

DJ Stances, Station Goals: Performing Identity on a Bilingual Arizona Radio Show²⁴

Amelia Tseng
Georgetown University

1. Background

Speakers share and invite others to participate in their understanding of the world through linguistic acts of self-projection (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985, p. 181). A productive approach to this process is Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) tri-part *positionality principle* model of levels of identity construction, which encompasses temporary, interaction-specific stances, local, community-specific positions, and macro-level demographic identity categories (p. 592). The present paper examines stance and its relationship to the other levels described by Bucholtz & Hall (2005). Stance is commonly defined as "a linguistic act which is at the same time a social act" (DuBois, 2007, p. 141) which expresses a speaker's "relationship to their talk ... (or) their relationship to their interlocutors" (Kiesling, 2009, p. 172). By taking stances and accepting or rejecting previous stances, "social actors simultaneously evaluate objects, position themselves and others), and align with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field" (DuBois, 2007, p. 163).

Stances are cumulative and recursive. Since participants monitor speaker responsibility for individual stances (Hill & Irvine 1993), these in turn may serve as references for future stances. This may take place within a single interaction (DuBois, 2007), over multiple interactions (Rauniomaa 2003), or intertextually (Damari, 2010). Stances therefore become available as performative resources for "speakers (to) position themselves and others as particular kinds of people" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 595). Finally, stances entail synthesis of linguistic acts and shared social value through "dimensions of sociocultural value which are referenced by the evaluative act. ... Via specific acts of stancetaking, value can be focused and directed at a precise target, as locally relevant values are activated to frame the significance of participant actions"

²⁴ I am grateful to Rob Podesva, Anastasia Nylund, and the Georgetown Language and Society Discussion Group for their suggestions during the initial stages of this paper. Deep thanks are also due to Michael Silverstein, Elizabeth Keating, and the audience at SALSA 2011 for their insightful feedback which greatly strengthened this paper. Finally, thanks are due to Otto Santa Ana, Rebecca Rubin Damari, Marisa Fond, and Jermy Jamsu for their comments during the revisions process. Any remaining errors are entirely my own.

(DuBois, 2007, p. 141). While stances are created in interaction, therefore, they can index (Eckert, 2008; Ochs, 1992; Silverstein, 2003) wider-circulating cultural Discourses²⁵ (Gee, 1990) through this shared knowledge. As Coupland and Coupland (2009) observe, “stances ... (are) clearly hooked into wider social discourses and ideologies, or are contextualized in important ways by them” (p. 228).

Radio offers a particularly appropriate domain for the study of these processes of linguistic construction. Structurally, radio relies on routinized, recognizable formatting such as “signature tunes, programme presenter, (and) *standard sequences for the programme material*” (Scannel & Brand, 1991, p. 203, italics mine) to create recursive, diachronous show identities that become familiar to audiences. Within these structures, broadcast talk exists as “institutionalized variants of ‘conversation’ (which) occur across the different programme formats within which ‘talk’ predominates” (Tolson 1991, p. 179). Importantly, in radio, genre-specific “norms of expectations” (Brown & Yule, 1983, p. 63-64, cf. Bakhtin, 1986) are created through regular listening, such that audience members anticipate “routine(s)-to-be-initiated” (Scannel & Brand, 1991, p. 219) such as call-in participation, give-aways, etc. These norms of expectation therefore mediate the relationship between institutional goals and listener participation. For example, the morning-show genre entails energizing listeners, “hooking” them for the rest of the day, and priming upcoming events (Fleming, 2010). Further, broadcast talk genres, or “institutionalized variants of ‘conversation’” (Tolson, 1991, p.179), can be identified by content and function. For example, Tolson (1991) identifies “chat” by displays of wit and topical shift towards the personal/private (p. 180), as well as functionally by “a clear shift of *register* within the programme format where it occurs, such that the primary business of the format is temporarily delayed or suspended” (p. 179).

Language choice in radio is motivated by assumed audience speech norms (Scannel, 1991; Bell, 1984, 2001) based on “everyday face to face talk” (Goffman, 1981, p. 325), often drawing on salient linguistic features to infer language varieties (Coupland, 1985, 2001). In the case of bilingual radio, this includes stylistic code-switching (Tseng, 2009) related to “idealized norms” of language varieties (Maehlum, 1996). However, language choice in radio is also dictated by assumed shared participant knowledge: “in television and radio interactions, we normally do not know our co-participants ... The language and knowledge resources employed and the choices made at any moment in the generic activity are indicative of some socio-historic and socio-cultural commonage assumed by those who participate” (O’Keefe, 2006, p. 31).

While Schilling-Estes (1998, cf. Bakhtin, 1981) notes that language is always performative, radio’s complete reliance on auditory communication makes it a particularly “natural environment for (linguistic) stylization” (Coupland 2001). This process is achieved through DJ talk, which linguistically constructs on-air identities. These identities in turn mediate show image: “the production and maintenance of programme/presenter identity is routinely accomplished through the talk of the DJ (Scannel & Brand, 1991, p. 204). However, all DJ talk ultimately addresses station goals (“hooking” an audience; branding) that in turn aim to increase and maintain listenership in order to maximize the station’s commercial appeal to advertisers. Radio stations employ multiple strategies to encourage long-term audience loyalty (station branding to a music/lifestyle/ethnic niche

²⁵ Gee (1990) defines “capital D Discourse” as “a socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, and of acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or ‘social network’, or to signal (that one is playing) a socially meaningful ‘role’” (p. 143). He distinguishes this from “little d discourse,” defined as “connected stretches of language that make sense” (p. 142).

market), and short-term continued listening (call-ins, giveaways to encourage listeners not to change stations).

DJ speech supports these strategies by creating “parasocial interaction” (Horton & Wohl, 1956, 1986) between DJs and listeners. Through talk, DJs create pseudo-relationships of trust and intimacy with the audience, creating a shared “range of shared space, cache of shared knowledge, and sense of common identity” (O’Keefe, 2006, p. 127). An important element of this shared knowledge and identity is achieved through stance, including claims to common knowledge and in-group positioning (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Further, strategies such as inclusive alignment, pronominal choice, footing changes, and authentication of presenters as “real” people through references to everyday actions, simulate co-presence by linguistically minimizing the distance between DJs and their audience. These strategies interact with routinized show formatting (Scannel, 1991) and small talk about daily events to create pseudo-intimacy through

routines such as signature turns, opening gambits with the audience, inclusive use of pronouns and simulation of co-presence. ... presenters can project themselves as seemly, ordinary people ... creat(ing) an ‘everydayness’ about the persona of the presenter that builds trust with the audience (O’Keefe, 2006, p. 125).

These pseudo-relationships encourage consistent listenership and increased audience numbers by “bridg(ing) the relational gap between stranger and friend” (O’Keefe, 2006, p. 92). In this paper, I use close examination of a contextualized segment of DJ talk to illuminate how DJ identity projection achieves these “pseudo-relationships” (O’Keefe, 2006) within the structural boundaries of radio show format.

To this point, I have reviewed key literature on stance’s relevance to multi-level identity performance. I have also reviewed the means by which DJ linguistic performance creates fictive bonds of intimacy, ultimately achieving marketing goals of increased listener numbers by promoting a particular show and station image. The next section will describe data collection and analysis.

2. Methods

Data was recorded from 95.1 Latino Vibe, a Phoenix, AZ radio station with a stated Spanish-English bilingual format and Latino and Latina target audience (Newpoff, 2005). This paper focuses on one broadcast segment from the “Latinos on the Loose Morning Show” (LLMS), recorded on November 30, 2004 and transcribed by the researcher following conversation-analysis conventions (Appendix A). The segment is 4 minutes long and contains 1306 words. The segment was introduced by an opening sequence, “brought to a close” by a closing sequence (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 289), and bounded on both sides by music programming. Speakers were two Latino and one Latina DJs, Mikey Fuentes (MF), José el Cubanito (JG), and Suzy G. (SG). All DJs were Spanish-English bilingual. Examples from the segment are incorporated into the body of this paper; more extensive transcripts of relevant excerpts can be found in Appendix B.

First, the segment’s structural organization was identified to give an idea of the framework in which DJ talk occurred. This consisted of both structural elements (i.e. “opening,” “closing,” “chat,” and the sequence or progression of these elements. Openings and closings were determined by preceding or following music formatting, and the presence of opening/closing elements (Tseng, forthcoming; MacLaughlin, 1984, cf. Alber & Kessler, 1978; Levinson, 1983). DJ “chat” (Tolson, 1991) centered around explicitly-identified topics took place between these boundary elements (namely “parenting,” and a local news headline). Having determined the LLMS show’s structure, qualitative discourse

analysis based on evaluative stance (DuBois, 2007) towards topic was applied to DJ chat segments. Evaluative stances were identified by the presence of evaluative language (“easy,” “stupid,” “badass”). 11 stances were analyzed, with surrounding talk and DJ meta-discourse used to contextualize results. This allowed examination of the interplay between interactional moves, the wider social context that Latino Vibe and its listeners inhabit, and station goals (“hooking” an audience; branding).

3. Results

Structurally, the LLMS segment comprised the following elements: opening, general topic establishment and discussion, more specific topic establishment and discussion, and a closing that framed an upcoming, regular show event (call-ins). This closing was repeated twice, with closing sequences separated by an additional topic-oriented chat segment. As this general pattern is typical of the Latinos on the Loose Morning Show (Tseng, forthcoming), I considered these elements and progression to be routine format (Scannel & Brand, 1991).

DJ chat comprised three main segments within this framework. These oriented around the related topics of parenting, local teen delinquency, and “badass” adolescent anecdotes. Throughout, DJ interactional work framed the following show activity (audience call-ins), provided a resource for further performance, and created fictive intimacy with the audience. Key excerpts from these chat segments are discussed below.

(1) “Heck yeah *disfrútalos*”

07 JC: *y esto es para todas las personas que son padres esto es para todas las*
and this is for all the people who are parents this is for all the

08 *personas que tienen niños:*
people that have children

09 and especially teenagers:

10 and of course this is for all the people like Suzy and myself that have

11 little ones: you know like three: four: five year olds

12 SG: [Thank god (hhh)]

13 JC: [And and and you know what?

14 But that’s the cool thing cause right now: my dad:

15 see my dad would always tell me *¿sabes qué mijo? Ahorrita ‘tá fácil*
you know what son? Right now it’s easy

16 *con los niños*
with the children

17 SG: Heck yeah *disfrútalos*
enjoy them

18 JC: Cause you know you could do whatever: *se ponen bravo* to
whatever

they’re up for

19 you’re doing you’re just like ey: *qué se siéntate aquí*
sit down here

In example 1, the first topic, parenting, is presented through explicit dedication. Lines 7-9 target a particular audience segment, parents, through explicit dedication (“*esto es para todas las personas que son padres esto es para todas las personas que tienen niños*”/ this is for all the people who are parents this is for all the people that have children,” lines 7-8). This dedication targets a particular audience, parents. The familiar opening sequence also frames (Tannen, 1993) the interaction, conveying “Morning Show” genre

expectations and priming the audience for a certain type of interaction (energizing and transgressive (Fleming, 2010; Lynch & Gillespie, 1998); providing the topic for upcoming telephone call-ins).

Next, DJs chat about parenting. First, pseudo-closeness is created by referencing shared experience (lines 10-11). Next, MF takes the stance lead (DuBois, 2007) in line 13 with a positive evaluation of early childhood as “cool.” This stance is reinforced by reported parental speech, which indexes epistemic authority (Clift, 2006, p. 585): “my dad would always tell me *¿sabes qué mijo? Ahorríta 'tá fácil con los niños/* you know what son? Right now it’s easy with the children,” line 14. Next, DJs align with Mikey Fuentes by following his positive stance lead (“Heck yeah *disfrútalos/* enjoy them”, line 15). Through shared evaluative stancework, they therefore position themselves as knowledgeable about children, creating an in-group based on this broader epistemic stance. This stancework also establishes an age-related dichotomy between young children’s “easy,” compliant behavior, which is located in the immediate and transient present (“*ahorríta/right now,*” line 14) and the “bad,” noncompliant/rebellious adolescent behavior that implicitly follows.

Next, a local news event about a runaway teenager was presented (lines 40-43). While the headline was read “verbatim,” a switch to “report” genre did not occur. Rather, chat around the topic turned the headline into a backdrop for further DJ identity work.

(2) “Like how stupid”

40 MF: So *mira*: In the news yesterday:

look

41 there was a story about: *a ver* Mingo just handed me uh this:

let’s see

42 this paper it says Runaway thirteen years old steals police car

43 then turns himself in

44 SG: (hhh)

45 MF: Like how stupid [dog

46 SG: [He’s thirteen dude

47 MF: and he’s so stupid the thing about the story was:

Here MF takes the stance lead by negatively evaluating the teen’s actions as “stupid” (line 45). While SG initially disagrees (line 46), she eventually aligns with MF by following his stance lead with the disbelieving interjection “Oh hell” (excerpt 2, line 59). Next, in example 3, a different stance is taken toward the teen.

(3) “*huevos* with *talco* on ‘em”

73 MF: the kid had *huevos* with *talco* on ‘em [dude
balls baby powder

74 SG: [Definitely yeah (hhh)

75 JC: *Por favor* [believe it
Please

76 SG: [(hhh)

77MF: Powdered *huevos* because you dude you need to have some hard *huevos*
for that one

This stance positively evaluates the teen as brave or “ballsy” through the Spanish slang term “*huevos*” (“testicles/balls”, lines 73, 77). This positive stance is ratified by laughter (line 76) and by JC’s use of the stock DJ phrase “*Por favor* believe it” (Please believe it), used in the LLMS as an interjection expressing incredulity and humorous

disbelief (line 75.) Again, therefore, shared stancework positions DJs in alignment towards the stance object (DuBois, 2007).

(2) “I bet you the little bull was *gabacho*”

- 91 MF: I bet you dude the little bull was *gabacho*: [I’ll bet you anything:
whitey
92 MF: you would not see a Latino doing that sucker
93 SG: [oh that’s cold (hhh)
94 JC: That’s because the *gabachos* don’t be whuppin that ass for their kids
95 MF: He’s like I’m just going to get t↑imeout
96 [and that’s exactly what the kid’s going to get is time out bro
97 SG: [yeah
98 JC: In juvenile hall *pero todo* time out
but still
99 MF: Exactly

As chat continues, stancework becomes recursive as DJs reference previous stances. MF takes the stance-lead with positive evaluation of Latinos as too smart to share in the teen’s behavior (“you would not see a Latino doing that sucker,” line 92), in implicit contrast with the previous negative evaluation (“stupid”). This attributed behavior is explicitly associated with ethnic macrocategories through the terms “*gabacho*” (whitey), an ideologically-loaded, mildly perjorative Mexican slang term for light-skinned Anglos, and “Latino.” SG’s response shows that this implication was understood: “oh that’s cold,” followed by laughter (line 93).

The teen’s negatively-evaluated, racialized (mis)behavior is attributed to lenient “*gabacho*” parents. This implied censure draws on the broad, epistemic “knowledgeable about children” stance and epistemic rights (Raymond & Heritage, 2006) bestowed by first-hand knowledge of Latino family behavior in example 1. A moral position is thus drawn between Latinos, who know how to raise children correctly, and “*gabachos*” who do not. Through opposition between negatively-evaluated “*gabacho*” child-rearing habits and implicitly positive Latino behavioral norms, the moral high ground is claimed for Latino parenting. This moral repositioning (Relaño Pastor & De Fina, 2005) addresses positive face-work (Brown & Levinson, 1987) to the audience to achieve relational work. Further, it challenges racist Discourses of Latinos as irresponsible parents, a stereotype that delegitimizes Latinos as morally negligent and not entitled to belonging²⁶.

Next, DJs initiated the first closing sequence, asking listeners to participate in the regular upcoming call-in segment by sharing stories of children’s bad behavior. Having constructed an in-group based on negative stances towards “bad” parenting, racialized as “*gabacho*”, however, DJs evidently realize that the target audience of Latino parents will be unlikely to volunteer stories about their children’s misbehavior in this frame (excerpt 3, lines 111-115). After “defusing” the situation with more chat and shortening relational distance through humor (Santa Ana, 2011), DJs recast the call-in request into more palatable terms. Thus, in lines 168-171, DJs reformulate the negative evaluative term “bad” into the positive term “badass,” meaning “tough or aggressive; excellent” (Collins English Dictionary, 2009).

(3) “Bad” into “Badass”

- 168 MF: Call us: if you’re a parent you got a badass kid: and you want

²⁶ As a brief example of these Discourses’ circulation, Google searches for “Latinos bad parents” and “Hispanics bad parents” on May 28, 2011 returned approximately 1,030,000 results each.

169 these tickets: we will hook you up: but it's gotta be a badass
 170 kid [It's gotta be
 171 JC: [Right

This positive evaluation term is less face-threatening (Brown & Levinson, 1987), and thus more likely to elicit the desired audience response. Next, DJs reinforce their positive stance toward “badass” actions as desirable behavior.

(6) “Harry Potter not worthy”

173 MF: Like the time my cousin uh joker stole that truck:
 174 and we went to summer school to pick up some girls in it and the cops pulled
 us over
 175 cause we crashed into somebody else and: [we all ran
 176 SG: [worse than that
 177 JC: There you go that kind of story: that kind of story
 178 MF: Not not Harry Potter kind of story where supposedly your kid goes to
 179 JC: yeah [yeah
 180 MF [Hogwarts whatever
 181 JC: Hogwarts not worthy [not worthy
 182 SG: [yeah
 183 MF: runs away but he doesn't [go to the next block because he can't [cross
 the street
 184 okay not that one
 185 JC: [... English (hhh)
 186 SG: [yeah

Here, JC takes a positive stance-lead toward sanctioned, “badass” transgressions as represented by MF’s personal anecdote. This story shares a similar narrative with the runaway teen (stealing a car; running from the police). It also has similar “ballsiness,” or bravery and risk-taking elements. However, since MF and his cousin were not apprehended, it is not evaluated as “stupid”. They thus position themselves as gatekeepers of authenticity and monitor the term “badass” in order to encourage appropriate participation (submission of “badass” stories) by the audience.

This contrasts with the hypothetical example of non-badass misbehavior (lines 178-184), negatively evaluated and dismissed as “not worthy” (line 181). This hypothetical exploit fails through lack of bravery: “runs away but he doesn’t go to the next block because he can’t cross the street,” (line 183). This evaluation obliquely references the previously-established gendered framing of this bravery as a masculine quality (“*huevos*”). Further, as an example of childish misbehavior (running away from home), it introduces a developmental element into the contrast between “badass” and “not worthy” behavior.

Throughout the LLMS chat segments, shared stancework aligned DJs as a group. First, a subset of the listener audience was invited to “participate” in this group through explicit dedication (lines 7-10) and implicit shared knowledge. Next, a related local-interest topic about a delinquent teenager was discussed (lines 40-43). While DJ stances initially differed, consensus was ultimately reached that the teen’s actions were “brave but stupid”. By orienting stances to different aspects of the teen’s behavior, DJs were able to align with each other and, implicitly, the audience, in evaluation of behavioral norms. DJ metadiscourse explicitly linked this sociocultural common ground to the macrocategory of ethnicity, allowing for moral repositioning that challenged existing racist Discourses. By doing so, this repositioning enhanced DJ-audience relational work through positive face appeal (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

DJs reformulated “bad” into “badass” in order to reduce face-threat to the audience and increase call-in potential. By policing this term, they created an opposition between “badass” and “not worthy” behavior. “Badass” is characterized as brave, strong, capable; “badass” exploits are transgressive, adult-like, and successful. In contrast, “not worthy” exploits are unsuccessful and childish, characterized by weak, incapable behavior. The “badass”/“not worthy” dichotomy references ethnicity: its reference to childish behavior resonates with previous characterizations of “time out” as a weak, specifically “*gabacho*” punishment (lines 94-95). This childish and “*gabacho*” behavior may in turn reference Discourses conflating ethnicity and social class, since time-out is a typically middle-class punishment for misbehavior. These Discourses also relate to gender and sexuality. Bravery was metaphorically associated with masculinity through the gendered evaluative term “*huevos*”, which co-occurred with discourse markers associated with masculinity such as “dude” (Kiesling, 2004). Further, MF’s badass anecdote rested on the sexual motivation of “pick(ing) up some girls” (line 174). The “badass”/“not worthy” divide therefore indexes a Discourse of heteronormativity: by characterizing “not worthy” behavior as “Harry Potter kind of stories”, MF invokes the (pre)pubescent protagonist of the popular young-adult fiction series to imply that this kind of rebellion is literally not manly enough to be “badass.” Discourses are not mutually exclusive: Bucholtz (1996, 2001, 2011) found rejection of the adolescent heterosexual marketplace to be a characteristic of “nerds,” racialized as white or even “hyper-white” (Bucholtz, 2001, p. 94). The opposition between positively-evaluated “badass” and negatively-evaluated “not worthy” behavior therefore foregrounds a particular, interactionally-constructed, “badass” persona – street-smart, transgressive, male, adolescent, heterosexual, and Latino.

Finally, stancework was supported by a gamut of other strategies, including code-switching (CS), ideologically-loaded terms, self-authentication strategies, and pronominal usage. Despite the station’s explicitly bilingual format, little CS was observed (120 Spanish/1306 English words, or less than 10%). CS in DJ chat consisted primarily of short intra-sentential switches (Muysken, 1995) of single lexical items and discourse markers. This “tag” switching is generally identity-related (Poplack, 1980). CS enhanced stancework by emphasizing key information such as voicing (Gardner-Chloros, Charles, & Cheshire, 2000) of attributed speech or “constructed dialogue” (Tannen, 1989), and ideologically-heavy terms such as “*gabachos*” and “*huevos*.” In addition to enhancing stancework, CS serves as a kind of instant “bilingual” branding in keeping with Latino Vibe’s explicit format and recent findings that Spanish and CS positively impact marketing to Latino audiences (Bishop, 2007; Carreira, 2002).

4. Discussion

This paper shows stance to be integral to identity work and the base for multilevel performance. Stances achieve multiple, simultaneous acts. Since evaluation entails positioning, stance “follows” create alignment between DJs towards the stance object (DuBois, 2007). This shared evaluation created in-groups and pseudo-relationships between DJs and the listener audience. DJ meta-discourse linked shared stances towards parenting behavior with explicit ethnic macrocategories through oppositional positioning, demonstrating that these categories are perceived as salient by DJs and listeners. In this, Latino and “*gabacho*” were positioned in opposition, not in a simple ethnic binary, but in terms of morality and sociocultural behavior. This dynamic is embedded in larger Discourses of ownership and belonging circulating in Phoenix’s contested social space, which are often invoked through ethnicity as an index of morality, legitimacy, and criminality (Santa Ana, 2002). As English-only, anti-immigrant legislation targeting

Latinos such as AZ Prop 202²⁷, AZ Prop 203²⁸ and SB 1070²⁹ makes clear, this sociopolitical conflict, framed in part through language ideology, affects the daily lives of Arizona's Latino population. DJs' moral positioning regarding cultural norms of behavior shared with the audience is thus *re-positioning* (Relaño Pastor & De Fina, 2005, *italics mine*) that subtly contests Anglo-centric dominant ideology. The salience of ethnicity and its indices in this context may be determined by the Discourses themselves. As Jaffe (2009) observed, different "ideological load(s) (may be) carried by particular discourses ... some discourses may be more 'stance-saturated' than others ... they may be overtly recognized as sites for more or less obligatory positioning" (p. 22). Through this repositioning, DJs appealed to the audience's positive face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The cumulative effect was to create an in-group that appeals to the audience, in which they are invited to "participate" through the assumed shared knowledge of "sociocultural significance" (Coupland & Coupland, 2009) on which radio depends (O'Keefe, 2006).

In this paper, I identified the structural framework within which DJ identity work takes place. DJ performance interacted with the genre expectations conveyed by "routinized format elements" (Scannel, 1991) to address commercial station goals. For example, "bad" was reformulated into the positive "badass" to mitigate face-threat and increase call-in participation. "Badassness" was attributed to a particular DJ through personal anecdote, with positive evaluation of the quality ratified by the other DJs through alignment. Policing of the term "badass" in ensuing chat allowed DJs to create a collective in-group identity through opposition with "not worthy," "Harry Potter-type" stories. This opposition foregrounded ethnicity by referencing previous racialized stancework, although other Discourses such as gender, class, and heteronormativity were also evoked. By doing so, DJs conveyed a particular kind of young, street-smart Latino persona consistent with Latino Vibe's explicitly-targeted niche market. Finally, this identity is genre-appropriate in terms of the "transgressive" presentations that morning shows often cultivate (Fleming, 2010; Lynch & Gillespie, 1998). Policing the term "badass" therefore allowed DJs to solicit appropriate audience participation (the "right kind" of story for the following call-ins).

In sum, DJ identity work addressed station ethnic branding, in keeping with Latino Vibe's stated format and target audience. Stance has been shown to be the base for multi-level identity performance. DJs used topic-oriented evaluative stances to position themselves and others, drawing on resources ranging from stylistic code-switching to circulating Discourses of ethnicity, class, morality, and authenticity to create in-groups and engage the audience in fictive bonds of intimacy. Competing stances were available for different aspects of a given event, and positions were negotiated and ratified through alignment, with stances recycled to highlight different aspects of identity and address show-specific genre goals. DJ identity performance therefore not only operates within show format, but interacts with format elements and genre expectations to achieve station goals of increased listenership, and, ultimately, high ratings and commercial success.

References

Albert, S. & Kessler, S. (1978). Ending social encounters. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 14, 541-553.

²⁷ The "Arizona Stop Hiring Illegal Act", November 2008.

²⁸ The "English for Children"/"Unz initiative," November 2000.

²⁹ The "Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act", April 2010.

- badass. (n.d.). Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition. Retrieved May 24, 2011, from Dictionary.com website: <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/badass>
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Trans. by Vern W. McGee. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society*, 13, 145-204.
- Bell, A. (2001). Back in style: Reworking audience design. In P. Eckert & J. Rickford (Eds.), *Style and sociolinguistic variation* (pp. 139-169). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bishop, M. (2007). The role of language codeswitching in increasing advertising effectiveness among Mexican-American youth. Ph.D dissertation, The University of Texas At Arlington.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7:585-614.
- Bucholtz, M. (1996). Geek the girl: Language, femininity, and female nerds. In N. Warner, J. Ahlers, L. Bilmes, M. Oliver, & S. Wertheim (Eds.), *Gender and belief systems* (pp. 119-131). Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group.
- Bucholtz, M. (2001). The whiteness of nerds: Superstandard English and racial markedness. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 11(1), 84-100.
- Bucholtz, M. (2009). From stance to style. In A. Jaffe (Ed). *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 146-170). Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. (2011). White kids: *Language, race, and styles of youth identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carreira, M. (2002). The media, marketing and critical mass: Portents of linguistic maintenance. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*, 21(2), 37-54
- Clift, R. (2006). Indexing stance: Reported speech as an interactional evidential. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10: 569-595.
- Coupland, J. & Coupland, N. (2009). Attributing stance in discourses of body shape and weight loss. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 227-249). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coupland, N. (1985). 'Hark, hark, the lark': Social motivations for phonological style-shifting. *Language & Communication*, 5(3), 153-171.
- Coupland, N. (2001). Dialect stylization in radio talk. *Language in Society*, 30, 345-375.
- Damari, R. (2010). Intertextual stancetaking and the local negotiation of cultural identities by a binational couple. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 14(5), 609-629.
- Du Bois, J. (2007). The stance triangle. In Robert Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction* (pp. 137-182). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(4), 453-476.
- Fleming, C. (2010). *The radio handbook*. London: Routledge.
- Gardner-Chloros, P., Charles, R., & Cheshire, J. (2000). Parallel patterns? A comparison of monolingual speech and bilingual codeswitching discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(9), 1305-1341
- Gee, J. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies*. London: Falmer Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981 [1979]). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of

- Pennsylvania Press.
- Hill, J. & Irvine, J. (1993). Introduction. In J. Hill & J. Irvine (Eds.), *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse* (pp. 1-23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horton, D. & Wohl, R. (1986 [1956]). Mass communication and para-social interaction: observation on intimacy at a distance. In G. Gumpert & R. Cathcart (Eds.), *Inter/Media. Interpersonal Communication in a Media World* (3rd ed., pp. 185-206). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jaffe, A. (2009). Introduction: the sociolinguistics of stance. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 3-28). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Johnstone, B. (2009). Stance, style, and the linguistic individual. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 29-52). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2003. *Epistemic stance in English conversation: A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on I think*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Keith, M. (2010). *The radio station broadcast, satellite & Internet*. Burlington, MA: Focal Press.
- Kiesling, S. (2004). *Dude. American Speech*, 79(3), 281-305.
- Kiesling, S. (2009). Style as stance: Stance as an explanation for patterns of sociolinguistic variation. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 171-194). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Le Page, R. & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch, J. & Gillespie, G. (1998). *Process and practice of radio programming*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- McLaughlin, M. (1984). *Conversation: How talk is organized*. Sage Series in Interpersonal Communication 3. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Maehlum, B. (1996). Codeswitching in Hemnesberget – Myth or reality? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25, 749-761.
- Muysken, P. (1995). Code-switching and grammatical theory. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 177-198). Cambridge, England; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Newpoff, L. (2005). Club 95 radio launches new Spanish, English format. *Phoenix Business Journal*. Released 6/3/2005. Retrieved from www.bizjournals.com/phoenix/stories/2005/06/06/newscolumn1.html.
- Ochs, E. (1992). Constructing social identity: a language socialization process. *Research on language and social interaction*, 26(3), 287-306.
- O'Keefe, A. (2006). *Investigating media discourse*. New York: Routledge.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.
- Rauniomaa, M. (2003). Stance accretion: Some initial observations. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Raymond, G. & Heritage, J. (2006). The epistemics of social relationships: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society*, 35(5), 677-705.
- Relaño-Pastor, M. & De Fina, A. (2005). Contesting social place: Narratives of language conflict. In M. Baynham & A. De Fina (Eds.), *Dislocations, Relocations, Narratives of Displacement* (pp. 36-60). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Santa Ana, O. (2011). Humor & Perlocutionary Control seminar. Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., January-May.
- Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American*

- public discourse*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Scannel, P. & Brand, G. (1991). Talk, identity, and performance: The Tony Blackburn Show. In P. Scannel (Ed.), *Broadcast talk* (pp. 201-226). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Scannel, P. (1991). Introduction: The relevance of talk. In P. Scannel (Ed.), *Broadcast talk* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Schiffirin, D. (2006). *In other words: Variation in reference and narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schilling-Estes, N. (1998). Investigating “self-conscious” speech: The performance register in Ocracoke English. *Language in Society*, 27(1), 53-83.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication*, 23, 193–229.
- Tannen, D. (1993). Introduction. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Framing in discourse* (pp. 3-10). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D. (2007 [1989]). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tolson, A. (2006). *Media talk*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Tseng, A. (2009). Code-switching and style in radio broadcasting. Master’s thesis, Arizona State University.
- Tseng, A. (2011). *Abriendo closings: code-switching, linguistic performance, and bilingual radio identity*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- 95.1 Latino Vibe (2009). *Advertise on 95.1 Latino Vibe*. Retrieved from <http://951latinovibefm.com/default.asp?pid=13461>.

Department of Linguistics
Box 571051
Intercultural Center 479
Georgetown University
37th and O Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20057-1001

at443@georgetown.edu

Appendix A

Transcription conventions (based on Cashman, 2005)

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Plain text | English original |
| <i>Italics</i> | Spanish original |
| <i>Text</i> } | <i>Original Spanish text</i> |
| Text } | English translation by researcher |
| [text] } | overlapping talk |
| [text] } | overlapping talk |
| (hhh) | laughter |
| <u>text</u> | markedly increased volume compared to surrounding talk |
| (text) | parentheses indicate analyst’s best attempt to render inaudible talk |
| (...) | periods within prenttheses indicate analyst’s inability to render indistinguishable talk |
| (1.0) | gap in talk, by seconds |

Texas Linguistics Forum 54:57-71

Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Symposium About Language and Society – Austin

April 15-17, 2011

© Tseng 2011

↑ rising inflection within a syllable
 ↓ falling inflection within a syllable

Appendix B

Excerpt 1

07 JC: *y esto es para todas las personas que son padres esto es para todas*
las
 and this is for all the people who are parents this is for all the
 08 *personas que tienen niños:*
 people that have children
 09 and especially teenagers:
 10 and of course this is for all the people like Suzy and myself that have
 11 little ones: you know like three: four: five year olds
 12 SG: [Thank god (hhh)
 13 JC: [And and and you know what?
 14 But that's the cool thing cause right now: my dad:
 15 see my dad would always tell me *¿sabes qué mijo? Ahorrita 'tá fácil*
 you know what son? Right now it's easy
 16 *con los niños*
 with the children
 17 SG: Heck yeah *disfrútalos*
 enjoy them
 18 JC: Cause you know you could do whatever: *se ponen bravo* to
 whatever
 they're up for
 19 you're doing you're just like ey: *qué se siéntate aquí*
 sit down here
 20 MF: I know: [when they're like twelve and thirteen then they know more
 21 than you do

Excerpt 2

40 MF: So *mira*: In the news yesterday:
 look
 41 there was a story about: *a ver* Mingo just handed me uh this:
 let's see
 42 this paper it says Runaway thirteen years old steals police car
 43 then turns himself in
 44 SG: (hhh)
 45 MF: Like how stupid [dog
 46 SG: [He's thirteen dude
 47 MF: and he's so stupid the thing about the story was:
 48 MF: I guess he was at a juvenile detention center
 49 MF: [uh yesterday:
 50 SG: [mhm
 51 and all of a sudden he got away he was able to escape:
 52 managed to get inside a cop car:
 53 took it
 54 SG: He's not that stupid (hhh)
 55 JC: [(hhh)

- 181 JC: yeah [yeah
 182 MF [Hogwarts whatever
 183 JC: Hogwarts not worthy [not worthy
 184 SG: [yeah
 185 MF: runs away but he doesn't [go to the next block because he can't [cross
 186 the street okay not that one
 187 JC: [... English [(hhh)
 188 SG: [yeah
 189 MF: Aright call now *dos sesenta cero cero noventa y cinco*
 Two sixty zero zero ninety-five
 190 JC: Ah
 191 MF: We about to hook you up with tickets to *Reggeton Festival* two
 192 thousand five: but you gotta have a badass kid
 193 JC: Aright *dale con la chancleta aquí abajo*
 hit it with the slipper here below