective narratives about language ideologies, norms and practices, towards better understanding some of the cognitive and behavioural antecedents motivating code choice practices among Locals in Hawai'i.

Data Analysis

Data suggest that participants maintain established ideologies about the status and opportunity associated with Standard English and Pidgin and draw from such beliefs when adapting language use. For example, many indicated that although they speak Pidgin on a routine basis in social, familial and employment contexts (i.e. with other employees rather than tourists or bosses), they speak Standard English in order to conform to professional norms of appropriateness (often learned by parents and family) during employment interviews, interactions with supervisors or in educational contexts. Individuals also indicated they perceived language performance as representative of group membership. Furthermore, those who are perceived as violating appropriate language norms for their normative ingroup are perceived negatively and often chastised (such as Locals who move to the mainland and return speaking like a Haole or Haoles who incorrectly attempt to speak Pidgin). Individuals who violate context-specific language norms may be criticised by family, friends or professional superiors and respond in varied ways including social withdrawal, humour tactics and suppressed hurt or resentment.

Ideology and utilisation of Standard English

Respondents regularly draw from convergence strategies (with Standard English and Pidgin at different times) to assist them in solidifying access and resources to professional and social networks. Respondents unanimously agreed that Standard English should be spoken in order to secure educational

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

and business advancement, yet they preferred (and reportedly are most proficient) speaking Pidgin (see Ryan, 1979). Although participants are cognisant of the fact that outsiders may view them as less intelligent for speaking Pidgin, they themselves feel less confident and able to articulate their thoughts when speaking Standard English. Moreover, some participants also reported worrying about 'sounding dumb or stupid' and having to 'keep it at a certain level' when they utilise Standard English, especially when interacting with superiors or groups that use the language exclusively. Participants described their motivation for employing Standard English during hotel employment, educational contexts or other professional situations, yet prefer to speak Pidgin whenever possible.

In the following dialogue, Participant 7, a 29-year-old man of Thai, Chinese, Indian and Spanish descent, moved to Hawai'i from Nevada as a child and is keenly aware of Local cultural and language norms. He discussed contextual factors that determine his ability and willingness to speak Pidgin, as compared with Standard English. Prior to this stage of the interview, the investigator questioned about specific situations in which the participant employed Pidgin, as compared to Standard English. The individual reported that he purposely speaks Standard English when at his place of employment, yet expressed feeling more comfortable speaking Pidgin. However, he admitted his mother's adamant disapproval on occasions when he did speak Pidgin because, she perceived, it made him sound 'stupid' or 'inferior'.

602. **J:** The way I see it, it has to be the right setting, like you said a comfort zone.
603. If you don't have it, it doesn't come on at all.
604. **M:** Mmm, hmm.
605. **J:** My mom doesn't like me speaking. She says it makes me sound stupid,
606. at times.
607. **M:** Why, when you're working with clients, do you use Standard English?
608. **J:** My mom taught me that it makes me sound inferior. People look down at
609. people who speak Pidgin. When I'm in a business setting I have to speak straight
610. English. I was taught very early on to speak straight English.

Despite his preference for speaking Pidgin, because it makes him feel more comfortable and connected to his social affiliations, Participant 7 also reported tension associated with his mother's training (and his acceptance, albeit haphazardly) that Pidgin indeed makes him sound 'inferior'. As such, he reported speaking Standard English in professional interactions almost exclusively.

Similarly, Participant 11 explained that her and her sister both teach their children Standard English so that others will understand them, they will be set 'for reality', and able 'to get through life' securing employment, education and economic stability.

101. **M:** Did your sister ever talk to you about why she wants her son to speak Standard
102. English?
103. **Ch:** No, but I think, I think it's because in the mainland, because people there
104. don't understand you. So, I guess to get through life you have to speak Standard English
105. You know?
106. **M:** Mm, hmm
107. **Ch:** I guess its like, how do I say it? Like a set, to set you for reality. I guess, you

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

108. know, like out there. That's what I think.
109. **M:** Mm, hmm
110. **Ch:** That's what I do for my son too. I teach him Standard English.
111. **M:** So, you said that 'to get through life' you have to learn Standard English. What do
112. you mean by that?
113. **Ch:** Well, like when you go for a job, you cannot talk Pidgin, because they won't hire
114. you.
115. **M:** Mm, hmm

Proficiency in Standard English is described as a skill that will set her son for 'reality', alluding to this individual's understanding of the Hawaiian Islands as sustaining unique language and cultural practices that may not be equally valued elsewhere. This dialogue also exhibits the profound influence that communication context exerts on code choice practices and illustrates that the transmission of language attitudes and practices takes place during intergenerational exchanges, in addition to social and professional contexts. Although this particular individual speaks Pidgin with her friends, as a mother she strives to teach her son Standard English so that he will be capable of accessing the same opportunities she has. As these excerpts suggest, in Hawai'i, Standard English is a language that is invested with a colonial, economic ideology, which positions it as the lingua franca of educational and professional interaction.

Ideology and utilisation of Pidgin

Language immigrants may adopt Standard English for functional purposes, yet loyalty to one's language of origin often remains (Clyne, 1982). This seems to be the case in Hawai'i as Pidgin maintains esteem and utility as the preferred mode of social communication, despite widespread convergence to Standard English when professionally advantageous. The vitality of Pidgin is rooted in common experience, functioning as a cultural touchstone that reifies ingroup membership and distinguishes 'the other'.

Participant 5, a 53-year-old woman of multiethnic European and Native American descent, married a Native Hawaiian and had lived in Hawai'i for 25 years at the time of research. Her children pursue their Hawaiian culture through music, dance and some Hawaiian language study. The following interview dialogue demonstrates that a majority of interactions in the home took place in Pidgin and reflect her understanding of the ways that communicative contexts determine whether she employs Standard English or Pidgin.

457. **M:** What about the language?
458. **D:** Uh, with Leilani (my daughter) it's mostly da kine (the kind), Pidgin, li dat (like that).
459. Now, the whole family has been li dat. The whole time, we've always talked Pidgin in the
460. home.
461. **M:** So, you speak Pidgin in the home with your family?
462. **D:** Right, in the home.
463. **M:** And when you're at school, do you switch to Standard English?
464. **D:** Right or close. I realise that when I'm around other people that are Local and they're
465. talking Pidgin it is very difficult for me to speak Standard English and when I am around
466. people who are using Standard English, it is very difficult to speak Pidgin.

UNCORRECTED PROOF

This excerpt reifies the communicative value of Pidgin during familial and social contexts, and also illuminates the ways in which interpersonal dialogue determine what linguistic codes people employ.

Although the motivation to accommodate various language norms is based on practical interests, there are also cultural and ideological values associated with both Standard English and Pidgin. For instance, during the focus group, Participant 14 explained the importance of children in Hawai'i learning the Pidgin language, so they would acquire and remember the cultural history that has contributed to current social and economic circumstances in the Islands. He stated that:

400. **G:** I think it's important for the kids, growing up here in the Islands to learn Pidgin, because
401. its reminiscent of how it was back in the days of the plantation . . . different cultures, different
402. ethnic groups. It's really important to know that and to embrace it because that's our own
403. culture. That's the culture of the Islands . . . it allows us to remember where we came from
404. and how it got us to where we are today.

As the findings demonstrate, the Pidgin language variety in Hawai'i represents an ideology of cultural and historical understanding among speakers and is positioned as the *preferred* communicative tool for familial and social interactions. Pidgin represents a linguistic and cultural collective, invested with an established historical perspective that observes, perpetuates, and ceremonialises the values of 'our own culture' and sometimes celebrates a *de*marginalising resistance to the formal linguistic demands of a colonial economic system.

Identity, language and group membership

Our data confirm current theory (see Sachdev & Giles, 2004) suggesting that language performance (and the identity negotiation that ensues) may often depict and influence group membership. Moreover, findings parallel Ritchie and Bhatia's (2004) research which shows that bilingual speakers often strategically utilise different languages depending on social and cultural attitudes associated with a given language variety. For instance, several individuals reported that they commonly spoke Pidgin when communicating at their job site, in spite of the mandate to speak Standard English at work and with supervisors, clients or tourists. In the following excerpts, participants articulated how Pidgin assists them in developing social rapport with colleagues and clients or in accomplishing tasks more efficiently.

Participant 3, a middle-aged woman of multiethnic European and Indian descent, described how she puts herself at her clients' level by speaking Pidgin, in order to assist the development of rapport and honesty.

307. **M:** When you say that you can 'turn on the Pidgin', could you tell me more about
308. that? Such as when and why you do it?
309. **B:** Say, I'm doing an assessment (clinical evaluation).
310. Ok, so they come in, maybe they're 25 years old,
311. born and raised here and they see me. Most people think that I am Local. Portuguese,
312. by appearance, so, if I sit there and I speak like a very well-educated middle-aged
313. woman, they're going to back off. I am going to lose their honesty right away
314. because they are going to try to put up a front.

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

Participant 2, a multiethnic Local woman in her mid-20s reflected on the professional advantages resulting from speaking Pidgin with clientele. Upon beginning employment at a public service position, the woman recalled the negative response she would receive from clients when she spoke Standard English because they would infer that she was a 'Haole'. To assist more effective communication, the individual would speak Pidgin ('broken English'), which has significantly enhanced communication during professional interactions.

612. **C:** It definitely helps now, well now with my job. The oddest thing is that I can turn
613. it off and on. I can be with a client that is very local and I can flip it in a second and
614. just start talking broken English.
615. **M:** So that's what you do then?
616. **C:** Yes. It really helps me to connect with my clients.

Much like the previous respondents, Participant 13 described her automatic shift into the Pidgin language when she interacts with a woman from work that she characterised as a Tita.[2] The participant asserted that she is motivated to use Pidgin with her co-worker because the 'Tita' may not understand her or have an adverse reaction to her use of Standard English.[3] In the following excerpt, Participant 13 explained that her co-worker may wonder 'who she is trying to act like', suggesting that this respondent is aware of the negative stigma that Standard English represents among some Locals in the Islands and does not want to be affiliated with a stigmatised group membership by speaking Standard English.

116. **J:** And my co-workers, like, I'll call up a co-worker on Oahu and automatically
117. my Pidgin just comes out, because she's a real Tita.
118. **M:** Yeah.
119. **J:** So if I speak Standard English to her and she talking to me in Pidgin . . . .
120. **M:** It won't work as well?
121. **J:** Yeah.

Such information verifies that Pidgin is preferred in familial and social settings, yet also enhances professional task efficiency by enhancing social rapport between co-workers, clients or other colleagues. Although Standard English is utilised for professional and economic access, doing so in settings with other Locals who are speaking Pidgin (even in professional contexts) is viewed as a violation of the Local language norms in Hawai'i and may result in social exclusion and decreased task efficiency. The cultural imperative to speak Pidgin to Locals whenever possible – despite prevailing Standard English norms in professional contexts – implies some resistance to a dominant cultural and economic status quo.

As our findings attest, respondents often perceived Standard English and Pidgin to be invested with diverging values and ideologies. Standard English was seen as the language for professional and economic advancement, while Pidgin was utilised mostly in routine social or relational contexts. Locals in Hawai'i reported drawing from context-specific and, often, implicit assumptions about the appropriateness and effectiveness of Standard English in comparison to Pidgin. Furthermore, the Hawaiian example explored here illuminates the complexities involved when language immigrants (either

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

Locals in a Standard English speech community or Haoles in a Pidgin speech community) attempt to access social and cultural group membership by accommodating to the dominant communicative norm. Therefore, this study verifies that unsuccessful speech accommodation attempts predicted group categorisation and exclusion for respondents, both in their perceptions of others and their own experiences. Drawing from our findings, we now discuss how principles of communication accommodation, ethnolinguistic vitality theory and the markedness model inform the study of code choice practices among Locals in Hawai'i.

Discussion and Conclusion

Linguistic convergence by Locals to the dominant language of business and government has become prevalent throughout the world. For example, Gallois and Callan (1991: 247) suggested that 'in spite of the multicultural policy adopted by the government, Australia is a very monolingual country (Callan & Gallois, 1987), and both aborigines and immigrants are thus under considerable pressure to speak Australian English, the majority language'. In comparison, the Hawaiian example explored here depicts a scenario where the preferred language in the Islands, by a majority of Locals, is Pidgin, yet the status and necessity for Standard English positions it as the gateway to the modern professional marketplace. Nonetheless, Locals' narratives underscore the covert prestige (Trudgill, 1974) of Pidgin and the demarginalising energies that have overtly persisted to maintain its vitality.

The data herein suggest that Locals in Hawai'i prefer speaking Pidgin during most familial and social interactions because it reifies personal identity and collective understanding. However, the same individuals also demonstrate their investment in the economic infrastructure of the Islands by converging to Standard English when advantageous. Thus, our findings parallel Carbaugh's (2005: 23) assertion that conversation reflects and reifies social and cultural conditions, 'people, relations, actions, feelings, and living in places. Conversations derive from a history of practices, and can subsequently re-create or transform those very practices.'

Although convergence and divergence practices have been extensively explored in previous research, results of this study illuminate the complex identity and social processes inherent for those who strive to maintain ingroup solidarity, while securing individual prosperity. The same individuals who admitted converging to Standard English for professional benefit also criticised other members of social groups who were perceived as violating ingroup norms by speaking Standard English. Indeed, those who converge towards dominant language norms encounter alienation by others within their ingroup (Hogg *et al*., 1989), who may not approve of the decision to converge (Sachdev & Giles, 2004). Language violations were viewed as an attempt to elevate one's status above that of the group and, in many cases, was responded to with ridicule, criticism and communicative exclusion. Furthermore, we have begun to discuss the ways in which individuals manage the ongoing tensions associated with utilising diverging (often ideologically opposed) language varieties.

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

This study has also shown that Standard English maintains strong vitality (both objective and subjective) in the Hawaiian Islands, despite the fact that most of the population prefers (or are only able) to speak Pidgin in familial and social contexts. Clearly the preference to speak Pidgin suggests high subjective vitality of the language. We have argued that such vitality exists for Pidgin because it represents a shared history, culture and ideology for speakers. Further investigation must continue this topic of inquiry in order to inform the long-term use and survival of languages that are strong in objective vitality, yet low in subjective vitality (Standard English) and vice versa (Pidgin).

The markedness model purports that those who adopt socially denigrated language varieties are designated as 'marked', while those who employ varieties that are perceived as appropriate, routine and normative are labelled 'unmarked'. The findings of our research demonstrate that language appropriateness is highly context-specific and dependent on perceptions of ingroup versus outgroup status. For instance, among Locals in social or family environments, the unmarked variety is Pidgin, however, while in educational or professional contexts (especially with supervisors), Pidgin is viewed as the marked (hence disadvantaged) variety. Comparatively, Standard English in Local social or family contexts is viewed as marked (stigmatised), yet is unmarked, tolerated and even promoted in educational contexts.

Our investigation also highlights the fact that individuals vary in their ability to comprehend what language is marked and what social responses will develop. For example, Locals that misevaluated language appropriateness and attempted to speak Standard English with their authentic community were negatively viewed and treated. Also, in the context of the service industry, respondents noted that co-workers who would incorrectly engage Standard English (despite their attempts) would suffer criticism from tourists and clientele. Similarly, Haoles who incorrectly evaluated their legitimacy to speak Pidgin with Locals were ridiculed and socially excluded. This evidence suggests that what constitutes a 'marked' variety depends on ability, context and social legitimacy.

Research must also account for the historical and economic reality of colonisation and forced annexation of Hawai'i to the USA, along with a host of remembered historical injuries. These would include: the outlawing of the Hawaiian language and religion for nearly a century; the harsh plantation days of indentured servitude for immigrants; the WWII internment camps for Japanese–American citizens; and the illegal seizure of properties, along with a host of other, less acknowledged oppressions, not the least of which is the censure of the Pidgin language in education and public affairs for the last 30 years. It is not surprising that Locals who are the descendants of survivors from such abuses are sceptical and resistant to changes that appear to threaten their fragile cultural and economic existence. Rohter (2005: A6), in addressing the colonisation of language and culture in the Brazilian Amazon, referred to Persida Miki, a Professor of Education at the Federal University of Amazonas, who suggested that among oppressed people, language became 'a mechanism of ethnic, cultural, and linguistic resistance'.

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Hawaiian Pidgin is not officially recognised by the US Census Bureau, despite being the language of choice for over 50% of the population in Hawai'i (and with this mind, we need to investigate larger samples than herein with a diversity of methodologies). Such exclusion marginalises and disqualifies a language and social tool for a large part of the population and is reminiscent of the historical effort to eliminate the Hawaiian language from the public vocabulary. Gumperz (1982) proposed that codeswitching practices serve to mark and distinguish an understanding of 'we' (minority) versus 'they' (majority) languages. Inquiry should proceed to examine the objective and subjective language vitality of Pidgin because it is the practice of choice for many in the Islands and because it represents a shared cultural history and reality that Standard English has not adequately conveyed. In other words, it has resisted marginalisation. Standard English, in the history of Hawai'i, has been the language of the 'other', 'the Haole' and 'the outsider'.

Acknowledgements

We appreciate the constructive and detailed feedback from three anonymous reviewers and this journal's Editor on previous drafts of this manuscript.

Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Mikaela L. Marlow, University of California, 5843 Ellison Hall, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4020, USA (mmarlow@umail.ucsb.edu).

Notes

1. Data collection began during December 2004 and was completed in August 2005.
2. Tita refers to a very well known stereotype of a Local woman who is usually independent, tough, speaks Pidgin, and may be willing to fight with other women or men, if provoked.
3. Numerous individuals in Hawai'i perceive Standard English as the language of the coloniser, representing the cultural and linguistic oppression of Hawai'i by US economic and political interests.

References

Beechert, E.D. (1985) *Working in Hawai'i: A Labor History*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Bickerton, D. (1983) Creole languages: Pidgin English Hawaii. *Scientific American* 249, 116–122.

Bourhis, R.Y., Giles, H. and Rosenthal, D. (1981) Notes on the construction of a 'subjective vitality questionnaire' for ethnolinguistic groups. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 2, 145–155.

Bourhis, R.Y. and Sachdev, I. (1984) Vitality perceptions and language attitudes: Some Canadian data. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 3, 97–126.

Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2005) Identity and interaction: A sociocultural approach. *Discourse Studies* 7, 585–614.

Callan, V.J. and Gallois, C. (1987) Anglo-Australians' and immigrants' attitudes toward language and accent: A review of experimental and survey research. *International Migration Review* 11, 48–69.

Carbaugh, D. (2005) *Cultures in Conversation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

Cenoz, J. and Valencia, J. (1993). Ethnolinguistic vitality, social networks and motivation in second language acquisition: Some data from the Basque Country. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum* 6, 113–187.
Clyne, M. (1982) *Multilingual Australia*. Melbourne, Australia: River Seine.
Creswell, J.W. (1998) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Currie, M. and Hogg, M.A. (1994) Subjective ethnolinguistic vitality and social adaptation among Vietnamese refugees in Australia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 108, 97–115.
Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (eds) (1994) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
Edwards, J.V. (1994) *Multilingualism*. London, UK: Routledge.
Fishman, J.A. (1972) *The Sociology of Language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Fishman, J.A. (1977) Language and ethnicity. In H. Giles (ed.) *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations* (pp. 15–57). London: Academic Press.
Gallois, C. and Callan, V.J. (1991) Interethnic accommodation: The role of norms. In H. Giles, J. Coupland and N. Coupland (eds) *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolingustics* (pp. 245–269). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Gallois, C., Ogay, T. and Giles, H. (2005) Communication accommodation theory: A look back and a look ahead. In W.B. Gudykunst (ed.) *Theorizing About Intercultural Communication* (pp. 121–148). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Gibbons, J. (1987) *Code-mixing and Code Choice: A Hong Kong Case Study*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Giles, H. (ed.) (1977) *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.
Giles, H. (2001) Ethnolinguistic vitality. In R. Mesthrie (ed.) *Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 472–473). Oxford, England: Elsevier.
Giles, H. and Johnson, P. (1981) The role of language in ethnic group relations. In J.C. Turner and H. Giles (eds) *Intergroup Behavior* (pp. 199–243). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
Giles, H. and Johnson, P. (1987) Ethnolinguistic identity theory: A social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 63, 69–99.
Giles, H., Bourhis, R.Y. and Taylor, D.M. (1977) Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (ed.) *Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations* (pp. 307–348). London, UK: Academic Press.
Giles, H., Coupland, N. and Coupland, J. (eds) (1991) *Contexts of Accommodation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
Grimes, B. (1996) *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (13th edn). Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics, Inc.
Gumperz, J.J. (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Gumperz, J.J. and Cook-Gumperz, J. (1982) Introduction: Language and the communication of social identity. In J.J. Gumperz (ed.) *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Harwood, J. and Giles, H. (eds) (2005) *Intergroup Communication: Multiple Perspectives*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
Hogg, M.A., D'Agata, P. and Abrams, D. (1989) Ethnolinguistic betrayal and speaker evaluations across Italian Australians. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs* 115, 155–181.
Kamana, K. and Wilson, W.H. (1996) Hawaiian language programs. In G. Cantoni (ed.) *Stabilizing Indigenous Languages* (pp. 153–156). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University Press.
Kim, Y.Y. (2001) *Becoming Intercultural: An Integrative Theory of Communication and Cross-cultural Adaptation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Lawson, S. and Sachdev, I. (2000) Codeswitching in Tunisia: Attitudinal and behavioral dimensions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 1343–1361.

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

Malone, N.J. and Corry, M. (2004) *Make It Count: Native Hawaiian Population Estimates in Census 2000 and Implications for Other Small Racial Groups*. Honolulu, HI: Kamehameha Schools.

Marlow, M.L. and Giles, H. (2006) From the roots to the shoots: A Hawaiian case study of language revitalization and modes of communication. In C. Beck (ed.) *Communication Yearbook* 30, 343–385.

Masuda, H. (2000) *The Genesis of Discourse Grammar: Universals and Substrata in Guyanese, Hawai'i Creole, and Japanese*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1998) *Codes and Consequences: Choosing Linguistic Varieties*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ohama, M.L.F., Gotay, C.C., Pagano, I.S., Boles, L. and Craven, D.D. (2000) Evaluations of Hawaii Creole English and Standard English. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 19, 357–377.

Reineke, J.E. (1969) *Language and Dialect in Hawai'i*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Riessman, C.K. (1993) *Narrative Analysis. Qualitative Research Methods*, Vol. 30. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ritchie, W.C. and Bhatia, T.K. (2004) Social and psychological factors. In T.K. Bhatia and W.C. Ritchie (eds) *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 336–352). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Rohrer, J. (2005) Haole matters: An interrogation of Whiteness in Hawai'i. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawai'i, Manoa.

Rohter, L. (2005) Language born of colonialism thrives again in Amazon. *The New York Times* August 28, A6.

Ryan, E.B. (1979) Why no low-prestige language varieties persist? In H. Giles and R.N. St. Clair (eds) *Language and Social Psychology* (pp. 145–157). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Ryan, E.B. and Giles, H. (eds) (1982) *Attitudes Toward Language Variation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Sachdev, I. and Giles, H. (2004) Bilingual accommodation. In T.K Bhatia and W.C. Ritchie (eds) *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 353–378). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Silverstein, M. (1979) Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P.R. Clyne, W.F. Hanks and C.L. Hofbauer (eds) *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Simard, L., Taylor, D.M. and Giles, H. (1976) Attribution processes and interpersonal accommodation in a bilingual setting. *Language and Speech* 19, 374–387.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J.C. (1986) The social psychology of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel and W.G. Austin (eds) *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson.

Tracy, K. and Haspel, K. (2004) Language and social interaction: Its institutional identity, intellectual landscape, and discipline shifting agenda. *The Journal of Communication* 54, 788–816.

Trudgill, P. (1974) *Sociolinguistics.* Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

US Bureau of the Census (2000) *Statistical Abstract of the United States* (1st edn). Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office.

Velupillai, V. (2003) *Hawai'i Creole English: A Typological Analysis of the Tense-mood-aspect System.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Williams, A., Garrett, P. and Coupland, N. (1999) Dialect recognition. In D.R. Preston (ed.) *The Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology* (Vol. 1., pp. 345–358). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Zilles, A.M.S. and King, K. (2005) Self-presentation in sociolinguistic interviews: Identities and language variation in Panambi, Brazil. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9, 74–94.

UNCORRECTED PROOF

Y:/Multilingual matters/MD/Articles/MD060/md060.3d[x] Wednesday, 19th September

Mikaela L. Marlow completed her doctoral research at the University of California at Santa Barbara and is an assistant professor in the Department of Psychology and Communication Studies at the University of Idaho. Her inquiry explores theoretical and applied intergroup communication among diverse language, ethnic, and cultural collectives. Recent work has appeared in *Communication Yearbook* and *Human Communication Research*.

Howard Giles is Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Director of the Center on Police Practices and Community, and Professor of Communication at the University of California, Santa Barbara. His research explores different facets of applied interpersonal and intergroup communication research and theory, including intergenerational and law enforcement issues. On Editorial Boards of dozens of journals across disciplines, he has been Founding/ Co-Founding Editor of two of his own, & is past President of the International Communication Association.

UNCORRECTED PROOF