GIRL TALK:

A DIALOGIC APPROACH TO ORAL NARRATIVE STORYTELLING ANALYSIS

IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESEARCH

by

M'Balia B. Thomas

———————————————

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

GRADUATE INTERDISCIPLINARY DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN SECOND

LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND TEACHING

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2014

UMI Number: 3642292

UMI

Dissertation Publishing

UMI 3642292

ProQuest®

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by M'Balia B. Thomas entitled Girl Talk: A Dialogic Approach to Oral Narrative Storytelling Analysis in English as a Foreign Language Research and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____Date: May 2014

Linda Waugh

_____Date: May 2014

Chantelle Warner

_____Date: May 2014

Grace Fielder

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

_____Date: August 2014

Dissertation Director: Linda Waugh

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that an accurate acknowledgement of the source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: M'Balia B. Thomas

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am incredibly indebted to so many people for the completion of this dissertation. First, I owe so much to Dr. Linda R. Waugh, my dissertation chair, advisor, mentor and great supporter in this journey to establishing myself as a member of the Academy. Lin, you have seen potential in me that I do not always recognize, and this allowed me to see beyond the immediate challenges of growing in academic knowledge and wisdom.

In addition, I acknowledge the time, support and encouragement of Drs. Chantelle Warner, Grace Fielder, Perry Gilmore, and Antxon Olarrea, who as members of my dissertation committee and comprehensive exam committee have been fundamental to the path. Along with them, I acknowledge the wonderful ladies of the Bible study group upon which this dissertation is based. To maintain the anonymity of those featured in this dissertation, they will not be named – but THEY know who they are. I would not have made it through graduate school without the friendship, support and FOOD this group has provided me, or without the research data I was privileged to collect.

Championing me from the sidelines and from behind have been my parents (birth and extended), sister and numerous friends and colleagues around the globe. Most significant of all of these, however, is my wonderful partner-in-life and crime, Scott Cossel, who has encouraged me, fed me, scolded me about working too hard and ignoring my health, and has been steadfastly with me during this process. I am so thankful for your loving presence in my life.

In closing, I acknowledge a very key contributor to the writing of this dissertation – my $280 Acer laptop computer that I bought from Walmart. This little gadget has been dropped, carried around town, flown from coast to coast, left both running and without a battery charge, and in general mistreated worse than an entity should -- and yet -- it has served me incredibly well during this arduous writing process.

Thank you laptop! Thank you Scott! Thank you family and friends! Thank you, ladies! Thank you Drs. Warner, Fielder, Gilmore, and Olarrea! And thank you Lin!

DEDICATION

For my mom, **Helen Yvonne Bryant**,
for whom the dream of acquiring a Ph.D. has been achieved through me, her eldest.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Research in the fields of Applied Linguistics (AL) and Second Language Studies (SLS) has begun addressing the ways in which second and foreign language (L2) use is a "material" struggle to understand, acquire and author L2 words for one's own creative purposes – particularly in the face of ideologies about language learning and language use (Squires 2008; Suni 2014). This struggle has implications for the subjectivity, agency and ultimate acquisition and use of the target language by L2 users. This dissertation seeks to augment scholarship in this area by demonstrating how material struggle can surface in the process of data collection (a research interview). It presents an analysis of a recorded narrative of an English as a foreign language (EFL) user, who was a second year graduate student enrolled in a university in the southwest US. She was invited by the author -- a native speaker of English -- to tell an oral narrative story in English to a group with whom she met regularly. However, in positioning the EFL subject as "non-native" in the recruitment process, the author as a native speaker failed to anticipate the manner in which her request was interpellative (Althusser 1971[2001]), thus reproducing and subjecting the "non-native" to the ideology and discourses associated with that category and setting into motion a creative authoring of response to this interpellative call.

In approaching the analysis from this perspective, this dissertation adopts an approach to oral narrative story analysis that is based on the Bakhtinian-inspired notion of dialogism (Bakhtin 1981, 1986). Dialogism underscores the resultant narrative as a collection of utterances poised to respond to the request to "tell a story," while simultaneously addressing the ideology and discourses associated with this request. Additionally, the analysis explores the dialogic nature of the narrative from the standpoint of "tellability" (Norrick 2005; Ochs and Capps 2001), thus highlighting aspects of the narrative that render this tale of friendship, an extramarital affair and a friend "in hatred" meaningful in the context of its telling.

Guided by an interest in Bakhtinian dialogism and driven by a concern for narrative tellability, three differing, yet complimentary, analyses of the narrative are explored: 1)

genre, register and vague ("vaguely gendered") language, 2) face work, framing and cooperation and 3) gossip, stance and the representation of speech and voice. These analyses likewise uncover three themes that underlie the narrative context of the tale. These themes are: the backgrounding of nativeness and foregrounding of gender, the simultaneous and ambiguous struggle for solidarity and power, and the display of personal style through moral stance in the presentation of a continuous self over time and place. The implication of this work for future research and assessment in AL and SLS is addressed.

GIRL TALK:

A DIALOGIC APPROACH TO ORAL NARRATIVE STORYTELLING ANALYSIS

IN ENGLISH AS AFOREIGN LANGUAGE RESEARCH

I.

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Dialogism, Studies of Language Use, and the Foreign Language User

It is said that narrative storytelling, the social and discursive practice of recounting and temporally ordering human experience and events, is a "universal function of language" (Hymes 1996: p. 112). As such, "[n]arratives represent storied ways of knowing and communicating" (Riessman 2005: p.1, referencing Hinchman and Hinchman 1997) -- from the sharing of "small" stories (eg. Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008) and jointly-constructed retellings at family gatherings (eg. Ochs et al 1989) to longer accounts of personal experience (eg. Hill 1995) and ritually performed folklore that communicate the moral values of a community (eg. Hymes 1981). Yet, the manner in which individuals narrate stories and the linguistic means by which they orient and highlight relevant details within these stories can differ significantly across speech communities. For example, the culturally normalized ways of introducing, interrupting, and jointly participating in the construction of tales can vary, as can the discourse strategies and rhetorical devices speakers employ to move through narrative time and plot development. These are socio-cultural (pragmatic) features of language use and they are not always explicitly taught in the formal setting of the academic environment; rather, they are implicitly obtained through an individual's socialization and lived experience within a speech community (eg. Blum-Kulka 1993; Heath 1982; Melzi 2000). Thus, the competence to successfully narrate a tale is a sociolinguistic feat reflective of both language socialization and linguistic "competence" (broadly defined). Such an accomplishment is particularly notable when the narrative is delivered in the storyteller's "second" or "foreign" language (L2).

The following dissertation presents such a notable event. It features a dialogic analysis of an English-language oral (spoken) narrative of personal experience elicited from an L1 Mandarin Chinese/L2 English (as a Foreign Language) doctoral student at a large land-

grant university in the southwest United States. In this work, the term "English as a Foreign Language" (EFL) refers to 1) foreign language learners who learn English in a home country where English is not the primary language of use outside of the classroom context, 2) foreign language learners engaged in learning English in a study abroad setting where English is the primary medium of communication outside of the learning context, and 3) foreign language "users" for whom English is the primary means of conducting business or acquiring an education in a linguistic setting where English is the primary medium of communication.

Few studies investigate the narrative storytelling abilities of EFLs or even the wide spectrum of foreign language learners (FLLs). Of those that do, even fewer analyze these abilities from a *dialogic* perspective. Dialogic (and its related terms, "dialogue" and "dialogism") is a term applied to a network of concepts about the nature of language -- conceptualized as words and "utterances" -- found within the writings of Mikhail Bakhtin (1981, 1986, 1990), Pavel Medvedev (1985), and Valentin Vološinov (1986[1973]). One of these concepts consists of the notion that words and utterances are the products of their social and historical journey through a speech community. As such, they "come[] to us already dialogized, already spoken about, already evaluated" (Morson and Emerson 1990: p. 145). Related to this concept is the idea that words and utterances are "…encountered and learned as something used and patched, as an aggregate rather than a system" (Morson and Emerson 1990: p. 145). An additional concept emphasizes that words and utterances exist in relation to – both in response to and in anticipation of -- other words and utterance. The implication of this concept is two-fold: that the authoring of words and utterances is not neutral and the responses to this language use can thus be analyzed at the level of the word/utterance – even ones as long as a narrative story (Bakhtin 1986). A final concept is that words and utterances reflect the social nature of human language and through the voices, the tones, the world views and the consciousness of speech (heteroglossia) expressed through these utterances (and which stand in hierarchical relationship to one another), language provides an outlet for meaning and ways of understanding self, others and the world (Björklund 2011: 43; also Holquist 2002: p. 30). Together, these concepts underscore a particular reality of language and language use within human communication

labeled dialogism. In addition to these concepts, dialogism further emphasizes two aspects central to meaning-making and understanding in human communication: 1) the importance of context, particularly what Vološinov terms the "extraverbal context" (1976: p. 99) and 2) the inherent struggle involved in authoring words and utterances that anticipate, respond, address this context and creatively and agentively render speakers "answerable" within the context of language use. Thus, to present and analyze an oral narrative story of a speaker of English as a Foreign Language from a dialogic perspective is to produce an analysis that advances this network of concepts about language and language use, accounts for the context in which meaning-making and understanding occurs in human interaction, and highlights the narrator's struggle to creatively and agentively author responses that render the narrator "answerable" (contextually meaningful, recognizable and also anticipatory of a response) in the context of the narrative.

There is a need for research that adopts a dialogic orientation to the analysis of oral narrative storytelling in Applied Linguistics (AL) and Second Language Studies (SLS). Traditionally, narrative research in these fields has suffered from a bias toward *monologic* rather than dialogic analyses of narrative data produced by L2 speakers. These works typically limit the scope of analysis to a study of the structural (grammatical) system of language where emphasis is placed on one-to-one, referential meanings of word forms and a priori-determined morpho-syntactic structure. Additionally, the research methods employed by these studies tend to rely on static and/or visual story prompts to elicit narrative responses (eg. Chafe 1980) rather than stories elicited from the individual's personal experience. As such, much of this work ignores the variability in language production that appears in narrative utterances -- variability that on further examination might prove to be, not primarily a reflection of competence (again, widely defined), but instead attention to audience design, shifts in genre or register, personal style, and individual stance or response to discursive or interactional positioning. When such style-shifting matters are attended to by scholars, variability is often examined as a linguistic (phonological, morphological and syntactic) phenomenon resulting from variation in the planning, task, L1 background, or interaction itself (eg. Beebe 1980; Broner and Tarone 2001; Collentine 2004; Ellis 1987; Tarone 1985, 1988). A focus on the more linguistic

aspects of variability, while shedding light on the process of language acquisition and interlanguage development, fails to account for the emergence of an everyday, interactional social and linguistic competence acquired by L2 users. Such a competence is reflective of the extralinguistic aspects of speech that accompany *spoken* language and reflect the reality that all of language -- even grammatical structure -- is: 1) dialogic, the result of the parts and/or wholes of the speech of others (Bakhtin 1986: p. 93) and 2) emergent in interaction, resulting in a "real-time, social phenomenon...[whose] structure is always deferred, always in a process but never arriving, and therefore emergent" in its context of use (Hopper 1998: p. 156).

Since the 1990s, this monologic approach to the study of L2 narrative has broadened and now incorporates scholarly work that investigates the flexible and adaptive nature of language-in-use, research where the analytical focus has shifted from the production of a perfectly "competent" execution of narrative within an inflexible language system, to the recognition and description of language users' capacity for use of multiple linguistic resources as tools for meaning-making in multilingual and multiliterate contexts (see Rampton 1995, 2011 on crossing; Garcia 2009, Garcia and Leiva 2014; Wei and Hua 2013; Williams 1996 on translanguaging; Auer 2007; Koven 2001 on code-switching and bilingualism; Blackledge and Creese 2014; Busch 2012; Dufva et al 2011 on heteroglossia). Scholars conducting research in these settings acknowledge that language users draw upon a multiplicity of linguistic resources in their interactions (speech styles, verbal genres, different regional and urban vernaculars, intonational responses), and in the application of these resources, language users demonstrate creativity and agency in their authoring of speech. The multilingual speech forms authored reflect the local registers, codes, discourses, indexical stances, linguistic strategies and circulating and intertextual references that are part and parcel of the ways of communicating and making meaning in a multilingual, multicultural and global society. The interest in L2 multiliterate repertoires reflected in the narrative stories collected in these settings is due, not as much to what these repertoires reflect about acquisition or competence, but more to what these narratives suggest about the social meaning linguistic forms entail for speakers in communicative contexts, particularly in terms of investment in their language learning and identity

(re)construction. As a social tool, these linguistic repertoires become symbolic and material resources for language users to take up in the presentation and authoring of self in social interactions (see Kouritzin 2000; Koven 2004; Norton Peirce 1995; Pavlenko 2001a, 2001b, 2001c; Pavlenko and Lantolf 2000; Vitanova 2004, 2005, 2010).

This movement toward a multilingual and multiliterate language analysis has progressed through research dedicated to the study of language use in the face of macro-social elements related to power, language ideologies and circulating discourses. In these settings, decisions on language use and linguistic repertoires are increasingly influenced by globalization and the global circulation of cultural and linguistic images. Heller (1999, 2002) and Duchene and Heller (2012), for example, call attention to the ways in which linguistic repertoires have become "an acquirable technical skill and marketable commodity" (Heller 2002: p. 47) for L2 users in the current global economy. In some cases, the linguistic skills valued in the marketplace (i.e., linguistic style, degree of formality, use of vernacular or regional dialect) differ significantly from the language forms actually spoken "on the ground" or taught in the classroom. This difference has an unfortunate impact on language identity, as well as understandings of linguistic competence within these contexts (Duchene and Heller 2012). In a related theme, structural manifestations of power, and in particular the global circulation of discourses and ideologies, may prohibit individuals from being or even imagining themselves part of a linguistic community (Ibrahim 1999; Mori 1997; Siegal 1995, 1996). Instead, these individuals may be positioned into specific linguistic identities based on the discourses and ideologies that pre-exist them in the new context. For example, Ibrahim (1999) investigates the impact on Francophone sub-Saharan African immigrant youth in Canada of the socio-cultural practice of ascribing race and pre-defining all "Blackness" as "African-American". This practice of racializing these immigrants impacts (and for many, limits) the ways in which these youth are able to imagine themselves as English speakers. As a result, a number of these students draw upon the social and linguistic speech "rituals" associated with African American rap and hip hop culture, such as "whassup?" and "whadap?" for "what is up" = "what is happening" (in a less formal register) and morphological patterns of pronunciation ("de, den, dat" instead of "the, then, that") (Ibrahim 1999: pp. 351, 360).

As these examples demonstrate, macro-social factors of context can have a significant impact on the linguistic repertoires L2 users adopt, repertoires themselves steeped in a social-historical context that demonstrate that the words and utterances adopted by these speakers are indeed "already dialogized".

Much of the aforementioned multilingual research was conducted with second and bilingual language learners. Less of this work, however, explores the development and display of language use by foreign language learners (FLLs). This is an unfortunate oversight in the field since FLLs are just as likely to engage in multilingual practices and to be exposed to the socio-cultural and socio-political situations that mark language learning and use in this global world. To this point, Squires writes:

> Classrooms and individuals are not isolated from larger currents in society. Their language, the tool they use for interaction (and the object of learning in SLA contexts), is constitutive of their subjectivities within the learning situation and in the cultural context in which they are learning. It is the economic and social structures that exist in the material world that condition their subjectivity as they necessarily must enter 'definite social and political relations…[and] as they act, produce materially, and hence as they work under definite material limits, presuppositions and conditions independent of their will' (Marx, 1998, p. 41) (2008: pp. 107-108).

The relevance of Squires' statement is highlighted in Pomerantz and Schwartz (2011), who demonstrate that the foreign language classroom is a place where language ideologies about foreign language learning at the societal level are reflected in the narratives produced by learners in the target language, as well as in the failure of many instructors to recognize and capitalize on the linguistic and cultural resources their multilingual, multiliterate, and multicultural student bodies bring to the L2 classroom. In terms of foreign language learning in study abroad contexts, Talburt and Stewart (1999) analyze the effects of race and gender on the study abroad experiences of their lone African American participant. For this young female student, race and gender uniquely impact, not only her social encounters, but the genre ("piropos", gendered and not infrequently sexualized, practice of catcalling found within the study abroad context of Talburt and Stewart's study – see Twombly 1995), register and content of language to which she is exposed outside of class – "Everywhere I go in town…I'm little *morena*, or I'm little *negrita*, or *chocolate*"

(Talburt and Stewart 1999: p. 168). A growing body of research in the area of foreign language learning in study abroad settings examines how the socio-cultural context impacts the type of language to which learners are exposed, their overall investment in the language learning process (Kinginger 2004), their language use, misuse, or even lack of use (Polanyi 1995), and ultimately their feelings of legitimacy and authenticity in using the language (Kramsch 2012a, 2012b). Finally, the socio-political impact of language use has increasingly become relevant for those foreign language users pursuing academic and technical training abroad or work/professional situations in an L2 setting. For these individuals, market-driven forces not only dictate their acquisition and use of linguistic code, but also the genre and focus of "communication" and "literacy" -- skills that not infrequently conflict with their L1 cultural styles. Such processes can have lasting impact on the local language practices of a community in which the L2 plays a significant role (Cameron 2002; Duchene and Heller 2012; Kubota 2002). They may also shape the language practices adopted by individual learners in these study abroad settings, practices that a dialogic approach to the analysis of language use can uncover.

1.2. My Experience

This desire to undertake a dialogic analysis of language use within an L2 narrative story is born from my observation of L2 English language use in an Evangelical Bible study fellowship I attended between fall 2009 and summer 2014. The Bible study group was hosted by "Kathy", a doctoral student of ethnic Chinese descent, and attended primarily by master's and doctoral students born and raised in either China or Taiwan and for whom English was a foreign language. I was invited to join the group by the host, whom I had met while attending the same church. The Bible study was a nondenominational Christian gathering organized for the purposes of socializing with fellow Christians over a meal and (for the non-native speakers of the group) improving English conversational skills through a chapter-by-chapter reading and discussion of the Bible. Although I am a native born, L1 speaker of English, I was very much drawn to this mostly L2 English group of Christian believers. As a relative new-comer to the southwest, I – like my fellow Bible study participants -- felt alien in my new environment. Not only were the geography (a literal desert compared to the lush green of my southeastern home state) and the racial/ethnic

makeup of the area drastically different from my home state (I went from living in a"

majority-minority" city where the lived experience of being a minority was an abstract

concept rather than an actual physical reality, to a city where African Americans made up

less than 5% of the population), but also the pragmatic rules of engaging in daily service

encounters -- the social niceties associated with "Southern Hospitality" -- were less often

observed. My social interactions in this new environment left me feeling "unmoored"

(Phipps 2013) and the experience of culture shock was more strongly felt in this

environment than in my year living abroad in Spain. It was over this shared sense of

"foreignness" and attempt to reestablish a sense of self and belonging in the new setting

that I bonded with this group.

The food and discussions that flowed during the two-to-three hour Bible study gatherings

presented me with a space of great comfort, acceptance and friendship. It also provided me

with a rich linguistic environment in which to observe L2 use. During our meetings, I saw

participants not only read complex biblical texts (complex in terms of sentence structure,

interpretation, and the pronunciation of obscure biblical names), but also discuss

metaphorical and allegorical interpretations, create or hypothesize rules of pronunciation

for words that violated standard English rules, and struggle to communicate abstract

concepts about life, death, God and morality. I witnessed such language use, not only

during our discussions, but also our meals and prayers. This was language use that reached

beyond the religious genre to include advice-seeking and encouragement on issues from

family to academic life to our most painful heartbreaks. Although I had previously

approached the group about regularly recording our meetings for research purposes (the

request was denied given the private nature of our discussions and the desire to maintain

openness in this setting), it was only in the spring of 2010 that the group approved my

recording one of our interactions for a qualitative research methods course I was taking at

the time. The purpose of the assignment was to collect spoken narrative data using a

sociolinguistic approach (Labov 1972; Labov and Waletzky 1967[1997]) and analyze the

narrative structure and interlanguage aspects of this data, specifically, variability in past

tense marking in discourse clauses (eg. Berlin and Adamson 2009; Wolfram 1985). Based

on previous narrative research conducted with L2 speakers of English, the assumption was

that systematic differences in narrative structure and variability in past tense marking would surface in these narrative stories in contrast to the narrative structures and tenses markings produced by native speakers of English. "Jamie" a third year doctoral student from a Mandarin-speaking country (L1 Chinese/L2 English), volunteered to provide the narrative. The recording of Jamie's narrative took place in a restaurant, and similar to the group sociolinguistic interviews recorded in group settings by Labov (1972), Jamie's narrative was recorded in the presence of three others – myself (MBT), "Kathy" (the host of the Bible study fellowship) and "Ruth". Both Kathy and Ruth happen to be from the same country as Jamie and thus they too are L1 Chinese speakers. After ordering our meals, the tape recorder was lain out in the middle of the table where Jamie narrated a 13-minute tale about love, betrayal and a woman who was "in hatred" (line 153) -- feeling hate.

During the telling of the narrative and afterwards as I approached the task of transcribing and analyzing the data, I felt the potential complication created by my change in role from participant to participant-observer. As a researcher, I found Jamie's use of language and the topics discussed incredibly rich. However, as a friend, I was worried that the story was too personal to be submitted for the course assignment; the narrative felt transgressive (Norrick 2007) in its sharing of such controversial themes as extramarital affairs and abortion. I felt the need to protect the "face" – a term I adopt from Goffman to refer to "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (1967: p. 5) -- of the participants and in particular Jamie, who volunteered to tell the story. Furthermore, the story felt "wrong" in the generic sense that it was not a fable, fairytale or other classic narrative that would lend itself to an easy analysis of the differing storytelling techniques between the East and West. Yet, the longer I sat with Jamie's narrative data, the more I recognized the presence of ideologies and expectations I held personally for the task. I began to wonder how these unspoken expectations might have been obvious to Jamie and perhaps influenced the style or theme of her narrative. I wondered how similar expectations held by other scholars influence the language and linguistic repertoires produced by their subjects. I then considered the effect of the storytelling context on Jamie's telling: the restaurant setting with four women

(reminiscent of images of the four protagonists in HBO's "Sex and the City" series who often gathered over meals), the telling of the story in a group rather than a face-to-face interview setting, and my presence as participant-observer. I was already "one of the girls", someone who had actually participated in the sharing of personal stories on previous occasions. The more I reflected on the context of the interview -- from my approach to the task (my request to be told a story) to the location and set-up of the interview – the more I recognized that a space of dialogic potential had always already existed for Jamie's creative authoring of a response beyond any plans I may have had as a researcher. I then understood that my goal as an analyst was to highlight (beyond grammar and structure) the varied linguistic resources Jamie brought to this narrative task in this particular context of interaction.

1.3. Purpose, Scope and Organization of the Dissertation

Therefore the purpose of this dissertation is to explore the application of dialogism to the analysis of an oral narrative story produced by a speaker of English as a foreign language. It joins a growing body of work in AL/SLS that adopts a Bakhtinian-inspired approach to the analysis of L2 narratives: Blackledge and Creese 2014; Hall et al 2005; Menard-Warwicke 2005a, 2005b, 2007; Pavlenko 2007; Vitanova 2010, 2013; Warriner 2004. Holquist (2002) writes that the dialogism of the "Bakhtin Circle" is "a manifold phenomenon…[that] can be reduced to…an utterance, a reply, and a relation between the two" (p. 38). This work explores Jamie's narrative as a reply to the uttered request to "tell a story" as an L2 speaker of English and the analysis aims to make explicit the relationship between the request and reply -- namely the ideology about nativeness and L2 language use the request implies. It further posits that through the linguistic resources and rhetorical strategies Jamie adopts to tell her story, she implicitly addresses ideologies and expectations about nativeness, including perhaps, unspoken assumptions about the types of language legitimately available to non-native speakers (Kramsch 2012b). This dialogic analysis will be informed by analytical approaches utilized across a number of social scientific disciplines concerned with the micro-interactional (rather than structural or performance) study of narrative storytelling. These include an interest in speech genres (Bakhtin 1986; Vološinov 1986[1973]), a concern for ritual and meaning in language use

drawn from within interactional sociolinguistics (Goffman 1959, 1974) and the connection between interaction, stance, and indexical meaning in the performance of individual and situated style (Eckert 2003, Kiesling 2009, Mendoza-Denton 2008; Rampton 1995). Additionally, it will address the overlap in ethnographic (eg. Mendoza-Denton 2008), sociolinguistic (eg. Labov 1972) and formal (eg. Mishler 1986) approaches to collecting narrative data, as well as the challenge to the researching that changing roles in relation to the subject can create as one moves from "complete participant" to "participant as observer" (Gold 1958). Finally, and most important, this dialogic approach to narrative analysis explores how a "simple" request to "tell a story" is neither simple nor is it neutral; rather, it is an act with the power to interpellate subjects (Althusser 1971[2001]) and produce creatively authored responses that are in dialogue with the ideologies behind the interpellation (Bakhtin 1986). Through this dialogic approach to narrative data analysis, this dissertation attempts to highlight such creativity through: 1) the style-shifting, heteroglossic and polyphonic speech produced by L2 speakers and the ways in which these speakers recognize and draw upon the social meanings indexed by specific styles, codes and voices to project or align with social identities, 2) the "multilayered" nature of interaction and the context of talk (D'hondt 2009), particularly as it relates to the symbolic and material capital that particular language use can provide, and 3) the observance and application of ritual -- though not necessarily sequential or ordered -- aspects of talk by an English as a foreign language speaker.

This investigation begins in **CHAPTER 2: "NARRATIVE STORYTELLING AND THE THEORETICAL BASIS FOR A DIALOGIC APPROACH TO L2 NARRATIVE ANALYSIS"** with a review of the literature on narrative studies, followed by a more thorough overview of the context of the Bible study fellowship and a transcription of Jamie's narrative in its entirety. The transcription is then followed by a review of the genre of talk featured in the narrative ("girl talk"), as well as a review (and critique) of the major approaches to narrative analysis adopted across the social sciences. This review is then followed by the proposed dialogic narrative analysis and rationale for this approach. Jamie's narrative data is introduced in this chapter for two reasons: 1) it is presented alongside background information on Evangelical Bible study groups, providing a context for the elicitation of the narrative data collected and which is

important to an understanding of the research questions that mark this dissertation; and 2) in introducing the data within the literature review, it is possible to also review literature related to the speech genre ("girl talk") that anchors this narrative and is key to understanding the later analysis. SECTION 3: "A METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH TO DIALOGIC NARRATIVE ANALYSIS", lays the ground work for executing the methodological analysis this work proposes – a dialogic approach to narrative analysis -- which will be carried out by attending to one specific dimension of narrativity, "tellability" (Ochs and Capps 2001). Tellability provides insight into the elements of a story that are foregrounded in such a way as to render a narrative credible, reportable, and worthy of being told. The dialogic creation of tellability in this tale will be discussed in relation to three analytical themes: 1) "Genre, register and vague ('vaguely gendered') language", which examines the linguistic repertoire and speech strategies the speaker draws upon to create a tale that is engaging, well-ordered and features several levels of narrativity and characterization within a specific genre of spoken and gendered talk called "girl talk" (Eckert 1990); 2) "Face work, framing and cooperation", which investigates the moves and tactics the narrator takes up to negotiate the interactional task of saving face in the process of engaging in girl talk; and 3) "Gossip, stance and the representation of speech and voice", which explores the speaker's struggle to create a moral frame for her tale while distancing herself from the moral implications of the tale and the actors within the tale primarily through the use of reported speech. This chapter is followed by CHAPTER 4: "GIRL TALK", in which the three analyses and a summary discussion that links the three analyses to the overall genre of girl talk are presented. Finally, concluding thoughts and implications for future AL/SLS research will be presented in CHAPTER 5: "CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS."

2.

ORAL NARRATIVE STORYTELLING AND THE THEORETICAL BASIS
FOR A DIALOGIC APPROACH TO L2 NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

2.1. Oral Narrative Storytelling

Oral narrative storytelling is widely researched across the social sciences. It is an area of study found within such disciplines as *sociology* (Chase 2005; Gubrium and Holstein 2009; Holstein and Gubrium 2000)*, social and discursive psychology* (Bamberg 2004, Bruner 1987, 2002; Mishler 1986; Riessman 2005, 2008), *anthropology* (Bauman 1986; Bauman and Briggs 1990, Holland et al 1998; Ochs and Capps 2001), *communication* (Tracy and Robles 2013), *linguistics and sociolinguistics* (Coulmas 1986, De Fina and Georgakopoulou 2011; Labov 1972; Labov and Waletzky 1967[1997]; Polanyi 1981, 1985; Schiffrin et al 2010; Tannen 1984, 1989[2007]), *education* (Gee 1991; Wortham 2001), *child language development* (Berman 1995), and *applied linguistics / SLA / SLS* (Kramsch 2009; Norton (Peirce) 1995, 2000; Pomerantz 2010; Pomerantz and Schwartz 2011; Pavlenko 2001a, 2001b, 2007; Pavlenko and Lantolf 2000; Vitanova 2010). Within the social sciences, work in narrative studies has included attention to "small stories," short stories embedded within conversational activities (Bamberg 2004, 2006; Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008; Georgakopoulou 2007; De Fina and Georgakopoulou 2011); danger of death tales (Labov 1972, 2013); life history narratives (Menard-Warwick 2004, 2005a, 2005b); autobiographies (Pavlenko 2002) and other oral histories, such as *testimonios* (Atkinson and Coffey 2002); narratives of illness (Frank 1995); narratives of dislocation and threat of deportation (Phipps 2013); and folklore, fairytales and grand myths (Bauman 1986, Hymes 1981, Propp 1928[1968]).

Given the breadth of the field of narrative study within the social sciences, it is not surprising that arriving at a single description of oral narrative storytelling is a challenge. Yet, across the social sciences, narrative storytelling is viewed as follows: it is a form of communication that is more than the production of discourse or talk; it is the temporal ordering and sequencing of experience, as well as the involvement in, relating and evaluation of this experience to others. Narrative stories are not neutral mediums of

discourse, nor are they simply stories; rather, "narrative serves as a transmitter of beliefs and shared values" (Vitanova 2010: p. 30) reflecting the moral and social order of a society (Labov 2013). They are forms that give voice to the experiences of an individual or groups of individuals. Though narrative stories are often about characters and the representation of characterological figures (where even "I" can serve as a main character), these protagonists provide discursive spaces for the enactment of identities and the exploration of ideologies, social practices, and styles of talk. Finally, narrative tales are interactional spaces in which the primary purpose of talk is relational. Thus, an episode of narrative storytelling can be a "purposeful" instance of talk (Mishler 1999: p. 18) through which individuals express their relational selves thoughts, feelings and respond to and communicate ideologies and discourses (cf. Wortham and Rhodes 2013).

It is important to note that the focus of this dissertation is specifically on oral narrative *storytelling* and not narrated talk or narrated accounts of events. Much of the work in SLS/SLA analyzed as narrative draws from recorded samples of narrated talk or accounts; these instances of language use are utilized often for the purposes of uncovering discourse or ideologies in talk or investigating themes related to speaker subjectivity, positioning and identity (eg. Pavlenko 2007, Vitanova 2010, Warriner 2004). Narrative storytelling, however, is "centered upon a *most reportable event*", one that is also credible, has some emotional resonance for the audience, and addresses the question "so what?" (Labov 2008: p. 7-8). This "so what" is typically expressed in the form of an evaluation provided in the tale that relates the tellers' perspective of the importance – to the speaker and the audience -- of recounting the story in that moment in time. In many respects, the act of telling a story provides some statement or stance toward the narrated event itself. This is the case for the life history narratives presented in Menard-Warwick (2005a, 2005b). Through these narratives of personal experience, Menard-Warwick's subjects are able to give voice to their experiences and make sense of the effects of changing socio-political situations on the intergenerational differences in educational development witnessed in one context (2005a) and the social/political participation of family members in another (2005b). As oral narrative stories are represented in printed form in academic writing, even a journal article can present itself as a narrative story. Phipps (2013) is an example of such scholarly

storytelling. In her autoethnographic writing she poetically describes her experiences with immigration and her daughter, the fears and processes through which the harrowing events surrounding the impending deportation of her adopted daughter are related. Finally, evaluation and order can be found within the narrative tale of a schizophrenic patient (Gee 1991). By organizing the tale into "idea units" (a methodological practice of structuring spoken language based on intonation and pauses in speech) and stanzas, Gee is able to highlight and make recognizable the narrative structure, reportable elements and evaluative themes of the tale.

Research into narrative storytelling can be categorized in a number of ways, one of which is the method by which the narrative data is obtained. From this perspective, research into oral narrative storytelling falls primarily into two categories. The first category consists of *"naturally-occurring"* narrative stories (eg. Norrick 2000; Ochs and Capps 2001; Riessman 2008). Naturally-occurring narratives are collected in settings where talk occurs regularly and naturally. These narratives are collected with the expectation that such language use exhibits more naturalistic features of talk (such as phatic communication, the use of repetition, formulaicity and disfluencies) than that artificially elicited (Norrick 2000). Narrative research on naturally-occurring talk often involves the analysis of narrative stories that emerge in conversation. Studies of naturally-occurring conversational narratives address a range of topics and contexts of telling, such as small talk and chat (Coupland 2000), humor and "put down stories and dream reports" (Norrick 2000, anecdotes (Slade 1996), and gossip (Bergmann 1993; Blum-Kulka 2000; Eggins and Slade 1997; Slade 1996). The focus within this research is on the observation and documentation of the interactional and conversational strategies storytellers employ in talk (Norrick 2000: p. 2). These include aspects of conversational talk related to the ways individuals align to the storytelling event and the stories themselves, the conversational flow of talk (discourse strategies for openings, closings, interruptions, strategies for holding/ceding the floor), the negotiation of interaction (the turns at talk), and the introduction, development and change of topics (Thornbury and Slade 2006: p. 127).

The second category of oral narrative storytelling research is comprised of narratives *elicited* within formal interview settings. Within SLS/SLA, the most widely adopted method is the sociolinguistic (variationist) method associated with Labov and Waletzky (1967[1997]) and Labov (1972). Narrative storytelling data collected under this approach is elicited from a prompt (e.g., Labov's famous "danger of death" prompt) and collected for the primary purpose of observing and analyzing the patterned linguistic properties (syntax, phonology primarily) of stories. Through this particular method of gathering linguistic data, Labov found that *the content* of narrative most freely flowed "at a high level of intensity in every day life" in the recounting of stories related to danger of death, sex and relationships, and moral indignation (2013: p. 4). This elicitation method also resulted in the production of colloquial/vernacular forms, forms which allowed for later studies of style and enregisterment of linguistic forms (and the social meaning such forms have) represented in such narrative talk (Johnstone 2007).

More common across the social sciences, however, is the in-depth, structured interview method of acquiring narrative data (see Mishler 1986, 1999). Drawing from Dell Hymes (1967), Mishler approaches narrative interviews, not as tales, but as speech events within a speech situation (the interview session). In this setting, the narrative is elicited in response to specific questions posed; questions whose meanings matter in terms of contextualizing and understanding how subjects respond and answer such questions (Mishler 1986: p. 35-51). Speech events are made up of one or more speech acts; they are comprised of rules of talk -- or absence of talk (Hymes 1967: p. 19) and they provide a place for talking about language. These speech events are jointly produced between interviewer and interviewee, and they are rule-governed according to the norms of speech (Hymes 1972: p. 56). Within the speech situation of the formal interview, Mishler viewed the resultant language as dialogue, contextually shaped and resulting in speech activities best made meaningful within the context from which the language arises. Drawing from Hymes (1967, 1974) and also John Gumperz (1982), Mishler further concentrates on the fact that in research arises "[d]ifferent speech activities, such as chatting, telling a story, lecturing, and of course interviewing, [which] 'imply certain expectancies about thematic progression, turn taking,

rules, form, and outcome of the interaction as well as constraints on context'" (Mishler 1986: p. 35, referencing Gumperz 1982: 166).

The next section will introduce the narrative at the heart of this dissertation -- *"Jamie's Tale"*. There are several relevant aspects of the context of the narrative that will be discussed over the course of this second chapter. One key element of note is that the narrative was elicited and recounted in a public venue and in the presence of a small audience, and thus it features narrative and interactional elements reminiscent of naturally-occurring conversational narratives. Given the manner in which the data was elicited, the interview setting in which the narrative was recorded will be described and analyzed as a jointly-produced narrative event within the speech situation (the sociolinguistic interview), thus adopting Mishler's Hymesian-influenced view of the interview and orienting the focus of this investigation toward the context surrounding the interview itself.

2.2. Jamie's Narrative Tale

2.2.1. Context of the narrative (the Evangelical Bible study group)
Jamie's narrative story was collected in the spring of 2010 during a special meeting of the Evangelical Christian Bible study gathering she attended on a weekly basis and which features prominently in understanding the context of how such a story came to be told and how it can be understood. Though the label "Evangelical" has a rather narrow association with political and social religious conservatism, the term more broadly refers to branches within the US Christian church that pursue an active mission toward religious observance through regular Bible study participation and intimate fellowship with other practicing Christians (Bielo 2009). According to Bielo (ibid), the Evangelical Bible study group "is the most prolific type of small group in American society, with more than 30 million Protestants gathering every week" (ibid: p. 3). These groups meet in churches, across university campuses and in private homes. A description of a typical Bible study group meeting is provided by Bielo (ibid) below; it is one that accurately describes the meeting format of the Bible study group to which Jamie belonged:

The typical meeting begins with a prayer, usually a brief request for God to 'bless' the group members' time together. The majority of the meeting alternates between reading and an interactive discussion about the text of the study. As we will see time and again through the case studies presented, Bible study conversations are distinctive in Evangelical life for their blend of self-deprecating and insightful humor, curious inquiry, intense intellectual banter, and intimate exchanges of information. Groups move with ease among topics as diverse as theological doctrines, hermeneutics, moral questions, politics, social mores, history, current events, congregational concerns, and personal experiences. Biblical texts are often the basis of discussion but are certainly not the only type of text that is read. Members are voracious readers, systematically working through Biblical texts, Biblical commentaries, devotional materials, best selling Christian books, and print and online articles from Christian periodicals. (A select few groups also interspersed video or audiotape study series or lengthier films into the group schedules). Discussions are followed by a closing prayer, which can be brief or extensive, sometimes lasting upwards of thirty minutes. Bible studies rarely last for less than an hour and often exceed two hours. Before and after the typical Bible study meeting, participants socialize with one another: laughing, trading stories, exchanging books, and generally enjoying each other's company (ibid: p. 4).

One of the hallmarks of the Evangelical Bible study gathering is the rather flat nature of leadership. Though there may be individuals who organize and coordinate the meetings (and Kathy was such a figure in this group), the biblical text is considered the ultimate leader and authority within these meetings. Such a move, that is, "[r]eplacing 'a leader' with God as the primary teacher", Bielo suggests "ostensibly places everyone on equal footing, engendering an environment where relationships are more egalitarian" (ibid: p. 79). An additional feature of the Evangelical Bible study group is its often implicit aim to create an intimate religious space for its participants through shared social experience. Emphasis on the shared social aspect of this setting is stressed as a physical manifestation of the spiritual relationship between man and God (ibid: p. 76). This shared experience is fostered through group prayer and the sharing of personal experiences during Bible study meetings. Finally, language plays an important role in this space. Evangelical Bible study groups participate in what Bielo refers to as an "open, reflexive and critical dialogue" with the Bible (ibid: p. 3). In these Bible study groups, participants develop and hone the language of spirituality (Christianity) through reading, memorizing and discussing biblical texts. They further develop a language, a way of speaking, even an "anticipatory stance" in

the sharing of intimate details and personal experiences (ibid: p. 82). On this topic, Bielo writes:

> The Bible study experience provides an opportunity to reveal what remains hidden in the rest of these believers' everyday interactions. For this reason, it serves as a unique event in their lives, one they distinguish from all other social encounters. They anticipate each meeting for the chance to unburden themselves: sometimes excitedly for what they learned, sometimes anxiously for what they feel compelled to divulge. Bible study in turn becomes a space defined by an increasing knowledge of one another's preoccupations, worries, joys, and questions ibid: p. 81).

In this way, the Evangelical Bible study gathering becomes a space of sharing and social intimacy fostered through language as individuals discuss the secular and religious aspects of their lives; a way of speaking typically filtered through the language of religious spirituality.

Although Bible study groups refer to themselves as "communities" and their participants as "members", and though there are ritual aspects of worship that these groups follow that mirror the ritualistic behaviors of "communities of practice" (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998; Wenger et al 2002), in actuality these groups more closely resemble what Gee describes as an "affinity space" (Gee 2004, 2005). An affinity space is a place (virtual or real) where "[p]eople are brought together through a shared affinity for a common goal, endeavor, or interest, not first and foremost because they are 'bonded' to each other personally…." (Gee 2004: p. 98). This type of membership relationship is in contrast to communities of practice which rely on much deeper notions of "belongingness", "close-knit ties", or "membership" affiliation (Gee 2005: p. 214). For the participants in Kathy's Bible study group, "membership" was loosely, if at all, defined. Each weekly meeting could consist of different individuals, formal attendance was never taken, and there was little value gained by being a long-term participant versus a newcomer (ibid: p. 225). Though many of the Bible study gathering's participants were introduced or drawn to the group through either a shared Asian background or desire to speak English in a friendly setting, participation in the Bible study group ultimately was based on interest in being part of a shared Christian-identified activity (even though not all of the participants were

"Christian" or active church go-ers). Additionally, gender was of secondary importance to participation in the group, although it was the one social identity shared among the participants. Males would occasionally attend the Bible study meetings, but often they were the husbands or boyfriends of one of the regular participants and their participation was often neither long-lasting nor on a regular basis. Finally, though the group met regularly and shared intimately, participants still maintained separate and independent relationships and attachments outside of the group.

An additional difference between the Bible study group and organized entities commonly described as communities of practice is that, unlike the latter, the Bible study gathering held at Kathy's home was not formally or hierarchically organized. Rather, it was a loose, but mutual, coming together for participation in a common activity (Gee 2005). As host of the Bible study gathering, Kathy began, organized and coordinated the flow of the meetings. Though an element of hierarchy is implied in Kathy's role of coordinating the meetings, no individual was officially in charge of the group, nor did the group report back to a higher church body. This lack of formally defined hierarchy was also observed in the sharing and distribution of biblical and linguistic knowledge. Though each Bible study participant brought her own religious and linguistic "capital" (Bourdieu 1991) -- whether it was a cultural or religious knowledge of English, a less marked English accent and strong pronunciation, or a more natural and comfortable reading style, etc. -- any of these skills could become relevant material and symbolic resources upon which a participant could draw during prayer, discussion or dinner (Gee 2004: p. 85-86). Thus, hierarchy and power were both flexible and negotiable in interactions within this space. For example, Kathy was acknowledged to have the deepest Biblical knowledge and knowledge of the language of prayer and spirituality. The author, as a native speaker of English and having grown up in an Evangelical environment, brought local (US) and historical knowledge of Christian doctrine and interpretation (such as differences in denominational understandings of controversial Christian topics such as "predestation") that allowed her to be frequently sought after as a local reference to interpreting biblical texts and contexts. Yet, this potentially privileged linguistic position was counterbalanced by the fact that most of the regular participants of the Bible study group shared the same native language and came

from the same country. At any time the language dynamic could shift to Mandarin Chinese when explanations and clarifications were needed or when intimate or complex ideas needed to be shared, excluding the author from the discussions as a non-speaker of Mandarin. Thus, language created an internal checks-and-balance system that helped maintain the dynamic and flexible structure within this group.

Thus the Evangelical Bible study group, and in particular, this one, can be viewed as an affinity space where participation is based on both a more egalitarian framework and the social and interactional resources participants bring to the various encounters. Specific to the Bible study group of which Jamie was a part, language development and metalinguistic discussions on language use played an important role in the group interactions. As such, this affinity space created interactional opportunities and access to linguistic resources for L2 language and cultural brokering (see Pavlenko 2000 for an overview of research and issues in this area). It provided the L2 speakers in the group with a place to develop and practice their English language skills in an environment that nurtured a feeling of validation, authenticity and legitimacy. Further, it provided a setting in which interactional status could be obtained in individual ways and thus could always be shifting depending on who was present and what themes or topics (which knowledge resources) were relevant for the current discussion.

2.2.2. Data collection and textual representation of the spoken narrative
On the day the recording was made the author (MBT) met with Jamie, Kathy, and Ruth for lunch at a local Chinese restaurant to celebrate the birthday of one of the participants. Once seated at the restaurant, MBT announced to the group her desire to record a story narrated by a "non-native speaker of English" for a research methods class. Jamie, who had been in the US for 2.5 years at this point, volunteered to provide a story. Jamie was a doctoral student in a language related field, and in addition to taking doctoral courses (and interacting with fellow doctoral students in and outside of class in her L2, English), she also worked as a teaching assistant at the undergraduate level with L1 and L2 English speakers. Because of the importance of English oral skills in her home country and future work environment, Jamie placed high value on pronunciation and mastery of English oral

proficiency. In fact, some time after the recording of this data Jamie enrolled in a local Toastmasters group (a public speaking group affiliated with her University) specifically designed to assist international students in the development of their public speaking skills in English. While waiting for lunch to arrive, MBT recorded Jamie's narrative, which is transcribed below.

In contrast to Mishler's (1986) suggestion to always include the interview question as part of the recording, the recording of this interview began after the question was posed. Thus the exact wording and intonational delivery of the request, the discursive exchange surrounding the request, the decision by Jamie to provide the narrative, and the context surrounding the selection of this particular story are not available for reproduction as part of the transcribed data. Yet, the full transcription of the recorded narrative story is provided below. The transcription has been rendered broadly according to intonational units (see Chafe 1993; Cruttenden 1986). These units are indicated by the marker "/" and the text breaks at each line. A transcription method based on the intonational unit was adopted in order to faithfully represent the meaningful aspects of the speaker's utterances. According to Goodwin (1981), intonational units allow analysts to look at interaction beyond turn-taking in order to focus on the information or elements of the interaction the speaker attends to at different points in a narrative story, such as the movement of ideas and the foregrounding and backgrounding of information. The transcription notation follows the general notions identified in Du Bois et al (1993), though with some modifications adopted from more recent sociolinguistic work (specifically Bucholtz 2009). References to the exact notations are provided at the end of the transcript. The transcription notation adopted and modified from Du Bois et al (1993) is designed to highlight any obvious changes in volume, intonation and tempo. Given that the interest in this data is not related to accent or intelligibility, the transcription does not reflect these features of speech or nuances of speaking style.

2.2.3. The data

Jamie's Tale
(13:20)

1.	JAMIE:	Yeah so / so when we were kids
2.		I was playing the role of a…the princess
3.		and she…she's…she's just like the…the follower
4.		but we were very great friends
5.		And…when she had / when she had…ah…all kinds of troubles
6.		in schools or in friendships or in her personal relationships
7.		she always told me…ah asked for my advice.
8.		she said **/** ↑*hey Jamie* **/**
9.		*could you tell me what I can do in this kind of situation*
10.		something like that / and that was back to the days in high school
11.		And then we went to different types of colleges / right
12.		so…there were / there was a long time
13.		like maybe 10 years we did not contact with each other
14.		Because at that time / we did not…well↑ (SLIGHT RISE IN VOICE, due to interruption in the background) at that time the internet
15.		or the chatting room / was not popular / yeah…was not common
16.	KATHY:	You could call each other (LAUGHING)
17.	MBT/RUTH:	(LAUGHTER)
18.	JAMIE:	[But either…]
19.		Yeah but remember that when I / [unintelligible comment about the challenges of international contact availability] / was not common
20.		until I was in my third…or / in my third year
21.		Yeah so / before that it's not easy to contact with each other
22.		But afterwards / like maybe…after we all
23.		we both graduated from colleges / in…uh
24.		under a regiment of another…classmate
25.		We got…we got together again
26.		And then…it was not just / uh / two years ago
27.		we got together…finally↑…after more than 10 years
28.	ALL:	["Ahhh"] [Awesome](SIMPATHETIC SIGHS)
29.	JAMIE:	[But the feeling / the friendship / is still there]
30.	MBT:	That is great
31.	JAMIE:	Yeah↑… it's just like we graduated the other day
32.		Yeah…yeah
33.		so after the reunion we started our contact online
34.		So…and / just last week / she told me a very shocking news / to me
35.		It's about her life
36.	MBT:	A sex change operation ↑ (questioning, rising tone)
37.	KATHY + RUTH:	(LAUGHTER)

38.	JAMIE:	Not that serious (responds in a straight voice)
39.	MBT:	Okay okay
40.	JAMIE:	And, ah… / Because she…
41.		Sometimes / when she has a secret or some dirty thing about her life
42.		she…she thinks I am the only person that she can trust
43.		So she told me the…the secret
44.		And when I listened to her story, I was pr…completely shocked↑ (rising tone over this phrase)
45.		because I thought that kind of drama should have happened to a
46.		person like me / or…or…or that others / Yeah
47.		But [unclear] an oppositional way
48.		And I would think / it was very difficult for me to connect…ah…
49.		the way she is and the way she was / 10 years ago
50.	MBT:	Right…right
51.	JAMIE:	And the story is that she met a guy / maybe about 1 year ago
52.		and she told me that at that time
53.		I was…the only advice I gave her was that /
54.		*well / you need to watch out / he's not the right person*
55.	RUTH:	How…how did you know / did you know the guy
56.	JAMIE:	I did not know him in person / but I just listened to her story / yeah
57.		But definitely / anyone who has friend would consider
58.		that guy is / completely a crap / yeah
59.	MBT:	Um hum
60.	JAMIE:	Yeah / Because she had fallen in love with him *deeply*
61.		and I did not want to judge her / at that time
62.		so I…the only advice I gave her was that
63.		*you need to know how to protect yourself*
64.		*I know you are in love / but in love doesn't mean that you…you need*
65.		*you…you can do anything that without considering the future*
66.		Yeah…yeah.
67.		And then…after 7 or 8 months / she…she left me a message
68.		the other day on MSN / and she told me that / she got abortion↓
69.	ALL:	Oh no (SIGHS AND MOANS)
70.	JAMIE:	Yeah
71.		Well that guy was pretty bad because she (he's) married.
72.	MBT:	He's married? (DRAWN OUT AND RISING)↑
73.	JAMIE:	He's a married guy / Because…because my friend…
74.	RUTH:	Did she know?
75.	JAMIE:	[quickly responds] Yeah
76.	MBT:	Oh no
77.	JAMIE:	[My friend (rising voice)] is an elementary school teacher
78.		So you know / she's a kind of person with good manners

79.		with good characters / and is hard working
80.		And that guy…is uh…how do you say…the / he's a…
		((utters phrase in Mandarin))
81.	KATHY:	A chiropractic?
82.	MBT:	Oh chiropractor / right ok
83.	JAMIE:	So he's the practitioner / and so in the beginning
84.		they were in a very simple relationship between
85.		a client and a practi-…practitioner
86.		And so you know that kind of therapy / you need…he needs to touch
87.	KATHY:	Physical contact…yeah
88.	JAMIE:	And when my↑…(RISING VOICE)
89.		last year last year when I was in [my home country] during the
		summer / my friend told me this story
90.		I just ↑ would like to tell her that / *stop it / you can make it*
91.		*It's never possible for you to get happiness from this guy*
92.		Yeah / but because she trusts me enough
93.		and if I said something like that
94.		she would never tell me any kind of story or experience
95.	MBT:	Right / right
96.	JAMIE:	So I just gave her the advice of **/** *just be careful / don't get hurt*
97.		But…but eventually she still had this issue
98.		And when she told the guy that…she was pregnant↓
99.		the guy disappeared
100.	MBT:	Urghhh
101.	JAMIE:	[Gosh!](EXASPERATED)
102.	RUTH:	[He disappeared?] / How could he do that!
103.	JAMIE:	He did not answer the phone
104.		And that↑(RISING-FALLING VOICE) / and my friend / she's a *decent* girl
105.		it is impossible for her to go to the guy's family household to…
		argue with him
106.		So I…I asked her / *how do you deal with this tricky issue*
107.		She said she went to the clinic and got medicine
108.		I was so shocked↑ / and I↑ / but ↓ I did not tell
109.		I did not say anything as she…uh…
110.		did the narrative to me
111.		I just tell her that / *since all this has happened*
112.		*the first thing and the priority thing for you*
113.		*is to check whether the medicine has some…some*
		[side effects]
114.	KATHY:	[side effects]
115.	JAMIE:	So I…I told her…I told her to look for some medical…advice
116.		to make sure she's okay / otherwise / maybe her… her..[trails off]

(Dialogue not completely comprehensible)

117.	JAMIE:	Her image / when…when we were in high school
118.		her persona is just like the cartoon / "Peanuts"
119.		You know there was a character / Lucy
120.	MBT:	Yeah
121.	RUTH:	"Peanuts"
122.	KATHY:	Yeah "Peanuts"
123.	JAMIE/KATHY:	Snoopy / Snoopy
124.	RUTH:	OK / Snoopy (LAUGHS in recognition of the Peanut's character)
125.	KATHY:	When people fall in love they just tend to do things irregular[…]
126.	JAMIE:	[I can't believe] such kind of drama
127.		would happen to this kind of carefree girl / Yeah
128.	MBT:	Yeah
129.	KATHY:	(unclear)
130.	JAMIE:	The worse thing is that after she got abortion↓
131.		that must be 2 or 3 weeks
132.		after when she told him the news that she was pregnant ↓
133.		So well recently / the guy called her again and tell her that…told her that
134.		*I did not mean to hurt you / but I just did not know how to deal with this tricky issue/ and…*
135.	RUTH:	He showed up again / he did know that she had abortion
136.	MBT:	Yeah…but he did know /she told him
137.	JAMIE:	Yeah…because the guy / when they first told about this news
138.		the news…the guy did not know how to respond
139.		and then suddenly she…he dis-disappeared.
140.		And my…my friend left a message / a simplified message
141.		to his cell phone / saying that
142.		*well I will deal this with, with my…myself.*
143.		So…after the abortion↓ / the guy showed up again and telling
144.		telling her *that I did not mean to hurt you*
145.		*but could you wait for me for another 15 years*
146.		*after my children **grow.up** then I am done with my responsibilities…*
		(emphasized through brief pauses between Grow and Up)
147.	RUTH:	One.Five! (INCREDULOUS LAUGHTER)
148.	JAMIE:	15!
149.	RUTH:	Are you kidding me ↑/ [for that long ↑](LAUGHTER)
150.	JAMIE:	[*when I am done with my responsibility of being a father*]
151.	MBT:	So…what did your friend say?
152.	JAMIE:	Of course she was heart-broken / But she…

153.		I think the bad thing for her now is that she is in hatred
154.		*She could not forgive herself and the guy.*
155.		*And…I told her that…we…*
156.		*let's just put the guy aside because he is not important anymore*
157.		*But nowadays…now you need to forgive yourself*
158.		*otherwise you cannot move on*
159.		(.5) Ah.crap
160.	MBT	Uh
161.	JAMIE:	You know / if I were in [my home country]
162.		I need to do something for my friend
163.		(exasperated exhale of breathe) *Come on ↑/ she's my girl*
164.		*how could you hurt* her *in this way*↑
165.		But because back in [my home country]
166.		I was always the person who would jump in and protect her
167.	MBT:	Wow…but doesn't she have…like… / I don't know
168.		you would…you would think she would have family or friends
169.		who would tell her not to date this married guy
170.		There was nobody around to tell her *not* to date the married guy?
171.	JAMIE:	(RESPONDS QUICKLY) One was me and one was another teacher friend
172.	KATHY:	[(initial part of the statement is unclear)…(SLIGHT LAUGHTER) how is someone going to tell you not to do it, just not to do…]
173.	MBT:	I know…I know but how can you get / uhhhh
174.		I don't know / I don't know…wow /
175.		can you get away with dating a married guy↑
176.		I don't know / but yeah
177.	JAMIE:	Well…the point is that/ maybe we cannot avoid love happening
178.		but at least we can avoid getting hurt or hurting others
179.		but she did not get the point. (13:20)

Transcription ends here; interaction continues for another 1:20 minutes on other related topics.

Transcript Notation:
[ ]   Overlapping dialogue
( )   Unable to transcribe, inaudible
/   Marks an intonation group boundary
↑   Rising intonation/pitch
Bold   Emphasized language
Italics Reported speech
Ye::s   Lengthened sound
…   Micro pause, typically the result of a false start, disfluency, repairs (less than .2 sec)
(2.0)   approximate length of pause, seconds)
(.)   micropause (less than .2 sec)

2.2.4. Key features of Jamie's narrative tale

Jamie delivers a more than 13-minute unplanned narrative story in a public space and in front of a "live" audience. The narrative is not a solid, uninterrupted flow of narrated events, but an interactionally achieved story that features emotional language (lines 58, 108, 159, 163) and emotionally-intoned responses and statements (lines 99-103, 145-150) and engages with the comments and backchannel responses of the audience (lines 27-32, 73-77). The events of the narrative story are presented through the representation of previous conversations reported to have occurred between several (including absent) characters. Their voices, thoughts, and emotional responses are represented in the narrative and punctuated with colloquial phrases and vernacular expressions (lines 159, 163) that are in dialogue with one another in gendered and ideological ways (lines 2-3, 117-127). An initial review of the narrative content suggests Jamie constructs a tale that draws from an event of talk referred to in the literature and in popular culture as *"girl talk"*. Girl talk – also referenced as "coffee-klatsch" (Bergmann 1993), "women's talk" (Innes 2006; Lane 2009) and "rap talk" (Leung 2009) -- is a speech event that belongs to what Jones describes as "female oral culture" (1980: p. 193). It has been described by Eckert as a "typically female speech event involving long and detailed personal discussions about people, norms and beliefs" (1990: p. 91). The storytelling that appears in an occasion of girl talk allows women to narrativize aspects of their lives in order to make sense of events, commit them to memory, and document them as a way of making these experiences a concrete and known reality beyond that of the individual to whom they have occurred. Finally, as a speech event, girl talk "provides females with the means to negotiate…[community] norms and to measure their symbolic capital in relation to them" (ibid, p. 91).

Girl talk – identifiable by its setting, participants, ends, keying, genre, etc (Hymes 1974) -- has the features of an intimate, private sphere of speech activity that, nonetheless, can occur in the most public of spaces (coffee shops, restaurants, etc). Language in this genre is drawn from an informal register of talk, featuring vernacular lexical items and emotive intonation reflective of affective speech – from joy, laughter, pain, anguish, and envy. Some of the more positive or neutral images associated with this kind of talk are that of solidarity, sisterhood, and a bracketed space where time turns inward -- a theme

represented by the inward facing (physical orientation) stance women engaged in this type of talk take (Lane 2009: p. 158). Images of girl talk are epitomized and have been circulated worldwide through the HBO series "Sex and the City" (1998-2004) and directly referenced in the movie version of the show, "Sex and the City" (2008). In this setting, the camaraderie established in the female friendships through engagement in such talk is highlighted, often in episodes where the four protagonists are seated around a table (usually over coffee, drinks or a meal). In fact, food and/or beverage are frequently associated with the occasion of this genre of talk (Bergmann 1993; Leung 2009). In contrast, less positive views of girl talk depict this talk as purposeless, aimless, and idle chit-chat (Bermann 1993; Kartzow 2009). In fact, Bergmann describes the activity of "coffee-klatsch" as "typically a circle of acquaintances who – either in a café or at home in a living room – gather for coffee and cake – unburdened by pressing obligations, turn their attention to one thing: the discussion of the flaws and actions of their absent acquaintances and endless talk about things that do not concern them" (1993: p. 71).

Bergmann's description highlights one of the common associations with girl talk: the incorporation into this speech event talk about absent third parties -- gossip. The genres of gossip and girl talk are often conflated in the literature (eg. Bergmann 1993). However, as noted by Eckert (1990), they are two distinct categories of talk, with distinct functions and interactional purposes. Whereas girl talk is a speech event and a speech genre, gossip can be viewed as a genre of talk or more specifically, a speech act. A speech act is a linguistic utterance that performs a social function whose social meaning in interaction can be uncovered by asking "What is a person doing in saying X?" (Tracy and Robles 2013: p. 78) and whose effects are made real through the utterance, the individual's relationship to this utterance and the social power with which the utterance is endowed. As a speech act, gossip is a linguistic utterance that "takes place between individuals who stand in a special relationship to each other" (Abrahams 1970: p. 290) and brings these relational states and subjectivities into being through language. Thus as Tannen states, "not only is telling secrets evidence of friendship; it *creates* friendship" (1990: p. 98, emphasis not in the original). Additionally, as a speech act, gossip can highlight and reinforce the moral codes and social anxieties that underlie a society (eg. Gluckman 1963, 1968; Haviland 1977a,

1977b; Innes 2006; Shoaps 2009; Spacks 1985). For example, Haviland posits that understanding the linguistic codes by which a society participates in acts of gossip can shed light on the shared cultural and moral preoccupations of that society (1977a, 1977b). Further, he suggests "there is an intimate relation between the native's knowledge of his own society and his ability to gossip (or to understand gossip)" (Haviland 1977a: p. 3). Both forms of knowledge are highlighted in Shoaps' (2009) study of the structure and interaction of gossip within the Sakapulteko communities of Guatemala. For the Sakapultek, attempts to appease the moral anxiety associated with gossip are legitimated through linguistic means that draw upon relationships of vertical kinship, such that if one gossips, one tends to do so by "adopt[ing] a voice of vertical kin speaking downward" (ibid, p. 470). In this respect, the act of gossiping acquires more legitimacy as it is then viewed by the recipient as being more trustworthy and less malicious when voiced through language that draws upon cultural associations with specific kinship ties. Thus, participating in gossip requires some understanding of the cultural and social codes and ways of expressing these linguistically in order to be interactionally successful.

Finally, gossip is a speech act that can impose constraints on the social behavior of self and others. For example, Innes (2006) describes the connection between gossip and morality among the Muskogee (Creek) tribe. For the Muskogee, language is viewed as a material "form of action" and thus gossip has the potential to literally upset and alter the social structure and social interactions (ibid, p. 236). In Innes' work, gossip impacts the social by directly informing a woman's decision-making on topics (such as influencing a woman's decision to stop dating a particular individual due to community gossip surrounding the relationship or the person), which can ultimately effect the "relationships, social standing, health and welfare" of those around her (ibid, p. 246). Eckert (1990) explores the relationship between gossip and social control among high school girls. In this setting, gossip functions as a vehicle for the women to maintain an outward presentation of adhering to social norms through their social relationships and the monitoring and evaluation of the social (moral) behavior of other women. She writes:

> It is argued that the function of girl talk derives from the place of females in
> society, particularly as a function of the domestication of female labor. Deprived of

direct power, females are constrained to focus on the development of personal influence. Thus constrained to define themselves, not in terms of individual accomplishments, but in terms of their overall character, females need to explore and negotiate the norms that govern their behavior and define this character. Girl talk is a speech event that *provides females with the means to negotiate these norms and to measure their symbolic capital in relation to them* (Eckert 1990: p. 91 – italics not in the original).

In this and the Muskogee settings, gossip is a speech act that is a form of social control that Innes and Eckert suggest is primarily a gender (female) specific act through which women can acquire symbolic capital in social interactions through moral authority gained through "telling stories about others" (Abrahams 1970: p. 291). This connection between gossip and symbolic (and even material) capital has been posited in the work of Abrahams (1970). Abrahams examines the Vincentian English Creole (St. Vincent Islands, the British West Indies) speech act *"cōmmess,* a category of language "related in the minds of Vincentians with other traditional acts as joking ('ragging', 'making mock'), arguing ('making boderation', 'giving vexation') and ceremonial performances of a more ritualised sort" (ibid: p. 291). The linguistic skill expressed through *"cōmmess* is viewed in the local community as a verbal art, and as such, its performance is evaluated like other art forms (narrative stories or songs); as a linguistic repertoire, it can be taken up by speakers as a resource for garnering symbolic capital (ibid: p. 292). Of course there are social and cultural rules and norms for how such "arts" are appropriated by speakers for these purposes, and once obtained, speakers must work to maintain their capital. For example, in another context, gossip is adopted in an effort to protect the loss of symbolic capital through the loss of face (Cheepen 1998). Cheepen posits that gossip serves an interactional function to protect the "actual or potential loss of face to a participant…by gossiping about an absent "scapegoat," thereby deflecting the damage on to someone who, not being present, suffers no face threat" (Cheepen 1998, cited in Thornbury and Slade 2006: p. 172).

Unlike work on women's talk that conflates gossip with girl talk (such as Bergmann 1993), this work (like Eckert 1990) posits that girl talk is a speech event that emphasizes camaraderie, community and shared norms. Girl talk is distinct from the act of gossiping; rather, it is a speech event that *draws* upon gossip as a way of highlighting the social and relational aspects of this genre of talk. Therefore, in a speech event that orients itself

around the genre of girl talk, gossip can be incorporated into the talk as a means through which women attempt to "do" or accomplish interactional work – such as, relate to others (Thornbury and Slade 2006), voice their concerns as women, draw closer together and define who is in / out (Coates 1996), "repair conversational 'trouble' (Cheepen 1998, cited in Thornbury and Slade 2006: p. 172), give advice and scold (Shoaps 2009), and gain or maintain symbolic /material power (Cheepen 1998; Eckert 1990). Thus, if engaging in gossip is a "means to an end", one of the questions which will be relevant to an analysis of Jamie's tale is the interactional work achieved by combining girl talk with gossip in the narrative.

2.3. Approaches to Analyzing L2 Narrative Storytelling

Approaches to L2 narrative analysis can differ greatly across scholarly works, with the difference residing primarily in the fact that different scholars bring their own epistemological orientations to an understanding of the nature and role of narrative in the lives of individuals. This difference in turn shapes the methodological approach adopted in the analyses of these scholars. One scholar, for example, might approach narrative as *a doing* in which truth and accuracy "take[…] a back seat to what is socially accomplished through storytelling" (Holstein and Gubrium 2012: p. 7) and "credibility and believability [become] something that storytellers accomplish" (Chase 2005: p. 657). Another scholar may approach narrative as *discourse* in which narrative storytelling represents discursive ways of performing speech acts (i.e., complaining, boasting, entertaining, drawing closer) which can be analyzed linguistically. Yet another scholar will approached narrative as a *socio-cultural practice* informed by scripts and schemas that are shaped by knowledge of practices and processes by which these unfold in interaction (Bamberg 2011; Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008). As a socio-cultural practice, narrative serves the purpose of "passing along and handing down culturally shared values…" and through these values "…individuals learn to position their own values and actions in relationship to established and shared categories…." (Bamberg 2011: p. 103). Additionally, as practice, narrative can be analyzed as performance (Bauman 1977; Hymes 1981; Langellier and Peterson 2006), not only in terms of how narrative is performed, but also in terms of the linguistic elements that make the performance recognizable and meaningful. Finally, narrative is viewed as

"forms of action" (Wortham 2001) through which the act of narration is viewed as agentive and stories are analyzed for the ways in which narrators use storytelling to position themselves. Furthermore, as action, narrative opens up an interactional space, reflective of the interactional and social needs of the speaker or audience, in which one can gain understanding of self or state (such as states of illness, migration, etc.).

2.3.1. Analyzing narrative as competence, identity, selfhood

Within AL/SLS, there are a handful of discipline-specific approaches to narrative analysis that mark the field. Traditionally, a linguistic-oriented approach to narrative storytelling approaches narrative analysis as reflective of a systematic, ordered and analyzable structure. Such an analysis draws upon the work of Labov and Waletzky (1967[1997]) and Labov (1972) whose research reveals an underlying structural component to narrative based on patterns of verbal properties that reflect temporal sequencing. In fact, Labov and Waletzky define narrative in these structural terms as "one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of the events which actually occurred" (1967[1997]: p. 20). Yet, it is the formulaic (and formalist) surface features that characterize narrative structure that were uncovered by Labov and Waletzky and have been used by linguists and sociolinguists to analyze the narrative competence of learners. Labov and Waletzky observed that narratives share a similar surface structure, one in which narrative tales often, though not always, begin with an opening (abstract) and an orienting series of events (orientation), a complicating action (which often includes or results in a climax), an evaluation (internal or external), and often a closing moral (the coda). Labov's format has been a very useful one in research; it is measureable and can be used to create comparable analyses across researchers. In this kind of sociolinguistic work, the text is consulted to help the analyst make sense of the tale. For Labov, sense making is provided primarily through the narrative's evaluation which "give[s] the teller's perspective on the recounted events and make clear the significance of the events for the listener" (Menard-Warwick 2005b: p. 534). Ultimately for Labov the "why" (the reportability) of the story is important in research; in particular, the ability of narratives "to transmit to listeners the emotional impact of the central events of the narrator's experience" (Labov 2013: p. 6).

Labov's structural-formalist approach to oral narrative analysis has been adopted and/or extended in AL/SLS research by several scholars from different schools of linguistic thought interested in using his hypothesis about an inherent narrative structure and narrative syntax to demonstrate, describe and compare narrative (grammatical) competence (and variability in this competence) by L2 learners. For example, Bardovi-Harlig – drawing from Labov (1972), as well as the pioneering linguistic work by Hopper (1979), Dry (1981, 1983) and Schiffrin (1981) on grounding in narrative clauses -- examines the narrative competence displayed by learners' use of "…emerging verbal morphology [tense-aspect, as well as word order and voice] to distinguish foreground from background in narrative" (1994: p. 43). Work on grounding -- foregrounding and backgrounding -- has been essential to understanding the structural "creation" of temporality in narrative clauses as expressed in the relative order in a given narrative: if a change in the order of the clauses changes the meaning or interpretation, then one is dealing with narrative (foregrounded) clauses (Bardovi-Harlig 1995). Grounding predicts/shapes the tense required in narrated events; thus, the analysis of a language learner's use of tense in the foreground/background can be used to inform about their narrative competence. In several studies (1995, 1998, 2000), Bardovi-Harlig examines narrative competence through verbal use in narrative structure, specifically focusing on the implementation of tense, aspect and discourse structure in the successful navigation of the foreground-background and the variability in producing correct structures by L2 learners. A similar concern for learner variability is seen in the works of Tarone (1983, 1985) and Ellis (1987) who explore the theme of oral narrative competence as it relates to interlanguage development through the study of variability ("style-shifting") observed in the phonology, morphology and syntax of language learners. This element of style-shifting examines how differences in learner production can result from different speech tasks (written vs. oral forms, careful vs. vernacular forms) requiring different attention to forms (Ellis 1987) and the effects of the structuring of narrative task (task design and task complexity) on narrative ability (Kormos and Trebits 2012; Robinson 1995; Skehan and Foster 1997; Tavakoli and Foster 2011). In contrast to their work on variation at the sentential level of grammar, Pavlenko (2006) focuses her attention on development of the discourse-level aspects (narrative structure,

evaluation and cohesion) of oral narrative competence for L2 learners. Her analyses demonstrate a concern for the ways in which learners learn to "interpret, construct and perform personal and fictional narratives similarly to a reference group of native speakers of the target language" (ibid: p. 107). Her work is further concerned with differences in narrative styles across cultures and how these impact the narrative competence / reception of learners. Finally, a more cross-linguistic perspective on narrative competence can be found in Berman (1995, 2001). Berman investigates the narrative skills demonstrated in storytelling between Hebrew and English speakers, while Pomerantz (2010) examines textual, pragmatic and interactional aspects of language use and how learners develop new narrative systems. The point of these studies is, as Berman states, to show the ways in which "[l]inguistic forms thus come to serve discourse motivated purposes in a globally organized narrative frame" (1995: p. 304). In all, the approaches to L2 narrative analysis reviewed in this section are concerned with what a linguistic exploration of narrative grammar (competence) uncovers about the systematicity of language and the variability of learner production as an expression of their interlanguage). Yet, most of these investigations represent monologic approaches to narrative analysis.

In more recent work, analyses of narrative in AL/SLS have taken a more poststructuralist / postmodern direction (eg. Block 2006; Martinez-Roldan 2003; McKay and Wong 1996; Norton 2000; Norton and Early 2011; Pavlenko 1998, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c; Pavlenko and Lantolf 2000; Teutsch-Dwyer 2001; Toohey 2000; Vitanova 2005, 2010). Scholarship in this area recognizes narrative discourse as a means by which individuals define, recreate, negotiate and claim identities for themselves (Bamberg 1997) and thus such work analyzes narrative for what it can show in this regard. In this genre of narrative work recurring themes appear. One such theme is the *discursive construction of self*. In this case, an oral representation of self is created through language that draws on discourses and ideologies which can then be analyzed in a number of discursive and conversational analytical ways. Work in this area on written narratives has been produced by Pavlenko (1998, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2002, 2004, 2007) and Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000). These scholars adopt a "socio-historical" approach to analyzing first person (memoires) narratives of recent immigrants. Through these memoires, they explore identity in relation to the language

learning trajectories and ideologies these immigrants faced during their transition. Specifically, they examine how identity is negotiated, and how language learning is achieved in the face of competing ideologies about what language learning should instead be like (Pavlenko and Lantolf 2000). Pavlenko (2001a, 2001b, 2001c) and Pavlenko and Lantolf explore the memoire as a genre influenced by the social, historical, cultural and linguistic contexts in which they were written (2000: p. 39), with Pavlenko examining memoires as texts reflective of the uprooting of identity that "crossing borders" can create for individuals. Through reflections on experience, especially experience with language that appears in these works, it is possible to see the ways in which learners linguistically and discursively work to reconstruct and make sense of a repositioned sense of identity that moving into new positionalities creates for these learners – it is "a never-ending process of self translation" on new soil through adoption of the words and languages of others (ibid: p.170). In another work, Prior (2011) adopts a narrative constructionist approach (using discourse and CA methods of analysis and seeing narrative as "accounts" rather than as reflective of reality) to explore how retellings and framing can shape the way the speaker wants the story to be understood and himself to be presented. This paper explores the "personal and emotional history" of an individual (ibid: p. 74) to see how language users present themselves across time (two years).

Early work by Kondo (1986) and more recent work by Lee (2013) and Hult (2014) explore the theme of *positioning* as they address the analysis of more reflexive narratives of selves by "transnational" researchers. These are individuals who write stories about their own experiences of crossing borders and their attempts to straddle positionings as insider/outsider. This struggle for positioning is born out linguistically through such strategies as highlighting or diminishing aspects of their linguistic and social identities while in transnational spaces. Narrative work is interesting in that it presents the challenge to these scholars to "negotiate multiple identities in relation to different people and social settings" (Hult 2014: p. 65, referencing Narayan 1993: p. 682). These narratives are analyzed in terms of how these language users orient to language and language use (code-switching, translanguaging). They are also analyzed according to narrative dimension. For example, Lee (2013) analyzes the dimensions of tellability, tellership and embeddedness in

exploring the co-construction of gendered identity in a community of practice (a specific space).

Research on the role of narrative and identity-making explores themes of *belonging and participation* and what the narrative expresses about the effect of macro and micro aspects of power on the ability of language users to agentively express selves and desire in the L2 (Pavlenko 2002: p. 214; see also De Fina 2003; Norton Peirce 1995; Pavlenko 2004, 2007; Pomerantz 2010; Waugh 2010). This direction in research is relevant in that it explores the limitations of identity construction through discourse because of the presence of power in interactions, power which has the effect of significantly shaping L2 user's participation and investment in language use. For example, Norton (Peirce) (1995, 2000) -- through short story narrative responses and information taken from journal entries -- explores how participation and investment are related to language learning. Her work adopts a discourse analysis approach to exploring the language of these narratives. Similar work has been undertaken by Baynham and De Fina (2005), in addition to more sociolinguistic-oriented SLS work linked to stance and style (cf. Coupland 2007; Jaffe 2009; Meyerhoff 2006). Though much of this sociolinguistic approach to narrative analysis is conducted outside of AL/SLS, it nonetheless has important implications for the field. This attention to style is related to but different from the grammatical style of the grammar competence people. Attention to style "provides one source of indirect evidence about the social meaning of different patterns and preferences" (Meyerhoff et al, 2012: p. 130) and how learners recognize and attempt to adapt these forms. To get to these elements of style, the methods and analyses used in these studies focus on such things as reported speech and other aspects of language. In all, much of this work has been very good. However, it has been about the experience of immigrant learners; with a few exceptions, not much work has been about the experience of FL learners. Wei and Hua (2013) is one such exception. Their work examines the translanguaging practices among a transnational group of students of ethnic Chinese descent (transnational in the sense of hailing from a variety of countries and schooling –language of learning -- backgrounds) in a British university. The focus here is on using narrative data to expose the linguistic practices (language styles) used within these groupings across the diverse members and the roles they play in identification as

socio-political beings. Much of this work is analyzed to examine stance and style as they appear in instances of reported speech, voice and other dialogic representations of language.

Finally, *subjectivity* is a common theme in poststructuralist approaches to narrative analysis. The poststructuralist notion of self is often expressed analytically in works as an interest in "voice" and "voicing". Voice, or rather the struggle to find voice or personal expression through narrative discourse, is a key analytical theme across narrative approaches to L2 identity research. Though related to research on social and personal identity, an analytical focus on voice instead refers to the ability to discursively bend the words of another for the purposes of the individual in an interactional moment. This view of voice is described in Cazden (1989) through her recounting of one graduate student's struggle to reconcile the difference and find an authentic voice between the oral speech of his community and the written register required in academic writing (Diamondstone and Merriman 1988). An analysis of voice is also seen in Vitanova (2002, 2005, 2010), who adopts a Bakhtin-inspired approach to her analyses of narratives collected from Eastern European immigrants about their lives in the US as second language learners. Vitanova's study examines the linguistic expressions of "gendered subjectivities" and claims to agency by these immigrants in their new context and through a new language (Vitanova 2010: p. 6). These speakers (often through direct speech) voice their experiences of being positioned by native speakers in interactions and their feelings about not being able to express themselves as they would in their native languages. Through their voicings of these experiences, Vitanova demonstrates the stance (viewpoints) of the immigrants towards the ideologies with which they are confronted and how through these voices they attempt to re-author themselves in their L2. Their responses, as recorded by Vitanova, demonstrate that language users can be agents in authoring their own responses and also that the responses are in dialogue with larger social contexts of language. Vitanova adopts what she calls a "dialogic discourse-centered" perspective, one that examines creativity in the authoring of response -- a creativity that dialogism argues extends to language use even when drawing upon the words of another (ibid: p. 6). Through her analysis, Vitanova demonstrates the manner in which language is available to speakers to author and address

responses as an aspect of their agency as language users. Vitanova's approach to L2 language use through the analysis of narrative stories demonstrates one way in which a dialogic approach to narrative analysis can be achieved.

2.3.2. Analyzing narrative as dialogue

Although in her analyses Vitanova (2010) draws upon concepts expressed in the writings of Bakhtin -- specifically the notions of self authoring, the consciousness of language use, the social and historical situatedness of this use, and the dialogic tie between the language use of her participants and the ideologies encountered in their macro-social setting -- the focus of her work is directed toward issues of identity, subjectivity and agency. The analyses fail to address some of the richness of thought concerning the nature of human communication, language use and context expressed in the works of Bakhtin, Medvedev and Vološinov regularly labeled *dialogism*. This is not a critique of her work; rather it is an acknowledgement of the differing interest in dialogism as a way to explore self and subjectivity through language use (a similar concern is seen in the work of Marchenkova 2005a, 2005b) rather than an exploration of what a focus on identity, subjectivity and agency reveals about the nature of communication and language. As presented in the introduction, dialogism is an extensive network of concepts that not only provides insight into human consciousness, but human communication, language use and the implications of both on an understanding of language competence. Thus, to analyze a narrative dialogically is to take into consideration the relational nature of narrative utterances to other utterances. In this sense, language is a two-sided act that "responds to what precedes it and anticipates what is to come" (Hall et al 2005: p. 2 referencing Vološinov 1986[1973]: p. 86). Thus, in communication, what emerges is language in response to language (and ideologies), where our utterance is a reflection of our understanding of the ways in which language can be used to address and answer what precedes it. Therefore, language is always in a state of answering or being answered, being formed or informed in anticipation of the responses of others (Frank 2005: p. 966). Bakhtin posits that this relational nature of utterances is a fundamental characteristic of language.

Yet, even though language is a "two-sided act" in which meaning in dialogue is shaped by the speaker with both the intention of the speaker AND with the object of the speech in mind, Vološinov (1986[1973]) points out that it is an act with a three-tiered response: the first tier exists between the text and context (in such an instance factors such as audience and space/place can play a role in the response); the second between the speaker and audience/addressee (understood as potentially multiple audiences/addressees); and the third between the speaker and superaddressee, "whose absolutely just responsive understanding is presumed, either in some metaphysical distance or in distant historical time (the loophole addressee)" (Bakhtin 1986: p. 126). It is at this third level that ideology presented to speakers is addressed and reflected in the response. Vitanova (2010), in her analyses of immigrant narratives attends to this aspect of a dialogic analysis in her work, analyzing narrative responses in relation to the ideologies these individuals encounter in their interactions.

Secondly, a dialogic analysis draws attention to an internal feature of language -- that speech utterances, with their multiple codes, representations of voices, and expressions of often conflicting and competing consciousnesses, are in dialogue with, responsive to and anticipatory of other utterances. The language represented is not simply the property of the entity speaking, but it is a reflection of language in contact and in encounter with other languages – social speech, dialect, registers, jargons, etc –that are hierarchically related to one another and "stratif[ied] into different socio-ideological 'languages' which are forms for conceptualizing specific world views" (Björklund 2011: p. 43 referencing Bakhtin 1981: p. 271-272). Bakhtin presents this notion of a stratified and hierarchical relationship between utterances – heteroglossia -- in *Discourse and the Novel* (1981) and *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984). This particular characteristic of dialogism is explored in much of the Bakhtin-inspired work in AL/SLS (Blackledge and Creese 2014; Menard-Warwick 2005a, 2005b; Pavlenko 2007; Vitanova 2010, Warriner 2004). It is also beautifully expressed in the non-AL/SLS work on illness by Arthur Frank (1995, 2005, 2012). Under the analytical title of "Dialogic Narrative Analysis" (DNA), Frank examines the practice of storytelling analysis – from theme selection to collection of data (stories) to selection and analysis of a tale. Frank (2012) specifically addresses the importance of

analyzing stories with the purpose of uncovering "how multiple voices find expression within any single voice" (ibid: p. 35). Yet, his interest in storytelling analysis extends to include a concern, not simply for what a narrator communicates about something or someone else, but "what can be said about someone 'in the mouths of others'…" (ibid: p. 34). Drawing from Bakhtin (1984), Frank writes that speech about others "is actually a dialogue between voices; [a]ny one voice always comprises multiple voices" (ibid). DNA examines language use at this level, exposing the ways in which storytellers narrate the details of their own lives -- drawing on, "artfully rearrang[ing]" and in dialogue with the represented and ideologically-saturated voices of others (ibid: p. 35). This level of analysis extends beyond the traditional discourse or conversational analysis with its focus on turns and the construction of talk; rather, DNA examines the multi-layering of talk as narrative and the presence of "others" (other voices, other dialogues, other ideologies) within this talk.

Similar attention to a dialogic approach to narrative analysis is observed in Yang (2007). Yang examines the discourse of re-employment in narratives of women laid off from state-owned Chinese factories who have been re-employed in often lower-wage and lower-status positions. The stories and the women they represent, discursively known and labeled collectively as "re-employment stars", are featured on television, in print and other forms of mass media through voices that ventriloquize the old ideologies of the Marxist-Leninist state through neo-liberalistic discourses of "re-employment" and rhetorical strategies (such as the "heart-to-heart" talk) that challenge women to more actively seek and accept their new (less equal) roles as members of the market-driven economy. Specifically, these ads give the new market economy legitimacy by drawing on gendered voices and speech styles that represent and reproduce the old discourses while recontextualizing and drawing upon their legitimizing and ideological power in the current economy through the voices of present-day re-employed "stars". The voices of these women are "double-voiced" – what Bakhtin refers to as internal dialogism (Bakhtin 1981) -- in that they simultaneously reflect the spoken words of the women and the "refracted" (and contradictory) interests of the government (Yang 2007: p. 87). These recycled voices that draw from the past, bring into the current context ideologies that resonate and are given new life in the modern context.

Yang concludes by pointing out the irony of giving voice to the voiceless (in this case, women made redundant / unemployed as a result of China's transformed market economy) through utterances that ventriloquize the political and economic consciousness of the very State responsible for the plight.

Finally, a dialogic analysis addresses the relational nature of language (specifically of utterances and words) across time and space where meaning and understanding are tied to and in relation to a specific context of use. This understanding of dialogism as meaning-making subject to context of time and space has been explored in Whooley (2006). Whooley investigates the differences in narrative content and tone of two texts produced about the same incident (in this case, a slave incident) described almost 100 years apart. Whooley explores how narrative representation and understanding of the same event -- one for an 1847 abolitionist audience, the other during the 1930s during the Great Depression and under the climate of Jim Crow America -- is discussed in different ways and using different language reflective of the discourses and ideologies of each period and location. Similarly, Spitulnik (1996) demonstrates the recontextualized flows of language and the ways uses and meanings can change across speech contexts. The type of language Spitulnik analyzes she refers to as "public words" (ibid). Public words are sound bites of popular media discourses that circulate from one context (radio broadcasts in English) and are picked up, used and even given new uses and meanings (recontextualized) in another context (be it speech context or social, geopolitical environment). Spitulnik's work stresses the processes by which these "publicly accessible" words become part of the social fabric that link a country together in the social imaginary and that contribute to the production of shared meaning (1996: p. 162, referencing Urban 1991: p. 10). In both the works of Whooley and Spitulnik, it is possible to see how language use and meaning are not static over time and place, that language use has a social existence that is relevant to the way words and utterances are to be understood and thus responded based on their context of use.

Thus, to truly analyze narrative data as dialogue requires a much more in-depth attention to language, its uses, its relation to past and present uses and across contexts, and the way it is

in a state of answering, being answered and anticipating a response. Such thorough attention to the complexity of a dialogic analysis of narrative is observed in Hill (1995). Hill's analysis explores all three aspects of dialogue. Hers is an elaborate analysis in which language use and meaning are discussed within the context of the narrative in relation to larger notions of conflicting local discourses on profit and gain, the narrator's stance towards these discourses and towards the key events of the tale, and the "struggle between speakers and ways of speaking" as reflected through a polyphony of voices presented in the narrative (Hill 1986: p. 89).

The narrative Hill analyzes was collected from a speaker of Mexicano on the murder of his son. Through a multi-layered analysis that draws on Labov's narrative story framework, Hill demonstrates the way in which Don Gabriel's narrative of the events leading up to and following the murder of his son unfold by drawing on a journey motif that "create[s] a moral geography [across the narrative story] in which spaces associated with peasant communitarian values are contrasted with spaces associated with danger and business-for-profit" (ibid: p. 111). Through a polyphony of voices that reflect various laminations of Don Gabriel's selves (himself as neutral narrator, involved narrator, evaluator, etc.) and figures of those associated with this event (the voice of the son, daughter-in-law, the town, etc.), Hill's analysis outlines the internal (the double-voiced) dialogism of the narrative. This internal dialogism of the narrative is prompted in response to Hill's inquiry of Don Gabriel as to whether he has ever "suffered any accident" (ibid: p. 98) and to which he narrates the tale of his son's murder with "a sideward glance" towards the capitalistic world with which he finds himself at odds (ibid: p. 97). Don Gabriel makes available to the analyst (Hill) his stance, not just toward the son's murder, but the ideologies of capitalism and greed he attributes as the cause of the murder, sentiments that are often communicated through contradictory and conflicting voices. Hill's work demonstrates that a thorough analysis of a narrative story need not rest solely with the examination of a story's evaluation ("what is going on inside the text"), but in investigating the dialogic space revealed by exploring a tale in relation to the context the culture and environment in which the story is petitioned and told, the audience and potential audiences who have access to the telling, and even the teller him/herself.

Hill's approach to a dialogic analysis is not one readily found within SLS/AL studies, even among work that claims to take a dialogic approach to narrative study (eg. Hall et al 2005; Marchenkova 2005a; Vitanova 2010, 2013). This dissertation, however, attempts a more thorough dialogic analysis along the line of Hill (1995). Through Jamie's narrative this work will demonstrate the inherent dialogism of all language use, even L2 language use. It will also highlight the ways in which an L2 narrative can be dialogic in the sense of being heteroglossic and polyphonic (and the ways in which this contributes to storytelling, interaction and presentation of self), but also in terms of being in dialogue with or reflecting conflict within the speaker herself, indicating the inherent struggle of all language users to bend words to one's own use (creatively, though still in ways that are authorized/legitimated within the culture) and in response to the words, utterances, and ideologies of others. In particular, this dissertation will examine the manner in which the authoring of response includes addressing ideologies (in this case about nativeness) that arise through the request for a narrative story in this particular interview setting. The interview itself is significant, as Mishler (1986) highlights. The interview as speech event is a dialogue between the interviewer and interviewee, it is not a neutral and unrelated aspect of the context of the narrative – it constitutes a part of the context and is integral to the content of the story itself (the situated moment in which the narrative itself was collected, the participants involved, the nature of their relationship, the context in which the narrative itself was collected). It is the entirety of these factors just described – the issue of nativeness, the struggle to author responses using the words of others, and the interview -- that are particularly relevant to a dialogic analysis of narrative storytelling as these elements can assist the analyst in addressing the question *"why this story, now?"(and in this form?)*

The starting point for this analysis rests within a theoretical perspective that is dialogically relevant, but Marx inspired. Jamie's narrative tale, a response to the request to "tell a story" solely based on Jamie's status as an L2 speaker of English, enters this request into the stream of utterances already in motion that address ideologies of nativeness and-- to use Davies and Harré's (1990) term -- *positions* Jamie (as well as the other participants of

the group) into the subject position of "non-native speaker". Although Davies and Harré's concept of positioning is a useful term for describing this discursive action implied by the request, it is Althusser's Marx-inspired notion of "interpellation" (1971[2001]) that provides a more precise description of the discursive and material effects represented by the request. The notion of interpellation reflects the strong macro-structural and micro-interactional forces of social ideologies against which a subject is confronted. To be interpellated as a non-native speaker is to be more than discursively positioned in interaction, it is to be -- within a macro-structural relation to society -- "always-already a subject, even before [one] is born…" (ibid: p. 119), but then called into the recognition of a social and material position into which one is placed by discourse and discursive practices that have a very real material consequence on one's being, learning, and existence (ibid). Further, it emphasizes the dialogic notion that a request is not a neutral action; it is an utterance whose existence is taken up along with previous utterances that address the ideologies -- assumptions, expectations, hierarchies, limitations, symbolic power and material relations -- about competence and nativeness embedded in the current historical and educational context. It is a stimulus that causes a mechanical reaction "as a thing reacts to external irritation" (Holquist 1986: p. 70); it is an utterance that "must take some position with respect to past words" (Wortham 2001: p. 21).

Though subjects may not have control over the ways in which they are interpellated in society, through creative authoring of responses it is possible to demonstrate agency (and resistance) in the face of interpellation This agency and resistance do not necessarily reflect a conscious, psychological control; it is a feature of language use (speech), it is verbal interaction (Vološinov 1986[1973]: p. 111). Our control in responding is exhibited in a number of ways; for instance, our selection of the speech genre adopted to frame our response. This speech genre is composed of cultural and social patterns that are learned, acquired, recognized, even if not used by members of a society -- that guide (serve as indexicals) our interaction in an effort to make our language recognizable/locatable on the interactional map. As Hall et al notes, "[w]hen we speak, then we do so in genres – that is, we choose words according to their generic specifications and at the moment of their use, we infuse them with our own voices" (2005: p. 3). Speech genres are chosen based on the

context – what is going on and who one is talking to, and the evaluation or stance one takes to both (Holquist 1986: p. 66). Thus, to choose a genre is a form of response, and in doing so the act "…removes any a priori distinction between form and function and between individual and social uses of language" (Hall et al 2005: p. 3). Thus, individuals are not restricted to specific social uses of language; they can select what they want and need for the purposes of the moment. Nonetheless, the language used within these responses (genres, in this case) is not flexible. We use language and language-like (paralinguistic) features to project our understanding of a situation, but we do so while observing social norms and rules of uses. These norms allow others to "read" our projection of an internal state of being. Because these forms are socially recognizable – such as *response cries*, "oops", "brr", "phew", "ah", "uh", "um", and other "nonlexicalized, discrete interjections" (Goffman 1978: 800) -- we present these linguistic acts " in a conventional way for providing information – a DISPLAY – a communication in the ethological, not the linguistic, sense" (ibid: p. 794).

In this way, social activity is a performance that draws from a conventionalized set of linguistic performatives, and any responses one makes, are made within the realm of cultural communicability. Our control may be exhibited in the authoring of a response (directly or indirectly) that verbally resists the ideology behind an interpellation by drawing on particular speech genres or dialects (which is citational according to Bakhtin), particularly those that rely on transgressive speech acts (gossip, parody, irony, for example) that are used to adopt moral stances, project ideologies, and more. Still, others will draw from a heteroglossic array of codes or a system of voices that, as "the site of consciousness and subjectivity in discourse", index particular styles and place the speaker in a specific and particular field of social play (with the potential to garner symbolic capital for the speaker) through their adoption of specific linguistic features (Hill 1995: p. 109). Finally, one may adopt language reflective of the ideologies of language learning in that time and place, as this is part of the materiality of foreign language learning. Language learning involves "specific modes of being and patterns of social interaction" (Squires 2008: p. 106) and the language used is "constitutive of [the learners' subjectivities" within the environment (ibid: p. 107-108). The language is reflective of the social and economic

environment. Thus individuals can and will adopt linguistic practices (narrative storytelling and the language that brings it to life) that allow them to push against, address, respond to the ideologies and material realities of language and language use inherent in/part of the social system.

It is from this perspective and understanding of language use that Jamie's narrative story will be analyzed. Specifically, the analysis attempts to uncover the ways in which the narrative is not only a literal response to the request to "tell a story", but also a creative authoring of response that addresses the interpellation of Jamie as a non-native speaker of English. As the story draws from the genre of girl talk and the speech act of gossip, the analysis will also explore the ways in which these features of language play into helping the speaker address and author the response, and why the speaker employs these features of language at this time and in this context. The aim is that in addressing these aspects of language use, that not only will we learn more about the ways in which users of an L2 can use a language, but perhaps gain some insight into what this tells us about the competencies these language users hold.

3.

A METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH
TO DIALOGIC NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

3.1 Tellability

Given the goals of this dissertation stated in the previous section, one approach to highlighting the language used in the creative authoring of Jamie's narrative story is to center the focus of the analysis on narrative *tellability*. In contrast to an analytical preoccupation with tellers (the narrating self and the power/authority to narrate) or tellership (the interactional work of narrative creation and telling), a focus on tellability addresses the ways in which the narrative "doings", "actions," and "events" (Bauman 1975: p. 290) are rendered (framed) interpretable, relevant and newsworthy in culturally significant ways (Polanyi 1981, referenced in Norrick 2004: p. 79-80). Tellability is viewed partly as "an inherent property of the (detached) content of a story" (Norrick 2005: p. 324). By "detached content", Norrick is referring to the narrated event (as opposed to the narrating context) of the story. Here the analytical emphasis is on the linguistic, rhetorical and/or discursive strategies employed surrounding how the story event is told and made to appear worthy to be told, particularly in relation to the audience (present and anticipated). Such strategies can include making the tale "highly involving" (ibid), either through such practices as collaborative telling of shared experience, drawing on emotion and other elements of involvement, incorporating humor, reporting and representing the speech of others, or presenting the unexpected through novel information or information that breaks/introduces a surprising frame (Blum-Kulka 2004; Norrick 2004; Tannen 1989[2007]). Finally, though tellability is viewed as an "inherent property of the [narrated] content", it is a "property" of the narrated text whose degree is negotiated by the author and her audience in the context of the telling.

An analysis of tellability also considers the appropriateness and relevance of a narrative for the particular context of culture or situation surrounding the narrative telling (Malinowski 1935, Ochs and Capps 2001; Shuman 1986), as well as the narrative strategies storytellers adopt to make the tale so. Of course, appropriateness and relevance are relative concepts;

they are elements that can vary depending on a number of factors (such as how often individuals come together and share similar life spaces) and so stories that might be judged appropriate for someone seen on a daily basis may seem too trivial for someone seen periodically (Sacks 1992, referenced in Norrick 2004: p. 80). Appropriateness can become relevant when stories are told at the wrong time or for the wrong audience (Norrick 2004) or when with their telling, they are felt to be too commonplace as to be newsworthy (Labov 1972: p. 370-371). Some stories can be viewed as too transgressive to be tellable and thus deemed inappropriate. A transgressive story is one that violates cultural expectations (Menard-Warwick 2005b), consists of "stigmatizing, traumatizing experiences to report" (Shuman 2012: p. 129), or simply relates content inappropriate for the particular time or place in which the narrative is being told. Nevertheless, untellable and even transgressive stories can be rendered tellable, either through the process of multiple retellings (Norrick 2000) or the framing or reframing of a tale (eg. Norrick 2004; Tannen 1978). Again, stories can be made tellable through negotiation in interaction (Norrick 2000, 2005; Ochs and Capps 2001). This is done often through back-channeling cues, interrupting or other means of the direction of talk, or through questions or negative feedback (Tannen 1978). In negotiating tellability, the presentation of self and management of face (Goffman 1959, 1967) is dependent on the moments of interaction, particularly in the telling of transgressive narratives where the identity of the narrator does not match up with the type of story being told (Norrick 2005: p. 329), or as narrators work to construct and make tellable a tale that presents a certain identity or presentation of self in and through the telling.

Further, tellability is a feature of narrative storytelling that can exist on a high (upper) or low (lower) continuum of telling (Ochs and Capps 2001: p. 76). The lower boundary of tellability refers to tellings that possess little interest and little threat for the narrator or audience with respect to face and aspects of identity (Bergman 1993; Blum-Kulka 2000; Coupland and Jaworski 2003; Eggins and Slade 1997), while the upper boundary consists of narratives that are more threatening and risky to projections of face or identity. These latter include tales of gossip and other transgressive stories (Coupland and Jaworski 2003), "self-aggrandizement, bragging, name-dropping" (Norrick 2005: p. 329), and extreme

emotion and personal experience (Phipps 2013). In the area of gossip narratives, much work has been conducted on this transgressive speech act. For example, Coupland and Jaworski (2003) show how gossipers lay the ground to make gossipy tales more tellable. They examined narrative technique and the manner in which the story was told: the style, the finesse; whether the telling is fluid, halting, humorous, frightening; whether the speaker knows all of the details, etc. (Ochs and Capps 2001: p. 34). Another strategy is to change the way in which the story is "keyed" – that is, to alter the elements that make an activity recognizable (meaningful) in one frame such that it is appropriate and relevant for another, secondary frame (Goffman 1974). Though transgressive tales can be made more tellable, there is a social risk involved in attempting to share such tales; there is risk to the face and esteem of the narrator, as well as to the face of the audience. Nonetheless, narrators risk this upper boundary of tellability for the sake of "greater intimacy and entertainment" (Norrick 2005: p. 323; see also Jefferson et al 1987) or because such tellings result in symbolic capital for the narrator (as seen for example in Abrahams 1970; Eckert 1990; Pietila 2007). Thus, the ability to maneuver a tale along the axis of tellability can be motivated by a desire for power and to be positioned or presented in face-benefiting ways in social structures and interaction

Though the approach to tellability described so far primarily addresses the content of a narrative tale, the dialogic focus of this dissertation and the interactional nature of the interview require attention be paid to the interactionally negotiated aspects of tellability. As previously stated, tellability is a feature of narrative storytelling achieved through negotiation in interaction, especially in narrative stories delivered in front of an audience or in a conversational setting (Karatsu 2012). Therefore, a dialogic analysis that uses the criterion of tellability for its analysis allows for a focus on both the linguistic and interactional feats of creative authoring. It specifically allows for an analysis of 1) the narrator's adoption of a specific speech genre and register of language to mark this genre, 2) the demonstration of (or lack of) cooperation in the storytelling, the awareness of and interaction with the audience and the process of negotiating their relationship to the tale, and the framing of the story events, and 3) the voicing and representation of discourses and ideologies within the narrated events. In the end, a dialogic analysis based on an

assessment of narrative tellability allows the researcher to see how language is used in a multitude of ways that inform the narrative competence of the speaker. Thus, tellability will serve as the analytical focus and anchor around which this dialogic narrative analysis is conducted. The analysis will examine Jamie's narrative response, not solely in terms of what makes it an effective story, but how – through the linguistic repertoire Jamie adopts -- she makes the story tellable in a way that addresses 1) the request to "tell a story" and 2) the ideology about non-native speakers that permeates the context of this particular setting. The narrative will be examined linguistically, exploring such things as the prosodic, syntactic and lexical cues of the narrative, the rhetorical strategies of language use, such as humor or other emotion, avoidance, repetition, etc that allow particular types of tales to be told in particular contexts, and the discourses and discursive strategies used.

3.2 Analyzing Tellability in Jamie's Tale

The features of tellability expressed in Jamie's narrative story will be explored through three separate analyses: 1) Genre, Register and Vague ("Vaguely Gendered") Language, 2) Face Work, Framing and Cooperation, and 3) Reported Speech, Stance and the Polyphonic Representation of Self. The analyses allow for a more thorough exploration of the linguistic, rhetorical and discursive strategies that Jamie uses to make this tale tellable. The analyses explore different aspects of the telling and emphasize different linguistic and interactional features of the narrative itself. In the end, all three analyses should provide a more complete and multi-faceted search into the dialogic aspects of Jamie's tale and what this tale uncovers about Jamie's ability to author a creative response in English (her L2).

3.2.1. Genre, register and vague ("vaguely gendered") language. Since no genre was specified in the interview, Jamie could have drawn on a number of linguistic styles – an academic style, a more straight-forward narrative style. However, what she produced was girl talk, an informal, colloquial, and gendered style of talk. Using Labov and Waletzky's (1967) model of narrative structure as a backdrop to examining how this narrative genre is signaled, created, uptaken, sustained and ultimately fulfilled in the narrative storytelling interaction, this section explores the nature of girl talk in Jamie's story. This analysis will explore the linguistic, paralinguistic, and rhetorical utterances produced by the narrator

(and her audience) that attempt to make her tale, tellable. Specifically, the analysis will examine the way Jamie draws upon a gendered speech genre (girl talk) and transgressive speech act (gossip) that are both recognizable and engaging for the audience. As part of the analysis, any discursive tropes, patterns and structures -- "such as conventional openings and closings" (Bauman 1975: p. 296) and organizational structure (Labov and Waletzky 1967[1997]) – and rhetorical styles (figurative language, parallelism, rhyme) that contribute in the negotiation of narrative tellability will be highlighted. Finally, any key features of intonation, rhythm and other paralinguistic features will be highlighted in order to show the role they play in the creation of tellability. Ultimately, the analysis will explore the way the speaker draws on this gendered genre of speech and the ways in which drawing on this genre (and the speech act of gossip) allows the speaker to respond to both the request to "tell a story" and author a response that addresses the ideologies of nativeness behind the request. It also gives some insight into the linguistic repertoire of gendered speech genre that an L2 user of a language can adopt and the competence demonstrated by an individual language user in populating such a genre with local language. This is key to understanding that authoring is an individual process, one which reflects an individual competence in bending the social language to individual use. There will be three key areas that will be explored: vague language, public words and response cries, and gendered language and gender ideology.

3.2.2. Face work, framing and cooperation. Given the way in which Jamie's interview was collected (a group storytelling setting in which the elicited interview was conducted in the presence of others, thereby creating a more interactive interview), the interactional aspects of the storytelling will be explored, particularly in relation to how the creation of a tellable narrative is cooperatively achieved. By cooperative, this work refers to the sense that interactants work to ratify, uptake and support the line (presentation of self) a speaker takes in interaction. The threat to face arises on two levels. The first threat is implicit in the request itself to "tell a story", particularly given the interpellation of the storyteller as a non-native speaker. Second, the topics of discussion (an extramarital affair and abortion) and the gossipy nature of the talk (who may perceive the sharing of privately confided information as both a violation of trust and inappropriate for the context) are also potential

threats to the face of both Jamie (as the narrator) and her audience (as passive or even active participants in the talk). This potential threat must be attended to in the interaction through face work – "the actions taken by a person to make whatever he is doing consistent with face" (Goffman 1967: p. 12). These challenges place Jamie's tale at the upper boundaries of tellability and complicate the telling of this story for both the speaker and the audience, as each attempts to manage any concerns for face that might arise on the parts of the friends present. Ultimately, the focus of this analysis is on the dialogic underpinnings of language that are expressed in the linguistic and interactional strategies (including strategies adopted in relation to the framing of narrative events) used by the narrator and her audience in the cooperative maintenance of face. These strategies will be discussed as interactional moves that are 1) tacitly cooperative, 2) ambiguously cooperative and 3) even "uncooperatively cooperative". In the end, the analysis works toward a broader, more dialogic notion of cooperation in narrative storytelling and demonstrates the ritual nature of face work, even among speakers for whom English is a foreign/second language.

3.2.3. Gossip, stance and the representation of speech and voice. Though the previous analysis addresses the narrative challenge of engaging in talk about an absent friend to current friends (gossip), this section deals with the moral stance suggested in telling a tale that engages in gossip and talk about abortion and an extramarital affair, for White writes, "[w]here, in any account of reality, narrativity is present, we can be sure that morality or a moral impulse is present too" (1980: p. 26). To explore the "moral impulse" of this tale, an analysis of the reported speech and voices depicted in Jamie's tale will be undertaken. Reported speech and the representation of voices are important elements in the creation of narrative; in depicting dialogue, they contribute to making narratives tellable. They do this by orienting the events and characters of a tale, as well as creating involvement and even tension in a story (Tannen 1989[2007]). However, a study of reported speech can highlight "the way that speakers draw upon sociolinguistic resources and repertoires to signal positionality" (Jaffe 2009: p. 10). This positionality is suggested in speakers' use of sociolinguistic variables of speech that hold indexical meaning/significance for speakers, meaning that reflects the "crystallizations of stances and viewpoints toward not only the

thematic content of the…[narrative] performance, but also the embodied figurations of particular (canonical) ways-of-being" (Shoaps 2009: p. 467). Thus, this third and final analysis will investigate the use of reported speech and voice in Jamie's tale, not simply as narrative elements that contribute to the creation of a tellable tale, but as instances of stancetaking represented by the styling of language featured in the narrative interaction (Du Bois 2007; Goodwin 1998, 2006; Kim 2014). In examining the linguistic and rhetorical features of the reported speech and representations of voice in the tale (and the audiences responses to this speech), this analysis can posit the social meaning these speech forms hold for the narrator in this interactional context (Biber and Finegan 1989; Ochs 1992; Eckert 2000; Rampton 2013).

4.

GIRL TALK

To begin, this section will analyze Jamie's narrative story for its creative authoring and addressing of ideologies. It will explore the hypothesis that in order to address the ideology of nativeness, Jamie employs a girl talk and gossipy style of discourse that backgrounds the focus on nativeness and foregrounds the one element that all members present in the talk share in common – gender. This focus also contributes to making the tale more tellable by making it relevant to all, though perhaps somewhat transgressive in its drawing on gossip and talk of extramarital affairs and abortion. This section demonstrates the different ways in which nativeness is backgrounded and gender is foregrounded through Jamie's narrative story and how the narrator works to make her tale tellable in the current setting. Specifically, the analysis uncovers the aspects of dialogism inherent in the telling of this tale by examining the narrative as a creative addressing of the interpellation of Jamie as a non-native speaker on the levels of 1) Genre, Register and Vague ("Vaguely Gendered") Language, 2) Face Work, Framing and Cooperation, and 3) Gossip, Stance and the Representation of Speech and Voice.

4.1. "Come on, she's my girl!"

4.1.1. Genre, register and vague "vaguely gendered" language

According to Sacks, "The sheer telling of a story is something in which one makes a claim for its tellability. And its tellability can be dealt with" (1992: p. 12). Thus, in offering up this story, Jamie immediately vies for its tellability; in elaborating on the story, she works to establish it. One of the ways in which she can be seen to do this is through the speech genre adopted to communicate the narrative. Though no particular genre of story is requested, she selects and builds a recognizable genre of talk that could be identified as girl talk. As previously described, girl talk is a form of talk that draws on vernacular language and it is talk engaged in by women with other women. As a speech genre, girl talk is, nonetheless, a highly heteroglossic genre in that it draws from a variety of social languages, styles of speaking and stylization of discourse as used by the interlocutors, which are related to one another in a hierarchical manner that gives this genre its specific

and overriding everyday, quotidian characteristic. The following analysis explores how in Jamie's case, this talk is rendered by drawing on very specific language -- vague, public and gendered language – that gives rise to a unified narrative and generic characteristic of speech identifiable as girl talk.

4.1.2. The orienting function of vague language

The narrative opens without an abstract (this could be because the narrative task was made explicit in the original request by MBT) and is immediately oriented to time, place, main characters. The orientation of this tale is accomplished partially through a particular style of colloquial (informal) language use -- vague language (Channell 1994; Overstreet 1999; Cutting 2007; Fernandez and Yuldahsev 2011; Terraschke and Holmes 2007). Vague language is a register of language "which deliberately refer[s] to people and things in a non-specific, imprecise way' (Carter and McCarthy 2006: p. 928), such as 'stuff', 'like', 'or anything', 'or whatever', and 'sort of'" (ibid). Vague language is also comprised of "approximators" -- which are described as "vague expressions used with numbers and quantities -- as in 'around six', 'five minutes or so', 'seven-ish', and 'loads and loads'" (Cutting 2007: p. 7). This language also consists of numerical hedges, such as "close to", "about/around" (Du Bois 1987), and "very" and "about" (Channell 1994) and "like maybe". Further, vague language includes *"general extenders" or "list completers",* such as "this kind of situation", "and/or something like that", "and crap like this" (Overstreet 1999), as well as "vague tags" (Channell 1994), such as "right" (not used as a question but a statement) and "something like that" (Warren 2007) and vague hedges ("like maybe"). Jamie uses several forms of vague language in the narrative, such as the hedges "like" (line 10) and "this kind of situation" (lines 9), and approximators of time, such as "like maybe 10 years" (line 13) and "like maybe, after we all, we both graduated from colleges" (line 22-23), "not just, uh, two years ago" (line 26), and "she met a guy about 1 year ago" (line 51). Several examples of vague language used by Jamie in the orienting passages of the narrative are featured below:

8.	JAMIE:	she said **/** ↑*hey Jamie* **/**
9.		*could you tell me what I can do in this* **kind of** *situation*
10.		**something like that** **/** and that was back to the days in high school

11.	And then we went to different types of colleges / **right**
12.	so…there were / there was a long time
13.	**like maybe** 10 years we did not contact with each other

Vague language is a very common way of participating in everyday, colloquial talk. It lays the ground work for tellability in that it allows the speaker to gather her thoughts (functions as a filler), as part of orienting this story and navigating the audience towards recognizing the genre of this particular talk (Channell 1994: p. 120; Evison et al 2007: p. 142). Additionally vague language functions like formulaic / lexical chunks (i.e. "once upon a time"). In this sense it is dialogic; such words have history and meaning when used in certain contexts that are specific to their use in the context – where "kind of" no longer means "a type", nor does "right" signify a request for confirmation or agreement, but is instead a neutral placeholder like "yeah". As a detachable language phenomenon, lexical chunks are attended to, picked up and recontextualized into the speech of the language user, who, in using these markers reflects a pragmatic competence in their usage. They also help make processing easier for the listener by decreasing processing time and facilitating meaning-making easier. However, vague language is also a feature of talk that indexes casual talk (see Crystal and Davy 1975). As a pragmatic device, vague language employs word usage in ways that assume the listener is "in the know" and can fill in the missing information and draws upon an emotive value that is attached to the word through its circulation and previous uses within a social group. Given this emotive value in interaction, vague language is often found in talk with the purpose of creating a shared sense of space and experience in interactions (where the speaker feels they need not say everything), as well as solidarity and rapport (Evison et al 2007). This vague language appears primarily at the beginning of the tale and tapers off in usage as the tale progresses, suggesting that it is indeed part of the processing and creation of the tale, but also plays a role in establishing a tone of solidarity and rapport from the beginning.

4.1.3. Expressing complicating actions through public words

The complicating action of the story -- expressed through "narrative clauses that recapitulate a sequence of events leading up to their climax, the point of maximum suspense" (Johnstone 2002: p. 93) -- is created through several *voices* represented in the

story world. These voices include laminations of Jamie's various narrative selves (her current self, her hypothetical self, her past self) and figures of characters (her friend, the friend's married boyfriend) through whom Jamie reports speech and constructs dialogue in the narrative. She gives the voices in the story a certain kind of social or ideological phrasing by drawing upon "familiar everyday speech" (Bakhtin 1986: p. 64). This speech is made up of nonstandard, colloquial (slang) terms and euphemisms which she expresses primarily through the reported speech of the characters and their voices, such as: *"that guy is...completely a crap"* (lines 52-53); "that guy was pretty bad" (line 63), *"tricky"* (lines 97, 114); *"such kinds of drama would happen to this kind of carefree girl"* (lines 106-107); Come on, she's *my girl"* (line 148).

Like vague language, these words are informal, sometimes nonstandard forms; and as such, they are "public words" (Spitulnik 1996) and they are peppered throughout the tale. Public words are "...so well-known and standardized that knowledge of them is virtually essential for one to be considered a communicatively competent member of a particular society or subculture" (ibid: p. 166). They consist of "proverbs, slogans, clichés, and idiomatic expressions that are remembered, repeated, and quoted long after their first utterance" (ibid). Public words have their own existence. They are transported across contexts and are carried into new arenas of use by media (ibid). Also, public words very frequently circulate with specific intonational shadowings that are attached to and carried over with the phrases into new settings. These features of transportability help the phrase to be recognized and recontextualized into new setting, such as the marked intonation of Ed McMahon's *Tonight Show* introduction of late night talk show host Johnny Carson (host from 1962-1992), "…and here's Johnny.

4.1.4. The evaluative work of response cries, gendered forms and self-talk
Of course, according to Bakhtin, all words are public words in that they are social and available for use, although they have to be bent to the use of the individual and this is not always easy. However, they are part of Jamie's tale and they are found particularly in places where there is an intrusion of ideological words into the narrative, marking her consciousness as a narrator and reflecting her point of view or evaluation of events

(Bakhtin 1981: p. 291). Evaluation plays a major role in narrative storytelling. It is the feature of the narrative that posits what is most tellable about the story and why it is being told; it answers the question "so what?" and "why are you telling me this?". Evaluative elements can be found throughout a narrative, though they are often found "in close proximity to the most reportable event" (Labov 2013: p. 30).

Evaluation in Jamie's tale appears in several forms of speech. An example of such language use can be seen below:

159.	JAMIE:	(.5) Ah.crap
160.	MBT	Uh
161.	JAMIE:	You know / if I were in [my home country]
162.		I need to do something for my friend
163.		(exasperated exhale of breathe) *Come on ↑/ she's my girl*
164.		*how could you hurt* her *in this way*↑
165.		But because back in [my home country]
166.		I was always the person who would jump in and protect her

In line 159, Jamie utters the phrase, "Ah.crap". This phrase enters just after Jamie voices her desire for her friend to move on. This is expressed as almost an intrusion into the story, where in one moment Jamie is narrating dialogue, but what follows in lines 161-162, is external to the narrative and directed at her listeners. A second instance of such speech is found in the phrase, "Come on/ she's my girl" (line 163). All of this is part of creating utterances, which according to Bakhtin, help to render the complicating action of a tale incredibly involving. These phrases are voiced as a hypothetical response by Jamie to a hypothetical encounter with "the guy" at the center of this tale. This voicing expresses Jamie's tone, her point of view, her stance towards the subject matter. She communicates this stance by drawing on informal/slang expressions to express solidarity and alignment with the friend against the guy. In drawing on these colloquial expressions and imagining herself talking to the guy, heteroglossia enters Jamie's tale. However, as public words these phrases are previously uttered, stylized, commented on and thus Jamie's use of them is dialogic.

Finally, there are gendered forms of talk evident in the narrative that are likewise evaluative. For example, her narrative language employs the forms "guy" (instead of man) and "decent *girl*" (instead of woman). Additional gendered word usage include such words and phrases as "princess" (line 2), "guy" (lines 51, 55, 58, etc), "my girl" (line 163), "heart-broken (line 152). Furthermore, we see the reference to gender and gender ideology through the metaphor of princess. Some words are associated with females, such as "drama" and "carefree" and in the context/relevance of this conversation, "elementary school teacher" (line 77), while others are associated with males ("guy", "crap"). Additionally, though action is not gendered, the attribution of action can reflect ideologies about the nature of male-female relationships. Such gendered attributions of action are suggested in Jamie's tale. For instance, in the narrative, the "guy" is marked by what he *does not* do in the narrative – the guy does not show up for the friend ("the guy disappeared"), "he did not answer the phone" (line 94). Through his inaction, the guy is established as a "crap". However, Jamie's friend is likewise marked by inaction, though of an involuntary kind. Jamie describes her as being incapable, restricted by some outside force (rather than unwilling) – social norms keep her from gong to the guy's house, she is a follower, someone who does not "get the point", etc. Against both of these characters, Jamie positions herself opposite the actions of both the friend and the guy. Jamie's actions are active – she tells and she advises her friend in several places throughout the narrative dialogue, voicing such warnings as, "watch out" (line 50), "protect yourself" (line 58), "stop it" (line 81), "just be careful, don't get hurt" (line 87), "check whether the medicine has some, some side effects" (line 103-104), "look for some medical advice" (line 105), "let's just put the guy aside" (line 135), and "you need to forgive yourself" (lines 136-137). These are all double-voiced samples of reported speech and as reported speech represents Jamie's internal evaluation of events. However, in representing her stance towards events in this way, Jamie contributes to making the narrative more interactive, emotional and personal. It invites response from the audience (which we see in several backchannel responses and utterances by the audience). Moreover the dialogue positions Jamie in a more active, dominant role in the friendship.

4.1.5. Vaguely gendered language and the authoring of girl talk

In closing, Jamie creates a tellable tale while simultaneously marking the speech genre of this narrative in a number of ways. First, she orients the tale through the use of vague language, given the tale the air of colloquial, everyday talk. The complicating action of the story is expressed through public words which provide sequence and involvement in the telling of the story. Finally, evaluation within the story is provided through response cries and other forms of talk. In the end, these forms are slightly gendered and create a vaguely gendered telling for a female gendered audience. They draw on ideologies of men and women in relationships. This is confirmed in the last lines of the narrative, represented by the coda. The coda (lines 177-179) provides the reason for the telling of the narrative; it sums up the point of telling the narrative, which as Jamie states, is a theme on love and relationships – an appropriate and common theme found within the genre of girl talk.

177.	JAMIE:	Well…the point is that/ maybe we cannot avoid love happening
178.		but at least we can avoid getting hurt or hurting others
179.		but she did not get the point. (13:20)

In navigating the language of this speech genre, Jamie expresses a competence beyond grammatical structure and knowledge, though these are expressed as well. Her use of language within this speech genre is comprised of several language forms -- from colloquial vague language and publically accessible words and utterances -- to gendered and ideological discourses that come together to create a recognizable genre of talk: girl talk. This genre renders her narrative tale both recognizable and worthy of being told. Jamie's drawing upon this speech genre implies more than an understanding of language; it "implies a set of values, a way of thinking about kinds of experience, and an intuition about the appropriateness of applying the genres in any given context" (Morson and Emerson 1990: p. 291-292). The richness of language use in this genre – the creativity authored and displayed by Jamie – is seen in the various utterances she and the others produce. Though the utterances may not be original in the sense of the ideology and theme, Jamie's knowledge of the forms in her L2 is worth noting. This demonstration of knowledge suggests the language has been imported from a similar L1 genre, though it could have as readily been learned and honed within the L2. Together, all of these features of language and the regularities and norms invoked in the telling work to imply a

heteroglossic genre of speech that is recognizable and readily associated with the setting/context in which the story is told. It is a genre that reflects the social and gendered nature of the talk, an approach to language (an expression of a world view) that, according to Bakhtin, is "shot through with intentions and accents" and observable through linguistic markers (Bakhtin 1981: p. 293). It is a form of language use very different from the academic oral and written genres of language Jamie uses as a doctoral student; this is a social language reflective of the context of the occasion and audience of the talk, and one whose instance of use suggests a desire for solidarity among the speaker and her audience. This is suggestive through the use of vague language, emotional language and gendered language that each of the participants as women may recognize. Thus, in this sense, it can be argued that not only has Jamie shifted the theme of the talk, but through the language of the talk she has called into being a different way in which the members align – by gender. Gender and not nativeness, becomes the salient point around which the activity is aligned. Thus the speech genre and use of language that marks this genre foregrounds gender and backgrounds nativeness in the story. Jamie states the coda explicitly beginning in line 177 ("Well…the point is that"), which in many ways returns the tale to its original purpose – to "tell a story".

4.2. "And just last week, she told me a very shocking news"

4.2.1. Face work, framing and cooperation

Though Jamie works to make her tale highly tellable, there are three potential threats to face that impact the tellability of the tale. The first potential threat to face is inherent in the request to "tell a story", as the request puts the speaker "on the spot" to deliver a narrative tale. The second potential threat to face is reflected in the request that the story be told by a non-native speaker of English. This request interpellates the subject and introduces into the interaction discourses and ideology related to nativeness. Finally, the content of the narrative (talk about abortion and an extramarital affair) is potentially a threat to face given the transgressive nature of these topics.

In addressing the subject of face and face work, the following analysis picks up on work by Bargiela-Chiappini (2003), Haugh and Bargiela-Chiappini (2010), and Arundale (2010) who attempt to dislodge the topic of face from the Brown and Levinson (1987) theory of politeness (namely, negative and positive face). Though discussions about face that draw upon notions of positive and negative politeness are useful in describing the manner by which politeness moves surface in interaction in cooperative ways, these notions are less useful in reflecting on issues of face involving absent third parties (gossip) for whom concerns of politeness are less relevant. Preservation of face and the interactional strategies of face work are much more relevant concepts in these cases.

Furthermore, work by Mao 1994 and others critique the Brown and Levinson understanding of face as individualistic and centered on the public self-image of the individual rather than negotiated in interaction (ibid: p. 454, referencing Goffman 1967). It is the negotiated aspect of face work – and the fact that face is negotiated in ritualistically observed ways -- that is of interest to this study and that falls readily within a Goffman framework of discussing face and face work. Within this framework, face is a "relational and interactional phenomenon arising in everyday talk/conduct, as opposed to a person-centered attribute understood as determining the shape of an individual's utterance" (Arundale 2010: p. 2078-2079). Thus, this analysis will consider face and face work as "conjointly" achieved (ibid: p. 2085) and as diffusely located in the flow of events in [an] encounter" (ibid: p. 2085 referencing Goffman 1955: p. 214).

Lastly, this work distances itself from the Brown and Levinson politeness model in response to continued criticism that the theory has shortcomings in applications outside of Western culture. More specifically, the model has been critiqued for failing to take into consideration different culturally-determined moral and social values that shape what is considered a face-threatening act or a show of concern for face (Gu 1990; Mao 1994). Given that the interactions in this paper are cross-cultural, and specifically involve interactants from Eastern and Western cultures, and the story is about interactants in an Eastern culture, again the Goffman approach to face is a more appropriate fit.

Goffman states, that "[w]hen a face has been threatened, face work must be done" (1967: p. 27); the threat must be neutralized (resolved) and it must be done in a way that allows the speaker to maintain a "ritual equilibrium" based on "moral rules that are impressed upon him from without" (ibid: p. 45). Goffman maintains that this work can take one of several facets – avoidance, corrective and aggressive point-making maneuvers – yet, whatever form it takes, it will be "cooperatively" accomplished (ibid). Drawing from early work by Goffman on face and cooperation in face work, cooperation in this analysis will refer to the joint participation and/or support in the ritually organized and interactionally accomplished work toward a consistent presentation of face of the self and the other participants (ibid: p. 12). In this sense, cooperation suggests the participants' "willingness to abide by the ground rules of social interaction" (ibid: p. 31) in order to achieve "a common purpose a common purpose, 'or at least a mutually accepted direction'''" (Ladegaard 2008: p. 649, citing Grice 1975: p. 45). By cooperation, I make a distinction that is not always made, which is to highlight the difference between cooperation (which is a form of ratifying, uptake and support) and collaboration (with its emphasis on co-construction). These two are not mutually exclusive, however. As Coates writes, cooperation can include collaboration (such as two individuals engaging in the back and forth repetition of each other's contributions), though jointly carrying out a communicative act (co-constructing a tale) would be considered collaboration (1991: p. 297). Nonetheless, cooperation is the focus of this work. A focus on cooperation in narrative storytelling is concerned not so much with the joint participation by interactants in the unfolding of a narrative, but the manner in which this unfolding supports or challenges, ratifies or not, the face of the individuals involved in the narrative interaction. Negotiation may be involved in the work of cooperation. And there could be many reasons why a story is not ratified by its audience (it could be transgressive or felt inappropriate for the context); nonetheless, the interaction overall will be cooperatively achieved. This cooperation can be seen in terms of how the audience cedes turns at talk to the narrator (Sacks 1974), repeats each other's words and phrases (Cheshire 2000) and even links stories (Mulholland 1996; Cheshire 2000).

One of the key issues in cooperation is in the cooperative maintenance of frames in talk. Frames help make clear what meaning is involved in (how one should interpret) a situated strip of talk. There is usually one primary framework that overrides an interaction; however, the relevance of this framework can be challenged, shifted or even contested at any time in the interaction. The orientation a speaker takes towards the cooperative maintenance of frames and the face work involved in this cooperation – whether they exhibit "a defensive orientation toward saving his own face and a protective orientation toward saving the others' face" (Goffman 1967: p. 14) – will be explored here. Both the cooperative maintenance of frames and the face work involved in this cooperation will be examined, while simultaneously attending to the presentation of a tale that is tellable in spite of the potential transgressiveness of the topics discussed and the gossipy nature of the talk. The analysis will also focus on how the story is framed at different points along the narrative, how the framing is cooperatively negotiated and what language and interactional strategies are used, and whether there are counter-framings or laminated /embedded frames suggested, and if so, how they are addressed and what interactional work this does in attending to face of all involved in the telling of the story. Additionally, the analysis will examine the linguistic codes -- speech and speech acts, the avowals and disavowels, the shifts in alignment (footing) -- that accompany shifts or brackets in frame or stance (Goffman 1981: p. 128). In adopting this approach to Jamie's narrative, it is possible to examine the multiple ways in which the construction and unfolding of the narrative is a cooperative, ritualistic, and co-constructed feat, the aim of which is support/maintain the line (face) that Jamie and the others establish for themselves and each other that render this transgressive and potentially face-threatening tale, tellable. However, as we shall see later in the analysis, cooperation does not necessarily mean solidarity, agreement, but simply mutual observance of ritual processes. In Jamie's narrative, cooperation can be seen in three moves – tacitly cooperative, ambiguously cooperative and cooperatively "uncooperative" moves.

4.2.2. Tacitly cooperative moves

From the beginning of Jamie's narrative, it is possible to observe the ways in which cooperation is tacitly achieved in an effort to address the face needs of the narrator and her

audience. This notion of tacit cooperation comes from Goffman (1967: p. 29), who refers to the acts (stances) interactants take to linguistically or symbolically express agreement or support for a line taken by another. Tacitly cooperative stances can be communicated through hints, pauses, jokes, innuendos, what Goffman calls "reciprocal self-denial" (the act of downplaying oneself and uplifting the other), and more (ibid: p. 30). We see such tacitly cooperative behavior from the beginning of the narrative in the narrative support and protective practices (ibid) the audience adopts with Jamie in her storytelling. In terms of narrative support, the audience cedes the floor to her (with few interruptions) and supports her initial foray into a tale of friendship through various backchannelling cues (cf. lines 30, 50, 59), response cries (lines 69, 76, 147), and other shows of affective support (lines 28,100, 102).

Protective practices, the kind that attempt to save the face of the other (the narrator in this case), are suggested in lines 34-38 of the tale with the interjection of humor by MBT. Such a maneuver is observed at the point when the narrator attempts to rekey (thus reframing) the narrative tale. Up to this point, the story is framed as reminiscing about a childhood friend and the relationship between Jamie and this friend. It is keyed with a light tone. However, at line 34, the story shifts footing. This shift is marked by the discourse marker "so" and punctuated with the strong word "shocking" news. This assessment of shocking news potentially highlights the tellability of the tale, and since it is talk about an absent third person (gossip), sends it to the upper boundaries of tellability. As others have written, gossip threatens face, to the one who speaks and to those to whom the gossip is told. Thus, it is not surprising to see an attempt to avoid such "shocking news" at the next turn. This avoidance move comes in the form of a humorous and exaggerated response: *A sex change operation?* (line 36) by "MBT", who attempts to interject an alternative keying of the narrative with humor. However, Jamie makes several successful bids to continue with the story, and in ritual cooperative fashion MBT cedes the floor with "ok, ok" (preserving the face of Jamie as narrator, whereas a continued attempt to change the floor could be perceived as a challenge to face and an implication that the story is not what she wanted) and Jamie continues with the more serious and gossipy tone she has taken up. In fact, at this point, the story is reframed and rekeyed from a tale of friendship (one in which the

relationship is one of princess-follower) to a tale about men and women in relationship, an extramarital affair, and other "tricky issues" (line 106). In the rekeying of this tale, Jamie takes her audience from seriousness (lines 38) to incredulity (lines 144-146) to righteous indignation (lines 159-164).

This tacit cooperation is also witnessed in terms of how the accuracy of the events and Jamie's evaluation of them are established and supported within the tale. For example, the princess-follower nature of the relationship is not questioned, nor is the depth of the friendship. Rather, support for the narrator's take on the nature of the friendship, as well as other second hand reporting on events (such as the reporting of conversations between the friend and the guy) are tacitly demonstrated through response cries -- such as "um hum" (line 59), "oh no!" (line 76) "urghhh!" (line 100) – and emotive comments, "He disappeared? How could he do that?" (line 102) and "Are you kidding me, for that long?" (line 149). This tacit cooperation is also expressed in the dialogic mimicry of the emotional tone of Jamie's utterance, uptaken and delivered back to her in response – as shown in the series of turns below:

27.	JAMIE:	we got together…finally↑…after more than 10 years
28.	ALL:	["Ahhh"] [Awesome](SIMPATHETIC SIGHS)
29.	JAMIE:	[But the feeling / the friendship / is still there]
30.	MBT:	That is great
31.	JAMIE:	Yeah↑… it's just like we graduated the other day
32.		Yeah…yeah

In these series of turns, Jamie's emphasized "finally" is ratified in the next turn by the group, who respond with sympathetic response cries. Jamie's follow up response in line 29, stated with emotion, is then responded to by MBT in line 30 with a similar intonational rise. Another sequence of turns that appears to be linked in a dialogical exchange of intoned expressions can be found in lines 98-103. In this exchange, Jamie explains that the guy, upon learning of the friend's pregnancy (uttered in a falling, almost whispered tone), disappeared. MBT follows Jamie's statement with a similar falling and whispered cry of "Urghh!" (line 100), which is followed by Jamie's exasperated cry of "Gosh" (line 101);

while Ruth's utterance of "He disappeared?" (line102) draws upon the same key word as Jamie's response in line 99.

98.	JAMIE:	And when she told the guy that…she was pregnant↓
99.		the guy disappeared
100.	MBT:	Urghhh
101.	JAMIE:	[Gosh!](EXASPERATED)
102.	RUTH:	[He disappeared?] / How could he do that!
103.	JAMIE:	He did not answer the phone

Similar verbal linkages between words and tone can be found throughout the narrative. These responses demonstrate tacit cooperation with Jamie's framing and telling of the narrative, and ultimately display a protective stance towards face in her telling of the narrative.

Yet, even when the accuracy of events or statements in Jamie's narrative are questioned, these interactions in which these challenges occur are likewise negotiated in a tacitly cooperative manner. For example, when Jamie introduces the friend's dilemma in line 51, Ruth queries, "How did you know? Did you know the guy?" (line 55). Such a question poses a challenge to Jamie's narratorship. However, in phrasing her comment as a question, the force of the challenge is lessened and becomes an indirect challenge.

51.	JAMIE:	And the story is that she met a guy / maybe about 1 year ago
52.		and she told me that at that time and she told me that at that time
53.		I was…the only advice I gave her was that /
54.		*well / you need to watch out / he's not the right person*
55.	RUTH:	How…how did you know / did you know the guy
56.	JAMIE:	I did not know him in person / but I just listened to her story / yeah
57.		But definitely / anyone who has friend would consider
58.		that guy is / completely a crap / yeah
59.	MBT:	Um hum

In terms of Jamie's response, these types of indirect challenges are handled in a number of ways. In this instance, Jamie "avoids" the critique by acknowledging her lack of personal familiarity with "the guy", but then draws on a type of shared understood knowledge, a universally understood way of sizing up "the guy". Jamie provides a direct response to the

question (lines 56-58); while support for Jamie's claim is tacitly provided through Ruth's lack of follow up comment and ratified by MBT's backchannel response, "Um hum" (line 59).

Finally, though all participants in this narrative interaction are tacitly cooperative in engagement in face work in the narrating of this tale, not all engage cooperatively in the same ways. Different types of involvement and support by the audience are observed. While Kathy provides language brokering (lines 80-81), Ruth's comments are primarily directed at the words and deeds of the boyfriend; in fact, all of "Ruth's comments, save for one question at line 74 which is indirectly related to the boyfriend (when she asks "Did she know?") are related to the acts/deeds of the boyfriend. MBT provides support in the narrative primarily through backchannel cues and response cries.

4.2.3. Ambiguously cooperative moves

Additionally there are interactional moves that appear in the narrative that are ambiguous in terms of their cooperative stance toward face in the narrative interaction. By saying they are ambiguous, I posit that the interactional moves appear contradictory in terms of the mutual support of the face or face claims of another. The most visible example of an ambiguously cooperative stance towards face is observed in Jamie's display of two types of linguistic actions which could be described as "face-saving" and "face-diminishing". Face-saving – or "face giving" (Goffman 1967: p. 9) -- moves are more frequently discussed in the literature. These are interactional exchanges that adopt a protective orientation toward the face of an individual who is confronted with a potential threat to face (Mao 1994: p. 454, referencing Goffman 1967: p. 14). Face-diminishing moves do not take such a protective approach; rather, these exchanges allow for or actively diminish the line (stance) a person can take whose face is at risk. Goffman (1967) does not address such moves directly (instead he talks about giving face to another and one losing face). However, his concern for the social nature of face (his position that face is negotiated, on loan from society) arguably leaves room for the notion of face-diminishing moves enacted by another. In Jamie's narratives, face-saving and face-diminishing moves are frequently

expressed in tandem, where Jamie counters any negative, face-diminishing information about her friend with positive, face-saving information:

1.	JAMIE:	Yeah so, / so when we were kids
2.		I was playing the role of a…the princess
3.		and she…she was just like the follower
4.		but we were very very great friends
117.	JAMIE:	Her image / when…when we were in high school
118.		her persona is just like the cartoon / "Peanuts"
119.		You know there was a character / Lucy
120.	MBT:	Yeah
121.	RUTH:	"Peanuts"
122.	KATHY:	Yeah "Peanuts"
123.	JAMIE/KATHY:	Snoopy / Snoopy
124.	RUTH:	OK / Snoopy (LAUGHS in recognition of the Peanut's character)
125.	KATHY:	When people fall in love they just tend to do things irregular[…]
126.	JAMIE:	[I can't believe] such kind of drama
127.		would happen to this kind of carefree girl / Yeah

For example, in the opening lines, Jamie describes her friend as "the follower" (to her princess), and then counters with "but we were very, very great friends". The diminishing aspect of being "the follower" (showing less volition) is countered with emphasis on the relationship. At another point in the story, a similar dyad can be found when Jamie refers to the friend's situation with face diminishing statement, "I can't believe such kind of drama" (line 126) followed by the face-saving descriptor, "would happen to this kind of carefree girl" (line 127). In this statement, not only is the positive nature of the friend emphasize, but the friend is absolved of any volitional participation in the action through the use of the conditional "would happen to". These contradictory statements help to frame the relationship as unequal, where the friend is more vulnerable and Jamie is stronger. This is achieved, not simply in the dyad quality of the statements, but also in the intertextual references (*Peanuts*/Lucy), metaphor (princess/follower) and euphemisms (drama/carefree) that Jamie draws upon in her narrative.

In another example, Jamie is "forced" to reveal a potentially face-diminishing fact about her friend -- the fact that the friend knew "the guy" was married (lines 73-75) -- but

counters and provides potentially face saving data by drawing on an ideological relationship between morality and profession.

71.	JAMIE:	Well that guy was pretty bad because she (he's) married.
72.	MBT:	He's married? (DRAWN OUT AND RISING)↑
73.	JAMIE:	He's a married guy / Because…because my friend…
74.	RUTH:	Did she know?
75.	JAMIE:	[quickly responds] Yeah
76.	MBT:	Oh no
77.	JAMIE:	[My friend (rising voice)] is an elementary school teacher
78.		So you know / she's a kind of person with good manners
79.		with good characters / and is hard working

So in responding "Yeah" to the question of whether or not Jamie's friend knew the guy was married, she was "forced" to admit that she did indeed know, to which MBT responds with an "Oh no!" However, Jamie quickly counters this remark, with rising voice stating the professional and hence social qualifications (capital) of the friend. Arguably, this move has the benefit of muting the moral implications of the friend's actions – partly by drawing on assumed known ideologies about the morality of teachers of young children, thus making the sharing of the friend's participation in morally implicated actions (a relationship with a married man, abortion) less salient. So again, we see that face-diminishing talks are followed up by face saving remarks.

Thus, there are ambiguously cooperative exchanges in this interactional narrative. The ambiguity in Jamie's cooperative approach toward managing the face of her friend may stem from the competing effort to attend to her own face needs; that is, the need to mitigate the perception of "guilt by association", of being connected to a questionable friend, one with questionable behavior, who could find herself in such a situation. She does this by distancing herself from her friend's *actions*. We see the distancing through several moves, primarily in the use of reported and indirect speech where Jamie is indirectly presenting herself in a more favorable light, as one who is more savvy, as someone who would "jump in" and "protect" (line 166) and someone who gets "the point" (line 179). In the end, both the face saving, face diminishing and distancing moves help position Jamie's friend as the victim while distancing Jamie from the actions of her friend. In the end, these moves could

be described as "ambiguously cooperative", as they are neither cooperative (they are face saving moves at the expense of the other) nor uncooperative. Perhaps these moves on an interactional level of narrative best describe what Goffman refers to as "the aggressive use of face-work" (1967: p. 24) -- the willful introduction of a threat to face because of the social prestige (face) that can be gained by the threat initiator.

4.2.4. Cooperatively "uncooperative" move

Face is negotiated in interaction, and cooperatively uncooperative moves demonstrate this. If tacit cooperation refers to the *ritualized*, joint attention to the positive evaluation of face, then cooperatively uncooperative moves describe the ritually observed social and linguistic ways in which individuals work with competing goals or objectives in their mutual support of face or even framing of events. They do this while managing to observe the cooperative rules of "the language game" (Ladegaard 2008: p. 651, referencing Leech and Thomas 1988). Cooperatively uncooperative moves are not cases of avoidance or defensive moves; rather they are moves in which there exists a lack or failure to cooperate. This is in contrast to non-cooperative moves, which are acts that intentionally fail to be cooperative – such as failing to respond or to observe rules of turn-taking, or that engage in acts such as joking, irony and such. This failure is perhaps due to interactants having differing agendas. In cases where there is lack of cooperation, Goffman writes that interactions can demonstrate the "interchange" of a ritual process that Goffman terms a "corrective process" (ibid: p. 19). The corrective process consists of four steps: a challenge, an offering, an acceptance, and an act of gratitude. In line 159 of the narrative, it is possible to see the observance of this ritual. At this point, Jamie talks about how she would ordinarily protect her friend, positioning her as the injured party. MBT introduces a challenge to this positioning and thus a challenge to the line Jamie has taken in the narrative:

159.	JAMIE:	(.5) Ah.crap
160.	MBT	Uh
161.	JAMIE:	You know / if I were in [my home country]
162.		I need to do something for my friend
163.		(exasperated exhale of breathe) *Come on ↑/ she's my girl*
164.		*how could you hurt* her *in this way↑*
165.		But because back in [my home country]

166.		I was always the person who would jump in and protect her
167.	MBT:	Wow…but doesn't she have…like… / I don't know
168.		you would…you would think she would have family or friends
169.		who would tell her not to date this married guy
170.		There was nobody around to tell her *not* to date the married guy?
171.	JAMIE:	(RESPONDS QUICKLY) One was me and one was another teacher friend
172.	KATHY:	[(initial part of the statement is unclear)…(SLIGHT LAUGHTER) how is someone going to tell you not to do it, just not to do…]
173.	MBT:	I know…I know but how can you get / uhhhh
174.		I don't know / I don't know…wow /
175.		can you get away with dating a married guy↑
176.		I don't know / but yeah
177.	JAMIE:	Well…the point is that/ maybe we cannot avoid love happening
178.		but at least we can avoid getting hurt or hurting others but she did not get the point.

This is a less than cooperative (smooth) interaction by MBT (in politeness terms, MBT's stance poses a threat to Jamie's positive face), even though she tries to smooth out her disagreement with Jamie by hedging. However, this exchange between MBT and Jamie could be considered a corrective challenge – one of two "basic kinds of face-work" which occur in an interaction (Goffman 1967: p. 15). This corrective challenge is indirect, but even an indirect challenge poses a threat to face. In this case, MBT questions the position that Jamie's friend is blameless and by doing so also indirectly casts blame upon Jamie. Further, MBT does not ratify the stance/the line Jamie claims for herself and her friend (that they are not culpable). MBT's uncooperative moves are seen above primarily through her repetition of utterances -- "wow" (in line 167 and again in line174), "not" (one delivered without emphasis in line 169 and the second with emphasis in line 170), "I know…I know" (173), and its contradictory counterpart, "I don't know (uttered in lines 167, 174, 176). However, Jamie tries to avoid the corrective challenge in line 171 (partly in stating her attempt to offer her friend advice, and thus protecting her own face), but ultimately (line 173) accepts the "offering" (ibid: p. 20).

This acceptance of MBT's offering is accomplished, not by acquiescing to the questionable actions and implications of the actions of the friend and hence herself, but rather by switching to an earlier frame (rather than a purely girl talk or gossip frame). The switch in footing -- initiated by "Well, the point is" (line 177) -- marks the shift away from the girl

talk / gossip frame (which allows room for more discussion, input and moralization) back to the storytelling frame (which re-centers Jamie as the author and evaluator of the tale, providing her with more control over what is to be said and why it is to be said). This metalinguistic act can be viewed as a corrective process that brings the audience back to another embedded frame in order to maintain face (that of Jamie's in response to MBT's persistent questioning of Jamie's stance toward the absent friend's actions). This move is supported in the interaction, as well as giving a signal that the story has reached its conclusion. The cooperative acceptance of the narrative frame – though not necessarily agreement or solidarity -- is supported by the fact that the story terminates at this point and no further questions or challenges are posed to the narrator.

Cooperation in the maintenance of face is a fundamental feature of interaction, and it can even play a role in interactive narrative storytelling. One of the functions of such face attending moves is that cooperation in narrative storytelling helps to achieve tellability in the narrative tale. It does this by allowing participants in the narrative to negotiate the boundaries of tellability at various points along the narrative, and in doing so, attends to the face needs of those involved. Cooperation in the maintenance of face is also demonstrated toward the narrated content and characters of the tale, in a manner that allows the narrator to manage her own face and presentation of self through the management of the face of the narrated other. According to Goffman, this is an aggressive use of face work, one in which it is possible that the particular telling of this particular tale was "willfully" (1967: p. 24) offered because of what could be gained by the narrator – solidarity, prestige, face -- in telling the tale.

4.3. "You need to watch out, it's not the right person"

4.3.1. Gossip, stance and the representation of speech and voice
Citing Vološinov (1986[1973]: p. 105), Morson and Emerson write, "no utterance can be put together without value judgment. Every utterance is above all an *evaluative orientation*" and such "always has ethical import" (1990: p. 134). Part of this evaluation is implicit in the act of gossip. Haviland writes that "[g]ossip reveals a set of relationships between narrator and protagonist…often draw[ing] an implicit moral contrast between the

protagonist and the narrator" (1977a: p. 60). He further states that gossip is "plainly aimed at the interlocutor" (ibid: p. 63), the audience, by which individuals "try…to convince their interlocutors, to arouse their sympathies, or to recruit their support" (ibid: p. 63-64). As speech acts with moral implications, the act of gossip can be viewed as *stancetaking*. Stancetaking -- "taking up a position with respect to the form or the content of one's utterance" (Jaffe 2009: p. 3) -- is about social and moral evaluation. Referencing the works of Clift (2006), Fox (2001) and Harré and van Langenhoeve (1991), Jaffe writes that "evaluation of and through language takes place within and invokes moral and social orders, systems of accountability, responsibility and causality…" (2009: p. 5). Stance is also about positionality and how individuals are placed or place themselves in language in relation to other speakers, audience and other aspects of context (ibid: p. 4). Finally, stance is about performance in that the stance one takes "is recognized as the performer's 'take'…on a particular speech genre" (ibid: p.11). This final section looks at the way in which Jamie uses the language of self and absent third parties to render the moral and transgressive nature of this narrative tellable, in addition to reflecting her affective (and evaluative) stance towards the acts/actions of others.

Linguistically, stance is embedded in many forms of language and represents a speaker's affective and/or epistemological point of view or positioning towards a subject/subjects, audience or context of interaction. And thus, stance is something inferred from a study of the linguistic forms employed in talk in interaction (Jaffe 2009). One of the very places where stance can be observed is in that feature that makes a tale most tellable – the reporting of speech and the representation of voice. Through this language, "interactants create and signal relationships with the propositions they utter and with the people they interact with" (Johnstone 2009: p. 30-31). This is represented in linguistic expressions such as formulaic speech and lexical bundles (Biber, Conrad and Cortes 2004), evidential and affective markers (Biber and Finegan 1989), and reported speech (Clift 2006). However, stance can also be marked by "tone of voice, duration, loudness, and other paralinguistic features" (Biber and Finegan 1989: p. 94). In fact, tone is very relevant. In the case of Jamie's tale, stance is highlighted in the representation of past speech and voicing. This language is heteroglossic (representing different speech styles and genres), hypothetical

(what she would have done / could have done), and evaluative / ideological (representing Jamie's stance toward the situation and toward the individuals and herself). Thus, a primary element of this section is to examine tellability through Jamie's creation of an interplay of voices as reflected in reported speech and explore the moral stance expressed through these voices. Examining reported speech and voice within this narrative employs a dialogic approach to analyzing Jamie's narrative, one that provides a closer look at the relationship between the representation of voice and its role in the presentation of self in interaction.

4.3.2. Reported speech and forms of reported speech in Jamie's narrative
Jamie's narrative contains several examples of dialogue that are presented as reported speech. Reported speech is the representation of previous talk beyond simple statements or temporal accounts by the narrator. Reported speech is typically depicted as a direct representation or close paraphrasing of another's speech. However, Tannen (1989[2007]) posits that reported speech in actuality is more than a paraphrasing of previous speech, it is a construction of this speech. It is constructed in the sense that the speaker is not providing a direct replication of the speaker's words (this is seen first in the changes in the grammatical structure of reported speech phrases). In fact, according to both Vološinov 1986 ([1973]: p. 67-68) and Bakhtin (1986: p. 105), the actual repetition of another's (or even one's own) words is not possible as every utterance is singular in its existence – they are not repeatable. However, the case with Jamie's is even more practical in that she was not present for much of the speech she presents in the narrative. Furthermore, she is representing speech that happened in the past (sometimes many years in the past) and is translating this dialogue from Mandarin Chinese to English. Though this speech is clearly constructed, it will be referred to as reported speech in keeping with much of the literature on this topic.

As a narrative feature, reported speech is a common narrative storytelling device. Though common, reported speech is not a neutral reporting medium; rather, it represents the words (utterances) of another, used and intoned by the author, that is partly (fully) brought under authorial control of the speaker (Vološinov1986[1973]). As such, it is put to work in a new

reporting context for specific ideological purposes of the author/speaker, becoming something "more" -- the author's dialogue about and evaluation of the speech of another. In this sense, reported speech is highly evaluative and relational. It provides the hearsay and points-of-view for tales, as well as represents the different players involved in the narrative story (it provides characterization). Reported speech also provides an element of authenticity to a tale, as well as creates involvement (Tannen 1989[2007]) -- and hence tellability. Additionally, reported speech contributes to the presentation of self and others through narrative story. It is how the speaker represents not only what was spoken, but what we should understand about the person of each speaker (Buttny 1997; Gunther 1999; Holt 2000; Koven 2001). Finally, reported speech provides moral compassing to the story. According to Tannen (1989[2007] and Hill (1995), evaluation is embedded within reported speech; it is evaluation that is not so much a judgment about an absent person whose dialogue is being animated, but "an active, creative, transforming move which expresses the relationship not between the quoted party and the topic of talk but rather the quoting party and the audience to whom the quotation is delivered" (Tannen 1989[2007]: p. 109).

The reported speech featured in Jamie's narrative is varied. This narrative features several instances of reported speech by Jamie's absent friend to Jamie (lines 8-10) and the absent friend to "the guy" (lines 142), as well as reported speech by "the guy" to Jamie's absent friend (lines 134-135). Further, the narrative contains hypothetical speech by Jamie to the absent friend (lines 90-91) and imagined speech to "the guy" (lines 163-164). Throughout the narrative, the reporting of speech is introduced through such pragmalinguistic phrases as, "I said," "she said," and "he said". Many of the phrases rely on traditional performative speech structures in which "advising", "telling", and "asking" are involved; though only twice is the more colloquial "say/said" used. Finally, this reported speech is often preceded by a shift in intonation and/or a brief (.2) pause in speech (for example, line 8, which features both a shift in intonation and a brief pause, as indicated by "/").

Much of the reported speech (which is represented in the narrative text in italics) featured in the narrative is *direct reported speech*

       5.   JAMIE: And when she had / when she had all kinds of troubles

6.	in school or in friendships or in her personal relationships
7.	she always told me...ah...asked for my advice.
8.	she would say / ↑*hey Jamie* /
9.	*could you tell me what I can do in this kind of situation*
10.	something like that / and that would (not clear] in high school.

Direct speech gives the dialogue a sense of authenticity, truthfulness in the reporting (Buttny 1998, Coulmas 1986; Holt 2000). Kuo, referencing Mayes (1990), states that direct and indirect reported speech "…serve[s] different discourse functions. Direct quotation is used to dramatize and highlight key elements in narrative and to present evidence, whereas indirect quotes function not only to background unimportant information but also to clarify information or correct errors" (Kuo 2001: p. 182). Jamie uses direct quoted speech primarily in this narrative. This usage seems to go against Lin's (1999) work that shows that Mandarin speakers tend to use indirect quoted speech (while English speakers use direct quoted speech in narrative according to Mayes 1990). However, Kuo (2001) shows that direct speech is used more in a speaker whose style depends more on narrative storytelling. Perhaps, because much of the text is about absent third parties, direct reported speech not only makes the story tellable by providing a format (structure) for the way gossip can be delivered to maximize its tellability (make it more palpable) and reportability (involvement), but also generates emotional resonance/distance between speaker and the person being quoted, "establishing and building on a sense of identification between speaker or writer and hearer or reader" (Tannen 1989[2007]: p. 104). This could be because direct speech is a form of internal evaluation (Labov 1972).

The reporting of one's own speech -- *first person reported speech* (i.e., lines 51-54, 96, 111-116) -- also plays an interactional part in language. It provides evidence of a previous event removed from that of the present speaking context (Clift 2006). Such reportings can be found after assessments in talk to index stance and "epistemic authority" (ibid: p. 583). Clift demonstrates that placement of this speech is systematic, appearing in assessment turns.

51.	JAMIE:	And the story is that she met a guy about 1 year ago
52.		and she told about it at that time.
53.		I was / the only other advice I gave her at that time was that
54.		*you need to watch out / it's not the right person.*

In addition, present in the narrative is *indirect reported speech*, which is not quoted and has the appearance of a paraphrase (lines 108-116), *(indirect) reported thought* (lines 45-46), and *hypothetical reported* speech (lines 90-91):

108.	JAMIE:	I was so shocked↑ / and I↑ / but ↓ I did not tell
109.		I did not say anything as she…uh…
110.		did the narrative to me
111.		I just tell her that / since all this has happened
112.		*the first thing and the priority thing for you*
113.		*is to check whether the medicine has some…some*
		[side effects]
114.	KATHY:	[side effects]
115.	JAMIE:	So I…I told her…I told her to look for some medical…advice
116.		to make sure she's okay / otherwise / maybe her… her..[trails off]

45.	JAMIE:	because I thought that kind of drama should have happened to a
46.		person like me / or…or…or that others / Yeah

90.	JAMIE:	I just ↑ would like to tell her that / *stop it / you can make it*
91.		*It's never possible for you to get happiness from this guy*

In the end, Jamie uses a variety of forms of reported speech, though primarily she is using direct speech. This suggests that the form of reporting of speech for Jamie is either a stylistic choice or function of her language use at this time; that perhaps she has a limited repertoire in the representation of speech in dialogue and narrative. Whatever the case may be, the fact that Jamie uses dialogue to represent the speech of others (rather than statements), "is a discourse strategy for framing information in a way that communicates effectively and creates involvement" (Tannen 1989[2007]: p. 110). It also emphasizes her role in playing advocate and advisor to her friend, as most of the reported speech reflects Jamie's words and sayings in this incident. Finally, the reported speech reflects Jamie's stance towards events in the narrative. Reported speech is not only constructed dialogue, it

is dialogue constructed in such a way as to take the words of another and from another context – place and time -- and use these words for the speaker's interactional purposes in a new context. In this sense, reported speech is dialogic (internally dialogic); more specifically, it is double-voiced (Bakhtin 1981). As double-voiced discourse, it is discourse that is commented on and has been weighed, measured and employed in speech as a means by which speakers position themselves or others (their thoughts, their identities) in relation to what has been reported (Buttny 2004: p. 98). To gain some insight into what stance this reporting of speech indexes, the next section will examine the voices within and surrounding this reported speech.

4.3.3. Voice and the interplay of voices

Within these instances of reported speech, as well as at various points throughout the narrative, there are the representations of various "voices". These voices, like reported speech, are the linguistic representation of the style, intonation and other paralinguistic features, point of view or ideological representation of another refracted to express the point of view of the speaker. Voice is reflective of the differing points of view that may reside within a single utterance (Roulet 2011: p. 210 referencing Bakhtin 1981) and it represents "the site of consciousness and subjectivity in discourse" (Hill 1995: p. 109 referencing Bakhtin 1981, 1984; Silverman and Torode 1980; Vološinov 1986(1973). Exploring voice within a narrative opens up a dialogic space where narrative tellability can be examined in a tale through the linguistic construction of various character figures and the stances adopted as expressed through the voices. Additionally, an analysis of voice in narrative can uncover what Goffman refers to as "expressions given off" by examining the author's stance towards these voices and their messages (Goffman 1959: p. 175-176). These expressions of self are evidenced in the text through a "kaleidoscopic series of selves" (McIntosh 2009: p. 74) expressed through various laminations of self and figures of others. These figures represent the site of moral evaluation and stance toward both the situation and action of others in a narrative (Hill 1995: p. 118).

As Hill (1995) demonstrates, these figures -- or rather the interplay between the voices of these figures -- can index moral conflict within the tale. Her analysis explores the complex

figures of voices (reflected through reported speech) and the intonational ranges and shadows that suggest a complexity of figures and ideologies reflective of the stance and moral evaluation of the speaker. Regarding the use of voice in her analysis, Hill writes:

> The voice system is the field for dialogue and for conflict, where authorial consciousness attempts to dominate and shape the text through its chosen voices. The voice system interacts with prosodic structure; prosodic strategies, particularly intonation, are important to its development and a prosodic interruption, the break through the narrative voice of an "intonational shadow" which may index 'artless' emotion, will be shown to pose a paradox for a search for a subject, a 'self' which might be the locus of consciousness and choice in narrative. Lexical choice and language choice are clearly important components of 'voices' as is the distribution of these across the large structures of the discourse such as episodic structure, plot structure, and systems of oppositions in geography, gender, and the like (ibid33: p. 109).

Ultimately, Hill's work demonstrates how a thorough examination of voice can uncover the stance a speaker takes through the voicings reflected in dialogue or discourse. With this in mind, the representation of voice reflected throughout Jamie's narrative, and in particular in the instances of reported speech (in which Jamie is supposed to be representing the dialogue of others), will be examined. There are several voices recognizable in this narrative. The principal voice is the authorial narrative voice of Jamie, which, in turn, animates several other voices, including various *laminations* of Jamie's selves (various expressions of stance Jamie takes towards her own narrative voice) and *figures* (characterological images of "the friend" and "the guy").

4.3.4. The voices of Jamie

The authorial (speaking) voice of Jamie constructs several voices, including several voices of laminations of Jamie's selves. There is the voice of Jamie as *neutral (past) narrative self*. This narrative self recounts events and provides order to the narrative flow without much comment or overt evaluation. We see this self introduced in the first line of the narrative, as well as in subsequent turns.

1.	JAMIE:	Yeah so / so when we were kids
2.		I was playing the role of a...the princess
3.		and she...she's...she's just like the...the follower
4.		but we were very very great friends

| 55. | RUTH: | How…how did you know / did you know the guy |
| 56. | JAMIE: | I did not know him in person / but I just listened to her story / yeah |

| 74. | RUTH: | Did she know? |
| 75. | | JAMIE: [quickly responds] Yeah |

Though there is no overt evaluation in the narrative, there is stance (or indirect evaluation) expressed in Jamie's comments regarding the relationship between herself and her friend, as well as toward the personal information she has about the friend and is sharing with others through her narrative story.

There is also the voice of *Jamie's hypothetical self*; that self that Jamie wishes had been available to her friend. The hypothetical voice is in contrast to the tone of the neutral narrator who simply recounts the story events and information. This voice is not neutral, it is double-voiced. It expresses wish and desire, but it also communicates evaluation and judgment. The words of Jamie's hypothetical self are expressed within instances of reported speech, as shown below:

89.	JAMIE:	And when my↑…(RISING VOICE)
90.		last year last year when I was in [my home country] during the summer / my friend told me this story
91.		I just ↑ would like to tell her that / *stop it / you can make it*
92.		*It's never possible for you to get happiness from this guy*
93.		Yeah / but because she trusts me enough
94.		and if I said something like that
95.		she would never tell me any kind of story or experience

161.	JAMIE:	You know, if I were in [my home country]
162.		I need to do something for my friend
163.		(exasperated exhale of breathe) *Come on ↑ / she's my girl*
164.		*how could you hurt her in this way↑*
165.		But because back in [my home country]
166.		I was the person who would jump in and protect her.

This is the voice of vague language – "something like that" (line 10), "like maybe" (lines 13, 22), etc. However, this voice also issues an indictment against the friend, when forced by Ruth in line 74 who asks the direct question "Did she know?" (referring to the marital status of "the guy") and Jamie responds with a quick and colloquial "Yeah" (line 75).

One of the first animated recognizable voices is *Jamie as advice giver/sage woman*, the voice of reason. Much of this voice is presented in reported speech of past discussions between Jamie and her friend. This is the voice that – in difference to the hypothetical voice of Jamie – actually performs the task of "advising" (lines 53-54, 62-65, 96) and "telling" (lines 111-116, 156-158) the friend what actions she should take to "protect" herself (line 63). There is no judgment in this past voice toward the friend or the situation and not excited speech, unusual prosody or colloquial expressions. However, there is quite a bit of gendered/relationship ideology.

60.	JAMIE:	Yeah / Because she had fallen in love with him *deeply*
61.		and I did not want to judge her at that time
62.		so I / the only advice I gave her was
63.		that *you need to know how to protect yourself.*
64.		*I know you are in love /*
65.		*but in love doesn't mean that you…you need /*
66.		*you…you can do anything without considering the future.*

Finally, there is the voice of the *evaluating narrative self.* This is the voice of the narrator in the current context (the restaurant) reflecting back on her own and the other's emotional response and emotional stance toward this most recent experience concerning the friend. This voice is "so shocked" (rising intonation); it is reflective ("of course she was heartbroken"). This voice uses an abundance of public words and phrases – such as, "*that guy was 'pretty bad'*", "*is completely a 'crap'*", "*gosh*", "*such kind of 'drama'*", "*ah crap*", "*you know*", "*come on*", "*she's my 'girl'*". These words "remember" and bring with them the ideology of men and women in relationships from their use in "earlier contexts" of girl talk (Morson and Emerson 1990: p. 139). Although these words may be borrowed from other contexts, the tone that Jamie uses makes the words fully and ideologically hers. Not only is the tone Jamie's, but the narrative device with which she introduces these voices is also interesting because of the way they enable Jamie to break

frame and introduce judgment and indignation (often directed toward "the guy"). For example, Jamie's response cry of "ah crap" (line 159) breaks frame, represents a shift in footing that brings us back into the space / time of the current storytelling setting. We get a real sense of language and expression from Jamie. She is "translatable" across time and space, again, the voice of the modern self, constructed over time and distance. This voice is typically marked/introduced by shifts in footing in the text, preceded by another voice, another aspect of the storytelling. This is the voice that has the most intonational contours and prosodic expression, which reflects popular, local language circulating in the local context. This is not the language of the classroom. It is a voice distinct from Jamie as advice giver/sage woman. This voice is evaluative, it is the voice of a supportive friend/protector.

4.3.5. The guy

Present in Jamie's narrative is also the voice of the un-named married boyfriend, who is referred to throughout the tale by the informal, impersonal colloquial label, "the guy". His narrative presence is made known in several turns -- "she met a guy about 1 year ago" (line 51), "that guy is…completely a crap" (line 58), "that guy was pretty bad" (line 71), "[he's] a married guy (line 73), etc. "The guy's" speech is represented in the following instances of talk:

133.	JAMIE:	So well recently / the guy called her again and tell her that…told her that
134.		*I did not mean to hurt you / but I just did not know how to deal with this tricky issue/ and…*
143.	JAMIE:	So…after the abortion↓ / the guy showed up again and telling
144.		telling her *that I did not mean to hurt you*
145.		*but could you wait for me for another 15 years*
146.		*after my children* **grow.up then I am done with my responsibilities…**
		(emphasized through brief pauses between Grow and Up]
147.	RUTH:	One.Five! (INCREDULOUS LAUGHTER)
148.	JAMIE:	15!
149.	RUTH:	Are you kidding me ↑/ [for that long ↑](LAUGHTER)
150.	JAMIE:	[*when I am done with my responsibility of being a father*]

Given that Jamie was not present when the conversation between "the guy" and Jamie's friend took place, clearly the representation of his speech is constructed dialogue recreated from a prior conversation between Jamie and her friend. As for the represented voice of "the guy", unlike the voices of Jamie, his voice does not rely on vague or public language -- though it does feature the euphemism "tricky issue" (line 134). In English, no sense of any identifiable social features of "the guy" that might mark his class, social standing, etc – what we know of him (his marital status and occupation) are provided through the narrative. Any social features that might have been evident in a Mandarin language retelling of this story are absent. Yet, this "guy" is still translatable across time and space. There are extralinguistic aspects of the speech that are ideological and even parodied that portray him as a stereotypical "man" who mistreats women (Jamie's friend and implicitly, his wife).

The narrative description of the "the guy" is a bit of a parody itself -- he is a chiropractor, he did not mean to hurt her; can she wait 15 years for him. However, it is the represented voice of the guy that calls attention. The representation of "the guy's" voice is (passive) double-voiced (Bakhtin 1981). Passive double-voiced dialogue is a parodization of the speech of others where the ideological speaking style of the Other is evident through the voicing of their speech and which has "been tested, and found not only wanting, but necessary to dispute" (Morson and Emerson 1990: p. 153). This double-voicing is evidenced in the represented words of "the guy" – "I did not mean to hurt you, I just did not know how to deal with this tricky issue" (lines 134) and "but could you wait for me for another 15 years" (line 145). There is an ironic "intonational shadowing" (Hill 1995: p. 116) introduced with "but could you" (line 145) and highlighted through the Jamie's punctuated delivery of the utterances "grow.up" and the emphasized "then I am done with my responsibilities" (line 146). In turn, this parodization is acknowledged by Ruth who utters and highlights Jamie's words by changing her utterance of "15 years" to the emphasized "One.Five", which is also punctuated with laughter (line 147). The rhetorical and narrative effect of this voicing is that it contributes to involvement in the story; however, this constructed authoring of the dialogue of "the guy" reflects Jamie's moral evaluation (stance) of him as the narrator of the story. It is the narrator's stance that is

laminated over the voice of the boyfriend and seeps through in the embedded pauses ("grow.up")(line 146), rising pitch/loudness (**then I am done with my responsibilities"**)(line 133), and the intonational shadowing of incredulity and repetition around the key statement made by "the guy" (**"when I am done with my responsibility of being a father")**(lines 150). This double-voiced discourse performs the moral and ideological work for Jamie by expressing her stance towards "the guy" and his actions in the constructing of this story.

4.3.6. The absent friend

Though the voice of the guy is present in the story and the presence of Jamie's friend is made known from the beginning of the tale, the *voice* of the friend is relatively absent. The audience knows of her feelings indirectly. She has been a presence in Jamie's life, though not a consistent one. She is in a hierarchical relationship to Jamie, one where Jamie is "the princess" and she "the follower" (lines 2-3). However, there are only two instances in which her voice is depicted in the narrative: one is in the reported speech of the friend as a younger self petitioning Jamie for advice (lines 7-9) and the second is the voice of the friend directed to the boyfriend (lines 142).

5.	JAMIE:	And when she had / when she had all kinds of troubles
6.		in school or in friendships or in her personal relationships
7.		she always told me…ah…asked for my advice
8.		she would say **/** ↑*hey Jamie /*
9.		*could you tell me what I can do in this kind of situation*
10.		something like that / and that was back to the days of high school

140.	JAMIE:	And my…my friend left a message / a simplified message
141.		to his cell phone / saying that
142.		*well I will deal this with, with my…myself.*

In terms of the narrative telling, only once is the friend (or the friendship) brought into the immediate narrative situation – "I think the bad thing for her now is that she is in hatred" (line 153). Outside of this statement, the audience is not made aware of the friend's current thoughts or feelings about the situation as she is not given much of a narrative voice to justify or address her actions. The only real comment provided about the friend's actions is reflected through Kathy's question about foreknowledge the friend had regarding the guy's marital status. Kathy asks, "Did she know?" (line 74), to which the response to this

question is brief (line 75) and relayed through Jamie. Finally, in regards to the friendship between Jamie and the friend, even this aspect of the relationship is a relatively recent renewing of friendship (within the last two years) and the contact has primarily taken place online (line 33).

The context of the relationship between Jamie and the friend, and the minor role the friend plays in the narrative dialogue, suggest that the friend is kept at some distance within the telling of this tale. This distance is expressed at both the temporal (narrative) and stylistic (stance) levels. Distance is achieved through the absence of certain linguistic features (for example, there are no public words featured in the voicing of the friend and the constructed English version of the friend's speech is monologized), as well as the presence of linguistic features (Jamie uses the larger pragmatic discourse function of the "he said/she said" format which likewise creates distance). Distance is also achieved in the narrative through Jamie's lexical choices which draw upon dichotomous images, such as princess/follower (lines 2-3), advice giver/advice seeker (lines 7-9), and reference to Lucy and the *Peanut's* cartoon strip. It is further achieved through the dialogic exchanges between the narrator and the audience, which further pushes the friend into a distant, past tense context. Finally, the distance created through the narrative is reinforced by the fact that the information the audience obtains about the friend is filtered through Jamie and Jamie's response / stance towards her situation. This rhetorical strategy has the effect of shielding the friend from direct criticism within the story and by the audience – and this is a friend who needs to be protected (even her name, which the audience never learns, is protected by Jamie). Moreover, it protects Jamie from the need to justify the actions of her friend or to have the characteristics of this friend surreptitiously attributed to her (the implication that this story might really be about her).

4.3.7. Heteroglossic style, moral tales and moral selves
Ultimately, the reported speech and the represented voices in the tale provide a context for Jamie to accomplish several narrative and interactional feats through this narrative story. First and foremost, the reported speech and voices allow for the representation of multiple characters, figures and laminations of selves in the tale. This provides characterization to

the tale which contributes to orienting a story for the audience and providing them with a point of view by which to understand the relationship between the characters represented by the speech and voices. It also creates audience involvement in the narrative action. Finally, presenting the interactions between the primary characters as reported speech provides the story with credibility. Together, these elements work to create a tale that is highly tellable.

In addition to rendering the tale tellable, the reported speech and represented voices enable Jamie to present laminations of her various selves – her neutral narrative self, her hypothetical self, her advice giver / sage woman self, and her evaluating narrative self. These selves come together in the voices and figures of Jamie, as well as those of Jamie's friend and the friend's boyfriend, to project Jamie's moral stance towards the individuals and events represented in the tale. Interestingly, this moral stance is less grounded on a religious stance towards the actions of the friend (a response that would be expected in this particular religious context); rather it is established upon the shared gender of the participant and an ideological stance towards men and women in relationships. This stance is constructed by Jamie through drawing on classic discourses about women (damsels in distress, good girl done wrong) and men (untrustworthy, taking advantage of good women). Jamie further presents a strong ideological message in the narrative through her representation of speech and voices, constructing the man as irresponsible, predatory and manipulative, the friend as good but unwise and easily manipulated by love, and Jamie as worldly, savvy and unlikely to fall for such *"a crap."* These voices are internally dialogized, related to one another in heteroglossic ways, and "morally situated" (Shoaps 2009: p. 473).

In this construction of the moral self, the audience is not passive, but is actively contributing to this construction (Goffman 1959). They participate in the process by supporting the distance between Jamie and the actions of her friend and the moral evaluation of the boyfriend. They linguistically support Jamie's positioning of the separation between herself and friend with sympathetic sighs and discourse markers (lines 28, 30, 100), and then they work with Jamie to co-construct a moral evaluation of the

boyfriend as *"pretty bad"* (line 71) and someone who could *"do that!"* (line 102). Such discourse falls under the modern folk label of *"girlfriend talk."* Additionally, Jamie is treated as a reliable narrator -- the truthfulness of the reconstructed dialogue is never questioned. Furthermore, though the audience supports the distance established in the narrative between Jamie and the friend, they do not let Jamie, or her friend, off the hook. In the narrative interaction, there is failure to immediately adopt the stance that Jamie puts forward – that is, a moral stance based on a more gendered ground in which solidarity and alignment are directed toward support of the woman in relation to the man. This accountability is observed in several instances during the narrative event – such as when Kathy questions whether the friend knew the boyfriend was married or MBT's challenge to Jamie regarding the friend's role in dating a married man.

Yet, drawing on language that allows one to present moral stance is not without struggle, and in this tale, Jamie does not navigate the dimensions of evaluative moral language very well. She adopts a number of discursive strategies to maneuver around what appears to be limitations in her moral vocabulary. In some places, she draws on metaphors and references not readily associated with the genre of girl talk, such as princess/follower (lines 2-3) and "Lucy" from the *Peanut's* cartoon strip (lines 118-119); the word "abortion", when uttered, is done so accompanied by a lowering of tone (lines 68, 130, 143) – it is also referenced once with the euphemism "got medicine" (line 107). Additionally, there are other linguistic displays where Jamie's fluency in using moral language is less visible, such as, "she told me a very shocking news to me" (line 34), "some dirty thing about her life" (line 41), "that guy is completely a crap" (line 58), "she's a kind of person with good manners" (line 78), and "she is in hatred" (line 153). In other areas of the narrative, Jamie utilizes reported speech to reflect moral stance, a strategy Hill (1995) suggests reflects moral conflict/positioning and internal struggle. For example, moral irony surfaces in Jamie's comment on the boyfriend – in addition to being a "married guy" and a practitioner whose craft is based on "touch", through Jamie's reporting of speech, he is disclosed as being a father who wants Jamie's friend to "wait for [him] for another 15 years after [his] children grow.up then [he is] done with [his] responsibilities" (lines 145-146). These discursive strategies, however, may simultaneously be reflective of the reality

that emotion is a discursive practice that has to be learned and developed in competent and interactional ways (Abu-Lughod and Lutz 1990: p. 10).

4.4. "Well, the point is that.…"

Guided by an interest in Bakhtinian dialogism and driven by a concern for narrative tellability, three differing yet complimentary analyses of Jamie's narrative uncover three themes that lie within the core narrative of Jamie's tale. These themes are: 1) the backgrounding of nativeness and foregrounding of gender, 2) the simultaneous and ambiguous struggle for solidarity and power, and 3) the display of personal style through moral stance in the presentation of a continuous self over time and place.

4.4.1. The backgrounding of nativeness and foregrounding of gender

Due to the author's original request for a story to be told by a "non-native" speaker of English, nativeness is foregrounded in this narrative event. To foreground nativeness in this context is to highlight difference and to impose a hierarchy in language use among the participants within the affinity space of the bible study participants. Difference is highlighted implicitly through the author's request, as the request indirectly references the discourses of difference that ideologically exist between native and non-native users of a language that circulate within the local context. The difference implied in these discourses is not neutral; rather, they are discourses that perpetuate the idea of a non-native user of a language as "a defective communicator, limited by an underdeveloped communicative competence" (Firth and Wagner 1997: p. 285).

The narrative Jamie authors indirectly references and addresses these discourses of difference. She produces a narrative that does not follow a traditional, scholarly/academic story arc; instead, she draws her narrative tale from a completely social, colloquial, and vernacular genre of talk to present a narrative about a woman in a relationship with a married man. Jamie populates her speech with emotionally intoned and uttered language that is morally-weighted and ideologically gendered. She navigates the face-threatening aspects of her tale through a variety of moves which are cooperatively supported by her audience. Finally, Jamie creates a highly involving tale, one that draws the audience into

the narrative story – not only in response to the complicating actions around which the tale is constructed, but also given the dialogue of reported voices and represented speech with which the tale is narrated. Together, these narrative elements work to create a highly tellable, even if slightly transgressive, narrative story that foregrounds gender. Foregrounding gender in this way reframes, or perhaps more appropriately, layers a secondary "girl talk" frame over this narrative event. This secondary frame shifts the focus of the speech event from one based on nativeness to one based on gender. This act places all of the women present on more common (neutral) ground based on the one social characteristic they all share -- gender.

4.4.2. Solidarity and power

From this place of neutral ground, two interactional potentials simultaneously open up for Jamie (though not exclusively for her) in this narrative interaction. First is the potential for narrative to be employed to foster solidarity between the narrator and those present *and* second is the potential for it to be drawn upon to generate symbolic power for the narrator through the narrating of the tale. The existence of these two potentials in this narrative are supported by the work of Cheepen (1998), Coates (1996), Eckert (1990), Tannen (1990, 1993, 2003) and Thornbury and Slade (2006), whose scholarly writings have demonstrated the role of talk engaged in by women with other women (and in particular acts of gossip), as purposeful activities with the interactional goal of either fostering solidarity within the group or capitalizing on the symbolic power (capital) that language in this setting realizes for a speaker.

This attempt to establish solidarity amongst narrative interactants is observed through the layering of a gendered narrative frame on the narrative event. Through Jamie's layering of the girl talk frame over the nativeness frame, the story locates itself on a different ground (footing), one in which the symbolic power between the individuals involved in the narrative interaction is placed on more neutral ground through engagement in girl talk. Such a shift alters the (symbolic) power dynamics of the group, from one based on ideological linguistic authority attributed to nativeness, to women in fellowship based on life experience, worldliness and personal attributes. Jamie's ability to re-frame the

interaction in this way demonstrates the "dynamic, contextualized and negotiated" nature of interaction (Waugh 2010: p. 113). It also demonstrates her bid for social and linguistic power within the group.

Nonetheless, Tannen (2003) posits that the interactional pursuit of solidarity and the pursuit of symbolic power are not conflicting actions. To understand her position, it is first necessary to understand Tannen's use of power. For Tannen, power does not refer to physical, economic or even social control over others; rather it reflects a general asymmetry or unequal positioning within interactions with respect to how one is seen, viewed or attended to, or even with respect to how one experiences an event or social interaction (ibid). She writes:

> In the context of family interaction, imagine an interchange in which one person announces, "I'm going to take a walk," and a second replies, "Wait, I'll go with you. I just have to make a phone call first." This response could be intended (or experienced) as a power maneuver: The second person is limiting the freedom of the first to take a walk at will. But it could also be intended (or experienced) as a connection maneuver-a bid to do something together, to express and reinforce the closeness of the relationship. In fact, it is an inextricable combination of both. Living with someone in a close relationship requires accommodations that limit freedom. Thus, solidarity entails power (ibid: p. 52).

Given this understanding of power in interactions, the pursuit of symbolic power is visible throughout the telling of Jamie's narrative story. It is demonstrated in Jamie's use of this nonstandard girl talk, a speech genre that draws upon a more colloquial and specialized language form than what is typically taught in an EFL classroom. The pursuit of power is also reflected in Jamie's attempt to navigate the moral language of an extramarital affair and abortion. Such transgressive talk requires attention to the nuances of interaction and storytelling and the ability to use language in ways that render the interaction as smooth as possible. To attempt such language use is to claim power for oneself. Additionally, power is suggested in the narrative interaction through the resistance to narrative style or flow of events by the audience; for as Foucault writes, "[w]here there is power, there is resistance…" (Foucault 1978: p. 95). This resistance can be seen primarily in the exchanges between Jamie and MBT, the native speaker/author. MBT tries to direct the flow of the story (line 36), she also makes the most comments (lines 72, 100, 136, 167-

170, 173-176), and she even provides the most backchannel cues (line 50, 59, 76, 120, 160) – a move that impacts the flow of the narrative story. There could many reasons for the resistance MBT displays in the interaction (reasons cited in the introduction to this dissertation – the desire to direct the story towards a less transgressive theme, the desire to protect the face of her subject). Whatever the reasons, the resistance is evident in the interaction, and thus the presence of power is suggested.

Furthermore, Tannen suggests that the presence of power in an interaction does not diminish or negate the active process of working to foster solidarity within an interaction. In fact, she posits that a polysemous relationship exists between power (as she understands it) and solidarity (1990, 1993, 2003). In describing this relationship, Tannen theorizes that the linguistic strategies used to demonstrate power are often the same strategies that in another context and interaction might be drawn upon to foster solidarity. This leads her to ultimately conclude that expressions of solidarity are really covert expressions of power in relationship (1993, 2003). Tannen's position on the relationship between solidarity and power provides an analytical framework through which to understand the content of Jamie's narrative, as well as its role in the authoring of response to the author's request for a story.

From Tannen's work, the face-saving/face-diminishing aspects of the tale by which Jamie describes the relationship between herself and her friend, as well as the ways in which she describes the friend and her actions, begin to make sense. Also, it becomes clear that the selection of the girl talk genre both creates a rallying point around which the women can bond, as do the ideological voices of a man and a woman in a relationship that Jamie voices through her reporting of speech and representation of voice. Yet, the genre is also a linguistic space in which Jamie can differentiate herself as an L2 speaker, gaining for herself symbolic capital in her ability to use and style herself with language indicative of this girl talk genre.

This bid for social power need not reflect negatively upon Jamie. Bids for social power in this way arguably mark interactions between women. Work by Eckert (1990) and others

posit that symbolic power is one of the ways in which women are allowed to gain social prestige. However, in Jamie's case, the bid for symbolic power may be more directly related to the interpellation she experienced at the author's request for a nonnative speaker of English to "tell a story". Thus, Jamie's use of language demonstrates the ability of language to be taken up as a cultural resource, part of the symbolic system of signs (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992), a symbolic resource that speakers appropriate for power, membership and presentation of self.

Thus, the pursuit of both solidarity and power are suggested in Jamie's adoption of the girl talk genre and the speech she employs within the genre, as well as the narrative and interactional strategies used within the narrative event. In this speech event, Jamie demonstrates power, both in her ability to self-author and engage in the telling of a potentially face-threatening and transgressive narrative (agency), but also in her ability to hold the floor, manage the interaction, and deliver her tale with language drawn from the colloquial, vernacular and public words of her local US context (symbolic capital). In this way, Jamie positions herself as a certain type of woman, one who *claims the right to the type of speech* readily granted to a native speaker. Furthermore, she addresses the discourses of nativeness implicit in the author's request and engages in dialogue -- with the ideologies that comprise these discourses, with the author, and with the audience…present, anticipated and imagined.

4.4.3. Genre and style and the reconstitution of self over time and place

The final theme explored in Jamie's narrative is the display of personal style through moral stance in the presentation of a continuous self over time and place. Because the narrative draws on gossip, it crafts a moral story. This moral story communicates ideologies reflective of the stance of the speaker (see McIntosh 2009). Through the representation of speech and voice in her narrative, Jamie presents her moral stance towards the individuals and actions reflected in the story. We see this in several ways. First, only the reported speech and voices of Jamie draw upon "local language" – those public words, vague language, and gendered language and language ideologies associated with the speech genre of girl talk. This local language is typically reflected in the speech of Jamie as narrator,

more so than when she voices the language of her past or current selves. Furthermore, this local language only features in representations of Jamie's speech and not that of the friend or the boyfriend. In this way, Jamie keeps her narrative voice distinct. Keeping her narrative voice distinct emphasizes Jamie's usage of "girl talk", showing her to be a savvy user of her L2. In this respect, Jamie is not "a *language learner* but…a *language user*, not a *deficient nonnative speaker (NNS)* but a *savvy navigator* of communicative obstacles" (Kramsch 2012b: p. 108). In addition, this use of local language portrays Jamie as a worldly woman, one above finding herself in such a "shocking" situation. Finally, the use of local language distances Jamie from the actions of a friend who historically and repeatedly finds herself in "such kind[s] of drama" (line 126). Both are moves that are evaluative and project moral stance.

Not only does Jamie project moral stance through this speech, but the way in which this language is distributed over the various laminations of Jamie's selves, suggests the interactional workings of a unified moral identity for Jamie across time and space (Pavlenko and Lantolf 2000). Through the reported speech and voices of Jamie, the audience is presented with the aspect of Jamie's moral identity that her moral stance towards the individuals and events of the tale indexes. This moral identity is not based on a religious moral, but a gendered ideological moral. It is an identity introduced through a consistent type of language use ("local language") presented over Jamie's past, present and hypothetical selves.

Nonetheless, though this language use across Jamie's selves suggests a continuous self across time and space, such instances of language use may simply reflect more immediate influence of stance and presentation of self or a claim toward a particular identity in the moment, rather than more continuous notions of identity. Thus, this language use is best reflective of Jamie's presentation of self in the current interactional context than a more consistent representation of identity across time, space and genre of talk. Additionally, the analyses can provide some insight into the social meaning this girl talk genre holds for Jamie in the narrative interaction. Specifically, it can illuminate the ways in the language of this genre is used to position the characters of the tale and ultimately what this suggests

for the presentation of self that Jamie projects within this context (Jaffe 2009: p. 7).
Because "[s]peech is always produced and interpreted within a sociolinguistic matrix --
that is, speakers make sociolinguistically inflected choices and display orientations to the
sociolinguistic meanings associated with forms of speech" (ibid: p. 3) -- speech genres and
various stylistic strategies (reported speech and voices) can index particular stances (ibid:
p. 13). In particular, through reported speech and the presentation of social voices,
individuals can "claim identities, reject identities, and experiment with identities
(Mattingly 1998, Nelson 2001)" (Frank 2012: p. 45).

5.

CONCLUSION, CLOSING THOUGHTS, AND IMPLICATIONS

In closing, the present work adopts a dialogic approach to narrative analysis. It examines the narrative elements of the tale that contribute to making it tellable and explores the personal storytelling style exhibited by the narrator, an L1 Chinese/L2 English language speaker. Moving away from more traditional structural or performative approaches to narrative analysis, this dissertation examines the narrative from a micro-interactional perspective that investigates the linguistic performance of narrative storytelling from the point of view of speech genres, ritual and meaning in language use, and stance and indexical meaning. Further, in drawing upon Bakhtinian dialogism, this approach reinforces the notion that all utterances are 1) addressed to someone, 2) anticipatory in their response, and 3) creatively uttered as they draw upon these various forms of language. This view and approach to the analysis of narrative language come together in this dissertation to demonstrate an example of a Bakhtinian-inspired dialogic analysis of L2 language use.

In concluding this work, I wish to share a few final notes regarding the narrative (in particular, Jamie's stance toward her own tale) and a final Bakhtin-inspired insight into the tale. Some years after she recorded her story, I debriefed Jamie (over a meal and preceded by a bit of girl talk) as part of the process of completing work on this dissertation. I was interested in hearing her perspective on the narrative she told – I especially wanted to know whether she was conscious of selecting this particular story for a particular reason, as well as the various features of language that appeared in the tale. According to Jamie, the story was told as a follow up to a petition for prayer for this particular friend that she requested at an earlier Bible study gathering. As for the reasons behind Jamie's use of the girl talk language, this was a question that was difficult to explore without explicitly leading Jamie into a discussion about language ideology and nativeness. I probed for metalinguistic evidence on Jamie's part about the kind of language she used in the narrative, but ultimately, no concrete discussion of language use took place.

Ultimately, the answer perhaps best lies with Bakhtin. According to Morson and Emerson, Bakhtin states that any response to an utterance, even when there is no singular understood author for that utterance, will be responded to as if "positing an author" 1990: p. 133). Drawing from Bakhtin, Morson and Emerson write:

> If we respond to a proverb (by denying its wisdom, or preferring the insight of a contrary proverb), we imagine someone who might have said it, and may imply that the experience that led to it was partial: we treat it as a German or Russian from whom it might have emanated. One can respond dialogically even to distinct styles of speaking if we imagine a 'typical' speaker who would unselfconsciously use that style. We may even respond to inanimate, naturally produced objects if we imagine them as signs that express someone's personality or voice. (1990: p. 133).

As the initiator of the request, I become the author of the utterance and the ideologies behind the request to "tell a story". Therefore, Jamie's response would be directed toward me, the author. My presence as a fellow student/scholar, as native speaker, as a southern African American woman – all social identities which I have openly discussed in our Bible study gatherings -- have implications for Jamie's choice of language in authoring her narrative tale in response to my request. Though these elements may have made their way into Jamie's response (and I have intentionally avoided positing which elements, as the scope of the data collected in this study does not allow for such an analysis), ultimately the "tone", the language, the selection of genre – all are reflective of Jamie's evaluative stance towards the story, its characters, and the context of the telling. Though the words may be borrowed from the public sphere of language use, their intention and the responsibility for uttering them are very much Jamie's own (Kramsch 2012a: p. 491). More importantly, the dialogic approach allows the focus to move away from language in terms of structure and pragmatics, to language on the level of call and response. Thus, the narrative is viewed holistically as a response to a larger interpellation. Having multiple narrative samples of Jamie's speech would provide a stronger argument for this creativity, perhaps even across different genres.

With this, I wish to introduce a key limitation of this study. The data for this dissertation is based on a single sample of narrative data. Though this data provides clear examples of attention to a specific speech genre, interactional cooperation in face work, and moral

stance in the use of reported speech and voice, this single sample is limited with respect to providing a more complete picture of Jamie's language use as it relates to the scope of Jamie's abilities within this girl talk speech genre, as well as her use of language across genres. In addition, it does not allow for a deeper investigation into issues of language use and social identity. Furthermore, it is not possible to extend the results of Jamie's language use across language users. Jamie's use of language remains specific to her, her abilities and her motivations -- limiting the implications of this data for L2 language use.

Based on the analyses, my debriefing conversation with Jamie, and my own intellectual interest, and despite the key limitation in this study of presenting only one sample of language use, I believe this research presents several implications for the field of applied linguistics. Much of the current research focus in the study of language use by foreign (and even second) language users approaches the language produced by these speakers as though it is limited in creativity. However, creative authoring in language use is not limited to native speakers, nor is it limited to L2 users who have attained a given level of fluency – creative authoring of response is available to language learners and users immediately. This dialogic investigation of Jamie's narrative should demonstrate the multiple ways language users demonstrate the creative authoring of response in an L2.

Such an increased focus on the dialogic nature of language use should increase the field's attention to L2 *linguistic style* -- beyond translanguaging and such multilingual linguistic practices. By linguistic style we mean the intentional use of a particular style to project stance or identity. With the exception of a handful of study's – Ibrahim's (1999) work on the adoption of hip hop and AAVE by Franco-African students in Canada or Iwasaki's (2010) study of the notice and adoption by study abroad students of local (Japanese) uses of more plain (rather than polite) speech style in Japan -- style is not a topic frequently discussed in AL/SLS work related to foreign language users, or when it is, it is discussed primarily in terms of grammatical style-shifting, for example (cf. Barron 2003, 2006; DuFon 2000; Kinginger and Farrell 2004; Siegal 1995). However, a study of style should reflect the breadth of the linguistic repertoire and linguistic practices (again, beyond code switching, translanguaging, crossing, etc.) of a speaker (Busch 2012), as well as investigate

the social meaning these styles hold for language users and the uses to which this language is put in the presentation of an L2 speaker's personal style -- particularly in the face of micro-interactional spaces in which learners may be confronted with discourses and ideologies with which they may ultimately decide to engage.

Additionally, this work has implications for language development (particularly in the area of personal style) and the role of *affinity spaces* in providing learners with knowledge of and access to a variety of speech genres, local language and linguistic practices, and language socialization acquired through meaningful interaction and knowledge acquisition and sharing through these spaces. Though this work does not attempt to demonstrate a direct link between language use and the language acquired by Jamie in the group, it does suggest that the Bible study group provided Jamie with a space in which use and experimentation with language was open, free and supported. It also suggests that within the group – because of the nature of the Bible study – there was a constant flow of talk between speech genres, from prayer, to social talk, to discussion of religious themes and texts. This ability to move between different speech genres, and with relative ease (though again, she does appear to struggle a bit with the moral language of the narrative), is reflected in Jamie's tale. This ease is suggested in the relative lack of disfluency in her language usage that would suggest possible feelings of inauthenticity or legitimacy (the disfluency we do see appears to be related more to recalling or finding the right word, rather than hesitancy in speaking or expressing thoughts). Such feelings may be backgrounded because of the safety (feeling of acceptance) in language use that has been set up within this group. Furthermore, the focus on a shared activity in affinity groups can also work to background language as a point of differentiation in these spaces. Additional research in this area is needed. Such a focus on language would support growing attention in the field on the role of social context in language learning, especially those contexts in which the focus is on learner engagement in practices (practice theory) as the source of language knowledge and use (see Young and Astirita 2013).

This dissertation also holds implications for *assessment and assessment practices* within the field of Applied Linguistics. Assessment of the language these learners produce should

be carried out in such a way as not to be limited to prescriptive notions of proficiency and grammatical competence, but rather inclusive of "language expertise(s), language inheritance, and language affiliation" of learners (Leung et al 1997: p. 544, referencing Rampton 1990). These concepts should also take into account the appropriateness of meaning, understanding, and the language produced in relation to the context in which it occurs. Such a focus demonstrates attention paid to the multiple genres and registers that can exist within languages, exploring speech as speakers move from academic or work related to *colloquial and popular genres*. Further, such work might be relevant to studies of proficiency. Boers et al talk about the ways pre-fabricated chunks, like the ones Jamie uses, as well as the absences of hesitation in speech help speakers "come…across as generally proficient speakers" (2006: p. 247). This contributes to one's "perceived proficiency" (ibid). Thus it may be worthwhile to study how such additions contribute to the perception of fluency or intelligibility of non-native speakers, to "diversify the notion of communicative competence", as Kramsch suggests (2012b: p. 116), or at least to continue to broaden the relevance of sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence in assessment, especially assessment of students using language in study abroad contexts where learning of colloquial language may be just as or more important than the academic language. Such expanded attention to the competence displayed in sociolinguistic and pragmatic rules of language use allows scholars to examine a wider field of language competencies. Additionally, this broader focus on language competencies has implications for SLS/AL research on identity, a major topic in the field. As Leung et al remind us, language use and social identity are "inextricably linked" (1997: p. 544), such that the various social identities claimed by one person can become relevant across contexts of use and result in the production of different styles of language use. Thus, assessment should cover the fullest range of linguistic capacities of a language learner/user.

This work further holds two implications for general research practices in the field. First, such a focus calls for the consideration of the limits of *learners as subject-objects* in research on interaction. In AL/SLS research, language users are often positioned as certain types of beings – learners, native/non-native, etc. – and assigned labels that place them in categories out of which they are not able to easily negotiate. However, we can see through

Jamie's response to the request to "tell a story" that other aspects of her identity – as a woman rather than a non-native -- are made relevant and thus reflected in the talk. This is what Firth and Wagner (1997) remind us is important in doing research, to consider the identities that language learners highlight as relevant in the interaction. Nonetheless, though identity is referenced and alluded to in this work, it is not the primary analytical focus of the narrative, nor do I believe it is the driving force behind the story. Rather, language ideology and ideologies about L2 users (and in particular, their language competence) underlie this tale and thus are the key analytical focus of this narrative.

The second implication for research practices is related to the analysis of narratives gathered through *elicited interview techniques*. This method of data collection has been critiqued by those who argue that it does not produce authentic narrative or authentic conversational data (Norrick 2000 and others). However, this work demonstrates that even interviews can produce interactional and conversational stories when elicited in the right circumstances. In this case, it is the familiarity between the group members and their shared experience of conversing that surely contributed to the more conversational and, hopefully, authentic nature of the narrative. Also, the location may have played a role – an interview over a meal could have sparked an association with the event of girl talk, which may have shaped the direction Jamie took with her tale.

Lastly, this work has implications for more postmodern and poststructuralist approaches to language research in applied linguistics; specifically, in furthering the adoption of the theory of the performativity (Butler 1990, 1993) in language studies. Butler's theory of performativity posits that identity – in Butler's work, the focus is on gendered identity) is not set a priori; rather she argues that constructs of social identity are brought into being and imposed upon bodies through "the repeated stylization of the body…" (Butler 1990, p. 33, cited in Pennycook 2004: p. 8). This stylization consists of "…a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal[s] over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being" (ibid). These repeated acts consist of ways of styling the body, gestures, etc, but they also include linguistic acts which are expressed through features such as accent (rhythm, prosody), grammatical structure. Through these

ritualized and repeated linguistic practices, ways of "being" and of "doing" self become "sedimented through time" (Butler 1990: p. 120), acquiring a material and ideological reality that calls the individual into being. In other words, it is the repeated stylization and the normalization of these acts that ultimately become attached to bodies and are misrecognized as being inherent to those bodies that is at the heart of Butler's notion of performativity.

Considering the role of language in the production of social identities as performative opens up the possibility that categories we take as fixed, as inherent in nature, are quite simply "the legacy of sedimented acts rather than a predetermined or foreclosed structure, essence or fact, whether natural, cultural or linguistic" (ibid: p. 274). These categories and the identities associated with them, thus are the expressions of norms, "ritualized production[s]… reiterated under and through constraint, under and through the force of prohibition and taboo, with the threat of ostracism and even death controlling and compelling the shape of the production, but not…determining it fully in advance" (Butler 1993: p. 95). Considering language in this way leaves the possibility that the apparent material existence of a social category like nativeness – reflected in repeated (recitation and repetition) and socially sanctioned and recognized ways of doing accent, grammar, and even response cries – are not necessarily inherent, given and uncomplicated truths; rather they are "constructed" realities based on the performative and normalized practices and ideologies that maintain these realities.

This performative view of language impacts not only the understanding of language and language use, but the notion of the language user as subject of and subject to discourses that impact their sense of self. For Kramsch (2012a), concerns for self are reflected in her exploration of the themes of legitimacy, authenticity and feelings of imposture (who one sees oneself to be and whether this self is legitimated by society) by language users whose language use falls outside the discursively constructed and maintained social categories of native / non-native speaker. The language use of these individuals raises awareness of the slipperiness of these social categories and prompts the creation of new categories. As noted by Kramsch, such attempts to maintain the reality of the binary categories native and non-

native have resulted in the application of such descriptive labels as "*passing* (Piller 2002), *animating* (Goffman 1981) and *styling/stylization* (Rampton 1999, Coupland 2001)" (2012a: p. 488) to the language use of speakers who do not readily fit into the normalized categories of language speakers.

Though Butler posits that such identities and symbols are imposed upon subjects, she also puts forward the notion that individuals are able to act in ways that are agentive and highlight the normative function of linguistic (and bodily) acts. Individuals attempt to do this by appropriating the legitimized symbols of another and employing them for their own (often unsanctioned) uses. This is one of the implications of the narrative story told by Jamie. In addition to its dialogic nature, its authoring of response to the interpellation of her as a non-native speaker, the analysis attempts to shed light on the way in which Jamie – as an act of agency or perhaps as an act of resistance -- appropriates the legitimate symbols of others (native speakers of English) through her adoption of the girl talk genre, framed as gossip and peppered with public word and phrases associated with local and colloquial US vernacular in a manner that is highly tellable. It is this performative aspect of language that ultimately is at the heart of this work and which I hope to take up as a next step in my work on L2 narrative storytelling analysis.

REFERENCES

Abrahams, R. D. (1970). A performance-centered approach to gossip. *Man*, 5(2): 290-301.

Abu-Lughod, L.& Lutz, C. (1990). Introduction: Emotion, discourse and the politics of everyday life. In C. Lutz and L. Abu-Lughod (eds.), *Language and the politics of emotion*, pp. 1-23. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Althusser, L. (1971[2001]). Lenin and philosophy and other essays. Ben Brewster (trans.). New York: Monthly Review.

Arundale, R. (2010). Constituting face in conversation: Face, facework, and interactional achievement. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42: 2078-2105.

Atkinson, P. & Coffey, A. (2002). 'Revisiting the Relationship Between Participant Observation and Interviewing', in J.F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein (Eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Auer, P. (ed)(2007). *Style and social identities: Alternative approaches to linguistic heterogeneity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. C. Emerson (Ed. and Trans.) Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M., Holquist, M., & Liapunov, V. (1990). *Art and answerability: Early philosophical essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press

Bamberg, M. (1997). Positioning between structure and performance. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, *7*, 335-342.

Bamberg, M. (2004). Talk, small stories, and adolescent identities. *Human Development*, 47, 366-369.

Bamberg, M. (2006). Biographic-narrative research, quo vadis? A critical review of "big stories" from the perspective of "small stories". In K. Milnes, C. Horrocks, N. Kelly, B. Roberts, & D. Robinson (Eds.), *Narrative, memory, and knowledge: Representations, aesthetics, and contexts.* Huddersfield: University of Huddersfield Press.

Bamberg, M (2011). Narrative practice and identity navigation. In J.A. Holstein & J.F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Varieties of narrative analysis*, pp. 99-124. London: Sage Publications.

Bamberg, M. & Georgakopoulou, A. (2008). Small stories as a perspective in narrative and identity analysis. *Text and Talk*, 28(3): 377-396.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1994). Narrative structure and lexical aspect: Conspiring factors in Second Language Acquisition of tense-aspect morphology. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20(4): 471-508.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1995). A narrative perspective on the development of the tense / aspect system in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17(2): 263-291.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1998). Narrative structure and lexical aspect: Conspiring factors in second language acquisition of tense-aspect morphology. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20: 471-508.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2000). *Tense and aspect in second language acquisition: Form, meaning, and use*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2003). Face and politeness: new (insights) for old (concepts). *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35: 1453-1469.

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Barron, A. (2006). Learning to say 'You' in German: The acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a study abroad context. In M.A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language Learners in Study Abroad Contexts*, pp. 59-88. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.

Bauman, R. (1975). The ethnography of speaking. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 4: 95-119.

Bauman, R. (1977). *Verbal art as performance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Bauman, R. (1986). *Story, performance, and event: Contextual studies of oral narrative*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]: Cambridge University Press.

Bauman, R., & Briggs, C. L. (1990). Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Social Life. *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 19: 59-88.

Baynham, M. & De Fina, A. (Eds.)(2005). *Dislocations/ relocations, narratives of displacement.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Beebe, L. M. (1980). Sociolinguistic variation and style-shifting in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 30: 433-441.

Bergmann, J. R. (1993). *Discreet indiscretions: The social organization of gossip*. J.Bednarz, Jr. (Trans). New York: Aldine de Gruyter. Originally published in 1987 as Klatsch: Zur Sozialform der diskreten Indiscretion, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Berlin, L. & Adamson, H. D. (2009). The acquisition of English irregular past tense by Chinese-speaking children. In H. D. Adamson (Ed.), *Interlanguage variation in theoretical and pedagogical perspective*, pp. 61–73. New York and London: Routledge.

Berman, R. (1995). Narrative competence and storytelling performance: How children tell different stories in different contexts. *Journal of narrative and life history*, 5(4): 285-313.

Berman, R. (2001). Setting the narrative scene: How children begin to tell a story. In A. Aksu-Koç, C. Johnson, & K. Nelson (Eds.), *Children's Language Vol. 10.,* pp. 1-31. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Biber, D., Conrad, S. & Cortes, V. (2004). If you look at… Lexical Bundles in University Teaching and Textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(3): 371-405.

Biber, D. & Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text*, 9(1): 93-124.

Bielo, J. (2009). *Words upon the Word: An ethnography of Evangelical group Bible study*. New York: New York University Press.

Björklund, M. (2011). Mikhail Bakhtin. In M. Sbisà, J. Östman and J. Verschueren (eds.), *Philosophical perspectives for pragmatics*, pp. 38-52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Block, D. (2006). Identity in applied linguistics: where are we? In T. Omoniyi and G. White (eds.), *The Sociolinguistics of Identity,* pp. 34-49. London: Continuum.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). "You gotta know how to tell a story": Telling, tales, and tellers in American and Israeli narrative events at dinner. *Language in Society*, 22(3): 361-402.

Blum-Kulka, S. (2000). Gossipy events at family dinners: Negotiating sociability, presence and the moral order. In J. Coupland (Ed.), *Small talk,* pp. 213–240. London: Longman.

Blum-Kulka, S. (2004). The role of peer interaction in later pragmatic development: The case of speech representation. In R. Berman (Ed.), *Language development across childhood and adolescence*, pp. 191-210. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Boers, F., Eyckmans, J., Kappel, J., Stengers, H. & Demecheleer, M. (2006). Formulaic sequences and perceived oral proficiency: Putting a lexical approach to the test. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(3): 245-261.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Broner, M. & Tarone, E. (2001). Is it fun? Language play in a fifth-grade Spanish immersion classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(3): 363-379.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. (1987). Life as narrative. *Social Research*, 54: 1-17.

Bruner, J. (2002). *Making stories: Law, literature, life*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.

Bucholtz, M. (2009). From Stance to Style: Gender, Interaction, and Indexicality in Mexican Immigrant Youth Slang. In A. Jaffe (Ed.) *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, pp. 146-170. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Busch, B. (2012). The linguistic repertoire revisited. *Applied Linguistics,* 33(5): 503-523.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. New York: Routledge.

Buttny, R. (1997). Reported speech in talking race on campus. *Human Communication Research*, 23: 475-504.

Buttny, R. (1998). Putting prior talk into context: Reported speech and the reporting context. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 31(1): 45-58.

Buttny, R. (2004). *Talking problems: Studies of discursive constructions*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cameron, D. (2002). Globalization and the teaching of "communication skills". In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.). *Globalization and language teaching*, p. 67-82. London: Routledge.

Carter, R. & McCarthy., M (2006). *Cambridge Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cazden, C. (1989). Contributions of the Bakhtin circle to "Communicative Competence". *Applied Linguistics* 10(2): 116-127.

Chafe, W. (Ed.)(1980). *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Chafe, W. (1993). Prosodic and functional units of language. In J. Edwards & M. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking data: Transcription and coding in discourse research*, pp. 33-43. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Channell, J. (1994). *Vague language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chase, S. E. (2005). Narrative Inquiry: Multiple Lenses, Approaches, Voices. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitiative Research, 3rd edition*, pp. 651- 679. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cheepen, C. (1998). *The predictability of informal conversation*. London: Pinter.

Cheshire, J. (2000). The telling or the tale?: Narratives and gender in adolescent friendship networks. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(2): 234-262.

Clift, R. (2006). Indexing stance: Reported speech as an interactional evidential. *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 10(5): 569-595.

Coates, J. (1991). Women's co-operative talk: a new kind of co-operative duet? In C. & R. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Anglistentag 1990*, pp. 296-311. Tubingen: Niemeyer.

Coates, J. (1996). *Women talk: Conversation between women friends*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Collentine, J.G. (2004). The effects of learning contexts on morphosyntactic and lexical development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 227-248.

Coulmas, F. (1986). *Direct and indirect speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Coupland, J. (2000). *Small Talk*. London: Longman.

Coupland, J. & Jaworski, A. (2003). Transgression and intimacy in recreational talk narratives. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 36(1): 85-106.

Coupland, N. (2001). Dialect stylization in radio talk. *Language in Society*, 30: 345–75.

Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruttenden, A. (1986). *Intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. & Davy, D. (1975). *Advanced conversational English*. London: Longman.

Cutting, J. (2007). *Vague language explored*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

D'hondt, S. (2009) "The pragmatics of interaction: A survey." In S. D'hondt, J. Verschueren & J. Östman (Eds.), *The Pragmatics of Interaction,* pp. 1-19. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Davies, B. & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the theory of social behavior,* 20:43-63.

De Fina, A. (2003). *Identity in narrative: A study of immigrant discourse.* Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

De Fina, A. & Georgakopoulou, A. (2011). *Analyzing Narrative*. http://lib.myilibrary.com.ezproxy1.library.arizona.edu/Open.aspx?id=359799&loc=1

Diamondstone, J. & Merriman, N. (February 1988). 'To be heard, to be understood, to be believed: Unpacking unpackables.' Paper presented at the annual *Ethnography in Education Forum*, University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education.

Dry, H. (1981). Sentence aspect and the movement of narrative time. *Text*, 1: 233-240.

Dry, H. (1983). The movement of narrative. *The Journal of Literary Semantics,* 12(2): 19-54.

Du Bois, B. (1987). "Something on the Order of Around Forty to Forty-Four": Imprecise Numerical Expressions in Biomedical Slide Talks', *Language in Society*, 16: 527–41.

Du Bois, J. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction,* pp. 139–182. New York and Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Du Bois, J., Schuetze-Coburn, S., Cumming, S., & Paolino, D. (1993). Outline of discourse transcription. In J. Edwards and M. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking data: Transcription and coding in discourse research*, pp. 45-89. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Duchene, A. & Heller, M. (Eds.)(2012). *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit.* New York: Taylor and Francis.

DuFon, M. A. (2000). The acquisition of linguistic politeness in Indonesian as a second language by sojourners in naturalistic interactions. (Doctoral dissertation. University of Hawaii, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International-A 60*(11), 3985.

Dufva, H., Suni, M., Aro, M,& Salo, O. (2011). Languages as objects of learning: Language learning as a case of multilingualism. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies,* 5(1): 109-124.

Eckert, P. (1990). Cooperative competition in adolescent "girl talk". *Discourse Processes*, 13(1): 91-122.

Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Eckert, P. (2003). The meaning of style. *Texas Linguistic Forum, Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Symposium about Language and Society* – Austin., 47:41-53.

Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Communities of practice: Where language, gender and power all live, pp. 89-99. In K. Hall, M. Bucholtz & B. Moonwomon (Eds.), *Locating power: Proceedings of the 1992 Berkeley Women and Language Conference.* Berkeley: Berkeley Women and Language Group.

Eggins, S. & Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.

Ellis, R. (1987). Interlanguage variability in narrative discourse: Style shifting in the use of the past tense. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9: 1–20.

Evison, J., McCarthy, M. & O'Keeffe, A. (2007). "Looking out for love and all the rest of it": Vague category markers as shared social space. In J. Cutting (Ed.), *Vague Language Explored*, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Fernández, J. & Yuldashev, A. (2011). Variation in the use of general extenders and stuff in instant messaging interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43: 2610-2626.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On Discourse, Communication, and (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3): 285-300.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality*, vol. 1. New York: Pantheon Books.

Fox, B. (2001). Evidentiality: Authority, responsibility, and entitlement in English conversation. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology,*11(2):167-192.

Frank, A. W. (1995). *The wounded storyteller: Body, illness, and ethics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Frank, A. W. (2005). What is dialogical research, and why should we do it? *Qualitative Health Research* 15(7): 964-974.

Frank, A. W. (2012). Practicing dialogical narrative analysis. In J. Holstein & J. Gubrium (Eds.), *Varieties of narrative analysis*, pp. 33-52. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In A. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson and T Skutnabb-Kangas (eds.), *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the local*, pp. 128-145. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan (former Orient Longman).

Garcia, O. & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and Enacting Translanguaging for Social Justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (eds.), *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Gee, J. P. (1991). A linguistic approach to narrative. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 1(1): 15-39).

Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated Language and Learning: A critique of traditional schooling.* New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2005). Semiotic social spaces and affinity spaces: from The Age of Mythology to today's schools. In D. Barton & K. Tusting (Eds.), *Beyond Communities of Practice: Language Power and Social Context,* pp. 214-232. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Georgakopoulou, A. (2007). *Small stories, interaction and identities*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gluckman, M. (1963). Gossip and scandal. *Current Anthropology* 4:307–16.

Gluckman, M. (1968). Psychological, sociological, and anthropological explanations of witchcraft and gossip: A clarification. *Man*, 3: 20-34.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1967). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior,* pp. 5-45. Middlesex, UK. Penguin Books.

Goffman, E. (1974). Frame Analysis. *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.

Goffman, E. (1978). Response cries. *Language* 54, 787–815.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gold, R. (1958). Roles in Sociological Field Observations. *Social Forces,* 36(3): 217-223.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, M. H. (1998). Games of stance: conflict and footing in hopscotch. In S. Hoyle & C. Adger (Eds.), *Kids' Talk: Strategic Language Use in Later Childhood*, pp. 23-46. New York: Oxford University Press.

Goodwin, M. H. (2006). *The Hidden Life of Girls: Games of Stance, Status, and Exclusion.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Cole, P., & J.L. Morgan (Eds.) *Speech Acts*, pp. 41-58. New York: Academic Press.

Gu,Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 237–257.

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2009). *Analyzing narrative reality*. London: Sage.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Günther, S. (1999). Polyphony and the "layering of voices" in reported dialogues: An analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(5): 685–708.

Hall, J. K., Vitanova, G., & Marchenkova, L. (2005). *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning: New perspectives*. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum.

Harré, R. & van Langenhoeve, L. (1991), Varieties of positioning, *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 21: 393–407.

Haugh, M. & Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2010). Editorial: Face in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42: 2073-2077.

Haviland, J. B. (1977a). *Gossip, reputation and knowledge in Zinacantan*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Haviland, J. B. (1977b). Gossip as competition in Zinacantan. *Journal of Communication*, Winter, 186-191.

Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and at school. *Language in Society* 11:49-76.

Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.

Heller, M. (2002). Globalization and the commodification of bilingualism in Canada. In D. Block and D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching*, pp. 47-63. London: Routledge.

Heller, M. & Duchene, A. (2012). Pride and Profit: Changing discourses of language, capital and nation-state. In A. Duchene and M. Heller (Eds.) *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit,* pp. 1-21. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Hill, J. (1986). The refiguration of the anthropology of language. *Cultural Anthropology*, 1(1): 89-102.

Hill, J. (1995). The voices of Don Gabriel: Responsibility and Self in a Modern Mexicano Narrative. In D. Tedlock and B. Mannheim (Eds.),*The Dialogic Emergence of Culture,* pp. 97-147. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Hinchman, L.P. & Hinchman, S. K. (Eds.)(1997). *Memory, Identity, Community: The Idea of Narrative in the Human Sciences*. Albany: State Univ. of N.Y. Press.

Holland, D., Lachicotte Jr., W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ho, M. (1986). Answering as authoring: Mikhail Bakhtin's Trans-Linguistics. In G. S. Morson (Ed.), *Bakhtin: Essays and dialogues on his work,* pp. 59-71. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Holquist, M. (2002). *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his world*, 2nd edition. London and New York, Routledge.

Holstein, J. A. and Gubrium, J. F. (2000). *The self we live by: Narrative identity in a postmodern world*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2012). *Varieties of narrative analysis*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Holt, E. (2000). Reporting and reacting: Concurrent responses to reported speech. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33 (4): 425-454.

Hopper, P. J. (1979). Aspect and foregrounding in discourse. In T. Givon (Eds..), *Syntax and semantics: Discourse and syntax*, pp. 213-241. New York: Academic Press.

Hopper, P. J. (1998). Emergent Grammar. In M. Tomasello (Ed.), *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure*, pp. 155-175. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hult, F. (2014). Covert bilingualism and symbolic competence: Analytical reflections on negotiating insider/outsider positionality in Swedish speech situations. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(1): 63-81.

Hymes, D. (1967). Models of the interaction of language and social setting. *Journal of Social Issues*, 33(2): 8-28.

Hymes, D. (1972[1982]). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, pp. 35-71.New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Hymes, D. (1974). Ways of speaking. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*, pp. 433-452. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1981). *In vain I tried to tell you: Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hymes, D. (1996). *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an understanding of voice*. London: Taylor & Francis..

Ibrahim, A. (1999). Becoming Black: Rap and Hip Hop, Race, Gender, Identity, and the Politics of ESL learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3): 349-369.

Innes, P. (2006). The interplay of genres, gender, and language ideology among the Muskogee. *Language and Society*, 35(2): 231-259.

Iwasaki, N. (2010). Style Shifts Among Japanese Learners Before and After Study Abroad in Japan: Becoming Active Social Agents in Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 31: 45-71.

Jaffe, A. (2009). *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jefferson, G., Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization*, pp. 152-205. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse analysis*, 2nd edition. Blackwell Publishing.

Johnstone, B. (2007). A new role for narrative in variationist sociolinguistics. In M. Bamberg (Ed.), *Narrative: State of the art*, pp. 57-67. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Johnstone, B. (2009). Stance, style and the linguistic individual. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Sociolinguistic perspectives on stance*, pp.29-52. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Jones, D. (1980). Gossip: Notes on women's oral culture. In C. Kramarae (Ed.), *The words and voices of women and men*, pp.193–98. Oxford: Pergamon.

Karatsu, M. (2012). *Conversational storytelling among Japanese women: conversational circumstances, social circumstances and tellability of stories*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kartzow, M. (2009). *Gossip and gender: Othering of speech in the Pastoral Epistles*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Kiesling, S. (2009). Style as stance: Stance as the explanation for patterns of sociolinguistic variation. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kim, M. (2014). Reported thought as stance-taking device in Korean conversation. *Discourse Processes,* 51(3): 230-263.

King, M. P. & Star, D. (Producers) & King, M.P. (Director). (2008). *Sex and the City* [Motion Picture]. United States: New Line Cinema.

Kinginger, C. (2004). Alice doesn't live here anymore: Foreign language learning and identity reconstruction. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds..), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts,* pp. 219-242. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kinginger, C., & Farrell, K. (2004). Assessing development of metapragmatic awareness in study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad 10*: 19-42.

Kondo, D.K. (1986). Dissolution and reconstitution of self: Implications for anthropological epistemology. *Cultural Anthropology*, 1(1): 74-88.

Kormos, J. & Trebits, A. (2012). The role of task complexity, modality, and aptitude in narrative task performance. *Language Learning*, 62(2): 439-472.

Kouritzin, S. (2000). A mother's tongue. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2): 311-324.

Koven, M. (2001). Comparing bilinguals' quoted performances of self and others in tellings of the same experience in two languages. *Language in Society*, 30: 513–558.

Koven, M. (2004). Getting Emotional in Two Languages: Bilinguals' Semiotic Resources for the Verbal Performance of Affect. *Text* 24(4): 471-515

Kramsch, C. J. (2009). *The multilingual subject: What foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2012a). Imposture: A late Modern notion in Poststructuralist SLA research. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(5): 483-502.

Kramsch, C. (2012b). Authenticity and Legitimacy in Multilingual SLA. *Critical Multilingualism Studies* 1(1): 107-128.

Kubota, R. (2002). Impact of globalization in language teaching in Japan. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching*, pp. 13-28. London: Routledge.

Kuo, S. (2001). Reported speech in Chinese political discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 3(2): 181-202.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, W. (2008). Where shall I begin? In D. Schiffrin, A. De Fina and A. Nylund (Eds.). *Telling stories: Language, narrative and social life*, pp. 7-22. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Labov, W. (2013). *The language of life and death: The transformation of experience in oral narrative.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. (1967[1997]). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7:3-38.

Ladegaard, H. (2008). Pragmatic cooperation revisited: Resistance and non-cooperation as a discursive strategy in asymmetrical discourses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(4): 649-666.

Lane, K. E. (2009). *More than girl talk: Situating Sex and the City in Feminist conversation.* PhD dissertation. Proquest UMI 3394556.

Langellier, K. & Peterson, E. (2006). Shifting contexts in personal narrative performance. In D. Madison & J. Hamera (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of performance studies*, pp. 1511-169. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

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

Lee, H. (2013). Telling stories and making social relations: Transnational women's ways of belonging in intercultural contexts. *Applied Linguistics,* Advance Access published December 13, 2013, doi:10.1093/applin/amt038.

Leech, G. & Thomas, J. (1988). Pragmatics: The state of the art. *Lancaster Paper in Linguistics 48*. University of Lancaster.

Leung, C. (2009). Collaborative narration in preadolescent girl talk: A Saturday luncheon conversation among three friends. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41: 1341-1357.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealized native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3): 543-560.

Lin, H. (1999). Reported speech in Mandarin conversational discourse. PhD dissertation. National Taiwan Normal University.

Malinowski, B. (1935). *Coral gardens and their magic*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Mao, L.R. (1994). Beyond politeness theory: "Face" revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21: 451-486.

Marchenkova, L. (2005a). Language, culture, and self: The Bakhtin - Vygotsky encounter. In J. K. Hall, G. Vitanova, & L. Marchenkova (Eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on Second and Foreign Language Learning*, pp. 171-188. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Marchenkova, L. (2005b). *Interpreting dialogue: Bakhtin's theory and second language learning*. Doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University.

Martinez-Roldan, C. (2003). Building worlds and identities: A case study of the role of narratives in bilingual literature discussions. *Research in the teaching of English*, 37(4): 491-526.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1998). *The German ideology*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books. (Originally published in 1845).

Mayes, P. (1990). Quotation in spoken English. *Studies in Language*, 14(2): 325-363.

McIntosh, J. (2009). Stance and Distance: Ontological Doubt and Social Boundaries in White Kenyan Narratives about the African Occult. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, pp. 72-91.Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McKay, S.L. & Wong, S.L.C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66 (3), 577-608.

Medvedev, P. (1985). *The formal method in literary scholarship: A critical introduction to sociological poetics.* A.J. Wehrle (Trans.), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Melzi, G. (2000). Cultural Variations in the Construction of Personal Narratives: Central American and European American Mothers' Elicitation Styles. *Discourse Processes*, 30(2): 153-177.

Menard-Warwick, J. (2004) 'I always had the desire to progress a little': Gendered narratives of immigrant language learners. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 3(4): 295-311.

Menard-Warwick, J. (2005a). Intergenerational trajectories and sociopolitical context: Latina immigrants in Adult ESL. *TESOL Quarterly,* 39(2):165-185.

Menard-Warwick, J. (2005b). Transgression narratives, dialogic voicing and cultural change. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(4): 533-556.

Menard-Warwick, J. (2007). "My little sister had a disaster, she had a baby": Gendered performance, relational identities, and dialogic voicing. *Narrative Inquiry*, 17(2), 279-297.

Mendoza-Denton, N. (2008). *Homegirls*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Meyerhoff, M. (2006). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. London & New York: Routledge.

Meyerhoff, M., Adachi, C., Nanbakhsh, G. & Strycharz, A. (2012). Sociolinguistic fieldwork. In N. Thieberger (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Fieldwork*, pp. 121-146. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mishler, E. G. (1999). *Storylines: Craftartists' Narratives of identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mori, K. (1997). *Polite lies: On being a woman caught between two cultures*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Morson, G. S. & Emerson, C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Mulholland, J. (1996). A series of story turns: Intertextuality and collegiality. *Text*,16(4): 535-555.

Narayan, K. (1993). How native is a "native" anthropologist? *American Anthropologists*, 95(3): 671-686.

Norrick, N. R. (2000). *Conversational narrative: Storytelling in everyday talk*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Norrick, N. R. (2004). Humor, tellability and co-narration in conversation. *Text*, 24(1): 79-111.

Norrick, N. R. (2005). The dark side of tellability. *Narrative Inquiry*, 15(2): 323-344.

Norrick, N. R. (2007). *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*, 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Ltd.

Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1): 9-31.

Norton, B. & Early, M. (2011). Researcher identity, narrative inquiry, and language teaching research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3): 415-439.

Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender . In Alessandro Duranti & Charles Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking Context*, pp. 335 –58. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. and Capps, L. (2001). *Living narrative: Creating lives in everyday storytelling*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.

Ochs, E., Smith, R. & Taylor, C. (1989). Detective stories at dinner-time: Problem solving through co-narration. *Cultural Dynamics,* 2:238-57.

Overstreet, M. (1999). *Whales, Candlelight, and Stuff Like That: General Extenders in English Discourse.* Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pavlenko, A. (1998). Second Language Learning by Adults: Testimonies of Bilingual Writers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 9(1): 3-19.

Pavlenko, A. (2000). Access to linguistic resources: Key variable in second language learning. *Estudios de Sociolinguistica*, 1(2): 85-105.

Pavlenko, A. (2001a). "How am I to become a woman in an American vein?": Transformations of gender performance in second language learning. In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller, & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, Second Language Learning and Gender*, pp. 133-174. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pavlenko, A. (2001b). "In the world of the tradition, I was unimagined": Negotiation of Identities in Cross-Cultural Autobiographies. *International Journal of Bilingualism,* 5(3): 317-344.

Pavlenko, A. (2001c). Language learning memoirs as a gendered genre. *Applied Linguistics,* 22(2): 213-240.

Pavlenko, A. (2002). Narrative study: Whose story is it anyway? *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(2): 213-218.

Pavlenko, A. (2004) "The making of an American": negotiation of identities at the turn of the XX century. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.) *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts,* pp. 34-67. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A. (2006). Narrative competence in SLA. In H. Byrnes, H. Weager-Guntharp & K. Sprang (Eds.), *Educating for advanced foreign language capacities: Constructs, curriculum, instruction, assessment.* Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 2005, pp. 105-117. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographical narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2): 163-188.

Pavlenko, A. & Lantolf, J. (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re) construction of selves. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), Sociocultural theory and second language learning, pp. 155-157. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pennycook, A. (2004). Performativity and language studies. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*. 1(1): 1-19.

Phipps, A. (2013). Unmoored: Language pain, porosity, and poisonwood. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 1(2): 96-118.

Pietila, T. (2007). *Gossip, markets and gender: How dialogue constructs moral value in post-Socialist Kilimanjaro.* Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Piller, I. (2002). Passing for a native speaker: Identity and success in second language learning.*Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 6: 179–206.

Polanyi, L. (1981). Telling the same story twice. *Text* 1: 315–336.

Polanyi, L. (1985). Conversational storytelling. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis 3: Discourse and dialogue*, pp. 183-201. London: Academic Press.

Polanyi, L. (1995). Language learning and living abroad: Stories from the field. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*, pp. 271-291. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pomerantz, A. (2010). Speaking Spanish outside the foreign language classroom: An analysis of learner narratives. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 7(1): 1-27.

Pomerantz, A. & Schwartz, A. (2011). Border talk: narratives of Spanish language encounters in the United States, *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(3): 176-196.

Prior, M. (2011). Self-presentation in L2 interview talk: narrative versions, accountability, and Emotionality. *Applied Linguistics,* 32(1): 60-76.

Propp, V. (1928[1968]). *Morphology of the folk tale*, 2nd Edition. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Rampton, B. (1990). Displacing the "native speaker": Expertise, affiliation and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44: 97-101.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.

Rampton, B. (1999). Deutsch in Inner London and the animation of an instructed foreign language, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3: 480–504.

Rampton, B. (2011). Style contrasts, migration and social class. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5): 1236-1250.

Rampton, B. (2013). Styling in a language learned later in life. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(2): 360-382.

Riessman, C. (2005). *Narrative, Memory & Everyday Life*. University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield.

Riessman, C. (2008). *Narrative methods of the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Robinson, P. (1995). Task complexity and second language narrative discourse. *Language Learning*, 45(1): 99-140.

Roulet, E. (2011). Polyphony. In J. Zienkowski, J. Ostman, and J. Verschueren (eds.), *Discursive pragmatics*, pp. 208-222. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, pp: 337–353. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation,* 2 vols. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schiffrin, D. (1981). Tense variation in narrative. *Language*, 57: 45-62.

Schiffrin, D., De Fina, A. & Nylund, A. (2010). *Telling stories: Language, narrative and social life*. Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics (2008). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Shoaps, R. (2009). "Ritual and (im)moral voices: Locating the Testament of Judas in Sakapultek communicative ecology." *American Ethnologist*, 36(3): 459-477.

Shuman, A. (1986). *Storytelling rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shuman, A. (2012). Exploring Narrative Interaction in Multiple Contexts. In J. Holstein & J. Gubrium (Eds.), *Varieties of Narrative Analysis*, pp. 125-150. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Siegal, M. (1995). Individual differences and study abroad: Women learning Japanese in Japan. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in a study abroad context*, pp. 225-244. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*,17(3): 356-382.

Silverman, D. & Torode, B. (1980). *The material word: Some theories of language and its limitations*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Skehan, P. & Foster, P. (1997). The influence of planning and post-task activities on accuracy and complexity in task based learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 1(3): 185-211.

Slade, D. (1996). *The texture of casual conversation: A multidimensional interpretation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Sydney.

Spacks, P. (1985). *Gossip*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Spitulnik, D. (1996). The social circulation of media discourse and the mediation of communities. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6(2):161-187.

Squires, T. (2008). A materialist approach to reading learners' narratives (Part 1). *Kinki University English Journal*, 2(1): 103-118.

Star, D. (Creator and Writer) and King, M.P. (Director). (1998). *Sex and the City* [Cable Television Series]. New York: Home Box Office Inc.

Suni, M. (2014, March). Tense dialogic struggle on the boundaries: Using and learning a second language at work. Paper presented at *American Association for Applied Linguistics* (AAAL), Portland, OR.

Talburt, S., & Stewart, M.A. (1999). What's the subject of study abroad?: Race, gender, and 'living culture.' *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2): 163-175.

Tannen, D. (1978). The effect of expectations on conversation. *Discourse Processes* 1(2): 203–209.

Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends.* Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Tannen, D. (1989[2007]). *In Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse.* New York: Cambridge University Press. Second edition printed 2007.

Tannen, D. (1990). Rethinking Power and Solidarity in Gender and Dominance. In K. Hall, J. Koenig, M. Meacham, S. Reinman & L. Sutton (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, pp. 519-529. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Tannen, D. (1993). The relativity of linguistic strategies. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction*, pp. 165-188. New York: Oxford.

Tannen, D. (2003). Power maneuvers or connection maneuvers? Ventriloquizing in family interaction. In D. Tannen & J.E. Alatis (Eds.), *Linguistics, Language, and the Real World: Discourse and Beyond: Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, 2001*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Tarone, E. (1983). On the variability of interlanguage systems. *Applied Linguistics*, 4: 142-163.

Tarone, E. (1985). Variability in interlanguage use: A study of style-shifting in morphology and syntax. *Language Learning*, 35: 373-403.

Tarone, E. (1988). *Variation in Interlanguage*. London: Edward Arnold.

Tavakoli, P. & Foster, P. (2011). Task design and second language performance: The effect of narrative type on learner output. *Language Learning*, 61: 37-72.

Terraschke, A. & Holmes, J. (2007) 'Und tralala': Vagueness and general extenders in German and New Zealand English. In J. Cutting (Ed.), *Vague Language Explored*, pp. 198-222. London: Palgrave.

Teutsch-Dwyer, M. (2001). (Re)constructing masculinity in a new linguistic reality. In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller, & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (eds.), *Multilingualism, Second Language Learning, and Gender,* pp. 175-198. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Thornbury, S. & Slade, D. (2006). *Conversation: From Description to Pedagogy.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Toohey, K. (2000). *Learning English at school: Identity, social relations, and classroom practice.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Tracy, K. & Robles, J. (2013). Eve*ryday talk. Building and reflecting identities.* New York: Guilford Press.

Twombly, S. (1995). Piropos and friendship: Gender and culture clash in study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 11(1). Accessed from http://www.frontiersjournal.com/issues/vol1/vol1-01_Twombly.htm

Urban, G. (1991). *A discourse-centered approach to culture.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Vitanova, G. (2002). *Gender and agency practices in a second language.* University of Cincinnati. ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing, 2002. 3062624.

Vitanova, G. (2004). Gender enactments in immigrants' discursive practices: Bringing Bakhtin to the dialogue. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education,* 3(4): 261-277.

Vitanova, G. (2005). Authoring the self in a non-native language: a dialogic approach to agency and subjectivity. In Hall, J. K., Vitanova, G., & Marchenkova, L. (Eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning: New perspectives.* Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum.

Vitanova, G. (2010). *Authoring the Dialogic Self. Gender, agency and language practices.*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved 10 August 2014, from <http://www.myilibrary.com.ezproxy2.library.arizona.edu?ID=272164>.

Vitanova, G. (2013). Narratives As Zones Of Dialogic Constructions: A Bakhtinian approach to data in qualitative research, *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 10(3): 242-261

Vološinov, V. N. (1976). *Freudianism: A Marxist critique*. I.R. Titunik (Trans.) and N. Bruss (Ed.). New York: Academic Press.

Vološinov, V. N. (1986/1973/1929). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. L. Matejka & I.R. Titunik (trans.). Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press. English Translation 1973; originally published 1929.

Warren, M. (2007). "{ / [Oh] not a < ˆ lot > }": Discourse intonation and vague language. In J. Cutting (Ed.), *Vague language explored*, pp. 182–197. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Warriner, D. (2004). "The days now is very hard for my family": The negotiation and construction of gendered work identities among newly arrived women refugees. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 3(4): 279-294.

Waugh, L. (2010). Power and Prejudice: Their Effects on the Co-construction of Linguistic and National Identities. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 7(2-3): 112-130.

Wei, L. & Hua, Z. (2013). Translanguaging identities and ideologies: Creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5): 516-535.

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

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

White, H. (1980). The value of narrativity in the representation of reality. *Critical Inquiry,* 7(1): 5-27.

Whooley, O. (2006). The political work of narratives: A dialogic analysis of two slave narratives. *Narrative Inquiry*, 16(2): 295-318.

Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, and C. Baker (eds.), *The Language Policy: Taking stock*, pp. 193-211. 12, 2. CAI, Llangefni.

Wolfram, W. (1985). Variability in tense marking: A case for the obvious. *Language Learning*, 35(2): 229-253.

Wortham, S. (2001). *Narratives in action: A strategy for research and analysis.* New York: Teacher's College Press.

Wortham, S. & Rhodes, C. (2013). Life as a chord: Heterogeneous resources in the social identification of one migrant girl. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5): 536-553.

Yang, J. (2007). "Re-employment stars": Language, gender and neoliberal restructuring in China. In B. McElhinny (Ed.), *Words, Worlds and Material Girls: Language, Gender, Globalization,* pp. 77-105. Berlin; Mouton de Gruyter.

Young, R. & Astirita, A. (2013). Practice theory in language learning. *Language Learning*, 63(1): 171-189.