

**ON NS/NNS IDENTITIES AND ‘WARRANTABILITY’:  
THE INTERACTIONAL CO-AUTHORSHIP OF AN OCCASIONED  
MEDIUM BY A FIRST AND SECOND LANGUAGE SPEAKER OF  
JAPANESE**

**CADE BUSHNELL**

*University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa*

**ABSTRACT**

In this study, I use conversation analysis (CA) and ethnomethodological sequential-categorization analysis to examine data that might typically be considered by previous research as sites within which participants demonstrably orient to categories such as ‘native speaker’ (NS) and ‘non-native speaker’ (NNS). In recent years, there has been a considerable increase in research from a CA perspective examining interactions between first and second language speakers of a common language which has emphasized the dangers of assuming the relevance of categories such as NS and NNS. Instead, these recent studies have sought to apply categorization only when it is warranted by the participants’ own orientations, made publicly observable in their interactions. Adopting a conceptual framework which draws upon Hester and Francis (2000), however, the present study further questions the applicability of categories like NS/NNS — even in instances when the participants are *prima facie* ‘demonstrably oriented’ to such distinctions. I argue instead that, in the data I examine, the ‘visibility’ of these categories is based upon an *a priori* knowledge that the participants are ‘native’ or ‘nonnative’, and thus draws upon tacit members’ knowledge as an analytical resource. I further argue that such an analytical approach threatens to obscure the actual interactional work and orientations of the participants in their talk. In the present study, it is shown that the participants in my data actually displayed a primary and pervasive orientation to negotiating and interactionally co-authoring a ‘medium’ (Gafaranga 1999, 2000, 2001; Gafaranga & Calvo, 2001; Gafaranga & Torras, 2002) for their interaction.

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been a considerable increase in research from a CA perspective examining interactions between first and second language speakers<sup>1</sup> of a common language. Much of this research has emphasized the dangers of assuming the relevance of categories such as ‘native speaker’ (NS) and ‘non-native speaker’ (NNS) (e.g., Hosoda, 2006; Ikeda, 2005; Kurhila, 2001, 2004, 2005; Park, 2007). Instead, they have sought to apply categorization only when it is warranted by the participants own orientations, made publicly observable in the interaction. One purpose of this paper, however, is to argue for the need of extreme caution on the part of the researcher when attempting an application of these ‘categories’—regardless of whether or not it appears to be ‘warranted’ by the participants’ ‘orientation’ to such categories in their interaction.

In the analysis section below, I examine several data excerpts which either have been, or, in my opinion, are likely to have been considered by previous research as possible sites within which participants demonstrably orient to categories such as NS/NNS. The analysis will show, however, that even in situations such as these, the participants may be doing something quite different.

## PREVIOUS STUDIES

Conversation and membership categorization analytic research has greatly emphasized the occasioned nature of participant identity in interaction (e.g., Hester & Eglin, 1997a; D. Zimmerman, 1998). Identity is seen in this light as a ‘discourse phenomenon[on]’ (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 3), which exists as a function of the participants’ interactional business — deployed, and locally managed by the participants according to the contingencies of their interactions: occasioned by, negotiated in, and existing only in and for specific interactional

---

<sup>1</sup> Use of the terms ‘native speaker’ (NS) and ‘non-native speaker’ (NNS) to refer to interactants has been greatly problematized by recent research seeking to develop a participant-relevant perspective (see, e.g., Canagarajah, 2007; Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007; Rampton, 1995). In referring to the interactants of this study, I will use terms which refer to attributes rather than social categories, i.e. ‘first’ or ‘second language speaker of Japanese’ rather than ‘native’ or ‘nonnative’.

moments. Thus, conversation analytic examinations of interactions between first and second language speakers of a common language have emphasized the ways in which participants in talk may occasionally make relevant for each other identities related to ‘native’ and ‘nonnative’ speaker status (e.g., Hosoda, 2000, 2002; Ikeda, 2005; Park, 2007).

In an examination of naturally occurring English conversations, Park (2007), for example, considers how the participants co-constitute NS identity in relation to NS identity in their interactions. She proposes that participants make the social categories of NS/NNS procedurally relevant to the ongoing interaction by incidentally orienting to discourse identities such as requestor/requestee during a word search. Park also argues that, by so doing, the participants are able to invoke an asymmetrical alignment among themselves. Additionally, it is noted that the NS/NNS identities, once made relevant to the interaction, may often be renegotiated by the participants. This renegotiation, it is argued, revokes asymmetries talked into existence in prior sequences, and provides resources for managing subsequent interactional sequences. In a similar vein, Ikeda (2005) also gives analytic attention to the ways in which the participants in her data interactionally achieve being a NS or NNS of Japanese. She focuses on the participants’ use of various resources (including embodied actions) in order to make their categories as NS/NNS recognizable and relevant for each other. Additionally, Ikeda argues that another way in which participants made the categories recognizable and relevant is through the practice of NSs making NNSs’ ‘inappropriate’ uses of language appear ‘appropriate’ within the course of the interaction while holding accountable other NSs who make similar mistakes.

Thus, previous research has attempted to provide a participant-relevant perspective of the various orientations-in-interaction displayed by the interactants in and for their talk. It has emphasized, for example, that the social categories of NS/NNS are occasionally oriented to and made relevant in interaction during such activities as ‘word search’ (e.g., Park, 2007) and ‘making inappropriate language use appropriate’ (e.g., Ikeda, 2005). However, conversation analytic research on bilingual interaction (e.g., Auer, 1984, 1998; Gafaranga, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2005; Gafaranga & Calvo, 2001; Gafaranga & Torras, 2002; Torras & Gafaranga, 2002; Wei, 2005) has understood ‘language’ not from the perspective of prescriptive appropriateness, but rather as being thoroughly and ineluctably locally managed in interaction by the participants. Gafaranga (1999, 2000, 2001), for example, submits the notion of ‘medium’ to understand the characteristics of such interactions. This notion is derived from an ethnomethodological

respecification of ‘code-switching’, wherein the participants are understood as organizing their language alternation based on a locally relevant ‘running index’ (Heritage 1984, p. 128) of the prior interaction. In this view, the participants produce the orderliness of their interaction by treating the use of certain linguistic codes as unproblematic while orienting to and repairing the use of others to co-author an (often) plurilinguistic interactional medium. Notably, a view of first and second language speaker interaction from this perspective greatly problematizes the notion of ‘inappropriate language use’<sup>2</sup> as conceptualized in many of the studies examining NS/NNS identities. Below, I will argue that an analytic approach which seeks to ‘warrant’ the application of categories to the participants based on researcher-relevant notions of linguistic appropriateness, for example, obscures from view what the interactants are actually doing in the interaction.

## STUDY

### *Methodology*

This study employs conversation analysis (CA) and sequential-categorization analysis (especially in Excerpts 5 and 6) to subject the data to a fine-grained, empirical examination. In recent years, CA has come to be a familiar analytic framework in second language research (see Kasper, 2006 for an overview). It provides an extremely robust set of tools by which to develop a participant-relevant understanding of how the participants co-achieve social order, assemble social actions, and co-create and maintain intersubjectivity regarding such things as ‘who-we-are’, ‘what-we-are-doing’, and ‘what-we-mean’ (Drew, 2005; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974; see also Tanaka 1999 for Japanese). Sequential-categorization analysis, on the other hand, combines the analytical tools of CA and membership categorization analysis (MCA; see, e.g., Watson, 1997). MCA finds its basis in Harvey Sacks’ analyses of data from calls to a suicide prevention hotline (Sacks, 1972a) and stories told by children (Sacks, 1972b). 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

---

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Canagarajah (2007) for a discussion of the participant-irrelevance of the notion that there is *an* ‘appropriate’ or ‘inappropriate’ way to mobilize linguistic resources.

categories’, including the ‘self-categorizations’,<sup>3</sup> and ‘collections’ of related categories. Membership categories organize people together into groups based on social and other characterizations (e.g., ‘father’). Collections of categories are gatherings of related categories (e.g., ‘father / mother / daughter / son / etc.’). 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, p. 335). 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., Jayyusi, 1984; Watson, 1978). Additionally, contemporary MCA views membership categories and their predicates not as preexisting objects that are ‘out there’ and ‘knowable in advance’, but rather as occasioned assemblies (see Jayyusi, 1984; Hester & Eglin, 1997a, 1997c) built up by participants in their talk. Thus, when combined with sequential analysis, categorization analysis can (a) provide a data driven, participant-relevant understanding of the occasioned categories worked up in the interaction, (b) describe the ways in which categories are sequentially co-assembled, negotiated, contested, and otherwise managed by the participants, and (c) show how such category work is implicated in social actions assembled in, through, and for the talk-in-interaction.

### ***Data***

Excerpts 1 and 2 are taken from published data (i.e., Ikeda, 2005; Park, 2007), while Excerpts 3 and 4 come from my corpus of naturally occurring Japanese interactional data, and feature an interaction between Dan, a second language speaker of Japanese (JL2 below) and Fumiko, a first language speaker of Japanese (JL1 below).<sup>4</sup> In a casual interview, Dan explained that the major goal of this interaction was for him to advise Fumiko on a paper that she was in the final stages of preparing for submission to a scholarly journal for publication. Two noteworthy points are that (a) the paper is written in English (Dan’s first language, Fumiko’s second) and (b) the paper is actually a ‘co-authored’ work based upon experimentation co-

---

<sup>3</sup> 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 & Eglin, 1997b).

<sup>4</sup> All names are pseudonyms. Both written and verbal consent were obtained from the participants to record their interaction.

conducted by the pair. Finally, Excerpts 5 and 6 are bits of interactions that occurred in two graduate seminars on Japanese linguistics at an American university.

## ANALYSIS

### *Laying the Groundwork: ‘Finding’ Identities in Interaction*

A number of researchers have been critical of the ways in which some conversation analysts ostensibly invoke members’ knowledge as a tacit analytical resource (e.g., Hester & Francis, 2000; Watson, 1997). In a reanalysis of data examined by Drew and Heritage (1992), Hester and Francis (2000, p. 398), for example, argue that the putative ‘institutional’ character of the interactions highlighted in Drew and Heritage’s (1992) analyses results from ‘preconceptions about professional/client relations [rather than the] contextual orientations which are demonstrably relevant to the participants themselves.’ Though Hester and Francis (2000) critique such practices in ‘institutional CA’ in particular, it is possible to apply some of their insights in examining ‘NS/NNSness’ in interactions between first and second language speakers of a common language as well. In this subsection, I will use two excerpts of published data, one from Park (2007) and one from Ikeda (2005), to illustrate the application of this stance to such data. In particular, I will uncover the ways in which the use of members’ knowledge as a tacit resource by the researcher can affect an analysis while simultaneously refocusing attention to the ‘contextual orientations which are demonstrably relevant to the participants themselves’ (Hester & Francis, 2000, p. 398).

In Excerpt 1, the interactants, Maria (M in the transcript) and James (J), are discussing current movies. (Transcription conventions are included in the appendix).

Excerpt 1 (Park 2007, p. 351; slightly edited)

1 M it's in de:: it's now in de::[( )  
 2 J [theaters? yeah.=  
 3 M =in de theaters?  
 4 J yeah, it's in theaters now.  
 5 M> ah, i love this sound, theaters,  
 6 J theaters, [sounds (b-)/(g-)  
 7 M [theaters ((imitating James's 'theaters'))  
 8 J> sounds better the way she says it though ((gazing at the camera))  
 9 M theaters.  
 10 J> 'cause i don't say it with any accent. i say theaters °hah hah.°  
 11 M we- any accent? really?  
 12 J> no, you say it with an accent. <that sounds good though.>  
 13 sounds- sounds european.  
 14 M europe(h)an [hah hah hah hah  
 15 J> [when you say- when you say it, it sounds  
 16 european, °yeah.°  
 17 M oh, really?

Park's (2007, p. 351) analysis of this excerpt maintains that the participants 'invoke' the categories of NS/NNS in lines 1 to 4, where James treats Maria's line 1 as a word search by providing 'theaters?' (line 2), with Maria subsequently uptaking James's candidate word (line 3), and James endorsing this uptake (line 4). Park goes on to argue that in 'the aftermath' (ibid.) of this invocation of NS/NNS, the participants continue to co-display an orientation to such categories through co-constructing an assessment sequence wherein Maria's pronunciation of the word 'theaters' is evaluated by James (lines 8, 12, and 15).

However, Park's (2007) analysis is problematic in several ways. It is unclear, for example, how the word search in lines 1 to 4 works to 'invoke' the categories of NS/NNS. Previous conversation analytic research has shown that such word searches are a common feature of at least talk-in-interaction between first language speakers of English (see, e.g., Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Schegloff, 2000). Thus, Park's assertion that this action works to make relevant the categories of NS/NNS for the participants in this interaction becomes tenuous. Furthermore, in the assessment sequence, the fact that James evaluates Maria's pronunciation of 'theater' does not conclusively document an orientation to Maria as an NNS by James, nor does it necessarily work to 'place' James in an NS 'expert position' (Park, 2007, p. 351). This fact becomes clear when we consider the possibility of an identical sequence between two 'native' speakers of English from different geographical areas (e.g., North American vs. British). Thus in sum, Park's (2007) analysis seems to be based upon 'presumed category relations' (Hester & Francis, 2000, p. 400), wherein the categories of NS/NNS are made 'visible' in interaction by, e.g., 'nonnative speakers' having lexical problems and non-standard pronunciation, and 'native speakers' orienting to such phenomena, and potentially 'correcting' or 'assisting'.

Excerpt 2 is from an interaction where five participants (three first language speakers of Japanese and two second language speakers) are taking part in a group discussion following an intercultural communication class at a university in Tokyo. Just prior to Excerpt 1, the participants were discussing various Japanese and English dialects. In the excerpt, one participant, Kato (K in the transcript), notably appears to be correcting Michael’s (M) prescriptively ‘inappropriate’ production of ‘oosakago’ (literally, Osaka-language).<sup>5</sup>

**Excerpt 2 (Ikeda, 2005: 71-2; slightly edited)**

- 1 M ninki no aru hoogen tte aru no kana  
popular M exist dialect QT exist N I  
I wonder if there is such a thing as a popular dialect.
- 2 K ni [hon (no koto)?  
Japan M thing  
(Do you mean in) Japan?
- 3 M> [ano (.3) nihongo da to oosakago: [suki tte hito  
um Japanese C if Osaka-language favorite QT person  
Uh, in the case of Japanese, those who prefer Osaka-go
- 4 K [ha::  
O:h
- 5 M o [oi  
many  
(are) many
- 6 K> [kansai [ben  
Kansai dialect.
- 7 M> [kansai:  
Kansai:
- 8 K> un. ((big nod))  
Yeah.
- 9 M> kansaiben, un.  
Kansai dialect, yeah.

In line 3, Michael uses the word ‘oosakago’ (Osaka-language). This word is not in the lexicon of standard Japanese, but is rather a neologism. In line 4, Kato displays an orientation to this object by deploying ‘ha::’ in a precisely timed manner immediately following ‘oosakago’, and clarifies

<sup>5</sup> Japanese language transcripts are presented in a three-tiered format: a Romanized transcription of the Japanese utterance, a literal translation with grammatical notations, and finally, a gloss in natural English. A key for the interlinear grammatical notations is provided in the appendix.

this orientation in line 6 by juxtaposing the standard ‘kansaiben’ (Kansai dialect). Both Ikeda (2005, p. 72) and I analyze Kato’s ‘kansaiben’ as being correction-relevant to Michael’s ‘oosakago’. This analysis is based on the fact that, in lines 7 to 9, the participants subsequently treat it as such: (a) the standard ‘kansaiben’ is offered in place of the non-standard ‘oosakago’, (b) the participant who has produced the offending item endorses the correction through uptaking it in his subsequent talk, and (c) the correcting participant acknowledges the uptake of the correct item. Furthermore, Kato’s production of ‘kansaiben’ is (a) in very close succession to Michael’s non-standard ‘oosakago’, (b) in overlap with Michael’s utterance, and (c) in unmitigated format. These kinds of interactional features have been noted to be characteristic of ‘correction’ in second-language classroom discourse (see, e.g., Seedhouse, 2004). Thus, the analysis would seem to support an argument that the participants are demonstrably orienting to the categories of NS/NNS. There is, however, a major problem with such an analysis: Michael is actually not Michael at all, but rather Miyake, a first language speaker of Japanese. Thus, the only reason that the participants’ actions were visible as warrantably invoking the categories of NS/NNS is because they were *a priori* seen as actions being done by a ‘native’ and ‘nonnative’ speaker.

I have provided the above illustrations in order to foreground the conceptual framework which underpins my argument. Specifically, I maintain that it is necessary for any claims about the relevance of categories to be truly warrantable from the actual actions and orientations of the participants in their talk rather than being based upon the tacit use of members’ knowledge as an analytical resource. An analytic approach that neglects such discipline may result in the analyst’s ‘promiscuously introducing into the analysis what the writing needs for the argument-in-progress’ (Schegloff, 2007, p. 476). Furthermore, such an approach may obscure from view the actual interactional work in which the participants *are* demonstrably engaging.

### ***Language Alternation and the Co-Authorship of a Multicompetent<sup>6</sup> Interactional Medium***

In this subsection, I will examine two data excerpts featuring interactional phenomena which, in previous research, might have been glossed as ‘understanding check’, ‘word search’,

---

<sup>6</sup> Problematizing Chomsky’s notion of the ideal monolingual native speaker, V. Cook (1991, 1992, 1995) proposed the notion of multicompetence. He defines multicompetence as a ‘compound state of mind with two grammars’ (1991: 112). In contrast, rather than viewing multicompetence as a state of mind, Hall, et al. (2006) argue for a ‘usage-based’ understanding of multicompetence, which challenges previous assumptions about L1 and L2 as being distinct mental systems, the existence of qualitative distinctions between mono- and multicompetence, and the notion of stable and equal language knowledge across speakers and contexts.

‘correction’, etc. —actions typically considered to potentially display an orientation to categories such as NS/NNS (see, e.g., Park, 2007). In the analysis below however, I will show that, while not warrantably co-categorizing each other as ‘native’ or ‘nonnative’ through such actions, the participants, Dan<sup>7</sup> (represented in the transcript as D) and Fumiko (F) do accomplish the co-authoring of a interactional medium (e.g., Gafaranga, 1999, 2000, 2001) in order to pursue their interactional business of doing, among other things, ‘being bioscientists’.

The two data excerpts below occur in relatively close succession to each other; they actually center around the common topic of the mating behavior of bees. Additionally, the excerpts occur quite late in the interaction, after Dan and Fumiko have more or less finished their interactional work concerning their current research and Fumiko’s paper (see the Study section above). The specific focus of the analysis will be on the phenomenon of language alternation, a frequent and pervasive feature of the data. I will argue that this language alternation is not random or without interactional consequence, but rather, that the participants use it methodically as one device by which to accomplish the co-authorship of a medium for use in their interaction.

Prior to the Excerpt 3, Fumiko has asked Dan if he knows of any insects that have temporally unrestricted mating behaviors similar to ticks. They discussed several species which do not seem to satisfy the requirements, and Dan comments on the apparent general paucity of research on the topic (line 1). (Note, terms deployed in English are *italicized* in the third line of the transcripts).

---

<sup>7</sup> All names are pseudonyms.

Excerpt 3: *bee*

- 1 D .hhh (iya) soo iu no mit:eru tokoro zen-zen nai  
no that say N looking place at-all NG  
**.hhh nah I think that (there) is no place at all looking at those kinds of things**
- 2 to omou n desu [ne,  
QT think N C I  
**you know,**
- 3 F [°nai desu ne:,° (1.7)  
NG C I  
°(There) isn't huh:,° (1.7)
- 4 F> .hh tyotto ma (.) aru tositara:, (.6) bee. (.9)  
little I exist if-so bee  
**.hh Kind of well (.) if there is, (.6) (it would be) bee(s). (.9)**
- 5 D ah:: [= (hai).  
oh yes  
**Oh::= yes.**
- 6 F [hati:: wa: aru kamo ~~sh~~renai.= hati  
bees I exist D can-know-NG bees  
**Bees might have (this characteristic).=**
- 7 saikin kek↓koo miteru n desu yo.= hati, ari=  
lately pretty looking N C I bee ant  
**recently (I/people have been) looking at bees a lot.= Bee(s), ant(s)=**
- 8 D =m. (.6) .tschhh ya hati wa soo iu [(.) ano=  
no bees I that say SF  
**=m. (.6) .tschhh nah bees (have) that kind of (.) um=**
- 9 F [m:. ((nodds))  
yeah
- 10 D> °=demo hati wa workher tokha (.2) hive ga aru kara.°  
but bees I worker D hive S exist so  
°=**but bees (have) things like *worker(s)* (.2) and *hive(s)* so.**°
- 11 F m.  
yeah  
**Yeah.**

Throughout the data from which the above excerpt was taken, the participants may be observed deploying both English and Japanese elements in their talk. In general, such alternation

into English seems to have occurred most frequently in relation to specialized terminology.<sup>8</sup> I will argue below, however, that there is much more to the participants’ language alternation than is suggested by this initial observation.

The first example of language alternation in Excerpt 3 comes in line 4, where Fumiko alternates within her turn from Japanese to English, producing ‘bee’. Fumiko’s line 4 is relevantly deployed in the context of the turns preceding it. In lines 1 to 2, Dan indexes the previous talk by deploying *soo* ‘that’. His utterance final *ne* ‘right/you know’ makes relevant a listener response in the form of alignment with his statement (Tanaka, 1999). In line 3, Fumiko provides a second pair part by producing the relevant alignment, a ‘first-priority response’ (Bilmes, 1988, 1993, 1995) in overlap with Dan’s *ne*. At this point, the participants allow a 1.7 second gap to occur in the talk.

In line 4, Fumiko self selects and uses this gap as a resource to produce material, in a manner disassociated from her displayed alignment in line 3, that is opposition-relevant to the proposition of Dan’s prior turn, i.e. that the kinds of mating behavior that they had just been discussing are under-considered in prior research. She proposes research concerning bees as being one caveat to Dan’s prior assertion. Notably, instead of using the Japanese word *hati* ‘bee’, she alternates to English by producing ‘bee’. In an analysis which draws upon the members’ knowledge that Dan is a JL2, Fumiko may here appear to be orienting to a possible deficiency in Dan’s lexicon, i.e., he may not be familiar with the Japanese word *hati*.<sup>9</sup> Importantly, however, Fumiko’s deployment of ‘bee’ instantaneously becomes part of the sequential context for the next-actions of the participants. This fact will allow us to see how *they* treat Fumiko’s action in their subsequent turns-at-talk. In line 5, Dan displays of change of state (Heritage, 1984) by producing ‘ah::=(hai)’, which Fumiko immediately treats as making relevant a continuation by her. She produces ‘*hati:: wa: aru kamo sirenai.=*’ (Bees might have [this characteristic]=; line 6), which is formulated as an upgraded version of, or even an answer to her line 4 utterance.

Importantly, in Fumiko’s line 6, she alternates from her line 4 English ‘bee’ to Japanese by deploying ‘*hati*’ (bee). She continues this usage twice more in close succession (lines 6 and 7). This action works to categorize Dan as ‘someone with whom both English and Japanese may be

---

<sup>8</sup> Indeed, there are a great number of loanwords in diverse fields in Japanese derived from English and other languages. These lexical items are, however, adopted as a legitimate part of *Japanese*. Contrastively, here Dan and Fumiko exhibit a novel and occasioned use of *English*.

<sup>9</sup> It is *highly* unlikely that Dan would be unfamiliar with *hati* ‘bee’.

combined in the same medium’ (Gafaranga, 2001). Simultaneously, it also works to construct an identity for Fumiko as ‘one knowledgeable in multiple linguistic domains’. Furthermore, Fumiko here displays an epistemic stance (Ochs, 1996) of ‘one who is knowledgeable about bees’, and treats this display of stance as being accountable by latching on to her turn-so-far with ‘hati saikin kek ↓ ko miteru n desu yo.’ (recently (I’ve/they’ve) been looking at bees a lot). The ending of this utterance, ‘n desu yo’ (it is the case that) marks her utterance as providing information that is within her territory (Kamio, 1997) as an ‘explanation’. She then performs self repair by latching ‘hati, ari’ (bee(s), ant(s)), which seems to (a) begin the interactional construction of a taxonomy (Bilmes, 2008) which includes bees and ants as ‘sister’ nodes<sup>10</sup> and (b) bolster the credibility of her assertion about bees by suggesting that that she has lately been researching the matter in relation to several types of insects (this may also be suggestive that she has further supporting evidence). Thus, Fumiko’s turn accomplishes (a) being a competent scientist and (b) being a multicompetent user of language (V. Cook, 1991, 1992, 1995; Hall et al., 2006).

Dan’s line 10 is the site of the next instance of language alternation in this excerpt. In line 8, Dan self selects by latching onto Fumiko’s line 7 by receipting it with ‘m.’. This token is then followed by (.6) and ‘.tschh’, which Dan uses to successfully stake a claim for the floor. He then proceeds to formulate his turn as being likely ‘opposition relevant’ by deploying an initial ‘ya’ (no/nah) (Saft, 2001). Fumiko produces a continuer, ‘m.’, in line 9 and nods in overlap with the micropause between Dan’s ‘iu’ and ‘ano’, through which she displays her orientation to a projected possible transition-relevance place (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Tanaka, 1999) and her non-intention to vie for the floor. At this point, Dan slightly alters the oppositional force of his turn-so-far and self repairs *en route* by reformatting his utterance so that it (1) is prefaced by the possibly less directly oppositional (Mori, 1999, p. 102; see also Saft, 2001) disjunctive marker *demo* ‘but’, and (2) dis-cludes the deictic *soo* ‘that’, which directly indexes Fumiko’s prior utterance, and instead provides a general statement about some characteristics of bees. He continues by ending his utterance with *kara* ‘so’ while omitting the projectable main clause. By using *kara* to frame his utterance as a subordinate clause, Dan effectively calls upon Fumiko to do the interpretive work in determining how the oppositional

---

<sup>10</sup> This taxonomy is uptaken and further developed by Dan later in a portion of the interaction not shown here as a resource to undercut Fumiko’s claims and (re) assert his own.

relationship between Dan’s subordinate clause and her prior turn obtains (Mori, 1999, p. 128). By using these resources, Dan indirectly implies that bees are to be afforded a special status on account of the fact that they have workers and hives, and are therefore not available for consideration in this case. Thus, Dan is able to indirectly suggest a possible opposition to Fumiko’s line 7. Fumiko receipts Dan’s utterance with ‘m.’ in line 11.

The packaging of Dan’s turn is noteworthy. Though, as discussed above, it displays a possible opposition relevance to Fumiko’s prior turn, it simultaneously validates Fumiko’s competence in several ways. First, it echoes Fumiko’s use of ‘hati’ while juxtaposing it with the English lexical items ‘workher’ and ‘hive’. In this way, Dan endorses Fumiko’s categorization of him (i.e. as someone to whom may be deployed utterances constructed with both English and Japanese elements), while simultaneously accomplishing (1) being a competent scientist and (2) being a multicompetent user of language. His utterance also, by implicitly displaying an expectation of Fumiko’s ability to interpret the oppositional relationship it implies, further constructs Fumiko as a competent and knowledgeable scientist. In sum, lines 4 to 11 talk into being an interactional medium consisting of both English and Japanese (while simultaneously being ‘equivalent’ to neither), through which the participants engage in complex rhetorical work and accomplish the co-construction of one another as (1) multicompetent language users, and (2) competent and knowledgeable scientists.

Excerpt 4, below, occurs a few moments after Excerpt 3. Dan and Fumiko are still discussing the topic of bees, and Fumiko is just displaying a candidate understanding that queen bees may mate multiple times.

## Excerpt 4: queen

- 33 F .hh nan kai ka si-mas::en (.4) [°ka°= A↑RE:::!!  
 what time Q do-NG Q I  
 Doe::sn't (she) (mate) several (.4) °times°= H↑U:::H!
- 34 D [waka-n:ai (demo nai-)  
 understand-NG but NG  
 (I'm) not sure (but not-)
- 35 si-nai kana to omo-tta kedo:, .hhh (.4) waka-n:ai. (.8)  
 do-NG D QT think-P but understand-NG  
 (I) thought maybe (they) don't but, .hhh (.4) (I'm) not sure. (.8)
- 36 soo iwareru to (.3) soko made:[(.2) kigatui- ano kangae-te,=  
 that say-PA if there until notic- SF think-L
- 37 F [a: wakara-nai desu ne::,  
 oh understand-NG C I  
 Oh: (it's) unclear ri:ght,

- 38 D =yo-nda koto nai n desu ne? (2) da ga sore ha, ^a ano:  
 read-P N NG N C I C but that T oh SF  
 ((36 & 38)) If (it) is said (.) like that (.3) (I) haven't read notic- uh  
 thinking, (.2) that far (2) but that('s), ^oh u:h
- 39 sin-jau kara, (1.5)  
 die-end-up so  
 (they) end up dying so, (1.5)
- 40 F uh uh [::: ((in a 'disagreeing' tone))
- 41 D> [atarasii mesu ga. (.8) ano: (.6) queen? (.2)  
 new female S SF queen  
 (A) new female. (.8) u:h (.6) queen? (.2)
- 42 aruiha, [tigau su wo tukuru tame-ni, (.8)  
 or different hive O make for-the-purpose  
 Or, in order to make a different hive, (.8)
- 43 F [m. ((nods))  
 yeah
- 44 D> queen (.) tuku-tte, (1.5)  
 queen make-L  
 (they) make (a) queen (.) and, (1.5)
- 45 F .hh a= >nan ka< (.3) soo iu syu mo iru n desu kedo.=  
 I like that say type also exist N C but  
 uh >Like< (.3) (there) is also that type but.=
- 46 soo janai syu mo iru mitai de, musiro (.6) fu↑rui su ↓ha:  
 that NG type also exist seem L rather old hive T  
 (there) also seems to be a type not like that and, rather (.6) ↑a:s for

(the) ↓ old hive

47 > moto moto:, (.5) °>nan te iu ka<° atarasi-ku kuru jo'oo  
 originally what QT say Q new-L come queen  
 originally, (.5) °>like<° (they) keep (it) for (the) newcomer queen

48 no tameni tottoi-te:, (.6) ↑de (.) mae no okaasan ha:, (.6)  
 M for keep-L L prior M mother T  
 a.nd, (.6) ↑and (.) a:s for (the) prior mother, (.6)

49 tugi no su wo atarasi-ku tukuru hazu na [-node:, (.5)  
 next M hive O new-L make expect so  
 (it is) expected (that they) will make (the) next hive anew so:, (.5)

50 D [hai:  
 yes  
 ye:s

51 F ° ^o >doo na no kana<°  
 oh how C N D  
 °^oh > (I) wonder how (it really is)<°

The analytical focus here is on lines 41 and 44 where Dan deploys the English term ‘queen’, and line 47, where Fumiko uses the Japanese *jo'oo* ‘queen’.<sup>11</sup> In the sequence that builds up to these lines, Fumiko displays an orientation to Dan as one knowledgeable about the mating behaviors of bees by formulating her utterance as a first-pair part asking Dan to confirm a candidate understanding concerning the matter (line 33). Dan displays an understanding of the questioning action projected by Fumiko’s turn by producing his second-pair part turn-beginning in overlap with Fumiko’s utterance final *ka*. Here, Dan deploys hedging devices (i.e., ‘wakan:ai demo’ ((I’m) not sure but), ‘*X to omotta kedo:*’ ((I) thought X but), and ‘wakan:ai’ ((I’m) not sure); lines 34 to 39) which work to qualify the extent of his knowledge on this matter. Notably however, Fumiko immediately treats Dan’s utterance-to-come as projecting opposition relevance by latching a highly affective ‘AR ↑ E:::!’ onto her overlapped-utterance-in-progress (line 33).<sup>12</sup> This interactional orientation plays out in the subsequent turns-at-talk: while continuing to display an orientation to Dan as one with expertise in entomological matters (cf. line 37 change of state display in response to Dan’s answer), Fumiko simultaneously shores up her position by

<sup>11</sup> Though the *kango* (i.e. SinoJapanese) term *jo'oo* ‘queen’ is most typical for use in reference to insect social structure, it is notable that the native Japanese term *kisaki* ‘queen’ and, importantly, the English import *kuiin* ‘queen’ are also available in Japanese.

<sup>12</sup> Fumiko may have based this action on the prior talk (cf. Excerpt 3) and on the fact that, in spite of Fumiko’s question being formatted so as to invite agreement (i.e., it is a negative question: *X simasen ka*), Dan’s ‘wakan:ai demo’ ((I’m) not sure but) does *not* hearably propose to provide such agreement.

constructing herself as being specifically knowledgeable about certain types of bees (lines 40 and 45 to 49).<sup>13</sup>

We may now examine the focal phenomena in lines 41 and 44, where Dan deploys the English term ‘queen’, and line 47, where Fumiko deploys the Japanese *jo’oo* ‘queen’.<sup>14</sup> I will argue that Dan and Fumiko here again co-author a medium for their interaction. Importantly, an analysis of lines 41 to 49 which draws upon ‘presumed category relations’ (Hester & Francis, 2000, p. 400) is likely to view this sequence as an instance where Dan’s ‘non-native’ status is made relevant to the interaction by the participants: (1) Dan ostensibly asks for help with an unknown lexical item in line 41 (notice the long pause before the English ‘queen’ and the rising intonation), and (2) Fumiko, being an L1 speaker of Japanese, orients to Dan’s limited language ability by providing the lexical item that he ‘asked for’ by her line 47 production of *jo’oo* ‘queen’. However, when the actual sequential unfolding of the talk is placed under close scrutiny, the ways in which the participants utilize resources from multiple languages, and in so doing, how they are able co-constitute one another as multicompetent language users and scientists while simultaneously orienting to and accomplishing the complex and rhetorical business of their talk, comes into view.

As noted above, Dan’s initial use of ‘queen’ in line 41 is said with rising intonation, or ‘try-marked’ (see Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), and is bracketed by pauses. These factors work together to make relevant a response from Fumiko in regard to the item ‘queen’, and to provide a space for Dan to monitor the response that he receives from Fumiko. Contingent upon Fumiko’s response, two distinct ‘meanings’ could potentially be constructed for Dan’s line 41 actions. First, should Fumiko treat ‘queen’ as a correctable, Dan’s actions might be constructed as having asked for help with a Japanese lexical item. Alternatively, by providing a continuer or other display of acknowledgement, or by initiating repair, Fumiko could treat Dan’s line 41 as having asked her if she understands the English word *queen*. Either of these actions by Fumiko would appear to display an orientation to the linguistic expertise of one of the participants: either that of Dan (as having not ‘known’ the Japanese word for *queen*), or that of Fumiko (as ‘knowing’ the

---

<sup>13</sup> Later in the interaction, however, she downgrades her claims and admits to having gained her expertise only through watching a television show about bees.

<sup>14</sup> Though the *kango* (i.e. SinoJapanese) term *jo’oo* ‘queen’ is most typical for use in reference to insect social structure, it is notable that the native Japanese term *kisaki* ‘queen’ and, importantly, the English import *kuiin* ‘queen’ are also available in Japanese.

English word *queen* or not).<sup>15</sup> Interestingly, however, an examination of the video data reveals that Fumiko displays absolutely no reaction (linguistic, kinesic, or otherwise). In fact, she visibly seems to be doing ‘not reacting’ — in spite of the rising intonation on Dan’s ‘queen’ and the .2 second pause. Crucially, this (non-)action by Fumiko works to treat Dan’s line 41 ‘queen?’ as (1) not being a correctable and (2) as not asking for a confirmation of her ability to recognize it. In line 42, instead of treating the non-response from Fumiko as problematic, Dan continues on by producing ‘aruiha’ (or). At this point, Fumiko produces the continuer ‘m.’, along with a nod. Finally, in line 44, by producing ‘queen’ again, this time without the try-marking, Dan displays an understanding of Fumiko’s actions as having passed on an opportunity to correct or otherwise initiate repair, and thus as endorsing the use of ‘queen’ in their interaction.

In line 47, Fumiko produces the Japanese lexical item *jo’oo* ‘queen’. This is remarkable in two ways. First, it comes very late in the turn (note that it is preceded by multiple transition relevance places (Sacks et al., 1974; Tanaka, 1999, 2000) and long pauses), and second, it is marked internally neither by pause nor prosody — ‘atarasi-ku kuru jo’oo no tameni tottoi-te:,’ ((they) keep (the old hive) for the newcomer queen) is uttered smoothly within and as a single intonational unit (see, e.g., K. Matsumoto, 2003; Tanaka, 1999). Furthermore, *jo’oo* is backgrounded information to the foregrounded topic, *su* ‘hive’<sup>16</sup> and is part of a complex clausal noun modification construction (see Y. Matsumoto, 1997). These factors together work to make Fumiko’s *jo’oo* visible as a ‘non-repair’ on Dan’s line 41 and 44 ‘inappropriate’ productions of ‘queen’.<sup>17</sup> Dan subsequently goes on to display a similar endorsement of Fumiko’s contribution of *jo’oo* (not shown). In other words, the participants’ actions here discursively constitute the multicompetent nature of the interaction by methodically allowing both Dan’s line 41 and 44 productions of ‘queen’ and Fumiko’s line 47 *jo’oo* to stand as they are in the discourse and

---

<sup>15</sup> Importantly, however, even if the participants *had* displayed an orientation to matters of linguistic expertise, this would not necessarily warrant an analysis of their actions as having made relevant the categories of NS/NNS. I will return to this issue in the conclusion section below.

<sup>16</sup> Interestingly, prior to Fumiko’s line 46 production of ‘su’, Dan produces ‘hive’ in line 10 of Excerpt 3 (notably treated by the participants as unproblematic), and then alternates to ‘su’ in line 42 of the present excerpt.

<sup>17</sup> It might be argued that the delayed production of *jo’oo* ‘queen’ is a function of its ‘dipreferred’ nature as a putative other-initiated other-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). I do not deny the possibility that Dan may have interpreted Fumiko’s use of *jo’oo* ‘queen’ as a repair of his use of ‘queen’ in lines 41 and 44. However, two things *are* evident in the data: 1) Dan does not *display* an interpretation of Fumiko’s utterance as such, and 2) The structure of Fumiko’s extended turn in lines 45 to 49 displays an orientation to the propositional content of Dan’s previous talk (she topicalizes *su* ‘hive’, which was mentioned by Dan in line 42) and *not* to its linguistic form. These facts make it unlikely that either Fumiko or Dan were oriented to Fumiko’s production of *jo’oo* as a repair on Dan’s line 41 and 44 utterances.

endorse them as legitimate and unproblematic contributions. These actions, taken together, work to produce an occasioned, multicompetent interactional medium, and allow us an *in vivo* glimpse of its genesis as it is talked into being.

### CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have considered several instances where the participants were *prima facie* demonstrably relevancing the categories of NS/NNS. A close examination has shown, however, that even in situations such as these, the participants were not warrantably oriented to such categories, but rather were engaged in activities such as doing ‘being bioscientists’. Based upon my analyses, I have argued that analysts must be accountable to the actual actions and orientations of the participants in their data rather than drawing upon tacit members’ knowledge as an analytical resource. If not, the actual interactional work in which the participants *are* demonstrably engaging may be obscured from view. I have shown that the participants in my data, i.e. Dan and Fumiko, *were* demonstrably co-constructing ‘what-we-mean’, ‘what-we-are-doing’, and ‘who-we-are’. While Dan and Fumiko were not warrantably co-categorizing each other as ‘native’ or ‘nonnative’, they were able to utilize the mechanism of language alternation in order to interactionally co-author a medium for this discursive work constituted by elements from both Japanese and English. I argued that this medium was generated in, through, and for their interactional business of doing ‘being bioscientists’.

However, this raises the question: are there times when participants *do* demonstrably orient to the categories of NS/NNS, and if so, what does it look like? Although I unfortunately do not have recorded data, I do have two sequences which I have noted down.<sup>18</sup> Both of these sequences occurred in graduate seminars in Japanese linguistics at an American university. The first, Excerpt 5, is from a lecture in Japanese phonology. The teacher (T) is a JL2 professor of Japanese linguistics, and Aoki (A) is a JL1 student participating in the seminar. The professor has been lecturing about identical phonemes that have different orthographic representations.

---

<sup>18</sup> Although mechanically or digitally recorded data is considered to be the *sine qua non* of conversation analysis, analysts do occasionally, for various reasons, also provide remembered or noted down instances to illustrate their arguments (see, e.g., Schegloff, 1992; Jefferson, 2007).

**Excerpt 5: keiki**

1 T so in standard tokyo dialect, keiki and  
 2 keeki are pronounced exactly the same.  
 3 > let’s have one of our native speakers demonstrate.  
 4 > ((gazes at JL1 students))  
 5 A kɛki. (pause) kɛki.  
 6 T ((gazing at A)) were they any different?  
 7 A u:h, no, i don’t think so.  
 8 T> ((shifts gaze to other students)) you see?

Excerpt 5 begins with T making an assertion about the phonologically identical nature of the lexical items *keiki* ‘economy’ and *keeki* ‘cake’. In line 3, he deploys an overt catagorial label, ‘native speakers’ in conjunction with a gaze to the JL1 students in the class. In lines 5 and 7, A responds to T’s utterances by providing the requested actions of modeling the pronunciation of the words in question and her opinion concerning the degree of phonological similarity between the two. In line 8, T then treats A’s lines 5 and 7 contributions as evidence in support of his line 1 assertion. Thus, the participants here sequentially co-constitute the category of ‘native speaker’ in their talk. In particular, T formulates his line 1 question as being relevantly answerable by a ‘native speaker’ while gazing at the students in the class who are categorizable ‘on-sight’ (Paoletti, 1998) as ‘Japanese’, an action which makes the explicitly mentioned category ‘native speaker’ conditionally and specially relevant for them (see Watson, 1978; Day, 1998). In line 5, A provides the second pair-part to T’s line 3 request, thus endorsing T’s categorization of her as ‘native speaker’. Finally, and most importantly, ‘native speaker’ is constituted *as* a category by the participants in their talk via their treating it as having normatively and morally accountable category-bound predicates (see, e.g., Watson, 1978; Jayyusi, 1984; Sacks, 1995) associated with it. In other words, on this occasion, ‘native speaker’ is associated with certain category-bound knowledge, expertise, and abilities, and the associated rights and obligations, by the participants in their interaction. Notably, however, if T had deployed a label such as ‘competent speakers’ or ‘more experienced speakers’ the same sequence of actions by T and A could plausibly have occurred, and in this case would have worked to assemble categories that include sets of members different from ‘native speakers’, but that are nonetheless bound to, e.g., linguistic expertise. Thus, in Excerpt 5, the relevance of the category ‘native speakers’ seems to be linked to its deployment as an overt label in the discourse.

This fact raises a further question: do the participants actually have to say ‘native speaker’ in order for it to be made warrantably relevant to the interaction? One possibility is that participants might deploy some kind of metonymical formulation like ‘we Japanese’.<sup>19</sup> Excerpt 6 is from a seminar on Japanese sociolinguistics at the same university. The teacher (T) is lecturing on the growing trend among ‘native speakers’ of Japanese not to use *kenjoogo* ‘humble honorifics’.

#### Excerpt 6a

1 T> ((gazing at B, C, and D)) do we even use that  
2 kind of language anymore?

In line 1, T, who is a JL1 and categorizable on-sight (Paoletti, 1998) as ‘Japanese’, directs her gaze to the seminar students also categorizable on-sight as ‘Japanese’, i.e. B, C, and D — all JL1s. Furthermore, she deploys the first person plural pronoun ‘we’, which potentially works to assemble T, B, C, and D together into the same category (see He, 2004). These actions seem to make T’s question hearable specifically as being relevantly answerable only by B, C, or D, who are co-categorizable with T on the basis of (at least) appearance and language expertise. Notably, however, there is no overt mention of ‘native speaker’. Do these actions by T nevertheless work to make ‘native speaker’ relevant?

#### Excerpt 6b

3 E> no. i don’t, and i don’t know anyone that does.  
4 T right? ((continues on with lecture))

Interestingly, the interaction continues in line 3 with E, a highly proficient JL2,<sup>20</sup> providing the second-pair part to T’s question. In line 4, T notably treats E’s second pair-part to her question as unproblematic. Thus, T’s lines 1 and 2 actions do not seem to have made ‘native speaker’ relevant in this case. Or do they?

<sup>19</sup> The Japanese term that most closely translates to ‘native speaker’ (i.e. *bogowasya*) is a technical term not typically used in casual talk (interestingly, however, *bokokugo* ‘native language’ is not a technical term and is encountered in casual conversation). When I asked an informant about why this might be the case, she said that because *nihonjin* ‘Japanese’ are the only possible ‘native’ speakers of Japanese, everyone else is a ‘nonnative’ speaker by default. Thus, in casual Japanese conversation, it would seem that *nihonjin* ‘Japanese’ entails *bogowasya* ‘native speaker’.

<sup>20</sup> E has a ‘superior’ OPI rating in Japanese, and has even received training to become an OPI rater in Japanese himself.

## Excerpt 6c

- 5 E> ((to B)) yabai. nanka, bogowasya no tumori de  
oh no I native speaker M intention by
- 6 kotaetyatta yo:.  
ended up answering I  
oh no. (I) ended up answering as if (I were) a native speaker.
- 7 B a hontoo? sugo:i. ((laughs))  
a really wow  
oh really? wo:w.

Note that, in line 5, E treats his line 3 actions as accountable. In so doing, E (a) displays an orientation to T’s line 1 as having been relevantly answerable by an incumbent of the category ‘bogowasya’ (native speaker), and (b) removes himself from this category, which (c) works to associate ‘bogowasya’ with (unspecified) category-bound predicates other than linguistic expertise. In line 7, B, a JL1 sitting next to E, receipts E’s account as newsworthy and hearably displays an affective stance (Ochs, 1996) of ‘amusement’, actions which further work to constitute ‘native speaker’ as a category which is bound to certain (unspecified) predicates not attributable to E. Thus, T’s lines 1 and 2 actions *are* treated by the participants as having made ‘native speaker’ relevant to the interaction, even though T made no overt mention of ‘native speaker’ herself. Interestingly, however, E displays his understanding of T’s actions as having done so in part by deploying the overt categorial label *bogowasya* ‘native speaker’ himself (line 5). If E had instead said something like, ‘yabai. kotaetyatta yo:.’ (Oh no. (I) ended up answering), it would remain unclear as to *what* he was treating as accountable concerning his line 3 action of answering T’s question. Why is this the case? Why aren’t T, E, and B’s actions alone sufficient to make ‘native speaker’ warrantably relevant to the interaction? One possibility is that it is because on any given interactional occasion categories like NS/NNS may be treated by the participants as being associated not only with such attributes as linguistic expertise (e.g. Excerpt 5), but with various other attributes such as nationality, racial and/or cultural heritage, etc. as well (e.g., Excerpt 6).<sup>21</sup> Thus, it becomes difficult for the analyst to warrantably claim that participant actions (such as orienting to linguistic expertise) alone work to make relevant the categories of NS/NNS in the interaction in the same way that such actions do make relevant

<sup>21</sup> Notably, these kinds of attributes are in turn treatable as being bound to other categories such as ‘teacher’, ‘cultural expert’, ‘legal citizen’, etc.

certain ‘situated identities’ (Zimmerman, 1998) such as ‘relative novice/expert’ (see, e.g., Hosoda, 2006).

## REFERENCES

- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University.
- Bilmes, J. (1988). The concept of preference in conversation analysis. *Language in Society*, 17, 161-181.
- Bilmes, J. (1993). Ethnomethodology, culture and implicature: Toward an empirical pragmatics. *Pragmatics*, 3, 387-409.
- Bilmes, J. (1995). Negotiation and compromise. In A. Firth (Ed.), *The discourse of negotiation: Studies of language in the workplace* (pp. 61-81). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Bilmes, J. (2008). Generally speaking: Formulating an argument in the US Federal Trade Commission. *Text*, 28(2), 193-217.
- Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(s1), 923-939.
- Cook, V. (1991). The poverty-of-the-stimulus argument and multicompetence. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 103-117.
- Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for Multicompetence. *Language Learning*, 42(4), 557-591.
- Cook, V. (1995). Multi-competence and the learning of many languages. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 8(2), 93-98.
- Day, D. (1998). Being ascribed, and resisting, membership of an ethnic group. In C. Antaki & S. M. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 151-170). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Drew, P. (2005). Conversation analysis. In K. L. Fitch & R. E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 71-82). Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1995). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-300.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(5), 800-819.

- Gafaranga, J. (1999). Language choice as a significant aspect of talk organization: The orderliness of language alternation. *Text*, 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. (2001). Linguistic identities in talk-in-interaction: Order in bilingual conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(12), 1901-1925.
- Gafaranga, J. (2005). Demythologising language alternation studies: Conversational structure vs. social structure in bilingual interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 281-300.
- Gafaranga, J., & Calvo, M. (2001). Language versus medium in the study of bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5, 195-219.
- Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M. (2002). Interactional otherness: Towards a redefinition of codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 6(1), 1-22.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, 62(1/2), 51-75.
- Hall, J. K., An, C., & Carlson, M. T. (2006). Reconceptualizing multicompetence as a theory of language knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(2), 220-240.
- He, A. W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 568-582.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (1997a). Membership categorization analysis: An introduction. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis*. Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (1997b). The reflexive constitution of category, predicate and context in two settings. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis*. Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (1997c). Conclusion: Membership categorization analysis and sociology. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis*. Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.

- Hester, S., & Francis, D. (2000). Ethnomethodology, conversation analysis, and ‘institutional talk,’ *Text*, 20(3), 391-413.
- Hosoda, Y. (2000). Other-Repair in Japanese conversation between nonnative and native speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 39-63.
- Hosoda, Y. (2002). *Analyzing Japanese native-nonnative speaker conversation: Categories, other-repair, and production delay*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 25-50.
- Ikeda, T. (2005). The interactional achievement of being ‘native’ and ‘nonnative’ speakers: An analysis of multiparty interactions between Japanese and international students. *CLIC: Crossroads of Language*, 6, 60-79.
- Jayyusi, L. (1984). *Categorization and the moral order*. Boston: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Jefferson, G. (2007). Preliminary notes on abdicated other-correction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(3), 445-461.
- Kamio, A. (1997). *Territory of information*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review*, 19, 83-99.
- Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(7), 1083-1110.
- Kurhila, S. (2004). Clients or language learners: Being a second language speaker in institutional interaction. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 58-74). London: Continuum.
- Kurhila, S. (2005). Different orientations to grammatical correctness. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 143–158). Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Matsumoto, K. (2003). *Intonation units in Japanese conversation: Syntactic, informational and functional structures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Matsumoto, Y. (1997). *Noun-modifying constructions in Japanese: A frame-semantic approach*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Mori, J. (1999). *Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Japanese: Connective expressions and turn construction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407–437). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Paoletti, I. (1998). Handling “incoherence” according to the speaker’s on-sight categorization. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 171–190). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Park, J. (2007). Co-construction of nonnative speaker identity in cross-cultural interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3), 339-360.
- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Sacks, H. (1972a). An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 31-74). New York: Free Press.
- Sacks, H. (1972b). On the analysability of stories by children. In J. J. Gumperz & D. H. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 325-345). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 54–69). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Limited (First presented in 1973 as a public lecture at the Linguistic Institute, University of Michigan. Edited by E. A. Schegloff with the assistance of J. Mandelbaum.).
- Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on conversation*. Boston: Wiley-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.
- Saft, S. L. (2001). *Arguing in the institution: Context, culture, and conversation analysis in a set of Japanese university faculty meetings*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI.

- Schegloff, E. A. (1981). Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some uses of ‘uh huh’ and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk. Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1981* (pp. 71-93). Washington, DC: Georgetown University.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5), 1295-1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*, 29(1), 1-63.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(3), 462-482.
- 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.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tanaka, H. (1999). *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar and interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tanaka, H. (2000). The particle *ne* as a turn-management device in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(8), 1135-1176.
- Torras, M., & Gafaranga, J. (2002). Social identities and language alternation in non-formal institutional bilingual talk: Trilingual service encounters in Barcelona. *Language in Society*, 31, 527-548.
- Watson, R. (1978). Categorisation, authorisation and blame-negotiation in conversation. *Sociology*, 12, 105-113.
- Watson, R. (1997). General reflections on ‘categorization’ and ‘sequence’ in the analysis of conversation. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis* (pp. 49-75). Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis and University Press of America.
- Wei, L. (2005). ‘How can you tell?’: Towards a common sense explanation of conversational code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 375-389.
- Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Identity, context and interaction. In *Identities in talk* (pp. 87–106). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**APPENDIX:****Transcription Conventions:**

^	glottal stop
heh hah	laughter
↑↓	high or low pitch (placed prior to affected element)
>words<	quicker than surrounding talk
<words>	slower than the surrounding talk
[	beginning of overlapped speech
]	end of overlapped speech
=	latching (i.e. no pause after the completion of one utterance and the beginning of another)
(3.3)	length of pause (measured in seconds and tenths of seconds)
(.)	pause less than one tenth of a second
(words)	unclear utterance
(***)	unrecoverable utterance (number of syllables indicated by asterisks)
((words))	commentary by transcriptionist
wo::rd	geminate sound
WORDS	louder than surrounding talk
°words°	softer than surrounding talk
<u>words</u>	more emphasis than surrounding talk
wo-	cut-off
,	continuing intonation
¿	rising but not questioning intonation
.	final intonation
?	question intonation

**Interlinear Key for Japanese:**

C: Copula

CT: Continuer

D: Double particle (*kamo, toka, etc.*)DA: Dative particle (*he, ni*)

F: Speech filler

IP: Interactional particle (*yo, ne, sa, na, etc.*)IT: Interjection (*e, a, ^e, ^a, etc.*)L: Linking device (*-te, de, si, kedo etc.*)M: Noun modification particle (*no, na, etc.*)

N: Nominalizer

NG: Negative

O: Object marker

P: Past tense

PA: Passive

Q: Question marker

QT: Quotation marker

S: Subject marker

T: Topic marker

**Stylistic Indicators (When Necessary):**

DS: Distal style

FS: Formal style

H: Honorific

HU: Humble

PS: Plain style

