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WARNING: This paper is very much work in progress, of value only to the very committed. It contains important points and reasonable pieces of analysis, but they do not yet cohere in a straightforward reading experience.
This working paper is designed as an exploratory contribution to the study of L2 style that (a) avoids an a priori separation of first and second language speakers, (b) analyses artful performance and L2 linguistic limitations together, and (c) addresses the dynamic interrelations of structural form, interactional practice and language ideology. It presents the case-study of a man who migrated to London in his late twenties, and uses three complementary definitions of style to examine his English segmental phonology: style as quantitative style-shifting, as rhetorical stylisation, and as register. It offers normative appraisals of his speech, pegged to the local currency of different forms, to situation-sensitive expectations about genre and footing, and to the compensatory effect of co-occurring semiotic signs, and it examines his stylistic self-positioning within two axes of ideological differentiation, one related to migration and the other to social class. Working at the interface between sub-disciplinary traditions, the paper also addresses methodological issues in some detail, and although there is no longitudinal component, it concludes with reflections on learning and metalinguistic reflexivity.

This paper provides the snapshot of a man who says that he really only started to speak English when he migrated from India to London in his late 20s, and it focuses on the styles of English that he uses. But this is not straightforward, since historically, ‘style’ and ‘second language’ don’t go together in language research, and they have often been associated with antagonistic views of non-standard mixed speech data. While L2 research has typically drawn on notions like learning, development, error and interference, sociolinguistic studies of style speak of social differentiation, identity-projection, sociolectal form and code-switching, and the selection of perspective is often presented as an issue of ‘either/or’ (see e.g. Gumperz 1982:63-65; Rampton 1995:Ch.11.5; Svendsen & Quist 2010:xvi). But there is surely no necessary incompatibility of ‘style’ and ‘L2’ (cf Rehner et al 2003; Talmy 2008; Iwasaki 2010; Sharma & Sankaran 2010). Kramsch suggests that “imagined identities, projected selves, idealisations or stereotypes of the other... seem to be central to the language-learning experience [even though...] they are difficult to grasp within the current paradigms of SLA research”, (2009:5), and when Eckert proposes that in “one way or another, every stylistic move is the result of an interpretation of the social world and of the meanings of elements within it, as well as a positioning of the stylizer with respect to that world” (2008:456), there is no principled reason for excluding the L2 user from analysis. So as someone’s grasp of a different language develops, it is worth asking: which social categories, figures and stances do they (start to) explore through the non-referential, socially indexical possibilities of the language they’re using, how, where, with whom and with what kinds of alignment? Indeed, how far do the abilities to distinguish different social types, to recognise the ways of speaking associated with them, and then to reproduce them linguistically, develop in synchrony?

In interactional sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, the relationship between self-positioning and non-native and ‘other’ varieties is central to the now extensive body of research on crossing and stylisation (Rampton & Charalambous 2010), and there is prima facie relevance to L2 research in the very definition of stylisation as “communicative action in which speakers produce...
representations of languages, dialects and styles that lie outside their own habitual repertoire” (Rampton 2009:149). But this work leans towards celebration of the socio-cultural skills involved the use of subordinate outgroup varieties. Sometimes ‘second language learners’ do enter the account, but they almost invariably only feature as stylised persona projections (‘foreigner talk’), produced by people who can actually speak the language very well (e.g. Rampton 1995; Hinnenkamp 1987; Depperman 2007). In contrast, it is hard to find any studies of stylisation that examine the repertoire of L2 speech styles among migrants for whom second language learning has been part of a long term, life-changing project, and that also consider questions of linguistic proficiency alongside issues of interactional strategy and social alignment. This is a serious gap. Style variation among L2 users may be less spectacular than crossing and stylisation in mixed adolescent peer-groups or in popular media, and it may be less consequential ideologically. But even mainstream dialectologists now recognise that in contemporary globalisation, L2 users are an integral part of the sociolinguistic landscape, and it is important for language research (a) to develop methods that don’t rest on an a priori separation of L1 and L2 speakers, and (b) that are able to account for ‘stylistic moves’ and their ideological and interactional dynamics without erasing issues of proficiency. Or at least, that is the motivation for this paper. Going beyond ‘either/or’ accounts, how can our fine-grained descriptions do justice simultaneously both to L2 users’ dynamic stylistic attunement to their social and interactional environments and to their linguistic limitations? In view of the lack of roadmaps for this kind of analysis, it is necessary to start with an account of working definitions, analytic pitfalls, the guiding standards of adequacy and the methodologies in play.

1. Methodological preliminaries

1.1 Defining ‘style’ and ‘L2’

‘Style’ is a complex notion in sociolinguistics (see Eckert & Rickford (eds) 2001; Coupland 2007a; Auer (ed) 2007), and the ensuing analysis orients to style in three different senses (cf Agha 2007:186-7):

S1: as ‘style-shifting’ in the tradition of variationist sociolinguistics: patterns of phonological variation identified with different situations by analysts using quantitative correlation (cf Labov 1972);

S2: as ‘enregistered style’/‘register’: distinctive forms of language, speech and non-linguistic semiosis associated by users with differentiating typifications of person, situation, relationship, behaviour etc, used as a normal part of social interaction (Agha 2007:186; 2004)

S3: as ‘stylistisation’: more reflexive communicative action in which speakers produce specially marked and often exaggerated representations of languages, dialects, accents, registers or styles that lie outside their habitual repertoire (at least as this is expected within the situation on hand) (Agha 2007:187; Rampton 1995, 2006)

In what follows, I will dwell much more on style-shifting (S1) and stylisation (S3) than on register (S2), but as Agha offers a very cogent and far-reaching account and it is also presupposed in stylisation, it is worth giving a preliminary sketch of register right at the start.

‘Register’ covers roughly same span of empirical phenomena as the sociolinguistic notion of ‘variety’, but unlike standard treatments of the latter (e.g. Hudson 1996:22; Holmes 2001:6), Agha insists that one can only speak of a register if there is reflexive metapragmatic awareness among producers and receivers. “A register”, says Agha, “exists as a bounded object only to a degree set by sociohistorical processes of enregisterment, processes by which the forms and values of a register become differentiable from the rest of the language (i.e. recognisable as distinct, linked to typifiable social personae or practices) for a population of speakers” (2004:37). The processes of differentiation associated with ‘enregisterment’ range from small-scale metalinguistic actions – the use of register names, stylisations, explicit accounts of usage, next turn responses – to institutional

---

2 In virtually all sociolinguistic studies, certainly all that take place in developed communities, subjects are likely to differ with respect to their natal roots (Chambers 2002:128).
fields and discourses like lexicography, schooling and literary representation (cf Agha 2007:151-2; 2004:27), and they work in different combinations to construct links between particular (sets of) linguistic forms and social typifications (2005:46; 2007:81). The ‘populations of speakers’ in which a given register has currency vary in scope, durability and organisation, and Agha’s account is especially relevant to a study of L2 style when he emphasises that even within the range of groups and settings where a register circulates – even within its ‘social domain’ – the ability or opportunity to recognise and produce it are unevenly distributed (2004:37).

‘Second language’ is obviously a much more contested term than ‘style’. Certainly, ‘language learning’ and ‘learners’ are culturally recognisable practices and identities, and there is a basic truth in the idea that adults with different lexico-grammars can be mutually unintelligible, and that one of them may need to start learning the ‘second language’ before they can begin covering a full range of topics alone together in conversation. But as the focus of government policies, professional specialisations, educational curricula, media reporting etc, L2 learning is hugely politicised, and there is a considerable history of the term being misapplied, both globally and to people from South Asia in the UK (cf Pennycook 1994; Rampton 1983, 1988). So it is important to guard against this overextension/stereotyping, and to do so, it is worth specifying three interpretive risks presented by a dataset like ours right at the start.

1.2 Dataset and interpretive risks

The data informing this working paper come from a project in 2008-9, focusing on an area with a substantial history of immigration, particularly from India and Pakistan. We collected data from 75 informants with mainly Punjabi ethnic backgrounds, aged between 14 and 65, born both in the UK and abroad (in India, Pakistan, East African, Malaysia and Hong Kong). Fieldwork was conducted over 8 months by Devyani Sharma and Lavanya Sankaran, and it involved participant observation and interviews, as well as self-recordings conducted by a smallish subset of the informants. The focal informant in this case-study, Mandeep (not his real name), came to England from the Punjab in 2001 aged 28, and he was recorded in 6 settings – two interviews with Lavanya Sankaran (one focusing on life experiences and attitudes, the other on his networks, everyday practices and patterns of language use), and four self-recordings (with group of colleagues at work (involving one Anglo and several people born in India); with an Indian-born friend; with newly arrived relative; on his own in the car). The total dataset amounted to nearly 5½ hours.

Faced with this dataset, an interest in L2 style faces at least three major challenges: (i) ensuring a properly situated perspective on L2 status and proficiency; (ii) avoiding inadvertent slippage from didn’t to can’t; and (iii) understanding social meaning in idiosyncratic performance.

i) As noted above, research in this area risks either ignoring limitations of proficiency or identifying people as L2 speakers incorrectly, and my efforts to avoid this involve:

- checking the focal informant’s own linguistic self-classification, and his experience of being classified by others
- calibrating his speech with the language of people who inhabit the same environment but have been using English all their lives. This is necessary because “[p]rocesses such as diaspora [that]... develop over long spans of time... result in lasting... social,...sociolinguistic and discursive reconfigurations which have effects across wide ranges of situations” (Blommaert, Collins & Slembrouck 2005:201), and what sounded ‘foreign’ 30 years ago may no longer do so today;
- reckoning with the situated expectations associated with particular interlocutors and interpreters, genres, footings etc. This is obviously relevant to interactional styling, but it extends to judgements of L2 achievement as well. Traditionally, L2 research conceptualised competence as inhering in the individual, but co-constructionist approaches now see all aspects of communication as relational (Young 2009:165). The dynamic between co-present producers and recipients is obviously crucial to these performance assessments, but it is also essential to reckon with the more temporally distended connections between informants and their subsequent analysts (Blommaert 2008:179-80).
ii) With data on ordinary talk, there is the perennial risk of inflating what someone did or didn’t do on a specific occasion into claims about their general capacity. So it is vital not slide loosely from ‘didn’t’ to ‘can’≠t’, or to slip textually into the reifying ‘ethnographic present’. With this in mind, it is worth saying right at the outset that there is no data on Mandees’s styles with white Anglos only, and this inevitably restricts what we can claim about his style range.

iii) Even though it is a general problem (cf LePage & Tabouret-Keller 1985:182 (ii) & (iv); Agha 2007:8,70), the task of saying that specific speech forms index particular stances, images, categories or stereotypes can be especially tricky when there are people involved who aren’t particularly proficient in the language in play. Even if they can discern a particular style receptively (which of course can’t be taken for granted), they may not have the resources to reproduce it accurately, in spite of their efforts to do so (cf Preston 1989:254; Sharma 2005:215).

Lastly, with these precautionary observations now in place, it is worth considering the standards of adequacy that the paper aspires to, and the specific combination of sub-disciplinary traditions it involves.

1.3 Standards of adequacy and the methodologies in play

Beyond its very general relevance to sociolinguistic study, there are two reasons for orienting my analyses to what Silverstein calls the ‘total linguistic fact’ (see also Agha 2007:147-150).

According to Silverstein, “[t]he total linguistic fact, the datum for a science of language is irreducibly dialectic in nature. It is an unstable mutual interaction of meaningful sign forms, contextualised to situations of interested human use and mediated by the fact of cultural ideology” (1985:220). This is broadly equivalent to the triangle in Hanks’ theorization of language as communicative practice,

```
formal structure
  /
 /|
 / \\
activity -- --- -- ideology (1996:230)
```

The integration of form, practice and ideology in these formulations is particularly valuable here,

a) because it steers us away from reductive description of L2 speakers, making it harder to erase or to romanticise their political positioning, their rhetorical capabilities, or their linguistic proficiencies by over-emphasising one of these dimensions at the expense of the others; and

b) because it provides a benchmark for my attempt to contribute to the growing mutual alignment of interactional and variationist sociolinguistics (IS and VS) (Woolard 2008:436-7; Buchholtz & Hall (eds) 2008), investigating the relevance of their combination for the study of L2 speech.

The concerns underpinning (a) have already been discussed, but it is worth briefly considering (b).

Historically, interactional sociolinguistics (and linguistic anthropology more generally) have differed from VS and L2 research in their ontological assumptions, but more recently, they have come to share common ground in practice theory, a “broad and capacious...general theory of the production of social subjects through practice, and the production of the world itself through practice” (Ortner 2006:16; Gumperz 1982; Eckert 2000; Young 2009). This convergence means that attempts to

3 Traditionally, this is overcome with experimental elicitations, and in what follows, our informant’s sense of sociolinguistic space and his phonological abilities probably could have been probed more systematically with the field methods of perceptual dialectology and some cleverly devised pronunciation tests. But obviously, these give little idea of how linguistic resources and a sense of social space come together in practice, and it is this that the current paper prioritises.

4 While IS has been guided by a constructionist interest in agentic practice from the outset, seeking a “dynamic view... of social environments where history, economic forces and interactive processes... combine to create or to eliminate social distinctions” (Gumperz 1982:29), VS has worked with a more structuralist interest in how social patterns are reflected in linguistic systems (Cameron 1990; Eckert 2000:44). Recently, though, variationist research has turned more to practice theory, seeing speakers “not as incidental users of a linguistic system, but... as agents in the continual construction and reproduction of that system...as constituting, rather than representing, broad social categories” (Eckert 2000:43,3). Indeed, there has been a comparable reorientation in L2 research. Young, for example, defines practice as “the construction and reflection of social realities through actions that invoke identity, ideology, belief and power” (2009:1), and he looks for an analysis of language learning in which “the acquisition of knowledge about language” is embedded in accounts that address
combine IS, VS and L2 research are no longer threatened by fundamental philosophical incompatibilities, but even so, their engagement with the total linguistic fact is still often partial, and they have tended to address only two of the TLF’s three elements, in different combinations. Referring to recent L2 research, for example, Young suggests that “in studies [of L2 discursive practice], rich descriptions of context are illustrated with superficial analyses of language, whereas in other studies, a close analysis of a newcomer’s developing utilization of verbal, non-verbal, and interactional skills is explained by a rather thin description of context.” (2009:230). Nor are balanced treatments of form, activity and ideology routine in variationist or interactional sociolinguistics. In what follows, I will draw on

- variationist sociolinguistics for a wider view of speech patterns and language change in the area where the focal informant lives, and for a specification of the linguistic forms providing the point of entry into analysis;
- interactional sociolinguistics for an orientation to discourse organisation, to situated sense-making and agentive improvisation, and to stylisation as ideological positioning;
- second language research for a concern with the approximations and strategies produced by people working at the borders of their linguistic expertise, for an interest in the social aspirations driving language development, and an acceptance that the analysis of L2 speakers often entails higher levels of interpretive indeterminacy than work on the more regular grammars of people using a language since childhood (Corder 1981:26-44; van Lier 2000:248). Movement between these perspectives should illuminate phenomena and processes that might otherwise be missed, and the TLF serves as both impetus and reference point for overall appraisal of the adequacy of this interchange. My main formal focus is on segmental phonology, much studied in the sociolinguistics of style and well enough charted to allow the proficiency assessments prominent in L2 research. But the normative appraisal of Mandeep’s phonological speech styling will be tuned to survey findings about the local currency of different forms, to situation-sensitive expectations about narrative performance and direct reported speech (genre & footing), and to the potentially compensatory effect of co-occurring semiotic signs (1.2.i). I will also address L2 attitude issues, but treat these as matters of language ideology, approaching them through analyses of Mandeep’s stated and implied alignments with different voices, figures and positions in the social landscape.

With this outline of definitions, caveats, aspirations and foci in place, we can now turn to the empirical analysis. This starts with a description of the central informant, his experience of England and his observations about language (Section 2), and then moves to the variationist analysis, comparing Mandeep’s style-shifting with British-born Anwar’s (3). Focusing on stylisation in narrative quoted speech, Section 4 analyses a specific strategic device (okay), describes the variation

“the participation of people in practices, how their participation changes, how learners’ communicative resources are adapted in the recurrent performance of a practice with different participants, and how they reconfigure those resources to meet the demands and affordance of unfamiliar practices” (2009:5).

5 Bayley & Regan also comment: “Although a number of important studies of second language learners... have used ethnographic methods to gain rich insights into speakers’ experiences in acquiring a second language, few studies have combined the intensive ethnographic study and linguistic analysis that characterises some of the best current research in quantitative sociolinguistics” (2004:333).

6 Pioneering the links between linguistic variability and language attitudes (e.g. Labov 1972), variationist sociolinguistics is typically stronger on the interface between formal structure and ideology, and even in Eckert’s work, practice stops short of the micro-analysis of talk, dwelling instead on cultural styles, tastes and activities captured through ethnographic observation (cf Coupland 2007a:51; for exceptions, see e.g. Schilling-Estes 1998:55; Kiesling 2004, 2005; Fygal 2010). Interactional sociolinguistics is also often partial in its engagement with ‘the total linguistic fact’. For Gumperz, “[v]ariability is not language specific but situation specific so that the primary unit or domain of analysis is not a language, dialect or code seen as a structurally cohesive entity, but rather a situation, social encounter or speech event’ (Gumperz 1992:41). As a result, rather than focusing on the indexical value of specific linguistic systems or variables (as in VS), social meaning is treated as the cumulative effect produced by a range of different semiotic signs working together in any given encounter (prosody, information-structure, lexis etc). Similarly, in influential IS research on L2 learning, patterns, rates and routes in the development of linguistic structure play little part: “A holistic and interpretative approach to second language research is... not concerned with general developmental trends of particular features but with understanding the nature of intercultural communication and the conditions under which a measure of shared interpretation and language development may take place” (Bremer, Roberts et al 1996: 214; Block 2007:76ff). In sum, while the non-reductive integration of linguistic, interactional and cultural analysis is certainly not without either theoretical or empirical precedent (and has long been the central preoccupation in research on language socialisation (Ochs & Schieffelin 1984)), it remains a significant challenge in the traditions invoked in the study that follows.
in Mandeep’s alignment with non-Indian and vernacular Englishes, and evaluates his rhetorical effectiveness. Section 5 then looks for ‘enregistered style’ in non-narrative speech, but this is harder to find. Last, Section 6 concludes with a characterisation of Mandeep’s local sociolinguistic positioning and some implications for our understanding learning and metalinguistic reflexivity.

2. The informant’s locality, biography and reflections on style

Since the 1950s, west London has been a major area of settlement for people with links to South Asia in general and the Punjab in particular. According to the 2001 Census,7 the c. 89,000 population in Ealing Southall was 47.8% Asian (23.2% Sikh, 12.4% Hindu, 13.3% Muslim), 37.6% white and 8.9% black, with 43.4% overall born outside the UK. This is not an affluent area, and according to Ealing Council, there are "areas within Southall [that] appear within the top 5% most deprived in the country in terms of income deprivation, crime and barriers to housing and services".8 There is a strong history of voting for the Labour Party in elections, and the Punjabi cultural presence has been very significant for more than 40 years, with Southall often referred to as ‘little India’ and ‘little Punjab’ (Gillespie 1995:35)

Mandeep, the focal informant, had been a teacher in the Punjab, with an MA in Economics, and he left India for England because he thought that unless you were very rich, there was no “opportunity to live a normal life there” (MI.281). Soon after arriving in west London, he found “a very basic job” in a retail warehouse, and he then moved to night shifts in a supermarket chain so he could look for a better job during the day. After two months he found a peripatetic job as a temporary classroom assistant, and for short while – “the hardest time I had in my life” – he worked both day and night. But then one of the schools where he worked agreed to employ him on a more regular basis, and so he left the supermarket (which had refused him weekend work) and worked as a classroom assistant for about a year and half. During this period he started to do part-time news work in a local Punjabi radio station, and for a while, this turned into a full-time occupation as a news editor and reader, which also involved quite a lot of training from the BBC. But as a community organisation principally staffed by volunteers, Mandeep was not particularly well remunerated and at the time of the interview, his radio work was once again part-time – for four full days a week, he was doing a one-year maths enhancement course, with a view to qualifying for post-graduate maths teacher training.

Mandeep didn’t have family settled in the UK, but “three or four girls [from my village] are living here” and with so many people – and so many other Jats – from the Punjab in Southall, “you won’t feel like you are living abroad” (MI.88-9). As well as finding work in the language, his neighbours spoke Punjabi, and so did his local doctors and shopkeepers. He used Punjabi with most of his Southall friends, and maintained phone contact with friends in the Punjab. He phoned his parents twice a week, they’d made two 4-5 months visits to Southall, and last year he’d gone to India for a week for his mother’s retirement celebration. And four years ago, he’d married a professional woman who had joined him from India.

As for whether his taste in music and media programmes had changed over the years, Mandeep said “it’s not changed, it’s developed... it’s opened up new branches, kind of” (MQ.34,35). He still liked a range of different kinds of Punjabi music best, but now he also listened to Capital FM and Magic, and when he was driving, he switched between the station where he worked, Capital, Magic, and talk-shows on BBC London where “the beauty is, you will learn so many new things about British culture” (MQ.27,17). If he was spending money eating out, he said he’d normally go to “other cultures’ restaurants – go to Thai, go to Greek, go to Turk”, and although he didn’t get any time in the UK to watch cricket, he’d support England in a match against India – after all, there were now two Punjabis in each team (Harbhajan & Yuvraj versus Panaseer & Bopara), plus, he felt, India was too large and diverse for any meaningful cultural affiliation.

Turning to his experience of English, Mandeep said that “I never used to speak English. I learnt everything here so it just hard” (MI.1041) and “up to the age of 28,... I was not... speaking English at all” (MI.1046). But actually, he had had a lot of exposure to the language through study (MI.1047).

---

7 http://ukpollingreport.co.uk/guide/seat-profiles/ealingsouthall - accessed 12/6/10
8 http://www.visitsouthall.co.uk/Local_Info/southall_middlesex.php - accessed 12/6/10
Most of his primary and secondary education had been Punjabi-medium, but an uncle abroad had encouraged him to write him letters in English (sending back photocopies with corrections), and four of the five subjects he’d taken for his two-year higher-level school exams had been English medium (Maths, Physics, Chemistry and English); as an undergraduate he did maths with English mostly in English; and most of his Masters had been in English as well. Since arrival in the UK, he had done a one year GCSE in English, and as a result of his current maths course, he was now counting in English rather than Punjabi. On the course, there were a few (British born) Punjabis, a handful of international students and a lot of white Anglos – he was good friends with a middle-aged East European woman, with whom he travelled to class from Southall and studied at weekends, and with the white Anglos, “I am perfectly fine, it’s fine, you always mingle with them, talk with them, joke with them” (MI.300-5). Sometimes, “obviously you don’t know every single joke... they are talking about something and...you are not understanding” (MI.337), but this was no reason for feeling that “you are... being excluded”. On the television, he watched the ten o’clock news, everyday if possible, and he also watched soaps (The Bill, East Enders) – “my tendency is to learn as well, so these soaps always tells you about the culture and language, and normally I switch on the teletext as well, so you see the words and what they say, how they say... that’s the way how I improved my English as well... that’s a very good facility as well” (MQ.31.35). He acknowledged that people of Punjabi descent long established in the UK had called him a ‘freshie’ (for ‘fresh-off-the-boat’), and deemed this a “nasty thing. You are saying ‘you are bloody bastards, new people’... and... it’s to do with accent as well” (MI.797-9). But in his reply to this, he combined a conviction that “if you are calibre enough, no one can stop you” with the perception that in comparison with the pleasures of growing up in the Punjab, British life was oppressively work-oriented:

“If someone... is saying to me ‘freshie’, so I will say ‘you are worn out. you are finished. .. I’m a freshie at least I have something to look forward to, you have nothing’... If you’re strong enough: how dare you to say me freshie! What do you know?... You started work at GCSE and I haven’t done anything up to twenty-seven. I enjoyed whole of my life. Now I’m here. I will live better life than you’.” (MI.805-816)

So far from these interviews, the picture emerges of a middle class professional who, in terms of Block’s sketch of adult L2 migrant trajectories, resembles the classical immigrant more than the expatriate or the transmigrant – an individual “who settle[s] in a new country – socially, economically and politically – with little or no expectation or prospect of returning to their country of origin”, rather than one who expects to return home (expatriate) or who “organise[s] daily economic, familial, religious, and social relations within networks that extend across the borders of two nation-states” (transmigrant) (Block 2007:32-3). Mandeep certainly maintained transnational kinship links, and in the community radio station, he found a rewarding space where his educated Punjabi cultural and linguistic repertoire was very well deployed (cf Blommaert et al 2005:198). But like the middle-class Indian migrants described by Voigt-Graf 2005, he wasn’t involved in transnational economic or business links with India, and instead, his Punjabi radio-work served as an important but still secondary source of sustenance and value supporting his primary project, the arduous process of revalidating his professional skills within the regulatory regimes of the nation-state where he now resided.

As Agha notes, registers and styles are socio-historical formations, and we can already see some of the historical and institutional processes enregistering different styles in this environment: schooling, higher and further education, valorising literacy in English as well as Punjabi (and Hindi); migration, turning spoken English into a pressing need and marking Mandeep as a ‘freshie’. And the “lasting sociolinguistic and discursive reconfigurations” produced by diaspora (Blommaert et al, op cit) can also be seen in Punjabi’s local public currency. At the same time, there can be a great deal of interpretive plurality in a globalised environment like this (cf Dürrschmidt 1997; Alibrow 1997), and the investigation of someone’s L2 stylistic repertoire can’t just rely on the analyst’s reading of the context. So it is essential to turn in more detail to Mandeep’s own account of different ways of speaking (which of course also accords with Agha’s emphasis on the centrality of metapragmatic awareness to register/style). Mandeep’s comments on different types of language use covered Punjabi as well as English, but for present purposes, I will focus on the latter.
From the preceding discussion, it is clear that Mandeep was very well-tuned to the distinction between English as a first and second language. Asked how he thought Indians speak English compared to English people, he said “it’s heavy accent and uh... no it’s not just the accents, it’s another language... because most of the Indians who come from there... it’s not their first language” (MI.1037-1041). As we’ve seen, he included himself in the L2 category. He admitted that “because [English]’s my second language, so I was always be uncomfortable as compared to Punjabi” (MI.1121), but “if I have to speak whole day English, I won't be saying like ‘oh my God I was speaking whole day English, my tongue is hurting now’... it's not that now. So if I have to speak English for the whole day, is fine.” (MI.1116). He differentiated his own English from the speech of young people raised in Punjabi families in Britain, thought that it was often harder for them to speak Punjabi, and noted that their English sometimes mixed in a few Punjabi words (MI.1154). He didn’t appear cowed by accusations of ‘freshie’ – indeed, we also encountered some young people who were emphatic in their rejection of its negative associations (“I love freshies – they bring the Punjabi into Southall – I love them” (18 yr old female, Punjabi family,UK born)) – but he knew he was vulnerable to this kind of denigration, partly on the basis of his accent in English. Aside from considerations of ‘freshie’, he said he avoided the Punjabi pronunciation of his name with the Anglos in the Maths classes he was attending (MI.322ff), and also claimed to de-anglicise his speech with non-Punjabis who were weak in English: “sometimes some person comes, you know, even their- er first language is not Punjabi not English, so they struggle in English, so then ‘water’ becomes ‘waTeR’” ([wɔːtə] => [wɔːdər:], with retroflexion and voiced trilled R added to the adjusted version (MQ.73.50)).

Beyond this first/second language axis of differentiation, Mandeep mentioned regional varieties of English – he knew that London and Birmingham accents were different (MI.1078) and in one of his self-recordings, he engaged in discussion of a lexical difference between British and American English (‘maths’ vs ‘math’). He was also aware of classed styles, linking language to a wider range of evaluatively differentiated dispositions and practices:

“accent is to do with... watching telly, talking to the other people... Sometimes, say in English, you’re swearing a lot, and ‘yo mate yo mate’ or something you’re doing, and then- you’re glorifying yourself, some other people are glorifying you, then you develop that accent for the whole of your life. Then your family says, ‘no, that’s not the way how you speak’” (MQ.72.30 abbreviated/simplified)

This extended into a comparison of secondary schools where he’d worked – whereas one was “too noisy”, the one with “more posh people” was a “quiet school, proper resources, amazing, really good”, due to “middle-class families of... Indian or Pakistani sub-continent [who] teach their kids proper” (MB.19:25). Mandeep’s own alignment with the middle class was clear, and was also linguistically indexed in his educated lexical repertoire – indeed, it’s worth noting how he started his list of influences on the way you speak: “literature, your mum, the people around you” (MQ.70.50). But he was also emphatic that in the UK now, there was no straightforward mapping of ethnicity on to class differences:

“the children of Indian sub-continent, [the] third generation... know other things as well – pub culture, these sorts of things - [and] now they are as bad as white partners and as good as white partners – they are now normals... of this country” (MB.22.08. Simplified)

So evidently, (a) Mandeep was aware and articulate about two major dimensions of British sociolinguistic differentiation – Indian/newcomer versus British/local, and high/posh versus low/non-posh. At the same time for him, (b) immigrant or minority ethno-linguistic inheritance wasn’t linked to social solidarity and/or class positioning in any straightforward relationship, and in this case, the traditional image of a minority ethnic second language learner migrating into a host society dominated by majority L1 users is no longer relevant.

In the account so far, then, I have outlined Mandeep’s biographical situation and the metalinguistic views and positioning he articulated in interview. But in terms of the ‘total linguistic fact’ (1.3 above), there has been no systematic analysis of linguistic form (see also Young 2009:230).
It is worth turning to this, beginning with quantitative variationist methods which not only cover ‘S1’ style-shifting (1.1), but also stand out for their ability to locate Mandeep’s speech in a broader sketchmap of the local soundscape.

3. Quantitative variationist analysis

In essence, the methods for the study of style pioneered by Labov (Labov 1972; Hudson 1996:Ch.5) involve:

i) the identification of linguistic features that can be produced in more than one way. (For example, the -ING in ‘speaking’ can be realised as either ‘speaking’ or ‘speakin’, these two realisations being described as ‘variants’ of the -ING variable.)

ii) quantification of the extent to which particular speakers use particular variants of a feature in particular linguistic and situational contexts. (Nouns and verb participles are, for example, two different ‘linguistic contexts’ for the -ING variable [which can occur in words like ‘thing’ and ‘going’ respectively], and ‘chatting with friends’ and ‘reading aloud’ are two situational contexts.)

iii) comparison of the extent to which different variants get used across contexts, speakers and social groups, looking, for example, at how far middle class women use either ‘-in’ or ‘ing’ in reading aloud as opposed to chatting, and how far this resembles or differs from the patterns of middle class men and working class men and women.

In our study of Mandeep’s speech, we focused on 4 linguistic variables, each with individual variants linked to Punjabi or British English in the research literature, and one which also involved a vernacular form: T, L, ‘e’ as in ‘FACE’ and ‘o’ as in ‘GOAT’. These variables and their variants are outlined in Table 1: 

Table 1: Linguistic variables used in the analysis of Mandeep’s situational style-shifting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic variable</th>
<th>Punjabi variant</th>
<th>Standard British English variant</th>
<th>Vernacular British English variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(t) in the environments vt#, #tv and vtv (as in ‘eight’, ‘time’, ‘thirty’)</td>
<td>Retroflex [ʈ]</td>
<td>Alveolar [t]</td>
<td>Glottal [ʔ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-vocalic (l) as in ‘will’ or ‘deal’</td>
<td>Light [l]</td>
<td>Dark [ɹ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) – ‘FACE’ (e) as in ‘say’ and ‘game’</td>
<td>Monophthong [e]</td>
<td>Diphthong [εi]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) – ‘GOAT’ as in ‘don’t’ and ‘road’</td>
<td>Monophthong [o]</td>
<td>Diphthong [oʊ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting at the beginning of each recording and continuing in until we had completed the auditory analysis of between 13 and 45 tokens representing each linguistic variable, we then assessed the percentages of Punjabi vs British variants in Mandeep’s speech in three different situations: (a) in self-recorded interaction with an Indian friend who was himself a fluent speaker of fluent standard Indian English; (b) in one of the interviews with Lavanya Sankaran (brought up in southern India and Singapore), and (c) at work, conversing together with an Anglo L1 English speaking man and several L2 Indian English speaking women. If this method of analysis showed clear differences in the Punjabi- or British-ness of his speech in these three situations, then this would be ‘S1: style-shifting’, broadly in line with variationist convention.

Our analysis showed that yes, there was style-shifting in Mandeep’s speech: he used most Punjabi variants with his Punjabi friend at home, and fewest at work (in the presence of an Anglo colleague). The results are displayed in Figure 1, and in Tables 2-4, and they invite three kinds of connection.
First, Mandeep certainly wasn’t the first person counting himself as a second language speaker who has been found to shift the proportion of L1 and L2 phonological forms produced in different contexts – this kind of style shifting is very well-attested in L2 research (e.g. Beebe 1977, Beebe & Zuengler 1983, Tarone 1983, and Ellis 1994:Ch.4 and Rehner et al 2003 for overviews). So he is not exceptional, and this provides initial grounds for suggesting that the findings emerging in the analysis of this case could be relevant to other L2 users.

Second, it was clear in his own metapragmatic commentary that the difference between British and Punjabi accented English was ideologically freighted, and so although it is difficult to say exactly what this shifting might mean (see below), there are prima facie grounds for rejecting the idea that it is socio-symbolically insignificant.

Third, as a method with origins in relatively standardised sociolinguistic survey research, one of the distinctive strengths of this approach is that it facilitates the analysis of quite large numbers of...
speakers, making it much easy to compare the cross-contextual patterning in Mandeep’s speech with that of others in the same locality. In the event, the procedures used to assess Mandeep’s situational style-shifting were carried on eight other informants who produced self-recorded as well interview data. There were several cases where the patterns emerging are not so readily aligned with Mandeep’s, but with three adult males who had been speaking English since early childhood, there were some broad similarities: with people who had marked non-British accents linked to the Indian sub-continent, there was greater use of Punjabi variants, while with people brought up in the UK, the use of British variants increased. Figure 2 shows the patterns from one of these, Anwar:

**Figure 2**: Anwar: Distribution of Punjabi and Anglo variants across four settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Anwar with Sri Lankan maid</th>
<th>Anwar in interview</th>
<th>Anwar with school friend from Southall</th>
<th>Anwar with family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mon-o</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glottal</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diph-e</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>darkl</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandeep obviously differed from Anwar (and the two others) in his non-use of glottal T, and this points to complex issues of style and L2 proficiency that we will return to later (1.2.iii above and 4.2 below). But before that, the comparison shows that:

a) retroflexion, postvocalic clear Ls and monophthonged ‘FACE’ and ‘GOAT’ vowels are no longer foreign in British-born London speech and Mandeep would not have to erase completely them in order to sound local (see also Sharma & Sankaran 2010);

b) the directionality of Mandeep’s stylistic adjustment with these four variants wasn’t idiosyncratic – it was broadly in line with the directions of shift produced by people who have been speaking English since early childhood.

Admittedly, in saying that the increased or reduced use of Punjabi variants was associated with the presence of ‘people who had marked non-British accents linked to the Indian sub-continent’ versus ‘people brought up in the UK’, the *situational* characterisation is only very approximate. In the analytic extraction of speech variants and their aggregation in Figures 1& 2 and Tables 2-4, there is no control for the talk’s discursive development – for changes of footing, topic, genre etc. In some of the analysis of Mandeep’s recordings, variants are included all the way from line 17 to 955, and in the figures on his talk at work for example, there is no attempt to differentiate speech addressed to either his Anglo or Punjabi interlocutors. So it is impossible to know whether these findings mask more delicate discursive shifts (a distinct narrative segment etc) or whether the quantitative method has picked up on a process of broadly focused and relatively stable person-to-person attunement that operates independently of more fine-grained interactional manoeuvres (see Auer 1988 on discourse-vs participant-related code alternation; Coupland 2007a:Ch.3). Furthermore, both in Mandeep’s speech and in the local area much more generally, it is quite common to find Punjabi, Standard and vernacular Anglo variants together in the space of one word (see the extracts below), and in
consequence it would be premature to claim on the basis of the patterning of just these four variables that someone’s speech sounded more Anglo or Indian overall. So the meaning of these phonological shifts remains unclear (see also Schilling-Estes 1998:55; Coupland 2007a:41-42, 2007b:219; Agha 2007:186). Nevertheless, cross-sectional quantitative analysis shows that Mandeep’s development of spoken English hadn’t started from a phonological baseline that was entirely alien to the area he’d moved into, and that – to try to formulate it in an appropriate level of generality/vagueness – his speech displayed signs of a socio-stylistic sensibility broadly in tune with long term residents’ In interview, Mandeep had said that if you come from Punjab to Southall, “you won’t feel like you are living abroad”, and the quantitative analyses of style suggest that there is some warrant for this claim, not only in Punjabi’s local currency but also in the patternings of local English.

We can now turn from the first to the last of the three notions of style mentioned at the outset – to stylistisation (‘S3’ in 1.1). Here we can address the unanswered question: how far did Mandeep actually cluster Anglo or Punjabi variants together in the construction of meaningful discursive strips? We will see that relative to British-born Anwar’s, Mandeep use of Anglo or Punjabi forms was rather inconsistent, so we then need to ask: if his mobilisations of linguistic code resources were somewhat unpredictable, how did he manage to achieve stylistic effects? In terms of Silverstein’s TLF and Hanks’ triangle (1.3), the account now turns to ‘activity’ and ‘situations of interested human use’, moving down from broad approximations like ‘talking to people brought up in the UK vs India’ to a closer view of speech production from one moment to the next.

4. The stylisation of reported speech in narrative

For most of the ensuing analysis of stylisation, I will focus on narratives that Mandeep produced in his interview with Lavanya Sankaran. Narratives often contain direct reported speech, involving socially identified characters who are conventionally seen as talking in particular styles, and this can provide an opportunity for narrators to put on different voices, as well as for audiences and analysts to see how well they manage it. Admittedly, there can be a good deal of variation in the extent to which reported voices are actually dramatised in any narrative, sensitive to the occasion, the audience etc (cf Coupland 2007a:147-8). In the wrong context, full performance can be embarrassing, so it is important for analysis to be tuned to the mood and expectations of the arena where the story-telling is taking place. In addition, the effective performance of a reported voice can draw on a range of non-segmental vocal resources, so the overall significance of accent features shouldn’t be exaggerated (see 4.3 below).

That said, Mandeep performed character speech in a number of stories, and some of this involved stylistic differentiation along the two axes he outlined in his metalinguistic commentary – Indian/newcomer versus British/local, and high/posh versus low/non-posh. These can be taken these in turn, focusing first (and at greater length) on his stylisation of the English spoken by British rather than Indian people, and then on his performance of working class English vernacular.

4.1 Stylisations of Anglo as distinct from Indian English

The question of whether or not Mandeep produced relatively dense clusterings of distinctly British English phonological forms can be addressed with data from his account of the difficulties he experienced when he first came to the UK. All of the employers he approached were asking for experience, even in basic jobs, and

---

9 The narratives told by migrants are obviously very varied in their social ramifications (cf Baynham & De Fina (eds) 2005; Maryns 2006), but given the congenial atmosphere of the research interviews with Mandeep, it is quite easy to align the data in this paper with the characterisation of narrative offered by Pastor & De Fina: “Narrative activity becomes particularly illuminating in the case of ‘displaced’ groups such as immigrants, in that it is through the process of retelling and reconstructing past experience that members of these groups often make sense of social encounters and conflicts and foreground an emerging sense of their identities, a process that in many cases implies contesting established roles and claiming social space” (2005:37). Issues of ideological self-positioning become focal in 4.1.2ff below
“then I was saying ‘no, I don’t have any- that sort of experience’, so they were giving me ‘okay wait wait’” (MI.5.24).

In this short sequence, Mandeep marked the difference between the narrating and the reported speech with shifts in tempo, becoming much slower in reported speech, and the voice of the employers was rendered in exclusively British variants:

Extract 1: ‘okay wait wait’
Mandeep in interview with Lavanya Sankaran. (Key: Anglo variants; Punjabi variants)

1. then I was saying
   [ðen a wz se인]

2. “↑no: I don have any- that sort of experience”
   [nəu ar dɔ hʌv ənɪ ʤæt sɔtɔːv əkspiˈriːns]

3. ↑so .hhh
   [sɔ]

4. ↑they were giving me “ok: kay:
   [gə va ɡɪvɪŋ mɪ əʊkʰeɪ]

5. (0.3) wait wait
   weɪtʰ weɪtʰ]

6. and then -after- (0.5) two- (0.3) two months
   [ən ðən æftə lɔntʃu tʰu mənts]

The extract as a whole displays some of the variability identified in the quantitative analysis, especially in the GOAT vowel, which appears both as a diphthong and a monophthong twice (‘no’ & ‘okay’ in lines 2 & 4 vs ‘don’ & ‘so’ in lines 2 & 3). But in lines 5 and 6, he brings off the UK-based employers’ ‘okay wait wait’ in pure Anglo, with diphthongs on both the FACE and the GOAT vowels, and with alveolar rather than retroflex T. With an instance like this, it is clear that Mandeep could indeed produce quite Anglo sounding utterances, marshalling British variants together in narrative construction of the speech of British characters. At the same time, it is worth returning to the comparison with Anwar.

The mixing of Anglo and Punjabi features in other parts of Mandeep’s narrative – for example, in line 2’s ‘no: I don have any- that sort of experience’ – doesn’t of itself mark Mandeep as an L2 speaker. Mixing could occur even in the relatively formal English of Punjabis born and raised in the UK, as can been seen, for example, in Anwar’s business talk with an RP-speaking barrister:

the reason why called you is eːh I jus wanted to let you know that ((name)) he came.. and eːh we decided not to pursue his case

Nevertheless, across our dataset more generally, there were very clear differences in the length of the utterances in which Mandeep and Anwar maintained exclusively Anglo-accented character speech. Whereas Anwar produced one stretch of almost completely Anglo-sounding multi-clause direct speech that lasted 29 syllables, Mandeep’s exclusively Anglo-accented voicing never exceeded 12,
and as the extracts that follow will indicate, it was rather rare to find a consistent separation of Anglo and Punjabi form in the speech of the figures in his narratives.

So if Mandeep’s “okay: (0.3) wait wait” was actually rather rare in the consistency of its phonological anglicisation, how did he manage to stylise quoted speech as distinctly Anglo? At this point, we should turn to his use of okays, and here we can see some systematic links between stylisation, discourse strategy, and the grammatical organisation of Mandeep’s English.

4.1.1 The functional specialisation of okay as a device for strategic stylisation

There were 42 okays in the dataset on Mandeep with his friend, in interview, and at work, and they functioned in four different ways:

- lexico-grammatically, as an adjectival complement, in utterances like ‘you’re okay’
- as a ‘receipt marker’, standing more or less alone as “a short-hand display marking (a) acknowledgement and/or understanding (e.g. confirmation) of, (b) affiliation/alignment (e.g. agreement) with, what prior speaker’s utterance was taken to be projecting” (Beach 1993:329): A: ‘it’s cheaper’ B: ‘okay’
- as a pre-closing in a farewell sequence: ‘okay, D, see you’
- at the start of direct reported speech in narrative: ‘they were giving me “okay, wait wait”’

The distribution of monophthong and diphthong variants of the ‘AY’ – the stressed syllable in British English ‘okay’ – is reported in Table 5, and quite a clear pattern emerges: Anglo diphthong okays when ‘okay’ functioned lexico-grammatically, Punjabi monophthongs in receipt markers and pre-closings, and considerable variation between the two in direct reported speech.

Table 5: Realisation of ‘AY’ across different functions for okay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OKAY’s function + example</th>
<th>n.</th>
<th>Monophthong realisation of ‘AY’</th>
<th>Diphthong realisation of ‘AY’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Adjectival complement - ‘you’re okay’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Receipt marker - A: ‘it’s not cheaper’ B: ‘okay’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Pre-closing in farewell sequence – ‘okay, D, see you’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Introducing direct reported speech in narrative – ‘they were giving me “okay, wait wait”’</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There were 4 cases at the borderline of mono- and diphthongal pronunciation, and these have been excluded

Table 2 suggests that in at least three of its positions, Mandeep’s selection of Anglo and Punjabi variants wasn’t random or erratic. So what was going on in the fourth, direct reported speech, where the variability was much greater?

Here are three examples (involving 5 okays). The first comes from an interview discussion of the dispute about racism in Shilpa Shetty/Big Brother episode (to which we’ll return below). Mandeep is denying the significance of racism, and is arguing that the white contestants were simply ignorant about Shilpa’s culture – they hadn’t been sent on an Indian culture enhancement course and told that after thirty days they’d know how Indians did things:

Extract 2: okay’ introducing a direct reported utterance 1

Mandeep in interview with Lavanya Sankaran. (Key: Anglo variants; Punjabi variants)

1 Mndp: they were not taught for .hh [dəl] [notʰ tʰɔtʰ]

⇒ 2 “o’kay .hh [əukʰ eʰ]"
The second involves a short story in which his *mama* (maternal uncle in Punjabi) had worried about his mum preferring his brother, but then when he had two sons of his own, she asked him which of them he preferred:

Extract 3: ‘okay’ introducing a direct reported utterance 2 (MI 434 26.34)
Mandeep in interview with Lavanya Sankaran. (Key: Anglo variants; Punjabi variants)

1 Mndp: ‘he used to say that .’ .hh
   [se ðætʰ]
2 “‘my ‘mum loves my elder brother more .’ lān me’
   [æld]
3 (.)
4 but she made him think after that
   [ei]
5 when my (.).mama have two sons (.)
6 then she made him sit
   [ð]
   [ed]
7 “‘okay ‘now tell me (0.4) (faster:) ‘who you love more’(.)
   [u ke] [tʰ]
8 LS: (light laugh:) hehe
9 Mndp: (smile-voice:) so they said “no both have same”
   [sau]
   [naʊ][sau] [hav seim]
10 LS: hehe

The third involves an account of young Punjabis in Britain rushing into marriage:

Extract 4: ‘okay’ introducing a direct reported utterance 3 (MI 615 39.14)
Mandeep in interview with Lavanya Sankaran. (Key: Anglo variants; Punjabi variants)
Mndp: and they| find someone just (.)
[ŋ]
LS: ((very quietly;)) yes
Mndp: three nights something
four nights
sleep with them
[A] [ð]
((speaking more quickly, until line 15:))
and then after they say
[ŋ]
.hhh "↑′yea
she's the right ′girl”
[ɪ]
or
"↑she- he's right ′boy for ′me”
then
[d]
"↑okay .hh
[ʌkʰe]
((faster;)) ↓now::
I want to ′marry with them”
[ð]
.hhhhhh
((slowly;)) ↓hold on: (.)
[ʰauɬd]
y jus ′think
(1.2)
((at normal speed;)) so-(0.5)
in that sense you can gui:de them as well

Overall, the reported speech in these three episodes shows some of the inconsistency mentioned above: in Extract 2, line 6 starts Anglo but turns Punjabi on the last word (“okay:: .hh you Indians do that”); in Extract 3, the characters shift from monophthong ‘O’ and ‘AY’ in line 7’s ‘okay’ to diphthong variants in ‘no’, ‘both’ and ‘same’ in line 9; and in Extract 4, the ‘okay’ is Punjabi but there are Anglo variants elsewhere in the rendering of the young people’s speech (L in ‘girl’ in line 8, TH in ‘them’ in line 14). At the same time, all four episodes provide a clear view of the okays’ effectivity as a dramatic resource in narrative reported speech, conjuring the interactivity of dialogic exchange, and for the most part, they also point to okay’s value as a site for stylising/enregistering the rest of the quoted voice.

In Extract 1, the okay in ‘okay wait wait’ comes as a ‘Third Turn Receipt’, closing a reported sequence which begins with the employer’s question as the First Pair Part (‘have you got experience’) and Mandeep’s ‘no I don’t have that sort of experience’ as the Second Pair Part (cf Beach 1993:331-2; Schegloff 2007:120). But in Extracts 2, 3 and 4, which on three occasions also have inbreaths immediately following ‘okay’ (. hh), Mandeep reproduces the projective properties that okay sometimes has in interaction, serving as a preparation for matters coming up:

Ex2 lines 2-5: “okay .hh that’s a (. ) Indian culture enhancement course you have to: (. ) join for thirty days
Ex2 line 6: “okay:: .hh you Indians do that”
Ex3 line 7: “okay now tell me who you love more” (. )
Ex4 ll. 12-14: “okay .hh now:: I want to marry with them” (0.8)
In fact, Beach 1993 argues that *okay* often operates ‘pivotally’, looking both ways, “responsive yet also displaying ‘state of readiness’ for movements to next-positioned matters” (p. 329), “responsive to prior turn and preparatory... to what is offered as relevant for ensuing talk” (p. 338). If Mandeep’s *okay* are heard like this, then they can be seen as economical devices for *interactional dramatisation* of the reported utterance, pitching it in *media res*, evoking a larger stretch of ongoing interaction without actually having to reproduce what went before. Going a step further, we can hypothesise that the direct-speech initial position of *okay* also makes it a valuable resource for *enregisterment/stylisation*. Working projectively, *okay* can be seen as a site where the production of either a monophthong ‘AY’ establishes a social characterisation for the quoted utterance right at the start, imbuing the reported speech coming up with social colouring, and if this “formulates a sketch of the social occasion”, relations or identities clearly enough (Agha 2004:25), then it might not matter if, as the utterance unfolds, inconsistencies start to emerge. Mandeep might not sustain an Anglo style for very long, but quite a high level of phonological control over *okay* could be enough for the crucial introductory framing.

Some support for the idea that *okay* provided Mandeep with a flexible device for enregistering quoted voices can be found in a notable level of consistency between the pronunciation of ‘AY’ in *okay* and the ethnicity of the reported speaker:
- Extract 1: British employers – diphthong AY
- Extract 2 line 7: non-Indians – diphthong AY
- Extract 3: Mandeep’s grandmother – monophthong AY

In fact in the 13 instances where the ethnicity of an *okay*-producing character was identifiable in Mandeep’s narratives, ten had a consistent relationship between the ‘AY’ variants and the speaker’s background, as shown in Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Okay’ attributed to a non-Indian speaker</th>
<th>‘Okay’ attributed to a Punjabi speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diphthong ‘AY’ (Anglo)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monophthong ‘AY’ (Punjabi)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course, even among the most skilful narrators, reported speech often gets performed in accents that are strikingly different from the real ones used by the people that the speech is attributed to (e.g. Leech & Short 1981:168). Still, in a context where quoted speech-initial *okay* was very obviously designed to bring a flavour of dramatic interactivity to what was reported, it is not hard to imagine Mandeep adding a little extra social typification by tuning ‘AY’ one way or the other, doubling *okay*’s effectivity as a ‘contextualisation cue’ so that it evoked *both* interactional and social positioning, and the patterning in Table 6 lends some credibility to this.

It is easy to see Silverstein’s ‘irreducibly dialectic... interaction’ of signs, situated use and ideology in this analysis of *okay*, and the patterns identified in Table 5 – virtually categorical rules for the selection of Anglo or Punjabi variants in three environments but a high level of variability in the fourth – might take the analysis of form beyond the phonetic description of sociolinguistic markers (Section 3) towards a small functional grammar, showing how the linguistic realisation of ‘AY’ was kept variable by the ideological and discursive processes converging in the stylisation of *okay* in one of its loci of occurrence. Of course, such modelling would require much closer investigation of the

---

10 Indeed any attempt to seek verisimilitude in the speech that Mandeep dramatised is further complicated by the fact that as we know from his own account of the local environment, Punjabi ethnicity didn’t necessarily mean Punjabi-accented English, particularly among young people.
other three environments for okay,[^11] and potentially this could lead rather far beyond the present concerns. So instead, I will now turn to another important aspect of style.

Hitherto in this analysis of quoted speech, the account of ideology has been somewhat muted, entering the investigation of okay only as a landscape of figures and personae indexed by different speech variants. But as Eckert notes, “every stylistic move is... a positioning of the stylizer with respect to the world [evoked]” (2008:456), so it is worth now considering Mandeep’s own ideological self-positioning in narrative – at the same time, of course, not forgetting the complications introduced by the variability of spoken English learned as an adult, by the social milieu he inhabited, and by the specificities of the stories and arguments he was staging.

### 4.1.2 Ideological positioning around Anglo voices

When they perform directed reported speech in a story, narrators can vary in their alignment with it, using the quoted utterance ironically, quizzically, as a form of authorisation etc. This can provide a fully situated, *in vivo* view of speakers’ attitudes to the styles they’re using, and for a broad characterisation of the possibilities, it is worth referring to Bakhtin’s account of ‘double-voicing’.

Double-voicing is a term that Bakhtin uses to describe the effect on any utterance of a plurality of often competing languages, discourses and voices. With double-voicing, speakers use someone else’s discourse (or language) for their own purposes, “inserting a new semantic intention into a discourse which already has... an intention of its own. Such a discourse... must be seen as belonging to someone else. In one discourse, two semantic intentions appear, two voices” (1984: 189). Bakhtin then distinguishes two fundamental types of double-voicing. The first is ‘uni-directional’, where the speaker uses someone else’s discourse ‘in the direction of its own particular intentions’ (1984: 193). Speakers themselves go along with the momentum of the second voice, although it generally retains an element of otherness, which makes the appropriation conditional and introduces some reservation into the speaker’s use of it. But at the same time, the boundary between the speaker and the voice they are adopting can diminish, to the extent that there is a ‘fusion of voices’. When that happens, discourse ceases to be double-voiced, and instead becomes ‘direct, unmediated discourse’ (1984: 199). The opposite of this is – second – ‘vari-directional’ double-voicing, in which the speaker “again speaks in someone else’s discourse, but... introduces into that discourse a semantic intention directly opposed to the original one”. In vari-directional double-voicing, the two voices are much more clearly demarcated, and they are not only distant but also opposed (Bakhtin 1984: 193).

To get a closer view of Mandeep’s ideological alignment with British sounding English, it is worth looking at two occasions when he supported his argument with narratives and produced stylised Anglo speech alongside clear statements of his own position. On both occasions, he was discussing racism, holding to the line that people were generally too hasty to make accusations.

One of the discussions focused on the 2008 *Celebrity Big Brother* TV show, which became the focus of very considerable controversy when several of the contestants made a series of hostile and disparaging comments about Shilpa Shetty, the Indian film star who was also a participant. Mandeep’s general position was that the white contestants accused of racism were simply ignorant about Indian culture, that Shilpa should have been more prepared for this, and that anyway, she wasn’t an emblem of Indian culture that he’d want to defend. In the extract below, he develops his argument by interleaving two dramatised scenarios, the first referring to events in the programme (Shilpa

---

[^11]: It is interesting to speculate on the divergence between Anglicised okay-as-adjectival-complement and Punjabiified okay-as-preclosing+receipt-marker: while as an adjectival complement, okay falls within the normative regimes of English lexico-grammar, discourse particle okay in receipts and pre-closings is more exclusively concerned with interpersonal alignment, maybe allowing more room for individualisation?

[^12]: “The *Celebrity Big Brother* racism controversy was a series of events related to incidents of perceived racist behaviour by contestants on the television series *Celebrity Big Brother* 2007 shown on British television station Channel 4. The incidents centred on comments made by contestants on this reality television show, most notably *Big Brother* contestant Jade Goody, glamour model Danielle Lloyd, and singer Jo O’Meara, which were directed towards Indian actress Shilpa Shetty. The screening of these comments on UK television resulted in national and international media coverage, responses from the UK and Indian governments, and the show’s suspension during the 2008 season. Many agencies and corporations cancelled their contracts with the housemates accused of racism, citing the allegations as the reason for the terminations. Also, many sponsors of the *Big Brother* series cancelled or suspended their sponsorship of the show.” (Wikipedia consulted 18/8/2010)
getting criticised for touching some food), the second evoking a parent’s reprimand, his overall point being that there is little to distinguish them:

Extract 5: Shilpa Shetty (ML.373-397; 22.50)

In interview, Lavanya Sankaran has just asked Mandeep about his experience of racism in Britain.

(Key: **Anglo variants; Punjabi variants**)

1 M: in 'here
   (very quietly and quite slowly:)
2 .hh I do\(n't\) feel like any sort of *rac*ism or something (no)
3 L: like the 'Shilpa 'She*tt*ty thing at least (.)
4 'what did you 'think of that whole [incident
5 M: .hhhh (1.0)
6 'tha was (. ) very 'nasty 'incident (.)
7 J m talk-
8 ((accelerates:))
9 I m 'not talking about 'Shilpa side
10 I m talking about the other side
11 (. ).hh ((slower)) ↑ if she:s 'putting her 'fingers into the
   'chicken
12 (0.9)
13 'and if 'someone jus said that
14 (more quietly:))
   ↑ "why you 'bloody put your 'fingers- (. ) in the 'chicken"
15 .hh
16 ((pitch raised & a little louder, as if in defensive
    counter-assertion:))
   ↑↑it's a normal 'talk
17 (0.5)
18 if your 'son sometimes say
   'spoil some 'thing at 'home
19 what will you 'say to your 'son?
20 (1.0)
21 L: ((creaky voice:)) (hmm(mm)) ((perhaps a very constrained
   'I don't know'))
22 M:
   (((pitch level similar to line 16:)))
   ↑↑you will 'say the 'same what she is 'say to Shilpa 'Shetty
23 (0.7)
24 "so its- (. ) ((lower pitch:)) 'because-
25 ((fast:)) thats wha I m 'saying-
26 because- (. ) she 'wa:s (. ) .hh \bro:wn (.)
27 \then (.)
28 "o'kay (. ) (MInt 380 22.59 46.00)
29 ((drops pitch & loudness:)) ↓that was *rac*ism
30 (1.5)
31 "so y-y- if- m- m-
32 I m- my 'mum used to 'tell me
33 one 'day (. ) .hh J was 'very 'little (.)
34 and er my mum \bought some \carrots (.)

20
an I put all the carrots in:=- ()
er- as 'outside in- on the sand
so I spoiled 'everything
so 'she 'slapped 'me (.)
L: (very quiet laugh:) hehe
M: (half-laughing in 'bought' and 'that:))
that " I 'bough tha for 'us ((= 'I bought that for us'))
(0.2)
and 'you pu tha 'everything a'way " (('put' ≈ 'threw'))
. hh 'so (1.1)
th- th- th- ((a bit louder:)) ↑tha s not 'racism (.)
↑tha s 'simple talk as 'well
"and that was the- (0.2)
and 'other thing is ((Mandeep continues about another aspect))

As shown in the distribution of different fonts in this text, there was a lot of rapid alternation between Anglo and Punjabi variants, but with fricative TH and no retroflexion, Mandeep’s pronunciation was more consistently Anglo in the direct reported speech in line 14, when he represented the other contestants criticizing Shilpa:

14 "↑why you 'bloody put your 'fingers- (.) in the 'chicken"
[wai jiu blɔdɪ put jʰ fɪŋəz in də tʃɪkən]

Mandeep took the view that this complaint was reasonable, and he made his own perspective apparent in the way he minimised the force of their interrogative challenge, not only with ‘just’ in the lead-in reporting clause in line 13 and the evaluation immediately after — ‘it’s a normal talk’ (line 16) — but also with supra-segmental features in the utterance in line 14. Contrary to what one might expect in a context of such controversy, the onset of the putatively racist speech in line 14 was marked by a decrease in loudness, and although ‘bloody’ certainly signalled affective intensity, there wasn’t much acceleration in the speech rate, of the kind that might, for example, index the speakers’ impatience. Indeed, it was only in Mandeep’s own evaluation afterwards that there was an abrupt rise in pitch and loudness (line 16). So even though the criticism of Shilpa caused an international furore, Mandeep portrayed it as mild and unexceptional, both in his commentary and in the prosody with which he performed it, and overall, the double-voicing appears to be ‘uni-directional’, with clear alignment between Mandeep and the quoted speech.

Given Mandeep’s identity as a migrant who only started to speak English as an adult, one might ask whether the uni-directionality of the double-voicing here points to a more general sociolinguistic disposition — a pervasive inclination to integrate into English society, downplaying interethnic tension, converging to English when pressured by the politics of nation or race. But there are two reasons why these instances of alignment can’t be elaborated in a more encompassing attitudinal characterisation, one methodological and the other substantive.

First, the very variability of Mandeep’s accent presents an obstacle to an interpretation of this kind (cf. 1.2.iii above), and this becomes apparent in a closer examination of lines 28/29 and 44/45 in the extract above. There is clear parallelism between these lines, the first citing the accusation of racism and the second presenting Mandeep’s refutation:

Lines 28 & 29:

“↑okay (.) ((drops pitch & loudness:)) ↑that was ↑racism"

---

13 The directed reported speech in line 14 was uttered at an average of c. 0.24 seconds per syllable, compared with averages of c. 0.27 per syllable in line 13 and c. 0.24 in line 16.
Lines 44 & 45:

\[ \text{[au k\textipa{\textcircled{e}r}] [\textipa{\textcircled{j}}\textipa{\textcircled{e}t}] [\textipa{\textcircled{r}e}] } \]

The contrast between these utterances extends beyond the propositional negation in 44/45 to prosody: although the speech rate was broadly similar,\(^{14}\) the over-familiar indictment in line 29 was expressed with a lowering of pitch and loudness, whereas line 45’s rebuttal started louder and continues in a high fall. And crucially, this contrastive patterning extended to the word ‘racism’: in the free direct speech (Leech & Short 1981:322) which represents the view Mandeep opposed in lines 28/29, ‘racism’ began with a (Punjabi-sounding) trilled R, whereas when it was incorporated into his own view in line 45, the pronunciation of the first syllable is Anglo, with an approximant R and a longer closing glide on the vowel ([\textipa{\textcircled{i}e\textipa{\textcircled{i}}]). This alignment between Anglicised pronunciation and Mandeep’s own personal view was consistent with his mild Anglo rendering of the voice of Shilpa’s (reasonable) critics, and it is tempting to claim that at least within this stretch of argument, British English was the ‘voice of reason’, with Punjabi accentuation equalling ‘misplaced accusation’ and Anglo accentuation equating with ‘sensible refutation’. But unfortunately for the equivalence hypothesised here, the okay that introduces to the spurious accusation in lines 28/29 is pronounced with an Anglo diphthong in the second syllable, and given the claim in 4.1.1 that Mandeep’s quoted utterance initial okays were especially sensitive stylistically, this discrepant evidence is very hard to discount.

Second, the patterns of double-voicing in other narratives indicate that the alignment apparent in the Big Brother discussion was actually only case-specific. In Extract 1, it would be difficult to claim that Mandeep identified personally with the anglicised procrastination in lines 4 & 5 (‘okay wait wait’), and in another set of argumentative narratives addressed to the topic of racism, the Anglo voice was rendered as positively unattractive. In this latter argument, Mandeep ran through three scenarios, all of them articulating the view that attributions of racism were generally mistaken and you shouldn’t overgeneralise on a single case or incident. Each scenario contained notionally racist speech/abuse which, on further reflection, Mandeep attributed to processes other than racism, and over the course of the three scenes, the hostile nationalist views expressed in direct report speech were progressively ‘de-othered’. Initially, these views were expressed in a rendering of white Anglo speech, but then Mandeep changed gear to argue that “sometimes you can do that (kind of aggression yourself)”. He shifted from the hypothetical hostile white example to an actual incident where he had been told to “go (back) to your country” by a British Asian in a motoring incident, and ended with a performance of Punjabis asking why Somalis “are ruining our England”, portraying this in a voice that was closest to his own. The sequence is too long for full discussion here, but here is his representation of the white Anglo:

---

\(^{14}\) c. 0.9 seconds for 4 syllables in line 27 and c 1.1 in line 42.
Although he saw neither as racist, it is much harder to see Mandeep aligning himself with the anglicised voice in line 5 of this episode than with the *Big Brother* housemates’ in Extract 5. The character here is described as ignorant, drunk, uncouth, informed only by the (very low brow) popular press, and the double-voicing is ‘vari-directional’, with a clear boundary between the performed utterance and Mandeep’s own stance. So plainly, it would be a mistake to extrapolate from Mandeep’s representation of Shilpa’s critics to a more general claims about his disposition towards Englishness.

In fact, with stereotypic attributions of lower class identity like drunkenness, ignorance and *The Sun*, Mandeep’s portrait of the white person in Extract 6 introduces another dimension of social differentiation, and at this point we should ask whether Mandeep’s perceptions of class work their way into his speech stylizations? We have seen some artful movement between Anglo and Punjabi variants in quoted narrative speech, but how far did this extend to stylistic variation on axis of British social class?

### 4.2 The stylization of Anglo-English vernacular

Mandeep’s sense of at least some of the ramifications of social class was reported in Section 2, when he referred to ‘pub culture’, talked about people of varying poshness, and linked accent to cultural practices like watching telly, swearing and behaving in ways that brought family censure. So how far was this awareness of class-related accent differences reflected in his own quoted speech performances, and if it was, what kinds of double-voicing were involved? Let’s go back to Extract 6.

Mandeep’s performance of “you bloody Asians, why you come to my country” in line 5 sounded more Anglo than Indian in its segmental phonology, but are there any signs that it was designed to sound more vernacular? Here is a more detailed transcript:

**Extract 7:**

```plaintext
((pitch step-up with shift to tense muscular phonation\textsuperscript{15})):  
“↑you ‘bloody ‘Asians ‘why you’ come to ‘my ‘country” or something  
[ju bʰədəi eiŋz wai ju kʰam tu mai kʰəntəi:]  
```

There are two pieces of evidence suggesting that Mandeep might have been aiming for more than just ordinary British. First, and more weakly, the onset of the diphthong in ‘my’ was relatively backed, as in popular London speech rather than RP ([əʊ], not [aʊ]). But second, and most conspicuously, Mandeep used a pre-vocalic dark L in his working class version ‘bloody’. This was highly unusual in our data on his speech, and it was quite distinct from the RP clear L occurring in the housemates’

\textsuperscript{15} [http://www.ims.uni-stuttgart.de/phonetik/EGG/page8.htm](http://www.ims.uni-stuttgart.de/phonetik/EGG/page8.htm)
version – [bʰʌdɪ:] here rather than the [bʌdɪ] before. So something different seems to have been happening here. How close, though, did the quoted utterance come to the vernacular London speech that a white working class person might actually speak?

Focusing first on segmental phonology, there was still a detectably Punjabi influence in country’s unaspirated word-initial [k], and the onsets of the diphthongs in ‘Asian’ and ‘why’ sounded like British standard English/RP, lacking the backed vowel quality of traditional working class London ([ɛː] not [æː], and [æː] not [ɒː]). Indeed the vowel in ‘why’ wasn’t hearably different from its rendering in line 12 of the Shilpa extract. In addition, although it is common in northern British varieties, pre-vocalic dark L isn’t widely noted as London vernacular feature. But segmentally overall, Mandeep’s performance of the white drunkard’s speech wasn’t so different from the housemates’. There was, though, an unmistakeable difference in their prosodic and paralinguistic production. Whereas “why you bloody put your fingers in the chicken” was spoken more quietly than the narrating speech that framed it, at the start of “you bloody Asians....” Mandeep abruptly raised pitch and introduced some tenser muscular non-modal phonation, producing the impression of shouting without actually doing so. The segmental phonetics didn’t sound especially vernacular, but with a supra-segmental strategy quite commonly used in ‘reported shouting’, he indexed loudness, and especially when it is linked to swearing as well, this is often stereotyped as non-posh/vulgar.

So even though he might not reproduce the vowels and consonants of working class vernacular speech, Mandeep knew that it sounded different and was willing to try to imitate at least some aspects of this. In fact, there is other evidence that he was aware of vernacular London features without successfully reproducing them, and that his apprehension of their connotational potential extended beyond social stereotypes to typifications of stance and/or familiarity.

In the comments on accent, informal conduct and family censure cited above, Mandeep linked ‘swearing a lot’ with saying ‘yo mate yo mate’, and he pronounced ‘mate’ as: yo [met] yo [met]

Stereotypically in the London vernacular, the post-vocalic T in ‘mate’ is a glottal rather than a standard alveolar stop (‘ma]?e’ rather than ‘ma[t]e’), and it looks as though Mandeep got half-way there – he removed the alveolar, but didn’t replace it with the glottal, producing a zero realisation instead. In fact, Section 3’s quantitative analysis showed that Mandeep produced glottal Ts only very rarely (3 out 88 possible realisations), and our quantitative survey showed that in this he was very similar to other informants born in India. But in the story of his mum’s scolding in Extract 5, he put the zero T to strategic use in direct reported speech:

\[ \text{Table 8: T-glottaling by generation:} \]

---

16 Since Mandeep has lived in London all his life as a UK-resident, it makes most sense to see London as the style that he was targeting.

17 One can only speculate on what was going on here – if Mandeep was aiming but failing to bring of vernacular London speech, maybe [H] introduced some of the back vowel resonance that was conspicuously missing from his rendering of the next two words (‘Asians’ and ‘why’).

18 It was clear that Mandeep also subscribed to this view in his comments on non-middle-class schools being too noisy in Section 2.

19 Across the wider population we sampled, glottal Ts were very rare among people born in India, more common among Punjabi-descended people born in the UK in the 1960s, and very often used by those UK-born in the 1980s (Sharma & Sankaran 2010). The analysis of glottal-T involved 18 informants born in India (9F, 9M), 10 born in the UK in the 1960s (6F, 4M), and 14 born in the UK in the 1980s (6F, 8M). The results are shown in Table 8.
Extract 8: Spoiled carrots (cf Extract 5; MI.50.01, 0.59.9)
Mandeep in interview with Lavanya Sankaran. (Key: Anglo variants; Punjabi variants)

33 one day (.)

34 and my mum bought some carrots (.)

35 all the carrots in:: (.)

36 er- as outside in- on the sand (t)

37 so I spoiled everything (d)

38 so she slapped me (.)

39 (very quiet laugh:)) hehe

40 (half-laughing in 'bought' and 'that:')

41 that "I bought the food (.)

42 and you put the everything away" (.)

43 hh so (0.2)

44 th- th- th- that is not racism (.)

45 that is simple talk as well (.)

46 and that was the- (0.2)

47 and other thing is ((Mandeep continues about another aspect))
Relating the story setting and the events and actions leading up to the reprimand (lines 33-38), Mandeep produced seven potentially variable T sounds and all of them were alveolar (‘li[t]le’, ‘bough[t]’, ‘carro[t]s’, ‘pu[t]’, ‘carro[t]s’, ‘ou[t]side’ ‘tha[t]’). But in the direct reported reprimand itself in lines 41-43, all three Ts were zero realisations (‘bough[ø]’, ‘tha[ø]’, ‘pu[ø]’). After that, zero realisations are carried into the evaluation in lines 45-46 (‘tha[ø]’, ‘no[ø]’, ‘tha[ø]’).

Table 7: Realisation of the post-vocalic Ts in Mandeep’s ‘spoiled carrots’ story:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environments</th>
<th>The setting, events &amp; actions leading up to the reprimand (lines 33-38)</th>
<th>The reprimand in direct reported speech (lines 41-43)</th>
<th>The evaluation (lines 44-46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V_#C, V_#V, V_C</td>
<td>[t] [?] [ø]</td>
<td>[t] [?] [ø]</td>
<td>[t] [?] [ø]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/7    0    0</td>
<td>0    0    3/3</td>
<td>0    0    3/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In combination with other cues (e.g. the shift in pronoun deixis - ‘I’, ‘that’, ‘us’, ‘you’), the contrasting distribution of alveolar and zero Ts marks off the direct reported utterance from the account which precedes it.²⁰

The approximations of vernacular London in this quoted utterance contribute to a character portrait that is very different from the white working class figure in Extracts 6 & 7. Here, the speaker is Mandeep’s mum; she is saying the kind of thing that Mandeep approves of (‘simple talk’ that only the misguided would read as racism); and indeed in its incorporation of zero Ts in the evaluation, there is a ‘fusion’ of the narrating and the quoted voices (Bakhtin 1984:199). So if it’s not just unruly working class types that Mandeep is trying to index with the concentration of zero-Ts in lines 41-43, what is it? Turning a comparative eye back to the quantitative data on Anwar’s style-shifting in Section 3, T-glottaling increased with family and friends (as well as with an East End mechanic), and this pattern gets repeated not just with other locally born individuals in our survey, but in British society much more generally. Vernacular forms commonly index not only types of person but types of stance and relationship, and it is very plausible that in the quoted speech here, Mandeep’s glottal-T approximations were designed to evoke the intimacy or informality of a mother-son relationship,²¹ ²² a relationship he seemed quite happy to inhabit. So although his reproduction of the linguistic specifics of emblematic vernacular English forms might only be partial, his apprehension of their social meaning wasn’t restricted to the stereotypes of people and groups that one might expect with speech styles seen from afar.

Compared, then, with Anwar’s speech and with the conventions of London English more generally, it looks as though Mandeep’s phonetic realisation of certain vernacular forms lagged behind his apprehension of the range of cultural typifications that they could index. But what consequence might this have beyond its potential interest to sociolinguists? Did this actually matter? This question tends to be particularly pressing in L2 research, and to answer it, it is necessary to move

---

²⁰ Perhaps his insertion of glottals in the second clause of the quoted utterance provides some support for the claim that he was targeting vernacular London without properly succeeding in reproducing it:

```
43 and you put the [?] everything [?] away’ (.)
[and ju puːθø ? ɛvənθiŋ ? əwaɪ]
```

The process here could be similar to what we hypothesised with the pre-vocalic dark L in ‘bloody’: Mandeep had glottals as well as backed onsets for closing diphthongs in his mental representation of vernacular London speech, but uncertainties over their exact placement meant that they were sprinkled in somewhat randomly (cf Preston 1996:66).

²¹ As we know from other data that his mum has always lived in India and only talks to Mandeep in Punjabi, we can be confident that it isn’t an accurate copy of her speech.

²² In another rendering of a scolding from his mum later in the interview, Mandeep brought off a glottal T: If I have to shou[t] at my wife so I will be getting a shou[t] from my mum ‘how dare you to say tha[ʔ]’ yea so it is always good ((laughter from interviewer)) (MI627 39.58).
4.3 **Success in narrative stylisation?**
Although assessments of linguistic idiosyncrasy can be intrusive and irrelevant to participant concerns, linguistic achievement often matters to actors themselves, and in such situations, there is a local warrant for appraisals of success. Story-telling is one such situation, qualifying as a type of ‘performance’ in Richard Bauman’s sense:

“[p]erformance in its artful sense may be seen as a specially marked way of speaking, one that sets up or represents a special interpretive frame within which the act of speaking is to be understood. In this sense of performance, the act of speaking is put on display, objectified, lifted out to a degree from its contextual surroundings, and opened up to scrutiny by an audience. Performance thus calls forth special attention to and heightened awareness of the act of speaking and gives licence to the audience to regard it and the performer with special intensity. Performance makes one communicatively accountable; it assigns to an audience the responsibility of evaluating the relative skill and effectiveness of the performer’s accomplishment” (1987:8).

Mandeep’s interview narratives were performances, and his productions of direct reported speech are particularly obvious instances of ‘speaking... put on display, objectified... opened up to scrutiny by an audience’. So how far was he rhetorically impeded by the phonological inconsistencies in his stylisations of Anglo English? How well did he do?

Immediate audience response is one important indication of a story-telling’s success. Audible laughter followed Mandeep’s quoted speech performance in Extract 3 (lines 8 & 10) (also Ex. 2 line 4 and fn 22), and there were other signs of the story recipient’s involvement: laughter elsewhere (in Ex. 5 line 39), and supportive intervention at a moment of disfluency (Jefferson’s 1983 ‘progressional onset’ – Ex. 6 line 15). Overall, it sounded as though the interview was enjoyable for both participants, but in the absence of a video-record, it is impossible to track the impact of Mandeep’s narrative performances in any detail, and a more distanciated analytic assessment is called for (cf 1.2.i). Fortunately, Agha’s 2005 account of voicing provides a scheme for reviewing Mandeep’s effectiveness with quoted speech that is well-fitted to narrative.

Agha points out that the identification of enregistered voices in the flow of speech presupposes “the perceivability of voicing contrast, or the differentiability of one voice from another”, and he distinguishes three types of voice. First there are ‘unnamed’ and socially unmarked voices’ that are “indexically articulated through arrays of signs in discursive interaction” without being attributed to specific speakers or social types. Next, building on the foundations of first-level ‘contrastive individuation’, there is ‘biographic individuation’, where ‘named voices’ are typified as the speech of specific persons, and last, there is ‘social characterisation’, in which ‘enregistered voices’ index/evoke particular types of social stance, relationship or person.

Plainly, Mandeep commanded the first two types without any difficulty. For example, in the free direct speech in lines 28/29 of Extract 5,

28 “o\kay (.)
29 (\{drops pitch & loudness:)↓,\Hat{that} was \textit{racism}"

he achieved an ‘unnamed voice’ by marking these words off from what preceded with “okay” and a drop in pitch and loudness, which also dovetailed with propositional contradiction of the position he had already stated (e.g. line 2: ‘I don’t feel like any sort of racism’). In line 14 of the same extract, he produced a ‘biographically individuated’ voice

13 ‘and if ‘\{someone jus said \Hat{that} (more quietly:))
14 “↑\{why you \textit{bloody} put your \textit{fingers- (.} in the \textit{chicken}”
marking this as different with the reporting clause which identified one or other of the housemates as speaker (line 13), with the deictic shift to “you/your” and some chicken known in common (“the chicken”), and with the dropped pitch and loudness, which was not only perceptively different from what just went before, but also worked indexically in the scene of controversy that Mandeep was referring to, evoking ‘mildness’ amidst the furore. Indeed in line 14, the housemates’ voice was also enregistered by the shift to more Anglo pronunciation (a voice can obviously be both biographically individuated and enregistered). But in Extract 7 (Ex 6 line 5), Mandeep went for pure social typification, with the drunk white person’s

\[ ((\text{pitch step-up and shift to non-modal phonation:})) \]

\[
\uparrow \text{“you ‘bloody ‘Asians ‘why you ‘come to ‘my ‘country”}
\]

As we have seen, Mandeep’s reproduction of the segmental phonologies of Anglo English varieties was only partial and seldom sustained for very long. So his imitation of the vowels and consonants of vernacular speech wasn’t enough to imbue this voice with full social colouring. But successful narrative dramatisation doesn’t necessarily depend on the accurate replication of accent in direct reported speech, and a distinctive linguistic style or register is often recognisable by more than segmental phonology alone. In the event, Mandeep’s inconsistency reproducing vernacular English pronunciation wasn’t rhetorically incapacitating, because he drew on other semiotic resources to build a scene that enregistered the voice (Coupland 2007a:112-4, 2007b). In addition to the devices marking this as someone else’s voice (the reporting clause, deictic shifts (‘you’, ‘my’), supra-segmental contrast), Mandeep drew in an explicit metalinguage of social types to characterise the speech/speaker both before and after (‘drunk’, ‘white’, ‘reading Sun’) (Agha 2005:46); he indexed ‘shouting’ through a rather conventional combination of raised pitch and non-modal voice setting; and he managed to shift his accent enough to signal ‘Anglo’ rather than ‘Indian’. Extracted from its narrative context, Mandeep’s impersonation of a ‘white London lout’ probably wouldn’t carry very far – the ‘social domain’ in which it could be effective, the range of groups and settings where it would be rated or even recognised for what’s intended, might be limited. But within the specific narrative world and narrating event in which it was produced, the social typification worked reasonably well and it could be heard by the interviewer and the subsequent analysts as the voice of a speaker of Anglo vernacular English.

In contrast, it is much less obvious that Mandeep succeeded in enregistering informality or intimacy in the stylisation of his mother’s voice in ‘spoiled carrots’.

41 that ‘I ‘bough ‘ta ‘fo ‘us (0.2)
[ðæt hæt ‘bɔʊ̯θ ə fəʊ əs] (.)

43 and ‘you pu ‘ta ‘everyt‘a‘ing ‘a‘way” (.)
[ænd jiu ˈpʊθ gəˈsiŋ ˈeɪvətɪŋ ˈeɪweɪ] (.)

First, the sociolinguistic iconography associated with ‘mums’ is generally much more indeterminate than the imagery associated with white working class readers of The Sun – stereotypes about the latter’s speech are so strong that regardless of how well a narrator actually brings it off, in their own mental soundtracks listeners are likely to dub the reported speech into broad vernacular English. Second, ‘mum’ receives very little social characterisation outside the quoted utterance – she’s just at home, buys, and slaps. And third, the phonetic approximations in Mandeep’s voicing of his mum don’t sound much like Anglo English, let alone vernacular London.23 Admittedly, low levels of T-glottaling are common in the English of local people born in India (see fn 19), and they might constitute a domain in which in which the social indexicality of the zero-Ts in the ‘carrots’ narrative could readily construed.24 But beyond that domain – and maybe even within – Mandeep’s styled

---

23 In addition, of course, we can’t even reach for verisimilitude to try to make sense of what’s going on – Mandeep’s lives in India and only ever talks to him in Punjabi.

24 Elicitations tests could be developed to investigate this (cf Gumperz 1982:31).
performance of his mum sounds odd rather than indexically nuanced, and although the argumentative point was clear once “put” was construed as ‘threw’, it took our research team quite a lot of time and analysis to generate a plausible interpretation of the social typification being attempted. In all, the social spheres in which this particular narrative stylisation could operate effectively looks far more limited than his performance of white working class.

So: Mandeep’s performances of vernacular English sounds were more approximate than his production of standard ones, but he marshalled a range of linguistic resources to produce voicing effects – not just segmental, but also lexical, grammatical and supra-segmental – and it would be a mistake to let a specialised interest in accent dominate the evaluation overall. In spite of the segmental inaccuracies, his occasion-specific orchestration of other semiotic resources could still link quoted utterances to particular vernacular typifications, although in leaner narrative contexts and/or outside social circles where e.g. zero- and glottal-T were routinely equated, noticeable shifts in pronunciation could be indeterminate or even anomalous in their indexical effects.

Turning to a second pressing concern in L2 research, how could we summarises Mandeep’s attitudes to the styles he performed, drawing together our observations of his double-voicing?

4.4 Narrative stylisation and ideological self-positioning in an L2

Overall, there was a good deal of variation in how Mandeep identified himself with the quoted speech he performed, and his double-voicing wasn’t either consistently uni- or vari-directional. He aligned himself with the housemates’ complaint in Extract 5 and his mum’s vernacular reprimand in Extract 8, but there was no affiliation with The Sun-reader in Extract 6, and in the Anglo voicings in Ex. 1 lines 4 & 5 and Ex. 2 line 6, it is hard to make out what his stance might have been.

To assess the significance of this variation, it is necessary to cross-refer to earlier work on double-voicing, focusing on adolescents in multi-ethnic peer-groups in the UK (Rampton 1995/2005). This found that double-voicing was consistently uni-directional when youngsters used Creole, a code which indexed an excitement and an excellence in youth culture that many aspired to, and invariably vari-directional when they did Indian English, which in contrast, symbolised distance from the main currents of adolescent life (see Rampton 2005:Ch.8.5). These patterns reflected the ideological salience of Creole and Indian English in an environment where politically, race, migration and minority ethnicity were very highly charged. The boundaries around these two codes were sharply drawn; there was a good deal of explicit normative segmentation of who could use them, when, where and how; and when they were used by other-ethnic youngsters from homes where these languages weren’t spoken, there was a sense of anomaly and ethnic boundary transgression that warranted the analytic category ‘crossing’. Mandeep’s situation was very different, and there was no question over the legitimacy of his using Anglo English. As an immigrant to an English-speaking country, this was very much expected – indeed, it was a central theme in public discourses about migration and ethnicity. Mandeep certainly sometimes made his speech sound more Anglo than usual for narrative effect, but he didn’t have to navigate the wary ears of the rightful owners of English watching out for expropriation or mockery. So this was stylisation, not crossing.

I will return to the significance of the variation in his double-voicing in the conclusion, but it is necessary now to turn (much more briefly) to Mandeep’s style in non-narrative contexts, where a third conception of style becomes relevant (S.2 in 1.1).

5. Non-narrative shifts of style

Outside narrative performance, Mandeep sounded most Anglo in a short piece of mock commiseration during some multi-person conversation about modes of transport in one of the self-recordings. In Extract 9 below, Baljinder says she hasn’t learnt to ride a bike, Adrian responds with an exaggerated ‘ahh’ after a short delay, and Mandeep joins in, elaborating with ‘what a shame’, a conventionalised expression of sympathy that is articulated with a vernacular intervocalic [d] and some London-sounding nasality on its Anglicised realisation of the FACE vowel (Wells 1982:326, 318):
**Extract 9: What a shame (811-840)**

Mandeep at work talking to Adrian (adult male, white Anglo), Baljinder (adult female, born in India) and Parvinder (adult female, born in India). (Key: Anglo variants; Punjabi variants)

1. Adrian: did you e– not– [‘ever ‘learn to ‘ride a ‘bike
2. Mndp: [ you di– ‘never ‘tried
3. Balj: “\no ‘never
4. Mndp: you ‘never ‘tried
5. (1.4)
6. Mndp: so s [‘how how can you [say tha
[se:::] [seɪ ə:ə]
7. Parv: [‘I do"
8. Adrian: ‘yeah
9. me too [‘I can ‘ride a ‘bike
10. Balj: [‘well in the Pun’jab ‘usually ‘girls
11. ‘all ‘girls ‘everybody (.) ‘rides a ‘bike
12. Adrian: \‘yeah
14. Adrian: [‘no
15. (1.4)
16. Adrian: a:::h
[ɑːː] [17. (.)
18. Mndp: a::[: [wh]at a ‘shame
[ɒː] [19. ‘learn to ‘drive"
[20. ? : ((laughter:)) hehe
21. Adrian: ((laughing:)) ↑‘yeah YEAH YE(HH)AH [YEAEHEHE]
22. Balj: ((smile voice:)) [learn to ‘drive
23. Adrian: ‘YEAH YOU ‘CUT OUT THE ‘MIDDLE thing [ eh ‘altogether=
24. Balj: [‘yes
25. Pam: hehehe
26. Adrian: ‘and you jst went to the ‘garage=
27. Mndp: she dn’ ‘ride a bike she ‘drive a bike
28. Adrian: ↑can anybody– ‘walk on ‘stilts

Adrian and Mandeep’s commiseration is neither offered nor taken seriously – their extended *aaahs* are out of proportion to the gravity of Baljinder’s disclosure of a non-cycling background, but she rebuts their ironic sympathy saying she learnt to drive instead, which generates laughter and more joking. In view of all this, it is difficult to see Mandee’s shift to Anglo as anything other than another piece of stylisation, a case of vari-directional double-voicing designed for short-term effect, embellishing a humorous move initiated in the prior turn with a little extra social colouring.

But what of style/register as ‘direct unmediated discourse’? So far, we have considered style in two of the senses identified in Section 1.1 – Labovian style-shifting (S1) and artful stylisation (S3). But what of S2, style as socially located frame for interaction that participants can sustain in the routine conduct of ordinary affairs? Once again, it is useful to preface the investigation of this question with some cross-reference to the dataset on Anwar.

With Anwar, it was quite easy to find shifts in accent that coincided with shifts in non-play, non-narrative discourse. In Extract 10, for example, he is answering an interview question about how much business he did with white British people, and when he shifts from a general claim (‘we interaction with all the communities’) to exemplify the kinds of service his clients asked for in lines 10 to 13, his segmental pronunciation becomes more exclusively Anglo, working in combination with a succession of rhythmically parallel fall-to-mid intonation contours (marked below by ‘;’ at the end of each intonation phrase) to mark this strip off from the talk before and after.
Extract 10: Functions (cf Extract 5; MI.50.01, 0.59.9)
Anwar in interview with Devyani Sharma. (Key: Anglo variants; Punjabi variants)

1 Anw: [t\o er:: er::
2 we [do in\ter\'act wi\t\h \wite \Br\it\i\sh \as \w\ell (0.4)
3 u::m::: (0.8)
4 because you know (.) in my- \line of \w\ork (0.6)
5 \people \liked in the \hospitality \industry
6 you know \where we re \based we- w-
7 you know we wi- \n\ter\act \wit\a \a\ll the \com\m\unit\i\es (.)
8 DS: yah
9 Anw: um:: .hhhh
10 "so you know\somebody wants to \have a \b\i\r\t\h\d\a\y;\n11 or \somebody\wants to \have a f- \f\u\n\c\a\n\t;\n12 or a \e\v\e\:nt;\n13 or a \lau\:n\ch;\n14 you \k\n\ow
15 DS: [yea
16 Anw: [\f\i- \it- its a-
17 we \h\a\v\e a m\a\j\o\r\i\ty \a\b\o\u\t \t\h\r\i\s\- \qu\a\r\e\r \t\w\e\n\- \f\i\v\e \p\e\r\e\n\c\i\s \is \er::
18 we d \n\ter\act \wit\a \t\i\e \t\h\e \t\h\s\i\n\s\i\s\a\n\s\i\n\s\i\n
19 DS: [yeh
20 Anw: [\a\n\d\a \t\w\e\i\t \t\w\e\n\- \f\i\v\e \p\e\r\e\n\c\i\s \is \er::
21 DS: [mhm
22 Anw: [\wit\a \er:: \t\i\e \w\h\i\t\e \c\o\m\m\u\n\i\t\i\y
23 DS: \o\k\a\y

Anwar also used quite a wide range of accent resources in several self-recorded telephone conversations. Talking to someone who he described to us as an East End Cockney, he very clearly increased the number of London vernacular features in his speech when e.g. concluding different phases of their discussion in consensus and when he moved into the closing stages of the conversation as a whole, and in conversation with an old school-friend, he slipped into the multi-ethnic urban vernacular (combining elements of vernacular London, Jamaican and Punjabi) when switching from business to personal issues, when protesting his affection, and offering support (see Rampton 2010). Overall, Anwar’s shifts and switches between styles of English resembled the kinds of change in footing that have been extensively documented in the research on bilingual code-switching (e.g. Gumperz 1982:75-84; Auer 1988), and a great many of these involved straight talk – Bakhtin’s ‘direct unmediated discourse’ – with no stylisation and nothing in the interaction to suggest that “the act of speaking [was being] put on display, objectified, lifted out to a degree from its contextual surroundings, and opened up to scrutiny by an audience” (Bauman 1987:8).

In Mandeep’s conversations in English, it was far harder to hear segmental phonology being discursively mobilised in footing changes than it had been with Anwar. Just as in discussion of the possible style shift from “\d\, \t\a\h\ t\a\s \t\a\ r\a\c\i\s\i\m\” to “\t\a\h\ a \s \n\o\t \t\a\ r\a\c\i\s\i\m\” in Section 4.1.2, there were instances in Mandeep’s self-recordings where variability impedes inhibits our attempt to identify styling. At work, for example, one of his colleagues asked him what a PGCE was:

Extract 11: PGCE (998.83ff/1.21)
At work, Dalvir (adult female, born in India) has asked Mandeep whether he is going to pursue further study. (Key: Anglo variants; Punjabi variants)
Responses to requests for clarification and repair are well-attested sites for both code and accent shifting (Labov 1972:43-54; Gumperz 1982:78-79; Auer 1988:199), and with an Indian-English accented interviewer, informants quite often responded to repair initiations and clarification requests by turning up the proportion of Punjabi variants in their speech. In the episode above, Dalvir speaks English with a strong Indian English accent, and there is a prima facie case for seeing a number of Punjabi-sounding segments in Mandeep’s ‘post graduate certificate in education’ contributing to the shift of footing indexed with the increased loudness and slower speech rate: the GOAT vowel in ‘post’ contrasts with Anglo ‘so’ [səʊ] in line 87, and the open realisation of the first vowel in ‘education’ [æ] was pronounced with much closer Anglo variants ([e] and [ɛ]) in four of the five times he used the word in (straight talk in) interview. But what about the Anglo realisations of the R in ‘graduate’ and the FACE vowel in ‘education’? How can we really be confident that the shifts on ‘post’ and ‘education’ were styled rather than simply random?

Of course there is absolutely no reason why a single word can’t do the work of enregistering a strip of speech – after all, this was a central contention in our analysis of okay in 4.1.1 (see also Coupland 2007b:220, 229). Nor, as we saw in 4.3, need accent play the central role, and we can’t assume a priori that the inconsistencies in Mandeep’s mobilisation of Anglo and Punjabi variants generated negative interactive effects for him. Still, because of the increased likelihood of a gap between what someone tries and what others can hear (1.2.iii and 4.2), L2 speakers present a particular challenge to analysts pursuing a relationship between segmental form and interactional footing. These analytic challenges aren’t insuperable, but the overall effect on the present study is that, of the three conceptions of style identified at the outset (1.1), my analysis of S.2 – non-stylised style, introduced and sustained as frame for the conduct of ordinary, non-keyed affairs – is the most inconclusive.

---

25 0.27 seconds per syllable in line 91, compared with 0.19 seconds per syllable in line 87.

26 In addition, the fifth of his interview productions of ‘education’ started with a front open variant similar to the one in line 90.

27 The listening strategies informing the study as it stands have been twofold: (i) for Section 3, a small selection of phonological variables defined in advance were subjected to impressionistic phonetic transcription, while (ii) for Sections 4 and 5, the procedure involved (a) a general listening through, leading (b) to the identification of strips of talk with a greater density of Anglo segments, subsequently turning (c) to discourse and other methods of analysis to try to work out what was going in the strips selected. But there is a third possibility: (iii) first building substantial collections of similar interactional sequences, and then examining these in considerable phonetic detail, asking whether segmental resources were contributing to the move from e.g. given to new information, from first to second formulations, from main message to qualification, or from reported speech to evaluation (as in Extract 3 lines 7 & 9 and Extract 4 lines 9 & 11 perhaps) (Gumperz 1982: Auer 1988). For speakers whose pronunciation was idiosyncratic, approximating rather than accurately reproducing the linguistic forms normally associated with particular styles, this would be especially valuable. If particular approximations tended to recur in specific discursive positions, then this could be a sign of attempts at enregisterment which more conventional ears were missing, and of course to develop the analysis, other semiotic cues could be consulted. Such an analysis would, of course, involve a lot more time, and would probably require the approaches taken in the present paper ([i] and [ii]) as empirical preliminaries.
6. Conclusions

This study of style in a second language has been principally sociolinguistic, and the sociolinguistic analysis is summarised in 6.1 below. But there are potential implications for L2 research as well, and these are addressed in 6.2.

6.1 Sociolinguistic style in a diasporic setting

Impelled by the sociolinguistic complexities of contemporary globalisation to abandon the a priori segregation of second language speech as phenomenon requiring its own specialised modes of analysis, our analyses of style have covered first and second language speakers in the same idiom, without erasing empirical differences. The bulk of the account has focused on someone who self-classified as a second language speaker of English (Mandeep), but it has also selectively cross-referred to someone who has been speaking the language since he was a child (Anwar), exploring these two cases with three conceptions of style: style as ‘style-shifting’, identified quantitatively as in variationist sociolinguistics (S1); as ‘stylisation’, involving a degree of artful exaggeration (S3); and as ‘enregistered style’, a distinctive way of speaking sustained in the conduct of routine affairs (S2).

The outcomes have been as follows:

- **S1**: The quantitative analysis showed that in spite of spending most of their childhood and early adulthood in different countries, several of the same linguistic forms displayed sensitivity to setting in Mandeep and Anwar’s speech, acting as Labovian ‘markers’, and that the directionalities of shift were broadly similar – more Punjabi variants of (o), (e), (l) and (t) with non-Anglo speakers of English, and more Anglo ones with people brought up in English. The most obvious difference was in Mandeep’s non-use of glottal T, although the qualitative analysis in 4.2 suggested that in spite of the formal difference, zero-T had similar indexical associations to the glottal variant.

- **S3**: The analysis of stylisation in narrative quoted speech showed Mandeep making rhetorical use of a contrast between Punjabified and Anglicised English, even though in this dataset, he leaned quite heavily on okay as a site for working this contrast, and he never sustained a purely Anglicised voice for as long as Anwar (who, incidentally, didn’t produce any quoted-utterance-initial okay). It was clear that Mandeep also recognised that vernacular vs standard Anglo English forms could index different social types and stances, but in terms of segmental phonology (and in sharp contrast to Anwar), his rendering of the Anglo vernacular variants wasn’t very accurate.

- **S2**: Looking beyond double-voiced stylisation to ordinary talk, it was rather hard to identify discursively patterned shifts and differences of register in Mandeep’s speech. The quantitative analysis provided a very broad-brush picture of variation sensitive to interlocutor/setting, but there was little to compare with the way Anwar used enregistered style to move between – to change, sustain and reciprocate – different interactional footings.

Plainly, the differences between Mandeep and Anwar were substantial, and extended to some of the phonological variants they produced, the durations of their adherence to conventionally differentiated socio-phonological styles, and indeed the number of identifiably distinct English registers they interacted in. Unquestionably, early language socialisation played a major part in these differences, and so too might the specificities of the particular milieux in which they each operated.28

Nevertheless, there are commonalities of style which identify Mandeep and Anwar as active participants in broadly the same sociolinguistic space, a space formed at the socio-historical intersection of socio-economic stratification within the UK on the one hand, and migration and movement between India and Britain on the other. These class and ethnic processes have drawn different sets of linguistic forms, practices and evaluations into the environment, and both in public discourse and everyday practice, widespread and continuous commentary and stylisation have configured these resources in a series of conventionalised contrasts - Punjabi vs English, vernacular vs

---

28 In Anwar’s school years, for example, Jamaican was a major influence, informing his ease with the multiethnic urban vernacular (Rampton 2010), and other styles in his repertoire – standard Anglo, standard Indian English, Cockney, foreigner talk, and varieties of Punjabi – could well be related to his work as a (transnational) entrepreneur.
standard English, high vs low, foreigner/newcomer vs local (Rampton 2011). Anwar showed fuller engagement with the differentiated positions in this sociolinguistic economy, moving into purer versions of the registers that constituted and/or emerged within it. But Mandeep was also tuned to these schemata (cp Kramsch 2009:13). He referred to these contrasts explicitly (Section 2); he performed them in narrative stylisations (4.1 and 4.2); and on at least one interpretation of the style-shifting described in Section 3, we might claim that the Punjabi \( \Leftrightarrow \) English binary had now worked its way into his ‘habitus’, taking ‘habitus’ as the pre-conscious disposition to hear and speak in specific ways insculpted into the individual through long-term experience of the purchase that their language resources provide in different kinds of setting (Bourdieu 1991:Part 1; Woolard 1985; Eckert 2000:13; Rampton 2006:229). To borrow metaphors of depth, it looks as though central features of local English sociolinguistic structure were part of both discursive and practical consciousness for Mandeep (Giddens 1984 ; also Voloshinov 1973:Pt II:Ch.3; Rampton 1995:Ch.12). As someone who had started to speak the language as an adult, English might be a second language for him, but he wasn’t a sociolinguistic outsider. His reproduction of the high-low binary traditional in Anglo English was much more limited than Anwar’s, but he exploited the contrast between Punjabi- and Anglo-accented English quite a lot, and this was widespread and well-established as a local practice, not simply confined to relative newcomers.

In interview, Mandeep talked about learning English as an adult, but in his particular case – and without denying that there are instances where it is appropriate as an analytical classification – there are three reasons why we should hesitate to call him an L2 ‘learner’. First, there are the limitations of the dataset – we don’t know whether or not he could already speak purer British English either in very formal settings or in exclusively Anglo company, and we would need longitudinal data to know whether or not his speech was still changing (cf. 1.2). Second, it is not obvious that he still wanted or needed to move his English pronunciation closer to Anglo norms. Yes, he objected to being called a ‘freshie’, but he didn’t seem cowed by this, and appeared to have found quite a workable social location, supported by abilities in English which among things included post-graduate literacy, conversational fluency and a capacity for vivid story-telling. Third, ‘learner’ implies mapped trajectories and institutional identities and practices and that ill-fit Mandeep’s biography in England, and in fact in our dataset, he didn’t ever use the noun ‘learner’.

Instead of calling Mandeep a ‘learner’, Bakhtin’s notion of ‘internally persuasive’ discourse offers a better characterisation of the relationship with traditional Anglo styles of English evidenced in these data:

“in the everyday rounds of our consciousness, the internally persuasive word is half-ours and half-someone else’s. Its creativity and productiveness consist in the fact that… it organises masses of our words from within, and does not remain in an isolated and static condition. It is not so much interpreted by us as it is further, that is, freely developed, applied to new material, new conditions; it enters into inter-animating relationships with new contexts. More than that, it enters into an intense interaction, a struggle with other internally persuasive discourses. Our ideological development is just such an intense struggle within us for hegemony among various available verbal and ideological points of view, approaches, directions and values.” (1981:345-6 [original emphasis])

Mandeep’s narrative stylisations of Anglo marked them as double-voiced and different from his own habitual speech – “half-ours and half someone else”s… inter-animating relationships with new contexts”. In Bakhtin’s formulation, there is full recognition of the potential for change, but no commitment to which words, voices or discourses ultimately win out, and this matches the mixture of uni- and vari-directional alignments in Mandeep’s performance of Anglicised styles. In view of the empirical uncertainty about longer-term change in his English, ‘internally persuasive discourse’ is also more parsimonious than ‘learner’/‘learning’, and lastly of course, Bakhtin’s account allows us to address Mandeep’s relationship with purer Anglo styles without marking him out as institutionally or culturally different – these are sociolinguistic processes experienced by nearly everyone.

How far and in what ways can this account speak to the concerns of L2 research?
5.2 The sociolinguistic dynamics of L2 use and development

If there is any contribution to L2 research in this paper, it is likely to derive from its attempt to engage with the ‘total linguistic fact’, moving back and forwards between form, activity and ideology (1.3).29 Formal phonological patterning has provided an analytic baseline for most of the account (Sections 3-5), but this has been linked to differentiated ideological representations of social space and to Mandeep’s discursive self-positioning (2.4.1.2, 4.2, 4.4), as well as to a preliminary grammar of okay (4.1.1). The analysis of double-voicing can be seen as an interactional sociolinguistic window on L2 motivation, and rather than opting for a celebratory sociolinguistic relativism, I have also engaged in normative evaluations of Mandeep’s phonological styling, pegging these empirically to neighbourhood (and national) norms, to generic expectations, and to the contingent specificities of the encounter, sequence and utterance (4.3). Admittedly, as the data isn’t longitudinal and we don’t know how far Mandeep’s English was changing overall, language learning and development have been very conspicuously missing from the discussion. But in fact together, the TLF and the analysis of stylisation have some quite distinctive implications for our understanding of language development and change, and it is worth closing with these, hopefully showing in the process that there is more to my argument than just a recasting of L2 issues and data in the vestments of contemporary linguistic anthropological sociolinguistics.

Mandeep’s purest renderings of Anglo occurred in markedly stylised speech, and since stylisation involves heightened metalinguistic reflexivity (cf Rampton 2009:151-2), there are implications for our approach to a topic of long-standing interest to both VS and L2 research – the relationship between linguistic development/change and language awareness (cf ‘attention to speech’, ‘change from above’ (Labov 1972), ‘focus on form’, ‘noticing’ (Schmidt 1990; Doughty & Williams 1998).

The *prima facie* connections between language changedevelopment, reflexivity and stylisation are particularly clear in relatively recent work at the intersection of variationist sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology:

> “the conscious, overt negotiation of meaning can be suggestive of the mechanisms at work in variation which is, arguably, constructed more on the fly and less subject to conscious manipulation. The fact that variables are tiny elements that occur over and over in the stream of speech, and that speakers do not have time to monitor each occurrence of a variable, does not mean that there is no such control. Rather there may be situations and events in which variation is foregrounded, and in which new elements of variable style take root” (2000:38; Schilling-Estes 1998; in an L2 context, see also Tarone 2000).

This is developed in Woolard’s (albeit speculative) 2007 discussion of how particular indexical associations (of community, stance or self) come to settle on specific linguistic forms. “Pragmatic salience” and stylisation – “the creative manipulations... [of] recognised social norms” (442) – play a leading part in Woolard’s theorisation, and her list of linguistic sites where intensive “semiotic work of social differentiation” occurs includes clicks in a ritual avoidance register (Irvine & Gal 2000), discourse markers encoding subjective evaluation (Traugott 2001), and words used in cursing, fighting, teasing and arguing (Eckert 2000; Woolard 2008:444). In all of these forms and practices, there are strong echoes of previous work on stylisation and crossing (see Rampton & Charalambous 2010).

But more important than this resonance itself, research on stylisation points to metalinguistic reflexivity’s embedding in describably different interactional dynamics, and this is clear in the account of Mandeep. There were two discursive contexts in which Mandeep’s pronunciation of English was most anglicised: first and foremost, in narrative quoted speech (4.1 & 4.2), and also in Extract 9’s “what a shame”, which Goffman calls an ‘interpersonal verbal ritual’, “a special class of quite conventionalised utterances, lexicalisations whose controlling purpose is to give praise, blame, thanks, support, affection or show gratitude, disapproval, dislike, sympathy, or greet, say farewell and...”

29 Hanks notes the risks in this enterprise: “It is tempting, depending upon one’s own commitments, to try to treat activities as if they were formal systems, or language structure as if it were no more than the temporary product of activity, or ideology as merely the projection of verbal categories or the misconstrual of action. But all such attempts distort their object by denying its basic distinctiveness. The challenge... is not reduction of this to a by-product of that but integration of distinct phenomena into a more holistic framework” (1996:231-2).
so forth” (1981:20-1). These two types of practice have something in common: regardless of whether or not they are filled with speech that is conspicuously stylised, both involve a break or partial suspension of the commonsense assumptions guiding routine communicative conduct, together with increased attention to linguistic form and to indexical, non-propositional meaning. In story-telling “the act of speaking is put on display.... lifted out to a degree from its contextual surrounding” (Bauman op.cit.; see 4.4), while interaction rituals are addressed to disruptions, exceptions and uncertainties in the ordinary flow of everyday conduct, and “[p]art of the force of these speech acts comes from the feelings they directly index; little of the force derives from the semantic content of the words” (Goffman 1981:20).

The central point is that reflexivity and metapragmatic denaturalisation involve more than just a relationship with language: they are situated socially, produced in a variety of different interactional arrangements, and Goffman’s theory of ‘keying’ provides us with a preliminary resource for systematic scrutiny of such occasions.

Goffman suggests that there are a number of basic ‘keys’ or interactional frames in which activity is understood as somehow special, not to be taken ‘straight’ or treated naively (1974:Ch.3). Narrative performance falls into the basic category ‘make-believe’, and interpersonal verbal rituals can be classed as one of his ‘ceremonials’. But there are also others: ‘contests’, including games (where crossing and stylisation often run rife), and ‘technical redoings’, involving activities which are “performed out of their usual context, for utilitarian purposes openly different from those of the original performance, the understanding being that the original outcome of the activity will not occur” (Goffman 1974:59). A crucial corollary is that across (and often within) these keyings, the participant relations differ – whereas narrative make-believe typically involves story-teller and audience, remedial rituals involve transgressor and offender, and in many games, the defining relations are opponent and team-mate.

So metalinguistic reflexivity never takes place in an interactional vacuum, and Goffman adumbrates a number of systematic possibilities that need to be addressed in any investigation of the relationship between language development and change on the one hand, and ‘conscious overt negotiation of meaning’, ‘pragmatic salience’, ‘focus on form’, and/or ‘attention to input’ on the other. Heightened metalinguistic awareness takes many socio-interactional forms, and whether and how a person or group develops new features of style will depend in part on the keying of the occasion in which they’re (made) aware of them. The key will steer or constrain their responses at least partially, and new and non-habitual language features are more likely to seem comic or enchanting in narrative, offensive or propitiatory in remedial ritual, provocative or celebratory in games, puzzling in technical redoings etc.

In addition, empirical research on crossing and stylisation shows that the interactional keys in which people reflexively engage with different styles are themselves influenced by widely circulating language ideologies affecting the status of different languages and registers, their legitimate use, and their accessibility to others. So, for example, in the south Midlands of England in the 1980s, where Caribbean styles had considerable cultural prestige among youth but racist discourses also had currency, it was much easier for white and Asian youngster to slip Jamaican Creole into interaction rituals (≈ Goffman’s ‘ceremonial’ key) than to draw attention to their crossing in artful performance (≈ Goffman’s ‘make-believe’. Cf 4.3; Rampton 2009). Elsewhere, in Greek Cypriot schools in conflict-ridden Cyprus after EU Accession in 2003, where most of the curriculum still represented Turkish Cypriots as the enemy, students and teachers participating in newly instituted Turkish foreign language classes were only able to proceed with their lessons if Turkish was treated as a neutral lexicogrammatical code, as a ‘technical redoing’, its social indexicality almost entirely suppressed (Charalambous 2009; Charalambous & Rampton 2010). It was suggested earlier that in the absence of concerns over its legitimacy, Mandeep’s production of more Anglicised speech entailed ‘stylisation’ rather than ‘crossing’ (4.4). But the fact that language ideological processes and positioning constrain the interactional keying in which people reflexively engage with new styles and registers invites a further inference. Anglo English’s status as a dominant rather than minority language is likely to increase the range and types of key in which it could be stylised, with hitherto uncharted ramifications for its learnability.

In sum: The study of stylisation insists that the reflexivity-language relationship is fully embedded in interactional and ideological relations, and describes some of the very different forms
that this can take. Certainly, reflexive metalinguistic practice denaturalises everyday language use, casting it in a different light, but it would be a mistake to read ‘attention to speech’ or ‘focus on form’ as transcendence or extraction from the social. Instead, Goffman provides an initial vocabulary for analytic differentiation of the interactional frames and relations in which new stylistic forms stand out, and studies of crossing and stylisation have pointed to the influence of ideology. Since it is all embedded in a commitment to describing the ‘total linguistic fact’, this doesn’t offer any empirical shortcuts to understanding the effect of metalinguistic awareness on the development of new elements of style or language. But it underlines the need for longitudinal studies of language development and change to pay close and differentiating attention to interpersonal rituals, artful performance and other keyed activities as potential crucibles for the emergence of new features.
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Transcription conventions

**Segmental phonology**

[ ] IPA phonetic transcription

**text** English pronounced with Anglo variants

**text** English pronounced with Punjabi variants

**Intonation**

\  low fall
'/ low rise
\  high fall
\  high rise
\ fall rise
^  rise fall
|  high stress
-  high unaccented prenuclear syllable
↑ pitch step-up
↓ pitch step-down
;  fall to mid

**Conversational features**

( . ) micro-pause

(1.5) approximate length of pause in seconds

[ ] overlapping turns

[ CAPITALS loud

.hh in-breath

>text< more rapid speech

°text° quietly spoken

( ) speech inaudible

 chậm speech hard to discern, analyst’s guess

((text:)) stage directions

“text” direct reported speech

⇒ words and utterances of particular interest to the analysis