



Spring 2012

**“Do you see any way in which all the things that you do connect?”:  
The Multiply Embedded Speech Event as a Discursive Meeting  
Ground**

Joanna L. Siegel  
*University of Pennsylvania*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel>

 Part of the [Education Commons](#), and the [Linguistics Commons](#)

**Recommended Citation**

Siegel, J. L. (2012). “Do you see any way in which all the things that you do connect?”: The Multiply Embedded Speech Event as a Discursive Meeting Ground. 27 (1), Retrieved from <https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol27/iss1/4>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol27/iss1/4>  
For more information, please contact [repository@pobox.upenn.edu](mailto:repository@pobox.upenn.edu).

---

**“Do you see any way in which all the things that you do connect?”: The Multiply Embedded Speech Event as a Discursive Meeting Ground**

# “Do you see any way in which all the things that you do connect?”: The Multiply Embedded Speech Event as a Discursive Meeting Ground

Joanna Luz Siegel

*University of Pennsylvania*

This paper explores a “found poetry” project undertaken in an English for English Language Learners (ELLs) high school class, in which students scoured popular magazines for text clippings, recomposed these clips into their own poems, and then presented and analyzed their work in an oral presentation. I focus on one student’s work to understand how the iterative, multimodal nature of the project opens up spaces for students to produce complex social discourses through creative engagements with mass media. I term this kind of project a *multiply embedded speech act*, because the evolving event of poetic composition is made to travel through various production formats and participation frameworks (Goffman, 1981), with students recontextualizing their snippets of discourse at each stage. I will show how such an approach to curriculum and pedagogy allows students—ELLs or not—to bridge their communicative repertoires (Rymes, 2011) with the academic/schooled repertoires of the teacher, while also being encouraged to draw on their own unique communicative repertoires in creative, generative ways.

## Bridging Repertoires

High school students bring an infinite assortment of social and pop-cultural semiotic resources to school that often go underutilized in the learning process. Even after a teacher has managed to make space in the classroom for these forms of discourse, a greater challenge may lie in bridging them with the teacher’s more formal, schooled *communicative repertoires* (Rymes, 2011). Beyond tokenizing or instrumentalizing these discourses to accomplish curricular goals, this bridging effort can invite students into *zones of proximal development* (Vygotsky, 1978)—in which students perform at the outer limits of their abilities and are scaffolded to expand those limits. It can also accomplish the perennial goal of educators to genuinely engage students in the life of the classroom and valorize their complex sociolinguistic identities, especially when they may feel like silenced (or simply bored) observers. This challenge of achieving discursive overlap can be compounded when students’ dossiers of linguistic and literacy practices have taken shape in radically diverse multilingual spaces, before being brought together by processes of globalization. Their teacher must help them breach communicative gaps (not only of competence, but also of register and

genre) in a “fragmented” linguistic context that Jan Blommaert describes as *super-diversity* (2010, p. 8).

A partial, paradoxical solution may exist to this problem: multimodality. What appears to be the further complexifying of discursive space can actually be a platform for integrating that space, and thereby bridging repertoires. I will demonstrate in this paper how classroom assignments can usefully incorporate multiple modalities and media for discourse production and interpretation, organized into a tiered, iterative project format. This kind of learning task provides an array of communicative opportunities for students with diverse linguistic repertoires, rather than one hit-or-miss opportunity. Moreover, the interstices between each iteration of discursive input and output, the spaces between multiple modalities and participant frameworks, serve as a dialogical meeting ground for interactions between student and teacher discourses. The result is a joint process of meaning-making that is both guided (toward curricular goals) and spontaneous (inviting “unofficial” student repertoires).

### Theories, Concepts, Analytic Devices

I will analyze this kind of assignment-in-process as a *multiply embedded speech event*. Framing my inquiry in this way allows me to undertake a diachronic inquiry of discursive meaning-making over time and space—a sort of natural micro-history of discourse (cf. Silverstein & Urban, 1996). It also allows for a more comprehensive reading of how the pasts and futures of a speech event function in the synchronic moment of its unfolding. To this end, Goffman’s (1981) notions of *participation frameworks* and *production format* serve as lenses that focus the “messy” (Blommaert, 2010) social-semiotic process of embedded speech events traveling across contexts.

The discursive units comprising these events are comparable to Rymes’ (2011) *repertoires of deference*: diverse communicative practices through which social actors deploy reverence toward particular concepts, values, and personages—which are recognizable by other people by virtue of mass media. When the object of deference is an abstract entity or concept, it can usefully be thought of as a *social category* (Couldry, 2010), because the term describing it—such as “justice,” in the case of the present analysis—becomes loaded by the meanings it gains through representations in the media, as well as the socially embedded interpretations people ascribe to it that are inevitably constructed by, through, and / or in opposition to a vast variety of mass media discourses. Bakhtin (1981) named this quotative tendency *double voicing*. Kristeva (1980) proposes an expanded understanding of Bakhtin’s notion with the term *intertextuality*, which Blommaert (2005) describes with particular relevance to the texts analyzed herein: “Whenever we speak we produce the words of others, we constantly cite and re-cite expressions, and recycle meanings that are already available” (p. 46). Key to the recycling process is change. Each product (or iteration) of recycling comes out differently, largely because an irrevocable shift in time and space has occurred, landing it in a new context, but also because agentive adjustments may have been made in its (re) construction. Urban (1996) distinguishes this process from the diffuse, ongoing nature of intertextuality, labeling it *entextualization*. Entextualization entails the designation or differentiation of a chunk of discourse, the constitution of a text (as

opposed to *text*, which surrounds us like the ether according to Bakhtin’s account). Although the products resulting from processes of entextualization, physically or formally discrete texts, remain interdependent with numerous other texts across space and time for their meaning, it is the presence of entextualization that allows us to disentangle the layers of the multiply embedded speech act to identify how they relate to each other, and how actors or discourses relate to each other in different ways at different stages of the overall project.

So, to integrate this matrix of analytic devices: social actors use their communicative repertoires to construct and orient around social categories, amid ongoing intertextuality and through particular entextualizations. These actors embed these social categories in situated discursive practices to orient their subjectivity with respect (literally and figuratively) to schemas of deference.

## Data Analysis

### Cross-Section of a Multiply Embedded Speech Event

The specific piece of data I will analyze in this paper represents one embedded iteration of a multiply embedded speech event, hovering somewhere in the middle of its traceable natural micro-history of discourse. The project assigned to the (super-diverse, transnational) high school English class for English language learners (ELLs), where I observed it occur, initially involved composing (or rather, compiling) a found poem out of clippings from a cache of mass media glossy magazines such as *Newsweek* and *People*—taking up intertextuality quite literally. The students were encouraged to take full poetic license with their poems; their teacher repeatedly encouraged aurality and wordplay over sense and accuracy. His aim was for them to explore the anatomy of literature, without feeling pressured to produce English phrases entirely on their own.

This stage of the task occurred over several class sessions of chatting, moving around the room for more magazines, cueing up streamed music on the teacher’s desktop computer, and receiving occasional comments about the project from the teacher and visiting researchers. Subsequently, they were asked to make an informal presentation before the class to explain their poem. Modalities traversed thus far include: reading/decoding and visual consumption of mass media magazines; tactile manipulations of physical objects (paper, scissors, glue) with elements of visual design and even sculpture; reading/decoding the composition of their own (re)making; oral presentation to the class; conversational interaction with teacher and fellow classmates (during presentation and throughout process).

Additional layers of this micro-history occurred in more modalities, involving other actors and actants, both before and after the assemblage and oral presentations. I will treat them as iterations of an ongoing, multiply embedded speech act known by those involved as “the found poems,” but they could also be seen as discrete speech acts, each entextualizing a common thread of discourse(s) associated with each student’s poem. For example, this project required the students to import shards of discourse from popular magazines that contain an entire pre-history of discursive production and transformation, presumably wrought under the joint constraints of appealing to a real or imagined readership, and generating maximum profits through advertising and other means.

Likewise, I captured the oral presentations in the modality of raw (i.e., editable) digital video, a co-researcher translated them into polished YouTube vignettes, and then I transcribed them into a digital document (a more dramatic entextualization, influenced not only by a severe transmodal shift but also by my choices of line breaks, emphases, font, etc.; See Appendices A and B). This transcript was printed and circulated in a seminar of which I was a member, in order to be marked up with interpretive readings from multiple actors, and accompanied by another oral presentation, my own, in which I was the principal but was also the animator of discourses authored by students at my research site. Moreover, the seminar viewed the YouTube video on a flatscreen TV, and discussed all these previous speech acts metapragmatically. Finally—or not, heeding Bakhtin’s acknowledgement of *unfinalizability* in a paradigm of intertextuality (Bakhtin, 1984)—I wrote this paper, which will court another iteration in the chain of discursive production and interpretation in the form of reader reactions and perhaps even comments.

Connecting every link is a point of contact between actors and actants in which a dialogic exchange occurs. I propose that by incorporating students across an extended portion of these kinds of discursive chains—processes of embedding and generating recursive, reflective iterations of themed speech events—teachers create spaces where their own communicative repertoires and classroom goals can overlap with students’ repertoires of deference.

### Production, Participation, and the Podium

Goffman warns, “the significance of production format cannot be dealt with unless one faces up to the embedding function of much talk” (1981, p. 151). Now that I have attempted to face up to the embedding (and embedded) functions of the talk at hand, I turn to the significance of production format, as well as the participation frameworks co-constructed by the producing agents. The student, Cengiz [pseudonym], gave an oral presentation of his found poem; like the rest of his classmates, he did not write anything down to prepare for his presentation despite the teacher’s gentle recommendations, although before his turn he did use a marker to embellish his paper with more visible demarcations between the stanza-like sequences of his verses. He is the animator of the oral presentation, insofar as it counts for interpretive/academic content, and to some degree of his poem, of which he reads selective verses directly from the page. From a formal standpoint, he is the principal in the performance of oratory, utilizing semiotic repertoires of gesture and speaking confidently with the volume and postural stance typical of the oral presentation ritual in the American classroom.

Goffman (1981) also warns that the paradigmatic notion of participation frameworks as applying to two-person conversations falls short in describing *podium events* such as this one. He states that talk occurring on such a platform—the unilateral oratorical monologue, often scripted—creates “audiences [that] are not, analytically speaking, a feature of speech events (to use Hymes’ term), but stage events” (p. 139). Cengiz’s turn at the podium resides somewhere between a *speech event* and a *stage event*: extemporaneous but firmly rooted in a written text (of which he, and not a speech-writer, was the operative author—although he directly cites the language of magazine copywriters at the level of the word or phrase). He has the floor, and there is a general expectation that no other students will talk

during his turn, but one classmate does pipe up early on to clarify something that she either did not hear or was surprised to hear (line 9; for all line references, see Appendix A).

Contributing further to the dialogic dimension of this kind of podium event, the teacher occupies yet another footing among the audience; after introducing Cengiz as the speaker, Mr. K [pseudonym, the teacher] does not speak until Cengiz comes to the end of reading his poem, but at that point (line 26), he immediately shifts footing into a more active, guiding role in the interpretive enterprise. But this participation is not an intrusion on the floor, coming from the authority figure in the classroom; Mr. K’s corroborating statements (lines 28, 32, 36, 41-42) mark his agreement and approval for Cengiz’s interpretations. The participation framework and production format have shifted from a one-actor, expert oral presentation in which Cengiz is author, animator and principal to a two-actor dialogue in which the discussants share expertise; while Cengiz remains author and principal of the event, Mr. K emerges briefly as co-animator. Finally in lines 44-45, Mr. K arrives at a position of co-author, offering an evaluative prompt: “Do you see any way in which all the things that you do connect?” His question gently molds the end of Cengiz’s presentation into the generalized conclusion format expected of the schooled genres of essays and oral presentations alike, establishing a unified theme reflected in each subsection (commonly three or five main points). His language steers clear of the schooled communicative repertoire; rather than asking for a preordained theme or main point, he focuses on process and discovery. However, his layperson’s repertoire still pays deference to his goals as a high school English teacher.

The semantic subtlety of Mr. K’s question also highlights his intention for the assignment to be open and associative; he didn’t expect students to control the meanings of their poems as they constructed them, but he did position them to interpret the (perhaps unexpected) discursive outcomes of their own wordplay. Similarly, by shifting the monological footing of Cengiz’s oratory into a more dialogical participation framework, the teacher scaffolded the student’s successful execution (with his own communicative repertoires) of schooled literary criticism.

## Rituals and Narratives

Having established the embeddedness and audience-participant frames configuring Cengiz’s talk, I now look more closely at the language of the talk itself—although my discussion inevitably refers back to the aforementioned aspects of the speech event, underscoring the ubiquity and intricacy of their relevance.

When Cengiz initiates his oral presentation, he steps into the podium ritual that has just been constituted informally and iteratively by the rest of his classmates who went before him; in fact, he is the last to take the podium, so a variety of presenting styles have already built up expected parameters for the ritual through repetition and variation. He enacts the ritual bracketing that has been established for these presentations with a brief overview statement of what his poem is about—but diverges from the common practice of mentioning one central topic, instead “chunking” it (Wortham, 2001) into three topics: “about myself, about the global terrorism, and ahm, a little bit about LeBron James” (lines 5-6). The surprise of this topical mosaic, rife with disjunction and juxtaposition, spurs laughter across the classroom.

Leaping between sociolinguistic scales (Blommaert, 2010) of the local, the global, and the interfaces between them, and injecting supposedly high-art poetry with lowbrow news and tabloid topics, Cengiz's work exemplifies Bakhtin's *double-voicing* (Bakhtin, 1981). Other critics connect Bakhtin's concept usefully to the term *pastiche*, which describes both a hodge-podge and the literary technique of stylistic imitation. Literary critic Jean Franco (1999) remarks on how little Bakhtin used a term so resonant with his theory, "preferring *stylization* or, more generally, *double-voicing*" (p. 394, emphasis original). Wortham (2001) echoes this observation: "*Authoring*, for Bakhtin, is the process of juxtaposing others' voices in order to adopt a social position of one's own" (p. 63, emphasis original). Cengiz's *pastiche*-prelude briefly invokes masculinized discourses, such as fascination with the military and idolization of sports celebrities, priming his audience to expect a performance of deference to popularized adolescent masculinity that may seem like an awkward or humorous repertoire for this setting. However, he proceeds confidently, perhaps with the knowledge that the stances he will take toward these sociolinguistic frames of reference will surprise his audience and author a subjectivity of his own.

### "About myself."

Cengiz's exposition follows in the neat chunks promised—although attention will be paid to how he transitions between them to forge an organized discursive chain, re-positioning himself in the process. He launches into the autobiographical chunk with an *epistemic modalization* (Wortham, 2001), a narrative device that qualifies the speaker's stance toward the events being described, evaluating the status of some past knowledge (hence "epistemic") through particular uses of verb tense or modal verbs (hence "modalization"). In the case of talking about oneself, this practice can be understood as a comparison between one's stance in the present *narrating* event and one's stance in the (presumably past, or perhaps fictional) *narrated* event. Cengiz evokes an embedded animator from his past: "I used to think, ah, I'm lazy" (line 13), implicitly conveying that a shift has since occurred in his stance. By positioning himself in this less than ideal starting place with respect to his self-knowledge, he sets up the narrative arc to follow. His ensuing narrative of redemption and growth—"I prayed for, to be better" (line 14)—is a *bildungsroman* in miniature, locating Cengiz in a new position of moral integrity from which he may level his ensuing sociopolitical critique.

Cross-referencing this excerpt to the artifact of his found poem (see Appendix B), it is interesting to note that Cengiz has transposed the third-person voice of his poem into first person here, aligning himself directly as the source of the discourses built in text. He explicitly aligns his own voice with the poetic *voice*—which many literary critics distance as the *speaker*, *mask*, or *persona*, particularly in the school of New Criticism. This injects his poem with personal qualities (and *visa versa*) and invites the audience to draw from their experiential associations with him.

In his first transition between stanzas, Cengiz affirms his dedication "to replace violence with justice" (line 15), thereby blurring the distinction between his local, personal narrative and a global narrative of violence and injustice he will describe in the subsequent stanza. Rymes (2011) has observed this practice in high school students' repertoires of deference with respect to hip-hop. Through various

semiotic practices, youth recontextualize the mass-mediated emblems of hip-hop music and culture in their daily lives to create socially situated meanings and align themselves with localized values. In this case, Cengiz indexes his deference to a *social category* (Couldry, 2010) of “justice,” broadly defined in relation to the personal virtues listed in his first stanza (“hardworking, reasonable, responsible, and thoughtful,” see Appendix B) and in contrast to the poetic-discursive construction of global terrorism that follows.

**“About global terrorism.”**

The transition to the second stanza marks a shift in footing from a more prosaic writing style to a politically-charged poetics inlaid with formal devices and strong figuration. Global terrorism is described as “ingeniously ghost masked” (line 18), doubly ensconced in deception—both spectral and masked; because it is a “political...and financial killer” and not “military” (line 19), it is deceitful even with respect to the militaristic premise people (American consumers of media, idealistic young jihadists) might ascribe to it. But before Cengiz reads these lines from his paper, he adds the statement (not present in the text), “fight global terrorism” (line 17), but skips the verse “we didn’t start this but we will finish it” (see Appendix B), which would entail a shift of footing from critical to bellicose with respect to the question of war. He also elides a shift into the first-person inclusive voice to arrive at a more passive attribution of violence in the next verse, which I describe shortly. In the meantime, he has shifted from a localized scale of discourse to an agitated, global scale, and his poetic style has followed him.

The second stanza transition functions formally, discursively, and multimodally to make the seemingly impossible leap from global terrorism to LeBron James. Cengiz’s social category of “justice” has accrued additional meanings since it was introduced in the first transition. The vice of laziness takes on a new connotation of deceit, because it leads one to “give up” on the quest of “replac[ing] violence with justice” (line 15); this parallels the last line of the terrorism stanza: “A new rohlush—revolution is what you get, and ah, what you see is not justice” (lines 20-21). In animating these lines through his oral retelling, Cengiz reveals how they can be understood as a textual sequence known in literary analysis as a chiasmus<sup>1</sup>; it begins at a stanza-ending verse at the right-hand edge of the page and conjoins that stanza to the first verse of the following one. The two verses are spatially displaced on the page and separated by a drawn-in ornamental border, hiding their formal structure from the eye, but not the ear (or the inner voice of a lone reader). However, they are, in another sense, visually and syntactically connected on the page. Cengiz has clipped a single line of neatly repetitive magazine copy (a distinct exemplar of *adspeak*<sup>2</sup>: “What you see is what you get”) by building his inverted parallel clauses out of each half of the original. The matched color and typography of the found copy unite the severed twin clauses; Cengiz has

<sup>1</sup> “In rhetoric, chiasmus (from the Greek: *χιάζω*, *chiázō*, “to shape like the letter X”) is the figure of speech in which two or more clauses are related to each other through a reversal of structures in order to make a larger point; that is, the clauses display inverted parallelism” (en.wikipedia.org, December 11, 2010). [Nb. I have chosen to cite definitions from Wikipedia.org and Wiktionary.org in accordance with my support for participatory knowledge production, as explicated further in Siegel (2011)].

<sup>2</sup> “The sort of language used in advertisements, typified by bold claims and optimistic encouragement” (en.wiktionary.org, December 11, 2010).

also pasted them at the same angle, separated only by a photo of camouflaged soldiers. The print-based iteration of Cengiz's speech act preserves the integrity of the original magazine text as an antecedent layer in the poem-as-palimpsest, reinforcing the sharp irony of the (supposedly) original message in its newly entextualized form. When this new context is animated orally, a sophisticated formal poetic device emerges.

**"A little bit about LeBron James."**

This instance of multimodal meaning-making leads into Cengiz's first mention of the three large images he incorporated onto the page: "I put some, ah, picture of soldiers" (line 22). When he ventures into the terse third stanza (only twelve words), his audience still is not quite sure what to make of LeBron James as juxtaposed into this ever-more serious poem. Still the principal, with his discursive stance at stake, Cengiz delivers the poem's clearly satirical but otherwise unclear denouement—"You should know about LeBron James is the latest punk with popstars" (lines 24-25)—his audience erupts in renewed laughter. Cengiz has once again positioned himself as moral whistle-blower. The modal "you should know" forebodes that he holds valuable information that his audience may not. Moreover, this information is positioned as a threat to the deceptive guise worn by a well-known, extensively media-hyped, figure. The indexical possibilities of the initial reference to LeBron James in Cengiz's introduction pointed to an array of probable self-positionings: will it index him as a sports fan? as a jock? as disinterested but pop-culture literate? as a student who doesn't register the tacit expectation that poetry is no place for sports media? The parodic response he gives to these latent questions seems to catch his audience off guard. It has a much more flip tone than the rest of his sobering discourse. Although the epithets "punk" and "popstars" (line 25) derive from pop culture, Cengiz aligns himself (*vis-à-vis* his linguistic repertoire of deference) with neither a recognizable pop-cultural narrative nor a stance of athletic esteem. To what discursively-constructed notion does this barbed stanza pay deference?

**"Because..."**

Bakhtin describes speech as "a word about a word addressed to a word" (1984, p. 266; cited in Wortham, 2001, p. 21). After referencing this description, Wortham notes that the utterance is also addressed to future words, in anticipation of future speakers' responses. Cengiz has clearly anticipated the fact that his slender, punchy LeBron James stanza will require elaboration, especially in light of the laughter it invited. His promptly launched elucidation coincides with Mr. K's gross shift in footing from passive observer to interlocutor. Cengiz defers to the teacher, pausing after one overlapped word ("because..." on line 27), but Mr. K emphatically returns the floor to him ("good, go on" on line 28) as soon as he registers that Cengiz's production format is shifting from recital to analysis, the latter being the curricular goal of this iteration in the speech event.

At this point, Cengiz has exhausted his pseudo-script and employs purely "fresh talk" (Goffman, 1981, p. 146); simultaneously, Mr. K has taken this shift as a cue to up his participation status from ratified listener to co-animator of

discursive interpretations. Cengiz grounds his critique of LeBron James in the Nike sponsorships for which he is paid “millions of dollars” (line 37), while children in Indonesia are paid, “like, just couple of bucks” (line 35) (the latter rendered with a sympathetic shrug). In the logic of Cengiz’s poetic-political discourse, a “lazy” (line 13) approach to the assignment at hand would involve ventriloquating the pre-formulated, hegemonic messages contained in his raw materials. We can only guess how the original copy line “LeBron James is the latest...” ended; even if critical, one can assume it addressed the recent controversy over his free agency rather than his collusion with the injustices of global corporatism. In equal or greater likelihood, the original line was hailing his famed athletic talent. Instead, Cengiz takes up the language of the commercial, mass-mediated magazines and the advertisements embedded therein precisely to critique the injustice they gloss over; in Couldry’s words, he *denaturalizes* the “particular context of interpretation” (2010, p. 84) that is encoded as natural for media consumers, thereby turning his own interpretation into a form of social action.

As Cengiz works through this critique using his own distinct communicative repertoires (“the Nike shoes maker,” line 31; “and they paying for them,” line 34), Mr. K supports him with nods and affirmations. Eventually, Mr. K returns to the language of the poem (“you see that with a lot of pop stars and stuff,” line 42) to integrate the narrative of sweatshop labor, a concept Cengiz takes up but does not name with technical terminology. With this move, Mr. K is also demonstrating the schooled expectation that analyses must adequately cohere to the text, and ideally have generalizable applicability. He uses informal linguistic cues (“and stuff”) and generalizing speech (“you see that” and “a lot of pop stars”) to bridge his authoritative repertoire with Cengiz’s, while reinforcing the ways that Cengiz’s discursive work meets schooled expectations.

We see how Mr. K has gradually constructed a bridge between Cengiz’s and his own repertoires. He bids his student to cross back over that divide, into the teacherly repertoire, with the question: “Do you see any way in which all the things that you do connect?” (lines 44-45). He keys into the way Cengiz has severed his discursive chain into three distinct narratives—the bildungsroman, ghost-masked terrorism, and popstar-punk LeBron James—but senses that they all pay deference to a coherent social category. Cengiz takes his time to deliberate, then answers that “life is not [...] equal, fair” (lines 47-48). He identifies the core category of sociopolitical injustice, which has informed several embedded speech events up to this point—his reading of the magazines, his pastiche of images and recycled discourses, his spoken representation of the text—without being explicitly named until this point. He elaborates why without being prompted: “because, uhm, they using like people to kill people, to get money, or to get what they want” (lines 48-50). His trio of parallel subordinate clauses applies his answer to each of the initially disparate instantiations of injustice. As the presentation draws to a close, Mr. K finally brings out a teacherly linguistic repertoire to supplement Cengiz’s word search (“they using like child, paying like less,” lines 50-51) with the term “labor,” conventionally associated with the sweatshop narrative and the critique of mass-produced commercial goods that Cengiz erected with his own linguistic-discursive resources. Such a participation framework both enabled Cengiz to formulate his own ideas and provided him with additional resources to transplant his discourse into a technical or academic register the next time he recontextualizes it.

## Conclusion

Although Cengiz's presentation (and poem) stood out as the most political in the class, virtually all of his classmates went through a comparable process of constructing a meaningful poem out of magazine mishmash and expanded upon it discursively in the modality of ritual oral presentation. During the social event of perusing magazines together, the students used their informal, social and pop cultural linguistic repertoires among each other, and slightly more formal registers to interact with their teacher and the visiting researchers. As they began to arrange their clippings, they constructed creative poetic intertexts with no particular audience in mind but themselves, their immediate peers, and perhaps the researchers. Standing before the podium, they unpacked the poem's metaphorical, incomplete (by nature of the project's constraints) or cryptic words and images through unscripted monologue and dialogue. In doing this, they also practiced the sometimes daunting genre of public speaking among a small group which the teacher strives to construct as safe for any communicative repertoires or lines of discourse the students have to offer—whether they wish to take them up or not.

At the level of each modality or participation framework in isolation, a “coherent” exercise in schooled knowledge construction may not succeed, depending on how super-diverse students' learning styles and linguistic resources map onto the particular context; whether it does or not, the results of the exercise stagnate as soon as it is completed. But as a layered, tiered process that engages multiple modes and participation frameworks, there is room at each level for teacher and student repertoires to find a meeting ground on which to co-construct a more holistic academic-artistic accomplishment. Furthermore, this approach accommodates both the teacher's academic goals and the students' linguistic repertoires without forcing them into a success-failure paradigm. It enables students to put their repertoires of deference to work in multimodal literacy practices with pedagogical value, making their classwork meaningful to them rather than making their meanings useful to *a priori* classwork.

### *Acknowledgements*

Foremost I thank Mr. K and his students, Cengiz in particular, for generously allowing me to observe in their classroom and get to know them. I am indebted to Dr. Betsy Rymes, as well as my undergraduate professors and peers at Columbia University's Center for Comparative Literature & Society, for providing the foundational readings and interest that led to this work. Finally, my sincere gratitude goes to editors Miranda Weinberg and Mariam Durrani.

*Joanna Luz Siegel is a doctoral candidate in Educational Linguistics at University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education. She is interested in the intersections between multilingualism, popular culture, new/mass media, and creativity. She invites readers to contact her at [josi@gse.upenn.edu](mailto:josi@gse.upenn.edu).*

## References

- Bakhtin, M. (1981). Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination* (pp. 259-422). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *Sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Couldry, N. (2010). Media discourse and the naturalization of categories. In R. Wodak & V. Koller (Eds.), *Handbook of communication in the public sphere* (pp. 67-88). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Franco, J. (1999). Pastiche in contemporary Latin American literature. In J. Franco, M. L. Pratt, & E. Newman (Eds.), *Critical passions: Selected essays* (pp. 393-428). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). Word, dialogue and novel. In L. Roudiez (Ed.), *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art* (pp. 64-91). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Rymes, B. (2011) Deference, denial, and beyond: A repertoire approach to mass media and schooling. *Review of Research in Education*, 35(1), 208-238.
- Siegel, J. (2011). Vampires, werewolves, and other humans: Learning from participatory responses to the representation of Native Americans in *Twilight*. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 26(2), 79-103.
- Silverstein, M. & Urban, G. (Eds.). (1996). *Natural histories of discourse*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Urban, G. (1996). Entextualization, replication, and power. In M. Silverstein & G. Urban, (Eds.), *Natural histories of discourse* (pp. 21-44). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wortham, S. (2001). *Narratives in action: A strategy for research and analysis*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

## Appendix A: Oral Presentation Transcript

1	Mr. K	Ahright, Cengiz will be our, uh, last one then
2	C	Um (1.0) I tried to talk about (0.5) three different things
3		<i>[lifts paper to show class]</i>
4	Mr. K	Okay
5	C	About myself, about the (.4) global terrorism, and ahm <i>[clicks tongue]</i>
6		A ↑little bit about LeBron James
7	Class	<i>[laughter]</i>
8	C	<i>[smiling]</i>
9	Rodi	About what?
10	C	<i>[turning to show paper to Rodi]</i>
11		↑Little bit about LeBron James
12		<i>[short gap in video]</i>
13		yu— yu—, I used to think ah, I'm lazy but, ah
14		I tried (0.8) I prayed for, to be better
15		And ahh, I don't give up to replace violence with justice (1.0) ahm,
16		<i>[grabs paper with other hand to straighten page; reads from page]</i>
17		Fight global terrorism, (0.8)
18		I said, ah, terrorism is ingenious—ingeniously ghost masked
19		Pohlitical, and <b>not</b> muhlitary, and financial, ah, killer
20		A new rohlush—revolution is what you get, and ah
21		What you see is not justice (1.2)
22		I put some, ah, <i>[gestures to paper, looks up]</i> picture of soldiers↑
23		And ahm, about LeBron James, (0.3) I said
24		You should know about LeBron James is the la- latest
25		Punk with pop stars
26	Mr. K	<i>[laughs]</i> [So you—
27	C	[Because—
28	Mr. K	— <b>Good</b> , go on
29	C	yeah <i>[puts paper on podium]</i>
30		I think because, um (0.4) you know like (0.5) you know the
31		Nike shoes maker, <i>[like]</i> they using ↓ <b>childs</b>
32	Mr. K	<i>[sure]</i>
33	C	In uh, Indonuzhia to make those shoes (0.3)
34		And they paying for them, like, just
35		<i>[shrugs/purses lips/shakes head]</i> couple of bucks
36	Mr. K	Yeah
37	C	And then ahh, but, <i>[looks at hand]</i> they paying millions of dollars
38		<i>[hand gestures, folds paper on podium]</i> to LeBron James to just (0.3)
39		<i>[turns palms up, glances down]</i> advertize the shoes ↓

"DO YOU SEE ANY WAY IN WHICH ALL THE THINGS THAT YOU DO CONNECT?"

40		[yeah] [ <i>takes paper off podium</i> ]
41	Mr. K	<b>Right</b> t— to [be—]
42		And you <b>see</b> that with a lot of pop— pop stars and stuff
43	C	[ <i>nods</i> ] Yeah
44	Mr. K	So wow↓, You cover a lot (0.5) Do you <b>see</b> any way in which all the
45		things that you do connect↓
46	C	[ <i>opens paper onto podium</i> ]
47		Yeh, I think um, [ <i>inspecting paper</i> ] (0.8) I think <b>life</b> is not just like,
48		(0.4) <b>not</b> , just not equal↑, fair, because, uhm (1.2) [ <i>inspects paper</i> ]
49		they using like <b>people</b> , [ <i>gesturing with hand</i> ] to <b>kill</b> people to get
50		money, or, to get what they want, and ahm, or they using like child↑,
51		[ <i>paying like less, and,</i> ] yeah
52	Mr. K	[ <i>yeah, like labor</i> ↑] That's interesting↓. Good. That's—that's very—
53		very thoughtful↓ [ <i>C folds paper</i> ] Ahright <b>good, thank</b> you.
54	Class	[ <i>applause</i> ]
55	C	[ <i>walks back to seat from podium</i> ]

Transcription Conventions:

[ <i>italics</i> ]	gesture or other non-speech communication
(1.0)	length of pause in seconds
<b>bold</b>	vocal emphasis
[brackets]	two speakers overlap
↑ / ↓	rising/falling pitch

