

Transferable Communicative Routines: Strategies and Group Identity in Two Speech Events

Author(s): Karen Ann Watson

Source: *Language in Society*, Apr., 1975, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Apr., 1975), pp. 53-72

Published by: Cambridge University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4166779>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Language in Society*

JSTOR

Transferable communicative routines: strategies and group identity in two speech events

KAREN ANN WATSON

East-West Center

ABSTRACT

Two speech events, narration and joking conversation, are analyzed from a sample of speech data recorded from Hawaiian children 5-7 years old, in a peer group setting. An underlying routine, which is transferable from one genre of speech event to another, is identified in both narration and joking. This routine is iterative, and allows for both stories and joking to be produced jointly in a contrapuntal style. Some social rules governing the use of the routine are discussed. (Linguistic routines, narration, joking, conversation, Hawaiian talk story.)

This paper examines one example of a communicative routine in an attempt to arrive at an understanding of the rules and strategies used by speakers in certain kinds of interaction.¹ By routine is meant a sequence of utterances or behaviors which is regular and procedural, and which communicates as much by its form as by its content (for a definition of linguistic routine, see Hymes 1971). A routine exists when conventional or symbolic meanings have become attached to speech or behavior carried out in a particular sequence and with a particular style. A communicative routine is interactional: its use presumes at least two participants in a communicative exchange. Routines may be verbal or non-verbal, bounded or unbounded, iterative or non-iterative. Examples of familiar bounded routines are greetings, leave-takings, thanks, and apologies. Analytically, routines lie somewhere between a single utterance and a speech event.

Routines probably make up much of the shared repertoires of a speech community. By their very presence in an interaction, they limit the alternatives from which speakers may select. As with all language behavior, they govern and are governed by constraints on content, participants, situation, and/or other aspects of a speech event.

In analyzing speech data collected from Hawaiian children 5-7 years of age, it seemed to me that certain aspects of both the situation and the texts produced were more similar in structure across genre of speech event than one might

[1] I am indebted to John Gumperz, who commented on an earlier draft of this paper, and to the members of his seminar in natural conversation, winter and spring 1973, UC Berkeley, for many ideas in this paper. Stephen T. Boggs, University of Hawaii, also made useful suggestions. This paper is a revised version of one presented at the American Anthropological Association Meetings in New Orleans, Dec. 1973.

expect. The genres of speech event included narration, conversation, joking and teasing, argument, and recitation. I became interested, therefore, in finding out whether the same routines which occur in narration can also occur in conversation, especially in joking. In other words, are there routines which can be transferred from one genre of speech event to another?

Such routines, unlike greetings or thanks, must consist of segments which can be readily combined and recombined, and which do not automatically limit an interaction to identification as a particular kind of speech event. Thus, for example, formal narrative structure itself is not such a routine, since its occurrence always identifies the speech event as storytelling, or as storytelling within a larger speech event. Transferable routines are iterative, and function something like do-loops in a computing program.

The data used for this study derives from several months of fieldwork with Hawaiian homestead children 5-7 years of age, conducted in 1970 and 1971. As members of a single class in the Hawaii English Program, the 52 children in the sample and myself were in a non-structured environment which allowed us to go in and out of the classroom at will. All of the sessions were tape-recorded in the school yard, and all performances and interactions took place before a self-selected peer audience, with no teachers present.

For a comparative analysis, I chose one joking or teasing conversation, and one serious 'talk story' (the local term for a rambling personal experience narrative mixed with folk materials). The text, with a commentary and gloss for each utterance, taking into account certain general features of paralanguage, is found in the appendix to the paper. The commentary and gloss became the framework for extracting the social rules implied in the interaction. In the case of talk story, it was also useful for noting the interplay of narrative structure with strategies for manipulating the audience.²

In contrast to the usual view of narrative, both talk story and joking conversation among Hawaiian children are cooperatively produced by *two or more* speakers. More specifically, both narration and joking take the form of a contrapuntal conversation (Reisman 1970; Gumperz & Herasimchuk 1972). The effect of this structure overlaid on the already musical intonation contours of Hawaiian English, is to create a speech contour which resembles chanting, and the kind of alternation which occurs in cooperatively produced texts resembles responsive reading. The performance becomes highly rhythmical so that even false starts serve to elaborate on the basic rhythm, indicating that proper rhythm is actually more important than proper content.

It is the underlying social rules governing these speech events which produce such a musical and rhythmic routine. A primary rule here is the conversation rule for taking turns (see Schegloff 1968, and Speier 1972). Turn-taking functions

[2] For an explanation of the terms used in the commentary for the structural features of narrative, see Watson 1972 especially, and Watson 1973.

TRANSFERABLE COMMUNICATIVE ROUTINES

as a major structuring device for group interaction. Participants have flawless memories as to whose turn it is, often carried over from one session to another, and sometimes past intervals of more than a week. At the same time, one test of social status and power is the ability of a participant to speak out of turn, or to wrest the turn away from another, with the approval of the whole group.

Yet turn-taking does not imply individual performance. Rather, the speakers most successful in keeping the audience disposed in their favor are the speakers most apt to encourage a partnership in performance. Sometimes the result is that two or more speakers alternate (as in swapping personal experiences or insults), and at other times it is contrapuntal or joint performance.

Even in joint performance, one of the participants will be the lead speaker, who in the case of talk story, will have the final decision on the topic and development of the narrative. The lead narrator has primary speaking rights, and thus must either relinquish those rights in some way, or be dislodged by audience or competitor, before another speaker can become the lead narrator. Physical possession of the microphone was usually the ultimate test of who was in charge, but not always. In the story sample analyzed here, for instance, it is clear that Keahi claimed the position of lead speaker over Kona rather early in the talk story, but Kona continued to hold the microphone for most of the interaction. Although Keahi initially gave up her speaking rights at the beginning, notice that she must give them up again at the end, in order for Kona to take a turn at being lead narrator.

In many cooperatively produced stories and joking sessions, the co-speakers alternate often even within an utterance, seeming to time a word or phrase to fit into the established rhythm. For example, in the story example analyzed in the appendix, we find:

- Ke 35: . . . he go put somebody inside da –
 inside da – }
Ko 26: – cave – }
Ke 37: – inside a cave, for give – for give Pele something to eat.
Ko 38: Yeah.
Ke 39: Dey suffering.
Ko 40: ‘Cause Pele –
Ke 41: – Pele –
Ko 42: – Pele –
Ke 43: – was –
Ko 44: – was die.

It should be emphasized that the alternation of speaking here is not an artifact of competition over possession of the microphone, a fact which is obvious when the tapes are heard. As pointed out before, Keahi actually held the microphone to Kona's face, as she did in a few other talk story instances. Contrapuntal talk

LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY

stories were occasionally told without a microphone present but when other contextual features favored their production, e.g. the same physical location, the same kind of peer audience, and the same kinds of triggering circumstances. Similarly, joking of the kind represented by the example in the appendix was observed to occur both with and without a tape recorder present. Sexual joking by its nature is competitive, and thus the alternating pattern of competitive utterances cannot be attributed primarily to the presence of a microphone. Furthermore, in the case of 'talk story' narration, the children seemed to show some conscious awareness of both the form and content of the genre. Thus, several sessions after the above story was recorded, Keahi and Kona were again before the microphone, and the following discussion (which triggered another contrapuntal narration) took place:

Ke: You know da story me and you just told, da same – da other one, on Sea Life Park in the night-time?

Ko: Talk about em.

Ke: Me and you, 'keh? 'Keh?

Also affecting rhythm and counterpoint are the kinds of utterances which co-speakers may make in alternation and counterpoint. Such utterances are not random, but are closely tied to the structural and rhetorical requirements of narrative and joking. Viewed analytically, given a proposition made by one speaker, the co-speaker may extend or complete the utterance in ways which offer support to the speaker's proposition (agreement, corroboration, etc.), assist the speaker by supplying cues to structure or content, or deal with audience interference if it occurs. Co-speaker contributions may elaborate on a proposition or description, corroborate a speaker's claims, emphasize a speaker's proposition by repetition or re-phrasing or by adding emotional impact through vocatives, offer opinion or interpretation, or summarize and recapitulate. Elaboration, for instance, may include this kind of interchange [Ke is lead speaker, Ko co-speaker]:

Ke 134: Dey suck da blood.

Ko 135: Dey wen eat all da bones, boy.

Co-speakers may also formulate or nominate the next proposition, or suggest a substitution. For example:

Ke 31: You know-you know, if he kidnap das mean he wants you for good, too.

Ko 32: – he can fly – and den –

Ke 33: Yeah. }

Ko 34: Afta he }

can pick you up he can take you away.

One important use of co-speaker contributions is cueing the lead speaker to

TRANSFERABLE COMMUNICATIVE ROUTINES

narrative structure, for instance, by supplying 'and then' or 'because' statements which help to carry the story forward. Frequently this occurs when the lead speaker is stammering or seems to have lost his or her train of thought.

- Ke 35: Yeah, he go put you inna –
 he go put you guys in –
 he go put somebody in –
 he go put somebody inside da –
 inside da – }
 Ko 36: – cave – }
 Ke 37: – inside a cave, for give –

And then the co-speaker may also handle audience interference:

- Ke 114: – you go die from you. }
 N 115: I go all night, I like go some. }
 K 116: Mmmm.
 Ke 117: Den he go [take?] you, he going [take?].
 Ko 118: 'Keh, you go, you going die, Noela.

Of course many utterances accomplish several of these at once, and in any case, the list offered here is meant to be descriptive and suggestive, not taxonomic.³

The overlapping structure of talk story and joking is made even more pronounced by selection towards redundancy, which strengthens rhythm as well as encouraging cooperative performance. That is, repetition and recapitulation of previous episodes, themes, and commentary, even where highly redundant, is favored, often over the introduction of new material. It is likely that such repetition is inherent in contrapuntal speech events; Reisman (1970), for instance, has shown that with several speakers talking at once, repetition serves to guarantee that an individual speaker's statements are heard. He also found that, in contrast to the expectation of hearing something novel or original, among Antiguans words or themes are picked up, elaborated, and 'put through all their paces', before being dropped for new ones. Repetition in talk story and joking includes references to past storytelling and joking sessions.

Redundancy is encoded in the iterative structure of routines used in storytelling and joking, and when participated in by speakers in counterpoint or alternation, often becomes the vehicle for competition. That is, it leads to an escalation of claims, such that each succeeding round of joking becomes more extreme, implausible, or shocking, and thus more hilarious; and each succeeding round of serious story-telling becomes more intense. This is possible because in both cases, the subject persons of storytelling and the victims of joking are the speakers themselves, or are present at the session and able to interact, by defense

[3] All of these uses appear in the story example; not all appear in the joking example, although they do all appear in other joking situations.

or retaliation. At the very least, they are nearby where they can be fetched by their supporters to come to their own defense. In nine months of recording, there were only a couple of occasions when a child was mentioned in joking who was not a member of the class which I was studying. This is rather remarkable, for the children had been assigned to the classes randomly, and all of the children in the school lived within a few blocks of each other. It would seem, therefore, that one of the rules governing storytelling and joking, is that the people who serve as co-speakers and audience are those who will be the topic of the speech event.

Of course this rule is directly tied to what may be an important function of certain routines in particular speech events in which the aim is to communicate group identity. Knowing the rules for speaking always identifies a speaker as part of the speech community, but such is even more true in the case of routines, which are larger blocks of interrelated rules, and which may be specific to small groups in a speech community. It is even likely that what we mean by such expressions as achieving rapport, sending and receiving 'good vibrations', or being in the 'swing' of things is in fact a function of knowing and flowing with the rhythms of speech as set by routines.

Even more important to group identity, in the case of talk story and joking, is the way in which form and content of a routine are interactive. Selection for redundancy, and the necessity of having present at the session the very persons who are talked about, function not only as outcomes and supports for the iterative structure of routines, but also function to strengthen group identity. They are closely related to another rule for speaking, which is that speakers and audience must have a mutual basis of shared knowledge of characters, events, location of events, or situation prior to embarking on narration or joking.⁴ For talk story, the structural correlate of this rule is an interrogative formal opening phrase with falling intonation: e.g. 'You know my brothers?' or 'You know down by Kailua?' When new characters, locations, or events are introduced internally in a story, the same kind of question is again put to the audience. A story does not proceed until the audience and storyteller have arrived at shared information or identification.

[4] Notice that Hawaiians thus have a somewhat different rule of reportability from that found by Labov for Black adolescents. Reportability refers to the rule that if the event is commonplace, it is not reportable. The most reportable kinds of events are dangerous ones, especially the danger of death or injury. It is, in other words, the unusual which is reportable, especially something which breaks the normal rules for behavior or reality (Labov *et al.* 1968:301). Given that Labov was working with adolescent males, an emphasis on danger is not surprising. The story selected for analysis here, of course, also uses danger to justify its telling. But talk story in general does not require danger, nor the unusual in Labov's sense; often it is a matter of soul-searching, or of analysis of people's motives. Thus often what is *familiar*, and what has been heard many times, may be preferred over what is unknown, and the storyteller's talent comes in the way he or she is able to elaborate on the known.

TRANSFERABLE COMMUNICATIVE ROUTINES

The effect of this routine on talk story is a tendency for many more narrational statements to be uttered with falling intonation than are intended as either genuine or rhetorical questions, making the progress of the story contingent on audience interaction, and contributing much to the overall melody of talk story. Such a necessity is the interrogative to a proper story, that it is not unusual to hear a speaker say of a peer standing next to him, 'You know her? She . . .' A personal experience story may even begin with 'You know me?' As the children become older and more seasoned artists, such anomalies may disappear, but their early occurrence indicates the strength of the rule.

In joking, since the victims are nearly always in the immediate audience, the interrogative is even more clearly a token or stylistic, but it always heads a joking cycle: 'You know Noela?'

Related to the rule of shared knowledge is a non-verbal routine which also expresses group identity, and is governed by the rule that speakers only report the facts (presumably) and are not responsible for them. The structural correlate for this rule is a tendency towards tonal detachment by the speaker at climax points in talk story or joking. That is, the speaker indicates tonally that he or she is not responsible for what has been reported, and that the audience, in essence, may believe it or not, as they choose. Tonal detachment also functions, of course, as a good ploy for warding off attack by victims in the case of jokes, or challenge by a disbelieving audience, in the case of story-telling.

To summarize, we are dealing here with two separate speech events, talk story and joking. Talk story has been defined as a rambling personal experience narrative mixed with folk materials. It is a common pastime in adult Hawaiian society, where it tends (like the example analyzed here) to focus on supernatural or spiritual experiences. Contrapuntal talk story differs from other forms of narrative recorded from the same set of children in that other kinds of narration are not produced by co-speakers, deal with topics other than personal experiences, and tended among these children to be headed by the formal opening phrase, 'Once upon a time'.

Joking of the kind analyzed here consists of allegations of obscene acts, taunting, and sometimes commands to perform certain behaviors. Although descriptions of sexual behavior in joking sometimes take the form of brief reports, joking is not narration: there is no preservation of sequential order over several interchanges, the boundaries for the speech event are not those of a narrative, and joking can be initiated or terminated under a variety of contextual conditions not open to narrative (see Watson 1972).

Although on the surface, therefore, talk story and joking are separate speech events, underlying both of them is a very basic, transferable, iterative routine, which operates interdependently with the content of the utterances:

S/Q → R/A → P → R/C → M → R/C → P etc.

S/Q > R/A → P → R/C → M → R/C → S/Q etc.

The co-speakers go through a number of iterations or cycles beginning with a summons or question (S/Q), followed by a response or answer (R/A). This response may come from the co-speaker, or the co-speakers may expect it from the larger audience. A proposition (P) follows, eliciting a response or corroboration (R/C). Then comes some form of mediation (M), that is, an utterance which qualifies, rounds out, or assists in interpretation. Mediations include elaboration, summary, emphasis, emotional expression, repetition, and recapitulation.⁵ Following mediation, there is usually another response or corroboration (R/C).

At this point, iteration may begin with another proposition followed by response and mediation. Or the iteration may return to the beginning, with a new summons/question. A related but distinct melody to the intonation contour accompanies each part of the routine. Response of the audience or corroboration of the co-speaker, may be actualized or may be tacit. The speaker 'makes room' for R/C tonally, but usually does not insist on it.

Finally, all co-speakers may offer propositions as well as responses – a co-speaker is not simply a sounding board for a lead speaker. Thus, cooperative talk story and joking are truly joint performances.

The effects of this routine on narrative structure are fascinating. It makes available a stock of overlapping narrative units which are easily woven into a new story network on demand. Knowing the routine, storytellers find it easy to cooperate in narration, and the tendency to argue or compete is greatly reduced. Secondly, the ways in which a single narrator and co-narrators proceed from beginning to end are quite different. With a single speaker, a narrative tends to be tightly structured, and the speaker usually moves in a direct line from beginning to end. In contrapuntal talk story, however, the narrative is more rambling, and the story zigzags from one temporary climax and commentary to another, towards a final close.⁶

Most striking is that narrative structure is adhered to despite the collaboration of two or more speakers. That is, the story nevertheless develops an over-all structure of beginning, middle, and end, just as if it were told by one person. This is especially impressive given that these speakers at age 5–7, are at the beginning of their careers as storytellers.

A number of fascinating avenues for further exploration of speech events, their nature and functions, are suggested by the approach used in this paper. In regard to the Hawaiian community, for instance, even very young children

[5] One of the more interesting things to pursue with a wide variety of data is whether there is an ordered sequence for the kinds of mediation which occur, or whether they are determined by something in the immediate context. Some evidence suggests that the acquisition of different kinds of mediation is age related (see Watson 1972).

[6] Notice, however, that a contrapuntal narrative is not necessarily dialectic. There is no particular semantic or structural goal aimed for in the telling, other than a properly formed story. The telling is usually a matter of cooperation rather than opposition, and in any case, each so-called 'thesis' or proposition is often itself jointly produced. Thus there is no antithesis in a dialectical sense.

TRANSFERABLE COMMUNICATIVE ROUTINES

are encouraged if not automatically expected to participate in a variety of verbal routines with parents and siblings, which range from joking to contradicting, from dramatic play to narration, from peace-making to debate (Boggs 1974). Most of these speech events train the child to rely on subtle cues for participation, and are highly interpersonal in focus and substance (*ibid*). Work is now underway to analyze speech events among Hawaiian children in different contexts across several age groups. The intention is to identify other kinds of routines, and to ascertain whether the underlying routine described here is found in speech events other than talk story and sexual joking (Boggs forthcoming; Watson & Boggs forthcoming; see also Bernstein 1969).

More generally, an important problem remaining to be solved is how we are to limit what is meant by a *routine*. In looking for routines in speech events, it is tempting at last to see nearly all speech behavior in that framework. Although such is an intriguing possibility, it seems more prudent to suggest that intensive analysis of routines and routine structures, comparable to the one provided here but also going beyond it, are needed to clarify the concept as an analytical tool, as well as to help specify the functions and uses of routines.

REFERENCES

- Bernstein, L. (1969). Humor as an indication of social relationships among twenty Hawaiian children. Senior Honors Thesis, Department of Anthropology. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- Boggs, S. T. (1974). Speech events involving part-Hawaiian children five years old and younger. Unpublished mss.
- (forthcoming). From the mouths of babes: reflections of social structure in the verbal interaction of part-Hawaiian children.
- Gumperz, J. J. & Herasimchuk, E. (1972). The conversational analysis of social meaning: a study of classroom interaction. In R. W. Shuy (ed.), *Sociolinguistics: current trends and prospects*. (Report on the 23rd Annual Round Table. Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics No. 25) Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1971). On linguistic theory, communicative competence, and the education of disadvantaged children. In M. L. Wax, S. Diamond, and F. O. Gearing (eds.), *Anthropological perspectives on education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Labov, W. et al. (1968). *A study of the non-standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican speakers in New York City*. Vol. 1. (Cooperative Research Project No. 3288.) Washington, D.C.: Office of Education.
- Reisman, K. (1970). Contrapuntal conversations in an Antigua village. Penn-Texas Working Papers in Sociolinguistics, No. 3. Austin: University of Texas.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *AmA* 70 (6): 1075-95.
- Speier, M. (1972). Some conversational problems for interactional analysis. In D. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in social interaction*. New York: Free Press.
- Watson, K. A. (1972). The rhetoric of narrative structure: a sociolinguistic analysis of stories told by part-Hawaiian children. (Unpublished dissertation. University of Hawaii.)
- (1973). A rhetorical and sociolinguistic model for the analysis of narrative. *AmA* 75 (1): 243-64.
- Watson, K. A., & Boggs, S. T. (1974). From verbal play to talk story: the role of routines in speech events among Hawaiian children. (Paper to be presented at the 73rd Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Mexico City.)

LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY

APPENDIX

Key to symbols

- } overlapping speech
- ===== sustained or prolonged hold
- | phrasing, where varies in position or length from conversational or typical breaks for the individual
- _____ (underlined blank) untranscribable
- [?] unsure of transcription
- ↑↓ rising and falling of intonation respectively (marked for interrogative or semi-interrogative utterances only)

Keahi and Kona Total Time: 5 minutes
Story Text

Text	Glosses and Comments
Ko 1: Only one ti- . .	<p><i>Phase One</i> <i>Ko 1: claim to speaking rights; framing the speech event; NS: formal opening phrase.</i> Ko is claiming right to speak (it's her turn) – projects her voice louder than normal. Intonation contour is narrational – typical for Ke and Ko in folklore-type stories.</p>
Ke 2: I did, I did, okeh now.	<p><i>Ke 2: miscommunication of intent; declining the floor.</i> Ke distracted, didn't realize Ko was starting and now urges Ko to talk. Gloss: 'I already told a story, it's your turn.'</p>
Ko 3: Only one ti- only one ti-	<p><i>Ko 3: repetition of claim to speaking rights</i> Ko echoes her opening, with slight hesitancy, less loud. Voice creaks at end.</p>
Ke 4: I did – keh, go ahead, I did.	<p><i>Ke 4: confirmation of speaking rights.</i> Ke slightly irritated at the confusion, uses insistent tone at first, then coaxes.</p>
Ko 5: I wen look at 6: Pele, only one pitcha have Pele on tee-vee.	<p><i>Ko 5-6: NS: orientation – character.</i> Ko picks up exactly where she left off after formal opening phrase. Note measured timing and phrasing – tone is half-way between narration and announcement. Introduces character and establishes Ko as personal authority on.</p>
K 7: Oh really?↑	<p><i>K 7: supportive audience response</i> K (researcher) responds as outsider; pro continuing the story, but pitch and intonation exaggerated. Gloss of intent: 'What would be an appropriate response at this point?'</p>
Ke 8: Yeah.	<p><i>Ke 8: initiation of cooperative storytelling.</i> Ke's tone signals entrance as narrating</p>

TRANSFERABLE COMMUNICATIVE ROUTINES

- Ko 9: Oh ya ya (rapidly).
- Ke 10: An' her hair was long, boy, }
long. }
- Ko 11: Yeah, I seen Pele – boy }
 12: Her hair was all red. }
- Ke 13: Oh, you go down Sea Life }
 Park inna night-time, }
 14: you gonna hear one – |you gonna }
 hear somet'ing good, }
- Ke 15: Don' laugh.
- Ko 16: Hale Pele.
- K 17: Oh. }
 Ke 18: Hear }
 somet'ing go dong.
- Ke 19: (louder) You are going hear one }
 owl go oooooooooooo like dat. }
 20: An' he go be in na back of you, }
 flying around. }
- K 21: Wow!
 Ko 22: Yeah (loud, sustained).
 Ke 23: He get long wing,
- partner (voice as loud and pitched with Ko's).
 She is addressing audience.
 Ko 9: *dismissal of audience disbelief*.
 Gloss: 'Of course, of course.'
 Ke 10: *NS: orientation – description*.
 Ke takes cue from Ko's 5–6, to move to descriptive detail of what was seen on TV. Exaggerated intonation contour imitates length.
 Ko 11–12: *Corroboration; NS: description*.
 Ko supports Ke's 10 by citing self as eyewitness. Her 12 parallels Ke's 10 in content, form and length. Voice breathy and constricted to emphasize red (fiery) hair, incredibility of Pele. Also restatement of 5–6 – note overlapping structure of story: it recapitulates or recycles at several points.
Phase Two
 Ke 13–14: *framing new, linked narrative; NS: formal opening phrase, orientation – situation*.
 Interrogative contour in 13 – 'if' clause substituting for more common question occurring at this point. Ke's stammers are probably stylistic: they show measured timing with spurts of ellipsis; makes performance rhythmic and musical, like chanting or poetry, at times syncopated.
 Ke 15: *NS: mediation (commentary)*
 Meta-statement of seriousness of story – warning (note: audience is being serious); guarantees audience continued silent attention; creates suspense.
 Ko 16: *NS: reintroduction of character*
 Ko inserts Pele, immediately supplying the source of fear; tone indicates 'this is obvious.' Literal Transl: 'Pele's house.' (Unclear whether 'hale' is actually intended here.)
 K 17: *supportive audience response*.
 Gloss: 'Keep talking.'
 Ke 18: *NS: orientation – situation*.
 Use of sound to create suspense.
 Ke 19–20: *NS: character, situation*.
 Ke's voice louder as introduces owl, the messenger of Pele. (Audience would – or might – know this.) Owl makes high pitched [u] with tremolo. Creates suspense, fear. At 20, Ke's pitch drops, intonation contour similar to 15. Gloss: mild warning but emotional detachment of speaker (common at climaxes) – 'I'm just reporting facts; take it or leave it, it's up to you.'
 K 21: *supportive audience response*.
 Ko 22: *corroboration*.
 Ko almost screams at peak – falsetto.
 Ke 23: *NS: character description*.

LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY

Keahi and Kona

Story Text

Total Time: 5
minutes

Text	Glosses and Comments
<p>he get long <u>wings</u> (stress on w) you know - } K 24: Yeah?↑ } Ke 25: He - he invisible, yeah?↑ } Kona - } Ko 26: Yeah! }</p>	<p>Parallel to description of Pele - long hair = long wings. 'You know' is matter-of-fact. <i>K 24: supportive audience response.</i> <i>Ke 25-Ko 26: NS: character, corroboration.</i> Description, also explanation for reliance on sound over sight. Ke summons Ko's response (Ko looking elsewhere). Ko answers with strong 'Yeah', to signal intent of continued participation.</p>
<p>Ke 27: So you guys betta watch out, you get kid-<u>nap</u> (warning).</p>	<p><i>Ke 27: NS: mediation (commentary).</i> Ke summarizes previous by introducing owl's intention, and gives warning; rapidly spoken.</p>
<p>K 28: Really?↓ (very high pitch)</p>	<p><i>K 28-M 29: supportive audience response; confirmation.</i></p>
<p>Ke 29: Yeah (strongly). Ko 30: Yeah. He - he can - (mid-high) Ke 31: You know-you know, if he kidnap } das mean he wants you for good, } too. }</p>	<p>Ko is incredulous, Ke is positive. <i>Ko 30-Ke 33: NS: situation, mediation (interpret.).</i> Ko and Ke overlap. Ke (even rhythm) is listening simultaneously to Ko; her 'yeah' is affirmation of Ko's line. 'You know's' at 32 ellipsed.</p>
<p>Ko 32: - he can fly - and den - Ke 33: Yeah. } Ko 34: Afta he } can pick you up he can take you away.</p>	<p><i>Ko 34: mediation (amplification).</i> Counterpoint of Ko's 32, 34, to Ke's of 31.</p>
<p>Ke 35: Yeah, he go put you inna - he go put you guys in - he go put somebody in - he go put somebody inside da - inside da - }</p>	<p><i>Ke 35: NS: situation, character intent.</i> Ke's even rhythm, with substitution of words only, is chant-like.</p>
<p>Ko 36: Cave. }</p>	<p><i>Ko 36-Ke 37: Cooperative prompting; NS: mediation (explanation).</i></p>
<p>Ke 37: Inside a cave, for give - for give Pele someting to eat.</p>	
<p>Ko 38: Yeah (subdued awe).</p>	<p><i>Ko 38: corroboration.</i></p>
<p>Ke 39: Dey suff'ring.</p>	<p><i>Phase Three (32-39 is transitional)</i></p>
<p>Ko 40: 'Cause, Pele -</p>	<p><i>Ke 39: NS: summary description, condition.</i></p>
<p>Ke 41: Pele -</p>	<p><i>Ko 40-Ke 45: NS: situation.</i> Exaggeration. Style is alternation, synco-pated.</p>
<p>Ko 42: Pele -</p>	
<p>Ke 43: - was -</p>	
<p>Ko 44: - was die.</p>	
<p>Ke 45: Yeah. (tentative)</p>	
<p>K 46: Really?↓</p>	<p><i>K 46-48: Negative audience response (challenge).</i></p>
<p>Ke 47: Yeah (more certain).</p>	<p>K gloss: 'Show cause.'</p>
<p>K 48: Why?↑</p>	<p>Ke gloss: 'I'm sure, and I know.'</p>
<p>Ke 49: S-he - he neva have food,</p>	<p><i>Ke 49-50: NS: situation.</i></p>

TRANSFERABLE COMMUNICATIVE ROUTINES

- wata an' dat (rapidly). Return to falling intonation storytelling (interrogative also) style.
- 50: So he-he wen to a gr-. .
he wen to grandma's house, }
Ko 51: He neva had nut-ting to eat. }
- Ke 52: - he wen to a grandma's house, an'
say 'May I have uh some food.'
- Ko 53: Food.
Ke 54: So da,| so da,|da-
Ko 55: Tu-
- Ke 56: -da gra-|da mu-|da gramma-
- Ko 57: So lucky t'ing
Pele leave - grandma leave
Ke 58: Dey neva die.
Ko 59: - Pele food.
Ke 60: Das - s'like uh da grandma gave
Pele when he was to leave to -
down da volcano.
61: So now|he-he neva die. He still
alive.
- K 62: Oh (weak, breathy, soft).
- Ke 63: Da gr - ev'ry day he go visit da
gramma.
- Ko 64: So y- no go Sea Life Park.
- Ke 65: Yeah. }
K 66: Did - }
Did you go there and they told
you this?↑
Ko 67: Yeah. }
Ke 68: Yeah. }
Ko 69: I did one night.
- Ke 70: Yeah (short, tentative).
- Ko 71: I did (subdued).
Ke 72: You - so my mother no take us to
Sea Life Park inna night-time.
73: She take us Sea Life Park inna
afta-noon.
- Ko 51: Corroboration and emphasis.*
Counterpoint to Ke 49.
Ke 52-Ko 53: NS complicating action, mediation.
Direct tagged speech mode of dialogue gives immediacy and believability. Ko echoes.
Ke 54-Ke 56: cooperative insertion.
Ke is evenly spacing words in syncopated style. Ko tentatively starts to supply 'tutu' (grandmother). This cues Ke, who substitutes gm, English term they have been using.
Ko 57-Ko 59: NS: mediation (summary).
Ko and Ke each summarize.
Ke 60: NS: complicating action.
Ke 61: NS: mediation.
Ke's tone implies audience should expect this. 'Alive' produced by constricted voice - creak, suggesting fear of Pele.
K 62: supportive audience response.
K subdued.
Ke 63: NS: mediation (continuing action).
Gloss: proper behavior of gratitude and respect for elder female consanguine, two ascending generations.
Ko 64-M 65: Corroboration and recapitulation.
Ko repeats previous warnings, emphasizing the point of the story. Ke confirms.
K 66: Supportive audience response.
Gloss: 'How do you know this? - but I'm not challenging you.'
Ko 67-Ke 68: Reply to audience query.
In chorus, both sustained, similar contour.
Phase Four
Ko 69-70: claim to authority and speaking rights
Validity by personal witness. Ke's unsureness related to Ko's previous strong warnings on SLP at night?
Ko 71: repetition of claim to speaking rights.
Ke 72-73: NS: mediation - summary.
Ke is matter of-fact, slightly detached, affectively.

LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY

Keahi and Kona

Story Text

Total Time: 5
minutes

Text	Glosses and Comments
<p>K 74: Ummm. Boy, that's scary (softly). } Ko 75: One night I did, }</p>	<p><i>K 74: Supportive audience response. noncommittal. Gloss: 'I'm not losing interest.'</i> <i>Ko 75: repetition of claim of right to speak.</i></p>
<p>76: but my father did (very soft). 77: It was spooky, boy! (strong emphasis) } Ke 78: If you guys get ticket for Sea - } if you guys get ticket for - but } if you guys get ticket for Sea Life } Park, in the night-time, you } guys - some h-haoles, hah?† }</p>	<p><i>Ko tries again, combined with formal opening phrase ('one night'). She backs off as to details in Ko 76, and in Ko 76 substitutes emotiveness instead ('spooky').</i> <i>Ke 78-80: NS: summary, situation.</i> <i>Ke's narration here as in 35, with more clearly and interrogative contour. (Note that Ko is talking in background; too faint to transcribe.) Ke tends to run together words here. Ke 79 'real' - very ellipsed.</i></p>
<p>79: Dey real-real haole, but da guys no come back round. 80: So dey still haole. 81: Den da haoles dey git ticket for tonight.</p>	<p><i>Ke 81-82: NS: complicating action.</i> <i>Gloss: 'You see what happens!'</i> <i>(Voice is creaky on 'tonight').</i></p>
<p>82: Dey go down dere, one haole almost die. K 83: Umm (subdued). } Ko 84: Yeah. (softly) } Ke 85: My brother - }</p>	<p><i>K 83: supportive audience response.</i> <i>Ko 84: Corroboration.</i> <i>Ke 85-Ko 86: maintaining speaking rights; NS: orientation - character.</i></p>
<p>Ko 86: Yeah?† Ke 87: My brother he - anyway he seen - N 88: Auh! (boy shouts into mike) Ke 89: - a boy died, an haole boy died, Ko 90: Yeah, so if I'uz you I wouldn't (fades).</p>	<p><i>Ke begins new episode, Ko acknowledges.</i> <i>Ke 87: NS: complicating action.</i> <i>N 88: negative audience response (interference).</i> <i>Ke 89: NS: complicating action.</i> <i>Ko 90: NS: summary.</i> <i>Ko summarizes for K's benefit - K is a haole.</i> <i>(negative audience response (interference))</i></p>
<p>(Both Ke and Ko drowned out here by N making lip noises into the mike; Ke is still talking) Ke 91: - down dere where Pele comes to live with da gramma,</p>	<p><i>Ke 91-Ko 93: NS: mediation - summary.</i> <i>Ko and Ke alternating in counterpoint with recapitulation of warning. Ko's 93 is matter-of-fact, emotionally detached. Her attention begins to drift at the end.</i></p>
<p>92: he died ova dere. } Ko 93: Ova by da - ova by, uh } so I's you no - no go Sea Life } Park. } Ke 94: Ova dere, where you know, } ova-ova here dis is da new, Sea } Life Park? (pointing) }</p>	<p><i>Ke 94: NS: mediation - situation and setting.</i> <i>To establish shared information.</i></p>
<p>K 95: Yeah. (Ko and N begin talking in background to each other; N is challenging Ke's above warning)</p>	<p><i>K 95: supportive audience response.</i> <i>(negative audience response (interference and competing conversation))</i></p>
<p>Ke 96: Right down dere where - } N 97: I like time I go [?] - }</p>	<p><i>Ke 96: NS: mediation continued.</i> <i>N 97: Competing narration/conversation.</i></p>

TRANSFERABLE COMMUNICATIVE ROUTINES

Ke 98: - where pa - |
 where da kine Pele's - }
 Ko 99: In da night-time? [to N] }
 Ke 100: - gramma live (falling intona-
 tion).

101: Dat's how wen get in - }
 Ko 102: Dat's how - }
 Ke 103: o-cean,
 an' den dey wen die.
 Ko 104: - das how da owl going take you.

Ke 105: Yeah.
 Ko 106: He going take you -
 107: He going take you a - | he going
 take you on -
 K 108: I didn't know there was a one-

Ko 109: - two owls, - }
 Ke 110: Ova dere da devil. }
 Ko 111: - da owl! (sustained, insistent)

112: An da de- . . an da devil, dey }
 get knife, you know (warn- }
 ingly).
 Ke 113: An he-he get . . down [?] den -
 if you stayed a-walk da beach, he
 go stab you,
 114: you go die from you. }
 N 115: I go all night, I like go some. }

K 116: Mmm (very low). (addressed to
 M)
 Ke 117: Den he go ___ you, he going ___ .
 Ko 118: 'Keh, you go, you going die, . . . |
 Noela.
 Ke 119: Den he really _____.
 Ko 120: I not lie.

121: I telling da truth - }
 N 122: Mmmm. }
 Ko 123: Somebody else lyin. }
 Ke 124: He go kill somebody else. }

125: So he get|-dey wen eat guys,
 yeah?↑
 Ko 126: Yeah, da guys - }
 Ke 127: Dey - dey - }
 Ko 128: - dey - }
 Ke 129: - chop em up - }

N is addressing this to Ko, claims his own
 lack of fear of going to SLP at night.

Ke 98: NS: mediation continued.

Ke 101: NS: mediation (explanation).

Ke and Ko in counterpoint, from here Ko is
 both talking to N and keeping an ear on an
 appropriate speech with Ke. Note parallel
 utterances. Ko is repeating previous narra-
 tion - recycling information.

K 108: Supportive audience response.

Very soft and vague.

Ko 109-Ko 111: NS: re-introduction of char-
 acter.

Ko starts with 'two owls', but Ke returns to
 devil, Ke's tone (to K): 'Did you realize
 this?' Ko insists on owl; gloss: 'Listen,
 you're leaving out the owl.' But she changes
 her mind and joins Ke in 'devil', following.

Ko 112-Ke 114: NS: mediation (description
 and situation).

Ke picks up from Ko to detail the warning.
 Ke's speech after 'he' is rapid, tone affectively
 detached.

N 115: Negative audience response (challenge).
 N is not too sure of self - voice trails off.

K 116: supportive audience response.

Ke 117-Ko 118: Counter-warning.

Ke and Ko responding to N.

Ko 120-Ko 123: Counter-accusation, response.
 N has accused Ko of lying?

120-flatly stated with emotional detach-
 ment and mild warning tone. 121 - flatly
 stated, honest tone. 122 - vague. 123 - slight
 accusatory tone mixed with innocence.

Ke 124-125: NS: mediation; enlistment

Ke continues story; 124 is quiet and un-
 approving. Then summons Ko for agree-
 ment and to resuming participation.

Ko 126-132: NS complicating action, descrip.
 Ko rejoins, contrapuntal narration resumes.
 Ko here is almost like the drone in classical
 Indian music - repeating the basic tone-
 theme of 'devil'.

LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY

Keahi and Kona

Story Text

Total Time: 5
minutes

Text	Glosses and Comments
<p>Ko 130: - devil - Ke 131: - dey got - dey guys - } Ko 132: - devil - Ke 133: - fight for da kine, } and dey suck blood. 134: Dey suck da blood (very softly).</p>	<p><i>Ke 133-134: NS: complicating action, mediation.</i> Incredibility mixed with certainty. At 'blood', voice constricted, loudness cut; gives impression of shock, disgust, understatement. Repetition for emphasis - low volume.</p>
<p>Ko 135: Dey wen eat all da bones, boy. Ke 136: Yeah. Ko 137: Dey eat da ____ an' ev'ryt'ing.</p>	<p><i>Ko 135-137: corroboration and augmentation.</i> Ko adds further emphasis with datum especially grotesque to Hawaiians: destroying bones of the dead. Gives impression of forcing out the consonants, severe speech, very tense in her body and face. But, aggressive not fearful performative stance.</p>
<p>138: But dey throw da - but dey throw - if - (distracted) N 139: [says something, unclear] } Ke 140: You neva } was at Sea Life Park, hah?↓</p>	<p><i>Phase Five</i> <i>Ke 140: Claim to speaking rights, recapitulation</i> Ke's question links to previous narration and is opening to new events. Much louder, addressed to K.</p>
<p>N 141: ____ Dono. Ko 142: No, Dono an da kine may-[-?]</p>	<p><i>N 141-Ko 142: Negative audience response (competing narration, conversation)</i> Ko and N drowning out Ke. N's 'story' is with reference to much earlier story by N, in which she and N argued, on episode of TV show Hawaii Five-O.</p>
<p>(all three voices confused at this point) Ke 143: An one of my auntie wen down Sea Life Park where Pali use to live, onna Pali, up da Pali - (tape recorder turned off by N, who wants to listen to the tape; in interim, K is trying to find out where Ke and Ko learned all this) K 144: Okeh, tell me - (tape switched off again by N) K 145: - want to hear some more about that (very rapid). (interference with background talk also)</p>	<p><i>Ke 143: NS: orientation, complicating action</i> Ke moves into interrogative intonation contour, and out again by final phrase. <i>K 145: positive audience response</i> K is not asking for more story, but for how Ke knew about Pele. Result, however, is that question is not answered directly; more story is offered instead.</p>
<p>Ko 146: Ho, man, last time when my bruddah dem wen at da uh - last time when - when da mother dem at da Park, hah?↓</p>	<p><i>Phase six</i> <i>Ko 146: N's interruption stopped last telling.</i> Thus: <i>framing narrative, claiming right to speak.</i> 'Last time' is formal opening phrase. Expletives emphasize that what follows is exciting.</p>

TRANSFERABLE COMMUNICATIVE ROUTINES

- N 147: *Dono - Dono car, hah?↓* *N 147: Neg. aud. response (competing narration)*
- Ko 148: *And his head was hanging on a tree | like nothing, boy.* *Ko 148: NS: mediation (description)*
Ko skips a crucial linking action between 146 and 148 - distracted by N? Ko may be competing by getting to the part most compelling to audience right away - horror. Bid for audience attention. Voice partly scratchy, final 'g' on 'hanging' exaggeratedly hard.
- N 149: *Why?↓* } *N 149: Supportive audience response (query)*
Ko's histrionics have captured N's attention; hereafter he seems scared.
- Ke 150: *So* } *Ke 150: False start*
he was, | he was -
Ke now excited, begins a too-high pitched description, becomes breathless; then Ko and Ke laugh at it.
- (Ko and Ke laughing)
 Ke 151: *Oh, you know one of my brother?↓* *Ke 151: NS: complicating action.*
(Note: the 'brother' is now Ke's).
He seen one clothes, ya?↑
- K 152: *Mmm.* } *K 152: supportive audience response.*
 Ke 153: *With* } *Ke 153: NS: description.*
blood on top of.
Ke carefully times this; after getting audience agreement on first part (151), she follows with this laconic statement.
- (slightly shocked pause)
 K 154: *Uh!* *K 154: supportive audience response.*
Audience caught off-guard. Gloss: 'ugh!'
- Ke 155: *An it - an it but had a cuts on top it, too.* *Ke 155-Ko 156: NS: mediation (description).*
Detail for emphasis. Ko supplies further linked expressive emphasis.
- Ko 156: *What a clothes you have . .*
 K 157: *Mmmm.* } *K 157: supportive audience response.*
 Ko 158: *- no -* }
 Ke 159: *Right down da Sea -* } *Ke 159-161: NS: mediation (setting, location).*
- Ko 160: *- go Sea Life Park.* }
Ko echoes Ke. Interrogative intonation contours. 161 given with force of surprise. Repetition.
- Ke 161: *- Life Park. | Right - dis new Sea Life Park had em clothes lying on da ground.*
 162: *If you go down Sea Life Park you go see plenny money.* *Ke 162: NS: mediation (situation summary).*
Ke introduces new theme - money. This is linked back to the story Ke told previously on Hawaii Five-O - and thus also to Ki's competing narration which he has now given up.
- Ke 163: *Ask da man w- | . . ask da man we seen, yeah?↑* *Ke 163: NS: appeal to authority, summons*
Ke asks for corroboration from Ko, who was also an eye-witness. Summons to participate.
- Ko 164: *Yeah (slow, thoughtful).* *Ke 164: corroboration.*
 Ke 165: *Dat when you | - when | - you-you like when ya | - you know when ya git da ticket?↓ | when you come up?↓ | oh, we got move, | we got side-door you come down, | den you turn up, | and ova here* *Ke 165-K 166: NS: mediation; audience support*
Ke's syncopated, chant-like phrasing with interrogative contour continues until audience shows shared understanding.

LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY

Keahi and Kona

Total Time: 5
minutes

Story Text

Text	Glosses and Comments
got a lady who give you guys da ticket↓-	
K 166: Yeah -	} <i>Ke 167-169: NS: complicating action.</i>
Ke 167: So -	
Ko 168: Oh, -	
Ke 169: - man who had da money, -	
Ko 170: - I tell you, I tell you -	} <i>Ko 170: corroboration, emphasis.</i> Ko's counterpoint is highly excited, almost entranced.
Ke 171: - man who had da money, hah?↑	<i>Ke 171-174: NS: complicating action.</i>
172: He wen - when he was go see da - see da show, hah?↑	Ke slows down and speaks deliberately. Voice creaky and high on 'die, eh?' Bits and pieces of Hawaii Five-O (previously).
173: He was go call up a - he was go call up da man who had da - who had his boy.	
174: So boy wen almost die, eh?↑	
175: So, uh. uh. uh you can say now. (spoken rapidly; pause)	<i>Ke 175: relinquishing right to speak.</i> Ke gives mike to Ko (who she addresses).
176: Tired already (breathy). (Ko and Ke laughing slightly)	<i>Ke 176 NS: formal closing phrase; explanation.</i> Formal closing of a kind. Sighing, with humor. Ko picks up from here on a new, related cooperative story.

Noela

Total Time: 1
minute

Sexual Joking Text

Text	Glosses and Comments
Ma 1: 'ey, Noela, Noela.	<i>Ma 1: Summons and enlistment of speaker.</i> Ma (boy) wants to enter in joking with N, is not attended to here however.
A 2: You know Noela?↓ Noela love—. (laughs, he and N struggle over microphone)	<i>A 2: Claim to speaking rights, framing the speech event: joking (teasing)</i> A (boy) begins with falling intonation question, to establish shared knowledge with audience of joking target. Struggle is friendly competition. Here possession of mike determines right to speak in a competitive situation.
N 3: You know Akaka,↓ he go kiss one girl.	<i>N 3: Contrapuntal response with escalation.</i> N (boy) parallels form of A 2 but adds more specific and thus risqué detail - kissing. Here N gains control of mike and with it control of speaking rights (primary) for remainder of this speech event.
Ma 4: Name is Kian - Kiana. Name is Kiana. (more softly)	<i>Ma 4: Audience support: prompting.</i> Though unattended, Ma offers name of girl

TRANSFERABLE COMMUNICATIVE ROUTINES

- N 5: You know why girls, when he walkin –
- A 6: 'ey.
- N 7: outside na beach.
(laughter)
- Mo 8: You know what?↓ You know Noela?↓
- Mo 9: (aside) No I not go talk about you.
- A 10: You know what?↓ You know Noela?↓
- N 11: 'ey, 'ey!
(mike struggled over, laughter)
- N 12: You know what?↓ You know Akaka?↓
- 13: He go da kine.
- Ka 14: Honey, utu-utu, he's go make –
- N 15: He's go make honey-honey wi- with Laka, an' den he's go broke his –
(struggle, during which:)
- A 16: Hey!
- N 17: -- La ka (very awkwardly, slurred).
- 18: You know da him↓ (very rapidly), he go broke his ding-a-ling (laughs, audience laughter).
- Ma 19: Laka and da kine (low pitch).
- N 20: You know him | he go broke——.
- who is (on and off) part of audience. Repeat is less forceful: nobody is heeding. Repeat may also be stylistic – to parallel length of A 2 and N 3.
- N 5–7: Abortive narration; audience support.* N moves into narration contour, since A temporarily looking away. A turns back, tries to take mike. Audience laughs – apparently infers love relationship from mention of beach (possible ref. to other jokes and stories previously; or, general situated meaning to this group).
- Mo 8: Contrapuntal corroboration.* Mo (boy) is 'standing in' for A who is not yet retaliating on N; Mo responds to need for a *turn* to be taken to complete this cycle of the routine.
- Mo 9: Warding off interference.* Mo turns aside to address A, who mistakes his 8 as intended against him.
- A 10: Contrapuntal response.* A now responds to N, essentially echoing Mo 8.
- A 11: Warding off interference.* Unsuccessfully, A tries to prevent losing mike to N again. Audience regards this semi-serious struggle as funny.
- N 12: Contrapuntal response.* N's production parallel to A 10, substituting names only.
- N 13: Elaboration and escalation.* Detached emotionally, in tone. 'Da kine' is a filler here. Gloss of intent: 'I'm only telling you the way it is.'
- Ka 14: Audience support prompting* Ka (girl) supplies concrete activity for 'da kine'. Gloss for utu-utu: sexual intercourse. Thus, is an escalation.
- N 15: Application of audience cue: escalation* N picks up prompt, echoing structure of A 14. Note that N has A doing it with a male member of audience (male transvestism acceptable in community; this may be unintended here, however).
- A 16: Warding off interference.* N 15 is halted by another (unsuccessful) attempt by A to get mike.
- N 17–18: Recapitulation and completion – escalation; audience support.* N repeats last part of N 15, then completes it. Gloss for ding-a-ling: the obvious: penis.
- Ma 19: Audience support: summary, echoing.* Gloss: 'Lake and A are in a love relationship.'
- N 20: Repetition for emphasis.*

LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY

Noela

Sexual Yoking Text

Total Time: 1
minute

Text	Glosses and Comments
(thereafter blurred by lips on mike – words indistinguishable – under 2 seconds)	Virtually echoes N 18 but becomes intimate with mike and indistinguishable, perhaps lapses into mumbling anyhow. Gloss: 'I really cannot think of anything else to say at the moment.'
21: And Laka go – no go come. (confused talk and struggle)	<i>A 22–23: Warding off interference.</i>
A 22: [æŋ ^h]! [æŋ ^h]! (trying to get mike from N; forced out, as if straining; mild frustration)	In struggle for mike, A moves from mild frustration to insistence, but N still controls mike. Several simultaneously arguments follow, not all related to speech event – some to harrassment of audience by newly arrived members.
23: [æŋ ^h]! [æŋ ^h]! (higher pitched, more insistent)	
(short argument ensues; untranscribable)	<i>A 24: Challenge to speaking rights.</i>
A 24: Noela, I want talk (whining, complaining).	A makes for him, a very rare whining demand for speaking privileges but loses.
N 25: You go jump on him, [æ]? he go kiss you.	<i>N 25: Rejection of challenge; escalation.</i> N spurns A's request by failing to answer it. Instead, attempts to goad A by making more explicit reference. Gloss: jump = lying down on.
(break)	Interaction ends due to sudden distraction of whole group elsewhere.