Identifying identity: Identity as an interactional construct, and some relations to second language learning

BUSHNELL Cade

Abstract

Raymond and Heritage (2006) argue that the interactional management of epistemological rights is a key resource for working up identities in interaction. This notion has broad implications for second language learning research. From the mid to late nineteen-nineties, a number of second language researchers have problematized the practice of grouping participants into generic categories such as 'Native speaker' and 'Nonnative speaker' (e.g., Firth 2009; Firth and Wagner 1997, 2007; Hosoda 2006; Kasper 2004; Kramsch and Whiteside 2007; Norton Peirce 1995, 1997, 2000; Pavlenko and Lantolf 2000; Rampton 1995). One thrust of this movement has been to increase recognition of the fact that second language learners are not one-dimensional. Some researchers have drawn on poststructuralist notions to develop more complex views of the identities of the participants in their data (e.g., Canagarajah 2004, 2007; Norton Peirce, 1995, 1997, 2000; Norton and Toohey 2002; Siegal 1996; see Block 2007 for an overview). Such studies have enriched our view of second language learners as second language users, and as people. However, with notable exceptions such as Hosoda (2006) and Kasper (2004), research examining the actual ways in which identities are treated by the participants themselves as being relevant for their second language learning activities are still relatively rare.

It is the goal of the present essay to provide some insights and footholds for future research examining the relationships between identity and second language learning. In particular, this essay provides a discussion of how participant identity is both conceptualized and analyzed from the perspectives of conversation and membership categorization analysis (CA and MCA). The ways in which sequential and categorial aspects of talk are reflexively constituted are considered and

demonstrated in the analyses. The ways in which identity has been understood and analyzed by both orthodox and poststructuralist approaches within the field of second language learning research are discussed. These approaches are critically considered in the light of an ethnomethodological perspective. Finally, consideration is given to some of the ways in which a categorial-sequential analytic approach can offer new perspectives and insights on second language learning. Specific consideration is given to the notions of access to practices and participation in interactional activity of vocabulary learning, and how the sequential and categorial aspects of talk are involved in managing such access.

I Introduction

It is the goal of this essay to provide a discussion of how identity is conceptualized and analyzed from an ethnomethodological perspective — specifically from the analytical frameworks of conversation and membership categorization analysis (CA and MCA). I will organize the discussion into five main sections, the first of which is this introduction. In the second section, I first outline the ways in which 'identity' is conceptualized and analyzed by CA and MCA, respectively. I also mention some of the points of convergence and divergence, and specific developments within each discipline. I then describe points of convergence and divergence across MCA and (sequential) CA. Finally, I discuss some of the major ways in which the sequential and categorial aspects of talk are reflexively constituted and intertwined, and demonstrate these points in the analysis of a data excerpt.

The third section focuses on a discussion of the ways in which identity has been conceptualized within the second language research literature. I briefly but critically consider both 'orthodox' and poststructuralist approaches. In discussing the poststructuralist stance, I specifically examine Siegal (1996), and reanalyze one of her data excerpts from a categorial-sequential analytical perspective. The fourth section turns to a consideration of the ways in which an ethnomethodologically based categorial-sequential analytic approach can inform and offer new perspectives to second language learning research. The discussion here focuses on the notion of access to participation in interaction, and the ways in which sequential and categorial resources are deployed by the participants in order to accomplish such social actions as petitioning for, granting, denying, negotiating, contesting, and adjusting such access. I illustrate the specific case of the interactional co-constitution of access to 'doing language learning' in an analysis of a data excerpt. I then conclude the essay in the final section with a brief summary of the main points.

II Identity from the perspectives of CA and MCA

In this section, I discuss the ways in which identity is conceptualized and analyzed by CA and MCA, respectively. I then consider points of divergence and convergence between the two approaches, and consider the ways in which the sequential and categorial aspects of talk are reflexively co-constitutive. Finally, I illustrate this reflexive relationship in the analysis of a data excerpt.

1 Identity in CA: Doing being X for one another

Conversation analysis (CA) is deeply rooted in ethnomethodology, which views social order as an ongoing members' accomplishment (see Garfinkel 1967). The ways in which CA conceptualizes identity are closely related to this view of social order. In a core paper published posthumously in 1984, the originator of CA, Harvey Sacks discusses how people accomplish "being ordinary." Sacks argues that ordinary is not a stable state of identity, but rather that it is accomplished ongoingly as "making a job of, and finding an answer to, how to do 'being ordinary'" (1984: 415). Thus, one analytical concern for CA is how participants in interaction co-constitute and accomplish 'being X' in and through their talk. Drew, for example, states that "[o]ur relationships with one another, and our sense of *who we are to one another*, is generated, manifest, maintained, and managed in and through our conversations" (2005: 74; emphasis mine). Hence from a CA perspective, identity is accomplished in and as social action: co-created, worked up, maintained, and adjusted, aligned with or contested in, through, and for specific interactional occasions.

Since, for CA, identity is seen as an interactional co-constitution by the participants of "who we are to one another" (Drew 2005: 74), identity is understood as being inextricably and reflexively related to the locally managed interactional order. Thus, a CA analysis of identity involves documenting how participants orient to each other through their actions. In other words, identity is seen as being co-constituted by the participants through an application of interactional resources such as turn-taking, paired actions (i.e. adjacency pairs), repair, etc. For example, using these resources, participants may co-construct and orient to 'discourse' and 'situated' identities[1] (Zimmerman 1998; see also Sacks 1995 on 'turn-generated' and 'distal' categories). Discourse

1 Zimmerman (1998) also mentions a third type of identity: transportable identity. Although he defers a substantial treatment, he does mention that transportable identities are not associated with any specific situation, but 'travel with individuals across situations and are potentially relevant [...] for any spate of interaction' (1998: 90). Transportable identities are often visibly available, i.e. 'ethnicity', 'age', 'sex', etc., and may be treated by participants as being category-bound predicates of situated identities (Omori 2008; see also Paoletti 1998).

identities are reflexively constituted in, through, and for a specific turn at talk. In the case of the discursive identities of 'questioner' and 'answerer', for example, the identity of questioner is related to the action of asking a question, while the identity of answerer to the providing of an answer. Situated identities, on the other hand, are "articulated" with discourse identities (Zimmerman 1998: 88) such that they are made visible, worked up, and managed through various discursive identities across multiple turns. An example of a pair of such situated identities would be a 'call-taker' at an emergency call center and a corresponding 'caller'. In this case, the situated identity of call-taker may be articulated with, constituted by, and involve the orchestration of several different discursive identities: 'questioner', 'advice-giver', 'reassurer', etc. It is important to note, however, that both discursive and situated identities are co-constructed by the participants moment by moment in their interaction. This means that such identities can be, and often are, negotiated, contested, undercut, usurped, etc., in interaction. Additionally, it can be a point of contention among CA researchers whether or not, and how, participants warrantably orient to situated identities their talk (see, e.g., Schegloff's [1991] discussion of Zimmerman [1984]).

2 Identity in MCA: Assembling categories to perform social action

Like CA, MCA is also firmly rooted in ethnomethodology, and thus also views social order as an ongoing members' accomplishment and conceptualizes identity in light of this view. MCA is based upon Harvey Sacks' analyses of data from stories told by children (Sacks 1972a) and calls to a suicide prevention hotline (Sacks 1972b) and is therefore a sister-discipline to CA. Sacks noted that people pervasively organize their common sense understandings about the social world into categories. MCA conceptualizes identity as being commensurate with both these 'membership categories', including the 'self-categorizations' participants reflexively constitute through the social deployment of various categorial resources[2], and collections of related categories. Membership categories organize people[3] together into groups based on social and other characterizations (e.g., 'father'), and collections of categories are gatherings of related categories (e.g., 'family', i.e., father / mother / daughter / son / etc.). However, it is important to note that, in most contemporary MCA, membership categories are not understood as preexisting objects that are 'out there' and 'knowable in advance', but rather as occasioned assemblies (see Jayyusi 1984; Hester and Eglin 1997a, 1997c; Sacks 1979[4]) built up in talk, text, and imagery.[5]

2 For example, a person might accomplish self-categorization as an educational psychologist through deploying resources which categorize a certain child as a troubled student (see Hester and Eglin 1997b).

3 Some researchers have also investigated place categorization (e.g., Jayyusi 1984; Schegloff 1972), concept and action categorization (Bilmes 2008; Bilmes 2009), etc. Categorial analysis is thus not necessarily limited to *membership* categories.

Sacks also noted that categories may be associated with particular actions, such that category membership can be implied and understood through the mere presence of "category-bound actions" (Sacks 1972a: 335). Sacks formalized these observations in developing the concept of *membership categorization device* (Sacks 1972a: 332). A *membership categorization device* (MCD) consists of (a) a collection of categories, and (b) rules of application, which include several rules and corollaries (e.g., consistency rule, economy rule, hearer and seers' maxims, etc.; see Hester & Eglin, 1997a for a detailed discussion).

For MCA, the major analytical goals are to (a) identify the categories made relevant in the data, (b) describe the ways in which categories are co-assembled, negotiated, contested, and managed by the participants, and (c) show how such category work is implicated in social actions, including (but not limited to) self- and other-categorization. As a major analytical tool, researchers have expanded Sacks' concept of category-bound actions to include not only actions, but also other category-bound *predicates*, which include, e.g., category-bound attributes, knowledge, entitlements, rights, obligations, etc. (see, e.g., Eglin and Hester 1992; Jayyusi 1984; Watson 1978). Thus, by examining participants' deployment of category-bound predicates along with overt categorial references and formulations, MCA analysts are able to identify and explicate the uses of the various categories and collections participants assemble and make relevant. In examining the ways in which categories are used in social action, analysts consider how participants ascribe, describe, or otherwise implicate categories and collections of categories to work up prospective and retrospective rhetoric (see, e.g., Watson 1978; Edwards 1991, 1997, 1998) in order to self-categorize, organize moral accountability, manage access to practices and participation (see below), etc.

3 Points of convergence and divergence between MCA and CA

The analytical foci, methods of analysis, and data of CA and MCA can be quite different. CA,[6] on the one hand, is specifically concerned with explicating the sequential structure of talk. This strong sequential orientation has led CA to focus on issues of identity only as they are made manifest on a turn by turn basis in the interaction — most fundamentally at the level of

4 Sacks also proposed that, in addition to occasioned categories, there are also certain natural categories, which are understood to be stable and known in advance. More recent research has problematized the notion of natural categories as being decontextualized and reified (see Hester and Eglin 1997a).

5 MCA has also been used to examine text and imagery (e.g., newspaper headlines [e.g., Eglin and Hester 1992; Hester and Eglin 1997b]; newspaper articles [Sacks 1995]; television commercials [Francis and Hart 1997]; visual images [Lepper 2000]; etc.).

6 Here, I speak of CA as a purely sequential analytic approach. As suggested above, there are various positions within CA itself.

discourse identity. Thus, in an analysis of identity, CA is interested in looking at how participants recurrently display to each other their joint understandings of 'what-we-mean', 'who-we-are', and 'what-we-are-doing'. CA seeks to access these participant understandings through building its analyses based on the participants' displayed orientations to the prior turn at talk, and by documenting the ways in which the participants locally manage their talk through application of the mechanisms of turn-taking, repair, etc. Therefore, CA absolutely requires detailed transcriptions of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction.

MCA, on the other hand, is concerned with how participants organize and use common sense knowledge about the social world. In other words, while CA is concerned with identity in terms of participant orientations to each other in performing social action on a turn by turn basis in talk-in-interaction, MCA focuses on the ways in which participants assemble people into categories, and how they use these assemblies to accomplish social actions. Analysts seek to uncover the ways in which participants assemble and use categories through an examination of categorial formulations, implications, and category-bound predicates apparent in the data. This type of analysis is not limited to talk, nor does it necessarily require detailed transcriptions.

However, as mentioned above, CA and MCA are both rooted in the ideas of Harvey Sacks. These ideas were developed by Sacks as he confronted his data from an ethnomethodological point of view. Thus, the two disciplines have important theoretical points in common, and are seen by a number of researchers as being highly compatible (e.g., Antaki and Widdicombe 1998; Day 1998; Edwards 1991, 1997, 1998; Hester and Eglin 1997a, 1997c; Watson 1997). For instance, in the analysis of identity, both approaches work to uncover the situated co-constitution[7] and uses of identity. As a result, both disciplines are deeply concerned with the ways in which identities are locally assembled and managed. Both CA and MCA require researchers to approach their data with an ethnomethodological indifference. Also, in the case of interactional data, both approaches require the researcher to produce a data-driven analysis based in the actual participant orientations as they are sequentially displayed.

4 The reflexive constitution of sequential and categorial organization

In this subsection, I will discuss two ways in which the sequential and categorial aspects of talk are reflexively constituted. The first is broadly related to the sequential organization of category work for accomplishing social actions in talk-in-interaction, and the second is related to a nexus between the sequential structure of the talk on the one hand, and normative orientations

7 Even in cases where the data of MCA is textual or imagery, analysis will still focus on the co-constitution and co-construction of identity — the participants in such cases being the author or creator of the text or image and the analyst him or herself (see Eglin and Hester 1992; Lepper 2000).

to category-bound predicates for discursive, situated, and transportable identities on the other. I will consider these notions in turn below, and then present an analysis of an excerpt of talk between a L1 and L2 speaker of Japanese in which I will show the reflexively co-intertwined nature of the participants' deployment of sequential and categorial resources in their talk-in-interaction.

(1) The sequential organization of category work

Watson (1978: 105) argues that one way in which sequence and category are reflexively constituted is through "conditional relevance in utterance sequences." He examines two data excerpts from a suicide prevention hotline in which the caller uses extensive category work to portray a particular profile of states of affairs. In so doing, Watson notes, the caller assembles two MCDs, i.e. 'types of religious faith' and 'racial groups', and uses the category-bound predicates and properties of these MCDs and the categories assembled into them to account for her indigent circumstances, and to apportion blame. In particular, the caller builds up an argument that, in spite of her category-bound entitlements as an incumbent of the categories 'Protestant church member' and 'white British', she has been denied human companionship and certain unspecified facilities, which others, notably 'black immigrants', 'Catholics', and 'Jews' receive. In response, the call-taker works up a 'challenge' to the caller's account by appropriating a categorial resource from the caller's own account (i.e. 'Protestant' in the MCD 'types of faith) and reformulating it as an MCD (i.e. 'Protestant [church]', housing the categories 'vicar/ church member / etc.'). The call-taker then invokes the category-bound responsibility of the caller to "speak with the vicar or someone at church" about her circumstances, and thus undercuts the caller's apportioning of blame.

Thus, Watson (1978) shows how the assembly and deployment of categorial resources is sequentially co-organized by the participants in and for their talk. Importantly, Watson's analysis shows a reflexive relationship between sequence and category, such that the shape and character of the sequence are directly linked to the conditional relevancies created by the caller's deployment of various categorial resources in accomplishing the social action of 'blaming'.

(2) Sequential structure and normative orientation to category-bound predicates

As discussed above, Zimmerman (1998) argues that discursive and situated identities are interarticulated and constituted through participants' turn by turn actions in their talk. He also argues that participants work to align their situated identities with each other (1998: 88), and that misalignment is often treated as problematic. One of Zimmerman's data excerpts features a call to a police station in which such a misalignment occurs. He notes that the call-taker treats as problematic the caller's fail to display an orientation to the call-taker as a 'police officer',

and to the call itself as being relevantly made to 'the police'. Though Zimmerman (1998) does not explicitly do so himself, I would like to argue that an understanding of the organization of participant treatments of such misalignment may be greatly informed by an MCA perspective. In my analysis of Zimmerman's police call data, for example, the participants treat situated identities as being associated with certain category-bound predicates. The misalignment thus results from a failure by the caller to produce the necessary category-bound actions for the situated identity of 'caller to the police'; the call-taker produces the social action of reproving as a display of a normative orientation to the absence of these morally accountable category-bound actions.

Excerpt 1 is taken from a dinner conversation between an L2 speaker of Japanese, Dan, and his L1 Japanese speaking friend, Sasaki. In the following analysis, I will show how these participants also display orientations to a misalignment of identities and their category-bound predicates, although the resulting interactional trajectory is quite different from Zimmerman's police call.[8]

Excerpt 1, naporitan (D = Dan, S = Sasaki)

1. S: mukasi (.5) nihon no supagetti tte ketyappu de
long ago Japan M spaghetti Q ketchup by

2. ajituke siteta n °desu [(yo).°
seasoning did N C I
A long time ago, (they) used ketchup to season spaghetti in Japan.

3. D: [a:: hai [hai hai.
a yes yes yes
A:: yeah yeah yeah

S

4. S: [sittemasu?
know
(You) know?

5. D: °hai hai°.
yes yes
° yeah yeah° .

6. (.6)

7. S: naporita:n [toka (itte),
Neapolitan such as say
(it's) called like Neapolita:n

8 Transcription conventions are included in the appendix.

8. D: [soo soo soo. tuma, z:utto sore
right right right wife all along that

9. tu [kutteta.
was making
Right right right. (My) wife used to make that a:ll the time.

10. S: [A HAH HAH TU(H)KUTTETA(H)? heh [heh
a hah hah was making heh heh
a hah hah (she) u(h)sed to ma(h)ke (it)? heh heh

11. D [so(h)o.
right
ye(h)ah.

Prior to this sequence, the participants were discussing the food that Dan had prepared for them and how he had used some unorthodox seasonings. In lines 1 and 2, Sasaki makes a statement regarding former Japanese practices of using ketchup to season spaghetti. This utterance potentially assembles Dan into certain membership categories. Notably, Sasaki explicitly invokes the category 'nihon' (Japan), and formulates this practice as taking place 'mukasi' (a long time ago). The use of these categorizations makes relevant through association the categories of 'foreigner' and 'newcomer'. In this regard, it is also important to note that Sasaki's turn is formulated as displaying a stance of epistemic authority through deployment of the utterance final token *yo* (see Kamio 1997; Rudolph 1993). Thus, Sasaki's turn works to make relevant a categorization of Dan as a 'foreign newcomer' who is unknowledgeable of past Japanese culinary practices, while simultaneously self-categorizing Sasaki as a 'native old-timer' with epistemic authority concerning such practices.

In line 3, however, Dan overlaps Sasaki's 'desu yo' with a 'priority response' (Bilmes 1993, 1995) formulating his own claim of knowledge concerning these practices. Sasaki immediately responds to Dan's claim with 'sittemasu?' ([you] know?). Dan replies with a minimal affirmation (note the lower volume) in line 5, which instantiates a second minimal claim of knowledge. However, after a .6 second pause, Sasaki displays an orientation to Dan's line 5 as being potentially accountable (note the .6 second pause; see Heritage 1988) specifically by means of a 'display of knowledge' through deploying a reference to the specific name of the dish indexed by his line 1, 'spaghetti Neapolitan'. At this point, Dan overlaps Sasaki's utterance to begin production of his lines 8 and 9, which notably upgrade his lines 3 and 5 from a general epistemic claim to an account of personal experiential knowledge: Dan's states that his wife often used to make spaghetti Neapolitan. Interestingly, this action potentially creates a misalignment in the situated identities made relevant by Sasaki's lines 1 and 2 by proposing category-bound predicates treatable as not normatively associated with the category 'foreign newcomer'. In

particular, Dan's wife (whom Sasaki also knows) is a Japanese. Thus Dan's reference to her implies that he has special access to Japanese practices that would not normally be available to foreigners. Furthermore, he formulates his utterance in a manner to propose that she used to make this particular dish frequently and over a considerable period of time. This suggests that Dan is an 'old-timer' in that he has longstanding knowledge about this particular dish. In line 10, Sasaki orients to the misalignment created by Dan's line 8 and 9 through a marked raise in volume and animation, which, taken together, seem to index an affective stance (Ochs 1996) of 'great surprise'.[9] Notably, Dan's actions not only work to undercut Sasaki's categorization of him, but also recategorizes Dan as an equal knower of this particular dish. In the sequence following Excerpt 1 (not shown), Dan treats Sasaki's line 10 as making relevant a display of category-bound knowledge for 'equal knower', and embarks on a detailed explication of the ingredients and methods of preparation for spaghetti Neapolitan, which is collaboratively co-constructed as 'doing reminiscing' by the participants.

This analysis shows how the sequential and categorial aspects of the participants' talk are reflexively constituted. For example, Sasaki's lines 1 and 2 work to make potentially relevant an application of the categories 'foreigner' and 'newcomer' to Dan. Dan displays an orientation to this potentially relevant categorization framework through deploying and managing his own categorial resources in the subsequent talk. In particular, Dan formulates certain category-bound predicates which work to disassociate himself with the category of 'foreign newcomer'. Notably, this action creates a misalignment between the situated identities made relevant by Sasaki's lines 1 and 2 category work, and effectively recategorizes Dan as a 'knower of such past Japanese culinary practices'. At this point, Sasaki displays an affective stance of 'surprise' in relation to this misalignment, which Dan then treats as making relevant a display of category-bound knowledge for 'equal knower'. By co-constituting a situated identity for Dan as 'equal knower' rather than as 'foreign newcomer', the participants make relevant to their interaction a co-constructed display of category-bound knowledge instead of an 'informing' sequence, which would have been relevant under the categorization framework proposed by Sasaki's lines 1 and 2. Furthermore, by *not doing* an informing sequence the participants are able to publicly display a dis-attending to the identities of 'foreign newcomer' and 'native old-timer'. Thus, the participants displayed orientations to categories which made relevant (or irrelevant) certain sequences, and these sequences simultaneously and reflexively worked to make the categories visible as such: category shaped sequence, and sequence shaped category.

9 The transcript does not do justice to the highly marked prosodic qualities of Sasaki's line 10.

III Identities and language users

In this section, I will provide a brief critical consideration of the ways in which non-L1 speakers have been conceptualized in the second language research literature in general, and by poststructuralist approaches in particular. I discuss an exemplary study by Siegal (1996), who adopts a poststructuralist stance in her analysis of a Caucasian woman learning Japanese in Japan. Finally, I will reconsider one of Siegal's (1996) data excerpts from a categorial-sequential analytic perspective.

1 Participant identity in second language research

The field of second language research is extremely broad and diverse. Generally speaking, however, orthodox second language research typically conceptualizes research participants in terms of easily quantifiable, one-dimensional, stable identities such as 'native speaker' (NS) and 'nonnative speaker' (NNS) (see Gass, et al. 2007 for a recent argument in support of this practice). Starting from the mid to late nineteen-nineties, however, such practices have been criticized by a number of researchers working in various theoretical frameworks (e.g., Firth and Wagner 1997, 2007; Kramsch and Whiteside 2007; Norton Peirce 1995, 1997, 2000; Pavlenko and Lantolf 2000; Rampton 1995). Some researchers have drawn on poststructuralist notions to develop more complex views of the identities of the participants in their data (e.g., Canagarajah 2004, 2007; Norton Peirce 1995, 1997, 2000; Rampton 1995; Siegal 1994, 1996; see Block 2007 for an overview). Notably, poststructuralist approaches view identity as multiple, fractured, and intimately related to notions of power and social position.

Siegal (1996: 360), for example, draws upon Weedon's (1987) notion of subjectivity to view 'language learners as active agents whose use (or non-use, 'silence') of their second language positions them in a particular place in society'. She additionally proposes to incorporate Goffman's (1967) notion of face in the presentation of a multiple and complex self. Siegal seeks to apply this framework to her examination of the relationship between learner identity and learning Japanese in Japan, and considers the ways in which her participant, Mary, engages in various linguistic and cultural practices to present herself as polite and deferential, and as a 'serious language learner and researcher who is progressing in her Japanese language acquisition' (1996: 367).

As suggested by the ethnomethodological conceptualization of identity discussed in the previous sections, however, both the orthodox and poststructuralist views of participants in interaction mentioned above are highly problematic. For instance, empirical research in CA and MCA robustly shows that participant identity is not one-dimensional or stable, but rather dynamic discursive phenomena variously co-constituted by the participants. On the other

hand, ethnomethodologically informed research on interaction also makes clear that such discursive phenomena are not the result of a fracturing and multiplying of selves, but rather are a function of the participants' interactional business—deployed, and locally managed by the participants according to the contingencies of their interactions. In other words, while poststructuralist approaches view identity as multiple and varying across a range of situations, an ethnomethodological perspective views identity as occasioned by, negotiated in, and existing only in and for specific interactional moments.

2 Re-examining participant identities from a categorial-sequential perspective

In this subsection, I will consider Siegal's analysis of one of her data excerpts and then reanalyze it from a categorial-sequential perspective. In her analyses, Siegal examines several interactions between Mary and her professor. Excerpt 2 shows Mary working to introduce an upcoming international conference to her professor.

Excerpt 2 (from Siegal 1996: 370-1; transcript edited according to CA conventions)

1. M: kono, anoo, kono. umm, nani, um ↓institution anoo
   this um this um what um institution um
2. sitteimasu, ne. anoo omosiroi anoo ↓international,
   know I um interesting um international
3. a: anoo kyoogi, anoo moo sugu, anoo, um narimasu.
   a um consultation um soon um become
   (You) know this, um, this. umm, what, um ↓institution, right. Um (there will) become an um interesting um ↓international, a: um consultation um soon.

4. P: a: soo desu ka.=
   a that C Q
   O:h is that right.=

5. M: =hai, anoo, ju, jo, iti, juuiti gatu no, su ju
   yes um te- ti- one eleven month M de- te-
6. iti gatu no, anoo hajime ni tuitati=
   one month M um beginning D first
   =Yes, um, te-, ti-, one, November (i.e. eleventh month) de- te- in the beginning of January (i.e. first month) first (i.e. first of day of the month)

7. P: =a: (koogi) [sitteimasu, sitteimasu.
   a lecturer know know
   O:h lecture (I) know, (I) know.

8. M: [soo desu. tuitati kara, a:
   that C first from a
   [right. From the first, a:

9. M: a soo desu ka. ja anoo, ↓pre-conference workshop
a that C Q well um pre-conference workshop
10. no hoohoo ga, um, kono, kono zassi ni
M method S um this this magazine D
Oh is that right. Well um, the ↓preconference workshop method (is) in um, this, this magazine

11. P: kore desu.
this C
It (is) this.

12. M: hai, soo. ja, doozo.
yes that well please
Yes, correct. Well, please (have a look).

13. P: (**)

14. M: ↓and. hai. omosiroi desyoo.
and yes interesting C
↓and. Yes. It's interesting isn't it.

((turn continues))

Siegal focuses her analysis of this excerpt on Mary's (a) lack of honorifics, and (b) her incorrect use of the epistemic modal *desyoo*. Siegal does not provide a sequential analysis, but rather examines Mary's language use from the perspective of prescriptive appropriateness. She notes that Mary's lack of honorific language when she addresses the professor may constitute a face-threatening act. Siegal also emphasizes that Mary's use of *desyoo* in line 14 (line 40 in the original) is also face threatening because it has an illocutionary force of asking for a confirmation of something that is already known to the interlocutor, and is therefore to be avoided when addressing superiors. Siegal claims that these inappropriate uses of linguistic resources work to undermine Mary's self presentation as 'polite'. In this way, Siegal emphasizes the difficulties facing learners who must attend to the diverse demands placed on them to use the language appropriately while simultaneously "engag[ing] in the act of impression management" (1996: 374).

On the other hand, in discussing the failure of Mary's professor to correct her "inappropriate language," and to show offense at her "pragmatic failures," Siegal points to "low expectations of Western learners" by the Japanese (1996: 375).[10] Siegal thus links Mary's identity of 'language

10 Siegal here alludes to *nihonjinron* 'theory of Japaneseness' notions regarding the putatively specially difficult nature of the Japanese language (see Befu 2001 for a detailed discussion of *nihonjinron*).

learner' to identities such as 'foreigner', and 'Westerner' in particular. She then goes on to discuss Mary's linguistic competence in terms of Bourdieu's (1991) notion of 'capital'. Siegal argues that such low expectations of Western learners works to position them at a disadvantage in Japanese society by limiting "the linguistic capital with which to become proficient in Japanese" (1996: 376).

Though the general lack of detail in the transcript complicates the task, I do not think that a re-examination of Siegal's (1996) data is implausible. Thus, I will reanalyze part of Extract 2 (lines 1 to 8)[11] below using a combined CA and MCA analytic framework. As Siegal emphasizes, from a prescriptive point of view Mary's Japanese is inappropriate in many ways. Siegal draws upon this prescriptive point of view in invoking notions of power differentials between Mary and her professor, and suggesting that Mary's low pragmatic proficiency works to position her at a disadvantage by undercutting her attempts to portray herself as polite. An ethnomethodological view, however, requires that such notions be suspended during the analysis. Thus, I will instead focus on the local interactional order as co-managed by the participants, and what kinds of social actions they work up in, through and for their talk.

In the following analysis, attention will be paid to (a) how the participants categorize each other and themselves, and (b) how they create and maintain intersubjectivity. Mary's turn in lines 1 to 3 orients to at least four social actions. First, it attempts to secure recognition from her professor of 'this institution', and second, it provides information about an upcoming 'international consultation'. Third, in so doing, Mary's turn categorizes her professor as 'one who is familiar with certain (presumably educational) institutions' and 'one to whom information about international consultations is potentially relevant', and fourth, it categorizes Mary as 'one who is knowledgeable concerning such things'. The professor's line 4 passes on initiating repair and responding to the categorizations made potentially relevant by Mary's turn, while simultaneously making relevant a continuation by Mary. In lines 5 and 6, Mary displays an analysis of the professor's line 4 as having claimed an understanding of her lines 1 to 3, and works to formulate an utterance about calendar dates, ostensibly making mention of the first of January. Notably, precisely at the moment she has clearly gotten off the elements of 'January' and 'first', the professor latches on with 'O:h lecture (I) know (I) know' (line 7). This utterance accomplishes several things:

1. It displays of change of state. This is accomplished by the token 'a:' in conjunction with the verb reduplication.

11 Excerpt 2 actually straddles several sequences, and ends before the last sequence is complete. Because of this, I will consider only lines 1 to 8 (lines 30 to 35 in the original).

2. It publicly displays an understanding of the proposition of Mary's lines 1 to 3 (cf. the claim to such understanding in line 4). The precise timing here suggests that this understanding was contingent upon the elements 'January' and 'first', provided in Mary's line 6.
3. It provides an 'embedded correction' (Jefferson 1983) of Mary's line 3 'kyoogi'. This correction potentially makes a situated identity of 'language learner' potentially relevant for Mary (see below).
4. It makes a knowledge claim in regard to the lecture. This is done by deploying '(I) know, (I) know'. Although Siegal (1996) provides no indication in her transcript of the relative speed of this utterance by the professor, the reduplicated manner of its production seems to display an orientation to a lateness in regard to deploying a display of recognition in relation to the lecture. This action by the professor both implicitly endorses Mary's potentially relevant categorization of him, and performs a self categorization of the professor as 'someone relevantly aware of the lecture'.
5. It passes on the opportunity to undercut Mary's self categorization as being a 'relevant knower' of matters regarding the upcoming lecture.[12]

Although it is not clear from Siegal's transcript, it appears that Mary may have produced 'soo desu' (that's right) in response to the professor's 'a: koogi'. If this is the case, Mary notably displays an immediate orientation to the lexical item *koogi* in the form of an affirmation rather than as an uptake of the correction. Mary' utterance thus neither explicitly accepts nor rejects the professor's embedded correction (see Jefferson 1983: 90), but rather displays an orientation to moving the interaction forward. Mary thus importantly does not orient to the situated identity of 'language learner', made potentially relevant for this interactional sequence by the embedded correction.

This analysis shows that, in this particular interactional sequence, Mary and her professor were able to co-constitute complex social actions and identities, and create and maintain intersubjectivity. In particular, and contrary to Siegal's (1996) analysis, though Mary's utterances were often linguistically and pragmatically inappropriate, an analysis from an ethnomethodological perspective shows that she and her professor were able to co-construct identities as 'people for whom international lectures are relevant'. Notably, however, Mary did not orient to an identity of 'language learner' when it was made potentially relevant by the professor's embedded correction of her use of the lexical item *kyoogi*. This fact seems to challenge Siegal's

12 Such an undercutting could be relevantly accomplished in this slot by deploying, e.g., *sitteimasu yo* instead of 'sitteimasu, sitteimasu'. The latter claims interactional involvement while the former claims epistemic authority and ownership (see, e.g., Kamio 1997; Rudolph 1993).

(1996) argument that Mary was placed into a disadvantageous position by her professor's failure to correct her linguistic and pragmatic short comings. Rather, opportunities for 'doing language learning' seem to have been treated as lower priority than the primary interactional business of 'doing international-lecture-related-talk'.

IV Categorial-sequential analysis and insights for research on L2 learning

As I have argued thus far, identity is inextricably related to performing social actions in talk. Among the social actions worked up and managed in talk is doing vocabulary learning.[13] Doing vocabulary learning instantiates one interactional activity for which the participants may negotiate and manage access to participation through the deployment of sequential and categorial resources. Access to doing vocabulary learning here refers to access to participation in sequences where such learning is the primary interactional business. Such access is often treated as being contingent on and reflexively intertwined with interactionally occasioned and epistemologically-bound identities such as asker/answerer; knower/wonderer; expert/novice; etc. Excerpt 3 (from the same dinner conversation between Dan and Sasaki) shows such an occasion. Prior to the excerpt, Dan and Sasaki were discussing *udon* 'udon' (i.e. thick Japanese noodles). Dan had mentioned that he likes the udon from a certain area in Osaka, and this touches off a long discussion about different types of udon and their various characteristics. In Excerpt 3, the participants talk about *tanuki-udon* (i.e., udon with either tempura in it [western Japan style], or bits of fried tempura batter in it [eastern Japan style]). (NB: the *kotti* 'here' and *mukoo* 'over there' refer to eastern Japan and western Japan, respectively).

Excerpt 3, tanuki udon (D = Dan, S = Sasaki)

1. S: kotti de (.7) tanuki udon tte iu to (.5)
   here at tanuki udon QT say if

2. tenpura no kahsu (mitai na no ga)
   tempura M dregs resemble C N S
   When (you) order (.5) tanuki-udon here (.7) something that resembles tempura dregs (comes in it)

13 I take it as an uncontested fact that vocabulary learning is one vital component of learning a second language. It should be noted, however, that doing vocabulary is a lifelong activity for any language user, and is therefore not limited to the realm of second language learning per se. As such, it is a certain possibility that sequential and categorial work similar to that discussed below might also be observed in interactions between first language speakers of a language.

3. D: a soo desu ne:
a that C I
a right hu:h,

4. S: u:n. (.9)
yeah
yea:h

5. D: a soo desu ka.= mukoo tenpura haitteru ne¿
a that C Q over there tempura in I

6. tanuki.
raccoon-dog
a really.= Over there there's tempura in (it) huh¿ Tanuki.

7. S: tanuki? a sore ka:nsai na n desu yo.
tanuki a that west Japan C N C I
Tanuki? a that's (in) we:stern Japan.

8. D: a soo [desu ka? ((smiling voice))
a that C Q
a really?

9. S: [kotti de tanuki tte iu to: (.8) tenpura
here at raccoon-dog QT say if tempura

10. no: (.3) agedama tte sittemasu?=[kasu.
M deep-fried batter QT know dregs
Whe:n (you) order tanuki here (.8) do (you) know deep-fried bits
of (.3) tempura batter?= Dregs.

11. D: [s:Oo: desu ne::.
that C I
Th:A:t's ri::ght.

12. S: sore sika [haittenai.
that except not in
That's all that (comes) in (it).

13. D: [ima made: (.) ki ga tukanakatta
now until didn't notice

14. desu ne:
C I
you kno:w (I) never noticed (.) until now

In line 1, Sasaki states that, in eastern Japan, tanuki-udon has something resembling the dregs from tempura in it. Dan responds in line 2 with 'a soo desu ne:,', which claims co-knowledge (see Kamio 1997; Rudolph 1993) of the proposition of Sasaki's line 1. Sasaki produces 'u:n.' in line 4, after which the participants allow a .9 second pause to develop. Then, in line 5, Dan

deploys 'a soo desu ka.', which ostensibly displays a change of state regarding Sasaki's lines 1 and 2, and minimally makes relevant a confirmation/repair from Sasaki, to which he latches on with 'mukoo tenpura haitteru ne¿ tanuki.' (tempura comes in tanuki [udon] over there [i.e. in western Japan], you know). This utterance works to present the difference between the two versions of tanuki-udon as a 'puzzle' (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998), and to make relevant an explanation or clarification from Sasaki. Importantly, this action also (a) makes a situated identity of 'knower' potentially relevant for Sasaki, and (b) self-categorizes Dan as 'wonderer'.

In line 7, Sasaki provides the answer made relevant by Dan's lines 5 and 6 by stating that only tanuki-udon in western Japan comes with tempura in it. Dan responds to this with another 'a soo desu ka', this time with a prosodic contour that makes it hearable as claiming an affective stance (Ochs 1996) of 'mild surprise' or 'amusement'. Sasaki immediately treats this as making relevant a further clarification by overlapping Dan's line 8 to begin an utterance which emphasizes the difference between the two versions of tanuki-udon. He does this by deploying 'kotti de tanuki tte iu to:' (when [you] order tanuki [udon] here), which is the first component of a "two-component TCU" (see Lerner 1991). This turn constructional format allows Sasaki to insert the first pair part of a Question/Answer adjacency pair: 'tenpura no: (.3) agedama tte sittemasu?' (do [you] know of fried-tempura-batter?) within his turn-in-progress. This question orients to the possibility that Dan may not be familiar with this lexical item, and thus orients to a situated identity for Dan of 'novice' or 'less-expert' in relation to this particular lexical item. Interestingly, Sasaki immediately latches on with a lexical substitute, 'kasu' (dregs), which is a more general term than 'agedama'.

In line 11, however, Dan overlaps Sasaki's 'kasu' (an action which minimally claims an understanding of the lexical item 'agedama', and thus undercuts the categorization made potentially relevant by Sasaki's line 10) with 's:Oo: desu ne:::.', which, with its falling intonation and marked prosody, is hearable as a claim of 'realization'. At this point, Sasaki provides the second component of his line 9 two-component TCU, 'sore sika haittenai' (roughly: that's all that's in it). Dan overlaps this by explicitly claiming a realization concerning the fact that the eastern Japanese version of tanuki-udon has dregs and not tempura in it (lines 13 and 14). In the interactional moments following Excerpt 3, the participants co-produce a telling in which Dan describes how, when he had ordered tanuki-udon for the first time after coming to eastern Japan, he was surprised that it had no tempura in it. Dan then accounts for this by stating that, until now, he thought he had been mistaken about the name of that particular type of udon (which, in eastern Japan is called tempura-udon, not tanuki-udon).

Thus, Dan and Sasaki make the interactional business of doing informing and learning visible to each other both through the categorial resources they co-deploy, and through the sequential organization that they co-manage in their interaction. In particular, they sequentially

co-constitute the situated identities of 'wonderer/knower' for each other. They also display a reflexive co-orientation to these identities in and through co-constituting an informing sequence, which notably becomes a frame within which they do informing and learning in relation to the semantic difference between tanuki-udon in eastern and western Japan.

V Summary and conclusion

The present essay has provided a discussion of how participant identity is both conceptualized and analyzed from the perspectives of conversation and membership categorization analysis (CA and MCA). The ways in which sequential and categorial aspects of talk are reflexively constituted have also been considered. Furthermore, this reflexive relationship has be demonstrated in the analyses. In particular, it has been emphasized that (a) potential relevancies created through the sequential deployment of categorial resources, and (b) normative orientations displayed by the participants toward misalignments in situated identity created by differential deployment of formulations of category-bound predicates are two areas wherein category and sequence are reflexively intertwined and co-constitutive.

Next, the discussion turned to a consideration of the second language research literature and the ways in which identity has been understood and analyzed by both orthodox and poststructuralist approaches, and critically considered each of the stances in the light of an ethnomethodological perspective. In illustrating one approach to a poststructuralist treatment of identity in relation to second language learning, I discussed Siegal (1996), and reanalyzed one of her data excerpts from an ethnomethodological perspective. Contrary to Siegal's (1996) analysis, when viewed from an ethnomethodological perspective, I argued that the participants successfully co-accomplished the complex social actions of co-categorization and creating and maintaining intersubjectivity. I also suggested that my analysis significantly challenges Siegal's (1996) poststructuralist view of Mary being placed in a disadvantageous position by her professor's not correcting her linguistic and pragmatic deficiencies. I showed, instead, that Mary passed on an opportunity to do 'language learning' by displaying an interactional orientation to doing 'talk-related-to-an-upcoming-international-lecture'.

In the fourth section, I discussed the notion of access to participation in vocabulary learning, and how the sequential and categorial aspects of talk are involved in managing such access. In the analysis, I showed how the participants used both sequential and categorial resources to reflexively constitute an 'informing sequence', which they used as a frame in which to do vocabulary learning in relation to the semantic meanings of the lexical item 'tanuki-udon'.

Raymond and Heritage (2006) argue that the interactional management of epistemological rights is a key resource for working up identities in interaction. This notion has broad

implications for second language learning research. From the mid to late nineteen-nineties, a number of second language researchers have problematized the practice of grouping participants into generic categories such as 'Native speaker' and 'Nonnative speaker' (e.g., Firth 2009; Firth and Wagner 1997, 2007; Hosoda 2006; Kasper 2004; Kramsch and Whiteside 2007; Norton Peirce 1995; 1997, 2000; Pavlenko and Lantolf 2000; Rampton 1995). One thrust of this movement has been to increase recognition of the fact that second language learners are not one-dimensional. Some researchers have drawn on poststructuralist notions to develop more complex views of the identities of the participants in their data (e.g., Canagarajah 2004, 2007; Norton Peirce 1995, 1997, 2000; Norton and Toohey 2002; Siegal 1996; see Block 2007 for an overview). Such studies have enriched our view of second language learners as second language users, and as people. However, with notable exceptions such as Hosoda (2006) and Kasper (2004), research examining the actual ways in which identities are treated by the participants themselves as being relevant for their second language teaching and learning activities are still relatively rare. It is hoped that the present essay will provide some insights and footholds for future research examining the relationships between identity and second language learning.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions:

^word	glottal stop
words	partial glottal stop ('creaky voice')
heh hah	laughter tokens
↑ ↓	high or low pitch (placed prior to affected element)
>words<	quicker than surrounding talk
<words>	slower than the surrounding talk
wo[rd	beginning of overlapped speech
wo]rd	end of overlapped speech
word= word	latching (no pause between utterances)
<word	'left push' (rushed, compressed beginning)
(3.3)	length of pause (measured in seconds and tenths of seconds)
(.)	pause less than one tenth of a second
(njilfamr)	unclear utterance (candidate hearing indicated in parentheses)
(***)	unrecoverable utterance (number of beats indicated by asterisks)
((words))	commentary by transcriptionist
wo:::rd	sound stretch

WORDS	louder than surrounding talk
° words°	softer than surrounding talk
words	more emphasis than surrounding talk
wo-	cut-off
a::	rising intonational contour
a::	falling intonational contour
,	level or slightly rising intonation
¿	mid rising intonation
?	full rising intonation
.	dropping intonation

Interlinear Key for Japanese	
C: Copula	PA: Passive
CT: Continuer	Q: Question marker
D: Double particle (*kamo, toka, etc.*)	QT: Quotation marker
DA: Dative particle (*he, ni*)	S: Subject marker
F: Speech filler	T: Topic marker
IT: Interjection (*e, a, ^e, ^a, etc.*)	Stylistic indicators (when necessary):
L: Linking device (*-te, de, si, kedo etc.*)	DS: Distal style
M: Noun modification particle (*no, na, etc.*)	FS: Formal style
N: Nominalizer	H: Honorific
NG: Negative	HU: Humble
O: Object marker	PS: Plain style
P: Interactional particle (*yo, ne, sa, na, etc.*)	

Works cited

上野直樹・ソーヤー理恵子.2007.『文化と状況的学習—実践、言語、人工物へのアクセスのデザイン』凡人社。

Antaki, Charles, and Sue Widdicombe. 1998. "Identity as an Achievement and as a tool," in Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage, pp. 1-14.

Befu, Harumi. 2001. *Hegemony of Homogeneity: An Anthropological Analysis of 'Nihonjinron'*, Japanese society series, Melbourne, Trans Pacific Press.

Bilmes, Jack. 1993. "Ethnomethodology, Culture and Implicature: Toward an Empirical Pragmatics," *Pragmatics*, 3, 387-409.

———. 1995. "Negotiation and Compromise," in Alan Firth (ed.), *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace*, Oxford, Pergamon Press Oxford, pp. 61-81.

———. 2008. "Generally Speaking: Formulating an Argument in the US Federal Trade Commission," *Text*, 28(2), 193-217.

———. 2009. "Taxonomies are for Talking: Reanalyzing a Sacks Classic," *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(8), 1600-1610.

Block, David. 2007. *Second Language Identities*, London, Continuum.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2004. "Multilingual Writers and the Struggle for Voice in Academic Discourse," in Aneta Pavlenko and Anne Blackledge (eds.), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp. 266-289.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2007. "Lingua Franca English, Multilingual Communities, and Language Acquisition," *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(s1), 923-939.

Drew, Paul. 2005. "Conversation analysis," in Kristine Fitch and Robert Sanders (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*, Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 71-82.

Day, Dennis. 1998. "Being Ascribed, and Resisting, Membership of an Ethnic Group," in Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage, pp. 151-170.

Edwards, Derek. 1991. "Categories Are for Talking: On the Cognitive and Discursive Bases of Categorization," *Theory & Psychology, 1*(4), 515-542.

———. 1997. *Discourse and Cognition*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

———. 1998. "The Relevant Thing about Her: Social Identity Categories in Use," in Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in talk*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage, pp. 15-33.

Eglin, Peter, and Stephen Hester. 1992. "Category, Predicate and Task: The Pragmatics of Practical Action," *Semiotica, 88*(3/4), 243-268.

Firth, Alan. 2009. "Doing Not Being a Foreign Language Learner: English as a Lingua Franca in the Workplace and (Some) Implications for SLA," *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 47*(1), 127-156.

Firth, Alan, and Johannes Wagner. 1997. On Discourse, Communication, and (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research," *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285-300.

———. 2007. Second/Foreign Language Learning as a Social Accomplishment: Elaborations on a Reconceptualized SLA," *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(5), 800-819.

Francis, David, and Christopher Hart. 1997. "Narrative Intelligibility and Membership Categorization in a Television Commercial," in Stephen Hester and Peter Eglin (eds.), *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*, Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America, pp. 123-151.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

Gass, Susan, Lee, Junkyu, and Robin Roots. 2007. Firth and Wagner (1997): New Ideas or a New Articulation?" *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(s1), 788-799.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual; Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*, Garden City, NY, Anchor Books.

Heritage, John. 1988. "Explanations as Accounts: A Conversation Analytic Perspective," In Charles Antaki (ed.), *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*, London, Sage, pp. 127-144.

Hester, Stephen, and Peter Eglin. 1997a. "Membership Categorization Analysis: An Introduction," in Stephen Hester and Peter Eglin (eds.), *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*, Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America, pp. 1-23.

———. 1997b. "The Reflexive Constitution of Category, Predicate and Context in Two Settings," in Stephen Hester and Peter Eglin (eds.), *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*, Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America, pp. 25-48.

———. 1997c. "Conclusion: Membership Categorization Analysis and Sociology," in Stephen Hester and Peter Eglin (eds.), *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*, Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America, pp. 153-163.

Hosoda, Yuri. 2006. "Repair and Relevance of Differential Language Expertise in Second Language Conversations," *Applied Linguistics, 27*(1), 25-50.

Jayyusi, Lena. 1984. *Categorization and the Moral Order*, Boston, Routledge & K. Paul.

Jefferson, Gail. 1983. "On Exposed and Embedded Correction in Conversation," in John Lee and Graham Button (eds.), *Talk and Social Organization*, Clevedon, UK, Multilingual Matters, pp. 86-100.

Kamio, Akio. 1997. *Territory of Information*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins Pub.

Kasper, Gabriele. 2004. "Participant Orientations in German Conversation-for-Learning," *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 551-567.

Kramsch, Claire, and Anne Whiteside. 2007. "Three Fundamental Concepts in Second Language Acquisition and Their Relevance in Multilingual Contexts," *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(s1), 907-922.

Lepper, Georgia. 2000. *Categories in Text and Talk: A Practical Introduction to Categorization Analysis*, London, Sage.

Lerner, Gene. 1991. "On the Syntax of Sentences-in-Progress," *Language in Society, 20*(3), 441-58.

Norton Peirce, Barbara. 1995. "Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning," *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 9-31.

———. 1997. "Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English," *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 409-429.

———. 2000. *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change*, Harlow, England, Longman.

Norton, Barbara, and Kelleen Toohey. 2002. "Identity and Language Learning," in Robert Kaplan (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 115-123.

Ochs, Elinor. 1996. "Linguistic Resources for Socializing Humanity," in John Gumperz and Stephen Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 407-438.

Omori, Makoto. 2008. "Constitution of Interculturality in an English Conversational Exchange Program," paper presented at the 18th International Congress of Linguistics, Korea University, Seoul, Korea, July 21-16, 2008.

Pavlenko, Aneta, and James Lantolf. 2000. "Second Language Learning as Participation and the (Re)construction of Selves," in James Lantolf (ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 155-178.

Paoletti, Isabella. 1998. "Handling 'Incoherence' According to the Speaker's On-Sight Categorization," in Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage, pp. 171-190.

Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*, London, Longman.

Raymond, Gregory, and John Heritage. 2006. "The Epistemics of Social Relations: Owning Grandchildren," *Language in Society, 35*(5), 677-705.

Rudolph [Yoshimi], Dina. 1993. *Getting Past Politeness: The Role of Linguistic Markers of Evidentiality and Informational Domains in Japanese Student-Teacher Interactions at the Graduate level*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, San Diego, California.

Sacks, Harvey. 1972a. "On the Analyzability of Stories by Children," in John Gumperz and Dale Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 325-345.

———. 1972b. "An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology," in David Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*, New York, Free Press, pp. 31-74.

———. 1979. "Hotrodder: A Revolutionary Category," in George Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, New York, Irvington Publishers, pp. 7-14.

———. 1995. *Lectures on Conversation*, Boston, Wiley-Blackwell.

Sawyer, Rieko. 2004. *International Graduate Students of Science in Japan: An Ethnographic Approach from a Situated Learning Theory Perspective*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Schegloff, Emmanuel. 1972. "Notes on a Conversational Practice: Formulating Place," in David Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*, New York, The Free Press, pp. 75-119.

———. 1991. "Reflections on Talk and Social Structure," in Deirdre Boden and Don Zimmerman (eds.), *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, Berkeley, University of California Press, pp. 44-70.

———. 1992. "Repair After Next Turn: The Last Structurally Provided Defense of Intersubjectivity in Conversation," *American Journal of Sociology, 97*(5), 1295-1345.

———. 2007. "A Tutorial on Membership Categorization," *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(3), 462-482.

Siegal, Meryl. 1995. *Looking East: Learning Japanese as a Second Language in Japan and the Interaction of Race, Gender and Social Context*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Siegal, Meryl. 1996. "The Role of Learner Subjectivity in Second Language Sociolinguistic Competency: Western Women Learning Japanese," *Applied Linguistics, 17*(3), 356-382.

Watson, Rod. 1978. "Categorisation, Authorisation and Blame-Negotiation in Conversation," *Sociology, 12*, 105-113.

———. 1997. "Some General Reflections on 'Categorization' and 'Sequence' in the Analysis of Conversation," in Stephen Hester and Peter Eglin (eds.), *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*, Washington, DC, International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America, pp. 49-76.

Weedon, Chris. 1987. *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*, Oxford, UK, Blackwell.

Zimmerman, Don. 1984. "Talk and Its Occasion: The Case of Calling the Police," in Deborah Schiffrin (ed.), *Meaning, Form and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*, Washington, DC, Georgetown University Press, pp. 210-228.

———. 1998. "Identity, Context and Interaction," in Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage, pp. 87–106.