Talking the talk: The interactional construction of community and identity at conversation analytic data sessions in Japan

Cade Bushnell, University of Tsukuba

Abstract:
A communities of practice framework (CoP) views learning in terms of identity (trans)formation within and through participation, utilizing a set of shared resources, in a community organized around a joint endeavor, or practice. From an ethnomethodological perspective, however, the theoretical notions of community, shared resources, and identity constitute not explanatory resources, but rather topics requiring data-grounded exploration. In other words, the following empirical questions arise: If and how the participants (a) organize their group as community, (b) co-constitute a shared repertoire of participatory resources, and (c) work up and manage identities as practitioners within that community. In the present study, I examine interactions at conversation analytic data sessions in Japan. The analyses focus on how the participants use terminology during their participation in doing data analysis, and how such terminology use is implicated in constituting their group as a community, and in working up and managing identities within that community.

Keywords: Conversation analysis; Membership categorization analysis; Communities of practice; Identity; Terminology

Introduction

In the present study, I use conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis to examine a number of interactions by a group of Japanese language users participating together in a series of self organized research meetings, or conversation analytic data sessions. This study is part of a larger research project which ethnomethodologically respecifies (see Rawls 2006) the theory of situated learning in communities of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998).

The purpose of the present study is to provide an ethnomethodological respecification of the communities of practice (CoP below) notions of community and identity. A respecification of the notion of practice is the topic of a separate study (Bushnell, in preparation). The analyses of the present study focus in particular on the ways in which the participants use conversation analytic terminology during their participation in doing data analysis at the data sessions, and how such terminology use is implicated in constituting a community, and in working up and managing identities within that community. I am particularly interested in describing the participants' procedures for interactionally co-constituting (a) their group as a *specific group*, and (b) their identities as members of that group.

Previous studies

Conversation analytic data sessions

There are still a very few studies examining data taken from conversation analytic data sessions (e.g., Antaki, Biazzi, Nissen and Wagner 2008; Tutt and Hindmarsh 2011; Bushnell 2011a). Antaki, et al. (2008: 1) articulate the goal of their study as being to "[bring] to light the workings of a routine piece of scholarly teamwork, […] and to reveal how accountability plays its part in scholars' management of competing institutional, and personal, identities." Using membership categorization analysis, Antaki, et al. describe the ways in which their participants jointly accomplish a reformulation of their evaluative,

non-technical comments, concerning the actions of the interactants appearing in their data, into technical conversation analytic terms. Tutt and Hindmarsh (2011), on the other hand, focus on describing how their participants used re-enactment as a resource by which to make mutually visible and hearable for the co-participants fleeting phenomena in the data at hand. Tutt and Hindmarsh employ sequential conversation analysis to describe the ways in which their participants deployed various verbal and gestural resources in order to highlight and (over)emphasize certain elements of the data so as to accomplish hearing or seeing an area of the data in a specific way. They further show how this is used by participants to "provide evidence for analytic claims" (2011: 234).

Finally, Bushnell (2011a)[1] uses conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis to examine a series of conversation analytic data sessions which took place at a Japanese university. Bushnell investigates the ways in which several of the core notions of the CoP framework, that is, practice, community, shared repertoire, identity, and learning as a transformation of identity within a community of practice (see Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998), interface with empirical descriptions of the interactional and discursive practices of the participants as they work to accomplish their activities in a mutually recognizable manner. Bushnell provides a comprehensive description of the various activity phases accomplished and organized by the participants at their meetings, the ways in which they treat the final activity of doing group data analysis as being their culminating and main practice, and how they manage identity over time across several series of interactional moments.

These previous studies demonstrate that conversation analytic data sessions can provide rich and useful data by which to explore the organization of social interaction. In this way, conversation analytic data sessions constitute a valid and fruitful domain of inquiry on par with any other domain; data collected from data sessions can and should be treated in a manner identical to interactional data collected from any other setting.

Communities of practice

Wenger (1998) defines community of practice in terms of a group of mutually engaging people who pursue a mutually accountable joint enterprize, and who develop and implement a shared repertoire. According to Wenger, a community of practice is ongoingly defined and reproduced by its members through a process wherein participation, learning, and identity are inextricably linked together, and both newcomers and old-timers co-negotiate their participatory identities in relation to an ever-evolving practice and its related resources and artifacts. Researchers employing CoP typically seek to understand how the members of a community jointly organize their community in relation to their practice, how they transform their practice, and their participatory trajectories and identities shift and change over time. Community participation incorporating a shared repertoire of artifacts and resources is seen as playing a vital part within this organizational and transformational process.

Traphagan (1999) and Sawyer (2003, 2004, 2007) adopt a CoP framework to explore the specific case of participation in communities of practice in Japan. Traphagan (1999) is an ethnographic study of a number of foreigners living and working in Japan. She emphasizes the complex mix of success and frustration experienced by her participants as they struggled to learn the Japanese language in and through their participation in various communities of practice. According to Traphagan, the participants' views of language learning, and their actual experiences using and learning Japanese through participation in interactions did not match their expectations. She argues that such frustrations may be

---

[1] The analytic sections of the present paper are based largely on Chapter 6 of Author (2011a).

traced to an unpreparedness on the part of the participants to navigate learning opportunities apparent in actual interactional situations, and a lack of guidance for the participants as they sought to engage in language use and learning in situations outside of the language learning classroom.

Sawyer's (2003, 2004, 2007) studies, on the other hand, focus on how socially organized access in relation to artifacts and the related modes of participation and identity is crucial for gaining opportunities to use and learn the linguistic resources associated with such artifacts and participation in the community. Sawyer's studies each use CoP to examine a common data set, and discuss, to varying extents, a contrastive pair of participants, Max and Karl. Max and Karl were both foreign students from countries in Eastern Europe who had come to Japan to pursue post graduate studies in science. Max was a matriculated student of the university in Japan and was pursuing a Master's degree in his program. Karl, on the other hand, was a doctoral level *research student*.[2] Sawyer notes that Max was able to gain access to artifacts vital to the practice of the lab community (e.g., machines for carrying out experimentation) while Karl was considerably less successful in doing so. Sawyer (2003, 2004, 2007) points up how Max's participatory trajectory worked to bring him into fuller community membership, attended by access to artifacts and resources seen as vital for participation in the practice of the community, while Karl, on the other hand, remained an outsider who could not be trusted to handle the delicate equipment used by the community in their science experiments.

These studies by Sawyer and Traphagan are valuable to the present study in terms of their specific focus on communities of practice in Japan. Furthermore, their detailed ethnographies provide insight and direction in terms of beginning to understand the ways in which identities are developed and managed in regard to a community and its practice. On the other hand, Sawyer's (2003, 2004, 2007) claims are not based upon an analysis of recorded interactional data, and though Traphagan (1999) does consider transcribed excerpts of recorded data, she does not present a systematic analysis of the data, and thus, the excerpts are largely illustrative in relation to her ethnographic descriptions. As such, the view of identity work done within communities of practice offered by these studies remains quite broad. A fine-grained and systematic analysis of on-the-ground interactional practices as they are organized and oriented to by the participants themselves during their joint participation in their practice could provide a much more focused view of the ways in which participation and identity are intertwined within actual interactional episodes. In other words, a participant-relevant approach based upon the systematic examination of interactional data could further elucidate the relationship between shifts in participation and identity, and the actual interactional practices of the participants.

Identity
Wenger (1998: 5) defines identity in terms of "personal histories of becoming in the context of our communities." The notion of identity is a key conceptual element in CoP. As discussed in the previous section, within CoP, learning and identity formation (and transformation of identity over time) are understood to be one and the same process. For example, learning may be viewed in terms of participation in the practice of a community as a newcomer or old-timer, and so on, and the ways in which these identities change over time in relation to changing modes of participation within the

---

[2] Research student is a particular status at Japanese universities which contrasts with matriculated graduate and undergraduate student status. Research students do not seek degrees from their host Japanese universities, but rather typically engage in research directed by an individual faculty member at the host university for a period of one to two years.

community. It is the goal of the present study to develop a data-driven, participant relevant description of the participants' identity work as it is accomplished in and through their development and implementation of shared resources for participation in their mutually accountable joint activity of doing data analysis.

Data, methods, and research questions

Data and methods

The data corpus of the present study consists of audio and video recordings of sixteen data sessions (approximately 2 hours each; 2,184 minutes total) held over the course of one year. All of the data sessions took place at a university in Japan. The meetings were self organized by the participants themselves, that is, they were not an official part of any curriculum of the university. All of the data were transcribed in full or part according to conversation analytic conventions. The transcripts were checked for accuracy as necessary by a Japanese first language speaker assistant (Moerman 1996). The transcripts of the present study adopt a three tiered format similar to that used in Nguyen and Kasper (2009). The first tier features a Romanized version of the Japanese according to a slightly modified version of the *kunrei-siki* system, and the second and third tiers provide a word-by-word literal translation and grammatical gloss of the first tier, and an English gloss of the first tier, respectively. Furthermore, when necessary, an additional tier providing information in regard to the non-verbal actions of the participants is included above the first tier. This supra-tier is linked to the timeline of the first tier via the use of brackets. Finally, because of grammatical and word order differences between English and Japanese (which are often the complete reverse of each other), it is at times quite difficult to provide a useful English gloss in the third tier on a line by line basis. In such cases, the English gloss is provided at the end of several lines of transcript.

The methodologies employed by the present study are conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis. Data analysis was carried out according to the standard CA practice of 1) making noticings of possibly interesting phenomena during unmotivated hearings and viewings of the data (see Sacks 1984a, 1992), 2) selecting instances to be analyzed in detail, 3) surveying the entire database for similar instances, 4) conducting a cross comparison of instances in order to identify generic interactional procedures, and 5) sharpening the analysis through the examination of deviant cases (Schegloff 1996; see also ten Have 2007; Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008).

The data sessions and participants

The stated purpose of of the conversation analytic data sessions was to provide a venue for people interested in conversation and discourse analysis to share their ideas with each other about the data with which they were each working. At each data session, one of the participants was the data provider for the session, and brought some already transcribed excerpts of his or her data along with the actual audio or video recording. As I discuss in detail elsewhere (Bushnell 2011a), each data session consisted of a series of activities: 1) a period of inspecting the recorded data and discussing the accuracy of the transcript, 2) a period of silent looking at the transcript, and 3) an open discussion of the data during which the participants would jointly work up and negotiate analyses in regard to various observable phenomena in the provided data.

At each of the data sessions, the participants were themselves engaged in examining audio or video-recorded interactional data. Because of this fact, the present study will have occasion to use the term *participant* in two distinct senses, that is, to refer to the actual participants of the present study, and to refer to the participants appearing in the data being examined by the participants of the present study.

In order to avoid confusion, from this point on, I will adopt a convention of first letter capitalization in referring to the Participants of the present study, with the uncapitalized term being left to refer to the data and participants of the Participants.

Research questions

It is the goal of the present study to develop a data-driven, participant relevant description of the ways in which the participants interactionally co-constitute themselves as a "group" (Rawls 2006: 42) co-engaging in a mutually accountable joint activity through the development and implementation of shared resources, and their identities as practicing members of that group. The following research questions are considered:

1.   In what ways do the participants treat certain terminological items as being shared resources for joint participation in their mutually accountable joint activity of doing data analysis?
2.   How do the participants interactionally co-constitute themselves as a specific group?
3.   How do the participants organize their talk-in-interaction to work up identities as practicing members within this group?

The use of terminology at the data sessions

The conversation analytic terminological resources used at the data sessions may be roughly divided into three types, English, Anglo-Japanese, and Japanese. There are three general points to be noted in relation to the participants' use of terminology. First, a major portion of the Anglo-Japanese terms deployed by the Participants seem to be derived from English language conversation analytic literature, and to have been developed and validated in, through, and for interacting at the data sessions. Second, the Participants also often deploy Japanese, and, less frequently, English terminology. Third, there are instances where these three sets of terminological resources overlap. That is, there are cases where English, Anglo-Japanese, and Japanese terms are available and differentially used by the Participants to do reference to single concepts and actions.

In the first 3 excerpts, we will look at examples of the Participants' differential use of English, Japanese, and Anglo-Japanese terminology, respectively, in referring to a single referent: the conversation analytic notion of try marking (see Sacks and Schegloff 1979). Excerpt 1 follows a hearing of the audio data, which was provided for this data session by Wendy. The Participants are jointly working towards building up a description of the manner in which one interactant seems to suddenly shift her interactional project mid-utterance. We join the interaction just as Elmer asks about the characteristics of the intonational contour of the participant's deployment of the word *kuruma*.

Excerpt 1: Try mark sareteru ka doo ka

```
01                    (1)
02       E:           .hh [ano kuruma wa:] (.2) ano: tr-
                      .hh    um   car    T         um    tr-
                      .hh um a:s for car (.2) um tr-
03       M:              [(x x x x x)]
04       E:           a- aga (.5) tte (.4)
                            rising
```

```
05     Y:        °ku[ruma.°
                    car.
                  °car.°
06     E:         [masita kke?=
                    was    Q
                  was (it) rising?=
07     P:        =.FFF (.5)
                  .fff
                 =.FFF (.5)
08     E:        tr- [ano tr- try mark (.3) sareteru=
                 tr-  um  tr-  try mark        being done
09     W:            [°kuruma.° un.
                       car      yeah
10     E:        =ka doo ka.
                  Q  how  Q
                 whether or not (it) was being (.3) tr- um tr- try marked.
```

In line 2, Elmer initiates a new sequence in which he first produces a topical element *kuruma wa:* ("car" + topic marker), which is done in overlap with some talk by Murata. Then following a .2 second pause he ostensibly continues on with the predication projected by his just-prior topicalization work. After some self repair, he incrementally delivers the predication-so-projected, *aga (.5) tte (.4) masita kke?* ("remind me was it rising?") (lines 4 and 6).[3] In line 5, Yi displays her understanding of the trajectory of Elmer's utterance-in-production by quietly enacting the intonational contour in question. In line 7, one of the co-Participants produces an audible display of considering the matter with a labial-fricative inhalation (i.e., .FFF). Then, following a .5 second silence, Elmer undertakes production of a new turn-constructional unit (TCU; see Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974) in line 8. This TCU employs the English term *try mark* to ask whether or not the participant's production of *kuruma* employed try marking.

In Excerpt 2, Elmer requests a Japanese equivalent for the English *try mark*. In this way, he displays an orientation to the Japanese language as being the medium of the interaction on this occasion (see, e.g., Gafaranga 1999, 2000; Gafaranga and Calvo, 2001). In response to Elmer's request, the term *sikoo hyoosiki* ("try mark") is collaboratively provided by Murata and Yi.

Excerpt 2: Sikoo hyoosiki
```
14     Y:        a: koko ni[:,
                 a  here  DA
                 a: here,
15     M:                  [>^a sikoo
                             a   try
                           ^a try
```

---

[3] Note that Elmer's self repair in line 2 seems to work to redirect from a production of try mark to providing an apparent circumlocution of the concept of try marking, in lines 4 and 6.

```
16              hyoosiki (da)<.=
                  mark      C
                mark.=
17      E:      =sikoo hyoo[siki?
                  try       mark
                =try mark?
18      M:                 [sikoo hyoosiki (xxx)=
                             try      mark
                           try mark (xxx)=
19      Y:                 [a:: a:: ha:i=
                             a    a   yes
                           a:: a:: ye:s=
20      M:      =so so soo.
                that that that
                =right right right.
```

Prior to line 14, Yi has been engaging in a search through a published article which she happened to have in her bag. In line 14, Yi claims to have been successful in her search for the term. She identifies the location through a pointing gesture with her hand and a deployment of the deictic term *koko* ("here"). In line 15, Murata briefly overlaps Yi's line 14 with *>^a sikoo hyoosiki da<* ("oh it's try mark"). This utterance not only functions to claim a recognition and validation of the term-so-found as being the relevant one, but also to make the term available to Elmer, who is seated on the other side of a table. Then, in line 17, Elmer displays having been able to pick up the phonological material-so-provided, and moves to obtain a confirmatory co-Participant response through the deployment of a rising intonational contour. Elmer's utterance is overlapped with strong claims of recognition and confirmation work (apparently in response to Elmer's line 17) by Murata and Yi in lines 18 through 20.

Thus, Excerpts 1 and 2 show the participants using two different terminological resources in order to refer to try marking, that is, the English *try mark*, and the Japanese *sikoo hyoosiki*. On other occasions, the Participants were observed to deploy yet another terminological resource: the Anglo-Japanese *torai maaku* and its morphological variant, *torai maakaa*. Excerpt 3 provides an example of this. Approximately five minutes after the end of Excerpt 2, Murata briefly leaves the room, and Yi, Elmer and Wendy are discussing the data in her absence.

Excerpt 3: Torai maaku
```
16      Y:      u:n. so- sono baai mo aru n
                yeah th- that case  also exist N
                yea:h. there are those cases too
17              desu yo ne,
                  C   P  P
                right,
18      E:      u:n.
                yeah
                yea:h.
```

```
19      Y:       torai ma[aku tte[yu no wa:
                   try    mark   QT say N  T
                 as far as try mark goes
20      W:                [u:n.
                           yeah
                          yea:h
21      E:                          [u:n. soo desu ne,
                                     yeah that  C   P
                                    yea:h. right,
((lines omitted))
34      W:       ((noise from mouse))
35      Y:       de soo yu koto na n da kedo:,
                 and that say thing C N  C but
                 and that's how things are bu:t,
36               koko de wa soo yu torai maa (.3) ka
                 here at  T that say try    mar     ker
37               jana:i kara:[.sss]
                 C-NG  because .sss
                 the try mar (.3) ker here is no:t that kind so: .sss
38      E:                         [u:n.]
                                    yeah
                                   yea:h.
```

In line 16, Yi says "*sono baai mo aru n desu yo ne*," (there are also cases like that right). Her utterance design functions to request a confirmation in regard to the matter from Elmer, which is provided with *un* in line 18. Then, in line 19, Yi produces *torai maaku* ("try mark"). Her production of this object is smooth and without hitch. Another notable characteristic of Yi's production of *torai maaku* is its clear and distinct Japanese phonology, which creates a distinct contrast with Elmer's just-prior productions of the English *try mark*.[4] Then, Yi produces a morphological variant, *torai maakaa* ("try marker") in line 36.

Excerpts 1 through 3 show the Participants using an overlapping set of terminological resources in order to refer to the notion of try marking: *try mark*, *sikoo hyoosiki*, and *torai maaku/torai maakaa*. Questions arise in regard to the interactional work accomplished by the Participants' differential use terminology. For instance, how do the Participants treat certain terminological resources as being valued tools for their joint participation at the data sessions? How does the Participants' differential use

---

[4] It is relevant to mention that Yi is able to speak English with fair proficiency, as is attested by her occasional participation in another conversation analytic gathering which maintains an English language format. Furthermore, in subsequent data sessions in the current data corpus, Yi uses a distinctly English pronunciation in talking about a bit of data that featured a participant alternating into English to talk about a picture of an urn that she was asked to discuss with another participant. Thus, it is highly unlikely that Yi was incapable of pronouncing try mark with a distinct English phonology. The fact that she deploys Japanese phonology in her productions in Excerpt 3 functions to make the object hearable as an Anglo-Japanese lexical item, and not an English one.

of terminology function to constitute themselves as a specific group? How is the deployment of terminological resources involved in working up identities as members of that group?

The use of Anglo-Japanese terms for doing data analysis
Ethnomethodology views social order as being an ongoing members' accomplishment (Garfinkel 1967). Sacks (1984b) adopts this stance in discussing how people accomplish "being ordinary." Sacks argues that being ordinary is not a given, and that it doesn't come about by chance or without effort. Rather, he maintains, being ordinary is accomplished by "making a job of, and finding an answer to, how to do 'being ordinary'" (1984b: 415). In other words, according to Sacks, being ordinary is accomplished in and through ongoing members' work to constitute their actions and the states of affairs around them as being unremarkable and usual. The ethnomethodological finding that social reality is accomplished in and through ongoing members' work is relevant to the analyses of this section. As we will see, the Participants of this study treat certain terminology as constituting an unremarkable and unnoticeable participatory resource.

Prior to the following excerpt, Zed had noted an area in the data where he claimed that the participants could have accomplished a topical shift but did not. Zed formulates a description of the area. The excerpt begins with Yi requesting a clarification in regard to Zed's prior talk, and in the course of providing a response, Zed deploys the term *ripea* ("repair").

Excerpt 4: Ma ripea tte yu ka

```
01      Y:        nana juu nana gyoo me de hoka no otoko no
                  seven ten  seven line.number at other M   man   M
                  at line number seventy-seven "is it another
02                ko desu ka? tte yu koto de: (1.1) doo
                  child C   Q   QT say thing by          how
                  boy?" by saying this (1.1) how
03                owarase:reba ii ka ga?
                   cause.to.end  good Q  S
                  to end it is?
04                (.6)
05                ((sound of pages turning))
06      Z:        soo. (.2) de(h)su ne, nanka nana .hh (.8)
                  that          C     P    some  seven .hh
                  right. (.2) le(h)t's see, like seven .hh (.8)
07                k- ko- koko de wa: ano hanashi wo tenkan
                  k- ko- here   at T  um   talk   O  change
                  h- he- here um changing the topic
08                shite mo ii desu kedo: .hh [kore wo (.4)
                  alright.to.do   C   but   .hh   this  O
                  would be alright bu:t .hh this (.4)
09      Y:                                    [u:n.
                                               un
                                              yea:h.
```

```
10      Z:        mae no hanashi (watashi wa) wakarimashita yo
                  front M    talk      I     T     understood     P
11                tte yu: .h koto shimesu tame ni kono nana juu
                  QT   say .h thing   show   so.that  this seven ten
                  in order to show that "I understood the prior talk" this line number seventy
12                nana gyoo me  no .hh [hoka no otoko no ko
                  seven line.number M  .hh  other  M    man   M child
                  seven "is it another boy?"
13           Y:                         [a::.
                                          a
                                         a::.
14      Z:        desu ka? tte yu  yoo   na (.) ma ripea tte yu ka
                   C    Q   QT say appearance M     well repair  QT say  Q
                  this kind of (.) well repair or
15                .hh sono*:* watashi wa rikai siteiru tte
                  .hh    that      I    T comprehend doing   QT
                  .hh tha*:*t "I understand"
16                yu    yoo   na (1) situmon wo sita n desu yo ne?
                  say appearance M     question  O   did  N  C   P  P
                  he asked this kind of (1) question, you know?
17                (2)
```

In line 14, Zed deploys *ripea* ("repair") as part of his response to the request by Yi in lines 1 to 3. In these lines, Yi identifies an area on the transcript and recycles a bit of Zed's prior, that is, *doo owarase:reba ii ka* ("how to end it") with a rising intonation (line 3). Notably, Yi's utterance is grammatically incomplete in that it ends with the subject particle *ga*, and hearably requests Zed to provide its grammatical completion (Lerner 2004; see Koshik 2002 for a discussion of a similar device in a pedagogical context). In this way, Yi's lines 1 to 3 are hearable as constituting a request for clarification in regard to the talk Zed has based upon his description of participant actions (partially reformulated here by Yi in lines 1 and 2).

Following a .6 second pause filled with the sound of pages turning, in line 6, Zed produces *soo* ("right"). This seems to treat Yi's lines 1 to 3 as a request for confirmation rather than clarification. However, following a .2 second pause during which Yi provides no indication of uptake, Zed undertakes the production of additional talk in lines 6 through 16, which ends up being a reformulation of his description of the interactant's actions, and an attempt at naming the actions. It is in the course of this activity, in line 14, that Zed produces *ripea* ("repair"). This item is produced following a micropause, prefaced by the discourse marker *ma*, which potentially functions to display a tentative stance in relation to the material following it, appended with the self repair initiation marker *tte yu ka* ("or rather") (Rosenthal 2008) and followed up with a reformulation of Zed's just prior suggestion that the question was designed to display an understanding of the prior talk. These features, taken together, work to indicate that Zed has deployed the term *ripea* as a provisional name for the participant's actions. It is important to note that the term *ripea* is deployed here in a smooth, unhesitant manner within the intonational contour of the phrase *ma ripea tte yu ka* ("well repair or rather"). In this way, Zed treats the

term as an unproblematic and matter-of-fact solution to his interactional business of providing a provisional name for the participant's actions. In other words, while he treats as possibly problematic the applicability of the term as a final name for this participant's actions on this particular occasion, he simultaneously treats the term as a transparent and unproblematic interactional resource. Thus, Excerpt 4 is an example of how the Participants treat their deployment of Anglo-Japanese terminology as an unnoticeable and unremarkable event.

Terminology use and identity within the group
    Self repair and constructing an identity as a group member
We may now examine some cases where the invisible is made visible as the Participants display orientations to the terms they deploy. This is done primarily through the use of self repair as a device for organizing the use of terminological resources. While the Participants very rarely apply other repair to the terminology used during their interactions, there are a number of instances in my data corpus where they apply self repair by replacing one term with another within their own utterances.

    A point that requires emphasis in relation to this kind of self repair by the Participants is the fact that, in most instances, the terminology which becomes the target of the Participants' self repair work is mutually understandable for all co-present. In other words, in many cases, it is not possible to attribute the targeting of the self repaired terminology to any issues of intelligibility. A question may be posed, therefore, as to the kinds of interactional work being accomplished by the differential deployment of these terms.

    Just prior to the excerpt, the Participants were discussing whether or not the participant's actions observable in the data at hand are analyzable as constituting embedded correction (see Jefferson 1983). We join the interaction just after Abe has submitted to the group a hypothetical version of the participant's actions which he seems to see as being a possible instance of embedded correction. Yi suggests that such a case would instantiate a repair initiation. In her reference to repair initiation, Yi initially deploys the Japanese term *syuufuku* ("repair"), but then self repairs by replacing this with an Anglo-Japanese term, *ripea* ("repair"). In the analysis, I show how Yi's actions display an orientation to *ripea* as being a valued terminological resource, and how her own use of this term works to constitute (a) the co-present Participants as a group with a shared set of terminology,[5] and (b) Yi herself as a practicing member of this group.

Excerpt 5: Ripea inisieesyon

---

[5] One reviewer was concerned that the status of terminological resources at the data sessions might come across incorrectly as being a "threshold issue" (Schegloff 1991: 62). It should be noted that I do not claim that the terms are necessarily pre-established or pre-known, though the Participants themselves may treat them as such. For instance Zed's fluent and matter of course production of ripea in Excerpt 4 seems to treat the term as one established within the group as a valued terminological resource prior to his deployment of it. On the other hand, there are some instances in the data that cannot be included here due to space limitations (see however Author, in preparation) where the Participants seem to constitute terminological items as being valued participatory resources in a rather impromptu or on-the-fly manner. Thus, the valued status of terminology does not seem (a) to necessitate a long history of use, (b) to be brought off in one take, nor (c) to be settled once and for all. Rather, the terminology is, in some sense, constituted anew as a valued resource with each instance of its deployment and ratification by the Participants.

```
01      Y:      ah. (.) e. (.2) juu go de:
                ah         e      ten five  at
                ah. e. (.2) at fifteen
02              (.2) isu?=
                chair
                (.2) chair?=
03      A:      =i- a: ju[u go de
                i-  a   ten five  at
                =i- a: at fifteen
04      Y:             [tte yuu.
                        QT   say
                         say.
05      A:      is[u tte yuu to[ka,
                chair  QT  say  and.so.forth
                say chair and so forth
06      S:        [un. a:.
07      Y:                      [sore wa: (1.3)
                                 that   T
                                 that is (1.3)
08              maa <syuufuku> (.4) inisieesyon.
                well repair          initiation
                well <repair> (.4) initiation.
09                 (.3)
10      Y:      a- a- n ripea inisiee[syon.
                a- a- n repair   initiation
                a- a- n repair initiation
11      S:                            [u:n.=
                                       yeah
                                       yea:h.
12      Y:      =ma kooi tosite wa ripea
                ma action   as   T repair
                =well as an action it is repair
13              i[nisieesyon. <de: .hh
                initiation      and  .hh
                initiation. <a:nd .hh
14      S:       [u:n. u:n. (xx)
                  yeah yeah
                  yea:h. yea:h. (xx)
15      A:       [u:n. u:n.
                  yeah yeah
                  yea:h. yea:h.
16      Y:      sono ripea inisieesyon de
                that repair   initiation   by
                by that repair initiation
```

```
17                nanka  hoka  no  koto
                  some    other M   thing
18                yattei[masu yo ne, tabun.=
                     doing      P  P   perhaps
                  he is doing some other thing you know, perhaps.=
19     S:                [un un.
20                =un.
```

Immediately prior to line 1, Abe asks a hypothetical question in regard to what kind of action would be instantiated were the participant to have said *isu* ("chair") rather than *mono* (thing). In lines 1, 2 and 4, Yi nominates line fifteen in the transcript as a candidate location for such a deployment of *isu*; Abe and Suzuki provide confirmatory and acknowledgement displays in response in lines 3, 5, and 6. Then, in line 7, Yi produces *sore wa:* ("that" + topic marker), which grammatically projects a comment to be provided in regard to the topic-so-marked. Yi's co-Participants display their understandings of Yi's utterance as so functioning through allowing a 1.3 second silence to develop in line 7.

Following the 1.3 second pause, in line 8, Yi produces *maa <syuufuku> (.4) inisieesyon* ("well repair initiation"). This utterance is prefaced by the discourse marker *maa*, which functions to display a tentative stance in regard to the material to follow. This, taken together with the 1.3 second delay (line 7), functions to frame the element *syuufuku* ("repair") as being the tentative upshot of a word search.[6] Furthermore, Yi produces *syuufuku* at a slow pace, and allows a .4 second pause following its production. These features of Yi's utterance design ostensibly function to treat her use of *syuufuku* here as being somehow marked.

Yi's line 8 instantiates a possible completion point for her TCU, and is followed by a .3 second transition space during which none of the Participants move to begin speech production. Then, Yi breaks the silence to produce "a- a- n," which functions to mark the initiation of self repair. She then submits *ripea inisieesyon*, which notably replaces the element *syuufuku* ("repair") with *ripea* ("repair") (line 10). In this way, Yi's utterances in lines 7 to 10 work to display an orientation to participation in the interaction on this occasion as being relevantly accomplishable through the deployment of *ripea* rather than *syuufuku*. In particular, Yi's repair work treats *ripea*, rather than *syuufuku*, as being the valued resource for participation on this occasion. In this way, Yi displays an orientation to her participation on this interactional moment during her participation in doing data analysis as being relevantly accomplishable via the use of a particular term, and hence to the group of Participants as instantiating a particular group, in the sense being "a set of interpretive procedures" (Rawls 2006: 42). In other words, Yi's actions in organizing her use of terminology display an orientation to the terminology as a shared participatory resource, and thus to using a "shared set of methods for producing [the] situation" (Rawls 2006: 44), i.e., doing data analysis. Furthermore, though her deployment of *ripea inisieesyon*, Yi accomplishes her own participation in doing data analysis as a display of group membership.

---

[6] Another possibility is that Yi spends the 1.3 seconds examining available evidence such as the transcript prior to providing the (relevantly analytical) comment projected by *sore wa:* in line 7. However, the absence of video data for this excerpt makes an analysis of gaze distribution impossible. It is relevant to note, however, that there are no sounds of paper rustling, or other indications that Yi might be examining the transcript during the pause.

In line 11, Suzuki overlaps the final part of Yi's *inisieesyon* to produce *u:n* ("yea:h"), which claims a recognition of and validates Yi's use of the term. It may be noted that, during the .3 second silence in line 9, Suzuki provides no such response following Yi's line 8 *<syuufuku> (.4) inisieesyon*. It is likely that Yi's line 10 self repair was carried out in part in reference to this lack of co-Participant response in line 9. In this way, *ripea* is interactionally treated by the Participants as the valued terminological resource relative to *syuufuku* on this occasion.

In lines 12 and 13, Yi reformulates her utterance as one specifically describing the "action" (*kooi*) of the participant. Here she again deploys *ripea inisieesyon*, notably with no hesitation marker or other speech perturbance. In lines 14 and 15, Suzuki and Abe provide u:n. u:n ("yea:h. yea:h") in overlap with Yi's line 13, just as it becomes clear that Yi is repeating *ripea inisieesyon*. At this point, Yi undertakes a new TCU with a left-pushed (Jefferson 2004; Schegloff 2005) production of the continuation-indicative *de:* followed by an inhalation (line 13).[7] Then, in lines 16 to 18, Yi produces an utterance which suggests that the participant's utterance is accomplishing additional work beyond initiating repair. Here, Yi again produces *ripea inisieesyon* (line 16), and does so seamlessly within the intonational contour of her utterance. In lines 19 and 20, Suzuki displays acknowledgement in regard to Yi's lines 16 to 18 suggestion. Thus, Yi's smooth and matter-of-fact productions of *ripea inisieesyon* in lines 10, 12, 13, and 16, and her co-Participant's responses to these productions, work to treat the term as being the appropriate resource for doing reference to the referent on this interactional occasion.

The following excerpt provides another example of a Participant, Suzuki, applying self repair to replace an initially deployed *syuufuku* ("repair") with the Anglo-Japanese term *ripea* ("repair"). At the data session from which the excerpt is taken, the group is examining a bit of data that features a brief instance of language alternation, from Japanese to English. Prior to the excerpt, the Participants had been working up an analysis in regard to this language alternation. In particular, the Participants were concerned with understanding how the participant came to produce the alternation at that point in the interaction. In the excerpt, Suzuki is formulating an analytic opinion based upon her description of the participant's actions (see Bushnell 2011a).

Excerpt 6: Syuufu- ripea

```
01      S:       yappari  juu no emmu de  ikkai kakuni:n
                 as.expected ten  M  'M'  at    once  confirm
02               mo- (.2) ima nan- syuufu- ripea
                 mo-       now  wha-  repai-  repair
03      ?:       ((rustling sound: .4))
04      S:       yookyuu sareteru no[de:
                 request  be.done.to    so

                 as expected at 10 M once confirmation mo- (.2) now
                 wha- syuufu- ripea (.4) is being requested so:
05      P:                          [u:n.
                                      yeah
                                     yea:h.
```

```
06      S:      .hh sore ni taisite (.2) hitotu
                .hh  that towards              one
                .hh to that (.2) one thing
07              (.2) sono (.5)   gokee      ni tuite wa
                     that   morphological.form  about   T
                (.2) that (.5) about the morphological form
08              kakunin <syoonin wo atae (.) teru no kana,
                confirm  endorse  O   give         N   Q
                I think she may be giv (.) ing confirmation <endorsment,
09      Y:      °(a)    gokee      ni tuite no kakunin (ka).°
                a morphological.form about   M   confirm   Q
                °(a) confirmation about the morphological form.°
```

Excerpt 6 features two instances of self repair by Suzuki, at lines 2 and 7, respectively. We are concerned primarily with the one in line 2. In lines 1 to 3, Suzuki develops a description by first deploying a line number citation, and then describing the participant's actions. She then appends the device *node* to this description (line 3), which works to set the description up as a rational basis for forthcoming analytic talk (Bushnell 2011a). This descriptive work is receipted by an unidentifiable Participant in line 5. Then, in lines 6 to 8, Suzuki delivers an analytic opinion that the participant's actions function to give a confirmation or endorsement in relation to the morphological form of the English word as a response to being solicited for repair.

In the descriptive portion of Suzuki's analysis, she first produces *kakuni:n* ("confirm") (line 1), and follows this with "mo-" and a .2 second silence (line 2). The sound stretch, cut off, and brief silence function to indicate the beginning of self repair operations. Suzuki then produces *ima* ("now") followed by *nan-* ("wha-"), which is likely the beginning of *nan tte iu no* ("what is it called") — a device typically employed to indicate that a word search is underway. It is at this point that she produces the self repair s*yuufu- ripea* ("repai- repair"). This self repair notably replaces *syuufuku* ("repair") with *ripea* ("repair"). Furthermore, Suzuki places emphatic stress on the replacement item (i.e., *ripea*). This feature seems to work to display an orientation to *ripea* as being the "item-that-I-meant-to-produce."

Suzuki's self repair is completed within her TCU, prior to a possible completion point (see Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977). In this way, Suzuki's self repair here differs slightly in terms of its positioning from Yi's self repair (cf. Excerpt 5, line 10), which was carried out in the transition space following the possible completion of her TCU, and seems to have been carried out in partial reference to an absence of co-Participant response. However, it is important to note that both of these instances of self repair target identical items as their trouble sources, that is, the Japanese term *syuufuku* ("repair"), and replace these with items which are also identical, that is, the Anglo-Japanese term *ripea* ("repair"). Thus, the analyses of Excerpts 5 and 6 demonstrate how the Participants treat the term *ripea* as being the valued resource for accomplishing their participation in doing data analysis, relative to the synonymous term *syuufuku*.

While, as discussed in the prior subsection, the Participants routinely treat their deployment of certain terminology as being unnoticeable, there are times when the Participants' use of terminology is treated as warranting special interactional attention. Excerpts 5 and 6 are two such cases: The Participants were shown to perform self-repair work to replace a Japanese terminological item with an Anglo-Japanese terminological item; I have argued that such repair work functions to treat the

replacement items as being valuable joint resources for participation in doing data analysis, relative to the replaced items. Furthermore I have suggested that, through displaying orientations to certain terminology as being valuable for participation in doing data analysis, the Participants co-constitue their group as a particular group, and their identities as practicing members within this group. In the following section, I further explicate the ways in which the Participants' differential deployment of terminological resources is implicated in working up and managing identities within their on-goingly accomplished group.

Terminology use in accomplishing the visibility of otherness

In the preceding section, we saw how the Participants' use of self repair worked to display orientations to using certain kinds of terminology over others, and how this functioned in turn to constitute their group as a particular group with shared participatory resources, and their identities as members within that group. Now, we will turn to a consideration of the corollary to this, that is, the accomplishment of the categorization of a Participant as a newcomer or relative outsider to the group. Such categorization work is accomplished by the participants through assembling self and other into separate categories. One procedure for accomplishing this involves the use of everyday Japanese terminology (rather than the terminology otherwise treated as being valued for accomplishing participation in doing data analysis) by longstanding member Participants in utterances directed to incipient member Participants. Such a use of terminology treats the incipient member Participants as not sharing the terminological resources of the group.

Excerpt 7 provides a clear example of this procedure. In order to appreciate the interactional work being done by the Participants, a bit of background will be useful: The term used regularly by the Participants during their participation in doing data analysis to refer to the notion of *pre-action* (see, e.g., Schegloff 2007) is *purii* ("pre"). In Excerpt 7, however, the use of this term is avoided, and an alternate term from everyday Japanese, that is, *maeoki* ("preface, introduction"), which is approximately synonymous with *purii*, is used instead. In the excerpt, the Participants are working with a bit of data provided by Zed. The group has just finished looking at the transcript and is working towards getting underway with the analysis. Ru, who had participated in only one prior data session, uses this shift between activities as an opportunity to ask a question in order to reconfirm the area of the data in which Zed is interested.

Excerpt 7: Maeoki

```
01      R:      sumimasen.
                excuse.me
                excuse me.
02      Z:      hai.
                yes
                yes.
03      R:      zed san wa (.2) ano ima mondai
                Zed  Mr. T       uhm  now problem
04              siteru⁸ tokoro wo moo itido
                doing    place  O   more once
```

---

[8] Prescriptively speaking, Ru's *mondai siteru* ("probleming") is incorrect. However, the Participants themselves do not appear to orient to this usage, and so I do not consider it in my analysis.

```
05                        ukagatte mo yorosii de[su kah? u heh
                             alright.if.I.ask-H      C    Q    u heh
                          would it be alright if I were to ask once the place (.2)
                          you are probleming? u heh
06           Z:                                         [a eet:o: .hh
                                                          a   uhm     .hh
                                                         a uh:m: .hh
07                        futatu  aru n desu ke[do:
                          two.items exixt N  C      but
                          there are two items bu:t
                                                       [((nods))
08           R:                                        [hai.
                                                        yes
                                                        yes.
09           Z:           hitotu wa juu go gyoo me:, (.2)
                          one      T ten five line.number
                          one is line number fiftee:n, (.2)
10           R:           hai.=
                          yes
                          yes.=
11           Z:           =no:. (.3) eeto puro tosite
                           M          uhm   pro   as
12                        motitakunai desu ka? [tte yu no ga:
                          don't.want    C   Q     QT say one S
                          =whe:re. (.3) uhm the one 'as a pro don't you want to have it?' is
                                                    [((nodds))
13           R:                                     [un.
                                                     yeah
                                                     yeah.
14           Z:           .hh maa n:anraka no kooi no (.2) pu-
                          .hh DM some.kind  M action M         pr-
15                        ano::: maeoki ni natteiru [to yu
                          uhm     preface   becoming    QT say
16           R:                                      [((nods))
17           Z:           fuu ni kanjita n [desu kedo:
                          like  felt    N   C     but
                          .hh well I felt like it forms a (.2) *pu- maeoki* for
                          s:ome kind of action bu:t
18           R:                             [hai.
                                             yes
                                             yes.
```

```
19    Z:        sore ga doo yu  kooi no maemuki⁹
                that  S  what say action M   positive
20              ni natteru ka wo .hh (.4) kijutu
                becoming  Q  O  .hh         describe
21              suru no ga hitotu no mokuteki: de
                do   N  S   one    M  purpose    C
                what kind of action it forms a positive for .hh
                (.4) describing this is one purpo:se and
                ((continues))
```

The excerpt begins with an attention getting sequence (lines 1 and 2), after which Ru requests permission to ask a question, that is, *ukagatte mo yorosii desu kah?* ("would it be alright if I were to ask?"). The question embedded in Ru's utterance ostensibly inquires about the area of the data in which Zed is interested. Zed provides an initial response to Ru's question by producing *futatu aru n desu kedo:* ("there are two items b<u>u</u>:t"), which projects an explanation, and specifies that the explanation will be organized into two parts (line 7). Ru receipts this with *hai* ("yes"), accompanied with a nod (line 8). In the analysis below, I examine only the first part of Zed's two part answer.

In line 9, Zed goes about delivering the answer-so-projected, an action which continues beyond line 21 of the excerpt. In his answer, Zed first indicates an area on the transcript via the deployment of a line number citation (line 9), after which he quotes the participant's utterance at this location (lines 11 and 12), states that he has an impression that this utterance by the participant instantiates a pre for some kind of action (lines 14, 15, and 17), and then specifies a concern for developing a description of what kind of action for which the utterance instantiates a pre (lines 19 to 21).

Of particular interest to the analysis is Zed's self repair work in lines 14 and 15. In line 14, following an inbreath, Zed first produces *maa n:anraka no kooi* ("well so:me kind of action"). This utterance is designed (through its formulation incorporating the devices *maa* ["well"] and *nanraka* ["some kind"], as well as the sound stretch) so as to display a tentative stance in regard to the exact nature of the participant's action. Then, following a .2 second silence, Zed produces what is almost certainly the first part of *purii* ("pre"), *pu-* (line 14). However, Zed cuts off mid production and follows with the considerably sound stretched filler *ano:::* ("uh:::m"), by which he seems to display some trouble with utterance production (line 15). Then, he resumes by producing *maeoki* ("preface, introduction"). Ru receipts this with a nod (line 16), and Zed continues on smoothly with utterance production (lines 15 and 17).

In the previous section, we examined in detail some ways in which the Participants apply self repair to organize their deployment of terminology during their participation in doing data analysis. In particular, the analyses pointed up how, by replacing certain terminological items, the Participants were able to co-constitute their group as a particular group with a shared set of resources, and themselves as practicing members within that group. Notably, the terminological replacements observed during this procedure involved changing out a Japanese term for an Anglo-Japanese term treated as being a valued resource for participation in doing data analysis. In this light, it is interesting to note that Zed's self repair work in lines 14 and 15 of Excerpt 7 involves a replacement ostensibly the inverse of those observed in the previous section. In other words, rather than replace some term with a terminological resource shared

---

⁹ Here Zed clearly says *maemuki* ("forward facing, positive").

by the group, here Zed replaces the shared term *purii* ("pre") with the everyday term *maeoki* ("preface, introduction").

In this way, Zed's self repair in lines 14 and 15 treats *purii* as being possibly problematic in some respect, while simultaneously treating *maeoki* as being unproblematic in that respect. Importantly, this action is assembled by Zed as part of a response to a question by Ru. In this way, Zed's utterance works up and makes visible identities for (a) him, as a practicing member who prioritizes use of the shared resources of the group (i.e., he initially formulates his utterance using *purii*), and (b) Ru, as an outsider or newcomer, who is not yet conversant with certain terminological resources of the group (i.e., he replaces *purii* with *maeoki*). Then, in his subsequent utterance, Zed deploys *maemuki* ("positive, forward facing") (line 19). The facts that (a) this word does not make sense within the context of Zed's utterance-so-far, and that (b) an identical utterance format, that is, *X kooi no Y* ("action X's Y") is deployed both here and in lines 14 and 15, strongly suggest that Zed's use of *maemuki* here is a slip of the tongue production of *maeoki*.[10] Assuming that this is the case, this subsequent unproblematic and unhesitating use of a replacement term for *purii* functions to display a further orientation to *purii* as requiring a substitute term from everyday Japanese on this occasion.

The analyses of this section have pointed up the ways in which the Participants interactionally co-constitute themselves as a group, and their identities within that group. In Excerpts 5 and 6, Yi and Suzuki, respectively, were demonstrated to display orientations to the use of a certain terminological item (i.e., *ripea*) over another (*syuufuku*). In so doing, their actions treat the use of *ripea* as a shared method (Rawls 2006: 44) for accomplishing their participation in the interaction, and reflexively, the co-present Participants as a group, and themselves as competent practicing members of that group. In this way, Yi's and Suzuki's treatment of the group-so-constituted as a providng a resource, or "set of interpretive procedures" (Rawls 2006: 42) by which to organize their participation is thrown into strong relief. In Excerpt 7, Zed's replacement of the Anglo-Japanese term *purii* with the everyday *maeoki* also draws on such interpretive procedures. In this case, however, Zed's actions function not only to categorize himself as a competent practicing member of the group, but to treat Ru as an outsider or newcomer to the group.

Conclusion

The analyses of the present study provide an ethnomethodological view of the accomplishment of identity, shared resources, and group, and elucidate the role of talk-in-interaction in the processes of these accomplishments. In particular, I have demonstrated the way in which a group is constituted in and through the talk-in-interaction of the Participants as they engage in the practice of doing data analysis. Likewise, identity in relation to that group and its joint activity was shown to be inextricably intertwined with the Participants' displaying for one another the ways in which they used certain terminological resources. Furthermore, the behavior of the Participants in regard to their use of terminology was shown to reflexively treat the terminology as being valued for participation on those particular occasions, and the Participants themselves as a particular group with a shared set of participatory resources. In this way, for the Participants, identity, shared resources, and group are reflexively constituted in and through their behavior in interaction while participating in doing data analysis at the data sessions.

The CoP conceptualization of learning focuses on the social organization of learning as the transformation of identities. In regard to the notion of identity, ethnomethodologically based research is

---

[10] Interestingly, later in the interaction, Ru seems to pick up this slip of the tongue usage and deploy it during her participation.

very clear: Identity is understood as being an interactional construct "occasioned by, negotiated in, and existing only in and for specific interactional moments" (Bushnell 2011b; Benwell and Stokoe 2006). The analyses of the present study have brought to light an ephemeral view of identity consistent with such an ethnomethodological perspective. For example, while Yi had been participating in the data sessions from the beginning, and had assumed the role of organizing the data sessions, her categorization as an expert practitioner within the community was not a "threshold issue" (Schegloff 1991: 62), but was rather accomplished momentarily and locally as a "discourse phenomenon" (Benwell and Stokoe 2006: 3).

        Thus, a question arises as to whether or not the view of identity as being interactionally occasioned and momentary which has been developed by this and other ethnomethodologically-based studies is fundamentally compatible with the ways in which identity is conceptualized by CoP. In regard to the notion of identity, CoP remains somewhat ambiguous. For example CoP generally seems to conceptualize identity in terms of continuous self or selves capable of undergoing gradual transformation (see, e.g., Lave and Wenger 1991: 53; Wenger 1998: 155). Such a view of identity corresponds with a post-structural conceptualization of identity, which sees identity in terms of multiple and fractured, though nevertheless continuous, selves which vary across situations (Menard-Warwick 2005; Weedon 1987). As such, a CoP conceptualization of identity appears to possibly be fundamentally incompatible with an ethnomethodological perspective, which rejects a view of identity based on the notion of a possesable and continous self (Bushnell 2011b; Benwell and Stokoe 2006). On the other hand, CoP also understands identity transformation to be accomplished as a "*negotiated experience* of self" (Wenger 1998: 150; emphasis mine) defined in and through social participation. This view of identity seems to be much less rigid, and to potentially leave the door open for researchers working to develop a more fluid and contingent view of identity. In other words, the idea of socially negotiated experience seems to resonate with the ethnomethodological notion that social reality is brought off by members as an ongoing accomplishment (Garfinkel 1967). As demonstrated by the analyses of the present study, the Participants' identities as members of their group was accomplished locally in and through their deployment of certain terminological resources and embedded within specific interactional moments. In this way, the CoP view of identity within a community of practice is respecified in ethnomethodological terms as a shared set of methods and procedures (e.g., treating certain terminological items as being valued for accomplishing participation) for producing and interpreting a situation, and the interactants whose ongoing work it is to produce and interpret it. In other words, the apparently continuous nature of identity noted by Lave and Wenger (1991: 53) and Wenger (1998: 155), for example, may be understood in interactional terms as being an ongoing accomplishment of members who have made it their job to work up and maintain such appearances (see Sacks 1984b), rather than as being a feature of an enduring and reified self.

        In this vein, the analyses of the present study have demonstrated that a data-driven ethnomethodological view of identity can provide a rich understanding of the actual ways in which interactants co-constitute their group as a community, and work up and manage their identities as practitioners within that community. There is no need for the researcher to impose a pre-held model of identity because, as seen in the analyses above, the Participants themselves pervasively work up and organize their identities within the group on a moment to moment basis as they participate in the talk-in-interaction. Viewed in this light, ethnomethodologically-based analysis can offer CoP a rigorous empirical grounding by demonstrating how the interactants themselves accomplish in and through the talk-in-interaction their interactions as practices, their groups as communities, and their identities as practitioners within those communities.

References

Antaki, C., Biazzi, M., Nissen, A., & Wagner, J. (2008). Accounting for moral judgments in academic talk: The case of a conversation analysis data session. *Text and Talk*, *28*(1), 1-30.

Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bushnell, C. (2011a). Interactionally constructing practice, community, shared resources, and identity: An ethnomethodological analysis of interactions at conversation analytic data sessions in Japan (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Hawaii.

Bushnell, C. (2011b). Identifying identity: Identity as an interactional construct, and some relations to second language learning. Tsukuba Daigaku Chiiki Kenkyuu, 32, 157–182.

Gafaranga, J. (1999). Language choice as a significant aspect of talk organization: The orderliness of language alternation. *Text and Talk*, *19*(2), 201-225.

Gafaranga, J. (2000). Medium repair vs.other-language repair: Telling the medium of a bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *4*, 327-350.

Gafaranga, J., & Calvo, M.-C. T. i. (2001). Language versus Medium in the study of bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *5*, 195-219.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis*. Boston: Sage.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Jefferson, Gail. (1983). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In J. R. E. Lee & G. Button (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organization* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31).

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *35*(3), 277-309.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lerner, G. H. (2004). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: Grammar as action in prompting a speaker to elaborate. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *37*(2), 151-184.

Menard-Warwick, J. (2005). Both a fiction and an existential fact: Theorizing identity in second language acquisition and literacy studies. *Linguistics and Education*, *16*(3), 253-274.

Moerman, M. (1996). The field of analyzing foreign language conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *26*(2), 147-158.

Nguyen, H. t., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives*. Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Rawls, A. W. (2006). Respecifying the study of social order: Garfinkel's transition from theoretical conceptualization to practices in details. In A. W. Rawls (Ed.), *Seeing Sociologically: The Routine Grounds of Social Action* (pp. 1-97). Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Rosenthal, B. M. (2008). A resource for repair in Japanese talk-in-interaction: The phrase TTE - YUU - KA. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *41*(2), 227–240.

Sacks, H. (1984a). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 21-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1984b). On doing "being ordinary." In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 413–429). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation* (Vols. 1-2). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15–21). New York: Irvington.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language, *50*(4), 696-735.

Sawyer, R. (2003). Identity formation through brokering in scientific practice. *Outlines*, *5*(2), 25-42.

Sawyer, R. (2004). *International graduate students of science in Japan: An ethnographic approach from a situated learning theory perspective* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Hawaii.

Sawyer, R. (2007). Rikei kenkyuushitsu niokeru soochi heno akusesu no shakaiteki soshikika [The social organization of access to experimental devices in a science laboratory]. In N. Ueno & R. Sawyer (Eds.), *Bunka to jookyooteki gakusyuu: Jissen, gengo, jinkoobutsu heno akusesu no dezain [Culture and situated learning: The design of access to practices, language, and artifacts]* (pp. 91-124). Tokyo: Bonjinsha.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 44-70). Berkely: University of California Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Confirming alllusions: Towards an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology*, *104*, 161-216.

Schegloff, E. A. (2005). On integrity in inquiry... of the investigated, not the investigator. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(4-5), 455 -480.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: Volume 1: A Primer in Conversation Analysis* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*(2), 361-382.

Traphagan, T. W. (1999). *Learning language in communities of practice: Cases of Japanese learners in Japan* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pittsburgh.

Tutt, D., & Hindmarsh, J. (2011). Reenactments at work: Demonstrating conduct in data sessions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *44*(3), 211-236.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.