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ABSTRACT

This dissertation takes a discursive approach to investigating the ways in which transnational women construct their identities and social belonging through everyday storytelling. I drew data from multi-party interactional stories of eight women from Japan, Korea, and the Philippines, who were living in Hawai‘i at the time of the study. My main interest lay in naturally occurring and interactionally achieved stories (Bamberg, 2004; Georgakopoulou 2006, 2007; Wortham, 2001) told in a wide range of contexts including the break time of an adult English as a Second Language (ESL) class, a workplace break time, and a variety of social gatherings. My primary goal in this study was to gain an overall picture of L2 women’s experiences of language use and learning, and their construction of gendered identities through participation in their communities.

The research questions are oriented toward how the women achieve access and membership in English speaking communities of practice (CoP), the kinds of social relationships these women create and maintain in English, and how the participants’ gendered identities emerge, are constructed, and are negotiated in the process of collaborative storytelling. I examined social belonging as a form of inclusion and participation; I did this through narrative analysis—a concrete, visible, and discursive method for analyzing participants’ daily interactions.

By analyzing how the women in this study make their stories tellable, how they use shared resources, and how they incorporate the talk of others into their here-and-now telling, I illustrate the discursive construction of CoPs. Specifically, the women in this study create discursive spaces in which to belong by finding common ground in their
storytelling. Through sharing concerns and complaints, they build a familiar, safe, and comfortable environment in which to practice their English, though they also construct spaces where they do not want to belong, as well as bounded spaces that do not permit others to enter.

Thus, this study highlights that, through an examination of L2 interactional narratives, we can come to better understandings of how the women construct meaning in concert with each other in storytelling. The exploration of their ways of claiming belonging enables us have a profound understanding of L2 speakers' friendship networks, which is a relatively underexplored area of research. It is hoped that this study both yields insights into the nexus of language and gendered identities, and promotes the analysis of L2 multiparty stories in studying language and identity.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1.0. Introduction

This study investigates how transnational women who speak English as an additional language (L2) negotiate their social networks and create social relationships in English. Through carefully analyzing the ways they use English with one another, this dissertation examines how their social relations are created in and through their everyday storytelling. The study analyzes how the women’s social networks provide them with Communities of Practice (CoP) that in turn provide opportunities to use English as they participate in these networks. The dissertation focuses on how these women make use of their stories to construct their identities and create a sense of community amongst themselves. The study demonstrates the collaborative process of constructing multilingual selves in storytelling and illustrates how the sharing of narratives is central to the women’s social networks. As a study of language use among speakers of English as an additional language, the dissertation highlights the importance of understanding what social networks L2 learners and users identify with and how they use their additional languages through the act of storytelling to establish a sense of belonging in these networks.

I also frame my study based on transnationalism since these women’s physical and social relocation, as well as their intercultural experiences, are frequently observed as story topics and interactional resources in the group. In the following section, I will demonstrate how the current study is situated within the framework of transnationalism.

1.1. Transnationalism and Identities

Current society is deeply affected by processes of globalization, and transnationalism is a direct product of globalization (Heller, 2003; Vigouroux, 2008). People find new work opportunities and seek new educational systems (Lee, 2010; Park & Lo, 2012), and the technologies and mobility across the world are contributing to this process. As Appadurai (1996) explains, our world is characterized by "global
interactions of a new order of intensity" (p.27); these convey new forms of contacts, linguistic and cultural practices, and different ways of communication and socialization.

Transnationalism is closely related to encounters between peoples from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds. It impacts on the ways identities are constructed and negotiated in transnational communities, and it also involves identities that index one's belonging in communities. This is a complicated process, and transnational identities are cannot be explained by the simple distinction between "the national and the transnational, the rooted and the routed, the territorial and the deterritorialized" (Jackson et al., 2004, p.2).

First, transnationalism plays a crucial role in my research due to its consideration of identity in relation to the community. Levitt & Schiller (2004) demonstrates the differences between ways of being and ways of belonging in his discussion on identities. Ways of being centers on the social relations and practices that a person engages in, rather than identities associated with their actions. On the contrary, ways of belonging denote the practices that people enact in relation to a particular community. People who engage in transnational ways of being and ways of belonging participate in transnational practices, and at the same time identify themselves with the groups in which they are involved.

Second, transnationalism in the field of applied linguistics comprises the important effects of globalization and the domain of my research, especially the area of identity construction and community (Lam & Warriner, 2012). One of the most significant aspects of adopting transnationalism as a framework is its consideration of "here and there", rather than only considering participants’ identities in new contexts. This is different from the traditional perspectives on immigrants who were often described as detached from their own culture and language as a result of dislocation or relocation.

Similarly, De Fina (2013) emphasizes in her discussion on transnational identities, "on the one hand, communities and individuals engage in new practices and put forth personae that emphasize their hybridity and diversity, but on the other hand, they often try to stress continuity and homogeneity" (p. 513). With this perspective, transnational
identity does not require a loss of immigrants’ and refugees’ L1 or C1, but as Green and Power (2005) argue, it is enhanced by keeping contacts with their roots. Rather, one's country or cultural origin can be enhanced by the transnational experiences or interactions (Ong, 1999; Ray, 2003; Song, 2003).

In this study, I use the term "transnational" to refer to individuals whose lives have been influenced by global and transnational processes. The women live their lives in more than one place, often beyond national borders. Though they are physically displaced, and even some of their lives may no longer be engaged in the process of transnational movement as actively as some other group members, their ways of being and ways of belonging are still influenced by transnational experiences.

The features of transnationalism discussed above shed light on my study in that the women in this study form 'in-between' spaces on their own. Even though this is an L2 community, they create a sense of belonging and maintain their community by using and sharing the cultural resources from their L1/C1, L2/C2 or even local Hawaiian culture. They create and maintain meaningful ties to more than one home country and culture, blurring the distinction of social and regional space. The data analysis in following chapters uncovers how communities are not regionally anchored but rather they are emerged in the performance of different types of practices; it also shows the ways these practices challenge the notion of communities rooted in space and time such as speech communities.

This study also explores important questions about gender among transnational individuals. Gender, as Norton and Pavlenko (2004) point out, is "a complex system of social relations and discursive practices, differently constructed in local contexts” (p. 504). In my work, I analyze how participants' multi-faceted identities enter their narratives in ways that offer a space for social belonging. Moreover, I explore how these social identities and relations facilitate the reconstruction of their L2 voices. These immigrant women's relocation may require them to take up different gender roles and expectations, as they are socialized into new contexts.

I demonstrate how language learning and use impact on constructing gendered identities and how transnationalism could impact this process. By observing immigrant
women's practices, beliefs, and discourses that are at play in the center of immigration experiences (Menard-Warwick, 2005a, 2007). I also illustrate how gendered practices and ideologies in transnational communities are incorporated into their construction of social belonging.

This dissertation researches how a group of women studying English in an adult education context create their own social networks in English. Unlike many previous studies on gender in education which engage with curricular innovation, including creating/revising language programs, or developing language learning materials and activities (cf. Norton and Pavlenko, 2004), my main research context is not the language class itself. Rather, I am interested in how the participants use this space and others beyond the adult school to create social spaces during break time in their immigrant language class; thus, what I can see during this specific time is the crucial site of investigation in this study.

1.2. Motivation for Conducting the Study

My experience of teaching English at an immigrant language school in Honolulu in 2008-2009 motivated me to closely investigate immigrant women’s stories and language use in diverse social contexts. While I was teaching, I noticed that the women in my class often eagerly gathered together for break time to have conversations. Over time, it became clear to me that many of them came to the English class not necessarily for the language learning, but for the social opportunities to meet other people like themselves and to make friends, in English. I became particularly interested in how they tell stories to each other in groups, and what they accomplish by doing so, especially since storytelling is the common practice in which the women engage. Based on these women’s strong and long interactional histories, which have been produced by attending the same level of English class together for several years, they have created comfortable social spaces where they interact with each other and build social relationships, while ostensibly pursuing the goal of learning or using English.

My observations led me to see that break time during ESL class was a crucial site of investigation. While conducting my preliminary research, I realized it was important to
also examine immigrant learners’ storytelling outside of language class because it more fully captures the ways that they create and maintain their social relationships, cultural belongings, and sense of community in various cultural milieus. Therefore, I designed the study to examine the social contexts beyond the language class.

While many learners study English for practical reasons, the participants in this study were learning English primarily for social reasons. Hence, this dissertation provides insights into examining the affective and social dimensions of informal language learning and use. This study attempts to offer insights into the multifaceted nature of learning as a social activity by investigating a wide range of issues and contexts including family lives, work lives, and social lives. There has been a need for L2 research to treat L2 learners as 'whole people' and to investigate a wide range of issues and contexts, such as their language use and learning outside of educational contexts including more private and social spheres. Studies on L2 learners' language use in a private, personal, and domestic spheres, for example, how to make a friend, are still underrepresented areas. Therefore, in this work, I investigate how the participants' social relations emerge out of various contexts of language learning and use.

I define interaction in this study as second language interaction. The interactional features in contexts in this study are somewhat different from the ones in other environments, such as Lingua Franca English (LFE). I make this differentiation because LFE literature tends to focus on users of English who are not engaged in deep social networks. Rather, the focus of LFE interaction is placed on the ways in which participants effectively accomplish their business at hand. One of the key features is "let it pass" (Firth, 2009) which emphasizes efficient ways of managing interactions. However, the focus of LFE and its features do not fit the interactions in this study, because my participants construct shared resources over a long period of time and across different contexts, and based on their interactional histories, they collaboratively find out a meaning or creating a new meaning. This is more common than use of resources that constructed in an impromptu fashion.

Despite the increase of research on immigrant learners (Menard-Warwick, 2004; Norton, 2000; Norton & Pavlenko, 2004a, 2004b, Warriner, 2010), there is still a
surprising lack of research on L2 use beyond educational settings. In general, how L2 learners including EFL and ESL actually use the languages that they are learning at all is not thoroughly explored. Though many people learn English, we might not have much of an understanding of how they actually use the language after studying it across the board.

Though there are some studies on immigrants' workplace interactions (Katz, 2000; Nair-Venugopal, 2003), it is still difficult to find studies on community based L2 use or informal social uses of language. This study seeks to begin to fill this gap in our knowledge. We cannot neglect the necessity for studying L2 use beyond classroom environments, and need to give more attention to the ongoing academic conversation about language learning/use, language socialization, and identity construction in applied linguistics in order to understand how, and for what reasons, learners put their additional languages to use. Therefore, in this study, I explore various social spheres including language classes, work places, and social gatherings to observe the participants' language learning and use as a whole, and to examine how they engage in different social activities across the diverse communities. In the following section, I will elaborate on how I position this study in the field of applied linguistics.

1.3. Situating My Study within Existing Literature

To situate my work alongside existing L2 theory, I draw on the work of Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000), who investigate language learning as a form of participation. They view learning as the process of becoming a member of a certain community, and this concept is based on the notion of participation from Lave & Wenger’s (1991). It places emphasis on social members as individuals and captures the variety and complexity of individual experiences. I use the concept of Communities of Practice (CoP) as one of the key frameworks for my dissertation, and mobilize it to discuss the meaning of participation and practice in L2 interaction; transnational women in an adult ESL community is relevant to my study.

The participants in this study not only undertake the reconstruction of their identities but also the appropriation of their new cultural environment. In my analysis, I provide evidence that being a member of a new community does not necessarily involve
only adaptations toward the target culture or unidirectional forms of socialization towards the majority language, but it is rather a multidirectional socialization process. Thus, my research builds on the dominant but relatively simplistic previous understandings of community and membership.

In this respect, Duff (2007) points out, “socialization does not necessarily lead to the reproduction of existing L2 cultural and discursive practices but may lead to other outcomes, such as hybrid practices, identities, and values” (p. 311). In accord with Duff’s argument, this study of adult immigrants’ narratives emphasizes L2 learning and use as a way of acting and engaging in multiple forms of participation in various CoPs.

Previous studies that adopted a CoP framework for analyzing gender identity investigated how women construct gender identities through participating in dynamic social practices. Following this research, I examine how the women in this study mutually engage and pursue joint enterprises in their communities, and how these processes work in identity construction. In addition, by looking at the women’s shared linguistic and discursive resources and how the women make use of these, I place a great deal of emphasis on the construction of gender identity in a specific CoP rather than on static gender categories. I take a discursive analytic approach to analyze the women’s stories and to observe their use of linguistic resources in their storytelling. My study expands the research on women’s identity negotiation in their L1s by examining how multilingual women who study and use English as an additional language telling their L2 narratives in their multilingual communities (Kinginger, 2004, Menard-Warwick, 2004, 2009).

The analysis of storytelling aims to presents multi-party storytelling as a rich resource for observing what people achieve in their specific spatial and temporal contexts. The women locate common concerns and complaints, using their stories to build a familiar, safe, and comfortable environment in which to construct their identities while using English. Telling stories, then, allows the women to create spaces in which to belong, as well as construct, invoke, and maintain their social identities and relations. From a more contextualized angle, the study also strives to show how the women build shared repertoires of stories, characters, and common ground that they continue to draw on in
constructing their social relationships with one another across time. The data is from a relatively tight-knit community of multilingual speakers and it offers me the opportunity to expand the field of multilingual research, which focuses a great deal on interactions among participants who are only acquaintances or who have social relationships restricted to business exchanges.

1.4. Conceptual Framework

One of the goals of this chapter is to frame my study by discussing theoretical issues of transnationals, community, participation, and gender, and how these different constructs are connected to one another. There are overlapping areas among these three constructs, and my discussion highlights these overlaps. By focusing on a group of women who use English primarily in multilingual contexts, this study seeks to identify how the concepts of gender and CoP, and sub-concepts including second language learning as participation (Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000), cultural belonging (Fougère, 2008), and community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002) can be redefined and also elucidated by way of narrative analysis—a concrete, visible, and discursive method for analyzing participants’ daily interactions, identity construction, and evolving shared histories. At the theoretical level, the data I have collected allow me to expand on the constructs of community, practice, and participation in Community of Practice (CoP) as they have traditionally been used in L2 studies. Ultimately, I demonstrate that the women participate in a CoP comprised of others like themselves.

The participants form a community through their interactions with other co-members, and their mutual engagement provides the foundation for their own forms of cultural and social belonging. These forms of belonging do not align with previous research in applied linguistics that makes use of CoP, which tends to treat L1/majority language speakers as members of the ‘target CoP’ (Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Duff, 2002; Higgins, 2011; Toohey, 2000) whom L2 speakers seek to emulate; in contrast, my study will intricately the notion of the CoP by displacing the L1/majority language speaker as
central to English language learning, and it will provide empirically-based illustrations of what this new CoP looks like.

I also discuss gender identity and its relations to multilingual interaction. I conceptualize gender within a CoP and multilingualism framework to investigate the process of how the women become members of different CoPs by participating in dynamic social and cultural practices. The concepts of engagement, participation, and practice in CoP are compatible with the notion that gender identity is constructed through both identification with a particular group and through the social interactions one has with other group members.

I highlight how gendered practices and ideologies in transnational communities are incorporated into actively created spaces in transnational contexts by observing immigrant practices, beliefs, and discourses that are at play in the center of immigration experiences (Menard-Warwick, 2005b, 2007). I analyze how their multi-faceted identities come into their narratives in ways that offer a space for critical reflection and how these identities facilitate the reconstruction of their L2 selves. Following researchers like Warriner (2004, 2007) and Menard-Warwick (2004, 2008, 2009), who investigate adult immigrant educational contexts and language learning’s impact on immigrants’ various social identities, my dissertation presents how women in the context of immigrant L2 learning and use construct identities by interacting with each other and responding to social behaviors and gender discourses.

1.5. Communities of Practice

CoP and its sub-constructs are useful tools in my research as they connect place, belonging, and practice, which are the key concepts in this study. The women build their communities (belonging) by interacting with each other and sharing their stories (practice) in a variety of contexts (place). The women are relocated, hence they are needing to find ways to belong in their new communities. One possible option for them is to find others who are like themselves. CoP provides a means to theorize and examine language-as-practice, not a priori defined and predetermined social categories. In this sense, a community is built based on mutual social interaction and shared goals. In
particular, participation and practice, as major sub-constructs of CoP, provide a foundation to understand the women's language learning and use in my research. I demonstrate, What is practice? What is participation, and why does the practice of telling stories matter to this particular group of women? I engaged in investigating the participants' ongoing practices in order to answer these questions.

Additionally, the participation model and situated approach in CoP research are useful means of investigating participants’ various practices. Instead of applying the concepts of community and social practice at an abstract and metaphorical level, I will apply them as more concrete concepts as they are constructed through interactions and across time. More specifically, I explore how gender identities and L2 specific participation are used as resources for being a part of a community. I also explore how participation in a community can challenge the construct of CoP. To discuss these concepts in detail, I will elaborate on two key components in the following section.

1.5.1. Participation and Practice

*Participation* and *practice* help to frame the process of how L2 English users become members of communities through taking part in various activities in the medium of English. First, the notion of participation is defined in Wenger (1998) as follows:

"I will use the term participation to describe the social experience of living in the world in terms of membership in social communities and active involvement in social enterprises. Participation in this sense is both personal and social. It is a complex process that combines doing, talking, thinking, feeling, and belonging. It involves our whole person, including our bodies, minds, emotions, and social relations. world" (Wenger, 1998, p.55, 56).

Participation is an active process. In addition, it does not just refer to engaging with people, but is an “encompassing procedure” of active involvement in the practice of communities and identity construction for individual participants—not only “what we do” but also “who we are” and “how we interpret what we do” (Wenger, 1998, p.4) are considered important aspects of participation. For example, the relations between parents and children or between workers and their boss are mutual in the sense that participants
shape each other’s experiences of meaning. They recognize something of themselves in each other.

Another crucial aspect of participation is that participation in social communities shapes our experience as well as shaping communities. In other words, our ability to shape the practice of communities is also our experience of participation. In addition, participation is much broader than engagement in practice. Their participation is not something that can be turned on or turn off but one's participation influences their experience, and is not limited to the particular contexts of their engagement.

Similarly, in my study, the women interact in the group in a mutual way. They recognize the mutuality of their participation and, in this respect, their participation becomes a source of shared identity. Their participation is part of who they are and it goes beyond specific activities in a community. They do not cease to be L2 users or L2 women when they are not together. Their participation in the community is not restricted to the specific context of their engagement. Their community of L2 women becomes a crucial component of their identities. Thus the participation is a part of who they are.

Next, according to Wenger (1998), practices can be defined as social activities, views, and attitudes that members understand to be a way of participating in a community. Wenger's definition of practice within the framework of Communities of Practice is a helpful tool to understand the relation between individual doings and social ways of understanding individual's practice. In particular, Shared doings and shared understanding in Wenger's concepts and these are related to shared sense of one's own or others identities within the frames of a particular group that exist because the members have common interests and aim (Wenger, 1998). In this respect, shared practices are indicators of belonging and resources in building social relations. Community is more than the collectives of people and practices which is more than just shared behaviors or shared ways of doing things through talk. Thus, CoP "represents social practice as developing in the habitus over time through sequences of social or mediated actions (Scollon, 2001, p.141) and transitory and inevitably "unfinalisable" (p.167).

Wenger (1998) also explains that the relations between participation and belonging. By proposing three different mode of belonging, engagement (involvement in
negotiating meaning), imagination (creating images of the world and find the connections through time and space from our experience), and alignment (coordinate the practice to fit to broader enterprises), he describes that this is the way of expanding identity through space and time in different ways.

Joint enterprises are created and maintained through the shared and negotiable resource of practices. In this study, the participants' use of local words (such as mu‘umu’u) and story structures are often repetitive and ritualized. These features frequently come into their interaction and the participants make use of them as shared resources (see Chapter 5 Shared Resources). Another example is the participants’ use of joking. Jokes become useful to this group of women to build a shared ground of telling stories.

In the current study, the women’s social participation entails meaning, practice, community, and identity, and goes beyond the concept of simply “doing”; instead, as it is constructed within a CoP framework, the women’s practice is “doing” within a particular historical and social context, and it offers structure and meaning to what they do (Wenger, 1998). This concept of ‘social practice’ thus offers me a way of understanding socially situated activities and grasping the complexity of the women’s positioning of transnational women and as English speakers. The women in this study participate in their community differently, as Wenger's study reveals variation in forms of participation in the case of peripheral and marginal participation.

Building of a community is a jointly negotiated enterprise. It is not just emerging as a by-product through mutual engagement in shared practices. Based on the solidarity and mutual liking, first the women in this study construct their social relations each other. Second, they voluntarily create their own safe zone for using and practicing English. In this group, the women could develop and expand their repertoire of shared practices which strength and enrich the community. In addition, what linguistic resources were brought to bear to construct their identities in respect to the community is also investigated.

The women's CoPs depend on the history of their membership, the regularity of their participation, and their shared cultural knowledge. The women differ in terms of
their participation status and they have different degrees of tellership derived from different (un)shared knowledge. Moreover, their participation statuses are not static—they change and develop differently within the various multilingual contexts (i.e., ESL classes, work, social gatherings). This study analyzes how the women take part quite differently in their discursively constructed CoPs. The data show that they bring knowledge or expertise to the groups and share them as they unfold and open up to one another. However, sometimes the women do not fully participate or they are marginalized, or the groups even break down because of constraints placed on their shared experiences. Additionally, some members also choose to exclude themselves from storytelling, placing themselves 'out' of the groups. This example shows that the women are differentially legitimated by one another, and their participation and telling roles are mutable constructs.

Based on a discursive approach to CoP that sees these women's statuses in their CoPs are continually in flux, I will complicate the notion of learning as legitimate peripheral participation (LPP), in which newcomers enter a particular community, join a community of practice with limited participation status, and then eventually participate more fully by interacting with other members. These women’s different forms of participation cannot always be clearly defined as peripheral or essential, and their participation is mutually and differently defined in the various CoPs in which they participate. For example, some unmarried women may be discursively constructed as peripheral in an interaction if they are not able to actively contribute to “complaints about mothers-in-law.” However, these same women may be less peripheral in an interaction involving stories about local culture. Even though novice learners are not passive recipients of knowledge, but rather active participants in a particular CoP, an examination of L2 users’ storytelling in English allows for a practice-based analysis of their ‘peripherality.’ Therefore, this study proposes a broader conceptualization of ‘participation’ and the process of being a member of a particular community, rather than limiting the understanding of these to a unidirectional notion of being a member or an expert of a community. Furthermore, this study captures locally constructed meanings of participation and practice by analyzing participants' daily interaction.

1.5.2. Community Memberships and Participation
This study emphasizes the existence and emergence of a CoP in particular social contexts. The women in this study shared some key CoPs including the Adult ESL CoP. The L2 users in this study are involved in a community but with different degrees of participation. The participants engage in their community to use their L2 and share their life experiences. Due to participants’ multiple cross-community memberships, their L2 community is necessarily connected and overlap with other communities. This perspective shows that language learning and use are not isolated or discrete processes, but rather are closely linked and are carriers of identities and social participation.

I observe the women’s multifaceted membership in different CoPs, including workplace CoPs, through an analysis of both micro-level practices and longitudinal perspectives, in order to capture a holistic picture of the participants' social lives and language use. I observe the opportunities for language learning and use that the women find and create in their various social contexts, and find that issues related to learning contexts and learning communities come to the surface. I examine participants' various communities beyond formal educational contexts, and consider the settings, participants, and their social practices (Wenger, 2004; Zuengler & Kramsch, 2003). I accordingly want to make a claim that the nature of a group and its practices facilitate language learning and use, and simultaneously -- that learning and use shape the nature of the community.

Building membership is a jointly negotiated enterprise; it does not just emerge as a by-product of mutual engagement. The participants in this study construct social relations with each other based on solidarity and mutual regard. They also voluntarily create a safe zone for using and practicing English. In this group, the women could develop and expand their repertoire of shared practices, which strengthen and enrich their community. For example, in the case of humor, the women use their shared and negotiated resources to maximize humorous effect and to build a friendly environment; that is, they build local meanings on the spot. Their humor is a collaborative achievement where they attempt to share ways of thinking, speaking, and believing. This does not always work, and does not work in other communities, and I will demonstrate how the boundaries around CoPs are instantiated and responded to by the participants.
1.5.3. CoP and Narratives

Moore (2006) uses narrative analysis to investigate the participants' community membership in her study of two different CofPs in a high school in England. Her analysis demonstrates how the speakers actively negotiate their personal and community behavior, and how legitimacy is mutually negotiated among the group members. Her study brings to light the benefits of adapting narrative analysis in investigating a CoP. It implies that narrative analysis can reveal a more complete story about the relation between a CoP and its membership. The analysis also highlights the importance of examining the specific social contexts where the concepts of membership or participation are negotiated. It also shed light on the fact that rather than approaching CoP as an abstract theoretical abstraction but focusing on its application in a particular contexts with empirical investigation.

Therefore, in this study, I will use CoP to examine how the women gain access to the 'community of L2 women speakers' (at the ESL school) and how this community is then linked to other social contexts including various social gatherings. By investigating the women's regular practice of telling stories and their shared resources in this group, I also illustrate how the three components of CoP, mutual engagement, joint enterpriser, and shared repertoires are realized in the women's interaction. As most of the CoP work is more institutional in nature as in the Wenger (1998), the current study has an educational institution (ESL class) and workplace. However, this study emphasizes the participants' discursive construction of CoP. Emma Moore’s study (Moore, 2003) of teenage girls in Northern England shows this discursive aspect of CoP. Her study traces the gradual division of a group girls. The author investigates how the two communities of girls, “populars” (rebellious group) and “townies” (this group emerged as the tougher) are constructed by practicing their divergent use of language (vernacular speech vs. more conservative styles), which reinforced the opposition of these two groups. The following diagram explains the three crucial elements of CoP with the examples from this study.
This diagram shows the key elements of CoP, and their application in my study. First, mutual engagement means the participants' regular interaction and relationship. The women in this study regularly meet and share their stories. The mutual engagement is related to the general topics of stories, particular projects, or concerns. The women's membership is internally constructed depending on group identities, and shared goals are defined and maintained within the group.

In addition, the joint enterprise refers to the ongoing process of negotiation within the community. The women choose to use English to tell their stories and share their lives as a means of making friends and maintaining their social relationship. In this process, they continuously decide who has the right to tell, whose stories can be accepted, and what kinds of stories can be acknowledged.

Lastly, shared repertoires mean continual development and maintenance of resources among the members. The resources accumulated over time include shared ways of doing things together and shared styles. Particularly, in this study, the participants' nickname practices, shared gendered identities, and shared experiences are considered as these resources. The women's shared stories consist of their inside jokes and knowing laughter. Shared repertoires are essential because they are closely related to the members' belonging and mutually define their identities. These are all crucial components for the CoP, L2 women's Community of Practice, and becoming a member of a CoP interacts
with the process of constructing gendered identities and building friendship with other women.

1.6. Social Belonging and Inclusion

In addition to a CoP framework, the concepts of cultural belonging and social inclusion are particularly relevant to this study, since the participants share their stories with other members of the community as a means of participation. Drawing on Fougère (2008), I discuss how the concepts of cultural belonging and cultural membership link to participants' identity constructions in relation to their communities (see also Elspeth, 1996; Kymlicka, 2006). In his investigation of narratives and intercultural identities, Fougère views narratives as ways in which identities are fashioned and social belonging is constructed. In particular, he claims that through narratives, people draw on spatial metaphors to indicate their belongings in particular spaces and communities. He examines how participants position themselves in their narratives with reference to space. The findings of his study show that some participants who have experienced being positioned as an "outsider" construct a strong connection to their home culture or create hybrid identities.

1.6.1. Examples of Social Belonging

In his study of identities and spatial metaphors in narratives, Fougère (2008) argues that spatial metaphors can be useful in describing the sense making processes that people experience in social contexts. According to him, through narratives, people draw on spatial metaphors to indicate their belonging in particular spaces and cultures. His claim is powerful to explain senses of belonging, too. One of the participants (Antonie) relays a narrative surrounding competence and role fulfillment at work; in it, he constructs his 'outsideness' as a liberating strength, in the sense that he does not feel much of a need for role fulfillment at work. It is because he does not have an identifiable role as a stranger in the work hierarchy, and "the fiction of cultures as discrete, object-like phenomena occupying discrete spaces becomes implausible (p.198)." This shows that being a stranger in a world gives freedom to a person because she/he can choose with whom to interact, and what meanings to give places (Sack, 1997).
Fougère's study also shows in-between or third space by discussing one of the participant’s (David) trajectories from France to Finland via Spain. David's narratives show that his intercultural identity can be developing in the process of constructing intercultural personhood through all of his cultural experiences and the exploration of these cultures so as to create a new space.

Following this work, I maintain that through narratives, the participants in this study also draw on spatial metaphors to manifest their belonging in particular spaces, times, cultures, nations, and groups. My analysis of narratives resonates with Sack’s (1997) explanation of spatial segmentation. He implies that this process makes us live “in a world of strangers” (p.10), allowing us to choose with whom to interact and what meanings to produce to ultimately construct our own world (see also 'imagined community' by Benedict Anderson). The participants in this study discursively co-construct their sense of belonging in particular social contexts through the dynamic process of storytelling, and I investigate how the contexts are constitutive of multilingualism, multiple selves, and multiple belongings.

1.6.2. Language use as Social Inclusion

Language learning has been conceptualized as a social inclusion and belonging (Higgins & Stoker, 2011; Kubota, 2011; Takahashi, 2013). Particularly, Piller and Takahashi's (2011) and Kubota (2011) draw attention to the complex interactions between language and social relations in the context of learning English. The researchers above claim that language mediates access to key social inclusion sites and that a sense of belonging is negotiated through language. The following quote from Kubota (2011) shows an extensive understanding of social inclusion and individual agency in a larger context.

"Social inclusion in a broader sense can be address the question of how each individual strives to be included in a particular society. This question broadens the focus of social inclusion from a public policy agenda to personal engagement, from socioeconomic empowerment to a sense of belonging, and from a nation-state to a global imagined community (p.473)."
The current study is attentive to how specific linguistic practices in a particular social context can be pertinent to social inclusion. Specifically, I study how social inclusions are enacted in daily practices of storytelling in the context of an intimate social group and how the participants carve out spaces for social belonging. This study attempts to expand and deepen the issues of language use and social inclusion to the context of a close-knit community, which is different from the focus on social inclusion in mainstream discourses on nation-state integration of disadvantaged people into the mainstream socioeconomic system.

1.7. Gendered Identities

Immigrants and gendered identities are widely discussed in the applied linguistics literature (Cameron, 2005; Gordon, 2004; Hirsh, 2000; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2003; Menard-Warwick, 2009; Norton, 2000). My study contributes to this body of work by adding another dimension to questions of gender and social relations; specifically, it demonstrates how women also build community and social relations while, and often as a result of, constructing gendered identities. Although gender in L2 research has been investigated with different goals, emphases, methods, and across different contexts (Higgins, 2010), such work commonly asks two main questions: First, how do learners’ gender identities interact with their motivation and efforts to learn and use an additional language? And second, how do learners construct gender through participating in different language learning practices? The answers to these questions are dictated by the paradigms a research agenda utilizes, as each theoretical framework posits the construction of gender and its relationship to language and language learning in different ways.

I follow Menard-Warwick’s use of the term “gendered identity” (Menard-Warwick, 2009, p.27) instead of “gender identity,” because this choice reveals the emphasis on gender in relation to other identities—identities are influenced by gender rather than gender being defined solely by gender itself. It also emphasizes a process of 'gendering’ — an active, ongoing set of activities and practices, according to a constructionist perspective. According to the idea that identities are fluid, multiple, and
locally constructed, local forms of gender are socially constructed through individuals’ regular interactions (Cameron, 2005). Additionally, gender is something you do, perform, and construct in particular contexts through particular practices. By investigating how these participants enact their gendered identities in the process of collaborative storytelling, this study offers detailed descriptions of local constructions of gendered identities. Our field still has given insufficient attention in general to immigrant women’s daily interaction with each other in various social contexts; we need more investigation on how these women access language resources and how they utilize them in (re)constructing their gendered identities.

In their convincing work on gender and second language, Norton and Pavlenko (2004) explain that gender is best understood as “a complex system of social relations and discursive practices, differentially constructed in local contexts” (p. 504). This constructive perspective on gender is found in a range of studies in second and foreign language education. There has been an increasing interest in how learners’ gendered identities shape and are shaped by their second language development (e.g. Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004; Langman, 2004; Norton, 2000; Norton & Pavlenko, 2004b; Pavlenko et al., 2001). Studies on how gendered identity is related to learners’ motivation to learn additional languages and how gender is performed in educational contexts (Menard-Warwick, 2008; Norton & Pavlenko, 2004a) illustrate this growing appreciation for a constructivist perspective and the complexity of gender identity. The studies investigating L2 development with learners’ gender identities view language development as mediated by identities which are not fixed, but fluid and local (Duff, 2002; Gordon, 2004; Menard-Warwick, 2009; Watson-Gegeo, 2004; Watson-Gegeo & Nielson, 2003). Considering the relations between gendered identities and language learning/use, in the following section, I elaborate more on gendered identities in relation to the larger concept of transnationalism.

1.7.1. Transnationalism and gender

Transnational discourse often comes into my participants’ storytelling; Being a relocated person with ties to multiple nations and cultural affiliations, they employ shared cultural and linguistic resources. Thus, it is necessary to relate my study to the concept of
transnationalism along with gender. Studies on gender in transnational spaces highlight that women in a new space sometimes renegotiate their traditional or patriarchy-influenced gender identities (e.g., Gordon, 2004; Pavlenko, 2001; Piller & Takahashi, 2006). As the participants in this study position themselves across national and cultural communities, the concept of transnational becomes salient. I use the term “transnational” (Fouron & Glick Shiller, 2001), to represent participants’ development of new hybrid and third place migrant identities based on their physical and social relocation or dislocation.

Following researchers such as Baynham (2007) and Hornberger (2007) who investigate complex multiple identities across race, gender, ethnicity, and the relation of these to bi-/multiliteracy and language learning, I discuss how the participants’ social relocations and different identities emerge in processes that extend beyond their physical migration. Similarly, I will use the word “transnational” to refer to the condition of interconnectedness and mobility across space (Kumaravadivelu, 2008; Menard-Warwick, 2009; Ong, 1999; Risager, 2007), and to refer to the process by which people forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their different orientations (Basch et al., 1994, p. 7). For instance, the women talk about issues beyond Hawai‘i or specific ethnic communities. In addition, some participants often visit their home countries to take care of their families (e.g. mother-in-law in Japan) or to do business (e.g. import/export beauty products), and these experiences feed into their stories. These physical movements convey intercultural experiences and comparative perspectives, which can be a ground for shared/non-shared stories.

Various studies have shown that access to language resources within refugee, immigrant, and imagined communities can accelerate shifts in identities (e.g., Pessar, 1984; Kibria, 1990; Ui, 1991; Gordon, 2004), as the transition to a different culture and society can involve changes in how one sees and performs oneself. Pavlenko (2001), in her research on transformations of gender as a system of social relations, views gender as a discursive performance during second language socialization. She defines “self-translation” as the reinterpretation of one’s subjectivity in order to position the self in new communities of practice and to find meanings in one’s new environment. Such a definition and its accompanying perspectives on gender and identity accord well with
other studies of gendered socialization in target cultures as a dynamic process of transformation (Garret & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002; Gordon, 2004), and will, therefore, frame my understanding of my participants as they call upon their transnational experiences to enhance their sense of self in their storytelling; engage with different CoPs in English; and take action, make decisions, and develop identities in networks of relationships.

1.7.2. Multilingual workplaces and gender identity

Another key research site for this study is the participants’ work places. There is a long research tradition associating gender with workplaces. In spite of a wide range of research in this area (e.g. Cameron, 2000; Ford, 2008), and in intercultural communication in multilingual workplaces (Duff, Wong, & Early, 2002; Firth, 1995; Gunnarsson, 2009; Katz, 2000; Li, 2000), there are still a limited number of studies focusing on both of these areas, that is ‘gender in multilingual workplaces.’ In response to these gaps in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics research, my target worksites consist of, like the most of the participants in this study, bilingual or multilingual worksites. This shows how the presence of this population manifests new cultures, new literacy, and new language demands in the workplace. These sites are also considered sites of socialization, and their institutional, professional, and social or personal discourses will be investigated (Robert & Sarangi, 1999). Influenced by studies on gendered migration and workplaces (Katz, 2000; Li, 2000; Gunnarsson, 2009), I investigate the different layers of discourses interacting with the participants’ new identities, and how they are articulated in the workplace; I do this by examining the ongoing interaction and story deployment in groups and the multifaceted process of identity construction -- especially the construction of the participants’ gendered identities. In particular, I investigate how workers who have various linguistic and cultural backgrounds share their experiences and use their shared knowledge in positioning each other at a workplace. By interacting regularly, they build a strong foundation of shared repertories, and this works as a useful tool to create a humorous and comfortable work culture. The workplace is a different CoP when compared to an adult language class or to other social gatherings outside of the class. I argue that studying the workplace allows
me to see how women participate in different CoPs through storytelling. The analysis sheds light on the exploration of multiple communities, which captures how the women similarly or differently find their belongings in these social spheres.

1.7.3. CoP and Gender

A CoP framework facilitates viewing gender and language through a social lens. In particular, the concepts of engagement, participation, and practice in CoP are compatible with the notion that gender identity is constructed through both identification with a particular group and through the social interactions one has with the group members. In line with the previous studies that adopted a CoP framework for analyzing gender identity (Norton, 2000), and investigated how women construct gender identities through participating in dynamic social practices, I examine how the women in my study mutually engage in and pursue joint enterprises in their communities, and how these processes work for making meaning in identity construction. In addition, by looking at the linguistic and discursive resources the women share, and how the women make use of them in their community, I place a great deal of emphasis on the local accomplishment of gender identity in a specific CoP rather than on static gender categories (Georgakopoulou, 2003)

1.8. Summary

Influenced by a CoP framework and language learning as participation, this study investigates how immigrant women construct their gendered identities through storytelling as a way of participating in social activities in a variety of multilingual contexts. These women’s relocation to Hawai’i is accompanied by different gender roles and expectations as they work to learn and use English. Detailing the process of their gender identity construction is complicated, because the fluid and flexible nature of multilingualism interplays with the construction of social identities and belongings.

This study captures the intricate facets of these women's identities. By examining different story dimensions, I investigate how the women participate in storytelling and what their participation means in building and maintaining their social relations. Through researching the participating women’s experiences across the contexts of the immigrant
adult education, workplace, and social gatherings they participate in, I investigate what kinds of linguistic and cultural resources the participants utilize in multiple communities.

A question this study seeks to ask is whether language learning and affiliation with CoPs encourage women to take on identities which may be seen as emancipatory or feminist in nature. Many studies on gender in transnational spaces assert that women in a new space can have the potential to liberate their traditional or conservative gender identities. For example, researchers view language learning as a site for challenging and transforming the common discourses of gender (Menard-Warwick, 2004, 2008, 2009). As one can see in her work, Menard-Warwick (2009) challenges the position that ESL learners occupy subordinate roles in society, which only works to perpetuate their already deprived socioeconomic status. As another example, studies of transformation, reconstruction, or negotiation of gender performance in the contexts of second language learning (Pavlenko, 2001; Blackledge, 2001) also highlight complex aspects of gender, but at the same time position the participants as minority.

In the following chapters, I will use narrative analysis to discuss these concepts in more depth, and expand upon how they are realized in more concrete ways. For instance, subsequent chapters discuss how gendered identity is constructed in collaborative ways among the participants, how different stories function as means of building a community, and how participants achieve opportunities of using English in the process of collective storytelling.
CHAPTER 2: NARRATIVES

2.0. Introduction

The goal of this chapter is to present how and why I use narrative analysis to study the ways that immigrant women create spaces for participating in different CoPs. Through telling stories, the women in this study create a space for sharing their interests and concerns and for using language and culture. In this chapter, I first discuss previous narrative studies in the field of applied linguistics in order to present how I arrived at choosing narrative analysis. Since much narrative work focuses on interview data as primary data, I discuss the merits of analyzing interactional narratives. I then define the meaning of a narrative and its functions to discuss how narrative plays a role in the participants’ lives.

Originally, proposed by Anthony Giddens (1991), the notions of 'brought along' and 'brought about', as well as the distinction between these, inform the ways I conceptualize interactional narrative data in this study. 'Brought about' signifies the observable accomplishments of speakers, and 'brought along' refers to ideological or metapragmatic assumptions; the latter refer to relatively wider contexts of institutional practices and ideologies. Theorizing my data through these notions has implications for analyzing my participants' stories. Analysts need to draw on contextual knowledge at the levels of ‘brought along’ and ‘brought about’ in order to more deeply understand their participants' stories as the means by which identity is performed. The analysis will capture the relations and dynamic tensions between the two dimensions of identity brought along and identity brought about in interaction. Narrative is a privileged site for exemplifying these relations and tensions and for the investigation of identity work.

The aim of this chapter is to foreground the intersection of narratives and identity analysis. I am interested in investigating two aspects of identity: 1) discourse identity, which refers to the active storytelling participation, including the women’s roles in telling and responding to stories; and 2) social identities, which refers to bring along with their stories. Thus, instead of separating these identities, my study examines the links between
them by analyzing narrative data, and by investigating the local accomplishments, resources, and constraints found in the women's storytelling.

2.1. Narratives in Applied Linguistics

2.1.1. Narratives in L2 Studies

The use of narratives in second language research has been expanding rapidly. Much of the contemporary research is driven by poststructural, critical, and feminist concerns, and gives a great deal of attention to issues of identity and the agency of immigrants, especially that of immigrant women (e.g., Goldstein, 1996; Langman, 2004; Menard-Warwick, 2004, 2009; Morrow, 1997; Norton, 2000; Norton, Pavlenko, & Burton 2004; Pavlenko, 2001; Vitanova, 2005; Warriner, 2004). These studies demonstrate that participants' narratives work as a powerful tool to understand learners' experiences and to offer a space for them to construct their identities in immigrant contexts. In addition, studies on immigrant narratives (De Fina, 2003a, 2003b, 2010; Georgakopoulou, 2006, 2007, 2008; Koven, 2007; Menard-Warwick, 2005, 2009; Pavlenko, 1998, 2001, 2007) illustrate the process of immigrant settlement; the stories do not simply convey language acquisition or cultural attainment, but are accompanied by more complex issues including identity, social relations, and belonging.

In their study of narratives from the people who have undergone international and intranational displacement or replacement, Baynham and De Fina (2005) explain that narratives are "discursive traces of trajectories in space and time from 'here' and 'there'" (p.8). As such, this research helps scholars to understand how L2 learners and users interpret their mobility and relocation. Baynham & De Fina maintain that these trajectories create identities, practices, and social spaces in locally situated ways. The study of immigrants’ stories of their displacement and resettlement offer a discursive space to account for and reflect on their experiences in relation to their relocation (De Fina, 2003). In this process, the language choices in narratives -- including grammatical aspects and linguistic repertoires -- are analyzed as the narrators’ ways of responding to a social world, rather than one that is naturally or neutrally selected. The investigation of
immigrants' lives in multilingual contexts shows that their lives that are mobile and flowing rather than static or durable.

In addition, autobiographic narratives are widely used in studies investigating multilingualism, intercultural selves, awareness, and belonging (e.g. Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Blommaert, Collins, & Slembrouck, 2005; Canagarajah, 2007; Fougère, 2008). Examining narratives is especially useful to researchers for exploring individuals' experiences and accounts. Much of the L2 research with narratives has given a great deal of attention to issues of agency, identity, voice, access, subjectivity, and realities of immigrants (Langman, 2004; Menard-Warwick, 2004; Norton, 2000; Warriner, 2004). These narrative studies provide insight into the experience of relocation and dislocation, and cultural and linguistic belonging, from participants' perspectives; these autobiographic methods are a useful tool for observing language use, motivation, investment, and participation. They offer a way of having a deeper and closer look into participants' lives -- bringing to light to the hidden dimensions of immigrant life experiences including their personal social relations and networks.

2.1.2. Discussion on L2 Interactional Narratives

Though narratives are extensively and predominantly used in investigating immigrants' lives, research on participants' interactional narratives outside of interview contexts is somewhat limited. Interactional narratives provide opportunities for the participants to share their experiences and allow us to see how they themselves tell their stories in daily contexts without formality or constraints, instead of answering questions drawn from an interview context. Previous studies on interactional storytelling have typically been based on ethnographic studies of relatively linguistically and culturally homogeneous groups.

In similar vein, Georgakopoulou (2007) investigates a group of female adolescents in a small town in Greece and how the participants construct and maintain their community in their daily gathering, by sharing stories predominantly on romance or dating. Despite the extensive investigation on interactional narratives (Becker & Quasthoff, 2004; Norrick, 2001; Juzwik & Ives, 2010; Wortham, 2001), there has been a dearth of research on interactional narrative in second languages. L2 interactional
narratives has neither been fully appreciated nor systematically studies from an applied linguistic perspective.

Practical issues may hamper extending small stories to this type of research (e.g. self-recorded conversations, research site intimately linked with local, especially geographical, contexts). Or, perhaps second language or multilingual contexts are not the main research interests of the majority of interactional narrative researchers. There has been little focus on multiparty L2 storytelling among research participants, despite the fact that storytelling enriches immigrant narratives theoretically and methodologically, and makes visible the complex ways that participants impact each other’s identities and social relations in multilingual contexts.

In this section, I underscore the benefits of studying L2 interactional narratives. As Norrick (1997) explains though his data is from L1, collaboratively constructed stories can be used by tellers as significant resources in their communities. Narratives provide teller(s) a means of organizing their experiences, situating them in relation to their experiences (Bruner, 1991) and, more importantly, locating them as tellable and hearable in ongoing interaction. In this sense, stories are a useful resource in researchers’ efforts to comprehend the processes through which tellers negotiate their relationships and the social contexts in which they interact. Narratives are an important way that people in complex linguistic and cultural contexts like transnational contexts craft social relationships within those environments, and in a different manner than they did in their L1s. In this sense, interactional narratives are particularly useful in L2 context.

Despite the significance of storytelling, the skills necessary to engage in successful storytelling are difficult to acquire in classroom settings: classes do not afford the opportunity to experience storytelling in an authentic, embedded social context – just as we are not able to learn how to ride a bike or how to swim without doing these activities in the actual settings in which they take place. Therefore, in order to provide evidence for the ways in which people use language and how they use it to craft social relationship, we must examine specific communities and further, specific practices within the community. For these reasons, I think exploring actual storytelling practices among L2 users is a crucial area for further L2 research.
Storytelling in interaction is a common human language practice, whether the languages used are speakers’ L1, L2, or even L3. Through telling, people locate themselves in relation to other people as well as certain culture and social expectation. Based on "social constitutive nature of oral-storytelling" (Blum-Kulka, 1993, p.396), we desire to know more about each other's stories, this motivation makes us tell and listen to stories each other. Just as we research L2 speakers’ linguistic knowledge such as grammar, pronunciation, or pragmatics, then, we need to also research their storytelling as an essential aspect of L2 learning and use. Being able to initiate stories, engage in ongoing storytelling, and respond to stories is surely one level of linguistic competency. Further, it is much more than that; storytelling is also a way of navigating access to speakers of the additional language and of claiming, earning, and negotiating membership and belonging in CoPs that they participate in.

2.1.3. CA approach to Narrative

Based on the idea that stories are achieved collaboratively by the participants through and in the telling (Jefferson, 1978; Liddicoat, 2007; Sacks, 1992; Sidnell, 2010; Wong & Warring, 2011), Conversation analysis (CA) scholars are interested in the structure of stories; how stories in conversation emerge and are designed within the context of ongoing talk and accomplish various social actions. As an example, the basic unit of structure or analysis includes the turn-taking system -- more specifically adjacency pairs (e.g. questions and answers, greetings, and return greeting, invitations and acceptances or declinations). The most prominent findings regarding storytelling from CA comes from by Sacks (1992, p. 222), "stories routinely take more than one turn to tell." The following structure explains this.

- Teller: story preface
- Recipient: request to hear the story
- Teller: story

CA views the structure as sequentially unfolding; it cannot be presupposed a priori, but rather emerges as a joint venture and as the outcome of negotiation by interlocutors in the course of the telling. Within a CA approach, narrative structure is dynamic and jointly drafted. Story structures have been investigated with the question of how tellers manage a story's beginning and end, and what actions they locally accomplish.
with it. Investigating narrative structure is important because it is closely linked to the ways in which stories are both launched into a conversation and exited from it. CA's view of narrative as a structured activity, and structure as a part of analytical inquiry, shed light on the following areas 1) how stories are prefaced (Sacks, 1974), 2) how tellers show links between a story and prior talk (Jefferson, 1978), 3) how stories can be followed by other stories (e.g. second stories, Sacks, 1974), and 4) how the participation framework in a conversation can frame a story's structure. Thus, CA scholars exclusively illustrate the sequential organization of storytelling in interaction (Liddicoat, 2011; Sidnell, 2010), and the analytical aim is to discover social order and systematicity in the event. In this respect, the operations within the turn-taking system, such as preface and continuer, are considered as important features in storytelling construction.

On the whole, CA’s influential contributions to the study of storytelling is that it proposes a perspective of narrative as talk-in-interaction, which now prevails in many discourse studies. Particularly to my study, demonstrating how stories are embedded and managed in turn-taking and what actions, like complaining, are surrounded and managed through their telling (Stokoe & Edwards, 2006) is importance aspect of analysis.

However, although CA focuses on the beginning (e.g. preface) and ending of a story in its analytical approach, not much emphasis is placed on the in-between parts of stories. Thus, we need both linguistic analyses that consider the importance of structure, as well as analyses of interactional roles and dynamics in telling. Moreover, tracing stories across time or contexts (as in the case of repeated stories) is not one of CA's main interests. De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012) also point out that "conversation analysis also finds it difficult to deal with a view of talk that involves links across time and space and norms and expectations or any other kinds of traces that discourses bear from previous texts and occurrences" (p.50). In other words, it is not clear how CA accounts for intertextuality in narrative and the link between a story and its relation to the previous stories is not clear.

The data from the women's stories in this study demonstrate that a story as a trajectory that builds connections with other telling, including for example, retellings, repeated stories, or allusions, etc.; these can emerge in one setting but develop in
different settings (Bauman & Briggs, 1990). My focus on narrative, in terms of data, is on interactional storytelling; in terms of analysis, my emphasis will be on approaches that have focused on social practices of storytelling. Another important question that I want to answer in this study is how intertextuality can be taken into account in narrative structures. I investigate how a story links to previous stories, how frequently-shared stories come into an interaction and are entertained by the participants, and the ways in which storytelling events connect with other tellings to answer my research questions in this study. I want to show how turn-taking system is inherent in storytelling, but also want to show how stories play a role in the development of further talk beyond the turn, as can be seen in the women’s stories in this study.

2.2. The Approach to Narrative Taken in This Study

I define a story as a social practice and a process that uncovers how people make sense of themselves in telling. I view narratives not as a tool or technique, but as a particular way of (re)constructing reality, knowledge, and experience. Rather than considering a story as a text constituted of chains of temporally and casually ordered events, it is a way of generating social reality, and of expressing one’s understanding of social experience. My goal is to investigate how people use their stories in interaction to establish their identities in CoPs, and to analyze how a story is integrally linked to issues of the particular social contexts where a story is told. There are various ways of categorizing different types of narratives. Narratives are often divided by the way in which they are generated or/and by the way in which they are analyzed. Narratives are produced from different types of interview contexts, and they are generated through other names including diary entries, news broadcast, and recently facebook entries as "networked narrative" (Page, Harper, & Frobenius, 2013, p.192). Georgakopoulou (2006b) demarcates narrative analyses into two categories: those that engage in the sociolinguistic and post-Labovian tradition and those that utilize interactional paradigms. More recently, De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012) suggest the division of narratives into "narratives as text and structure" and "narratives as interaction," which I will elaborate in the following section.
2.2.1. Definition of Stories

The use of narrative methods became prevailing since 1980s in various disciplines in the social sciences. Storytelling works as a tool for evoking analyze people's perspective and understanding of social issues as well as their local knowledge. By focusing on the ways in which people engender and how they show their understanding of social reality, narrative scholars take different ways regarding types of stories to be analyzed as well as analytical toolkit that they employ.

De Fina and Georgakopoulou distinguish narratives as form, text or genre from narratives as social interaction by taking into account several relevant elements, namely: narrative structure, contexts, and contents. This perspective views narratives as structure that is considered as structural representation of a sequence of events or ordered units such as orientation, complication, and result.

Bamberg (2012) in his recent discussion on distinctive features explains the narrative components as follows:

"Narratives are about people (characters), who act (events) in space and time; typically across a sequence of events (temporality). The narrative form (structure) is said to hold the content together (what the story is about--its plot) and sequentially arrange the story units (orientation, complication, resolution, closure) into a more or less coherent whole." (p.203)

The stories introduced in this study include the required components explained above. There are characters, events (contents), plots and temporalities (contexts), and structures in a story. Some of these components are shared and repeated by the group members, and work as resources. One of the examples is the participants' nickname practice. A nickname serves as shared information among the group members and their nickname practice impacts story units, especially story orientation (see excerpt 3.3. ōsha time, for example). Sharing resources and interactional histories also link to the participants' group membership and it shows who can access the ongoing story.

Within the perspective of narratives as social interaction, the participation structure in the unfolding of a story is considered important. This distinction is also related to the methodological differences in analyzing narratives. The following are three
different forms of narrative analysis 1) Focusing on language/style (i.e., How do people tell a story?); 2) Focusing on context/themes (i.e., What are the topics of people’s narratives?); and 3) Focusing on interactional process and social practices (i.e., How do participants engage in narrative practice, and why?)

In his interview-based study, Wortham (2001) established "interactional narratives", which blur the distinction between naturally occurring narratives and interview driven narratives. In a similar vein, narrative researchers have recently emphasized the methodological consideration of interaction in interview contexts (e.g. Talmy & Richards, 2011), and highlighted how stories emerge in different social interactions. They also problematize the clear-cut distinctions between “natural” and “artificial” interaction (De Fina & Perrino, 2011), and explain that, in addition to interview prompts, narratives are also naturally occurring narratives-in-interaction, usually through mundane everyday conversation.

Many narrative studies interchangeably use the term “narrative” and “story” (e.g. De Fina, 2003a), as well as “conversational narrative” (Norrick, 2000) and “interactional narrative” (Ochs and Capps, 2001). Despite different terminology, these studies agree on the usual, everyday definitions for terms such as “story,” “storytelling,” and “tale” (Norrick, 2000). I align with these studies in my view that stories in interactional narratives emerge from collaboration between a speaker and listener(s), rather than solely produced by a single storyteller.

In line with the idea that narratives are considered social activities and performances, stories allow people to accomplish their interactional goals (Bamberg and Georgakopoulou, 2008; Goodwin, 1997; Koven, 2002; Liddicoat, 2007; Norrick, 2000; Ochs and Capps, 2001; Sidnell 2010). In this study, I use the more general term "interactional narratives" interchangeably with "small story", which I will explain in the following section. In my analysis of the participants’ stories, I situate my work within the scholarship on interactional narratives for (Bamberg, 2004; Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008, Bamberg & Marchman, 1991; De Fina, 2013; De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012; Georgakopoulou, 2006, 2007; Goodwin, 1986, 1984; Ochs & Capps, 2001; Wortham, 2001).
I seek to examine how women construct social relations through their stories, and to identify what social actions and goals their stories produce in those interactions. Within the field of narrative analysis, this study is in line with the framework of “small stories,” which include the following dispositions: 1) a wider scope of story features, 2) an emphasis on the interactional history of the stories, and 3) an interest in repeated and recycled linguistic and cultural resources. In the following section, I will elaborate more on narratives for investigating identity research.

2.3. Narratives and Identities

This study draws on constructionism, and views identity as a process rather than an entity owned by a person or a group. Identities emerge in interaction and are maintained or contested through telling. As Ochs & Capps (2001) state, everyday conversational narratives are used as “a site for working through who we are” (p. 17). This shows how everyday interactional narratives are closely related to the construction of identity. In this section, I discuss how interactional narratives get at identity in ways that answer my research questions for this study. Starting from the idea that interaction is not part of a one-way process of identity construction, but rather identity and interaction must be seen as a reciprocal process (Spreckels, 2008), I demonstrate how a story captures the process of ongoing social interaction, and how it can provide new insight into the negotiation and construction of identity within local contexts. I treat the narratives of the women in this study as sites for working through who they are: individually, the women claim their identities, and together, they co-articulate and mediate the identities of the other women in the group. Hence, they not only tell stories, but perform or enact different persons and personas. What is particularly powerful about the concept of small stories, given my interest in immigrant women's gendered identities, is their significance for exploring the relationship between narrative and identity, or what Bamberg (2004) calls a “narrative construction of self” (p. 368). While life stories may be oriented toward life histories, small stories are situated in small talk or joke, frequently constructed in interaction. The process of constructing identities in telling stories ‘in-the-making’ and ‘coming-into-being’ (Bamberg 2004) is arguably different from the kinds of
identities often extrapolated from life-event or interview research that adhere to a framework of more traditional narrative methodologies (i.e., where participants’ biographies are elicited).

My choice of framing these narratives follows Bamberg and Georgakopoulou’s (2008) emphasis on the breadth and type of interlocutors’ participation in storytelling. My interest is in how these participants involve themselves in storytelling, and how their participation in their particular CoP develops over time. In using interactional stories, I will elucidate the shared and dense interactional histories, and linguistic and cultural norms, that emerge in the process of ongoing social interaction.

As Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) illustrate, by telling stories, narrators offer ‘edited’ descriptions (Georgakopoulou, 2002) and evaluations of themselves and others, providing salient identity characteristics at certain points within the story. The participants’ stories are then analyzed to show how the narrator’s sense of self is indexed and conveyed in the telling. By analyzing the women’s stories within interaction, I emphasize the value of stories in investigating the participants’ continuous and repetitious engagement in storytelling, and the constant process of identity-making as it is constrained by self-positioning and other-positioning.

When I discuss stories and identity analysis, the developmental dimension that Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) thematize has to be considered. They discuss how identities are constructed contingently in interactional storytelling and sediment into some coherent sense of identities.

The developmental aspect of storytelling within continuous and repetitious relations is closely linked to the development of shared repertoires and a sense of community. This relation is also observed by Bamberg's three level of positioning. Bamberg (1997) proposes a concept of three level of positioning to examine how identity work is carried out in telling stories; 1) Positioning on the level of the story: "how are the characters positioned in relation to one another within the reported event?" 2) Positioning on the level of interaction: "how does the teller position herself to the audience?" 3) Positioning with respect to the question of "Who am I": "how do narrators position themselves to themselves?" "how the narrator positions a sense of self/identity regarding
dominant discourses or master narratives" as a process of constructing himself or herself as a particular kind of person.

As another example, in their positioning analysis, Bamberg & Georgakopoulou (2008) show how 10-year-old boys in the context of a moderated group discussion utilize shared repertoires, or sense of community, in their storytelling. The boys' shared cultural knowledge is used in the process of constructing each other's identities. One of the participants, Victor, borrows lyrics from Shaggy, a reggae pop star, to respond to the implication that he wooed a girl. By using this example of "It wasn't me, hey, I'm Shaggy" Victor, as a primary participant, uses cultural knowledge for identity work, and his borrowing of It Wasn't Me has implications: Shaggy has a symbolic meaning of masculinity that is uninterested in relational commitments. At the same time, this borrowing indexically evokes a blurring of the boundaries between the character in the story and Victor himself. This shows that the participants perform or refuse to perform their masculinity in largely hegemonic ways.

In a similar vein, in her narrative study of relationally-close female adolescents, Georgakopoulou (2006, 2007) analyzes the relationship between participants’ telling roles in a story world and their larger identities. For example, Fontini, a girl who has relatively limited experience in dating compared to the rest of the girls in the participating group, is often positioned as the “proper" and "sexually inexperienced" girl by other members. Fontini's identity as less experiences and more proper are larger identities that characterize her beyond the moment-by-moment level of interaction and which emerge in the small stories that she produces with her friends. In this group she often seeks suggestions from other members and initiates projections (in a hypothetical format), rather than actively contributing to storylines or offering an evaluation based on her knowledge. In other words, she apparently takes a passive interactive role in the process of collaborative storytelling. This also links well with her position as a “desiring subject" (Georgakopoulou, 2007, p.97) who often engages in fantasies instead of a girl who can share her experiences with her friends.

The two above examples illuminate how local storytelling roles are related to larger social identities, and how these (i.e., storytelling roles and identity) mutually
inform and work for story construction. They also show that, in the formation of storytelling context, participants’ assumed selves and other identities can be used as shared resources for legitimating their participation. These shared repertoires (from interactional history and negotiable resources) are used in the formation of group membership, roles, and relations. In this section, my discussion of narratives and interaction provides the necessary foundation for the discussion that appears in the next section: small stories – which fit under the umbrella of narratives and identities.

2.4. Small stories

The study of small stories is elucidated when compared to “big” stories, which are identifiable by their canonical structure (Bamberg, De Fina, & Schiffrin, 2011; Georgakopoulou, 2006). Some stories are considered “small” in comparison to the grand narratives that detail long life histories or interview narratives or prototyped fully-fledged life events. Smallness refers to the fleeting moments of the narrative’s orientation to the world (Hymes, 1996). Influenced by interactional narratives or non-interview driven storytelling, small story research investigates how people use stories in their interactive engagements to construct a sense of who they are, while big story research analyzes the stories as a representation of the world and tellers’ identities.

Georgakopoulou (2006, p.129) characterizes small stories as an “umbrella-term that covers a gamut of under-represented narrative activities, such as telling of ongoing, future or hypothetical events and shared (known) events. Small stories are also allusions to tellings, deferrals of tellings, and refusals to tell” (p.123). Small stories communicate the fleeting aspects of life experiences, which concern recent, still unfolding, future, or hypothetical events in everyday social exchanges. Considering the fact that there are certain expectations about what kinds of stories are to be told or not to be told in particular contexts (Georgakopoulou, 2007), frequency of occurrence, acceptability, and tellability are related to the investigation of the fleeting moments of stories.

Additionally, small stories index shared experiences or interactional histories for insiders, which might be ‘nothing’ to others (Bamberg, 2004; Bamberg and Marchman, 1991; Georgakopoulou, 2006; 2007).
"small stories research stress that the definition of an activity as a story should not rest exclusively and reductively on prototypical textual criteria. Instead, stories should be seen as discourse engagements that engender specific social moments and integrally connect with what gets done on particular occasions and in particular settings" (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012, p.117).

Small stories are narrative fragments and snippets, allusively evoking a narrative telling. Georgakopoulou (2007) explores how these small stories, told in conversations and emails between members of a female Greek friendship group, draw on and contribute to the articulation of a shared communicative history among group members. This study’s discussion draws preliminarily on the audio-recorded stories of a group of female adolescents that was studied ethnographically in a town in Greece. Her study focuses on practice based approaches that the girls take to producing identities. As Georgakopoulou shows, shared stories accumulate when used among members of a community and hence can be drawn on in ongoing talk, providing an invaluable resource in the co-construction of shared identity among group members. In the following section, I will introduce different types of small stories. As explained in Georgakopoulou (2007), narratives-in-the-making and (re)making narratives include 1) stories to be told; 2) breaking news; 3) projection; and 4) shared stories. The examples below show that stories are embedded in their immediate discourses, and at the same time they occur in larger discourses, where they are intertextually connected for recontextualization (Bauman & Briggs, 1990) in a variety of local contexts. The first example is about stories to be told, which is characterized as "narrativization-in-process" (Georgakopoulou, 2007, p.41. Only the English translation is provided)

1) *Stories to be told*

1  > How are you?

2  Long story that, which I am hoping to tell you face-to-face when we hopefully meet up. In any case, there are

3  still some missing chapters, it would be good if I had

4  something other than the Prologue.
(34 year-old female to 40 year-old female).

As this email example shows, stories are initiated and bid for on email, and the actual storytelling is postponed for an offline interaction. Initiations such as "Remind me to tell you later" or "Oh, I shouldn't forget it" (Georgakopoulou, 2007, p.41) show intermediality in various ways of interaction especially online and offline communication. The women in my study did not have many cases of online interaction like email in the example above. However, postponed storytelling is often found in their interactions. For example, sometimes a story told during ESL class break time had to be paused because of the time limit on breaks. Instead of simply stopping their telling, the story was saved for later. The women often said, "I will continue after we finish the class." The delayed but saved story among the women has significance for their CoP. It shows that storytelling is an everyday practice in this community, and that it is a legitimated routine in this group of women. It also shows that storytelling is not just a one-time occurrence; rather, it is a continuous practice utilized to build group membership.

2) Breaking news

1  T:  Oh:: (. ) I didn’t tell you. This morning I go
2  past()(. ) it was packed (0.5)
3  Where’s Eclaire::tte?(. ) where’s Eclaire::tte?(. )
4  F:  the::re’s Eclairlette. There in a corner(. ) with his brush
5  V:  ((or vaccum clearner))
6  Man(. ) the brush and Ekleraki have become//one
7  //The Phillips vaccum clearner sucks the dust ((sings a
8  TV commercial jingle))
9  ((they all laugh))

(Georgakopoulou, 2007, p.47)

This breaking news story is about a story character with the nickname Eclairrette, a nickname given to a man by the girls, which is actually the diminutive form of a pastry.
In this group, added layers of meaning have been attributed to this nickname over time. T reports the latest event related to Eclairette, and she also evokes and reaffirms shared associations regarding the character in a playful way (line 3). This holds the story’s tellability in this specific context. The newsworthiness of breaking news is closely related to members’ focal concerns (e.g., sightings of men in this case). This also took place in the women's interaction in this study.

Next, I will explore the case of projection. Projected stories or stories of future events have not been widely discussed in the field of narrative analysis (Norrick, 2000). Georgakopoulou argues that, in her study of adolescent storytelling, projections indicate that the participants engage in much intertextual relevance. Particularly in this group, projection is constructed in the process of collectively planning an event or negotiating the details of the event. In addition, projection is often prompted by breaking new stories and it becomes a hypothetical or unfolding story. The following example from Georgakopoulou (2007, p.49) illustrates this point.

3) Projection

1  F:  Guys (...) what are we going to do tomorrow? Contain yourselves and be silenced. WHAT are we going to do?

2  V:  First of all you'll have a cold bath =

3  F:  = To relax?

4  V:  A cold bath (...) l and you'll have a hot coffee =

   ((further down))

8  V:  Fi:ne(.) then you'll sit down and relax (...) you'll do a facial..

   ((further down))

13 F:  Okay (...) and then?

This example illustrates how the participants in this story engage in talk about planning the future event and how the event is formed as temporally ordered sequences. This excerpt demonstrates how the participants plan collaboratively. The planning
involves co-authoring the details of the future event. Projections are initiated as bids for co-construction by using “we”, which frames the telling of the events as a joint project. Moreover, as this excerpt shows, the participants orient to talk about future events as a temporally ordered sequence of events. These stories also occur in my data. The case that women plan an ongoing event in their community can be the example. A story that begins with a question like "what kinds of food are we bring tomorrow?" for collaboratively planning the upcoming events such as a class potluck can be an example. It is a significant feature for discussing their CoP because projecting future event together is rooted in their shared experiences and knowledge. Next, the examples of shared stories will be illustrated.

4-a) Shared stories

29 F: And say he's looking that way (.) how am I going to draw his attention?

30 V: You will speak to him in hi language.

31 ((You'll say)) talk to him ma:n (..) talk to him

((personation of the character talked about))

((Participants, ie.g. F, T & I, laugh))

((further down))

59 F: So (.) I walk in and see him

60 What am I going to say?

61 V: Talk to him man (.) talk to him=

62 F: =hh hah hah-uh huh

63 Come on (.) we are talking seriously now.

64 So: (..) I bump into Makis right?

This example shows a quick reference to shared stories and it suggests that the contextualizeable part of a shared story is an evaluative comment, usually at the end of
the story. This shared story is achieved as a form of repetition, laughter, or a minimal acknowledgement of a response. Additionally, stories are not only embedded in their immediate discourse surroundings but also in a larger history of interactions and shared experiences. The following example from my own data also shows how the shared knowledge from previous experiences functions in the women's interaction. In the following excerpt, Yeon shares the news of her pregnancy with her friends. Rather than just reporting it, she initiates the story by drawing on references to their shared experiences.

4-b) Shared stories

1 Yeon: when I vomit last time (.) you remember
2 Masako: on the bus?
3 Yeon: yeah.
4 Masako: oh? pregnant?
5 Yeon: yeah.
6 Masako: oh::
7 Yeon: It was not morning sickness on the bus. But I
8 actually vomit last night. When I vomit something my
9 daughter told me 'why don't you go out?'

In this excerpt, Yeon shares news about her pregnancy for the first time to the group of women during break time in the Adult ESL class. The news report is initiated by telling a shared story/experience about vomiting. In line 1, Yeon uses a known story as a way to share her breaking news. Starting a story with shared experience offers a clue for the upcoming news and builds shared ground for further story development. Even though the comment about vomiting on the bus was not actually tied to her pregnancy, the shared memory leads to Yeon’s sharing the news of her pregnancy, which functions as an example of breaking news. It contributes to setting up Yeon’s storytelling in a smoother way. This example also shows how breaking news can be done interactively, with the listener acting as the one who contributes to the plotlines through drawing on shared knowledge of each other’s history.
In addition to the story types and elements mentioned above (Georgakopoulou, 2007), other studies on small stories also provide additional features. Story types beyond what Georgakopoulou (2007) provides are 1) allusions to previous telling, 2) deferrals of telling, and 3) refusals to tell as sorts of small stories, proposed by Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008). In addition, small stories are used in diverse contexts including facebook entries (Page, Harper, & Frobenius, 2013; West, 2013), language learning contexts (Early & Norton, 2012; Juzwik & Ives, 2010) or institutional contexts (Heinrichsmeier, 2012).

From these examples of different story types, it is noted that, in spite of each type's unique features, there are overlaps or ambiguous distinctions between the categories. In fact, this complex nature of stories is also found in my data, and logically prevents us from drawing clear lines between story categories. I elaborate more on narrative approaches in the following section, while taking into consideration features of small stories. Next, I discuss more in-depth the role of narrative analysis in analyzing identity.

2.5. Narratives, Positioning, and Habitus

2.5.1. Positioning and Narrative Analysis

The concept of positioning was first proposed by Davies and Harre (1990), and they offer discourse-based approaches to self. Their main focus centers on the types of positions achieved in discourse. However, they do not attend to authentic social interaction as data, nor to the identity negotiation process. In other words, the earlier researchers of positioning did not attend to interactional practices of positioning, and their work does not fit with fine-grained interactional analyses.

After Bamberg's (1997) well-known study on narrative analysis, a more situated, empirical, and interactional approach to positioning has developed. Particularly, Bamberg proposes different levels of positioning, to analyze how identity work is carried by telling stories. His levels are: level 1: positioning in narrated world, level 2: positioning in a narrating world, and level 3: positioning a sense of self with regard to dominant
discourses or master narratives). We can also find different layered analyses of narratives in later work.

In their study of young urban African-American fathers' interview narratives on parenting, Wortham and Gadsden (2006) propose four different levels of positioning analysis, specifically: 1) narrators position themselves as having experienced narrated events; 2) narrators voice the characters in the stories, including their own various narrated selves (i.e., narrators characterize him/herself and other narrated characters as being recognizable types of people); 3) when voicing characters in a story, they also evaluate those voices; and 4) narrators construct themselves during the interaction and construct along with their audience in the storytelling event. By analyzing the ways that participants use various linguistic devices to position themselves, the analysis of different levels of positioning offers a view into how the analysis is relevant to self-construction.

2.5.2. Community of Practice and Narratives

As social practice, narratives are an integral part of a community of practice, and are considered shared resources. Ochs and Capps (2001) explain the relation between the story participation and tellers' social relations as follows:

"Conversational involvement is a hallmark of familiarity. Informal conversation is the communicative glue that establishes and maintains close relationships in many communities. This does not mean that close relationships require continuous talk, but rather that commiserating, gossiping, philosophizing, exchanging advice, and other informal discourse interlaces lives and builds common ways of acting, thinking, feeling and otherwise being in the world" (Ochs & Capps, 2001, p.8).

In this respect, the understanding of narratives as part of communities of practice is well described by Georgakopoulou (2007), in her study of an all-female adolescent group living in a small town in Greece. CoPs is seen as "an aggregate of people who come together around a mutual engagement in an endeavor" (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1999, p. 191); this explains that shared resources accumulate over a period of regular contact and in the process of socialization among participants involved in a community. Georgakopoulou (2007) uses the concept of CoP in her work on narratives of adolescent
Girls, and she demonstrates the utility of a CoP framework in studying narratives as follows:

"When viewed as part of communities of practice, narratives are expected to act as other shared resources, be they discourses or activities. In particular, as we will show, they can form an integral part of a community of practice's shared culture as well as being instrumental in negotiating and worked, and strategically adapted to perform acts of group identity to reaffirm they are also potentially contestable resources, prone to recontextualization, transposed across contexts and recycled thus leading to other kinds of discourse" (p.10).

This perspective also captures the complexities of the relationship between conversational stories and other shared resources. In my study, the women's narratives can best be described and understood as the act of constructing part of a community of practice, and the women – over a period of regular contact and socialization— have developed shared ways of doing things. By telling stories, the women construct group identity and group goals, share their interests, (re)affirm roles, and show their expertise. Therefore, within the framework of communities of practice, narrative becomes important in a trajectory of networks that the participants represent and reflect. This perspective also highlights the shift from "language or structure to participants and ways of engagement in some project" (Hanks, 1996, p.221).

In their studies of adolescent boys’ stories and identities, Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) elaborate the concept of habitus in order to discuss the developmental aspect of identities. They discuss how identities are constructed contingently in interactional storytelling, and then become sedimented and coherent in the course of telling. I will expand on this in the following section.

2.5.3. Positioning and Habitus

In line with narratives and the model of positioning (Bamberg, 1997, 2004; Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008; Georgakopoulou, 2000; Wortham & Gadsden, 2006), I examine different layers of stories—the referential world and the interactive world—and consider how these link to the concept of positioning. This perspective lends itself well to both fine-grained micro- and macro- level analyses. Moreover, by examining continuously changing interaction among the participants, I illustrate how they achieve a
sense of constancy. This constancy relates well to the notion of *habitus*, despite the fact that identities are continuously practiced and tested out in the contexts of narratives-in-interaction. The participants' shared resources can be seen through Bourdieu's (1977) concept of *habitus*, which is linked with the concept of CoP. As Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) explain, everyday identity work becomes an engagement in more reflective and continuous positions. Continuing and repeating practices finally become *habitus*, which reveals a constant sense of who we are. Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) link small stories to the concept of *habitus* to illustrate a broader point about identity construction.

"With conceptualizing narratives-in-interaction (with emphasis on small stories) as the sites of engagement where identities are continuously practiced and tested out, we have begun to show eventually may lead up to the ability to engage in more reflective positions in the form of life stories that are typically elicited in clinical or research settings. It is in the everyday practices as sites of engagement that 'identity work' is being conducted; we believe that such continuous and repetitious engagements ultimately lead to *habitus* (plural) that become the source for a continuous sense of who we are---a sense of us as 'same' in spite of continuous change. (p. 379)"

Bamberg and Georgakopoulou describe the relation between narratives-in-interaction and continuous and repetitious engagement, which ends up as one's habitus. This resonates with my own interest in the CoPs that the women in my study engage in. By applying the model of positioning and narratives (Bamberg, 1997, 2004; Georgakopoulou, 2000), I examine ways the participants build and maintain social groups, and how the telling of stories discursively constructs their CoPs. I also adopt the notion of *habitus* to discuss the women's construction of sedimented identities in collective storytelling, and consider both fine-grained micro-analysis and macro-level accounts in more depth in order to analyze those identities. Over a period of regular contact, participants have developed shared ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs and values; based on these, participants construct group norms. Thus, larger identities are partly constructed through lived and contextualized narratives, and thus become part of the group's shared resources. For example, one identity that often gets expressed as a shared resource among the women is "L2 users" in immigrant contexts. The women often
tell stories about their L2 experiences and these stories are shared to strengthen their community.

Through examining a group's broader identities and shared resources, I am able to home in on what is considered to be normative among participants, and what events are tellable across different cultural and linguistic communities. The women make their experiences normative and maintain their tellership in storytelling as a means of staying in their established group. This happens through their regular gatherings and their orientation to the shared social categories in telling stories. Everyday identity work becomes an engagement in more reflective positions, and continuous and repeated commitment eventually become *habitus*, that is, a constant sense of who we are. In the analysis section, I demonstrate how a sense of constancy is achieved by continuously engaging in collaborative storytelling.

### 2.6. Analytical Focuses

My analytical aim is to examine in what ways people engage in their storytelling practices, and what the meaning of these practices is in their lives. Besides questions about how a story is collaboratively constructed by the participants, I also investigate how this examination is related to the bigger picture of CoP, that is, how the participants position each other in their group and how they maintain their social groups. The stories are from a close-knit group, and the group members build their cultural and linguistic knowledge in a collaborative way. Across Chapters 4, 5, and 6 of the dissertation, I demonstrate three analytical focuses in this study: 1) story dimensions and participation, 2) shared and repeated story structures as interactional resources, and 3) speaker roles and positioning self and others.

These three areas of focus are significant elements in interactional storytelling, and they offer clues for how participants construct their social relationships. First, in Chapter 4, I examine how a story is situated, how a story becomes tellable, and how the ownership of a story is achieved. Investigating these three story dimensions provides insights on the women's telling rights and their participation in storytelling. This is crucial for understanding the nature of CoP(s) since telling rights link to questions of who
are the qualified members of the community. Thus, the discursive dimension of storytelling is also linked to the discussion of participation and membership in their community.

In Chapter 5, I illustrate how linguistic and cultural resources are utilized by the participants in and across their narratives. Here, I am particularly interested in how repeated story structures and linguistic repertories are shared and (re)used by the women, so that these function as resource to promote story development. The analysis also shows how shared story contents and story structures serve as orientations for additional story.

In line with the recent methodological shifts towards narrative as practice and as process (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012), researchers have started to rethink structural properties of narrative in different contexts. This trend also influence the role of orientation such as time and space in narratives.

In her study of Mexican undocumented immigrants' narratives, De Fina (2003) expands the traditional notion of orientation as a sort of background in the story world by (Labov, 1967) at the level of interactional world management with the investigation of negotiating process of constructing orientation. She discusses how the management of orientation in telling stories links to the interviewer and interviewee's shared knowledge as well as interviewer's concrete life experience. The following example explains this point.

(Data Fina, 2003, p.382: Translated from Spanish)

(9) Ciro
01 [and we were] so happy, right?
02. going to have lunch and all [...] 03. "We are already on the other side!"

In her analysis, De Fina demonstrates that the shared use of the socially significant and shared space, and its central role as the crossing point. De Fina (2003) also puts, "it also shows that there are ways of talking about time and space that groups build and that become part of their common language" (p.380). In my data, for example, shared story contents serve the role of orientation. The important aspect of orientation in
my study is that it reveals the existence of shared understandings and of shared knowledge when the participants construct the social and personal space in their stories.

Last, in chapter 6, I examine different speaker roles as another prominent component in analyzing the women's stories. Analyzing different speaker roles in telling presents a dynamic process of constructing identities. In particular, I am interested in investigating how the participants draw upon different characters in a narrated world to refer to out-group members (e.g. different types of husbands), how they borrow others’ voices, and how they evaluate characters in the telling. This chapter attempts to demonstrate how the participants use footings and different voices in their storytelling. The investigation of how they incorporate the talk of others into the here-and-now telling illustrates the discursive construction of CoP. It also shows that the participants construct social positions for themselves and others. In the following section, I will demonstrate the analytical foci of Chapters 4-6 in more detail.

2.6.1. Interactional Roles in Story Dimensions

Analyzing different story dimensions – including embeddedness, tellership, and tellability of a story – can show how the participants establish their interactional goals in storytelling, which in turn reveal the various degrees of participation that the women are engaging in across their CoPs. Ochs and Capps (2001), emphasize functional perspectives on narrative and language use. They emphasize that telling a story is a social activity that can depend on the breadth and type of interlocutors’ participation. I introduce the following dimensions of interactive narratives: embeddedness, tellership, and tellability (Georgakoupoulou, 2007; Ochs and Capps, 2001) which guide my analysis.

**Embeddedness:** Stories are produced within a particular context, and can differ in terms of their embeddedness in surrounding discourse and social activity (Edwards, 1997; Ochs & Capps, 2001). The former feature is realized through interactional history and shared experiences (but is not limited to these). Narratives are not independent events that can be detached from their contexts, but rather, they are situated in a discourse setting. This idea also links to the ways in which stories can be reshaped, transposed, and recycled across various times and spaces. How much the participants share in the context of storytelling
is also closely related to tellership and tellability, because story context provides interactional resources for having tellership and for making a story tellable.

**Tellership:** Participants become co-tellers and make a contribution to telling a story. According to Ochs and Capps (2001), tellership refers to “the extent and kind of involvement of conversational partners in the actual recounting of a narrative” (p. 24). Participants in storytelling vary their involvement in many ways -- from displaying cursory attentiveness to requesting narrative details. I am interested in exploring how participants gain co-tellership as a way of asserting their belonging in a group. In other words, by participating in a story and constructing shared cultural knowledge, the women take active roles in their community. As an example, telling a second story is not only a way of collaboratively participating in a group, but also of claiming insider understanding or shared understanding of the group's experience.

**Tellability:** Tellability (Ochs & Capps, 2001) is participants’ orientation to what locally constitutes a tellable story (Georgakoupoulou, 2007). It captures the aesthetic, affective, and subjective aspects of narratives (Polanyi, 1989), and it links to the significance of events for particular interlocutors and the way in which events are shaped in narratives (Kiesling, 2006; Menard-Warwick, 2007). An example of tellability that emerges regularly in my data is what I term “complainability” in women’s stories, as it is a dominant feature of their interactions. If the women have something in common to complain about (e.g., mothers in law), then they have tellable stories and are treated as such by their peers.

These story dimensions imply that some stories can be elaborated on, developed, and completed, but some are constrained by the form, content, and purpose of ongoing social activities among members. Based on these interactional dimensions, I analyze locally accomplished and jointly constructed stories to more closely explore how the women construct their social realities. Through an exploration of these dimensions, we come to understand how people tell (tellership) and what people tell (tellability), which
captures the dynamic participation, and reveals how people claim their belonging in their community.

2.6.2. Shared Interactional Resources: Humor and Repeated Stories

Narratives are not produced by a single storyteller, but rather emerge from collaboration between speakers and listeners within a storytelling context; narratives, then, are social activities and performances (Blommaert, 2006) in which participants create social relationships with one another. This highly collaborative process depends on the shared resources and common ground among the participants (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008). This is especially true for the women in my data, many of whom who have built deep friendships with one another and have shared many experiences together.

Humor plays an important role in my data, and it is therefore important to address humor and narrative in this methodology chapter. Humor has been researched with different approaches, and there has been an increasing emphasis on the interactional aspect of constructing humor in sociolinguistics and applied linguistics (e.g., Bell, 2005; Holmes, 2000; Holmes & Marra, 2002; Norrick & Chiaro, 2009; Rogerson-Revell, 2007; Siegal, 1995). In my study, I observe what people accomplish with humor and how it is contextualized in a local setting. Mutual references and shared stories work as interactional resources among the participants, who have close relations with one another and interact on a regular basis. The participants use linguistic and cultural resources from their dense interactional histories, and these have crucial functions. Humor is often the consequence of recycled stories. Sunja (one of the primary participants in this study) and her co-workers' interaction at a work place consists of shared cultural understanding and recycled story structure to establish not only shared ground but also a cheerful working environment. Georgakopoulou (2005) points out that retellings of shared stories (i.e. stories of shared or known events) present a continuum of forms, as well as a quick introduction to a new story, which makes the new story more accessible. I also ask whether ethnic jokes work as a cultural divide or as a unifying factor in this cross-cultural group of people. The analysis in Chapter 5 illustrates that the use of familiar story
structures makes participants more involved in sharing stories, as well as in constructing identities and social relations.

Recycled stories are also realized as second stories; this act of recycling serves as a way of displaying alignment to a previous story. I emphasize the reciprocal function of second stories, as initially discussed by Sacks (1995), who was the first to claim that telling a relevant second story communicates to an interlocutor, “My mind is with you,” (p. 257). Similarly, Coates (2001) shows that second stories among male friends creates friendships by displaying connectedness. She argues that telling a relevant second story provides evidence that sequential storytelling works as a way of doing friendship.

In addition to looking at how recycled stories work as response stories (which helps in sharing common experiences), I also examine how the participants actively use linguistic resources to attempt to ‘top’ the previous story (Norrick, 2000). By employing recycled but amended stories, the participants compete to tell even funnier, scarier, and more compelling stories in a group. Overall, looking at these story features in a group is closely related to investigating close-knit groups such as close friends (Georgakopoulou, 2005; Manzoni, 2005) or families (Blum-Kulka, 1993; Ochs and Taylor, 1992; Tannen, 1989). These groups show how they utilized shared resources and how audience/co-tellers’ participation makes change by interrupting, repeating, and punctuating the stories with diverse responses.

2.6.3. Speaker roles and Constructing Self and Others

Chapter 6 will illustrate how the participants construct and shift different footings (Goffman, 1974) in tale world and how these are connected to the way that they construct their identities and social relations in the interactional world. The analysis highlights how the "other" can be discursively constructed in storytelling. Analyzing speaker roles in telling presents a dynamic process of positioning self and others. In particular, I will investigate how the participants draw upon different characters in a narrated world to refer to out-group members (e.g. different types of husbands), how they borrow others' voices into their telling, and how they evaluate characters in the telling.

2.7. Transcription
The transcript conventions used in the current study are adapted from those most commonly used in conversation analysis (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984), and thus, they include detailed information. Based on the idea that transcripts are subjective and selective (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Ochs, 1979), this approach encompasses issues of: 1) what was said, 2) who said it, 3) where it was said, and 4) how it was said. The most challenging part of the transcription for this study is addressing questions of “how”, because intonation, pronunciation, vocal qualities, speed, and pitch vary considerably, as the participants in this study have different linguistic backgrounds.

Particularly in this study, I have three concerns regarding the transcription. First, I need to address some issues surrounding the fact that the data comes from English as a second language users’ interaction. L2 data in this study includes various pronunciations, grammars, and word selections. In the process of transcribing, by following basic principles of the transcription, I tried to represent actual pronunciation as closely as possible. Some linguistic features produced by participants were influenced by their first or other languages, and participants sometimes created new linguistic forms that are not commonly used in other contexts. However, pointing out non-standard linguistic features is not the main focus of the analysis. They also create mixed and hybrid linguistic forms based on their linguistic or cultural experiences, especially forms that were only accessible by drawing upon contextual knowledge and shared interactional histories. When possible, I checked with the participants about any uncertainty, but that was not possible in all cases.

Second, some data are in languages other than English, for example, Tagalog in workplace interaction. Since Tagalog is not used by the focal participants of this study (but rather by non-focal participants), I limited the instances of Tagalog data in my analysis. If a Tagalog interaction was crucial to understanding the overall interaction, I transcribed it with assistance from a Tagalog speaker.

Third, most of the data are from multiparty storytelling that occurred in various social settings rather than in a quiet surrounding prepared for data collection. Some data includes conversation from people who are not focal research participants. This
interaction is not usually transcribed although they are hearable– and sometimes louder than the focal participants' interaction.

After transcribing the data, it was checked with other people who have an extensive experience teaching adult ESL learners. We went over the transcripts together, listening to the audio data and comparing it to the transcripts. This process made the transcripts more accurate. For my analysis, I selected stories that were thematically related to gender or L2 learning/using. I also considered structurally salient stories to discuss story organization, story dimensions, and story participation.

2.8. Summary

This chapter has laid out my methodological approach for understanding how the participants collaboratively build social relations in their narratives, and to identify what social actions and goals their narratives produce in their interactions. By investigating the participants' daily interactive involvement in storytelling, I will examine how they achieve common and safe shared ground for the telling of their stories. I will also investigate how participants share and negotiate the linguistic resources they have – including what kinds of linguistic strategies they build through their interaction – and this informs my discussion of the participants’ use of linguistic resources and forms within a multilingual interaction framework.

By examining stories at numerous informal times and settings, the following chapters present my analysis of the ways the women construct their identities and social relationships. The investigation of three dimensions of narratives, interactional resources and story structures, and positioning, I present what the story is about, how it is embedded in its immediate storytelling context, and how it forms part of the larger context of second language use. Narrative analysis has potential to expand our understanding in the fields of applied linguistics and sociolinguistics, as it shows how participants’ telling roles or different discourse identities (e.g., story initiator or story evaluator) are made visible in relation to their larger social identities and discourses, as well as in relation to their local contexts and social relationship.
In this chapter, I discussed small stories, with the purpose of highlighting identity analysis and contextualized aspects of storytelling. In her well-known study on autobiographic narratives, Pavlenko (2007) offers an analytical framework to examine second language user's personal narratives. She proposes systematic analyses at both the micro and macro level in narratives, by considering content, context, and form. She highlights the interdependency among these three analytical components. In the similar vein, and more recently, Bamberg (2012) proposes that "narrative inquirers are interested in how storytelling activities are (contextually) embedded, what they consist of, and how we can take their form, content, and context as cues toward an interpretation what the particular story meant--what it was used for and what functions it was supposed to serve" (Bamberg, 2012, p.203). These two scholars emphasize the role of storytelling activities, and both micro and macro level of narrative analysis.

Though there is a great deal of research on interactional narratives, second language or multilingual data does not receive sufficient analytical attention. Due to the lack of research within this particular area, and because of the intellectual potential of such inquiry, I will suggest possible applications of interactional narrative analysis to multilingual interactions—an analytical approach which may provide profound and more holistic understandings of participants' lives.

In sum, the discussion on narratives in Chapter 2 evokes further data analysis and discussion in chapters of 4, 5, and 6, where I will discuss how the transnational women in my study collaboratively produce particular kinds of stories in diverse multilingual contexts, under what circumstances those particular stories become tellable, and what kinds of contexts encourage, promote, or prohibit stories. Furthermore, I will discuss the ways in which the participants construct their identities and maintain communities of telling and sharing life experiences and concerns.
CHAPTER 3: DATA AND PARTICIPANTS

3.0. Research Questions

The goal of this chapter is to describe my research questions, research contexts, data collection procedure, and participants. Though all researchers describe these elements, I find it especially important to provide an in-depth discussion of my research contexts and data collection procedures as a means of contextualizing the small stories that I analyzed. Doing so helps me to analyze the three levels of positioning (Bamberg, 1997) in narrative analysis, including the level of positioning in the "narrating" world, that is, the interactional context of positioning among the women, often including myself as co-participant. This level of positioning is important to analyze since this “micro-context” is in itself responsible for the ways that the women co-construct their storytelling. Throughout my analysis in Chapters 4-6, I treat this context as an analytical category, and I include as much of the “macro-context” (Pavlenko, 2007) as well by drawing on my knowledge of the women’s personal and shared histories and the sociopolitical context of Hawai‘i in which they all live.

I spent three years (2008-2011) in close contact with the key participants in this study. As I have learned more about them, I have found it interesting that, despite the presence of L1 speakers of English around them, they appear to have built their own worlds in which English serves as a valuable tool for participation in L2-English speaking communities. This has led me to investigate the following questions:

1) How do immigrant women achieve access and membership in English speaking communities of practice?

2) What kinds of social relationships do these women create and maintain in English, as evidenced in their participation in interactional narratives?

1 This is an exempted and approved study by Institutional Review Board (IRB), The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (CHS 19127). For more details, please refer to the consent form and the study description as a part of IRB application in the appendix.
3) How do the participants’ gendered identities emerge, and get negotiated in the process of collaborative storytelling?

By examining the women’s stories in various social contexts, I reveal how the concepts of participation and community of practice are realized by the women. Specifically, I seek to answer the research questions by emphasizing how they articulate their shared repertoires in storytelling: analyzing the resources the participants bring to their interactions, with a focus on how they utilize their resources to participate in the interactional narratives I am studying. First, I utilize the notion of CoP to examine how the women gain access to the 'community' of L2 women speakers. They create opportunities to regularly interact with each other in English and collaboratively tell stories about their daily lives. As a continuum of the ESL class, telling stories during break time is also linked to other social contexts. During break time, the women arrange their gathering and plan details of their meetings. Moreover, for the second research question, I will analyze different story elements including story dimensions and story participation, in order to observe the women's ways of participation in their community. Last, I will examine the ways that the women's gendered identities are collaboratively constructed and managed in the process of storytelling. In particular, by looking at how they come to have stories, and how they come to share them, I will investigate the particular kinds of stories told and maintained by the participants (because not anything and everything gets told) and how these particular stories are relevant to the women's construction of identities.

I have collected data from an ESL classroom, a work place, and different social gatherings from 2008 until 2011. About 67 hours of multiparty narrative data were collected from across three different contexts. By observing these contexts, I was able to capture the emergence of multilingualism within the various social contingencies that the participants encounter in their daily lives.

Besides interactional narrative data, I also collected interviews from the focal participants, which are 8 hours in total. I also observed the participants' language class from fall 2009 to fall 2010 after I stopped teaching at the school. I interviewed two
teachers who taught the class after I left the school; this totaled about one hour of interview data per teacher. I mainly analyze the interactional data for this study, but other types of data (i.e., interviews and observation) are used for more fully understanding the women's stories.

3.1. Research Contexts

To understand the women’s day-to-day participation in their various CoPs, I focused on the key sites where they used English. My initial encounter with the participants was in 2008, as their ESL instructor at an adult education school in Honolulu. The class met four days per week and three hours per day. I taught this class 12 hours per week for two semesters, and I noticed that the same women were taking this class over that course of time. Though the class was ostensibly to learn English, it soon became clear to me that many of the students attended the class for mostly social reasons – that is, to see their friends and spend time together. A core group in the class also regularly got together for planned social gatherings, which I was also often invited to. Besides these two contexts, I also observed some focal participants' workplaces after they explained to me that they used English at work, and typically with other L2 users. After getting permission from the focal participants' co-workers and the institution, I could access their workplaces. However, I was not able to be physically present at their work place due to research restrictions, but I was allowed to record their interaction. Therefore, to extend the scope of the study, the following three major contexts were examined and are described in greater detail below.

1. Break time in the ESL class
2. Social gatherings
3. Workplace interactions

My choice of the focal social settings for this present study was not initially planned, but these three contexts share many common interactional features despite the physical differences between language class, work place, and social gatherings. It is
crucial to investigate these different contexts in order to more fully observe participants’ linguistic and cultural practices. These research contexts are “(participants’) sites of engagement” (Scollon & Scollon 2004, p.28), and participant story sharing is determined by the varying degrees of accessibility, participation, expectations, and norms about what is/is not licensed in each space.

Table 1. Description of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Key participants</th>
<th>Types of data</th>
<th>Hours of data</th>
<th>Period of data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Break time in ESL      | Sunja, Yeon, Aya, Masako, Mayumi, Tae, Keiko | -Interactional Stories  
-Background information  
-Participatory observation (2008-2009)  
-Researcher observation (2009-2011)  
-Field notes  
-Interview with participants' English teacher | 37 hrs | 2008–2010 |
| Social gatherings       | Aya, Masako, Helen, Tae, Keiko, Sunja         | -Interactional Stories  
-Follow-up/group interviews  
-Field notes | 24 hrs | 2008–2011 |
| Workplace              | Sunja and her colleagues (Ray, Alyssa, Joy, and Lucy) | -Interactional stories  
-Background information sheet  
-Follow-up interview with Sunja | Summer 2011: 2 hrs and 30 min  
Winter 2012: 3 hrs and 40 min | May 2011, November 2012 |
3.1.1 Site 1: Break time in the ESL class

The bulk of my data come from about 37 hours of recordings of break time interaction in an ESL class, which is a relatively unexplored social setting in applied linguistics. This study was motivated by my experiences as an ESL teacher at this school. I observed that language classes are more than a place where linguistic or cultural knowledge is acquired. In addition, this study is motivated by the theoretical concerns about how immigrants learn and use English in their L2 in diverse social contexts, and what CoP means to these L2 users.

I collected data from a community school for adults supported by the Department of Education in Honolulu, Hawai‘i. The course mainly focused on communicative skills and was offered for intermediate speakers. Their proficiency was determined by an assessment created by Department of Education (DoE) in Hawai‘i. The new students in this school take this assessment test as a requirement to register for classes and to be placed in the proper English class level. In addition, at the end of the each semester, all the students have to re-take another test in order to assess their achievement for a semester. Based on the test results, the school decides whether a student will be advanced to a higher level or stay in the current English class. Since the test is constructed from a very limited question bank, some long-term students who had been attending the school for several years were able to memorize some of the questions, and thus advance based on their memorization rather than actual learning. At the same time, I observed that advancing to a higher English level did not seem to be important to most of the participants, and some of them were even willing to stay in their current class because of the network that they had developed with the classmates.

Students met four days each week for three hours per day. Many students had been attending this ESL program for several years and attended regularly for four days each week. Therefore, they knew each other very well and were more like close friends rather than just classmates. During each 15-20 minute break time, I observed that students got together and had conversations, grouping themselves based on their interests and closeness. They either stayed in the classroom and chatted or went outside and talked
in the hallway. They also had snacks or coffee, and sometimes they brought food to share with their classmates.

More significantly, break time is the place in which learners construct their social relations through interactions with each other. In 2008, I conducted a preliminary study that explored the interactions that occurred during break time in one of the advanced ESL classes I taught. Once I built up a sound rapport with the students, I asked for their permission to record their conversations. I explained that I was interested in investigating immigrant language learners' daily storytelling, not whether their language proficiency.

I asked students to self-record their stories during break time, and then to return the recording device to me. The students initially appeared highly sensitive to the presence of the recorders, but over the course of the class they grew more relaxed. They all knew that I (Ms. Lee) was conducting my research at University of Hawai‘i and treated the request as “she needs our help.” After that, I extended the possible data collection sites beyond language classes. As I had become more familiar with the women in this class, I found out that they also often get together on more casual occasions outside of class. After I joined them during a few of their gatherings, I expressed my interest in looking at their language use outside of class. When I asked for their permission, they were willing to participate in the extended scope of data collection. However, they always said, "Sure, but my English is not good." I explained that I was not analyzing whether their English was correct or not, but rather in how they tell stories in the group (see also the description on the consent form in the Appendix. Most of the data collected is in the form of multi-party interactions which include more than two people in a group, while the rest of the data is comprised of pair interactions. I chose to analyze multi-party storytelling data to examine more dynamically drafted stories.

Their regular socializing over a long period of time created a dense interactional history that often emerged in their stories that I recorded. Later I realized that this interactional history was augmented with networking outside of the class in social gatherings as well.

3.1.2 Site 2: Social gatherings
I also explored the participants' interactions in various social gatherings, including a baby shower, a Thanksgiving party and casual lunch meetings. In addition, the participants often got together for lunch after finishing the class, and they also joined different types of social gatherings on weekends. The gathering was usually initiated by a few people with their suggestions for exploring new good restaurants. At these social gatherings, the participants shared their concerns and exchanged daily life issues.

I got an access to this group as I was invited to these gatherings. The women often asked me "Ms. Lee, can you join us for lunch after class?" "Do you have any plans for Thanksgiving?" "It's Yeon's baby shower, can you come?" etc. At the beginning, it was more formal invitation and they treated me as their teacher, but later as I joined more gatherings, my relationship with them at the social gatherings became more casual. That made me more frequently join their gatherings. Recording the conversation outside of class became a usual thing and when I was not able to join the social gathering, they asked me first if I want them to bring the recorder. In this case, not always the recording was successful because sometimes they forgot push the recording button or it was too loud outside setting. However, recording their conversation became routine among these women.

This context also related to the ESL class since they usually plan their gatherings in class, particularly during their break time. Not many of them had other roots of communicating each other like texting, facebook, or even email. They have an account but not many of them regularly check their emails. That makes English class was the time and space that they arranged other social gatherings. I would say the women's social gatherings seemed as an extension of their interaction during the lunch time. Thus in the case of impulsively scheduled social gatherings, usually the participants who attended class joined the gathering after class. The participants often bring their husband or friends to these meetings, so the people in the social gathering data are not limited to the focal participants.

They often went out for lunch after class to the restaurants near the school because not many of them drove to school. They sometimes had lunch at local Japanese, Chinese, or Korean restaurants. Among these restaurants, they often go to Chinatown in
Honolulu by taking the bus together. In Chinatown, there was a Chinese restaurant owned by Jose's close friend, so the women could get a "senior discount" (something that does not exist in the store, but is just called that by the women) when they go there for lunch. The women also went to various festivities together if these happened in town, or sometimes one of the women invited others to her house usually for lunch. In gatherings outside of class, they talked about various topics including other classmates, their family, and cultural differences. Social gatherings outside of language class were very fruitful times for the participants. They themselves voluntarily created opportunities to get together, for example, inviting each other to social events and attending cultural festivities together. Apart from showing physical aspects or time, social gatherings show the women's willingness to put extra effort in getting together. During this time, they could unreservedly tell stories about their daily lives, share information, and consult with one another about their life concerns – topics that were less likely to be shared in other contexts. The participants' regular socializing over a long period of time created a dense interactional history that often emerged in their stories.

3.1.3 Site 3: Workplace interactions: A Case Study

Besides break time in language class and outside of class social gatherings, I also investigated a workplace. During the summer 2011 and winter 2012, I collected data from a local workplace. The reason why I wanted to look at workplace data is to see how the women create their social relations in a different community. Investigating workplace offer me an idea that what sort of encounters the participants regularly have. Exploring workplace interaction gives me insights into the ways in which the women construct or participate in other CoPs in different contexts, that is, contexts other than their adult community of L2 women.

As for the workplaces, very limited number of the participants got jobs and started careers at the time I was conducting this research. Others already had jobs; one example was Sunja, who was a part-time nurse at a nursing home in Honolulu since 2010. I asked her to be the focal participant since she seemed to be interested in sharing her work experiences with other women in class.
Based on my observation and accessibility, I selected Sunja's place of employment as a target work place. Sunja reported to me that the participants interacted with other co-workers and customers mostly in English. However, I only analyzed the stories among focal participants and their interaction with co-workers, excluding the interactions with customers in order to observe continuously and repetitiously occurring stories. The reason why I did not include her use of English for her job (e.g. serving customers and communicating with patients in the nursing home) is due to the nature of the interaction, which is more like onetime and spontaneous communication and hardly carries deep social networks. Additionally, at work, they often have institutional restrictions and are given interactional goals to accomplish within this context, rather than openly constructing casual and personal social relations.

The interaction between Sunja and her co-workers was collected during their break times by Sunja, with the consent of her co-workers. Sunja’s main job was taking care of elderly people at a nursing home. Since each worker had a different schedule, they usually started and finished their lunches individually. Sunja collected the data as a primary participant: she turned on a recorder while she was having lunch with her co-workers. In addition to these recordings, I conducted follow-up interviews and questionnaires with the workers in order to better understand the research setting and participants’ backgrounds. Exploring participants’ workplace interaction provided an insight into how the participants interacted with others in diverse social contexts and what kinds of social relations they created in the workplace. More importantly, exploring a workplace helps me better understand how the participants create and maintain their CoPs in different ways in diverse social contexts. This is the value of a case study on workplace interaction for the wider study as well.

Three women Sunja, Masako, and Mayumi had a job at the time of this research. Thus they came to school only for the days that they did not work. Masako worked at a Japanese travel agency, and Sunja worked at a nursing home. Mayumi worked at a Japanese restaurant as well as a souvenir store in Waikiki. Sunja's work site required her to speak English. However, Masako's and Mayumi's workplaces did not require them to use much English at work because the most of the customers were Japanese.
In addition, it was challenging to get workplace data from the other two settings because of the institutional restrictions and accessibilities. In addition, by focusing on one workplace, I gained more in-depth data. Unlike classroom contexts, work places are not familiar to me, so follow-up interviews were conducted as a useful way to understand workplace dynamics.

3.2. Motivations for Data Collection

The analysis of participants’ stories from different social contexts is imperative since it captures shared ways of doing things, beliefs, and values in diverse contexts and shows how local CoPs and the relations within them are constituted. The data analysis required me to look at their lives holistically and to closely examine when, where, and for what purposes they use their stories. To this end, I needed to collect their stories in a range of contexts where they used English.

Social gatherings are sites where the participants create a space of their own accord. Therefore, I chose to collect data at these sites in order to observe the ways in which the participants form their own social group beyond the ESL class. Creating and maintaining the social group takes more complicated steps such as whom to invite, whom not to invite to the gatherings, and what types of activities they want to do with each other in what ways.

Considering Georgakopoulou’s (2007) emphasis on the significance of the storytellers’ shared interactional history, I continued working with the same group of women as they frequently got together and shared their private stories. However, my decision to focus on this data does not mean that all of the core members in the group got together all the time. Sometimes they were away from the group or new members joined the group. This provided me with insights into how the CoP works. The newcomers are finding their ways ‘in’ to the group – while others are maintaining their in-status somehow. The stories all had gender-related themes so that gender emerged from my interest in narratives. In the next section, I will explain the participants' profiles and background information.
3.3. Participants

At the initial site of the ESL classroom, data was collected from a class of 38 students. A large majority of students were women, and only five of them were men. The students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds were diverse. Considering their visa/legal status, the students’ population is largely categorized into two groups; 1) Short-term stayers or sojourners 2) Long-term immigrants: old-timer (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The former includes those who had dependent visa, F2 status (dependent of student visa), J2 status (dependent of visiting visa), and GED preparation students who usually stay in ESL class for a short time to prepare themselves to take GED (general educational development, in other word, high school diploma class). On the other hand, some students were permanently moved to Hawai‘i as immigrant, retired immigrant, and retired returnees.

There are largely two different types of immigrants in Hawai‘i: those who stay for a short period of time, and those who remain relatively longer. For the former type, the students came to the U.S as dependents of their spouses who work or study in Hawai‘i. They attended the class for a relatively short period time (from a few months to couple of years). Long-term immigrants, by contrast, had attended the class for several years. They are typically retired from their first or second job they had after having migrated to the U.S., and have been attending English class for the purpose of passing their time and making friends.

Table 2. Participants’ Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name²</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity of spouse</th>
<th>Length of marriage</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Number of years living in the US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aya</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>20 yrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Participants’ names are pseudonyms.

³ All of them use English as their second language.
In the end, I focused on long term and short term participants who attended an ESL class. Participants were in their early 30s to early 70s. Almost all participants who were involved in the data collection happened to be women. The participants frequently got together and shared their personal stories. The women who were involved in the preliminary study were Aya, Helen, Keiko, Masako, Mayumi, Sunja, Tae, and Yeon, and they participated continually in this study. They all met at the school and considered each other to be very close friends, having known each other for several years. They mostly sat together in class and often chatted with each other during break time. The male students were occasionally involved in interactions with other female participants, but their participation was very limited. One of the examples is Wong. Wong was known as a "good gentle man" or "good husband" in this group and was often compared to other female participants' husbands. In the following table, I list more details about the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>Years of Residence in the U.S.</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Filipino Tagalog</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>retired</td>
<td>20 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiko</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>early 50s</td>
<td>Anglo-American English</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masako</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>24 yrs</td>
<td>travel agency</td>
<td>24 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayumi</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>mid 40s</td>
<td>Czech, English</td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
<td>waitress, seller</td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunju</td>
<td>Korean, German</td>
<td>late 50s</td>
<td>Korean, Korean</td>
<td>35 yrs</td>
<td>nurse</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tae</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>70s</td>
<td>Japanese, English</td>
<td>50 yrs</td>
<td>retired</td>
<td>20 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeon</td>
<td>Korean, German</td>
<td>mid 30s</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participants to provide relevant background information for making sense of their stories and understanding their dynamic interaction during break time.

As this chart shows, many of the participants have a spouse who does not share their L1. The relevance of considering the spouses' ethnicity or languages is how much the women exposed to use English in their daily lives. I also included the length of the participants' marriage since it matters to some stories in the later chapters.

3.3.1. Participants' Profiles

Eight women (Aya, Helen, Keiko, Mayumi, Masako Sunja, Tae, Yeon) participated in this study. They migrated to the US and attended adult English as a second language class together. In this section, I will explain each of focal participants’ biographies in a detailed way.

Aya
Aya is a middle-aged Japanese woman who moved to Hawai‘i after her husband retired as an architect. She had also stopped working as a stage hand in theaters in Japan. At the time of the research, it had been three years since she came to Hawai‘i. Since she had to take care of her family members in Japan, Aya frequently visited Japan for a couple of weeks. The reason that she and her husband chose to come to Hawai‘i is that it is close to Japan, but more importantly, the couple thought that they might have a less stress in learning English or speaking "good" English if they came to Hawai‘i.

Helen
Helen, a Filipino immigrant, came to the US in her 30's. She was in her early 50’s at the time of the research. She lived with her youngest son who was attending college. She had been attending the English class for about four years. Besides English, she also speaks Tagalog. When she was young, she had different jobs including cashier and waitress. She did not work anymore at the time of this research, but hoped to go to culinary school to be a cook.

Keiko
Keiko is a Japanese woman who came to Hawai‘i a few years before she got married to a Hawai‘i local who was ethnically Japanese. After becoming a newly joined member and a newly married woman in the group at the beginning of this study, her stories and status
often became a topic in the group. However, interestingly, even after a few years when she was not newly married or new member anymore, other group members treated her as a new member in this group.

**Masako**
Masako, a Japanese woman in her early 50s, was married to a Chinese man. She had lived in Hawai‘i more than 20 years and they had a daughter who went to college a few years prior. She spoke English and Japanese and had a very limited knowledge of Chinese.

**Mayumi**
Mayumi was from Japan in her 40s. She came to Hawai‘i about 10 years prior to the time of the research – after she getting married to her husband who was from the US, but ethnically identified as Czech. They settled in Hawai‘i after they got married. Mayumi was a work-and-study student in the class, so her participation in break time or outside of class gatherings was somewhat limited because of her work schedule. She was the only person who lived with her mother-in-law and supported her. Her relationship with in-laws often became a shared topic for the stories in this group. Though her work schedule as a waitress at a Japanese restaurant and a seller at a local souvenir store was very tight, she regularly attended the English class to meet and continue interacting with other group members. Other group members often visited the restaurant where Mayumi worked to see her.

**Sunja**
Sunja, in her late 50th, is a Korean woman who was born and grew up in Korea, but had spent half of her life in Germany. After a couple of years of attending the school, she got a part-time job at a nursing home as a certified nursing assistant. Her main job was taking care of the elderly people at a nursing home. Before she came to Hawai‘i, she was a nurse for about 20 years in Germany, and she re-immigrated to the U.S from Germany.

**Tae**
Tae was the oldest participant in the group and had lived in Hawai‘i almost 50 years. She came to Hawai‘i when she got married to a local Japanese person. She had been attending the ESL class more than 10 years at the time of the research. She started school from the
beginning level, but when I first met her, she had been in a high intermediate class for several years. She worked at a duty free store and retail store in Honolulu when she was young, but she was retired. When she stopped working, she started attending the ESL class.

**Yeon**

Yeon is originally from Korea but spent a few years in Germany before she came to Hawai‘i. She was a high school teacher in Korea but moved to Germany and Hawai‘i because of her husband's graduate study. At the time of conducting this research, her husband did his post doc and she was one of the short-term stayers in the class. While she was attending the class in 2009-2011, she had her second baby. Hence, her pregnancy, delivery, breastfeeding, and child-raising often turned out as the topics that they shared in the group.

3.4. Language use among the participants

In this section, I will provide further details about the participants' language use at the three sites. The participants had the opportunity to speak in English with each other and make friends, which was often their main purpose for attending the ESL classes. In classroom discussion and interviews, I found out that their use of English beyond the classroom was very limited, for some of the focal participants, the classroom was the only space where they could use English in their daily lives. The classroom dynamics, then, revealed that the contexts in which the participants used and interacted in English were dominantly created by the participants both in and outside of class. Of course, they certainly had chances to interact with L1 English speakers outside of the class, such as in service encounters. However, their long-term, solid, and meaningful social relations were with L2 English speakers like themselves.

The following excerpt shows the women’s lack of opportunity for English use outside of the language class. Before this excerpt, the participants talked about one of the recent assignments they had to do, which was about practicing certain English expressions with other English speakers excluding their family members. They shared their difficulties finding a partner with whom to do their homework. Then, they started
talking about who they usually interact with in English in their daily lives besides their classmates.

Excerpt 3.1. ‘She’ is safe!’
(Aya, Keiko, Mayumi, Sunja)

1 Sunja: I don’t have many cases to use English,
2 maybe only in the elevator? hhh.
3 I start to talk what they have. hhh.
4 (2.0)
5 Aya: yeah I can talk about what they have
6 like yesterday, somebody has a cake, so I said
7 “oh, going to party?”
8 Mayumi: yeah. like “somebody’s (. ) birthday?”
9 Aya: yeah, yeah right.
10 Keiko: when you see baby in the elevator,
11 you have to start with she: um
12 (1.8)
13 Sunja: she is safe, haha[hah
14 All: [hahahahaha,
15 Mayumi: right. hahaha
16 Aya: I like that idea. hahaha
17 or a dog, what’s your puppy’s name?
18 Sunja: maybe she is safe here too?
19 All: hahahaha
20 Aya: yeah that’s successful hahaha

In this excerpt, the women shared their experiences of small talk in an elevator and made a joke about gender references and preferences. Sunja explains that she does not have enough opportunities to use English and gives a possible place to do small talk, which is inside of an elevator. She also gives one practical tip how to initiate the conversation. Aya acknowledges Sunja's suggestion and provides a recent example of the case. In line 8, Masako elaborates the ongoing story by adding more details. In line 10 Keiko turns to the case of the baby (if someone has their baby with her/him), and she suggests that using "she" instead of "he" is a safe way of initiating a conversation, particularly about the baby. This recommendation brings a laughter in this group because they shared the meaning of using male reference (boy) in a wrong way to refer a girl in the case that they are uncertain about the gender. This joke is from the women's shared stories. Yeon one day told the episode that someone in the elevator said to her daughter
that "Oh, he is so cute, like a little sumo player." Yeon got mad at this happening and shared this story with other members. The women in this excerpt feel use the pronoun "she" is safe because they think it's better to accidentally say that a boy is a girl (than to say that a girl is a boy). Therefore, the laughter might be something related to their shared stories of what would happen when you call a girl a boy.

In line 16, Aya shifts the topic to a dog and proposes a possible way for initiating a conversation in this case. However, rather than follow-up the case of a dog, Sunja links the case of dog to the previous topic, which leads laughter in this group. This excerpt shows that the participants have little opportunity to use English in their daily lives outside the ESL class. Small talk in an elevator is perhaps the only opportunity for them to use and practice English with L1 speakers, and they shared their experiences and useful tips on how to safely initiate and continue such conversations, rather than being embarrassed or losing their faces.

Learning new things in class is crucial to them, but they often told me one of their needs for learning English is not to lose what they have already known. Coming to class is being involved in English-speaking contexts, so that they can use their English as a means of maintain what they have learned so far. In addition, coming to English class is more like their hobby, which is corresponding to taking free Tai chi class or swimming class. Learning English is more like passing time and making friendship in their community to the participants. They often told me, "it is better to come to class than just staying home." or "it prevents my dementia develops." This conversation and discussion in and outside of English class give additional insights into their needs of using English.

In this respect, it is important to highlight that the participants in this study are different from those in previous studies taking place in an adult immigrant ESL class. First, previous studies on immigrant language learning highlight immigrant learners’ resistance to attend school or refusal to be categorized as ESL learners. Unlike earlier studies, the women in this study are highly motivated to come to the ESL class and diligently attend the class. Though their choice to come to school sometimes competes with other plans, they choose to come and practice their English with their classmates. Considering the fact that some participants had been attending the school more than 10
years, being present in an ESL class is their choice and language class serves as a very special space for them to practice English and build relationships beyond the language class. Thus, the language class not only functions as a location for obtaining knowledge, but also as a place in which to cultivate social relationships.

The goal of the class was to aid in immigrants’ socialization processes so that they can obtain a job or possibly higher education. The goal of this adult immigrant language school is described as follows:

“Adult Education is concerned with life-long learning and programs are designed to accommodate the interests and changing needs of individuals as they seek to expand their knowledge and improve their skills as parents, workers, citizens, and participating members of communities. Adult Education program areas include Naturalization, Adult Basic Education, Adult Secondary Education, Home-Family Education, Cultural-Recreation Program, and Senior Citizens Program.”

(http://mcsa.k12.hi.us/jobs.html)

The immigrant adult school emphasizes linguistic and cultural accommodation and socialization, and development of the students' social roles. From my experiences of teaching at the school, and listening to the students’ stories, social function of language learning including making friends and maintaining their social relations seem to be the most important reasons for them to attend the ESL class. In the next section, I will discuss how I position myself in this study and how I am positioned by other participants in the process of conducting this research.

3.5. Positioning the Researcher

The initial stage of data collection began in an adult ESL immigrant class that I taught in 2008 and 2009; therefore I could build contextual familiarity to this research site. While I was teaching at the school, I was rarely involved in the students’ break time interaction (except to set up the recordings), as I usually spent this time in the teachers’ room to prepare for the next class. However, after I left the school, I was still invited to share in the women’s life events for a couple of years, which I attended as often as possible. Our relationship retained elements of teacher-student interaction as the women still called me “Ms. Lee”. To learn the participants’ lives and ‘the way (participants)
understand what they are doing’ (Watson-Gegeo, 1988, p.576), I wanted to be a part of this community, and tried to understand their stories as an insider as much as possible. My own L2 status in Honolulu gave me an advantage to access the women’s community and we often shared stories related to language learning and use. Getting to know the women by joining them across different contexts changed our relationship from teacher and students to friends, and they started considering me as one of them at some point in this research.

Initially, the women identified me as someone who could offer ESL advice. At social gatherings, they often shared their language learning episodes with me. They told me stories about the kinds of mistakes they made or the difficulties that they faced accessing an English speaking network. Some of them asked me to help them write a business letter or job application. Sometimes they asked me to explain manuals or instructions for their new electronic products or medicine. Besides English, they asked questions on how to use a computer or how to find some information in internet.

Conversely, I sometimes contacted them to get some information since many of them had lived in Hawai‘i for longer than me and knew lots of local information including where to get a particular product or material at a good price (e.g. which store has better ox tails and how to access a local tofu factory to get fresh tofu). I tried to alter the "ESL expert" identity by asking them about their expertise and they also stop treating me as only an ESL expert over time. Thus, I was more or less involved in their gatherings not only as a researcher collecting information and audio data, but also as another woman wanting to share her life concerns and stories.

Additionally, when the topic of culture arose, the participants gave me the role of a Korean expert and asked me questions about Korean culture. Thus my presence as a Korean woman teaching English was often taken into account, and even shows up in some of the data. Interestingly, the way in which I was characterized in these interactions changed as I went through different life stages in the course of conducting this research, such as getting married and having a baby. The following conversation occurred when several students and I had lunch together and complained about our husbands.
When Masako complains about her husband, she makes a joke about a Roomba (automatic vacuum cleaner) that is better than her husband in helping with house chores. This short excerpt shows that the women agree that my recent change in marital status makes me eligible to fully join this group of women. As this example shows, interactional histories, shared knowledge, categories take a very important role in collaboratively constructing social relations. As another example, the local context of Hawai‘i plays an important role in the interaction. The participants are oriented to the local context of Hawai‘i and utilize the local cultural and linguistic resources to build a shared ground for telling their stories. In the following section, I further discuss the shared information and interactional history by the participants.

3.6. Shared interactional histories

The women's regular socializing over a long period of time and the dense interactional history which often emerged in their stories as a result is a crucial part of my analysis. As Pavlenko (2007) emphasizes in her often-cited study, narrative researchers have to know the interactional history, past, and contexts in order to adequately investigate what the participants tell and how they tell narratives. Contextualized narrative data not only provides background information but also helps to interpret participants’ narratives with a deeper understanding.

---

4 Roomba is an autonomous vacuum cleaner.
Therefore, utilizing ethnographic information does not mean accepting what participants say as factual, but rather, finding relevant larger historical or institutional processes or discourses where the study is situated, and then contextualizing this information in the immediate storytelling setting. This ethnographically informed narrative study contextualizes the participants' current experiences of learning and using English. Ethnographic information is then carefully unpacked to analyze participants’ stories.

As explained elsewhere, Geogakopoulou (2008) highlights the importance of contextualized aspects of narratives, since her participants' interactional history and shared knowledge play an important role in analyzing the data. Goodwin and Duranti (1992) view context as something that can offer the tool for interpreting a particular event which encompasses from setting and participation and the sequential organization to the community's shared knowledge. In this respect, a narrative is viewed as an activity constructing social meaning within local and global contexts (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012). Schiffrin (1996) explains that when people tell their experiences, they "situate that experience globally (p.168)." At the same time, they also locate it locally in relation of here-and-now interaction. Therefore, global and local contexts are relevantly emerged in narratives and it is difficult draw a line of two contexts.

One such example that shows the participants' shared knowledge is the participants' nickname practice, which was then extended to additional meanings over time. The women first use the the Japanese word “ōsha” (‘king’) in their interaction. Mayumi, one of the participants in the group, worked at a Japanese restaurant called “Ôsha no gyōza” (Dumpling King). Because of her work schedule at the restaurant, she had to leave the class in the middle of the lesson and students named the specific time, 10:40 a.m., or “ōsha time.” However, the reference did not stop there. The participants sometimes got together at Ôsha for lunch and the usage of the word was becoming a reference for Mayumi and common even for some in the group who did not speak Japanese. The following short example shows how the participants started referring to Mayumi as “ōsha girl” as her nickname. Though Mayumi was in her mid 40s, an age
when one is not normally referred to as "a girl," the use of this nickname by the women demonstrates a ludic and way to construct intimate group culture.

Excerpt 3.3a ōsha girl

1  tae: who brought this ice cream? did you see?
2  keiko: green tea?
3  tae: yeah.
4  sunja: [I don know.]
5  keiko: [that (.) the osha girl.
6  aya: what's- who is osha girl.
7  sunja: mayumi? she work at osha restaurant, no?
8  keiko: yeah. she brought it.
9  (3.0)
10 tae: um. she left already?
11 keiko: yeah.

The nickname, ōsha girl was first introduced by Keiko when the women talked about who brought green tea ice cream at the gathering. Even though Keiko brought the nickname in the group, Sunja could guess who the nickname refers to based on the idea that Mayumi works at the restaurant called ōsha. At first, the word ōsha was introduced as a restaurant's name where Mayumi worked in this group, and then became a nickname for Mayumi. However, later, the women began to use the word “ōsha” in a way that corresponds to the English words “early” or “in the middle of something,” which is linked to the women's observation that Mayumi often left early for her work as seen in lines 10 and 11 in the except 3.3.a. The women's telling about Mayumi and shared experiences serve as a reference for the later story.

The following excerpt shows how the reference ōsha was carried across the time, and how the meaning developed. It is not only about how a particular Japanese word was circulated in the group, but these two ōsha examples show how different slices of small stories are linked together and work as references and shared resources. This is a narrative resource because the previous telling of ōsha girl and the shared event that Mayumi left early for work as a vehicle for meaning-making in the following chain of story in the group.
Excerpt 3.3b  ōsha time

1  aya:  what time do you want to meet tomorrow?
2  keiko:  how about 10:30?
3  aya:  okay.
4  sunja:  but I have something at 12.
5  keiko:  I have to leave early.
6  keiko:  it's okay. you can leave ōsha time then
7  sunja:  yeah, hahaha

The excerpt 3.3b. is a projection, one of the small story types proposed by Georgakopoulou (2006 & 2007). Projection might be the most neglected and marginalized narrative types in narrative analysis (Norrick, 2000), but planning in this excerpt involves co-authoring and negotiation of details. It involves a future event and in this case, Aya, Keiko, and Sunja are in the process of choosing a time to meet. When Sunja expresses concern that she has to leave early because of another appointment, Keiko uses the word "ōsha" to refer to "early time." Keiko's use of the shared word brings laughter in this group as seen in the following line. This example demonstrates how the participants use their shared word and interactional history in their interactions; their joke contributes to building strong bonds each other through mutual knowledge, which also allows the participants access to their particular community, and to achieve the group membership.

The following chapter is the first data chapter among three where I begin my analysis of story dimensions and the members' storytelling participation. In Chapter 4, I will investigate story dimensions and the women's storytelling participation to demonstrate the ways they co-constructing community and build their group membership. In Chapter 5, a work place interaction will be examined and I will explore how the participants use their shared repertoires (including linguistic and cultural resources) in storytelling. The analytical focus in that chapter is to discover how the shared repertories of stories are relevant to constructing social relations. In Chapter 6, I will examine the women's positioning by analyzing different speaker roles in narrated world. By analyzing how the women take different speaker roles and bring others' voices into the narrated
world, I present the ways that they construct their own identities and position others in the storytelling world.

CHAPTER 4. CONSTRUCTING GENDERED IDENTITIES THROUGH STORY DIMENSIONS

4.0. Introduction

This chapter explores three story dimensions and investigates how these are related to the women's participation in storytelling and to their construction of community. By examining how the women participate in story embeddedness, story tellership, and story tellability that a narrative displays to differing degrees and in different ways, I investigate how they make claims to their belonging in their shared community. Story dimensions have been investigated in various interactional narrative studies to discuss issues including storytelling contexts, telling roles and participation, and storytelling rights (De Fina and Georgakopoulou, 2012; Ochs and Capps, 1996). Particularly, tellership has been widely discussed with the emphasis on how people achieve it in specific interactional contexts. Tellership is not just given, but is achieved and established, and thoroughly shapes the course and structure of narratives. This idea is strongly related to the shift in perspective from storytelling as a teller-centered activity to storytelling as a collaborative process, which highlights the participation of others in telling narratives. The nature of a story's emergence and co-construction, which is largely illuminated by Ochs and Capps (2001), can be explained by the idea that tellers make sense of the event with other people, 'telling a story with someone' (p. 91), rather than telling a story to someone. The issue of co-construction of storytelling or of sharing tellership is further discussed by Goodwin (1986, 2007). He distinguishes different degrees of participation by examining “interactive footing,” including the role of gaze in constructing different positions for story recipients; these distinctions show that recipients are also treated differentially by the teller(s). In their similar but more recent discussion, De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012) elaborate these different types of recipient roles as follows:
"the audience of telling may be composed of knowing vs. unknowing recipients, principal recipients, ratified recipients, recipients who may be promoting a teller's view or who may be delegitimizing or undercutting the telling activity, offering side comments, introducing other topics, etc" (p.92).

The different audience types and participating patterns are not only related to issues of entitlement and participation status, but they also influence the nature of a particular group's interaction. In this study, I focus on close-knit group interaction, which is in line with studies on intimate groups of people and their stories -- including friendship groups, and families (Blum-Kulka, 1993; Ochs and Taylor, 1992). These studies show intensive audience participation, which impacts participation frameworks, and shapes the way a story is told. Story openings seem to be less elaborate when tellers and recipients have intimate relations and regularly interact with each other (see also the discussion on shared stories and their introduction in Georgakopoulou, 2007), which implies that they carry shared knowledge.

The discussion on story dimensions in this chapter also draws on the idea of two crucial features of interactional stories, specifically, local occasioning and sequential implicativeness, which are proposed by Jefferson (1978). The notion of local occasioning reveals that narratives emerge in a particular interaction and in relation to local contexts; this is closely related to story embeddedness, which is discussed in the following section. Moreover, the concept of sequential implicativeness is defined as a reaction to a story, which includes evaluation on characters in a story, moral of a story, and a second story (i.e., a thematically related account that magnifies the points from the previous story; see examples in Norrick, 1993; Ryave 1978; Sacks, 1970, 1992). In these cases, once a story is told, it influences the talk that follows, as well as the way it develops. In this respect, sequential implicativeness is crucial, considering that it is related to the issue of how a story is accepted by audience. In other words, if a story does not have sequential impact on the following telling, it will arrive at interactional failure, which requires the teller(s) to offer an altered story. Keeping these two features of interactional stories in mind, I will investigate what elements make a story newsworthy, as well as who achieves storytelling rights, and in what ways these are achieved.
4.1. Story Participation

Ochs & Capps (2001) describe multiple co-tellers and their different degrees of storytelling roles and types of action. In multiparty storytelling, certain storytellers contribute more or less in ways the story is shaped. Similarly, some stories are accepted and some are not, and particular topics are deployed more easily than others. By investigating the three interactional features, embeddedness, tellership, and tellability, I show how telling roles, emerging story structure, and the larger social roles and identities are linked each other. This examination also presents how stories are away from beyond the immediate storytelling context.

In the sections to come, I ask questions including: who participates in the narrative interaction?; In what ways a story is achieved?; How do the multiple tellers in the group shape unfolding stories?; and, How can the telling rights and tellability of a story be shifted? To investigate these questions, I examine the women's story participation and its relation to their involvement in a community of practice.

4.2. Story Dimensions

In this section, I focus on how these three dimensions are at play in the women's stories. First, I discuss how the women achieve their tellership within the particular interactional environment. My discussion is informed by an analysis of excerpts on pregnancy, women’s complaints about their mothers-in-law, and a story about one of the member’s “non-traditional” husband. These three elements are more or less found in multiple stories, and therefore act as representative stories across the data I collected. Finally, I also discuss the implications of the women’s collaborative participation in storytelling.

4.2.1. Narratives and Embeddedness: Contextualized Interaction

Stories are anchored in a specific context, and telling stories is a process of ongoing contextualization of those very stories. Georgakopoulou (2007) notes that narratives occur in different kinds of discourse environments, and they are entangled with the culture(s) and language(s) present in local surroundings.
In this particular context of the women’s social gathering, their experience or knowledge about pregnancy works as an embedded interactional resource. The women share their stories based on their daily lives, and the topics are culturally and socially embedded; they include married life, pregnancy, and relationships with their in-laws. The following excerpt about Yeon’s pregnancy reveals how a story is collaboratively produced by Aya, Masako, and Sunja to perform social actions such as building solidarity. Yeon was pregnant, and other members of the group already knew about her pregnancy. Aya and Masako came to where Yeon was seated during break time and the interaction began when Aya asked a question.

Excerpt 4.1. “You can wear Muumuu.” (a projected small story) (Aya, Masako, Yeon)

1   Aya:   so (.) how old? (.) how many months?
2   Yeon: five [hehehe
3   Masako:  [wo:w but you have small belly, right?
4   Aya:    yeah but maybe next month she will have a [big belly.
5   Yeon:   [yeah I will be a
6   Yi:g you see (  )
7   A,M,Y:  ((laughter))
8   Aya    but don’ t wo:rry you can wear Muumuu though. hehehe
9   A,M,Y:  ((laughter))
10  Masako: yeah nobody knows ya? Hehehehe

Yeon’s visible pregnancy is shared knowledge in this group, and Aya asks a question about how long she has been pregnant. In line 1, she repairs her question from “how old” to “how many months”. Yeon’s answer in line 2 provides the information that Aya wants to know. Yeon’s laughter overlaps with Masako’s compliment (and surprise) about Yeon’s small belly. In line 3, Masako then reveals her expert knowledge on the size of a pregnant woman’s belly, and provides a comment with a comparative perspective.

In line 4, Masako’s comments are taken up by Aya in the form of agreement, and then Aya reveals her expertise on the size of pregnant bellies, a comment that is related to the projection (i.e., the near future event) of Yeon’s future state. In line 5, Yeon agrees with the projection and extends it by referring to herself as “a pig,” a jointly-understood
metaphor among the women that brings laughter to the group. In line 8, Aya takes up Yeon’s worry about her physique and provides advice to wear a loose article of clothing, which might conceal Yeon’s big belly. This advice is a contextualized joke based on shared knowledge of what a *muʻumuʻu* (‘Hawaiian dress’) looks like. This joke is based on the women’s agreement that a *muʻumuʻu* is something loose enough to hide a big belly. Because the women highlight the *muʻumuʻu* as maternity wear, rather than as formal or traditional dress for the local context, their joke points to their interpretation of this dress for their own uses, arguably indexes their non-local identities. While some local women may also wear muumuu as maternity-wear, this is not its most salient index in Hawai‘i among local and long-term residents. Hence, this excerpt shows how storytelling is contextualized and established by the members’ shared knowledge regarding pregnancy and Hawaiian clothing. The use of insider jokes brings laughter as a boundary mechanism for consolidating group culture and distinguishing insiders from outsiders (Tepper, 1997). Participants co-construct their boundaries in the specific contexts of social encounters. Pregnancy is a universally gendered topic, but the women utilize their local resources for constructing pregnancy as local social bonds by making reference to the muumuu as a way of dressing a pregnant body. This example also shows how past experiences (line 3 about the pregnancy and the size of the belly) shape expectations for future stories (lines 4 and 5), and that main storylines are constituted by breaking news (a news report on pregnancy), by introducing projections (near future events), and by introducing hypothetical scenarios (wearing a muumuu).

Storytelling requires specific context and telling a story is interwoven with the local context of telling in an intricate way. This is also related to who has telling right in that local context. With the local context, it establishes a particular reality.

### 4.2.2. Who is Telling a Story? Narratives and Tellership

Tellership is another prevalent aspect of women’s stories, and it shows storytellers’ floor holding rights, as well as their management of story sequences. Ochs and Capps (2001) define tellership as "the extent and kind of involvement of conversational partners in the actual recounting of a narrative. (p.24)" Co-tellership is
tightly related to third turn completion, invitation, and minimal responses among interlocutors.

The participants collaboratively contribute to telling stories, and their contributions link with the social identities and various affiliations in the group. In addition, these women’s participation forms differ from one another both in the degree of contribution and the different types of contribution. Next, in excerpts 2a and 2b, I examine (1) how story structures emerge and are negotiated by multiple storytellers, and (2) how women get opportunities to participate in telling and sharing their experiences. Mayumi starts off by telling a story about her mother-in-law who she portrays as possessive of her son, Mayumi’s husband. The traits of mothers-in-law and Mayumi’s complaints work here as shared knowledge for married women who might experience difficulties related to in-laws.

Excerpt 4.2. “You cannot take my son hundred percent”
(Aya, Masako, Mayumi, Sunja)

1 Mayumi: father was very nice to me hehe
2 but mother was very no um (.) looks:
3 Masako: mean
4 Mayumi: yeah yeah mean [mean and and
5 Sunja: [ah
6 Masako: jealous?
7 Mayumi: yeah yeah a lot of jealous and (.) but an-
8 we live together but room is separated o-of course
9 and but she came to she came our room every:
10 once every thirty minutes
11 Aya: um
12 Mayumi: everyday
13 Sunja: oh [every
14 Mayumi: [everyday °everyday° so after that I[yeah
15 Sunja: [what you see=
16 Mayumi: =yeah
17 Sunja: what you ( )=
18 Mayumi: =yeah
19 Sunja: what you do=
20 Maymi: =yeah yeah
21 she want to know everything everything everything
22 Masako: ah
23 Sunja: ah
24 Mayumi: and she said you cannot take my son
This excerpt illustrates how complaints are formulated by multiple tellers, and how shared complaints offer a room for co-tellership as well as a discursive site for belonging in a community of practice – in this case, a community of (intercultural) marriage women who experience challenges with their mothers-in-law. Mayumi initiates a story about her father-in-law in line 1. Masako contributes to Mayumi’s search for the right adjectives to illustrate the characteristics of mothers-in-law. The words “mean” and “jealous” are offered in contrast to the evaluation, “very nice” that Mayumi uses to describe her father-in-law in line 1. Mayumi looks for others’ assistance, and Masako offers the two evaluative attributes. In line 3 and 6, Masako assists Mayumi to complete her turns by providing possible words that show mothers-in-law’s personality traits. Mayumi takes them up in a very highly affiliated way. The contributions these women make are based on the participants’ shared knowledge of characteristics of mothers-in-law. The women’s shared knowledge is thus the foundation for their participation in telling.

This interaction reveals an emergent story structure and its development, which are important aspects of co-telling. Mayumi confirms aspects of her mother-in-law’s personality, which are also constructed by other members. Mayumi initiates a detailed canonical story from line 8. Mayumi’s story shows that there are canonical stories told as a deployment of abstracts, orientations, complicating action,

Mayumi’s use of “every” emphasizes the mother-in-law’s behaviors and it is taken up by Aya and Sunja in lines 11 and 13. Sunja provides inferences in line 15, 17, and 19, and these inferences about the possible reasons for the mother-in-law’s "invasive" behavior assist Mayumi to continue her complaint. At the same time, Sunja’s inferences increase the credibility of Mayumi’s irrational mother-in-law’s actions and intensify the seriousness of the case. These ideas are accepted by Mayumi, and she formulates an extreme case by repeating “everything” in line 21. In lines 9, 10, 14, and 21, Mayumi emphasizes the wrongness of the mother-in-law’s behavior (Pomerantz, 1986), and
Sunja’s suggestions, based on inferences, in lines 15-19 serve to propose the possible details of the story. The interplay between uses of extreme cases and inferences in the unfolding of the story helps the women co-tell the story.

In telling a story about her own mother-in-law, Mayumi offers her co-participants the opportunity to share in the co-construction of the characteristics of all mothers-in-law. We can see Mayumi’s mother-in-law stands out in this story. Other members respond to Mayumi with surprise (rising tones in lines 22 and 23), her story stimulates others’ curiosity, and they entreat Mayumi to say more. Therefore, commonality and exceptionality co-exist as an interesting balance in this excerpt. Even though Mayumi’s mother-in-law stands out in this story, the commonality of a difficult or demanding mother-in-law can be considered an interactional resource shared by participants. The mother-in-law’s frequent visits are evaluated negatively by other group members. Sunja and Masako encourage Mayumi to tell her story, and by asking for more detail, for her to add richness to the story; at the same time, they forge ground for themselves to participate in storytelling. Like Mayumi, Sunja and Masako also had experiences of living with their mother-in-law. Masako often told the group about her past experience of living with her Chinese mother-in-law and Sunja often shared her experiences of her mother-in-law when she lived in Germany.

After Masako and Sunja respond with surprise in lines 22 and 23, Mayumi elaborates on her mother-in-law’s jealousy with reported speech. Mayumi reports that her mother-in-law does not allow Mayumi to have time alone with her husband. By quoting her mother-in-law, Mayumi constructs her mother-in-law’s identity in the storytelling world as a jealous woman. At the same time, her use of reported speech serves as a powerful tool to strategically construct Mayumi herself as a pitiful and helpless daughter-in-law. Mayumi also holds the floor and keeps her tellership. This excerpt shows how the women collaboratively share their experiences of being a daughter-in-law. Though the main storyteller is Mayumi, Aya, Masako, and Sunja are aligned with each other and collaboratively outline the story. Sunja’s contributions to the interaction are in support of Mayumi’s complaints, even though she herself can understand why the mother-in-law is possessive due to having only one son. Mayumi’s
story brings us to Sunja’s inquiry into whether Mayumi’s husband is an only son or not in line 26. Sunja proposes that the possible reason of the mother-in-law’s regular visits is based on the fact that Mayumi’s husband is the only son. Sunja tries to search for a justifiable reason for Mayumi’s mother-in-law’s obsession, and after receiving Mayumi’s answer, she expresses that the mother-in-law’s behavior makes sense. Thus, without any other elaboration such as asking further questions or providing more explanations, Sunja reveals her understanding; this response is unnoticed by other members, however. Even though she says she understands the reason behind the mother-in-law’s intrusiveness, her response does not condone it. Line 28 also reveals Sunja's shared understanding of the special status of the only son. The women involve themselves in storytelling by contributing and proposing ideas about the mother-in-law, and this process shows how they build their affiliation based on their shared experiences or shared knowledge. These women are seeking commonalities, and this attempt is realized through taking part in constructing a shared complaint. The participants focus on their shared understanding of the identity of “daughters-in-law” who have experienced difficulties with in-laws, and who can complain about it. Moreover, the analysis also shows that tellership is not only about the co-telling, but it also related to how people speak others' voices and how they influence each other in the course of telling.

As co-tellership demonstrates the women’s participation in storytelling, what makes a story tellable is also an important question to investigate, since it is related to the significance of events for particular interlocutors and to the way in which events are shaped in narratives. In the following section, I examine what makes a story tellable.

4.2.3. Who Can Make a Tellable Story? : Narratives and Tellability

Tellability refers to participants’ orientation to what locally constitutes a story. Tellability is required no matter what genre of story is in question and in what ways the story is produced; this is because a story can only be told when it is newsworthy, tellable, or reportable, so that the audience(s) will want(s) to listen to the story (Labov, 1972; Norrick, 2005; Sacks, 1992; Thornborrow and Coates, 2005). In this sense, the storyteller is in the position to bring a hearable story, hold and maintain the floor, and finally show the relevance of her/his story to the ongoing interaction (Liddicoat, 2007; Sacks, 1992;
In this way, interactional narrative studies underscore tellability as an important dimension, since it indexes the significance of the events (e.g., Kiesling, 2006; Menard-Warwick, 2007).

In this section, I investigate how a story is produced within extended turns, which are developed and maintained by the primary speaker(s). The women in this study are differently legitimated by one another based on who can make a tellable complaint. In particular, I am interested in how tellable complaints are interactively achieved. After reading an article in our ESL class on shifting gender roles in different cultures, Sunja, Masako, Mayumi, and Keiko began to talk about their husbands and house work.

In the interaction, the husbands and their lack of contribution to household duties are clearly shared topics, which make them accessible and tellable among the women. Masako especially deploys her complaints about her husband, and this is taken up by the other women. The following excerpt illustrates how complaining about a husband is a ritualized interactional practice for the women. Based on what kinds of husbands they have, and how complaint-worthy they are, the complaint stories entitle the women to the interactional floor in different ways.

In Excerpt 4.3, we see how having a tellable complaint is required for participation in the complaint stories when Keiko initiates a story that highlights her husband’s active contributions to the domestic duties.

Excerpt 4.3. “My husband does do everything.”
(Aya, Keiko, Masako, Mayumi, Sunja)

24 Keiko: uh in my case nandakke ((what do you call it))
25 my husband uh uh does do everything hehehe
26 Every house >chores< cook:ing, cleaning the ro:om
27 Laundry So I- I- I [have no ((smiley voice))ahaha
28 Masako: [:oh:::
29 Keiko: >I am sorry< uh so nanka ((like))
30 I I think nanteyuuka ((how to call it))
31 Sunja: japanese or=
32 Mayumi: =american
33 Sunja: °american°
34 Aya: he does everything.
35 Keiko: he does everything.
36 so nanka I-I-I- I feel very sorry a- disappointing
37 uh (.) about myself. [hehehehe
38 Sunja: [hehe]
39 Keiko: I can’t uh nanka ((like)) take part in as a
40 housewife uh:
41 Masako: how how long you you have been married?
42 Keiko: uh (. ) six months.
43 Masako: six months okay=
44 Sunja: =oh [okay
45 Mayumi: [okay okay [hehehehehehehehehe
46 Sunja: [heheheheheheh ((con’t line 51))
47 Masako: just married=
48 Mayumi: =yeah yeah just married.
49 Sunja: aha hehehehehehehehehe
50 Aya: yeah that’s right.
51 Mayumi: hehehehehehe
52 Keiko: just married is good part I hav nandakke new[ly
53 Sunja: newly
54 ((whatchamacallit)) [newly newlywed yeah °I know°
55 Mayumi: >yeah yeah yeah yeah yeah<

This excerpt shows how certain complaints are treated as tellable while others are not. Keiko tries to join the group by complaining about her inability, but this is not accepted by others. After a long pause in line 23, Keiko initiates her story and tells the other women that her husband does all the house work. Masako shows her surprise at Keiko’s unusually good husband in line 28, and Keiko apologizes for her inability to belong in the group in line 29. This excerpt shows that two factors – her husband’s cultural background and the length of the marriage – are the important elements to consider. In line 31 Sunja asks about the nationality of Keiko’s husband. Mayumi answers “American” based on her background knowledge. This reveals that, for these women, checking where her husband grew up is the key to explaining his unusual involvement in housework. Sunja leaves the possibility that Keiko’s husband has a non-Japanese background. In line 41, Masako changes the topic to the length of the marriage. Considering that some other participants in this study have been in married for more than 10 years (see Table 1), Sunja and Mayumi claim their authority regarding how husbands who have been married longer cooperate, or fail to cooperate, at home. After Keiko mentions that she has been married for six months, they laugh throughout the conversation without any further explanation.
Keiko attempts to join the group and finds a tellable story. In line 30, Keiko searches for a word to continue her story, but other members interrupt and check details about Keiko’s husband. Sunja asks about Keiko’s husband’s background, which is answered by Mayumi. Additionally, Aya in line 34 confirms that Keiko’s husband does all the house chores. Keiko confirms what Aya has said and continues her story. Keiko’s apologies are further deployed in lines 36 and 37 as forms of emotional self complaints. In lines 39 and 40, Keiko explicitly labels herself as not good enough to participate both in her home and in the story as a “housewife.” In line 41, Masako asks about the length of Keiko’s marriage in search of a clue to explain Keiko’s unusually happy case. Keiko’s newlywed status is discovered, and it creates a social division between her and the other women. Keiko’s answer causes continuous laughter from Aya, Masako, Mayumi, and Sunja, but the source of laughter is not explicitly explained by anybody in this group.

In line 47, Masako confirms Keiko’s newlywed status and this is taken up by the others. Keiko evaluates her marriage in line 52. Keiko switches to a Japanese word *nadakke* (“whatchamacallit”) as a form of searching for the word. Here the word “newlywed” is one they recently learned in class. Sunja and Mayumi show their understanding of the word, as well as their agreement upon Keiko’s evaluation. Keiko tries to tell her story, but in this group of women who have established themselves as housewives who complain about their husbands, her story does not fit. The other members do not assist her in continuing her story; they only focus on Keiko’s newlywed status. The story continues with the women withholding the storytelling floor from Keiko with regard to telling complaints, as Masako tells her to “wait one more year” (line 56).

Excerpt 4.4. “You better wait one more year.”

56 Masako: so: you better wait one more year=
57 Sunja: =yeah↑
58 M, M, S, K, A: ((laughter))
59 Mayumi: ( ) change
60 Aya: yeah↑::
61 M, M, S, K, A: ((laughter))
62 Masako: now you have to enjo:y=
63 Sunja: =“yeah”
64 Masako: just (.) let him do=
65 Sunja: =“yeah”
As an expert who has been married for a lengthy period time, Masako suggests in line 49, “you better wait one more year”. This advice is taken up by Sunja in line 57 and the other group members laugh together in the following turn. In line 62, Masako shows her expertise by giving advice in imperative form. Sunja provides agreement with Masako’s idea in lines 63 and 65. Also, Masako projects Keiko’s husband’s future behavior with confidence. By giving Keiko advice, Masako declines Keiko’s right to complain as a housewife. Despite this advice, Keiko apologizes again regarding the fact that she does not live with in-laws, who are the source of many complaints among the other women in the group (see excerpt 2). In line 72, Keiko gets admiration from Mayumi which interferes with her efforts to continue to complain. In line 74, Masako again reassures Keiko about her worries, but Masako’s advice also carries an implication that Keiko will eventually be qualified to join the group of expert housewives who can complain about their husbands. Finally, in line 77, Masako shifts the topic to Chinese culture, and she searches for a new bit of common ground. Chinese culture might be more general, and appeal to others in the group. Changing topics is one possible way of discrediting a teller, as it indicates the current story is being ignored (DeFina and Georgakopoulou, 2012).

In this excerpt, it is interesting that Masako abruptly ends Keiko’s narrative by asking about Chinese funeral customs. Because her experiences as a housewife are very limited, Keiko’s narrative is contradicting the gendered perspectives that this community
of practice has constructed in this intercultural space. Masako, as a more powerful community member, first offers her interpretation of the narrative and then shuts the topic down entirely. In her study that considered gender identity construction, Menard-Warwick (2009) looked at how claims of non-traditional gender identities were met with laughter, or were not accepted by students in ESL classroom discourse; this seems to mirror the ways in which the women in this analysis respond to Keiko’s narrative about her husband.

In this excerpt, I highlighted the multilayered roles of women’s apologies or complaints. The question that emerges is whether they are really apologizing and complaining. I suggest that the apology or complaint works as a bid for attention as well as a bid for sharing experiences -- and that these bids carry emotion, which is shared by the women. In this respect, Keiko seems to be quite successful in using social strategies to be the center of attention, control the topic, and in her choice to ‘stay out’ of the ongoing conversation as a newlywed housewife. Keiko asks for them to help and take care of her with certain emotion. Expressing and taking up emotions such as envy, jealousy, or empathy can be considered ways of expressing affiliation and disaffiliation in storytelling (Lee, 2013). This excerpt draws our attention to the following questions: Who deserves to complain?; and, Who can make a tellable complaint? The answer seems to lie in how the women allow and disallow various actions in their talk, which are in turn related to their life experiences and their shared understandings of problems such as difficult mothers-in-law. Through ratifying certain contributions as valid complaints, they police interactions by placing certain requirements for complaining, and they accept or reject the opportunity to take the floor and make their story tellable. In addition, tellability (narrativity) not only shows the women's participation in story plots but also in habitual engagement.

4.2.4. Habitual Engagement in Storytelling.

To further discuss story dimensions and participation, in this section, I investigate the habitual aspect of identity in storytelling. In the following excerpt, Keiko mentioned her relationship with her husband with Tae, Lee, Masako, and Helen. This happened a few years later than the first data had been collected. Thus, Keiko was no longer a
newlywed as she had been married for several years at this point. However, Keiko's newlywed status was still circulated in this group as a topic of the story, and it also related to how Keiko involved in the group.

Excerpt 4.5. "10 years okay?" (Keiko, Lee, Masako, and Tae) (May, 2011)

1 Keiko: my-my husband support me.
2 Lee: mm
3 Keiko: we have a-I have a question
4 Lee: mm
5 Keiko: yeah he explain=
→ 6 Tae: =eh only five years
7 All: hahahahah
8 Tae: more than ten times ahahahaha
9 Masako: what? Yeah
10 Keiko: I cannot. Hhhhh

In this excerpt, Keiko initiates her story by explaining how supportive her husband is. However, in line 6, Tae raises an issue that her husband's kindness is from their relatively short length of married life. Even though Keiko's length of marriage is slightly less than five years at that time, Tae uses this number in an exaggerated way to makes a contrast between Keiko's relatively newlywed status and her own marriage in line 8, where she implies that she has been married for 50 years. In line 10, Keiko reaffirms not only her identity as a 'newlywed' woman but also a less experienced member of this group, who still cannot fully participate in this group.

The projection of the story explains that Keiko's taking a role of a neophyte regarding her lack of marriage life experiences and having less complaints regarding her husband are continuously circulated in this group. It is arguable that her being married for about five years does not stand for "newlywed" anymore, and it may not a newsworthy to the group members. However, Keiko is being positioned and takes the position of less experienced marriage women in this group, which also works as a tool to receive attentions from other women. Keiko's positioning also implies that small stories which are regularly practiced in the group offer a space for constructing a consistent sense of self in avoidance of deviating the group's expectation. She might get more tellership if they talk about other topic rather than complaints about their husband. Her marriage might keep her on the outskirts of tellability when they the women tell this topic, but on a
flip side, Keiko uses her position in this group to stay in this group by sharing her status as resources.

4.3. Further Analysis

After Soo gave birth to a baby, she returned to the school after a few months of the break. The women shared a story about breastfeeding together. In the following excerpt, I link the following data analysis to the thread of discussion above and the three aspects of the story dimensions that I have examined.

Excerpt 4.6. Breastfeeding

(P: *Pearl (Korean) Y: Yeon  A: Aya *D: Desiree (Chinese))

(Pearl and Desiree attended the same adult ESL school with Yeon and Aya, but took a different class. They are not the focal participants who join the group in a regular basis, but when this conversation was recorded, Pearl and Desiree happened to be with other women.)

1 Y: my my first daughter: (1.2) suck "my" hhh.
2 P: very strong?
3 Y: yeah. s- one year
4 P: ↑.hhh a:::
5 Y: one year=
6 P: =ah: that’s good.
7 D: breastfeeding one year?
8 (0.7)
9 Y: even even the breastfeeding is ahaahah
10 A: but it’s common in japan (. ) one year.
11 Y: *yeah*
12 P: ah
13 D: *oh* yeah.
14 (0.8)
15 Y: common in every : where= 
16 P: =yeah
17 Y: in deutsch
18 P: if you can (. ) yeah
19 Y: yeah because I was just a house (0.5) wife *yeah*
20 P: ah:::
21 Y: *just a housewife* (1.2)
22 I have enough time to take care [of
23 P: ↑[yeah. I had to go to work
24 D: yeah if you=
P: =yeah
A: oh sugoi ('amazing')
P: yeah
D: it’s kinda XX difficult [breastfeeding
A: [ehee::
P: I think (0.2) so this is kinda of menta::l (0.5)
D: uh problems mental relationship with bec-
A: uh I didn’t have a much ↓↑luck (0.6)
P: yeah it’s kind of stress=
D: =yeah
P: [because I had to go to the work
D: [that’s the problem (. ) right?= 
P: =yeah
D: that’s the [problem.
A: [↑↓oh: (0.4)
D: [and then you have to drink a lot of xx
P: usually I don’t drink a lot.
A: [↑oh
D: [that’s right you don’t
A: oh we hav-(0.9) mother have to::
D: >yeah<
A: oh::
D: mother like mi:lk (. ) or sweed soup=
P: =yeah shiweed soup (. ) [<important> yeah
A: [↑ehee:
P: yeah seaweed shoup hhhh. ((smiley voice))
Y: someone recommend drinking beer.
P: beer?
A: [ehe?
Y: while breast feeding
A: really?
Y: beer is very lo:w alcoho:l (. ) and the=
A: =ehe:
Y: they make a some (. ) ma- [big
A: [eh
Y: very mu- very many moisture [in the in the body
P: [↑ah
Y: so (0.5) that’s why we are going to bathroom,
Y: when we drink (. ) beer.
A: so (. ) >some say< it’s [no harmful (.) for [baby
A: [*yeah*
Y: even it- its [harmful
P: [yeah: I am not sure yeah:
D: I am not sur- (0.6) first time XXX hhhh.
Y: >I saw< I saw the the a:rticle in the baby magazine.
(0.7)
P: [ah::
A: [↑↑oh:::
Y: so it make the people say hh.
Y: it make a (0.6) breastfeeding a lot.
75 A:  um:
76 D:  that’s the that’s a::: that’s a evidence,
77 or just somebody write an article
78 (0.5)
79 Y:  yeah=
80 D:  google “research”
81 Y:  hahaha

In this excerpt, Yeon who recently gave a birth shares her experiences of breastfeeding with this group, and the other members share their own direct or indirect experiences of breastfeeding. This excerpt shows that based on Yeon's breastfeeding story (from line 1 to line 22), how the other members of the group collaboratively (re)construct each other's past experiences. At the beginning, Yeon recalls her past experience of breastfeeding for her first child and her story serves as narrowing down the topic to the length of the breastfeeding. Yeon's one full year of breast feeding receives Pearl's evaluation in line 6, but Aya in line 10 generalize the case, which prevents Yeon's further stories.

This excerpt also shows how the women normalize their experiences by making sense of their intercultural knowledge. The women construct what is considered morally acceptable. For example, the meaning of "normal" first introduced in line 10, is constructed by the participating women. They use their own cultural experiences and expertise in a highly affinitive ways.

In sharing information about the helpful food, Yeon offers "beer" which is considered as unusual food for breastfeeding mother in line 51. After other members' suspicion, in line 69, Yeon provides her epistemological knowledge from baby magazine and the logic to support her opinion. However, Yeon's attempt is disturbed by Desiree's challenging the source of the information (line 76~80) that Yeon provided to support her opinion, which prevent her keeps telling her story.

In line 18 and 19, Pearl shows the contrast between two different group introduced in this group but in line 19, Yeon offers immediate response, trying not to make Pearl feel bad about her experience. This example shows that the process of obtaining tellership also carries solidarity function rather than occurring in a competitive way.
As for the telling right and performance right, some scholars have investigated the ways in which telling rights related to the entitlement to tell the story (e.g. Blum-Kulka 1993; Sacks 1970; 1992; Shuman, 1986). For example, Sacks 1970/1992 examines tellership in relation to first hands experience. In other words, a teller who has experience of the topic of the story can have primary right to tell a story. Thus, an experience gives a right to tell a story. For instance, Aya who does not have any relevant experience in this particular story, minimally participated in the interaction. In line 44, she gets on the story and initiates the story with the first person plural pronoun, "we" but does self correct to mother as a means of excluding herself in her newly introduced story. Aya's self exclusion shows who possesses the right to tell a particular story in a group.

On the contrary to this, in Yeon's case, sometimes her ownership rights and performance rights become complicating and we can see one does not necessarily determine the other. Even though Yeon has knowledge and authentic experiences of breastfeeding, her claim (lines 61~63) does not accepted by other women in the group. This shows that the telling rights are controlled and redistributed.

The analysis of story dimensions also implies the following points. First, this story uncovers how the participants building their identities in the course of constructing a norm; how long is the normal period of breastfeeding and what are the helpful foods for breastfeeding. By showing the normative way of doing things with bringing their cultural knowledge, what they do is constructing their identities as certain types of mothers or women and at the same time drawing intergroup distinction (mothers vs. non mothers, complete breastfeeding vs. fail to complete breastfeeding).

In this respect, this excerpt also shows how the participants construct each other in this relation. In the form of conflicting story of "what is normal breastfeeding" the women bring their intercultural knowledge. Furthermore, the analysis also shows how the participants' roles in storytelling world impact their identities, and vice versa. Overall, the analysis also shows gender identities may not be constituted by the contrast with the other gender and may it occurs by contrasting with “other versions of the same gender” (Cameron, 2005, p.487). Storytelling can enhance a sense of understanding since it provides a space for teller(s) to propose their own view and from this, they build
solidarity. However, storytelling is not always cooperative. This excerpt shows that doing self is also linked to other interactional work including challenging each others' viewpoints. In the jointly drafted and constructed process of telling, the women negotiate and contest different cultural norms. More discussion on self and other will be analyzed in chapter 6 more in-depth.

4.4. Summary

Although break time in the ESL class is an institutionally assigned time and space, the women in this study use that time and space for constructing social relationships with one another. They draw on different topics, build affiliations based on shared experience and knowledge, and construct their own community of practice where they use their identities as daughters-in-law or as housewives who can complain about their husbands to participate. The women also actively participate in co-drafting stories so that they can hold tellership and achieve their interactional and social goals. Such aims include setting up an atmosphere of companionship, having an impact on one other’s sense of identity, and building intimate relationships. The co-construction of experience through joint storytelling not only provides these women with the opportunity to participate in their L2, but also with a space for belonging. The examples show that not everyone belongs equally, as is true for all CoPs. When Keiko did not have the life experiences necessary for telling a complaint-story about her husband, her role as a teller was effectively withdrawn by the other women. Similarly, Tae in excerpt 4.6. claims more tellability based on her life experiences in combination with the ways that they tell the story and get ratified as telling legitimate stories. Therefore, the women's tellability in the group is realized in ways that they claim their more or less legitimacy in the group.

To capture dynamic participation in storytelling, I considered three narrative dimensions: embeddedness, tellership, and tellability, and the links between these dimensions. These three components are in the continuum rather than as separate entities. People's involvement, their tellership, stories tellability can be different in the course of telling.
The analysis also shows that the three dimensions are relevant both to narrating as activity and to narrative as text. Each narrative dimension establishes a range of possibilities which are seen in particular narrative performances. I found that expressing complaints is a dominant interactional feature for the women in this study. Their stories were culturally and socially embedded, and they used contextualized interactional resources to make a joke or to project future events. Tellership was a very prevalent aspect of women’s stories, for it showed storytellers’ floor holding rights and sequential story management. Finally, we see that tellability is conceived of as participants’ orientation to what locally constitutes a tellable story. The members in a group must have access to shared knowledge, and not all complaints and involvements are necessarily accepted. For example, Keiko’s newlywed category, and the lack of significance of her stories to the particular interlocutors in this group, prevented her from crafting a tellable complaint. In the stories, gendered identities emerge and become a predominant topic in this group. As the first excerpt reveals, the universally gendered topic of pregnancy becomes local when the women utilize their local resources for constructing social bonds.

How the women involve in the process of collectively telling stories is also related to how they construct their social relations in their community.

To sum up, the data show that these women bring knowledge and expertise to their friendship groups. By showing and sharing their cultural resources, they created opportunities to unfold their stories. Sometimes they did not fully participate and were marginalized, or the groups even broke down due to constraints in their shared experiences. Considering the larger social contexts, the specific gendered identities the women constructed were relevant to a multi-ethnic family context, as in Mayumi’s case. For example, their collaborative story of mother-in-law shows that the way that tradition getting referenced in their stories is seen as construction of norms which are attached to certain cultural group. Whether the ideas about cultural norms are from the women's own experiences or other circulating discourses around them, the key is how the women utilize those ideas in their telling as shared resources.

In the following chapter, I will explore how the women construct their shared knowledge, and how they use it in collaborative storytelling. They use linguistic devices
to collaborate in telling a story. The chapter illuminates concrete ways of utilizing linguistic and cultural devices, and adds new dimension to the investigation of story participation discussed in the present chapter. In particular, the storytelling participation in this chapter can be compared to the ones at work place community.
CHAPTER 5. USE OF SHARED REPERTORIES IN STORYTELLING

5.0. Introduction

In chapter 4, I explored three interactional features: embeddedness, tellership, and tellability. The analysis illuminated that a story's tellability or reportability is an indispensable requirement for a story to be told. One common restraint in storytelling is that a teller has to tell a story which is not yet shared by the listeners (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell, 2010). However, this constraint becomes more complicated in the case of multi-party storytelling, especially when the group of people regularly interacts with each other and has extensive shared interactional histories. In addition, as we have seen in chapter 4, the notion of primary speaker often becomes indistinct, and the process of preserving a spot to tell a story in ongoing talk, and maintaining the floor, may become convoluted because of shared tellership by multiple speakers (Lerner, 1992; Ochs & Capps, 2001; Thornborrow & Coates, 2005). If we look at this from another angle, repeated or shared stories can be crucial interactional resources, as discussed in many recent interactional narrative studies (Georgakoploulou, 2013; Koven, 2002; Norrick, 1998; Prior, 2011; Schiffrin, 2006).

Extending the discussion from the previous chapter on story tellership, this chapter examines what kinds of shared story features are found, and how they are employed in multiparty storytelling contexts. Specifically, I investigate how the participants make use of shared or unshared linguistic and cultural repertoires. These two interactional features were often found across the three research contexts in my study, but in this chapter, I examine excerpts from workplace interaction.

Since not all primary participants have a job, and not all work places are accessible to collect data, I selected Sunja’s work place – a nursing home for the elderly. Since her interaction with patients at the nursing home was not open to research, I elected to examine her interaction with co-workers during break time after receiving the consent of the workers who often interact with Sunja. She communicated with her co-workers at an employees’ lounge, and their interaction was collected and analyzed. In this study,
only the break time interactions among the workers were collected due to the issues of residents' privacy.

Work-related topics such as stories about patients, co-workers, and work schedules often come out in their conversations, but participants also talk about more casual topics surrounding their daily lives, including what happened the previous day or what they plan to do after work. In addition, since this group consists of people with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, they share their own (and by extension, others') cultures and languages in their storytelling.

The goal of this chapter is to investigate workplace storytelling, and more specifically, how these immigrant workers construct their identities and social relations with co-workers. My main foci in this chapter are the ways in which the participants utilize repeated and recycled repertoires, and the roles these resources play in the participants’ relationships with one another. Principally, I scrutinize the use of shared humor and repeated story structures. Examining what kinds of shared resources they use and how they use them are related to the issues of how they construct a sense of who they are in relation to others in the community. It is closely related to how the women achieve access to their social networks, which is a key research question in this study.

5.1. Background

Following Labov's (Labov & Waletsky, 1967) leading study of narratives, most narrative studies examined stories of personal past experiences that were not shared with the interlocutor. In these studies, the narrating world is treated as occupied by one teller who has floor-holding rights and the secondary recipients or the audience who do not have access to that experience. Over the past several decades, the focus of investigation in story retelling has shifted—from early research on structural differences between original and retold stories (e.g. Chafe, 1977; 1998; Ferrara, 1988; Hymes, 1985), to more recent explorations on interactional dynamics and contextual issues of multi-party storytelling (e.g. Blum-Kulka 1997; Ferrara 1994; Georgakopoulou, 2007; Norrick, 1997, 1998). More recent studies observe interactional stories in relatively unexplored areas including online communities such as Facebook as storytelling contexts (Page, Harper,
and Frobenius, 2013). I follow Georgakopoulou's (2008) definition of shared stories, which states that "stories that are oriented to in interactions as familiar either because they have been told in the past or because the events reported in them are known to all or some of the participants, regardless of whether they have been narrativized in the past or not" (p.224). Recently, Georgakopoulou (2013) incorporates ways of telling, sites, and tellers as major elements to analyze iterative aspect of stories, and her positioning analysis also demonstrates how constructing iterativity in story links to one's stable identities. She discusses the issues of continuing aspect of self over time by analyzing the circulation of a story in different settings and the reappearance of a story in similar settings. These story features show "repeated enactments of social roles" (Georgakopoulou, 2013, p.92) regularly retold in an intimate group as a means of building group-bonds and solidarity. Turning to my data, I focus on repeated components found in the participants' stories, and how those elements have impact on the participants’ building of identities and social relations. The focus of analysis in Chapter 5 is about the participants' use of shared interactional resources.

The following excerpt show an example of how the participants use shared interactional resources. The first example is from Sunja's workplace. Sunja's co-workers often use the name of Ryan Bang, a Korean celebrity from the Philippines, after one of her co-workers mentioned him in their conversation as in except 5.1. At first, Sunja did not know about Ryan Bang, though the other workers put in some effort to explain him to her. Later, Ryan Bang was often mentioned in the participants' conversation. The following examples demonstrate how the interactional resources get generated and carried across time.

Excerpt 5.1. "this guy his name is Bang?"
(Alyssa, Lucy, Ray, Sunja)

1 Lucy: sunja, I am gonna tell you something.
2 Sunja: yeah.
3 Lucy: we have this actor (.) he's Korean.
4 in philippine.
5 Sunja: yeah?
6 Alyssa: he's so::: funny.
7 Lucy: yeah he's so::: funny.
Sunja: is he Korean but speak English?
Ray: our dialect is tagalog so he speak it.
but this guy his name is Bang B A N G
Sunja: bang.
Lucy: bāng.
Sunja: yeah bang.

This is the first telling that the participants tell about Ryan Bang in the group. Lucy introduces the famous Korean celebrity in the Philippines, and explains that he is very funny and speaks Tagalog. After Ryan Bang is introduced in the group, this character is often used in the group. The following example shows how this shared resource is used for their social function of inviting Sunja to the ongoing interaction.

Excerpt 5.2. "You know Bang?"
(Alyssa, Lucy, Ray, Sunja)

Lucy: she don’t understand she don’t understand XXX
Alyssa: yeah
Lucy: let him ta:lk
it’s just like=
Alyssa: =talking nonsense to her
Lucy: yeah.
Ray: ((to S)) you should you should come to the
Philippine and you can be like an artist Bang
like Bang
you know Bang?
Korean Bang?
Sunja: yes. you told me last time.

In this excerpt, Sunja does not participate in the ongoing story, but Ray brings their already shared resource into the discourse to both change the topic and offer an opportunity to Sunja to join in the telling of the story. By confirming whether Sunja had heard about Ryan Bang, Ray offers a chance for Sunja to join the ongoing story. This example shows that these participants explicitly reveal acknowledgement of shared resource. However, interestingly, the story about Bang does not continue after line 19, which shows using Bang as a shared resource has a social function in the group. The shared resource about Bang is known due to its being retold in the group and it becomes implicit knowledge shared by participants.
5.2. Workplace as a Research Site

Second language research involving the work place has received much attention, encompassing a body of literature in which researchers investigate participants’ various linguistic and cultural practices. Workplaces are considered alternative (outside of a language classroom) sites for English learning and use (e.g. Goldstein, 2001; Gordon, 2004; Homes, 1993; Rockhill, 1993), and as part of the social sphere, workplaces are considered sites of socialization (Duanduan, 2000; Duff, 2000, 2008). Thus, the participants’ institutional, professional, and social or personal discourses at workplaces have been investigated (Robert & Sarangi, 1999). Besides these investigations, as well as research into how participants deal with work related topics and the business at hand, recent work place studies emphasize a greater variety of issues, including multilingualism (Clyne, 1994; Higgins, 2009; Lippi-Green, 1997; Pauwels, 1994; Roberts, Davies & Jupp 1992), language learning (Belfore & Burnaby, 1995; Jupp & Hodlin, 1975), gender (Cameron, 2000; Ford, 2008; Goldstein, 2001; Gunnarsson, 2009; Katz, 2000; Kouritzin, 2000; Li, 2000; Peirce 1995; Norton, 2000), and ELF interaction at work (Firth, 2009; Poncini, 2002; Virkkula-Räisänen, 2010).

Across a variety of L2 research at workplaces, many researchers focus on communicative success regardless of participants’ first language and culture or other language and culture. In contrast to canonical intercultural communication studies, however, I choose not to focus on language difficulties and misunderstandings in interaction, but rather to emphasize the importance of investigating participants’ language use, and the way in which this depends upon the contexts in which a particular interaction takes place. Linguistic and cultural difference can be used as a bridge, or a way to invite others into participation frameworks (Higgins, 2009; Ryoo, 2007). Furthermore, another focus of this chapter is the ways in which the participants create opportunities to share stories and how they use their cultural and linguistic resources in their workplace interaction. I emphasize how the speakers put efforts into achieving and negotiating mutual understanding with respect to their languages and cultures. What I seek to present is how such cultural practices characterize interactions not necessarily as interference but as mechanisms that work to display participants’ identities.
This chapter investigates in the process of constructing social relations, how the participants' different identities are articulated in the workplace; I do this by examining ongoing interaction and story deployment in these groups of participants, as well as by examining the multifaceted process of identity construction, especially the construction of the participants’ ethnic and gendered identities.

5.2.1. Humor at Work

Among different features of workplace interaction, I am interested in investigating workplace humor to more closely observe how the participants intentionally exercise their shared linguistic or cultural resources in storytelling. Holmes (2000) defines humor and language in interaction as follows,

"utterances which are identified by the analyst, on the basis of paralinguistic, prosodic and discoursal clues, as intended by the speaker(s) to be amusing and perceived to be amusing by at least some participants (Holmes 2000)."

As this quote explains, humor is intentionally produced by speaker(s) and, at the same time, it has to be perceived by listener(s). Holmes and colleagues (2007) have been investigating humor within the workplace for many years; they claim that humor not only contributes to effective workplace relationships but also stimulates the business at hand. Humor at work is considered as a way of helping manage the tasks of doing work, including creating workplace relations (e.g., hierarchical), or building a collaborative working environment. I investigate the social functions of sharing or using humor in interaction at work with a slightly different focus. I observe how the participants in this study build social relationships and achieve their interactional goals by telling a funny story.

Identifying humor is closely related to various contextual factors, including audience response (Marra, 1998; Holmes, 2000); furthermore, humor can be subdivided into various categories including sarcasm, ethnic jokes, and sexual jokes. In many studies, humor is often considered as off-topic or as an interruption that obstructs the efficiency of work (Higgins, 2009; Schnurr & Chan, 2011). In this chapter, however, I observe that the workers' lunch time interaction is casual and relaxed, although it is still within the
physical context of work. As such, it is similar to the ESL break time conversations in that the participants are sharing an institutional identity (ESL learner, worker) but are not actively engaged in the institutional practices during the conversations. Here, it is important to note that, besides humor's predominant function to amuse, it also serves as a means of constructing ethnic or gendered identities and inviting or rejecting new members in a group. In this section, I thus investigate whether gender and ethnicity related humor serve to build solidarity and rapport, and how these are perceived by the participants.

5.3. The Context and Questions Investigated

This chapter examines the workplace storytelling practices of a group of transnational workers at a privately supported nursing home in Honolulu. Specifically, I investigate the interactions between Sunja – one of the principal participants in this study – and her co-workers during break time. The participants are all certified nurse assistants, and they have one 30 minute break time in their seven hour shift, in addition to several shorter breaks. Since each of them has a different work schedule and works different shifts, it is uncommon for all of them to have a break or lunch time together. However, I purposefully selected data generated by the same participants during their shared 30-minute break times to observe their continuous interaction over the course of data collection. The following three focal questions led me to investigate this research site: 1) What resources do the participants repeatedly bring to their work place interactions? 2) In what ways do the participants utilize their resources in constructing their identities and social relations? 3) What does a closer analysis of shared repertories in the workplace interaction tell us about CoP? Keeping these questions in mind, in the next section, I will describe more about the data and data collection procedures.

5.3.1. Details of the Setting, Participants, and Data Collection

The initial purpose of the data collection was to explore the participants' professional relationship storytelling at work. However, it turned out that the topics taken up by the participants were not limited to work. They tell about their daily lives, share information, and make jokes together. This chapter employed multiple methods of data
collection. First, I collected Sunja’s participation in telling and sharing stories with her co-workers during the summer of 2011 and the winter of 2012. About 8 hours of lunchtime interaction was collected in total. To accomplish this, I gave a digital audio recorder to Sunja, and she asked her co-workers for permission to record. She turned on a recorder while she was having lunch and talking with her co-workers. Thus, the recording happened while Sunja was on break and when there was at least one other co-worker interacting with her. The times at which participants in this chapter usually started and finished their lunch depended on their individual schedules. Besides recording, background information is completed by the participants, and follow-up interviews with Sunja were conducted in order to better understand the research setting, participants’ backgrounds, and their interaction. The background information gathered is as important as the work place interaction data, since the researcher was not able to be present at the workplace to collect this data. These multifaceted methods, which include a range of external sources and recordings of participants’ workplace interaction, extend the scope and methods used in previous studies on workplace interaction.

The main participant Sunja is a Korean woman who was born in and grew up in Korea but spent half of her life in Germany due to the job opportunities there to work as a nurse. She is currently a part-time certified nursing assistant. Her main job is taking care of the elderly people at a nursing home. Before she came to Hawaii, she was a nurse for about 20 years in Germany, and then she re-immigrated to the U.S. In the data presented here, I gathered interaction from among Sunja and her co-workers, Ray, Lucy, and Alyssa, who are from the Philippines, and Joy, who is from Hawaii. The following table provides more detail about the participants in these workplace interactions.

Table 3. Workplace participants’ background information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunja</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korean, German</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Participants’ names are pseudonyms.
Based on the above description of the research context and participants, in the following section, I explore the use of shared knowledge in storytelling by the participants. I begin with how the participants use shared knowledge in their interaction; this is followed by an analysis of shared humor and story structure, which are the central points for this chapter.

5.4. Shared Knowledge in Storytelling: The Case of Tahong

In this section, I demonstrate in what ways the participants utilize their shared resources in storytelling. The participants in this chapter also use their shared cultural and linguistic knowledge in communicating with each other. The excerpts in the following section show how shared resources are utilized in the participants' interaction.

First, the following excerpt describes how the participants intentionally utilized their shared local knowledge in order to invite Sunja to an ongoing story. Sunja does not understand the meaning of tahong because it requires knowledge of Tagalog (see excerpt 5.8.). In the process of explaining the meaning of tahong to Sunja, her co-workers propose relevant local knowledge, and linguistic and cultural clues to her to help her understand. The following excerpt, 5.3., is from right after the Ray's joke in excerpt 5.8. in the later section of this chapter.

Excerpt 5.3. "You can find it at tamashiro"

30 Ray: you know the clams? It it has a shell too.
31 (1.7)
32 Ray: >you don’t know?<
33 Lucy: [you go to tamashiro
34 Ray: [you you you don’t know Little Mermaid hahaha
Lucy: you go to tamashiro and then you will find.
Ray: you go to tamashiro and you will find y’know
Lucy: yeah. but it’s just like (.) a shell
Ray: look like,
Sunja: ah ha
Ray: looks like shell
Ray: it is a shell (.)
Sunja: oh it is a shell.

Right before this excerpt, Sunja asks about the meaning of "tahong" as she does not understand the point of the ongoing story. Everybody except for Sunja in this conversation gets the meaning of tahong, which prompts Sunja to ask a question. Based on her attempts to understand the word, Ray tries to explain the word to Sunja, but it takes several turns and different methods to make the story clear to her. First, Ray translates the meaning of tahong (seashell) into English, but Sunja is not familiar with the English translation, either. As a means of seeking common ground so that Sunja may understand his joke, in line 33, Ray and Lucy use shared local knowledge about tamashiro, a place they know where Sunja buys seafood that includes seashells and manila clams. This shows that the members are very explicitly welcoming Sunja in to the conversation by creating a sense of community through references she is familiar with and scaffolding her understanding. After connecting the unknown word to tamashiro, she finally comes to know the meaning of tahong, or seashell, which she did not understand at the beginning of the conversation, in line 2 of the transcription.

The data recording indicates that, to follow up on this, Ray goes back to his original story, retells it, and presents an extended joke to the entire group. When there is another new word that is new to Sunja ("manila clam"), Ray provides associated words like shell, clam, and mermaid to explain the target word and facilitate her understanding.

In this excerpt, we find ATN (all-together-now) talk, which was first introduced in Holmes’ (2008, p.113) work on humor in the workplace. The participants echo each other, fill the gaps together, and construct shared floors in this excerpt. Mirroring each others' comments, cooperating, and affirming each others' stories are all used as strategies to continue their stories without threatening other’s face.
Below, the story about seashells is elaborated further. In the following excerpt, Ray continues his story and attempts to explain the meaning of the words to Sunja. The following excerpt presents another participant’s joke. Since Sunja does not understand the meaning of the joke, Ray finally decides to draw an illustration of what it looks like. However, after he draws the picture of the mussel, the participants change their language to Tagalog and share sexual jokes.

Excerpt 5.4. "Lid me draw"

42 Ray: yeah
43 Sunja: yeah manila clams um
44 Ray: mussel ah no mussel?
45 Alyssa: mussel
46 Ray: then my nephew said
47 you know my nephew said
48 oh no uncle, you know manila clam you like oyster.
49 XX hahahahahah
50 XX can I brought more
51 Lucy: uh
52 Alyssa: can I brought more
53 Ray: cause her last name is seashell. yea
54 you know mussels
55 Lucy: um
56 you know the mussels right?
57 Sunja: um
58 (2.6)
59 Ray: lid me draw for you maybe you know that
60 Sunja: XXXXX
61 Ray: lid me draw
62 the mussel like this ((drawing))
63 give me my paper.
64 ((change to tagalog))
65 Alyssa: Yung drawing ni Ray parang bilat
66 that drawing of Ray seems vagina
67 Ray’s drawing looks like a vagina
((The woman is teasing Raul about his drawing and making fun of it))
68 A,R L: hahahahaha
69 Ray: Sobra ka naman.
70 Excessive you too much.
71 You’re too much.
72 Naisip mo bilat na naman xxx
thought you vagina again
You thought of vagina again xxx

((Ray jokingly tells one of the women that her comment about his drawing was a bit too much.))

Ray extends his joke (line 46) by inserting a new story about oysters. In line 59, Ray draws the seashell on paper to explain it. In lines 66 and 68, Sunja is excluded from co-telling this ongoing story due to the other participants' choice of language. Other group members make jokes about his drawing – and these could be considered vulgar. Obviously, Sunja is not invited to join this joke because the medium of interaction is Tagalog, which Sunja does not have access to. When Ray draws and shows the picture of the mussel to Sunja, other female members of the group, Alyssa and Lucy make jokes in Tagalog in the following lines. In Tagalog, Lucy talks about Ray's drawing, commenting that it looks like a vagina. It is interesting to note that the other participants suddenly shift their language from English to Tagalog for making this joke. This is a strategy to exclude Sunja from this sexual conversation. However, it is also an effective strategy to be more polite by avoiding being vulgar in front of Sunja. Thus, ironically, the interactional efforts to explain words to Sunja, and to invite her into the group, result in the use of Tagalog, a linguistic area that, as mentioned before, Sunja does not easily have access to. This example also shows how an unshared joke, which requires linguistic knowledge, creates in-group versus out-group boundaries (see Holmes & Hay, 1997) in this group.

Overall, Ray attempts to give a clear idea to reach mutual understanding. His joke requires that hearers have linguistic or cultural knowledge of Tagalog in order to understand it, and Ray and Lucy explain the necessary details to Sunja as a form of teaching, checking, and confirming, but in a less serious way. In addition, by echoing each other's ideas and suggestions (e.g. lines 7 and 8, and 35 and 36), Alyssa, Lucy, and Ray help Sunja in a collaborative way. This excerpt shows how Ray's humor opens a space for constructing mutual understanding and how he tries to facilitate Sunja into joining the group. It also shows that humor and cultural factors play an important role in this interaction. The participants actively use shared and available resources in telling stories.
In summary, not all linguistic knowledge are shared by all members, just as not all stories are shared in a group. The excerpts above present the ways in which the participants invite, involve, or are left out of (or decide to be left out of) groups. Due to the limits of her linguistic and cultural knowledge and background, Sunja does not get the point of the joke at first and misses the chance to laugh. Instead of giving up, Ray does different discursive work to explain the words in the story to Sunja with support from other workers. However, Sunja in this excerpt shows her very minimal responses to Ray's attempts, which shows her passive involvement in the current topic and her being uninterested in getting to know the joke or the source of the laughter. In the following section, I will delve into more examples of how shared cultural knowledge is used in this group.

5.5. Shared Cultural Resources: The case of kimchi

One of the most frequent topics of stories in this group is food, as the conversation was carried out during the participants’ break time, when they usually had lunch or dinner together. Therefore, they usually talked about what they brought for their meals and the recipes to make them. Sunja mostly cooks Korean foods and brings them to work for her lunch and for sharing with other people. Sunja knows about different Filipino foods but that does not necessarily mean that she often cooks them herself at home. She is knowledgeable of various ethnic foods because of her gathering from people around her (from school, work, and church). In this way, what affects her knowledge of Filipino food items and its references are mostly from her experience of sharing those ethnic foods at work.

Constructing shared metaphors is related to specific foods. One of the examples of this is *kimchi*, a traditional Korean dish. It is pickled cabbage, and is known to be a very spicy side dish. Interestingly, in this group of participants, *kimchi* is circulated not only as a food but also as metaphor for representing Korea or Korean culture. This is a crucial element of small story. In the following section, I will begin by exploring how *kimchi* is used in this group from the beginning: Sunja brings *kimchi* to the group from
home, and the following excerpt begins with Alyssa's compliment on the flavor of the
kimchi that Sunja made.

Excerpt 5.5. Kimchi-1 (June, 2011)

1 Alyssa: um this kimchi is good sunja
2 Lucy: [let me try
3 Sunja: [haha
4 (3.9)
5 Alyssa: eat
6 Sunja: eat kimchi just kimchi
7 Joy: let me eat some kimchi and rice
8 i haven't it that for long time
9 i haven't that long
10 ((coughing))

In this excerpt, kimchi is already a known food among the participants, although it
can be considered as representative of a particular culture. This excerpt shows that kimchi
is not foreign in this group, but a well-known food that the participants usually share
during their mealtime. After Alyssa's comment on the kimchi that Sunja made in line one,
Lisa also tries the kimchi. After a long pause for tasting kimchi, in line 7 Alyssa suggests
Joy to taste the kimchi. In this excerpt, recommending kimchi to each other shows that
kimchi is not something unusual or new in this group. The following excerpt also
describes how the participants construct kimchi as a previously shared food among group
members. Kimchi became one of the popular topics or resources in this group's
interactions and its metaphorical meaning had developed. Among many cases that the
participants talk about kimchi, including the cases of the taste of it, how it is made, and
where to buy good kimchi, the participants often use kimchi as something carrying
particular images including hot, spicy, warm, etc. The use of kimchi makes their stories as
shared and repeated small stories. This interaction also shows the fact that Alyssa and Joy
eating kimchi reveals how certain food crosses borders in the context of Hawai‘i.


1 Alyssa: oh kimchi
2 I need this
Joy: ho it looks very fresh
(3.0)
Lucy: *i am cold*
(5.3)
Alyssa: you are full what did you eat
Lucy: no i am cold
Alyssa: oh you cold
eat kimchi it will warm you up
(0.9)
Alyssa: eat the one
yeah you will that (. ) in the appetizer.

The following excerpt is from the later data set, which was collected six months later than the initial data collection. In this excerpt, after Sunja shared her kimchi with others at lunch time, Alyssa reveals her desire to eat kimchi. In line 3, Joy presents her assessment on the appearance of kimchi. While the women taste the kimchi, Lucy mentions that she is cold in a low voice which is mistakenly accepted by Alyssa in line 8. After Alyssa's question on the reason why she is full, in line 9, Lucy retells that she is cold. As advice, in the following line, Alyssa recommends Lucy to eat kimchi which will solve this problem by making Lucy warm. Moreover, in line 14, Alyssa elaborates her suggestion by constructing kimchi as a certain type of appetizer. Alyssa's way of constructing kimchi as an appetizer that warms up someone shows the particular way of using kimchi in this group, considering the fact that kimchi is not normally considered as an appetizer, but it is usually considered as a side dish. In sum, the two examples above demonstrate how the participants adopt a certain food that is usually shared into their ongoing conversation.

In the following excerpt, based on their shared knowledge of kimchi, the participants play with words and metaphorical meanings of kimchi. Due to kimchi’s flavors – specifically, hot and spicy – these group members also often use it as a sexual reference to say something is hot or sexy. The following conversation begins with Sunja saying that she misses kimchi because she does not bring it for her lunch. Ray follows up Sunja's self talk on kimchi and makes a joke in this group.

Excerpt 5.7. "Horny? what is horny?" (an example of refusal to tell)
Sunja: *uhm: I miss kimchi*
Ray: you miss kimchi?
Sunja: when I see rice
Ray: you know what I think (with mouth full of food)
people love to eat kimchi in korea?
Sunja: I don’t know, why?
hhhhh.
Ray: you know they say if you eat too much kimchi,
yknow this is you me- make
they say you look like ((XXX)) is it true
you eat too much spicy?
you get horny is it?
hahahhee
Sunja: what is horny? What what, what is?
Ray: you know what is horny?
Sunja: no.((laughs))
horny? What is horny?
(keeps making noise interrupting S)
Sunja: you-speak- - -Filipino ya?
can you interpret what is horny?
Alyssa: (talking in Filipino, curse words)
Lucy: oh my god
Alyssa: You are being nasty
Ray: no, no Sunja said, she said I miss my my kimchi, and
I said, there’s a saying that, there’s a saying that
if you eat too much spicy..
Sunja: uh hum
(3.5)
Lucy: Ray. you got too [much spice
Alyssa: [you get horny
Lucy: You get sex drive
Alyssa: Sorry, this is a bad word, don’t use it
Lucy: It’s already there.
Sunja: already but(..) I cannot understand (..) anyway
Alyssa: they will translate it for you later.
you
Sunja: it’s okay it’s not goo:d anyway.
you are too hyper what did you eat Ray
your adobo
all: hahahahaha
Lucy: yea but I didn't put any sugar on that one

Kimchi as a shared resources is circulated throughout the time, and in particular, the except 5.7. shows how the participants use this repeated and ritualized story. This excerpt begins with Sunja's talk about kimchi. She notes the absence of kimchi and expresses her feelings of missing it, which brings forth Ray's story. As the previous
excerpt shows, *kimchi* is considered an everyday side dish for these participants, rather than representative of a particular culture and ethnicity, in this case Korean. This is supported by Sunja's answer, which is followed by Ray's question in line 4 regarding whether Korean people love to eat *kimchi* in Korea. Instead of representing herself as Korean and answering this yes/no question, she reveals the ignorance of what Ray is alluding to, and asks why he is bringing up the topic. Sunja refers to *kimchi* as an everyday food that is absent in the present, but Ray references *kimchi* as a cultural product that is associated with Sunja. This also reveals that Sunja is oriented to everyday lunch time talk, as she talks about the absence of the certain dish they share regularly.

However, in the following lines, Ray addresses the relationship between spicy food and sexual desire as a form of reported speech from an anonymous third party, "they." The use of vague reference shows that Ray is denying that he is the source of the metaphorical relationship between *kimchi* spiciness and horniness. Line 8 shows an interesting formulation because in this context "they" could be Koreans who make this connection between *kimchi* and horny, but Ray made it inexplicitly.

One interesting point about this excerpt is the participants' refusal to tell. In line 14, Sunja asks Ray what *horny* means, upon which Ray, instead of explaining the word, tells Joy what happens; she is another participant in the setting, but not involved in the interaction. Ray asks Joy to explain the meaning of *horny* to Sunja in line 21. Ray's sharing the topic with other participants is followed by other participants' criticism, including cursing. After Alyssa reprimands his heavy joke, in line 24, Ray retells the story as a means of defending himself. In line 25, Ray claims that Sunja provided the source of the problem. Through reporting Sunja's wish for *kimchi* and the (reported) third party's opinion regarding a relationship between spicy food and sexual desire, Ray defends his innocence.

As the excerpts show above, Sunja's co-workers often sanitize their conversation as a form of avoiding to tell a story for the sake of her and her understanding. One might suggest that it is because of Sunja's age, which is much older than the other Filipino workers. However, considering that they do not often do this with Joy who is around the same age with Sunja, it reveals that it might be related to linguistic ability or resources.
The workers attempt to increase Sunja's accessibility to the shared resources, but Sunja gives a half-hearted attempt to be in the group. It can be also explained that the workers' invitation is designed particularly for Sunja because she is a new member of this community.

Turning back to the data, in line 28, Sunja shows that she agrees with the facts that Ray reports in previous lines. After the pause in the following line, Lucy and Alyssa accuse Ray again of telling a vulgar joke. In line 33, Lucy turns to Sunja and apologizes for being unable to explain the meaning of the word. However, in the following lines Lucy and Alyssa evade explaining the meaning, but offer other possible ways to come to know and understand the story. First, in line 34, Lucy explains that Sunja should know the meaning of *horny* because it is already explained in the story (i.e., she should be able to guess it from context). In spite of Lucy's explanation, Sunja still does not understand the meaning. In line 36, Alyssa, instead of direct explanation, offers an alternative way to find out what it means: finding other Filipino friends who could translate the word for her. It is notable that horny is an English word, but Alyssa suggests to ask this linguistic question to other Filipino friends. Her suggestion of asking the question to someone else is a way of evading answering by offering an alternative way to Sunja. Alyssa's rejection of a story in line 36 shows a small story example. It is a case of refusal to tell a certain story as a form of small story. Here, Alyssa constructs Filipino friends as a "safe informant" who would not be shocked or offended by her (Sunja) asking. It is also arguably shows that it is not a solely linguistic matter, but also can be the matter of how and with whom Sunja can interact and share those stories.

In line 38, Sunja does not pursue the meaning of *horny* further, but instead returns to blaming Ray for this exchange in a humorous way. Sunja claims that the reason for Ray being hyper is his food, *adobo*, which is a traditional Filipino dish. The *adobo* may not be relevant to any metaphor of "energetic" or "aggressive," but this specific food carries local meaning in this group, which is seen as a shared small story. In line 42, Lucy takes up this claim, and adds that she did not add sugar, which might be the reason for his hyperness. There are the relational pairs of *kimchi* and horny, and adobo and hyper in this excerpt, and these examples show how the participants enact their (un)shared cultural
resources. This might also be interpreted as failed humor. However, even though Ray's joke seems to have failed in this interaction, it turns out it offered a space for Sunja to at least participate in the story; at the same time, Ray maintains his tellership and boosts the other women's storytelling participation. The excerpts above also shows that the shared resources in stories accumulated over time as a form of routine and shared ways of doing things together. This is closely related to the notion of shared repertoires in CoP. In stories, the sharedness brings quick setup of a problem to be told, shortcuts to solve the problems, and the ease of bringing new stories. Telling small stories in a group shows the continuation of an ongoing process of making social relations.

In summary, in this excerpt, the particular foods that represented cultures (kimchi, adobo) are used and recycled by the participants as small stories, often with additional indexicalities added in over time. Rather than accepting or refusing imposed identities or cultures, Sunja more dynamically copes with the situation, and employs aspects of another culture, particularly in lines 39 and 40, in order to handle the unsolved situation. She responds to Ray's jokes and mocks him by referring to the food that is typically representative of his culture. Sunja, unlike her interaction with Ray in previous data, reacts to his joke and provides supportive back channels. As seen in this example, she makes a joke to Ray in return, by using her cultural knowledge from shared experiences. She is turning the table on him by using his own strategy against him. This is a creative way of getting the attention off of her by putting it onto him. Sunja's joke works to smooth out their interaction, particularly; it contributes to concluding the ongoing story in an entertaining way. In the following section, Sunja's discursive ways of creating distance in this group will be explored. Sunja constructs herself as an outsider in this co-workers' group by avoiding the imposing categories from her co-workers.

5.6. Repeated Story Structure: The case of a telephone Call

A story structure also works as shared repertoire and in this section I will illustrate in what ways the participants engage, disengage, and re-engage with certain types of stories. Here, I examine how Ray and other workers make use of recycled story structures. In the following excerpts, while they are eating a seafood lunch, Ray, the biggest joker in
this group, brings up funny stories, and it creates a cheerful work atmosphere. His story
serves as a means of inviting or getting to know Sunja more, since she is relatively new to
the group. Sunja, however, often does not understand the jokes because of her lack of
shared linguistic and cultural knowledge. This results in a change in the ways the workers
tell the stories so as to be inclusive of Sunja. In other words, the stories get told in a way
that other workers presuppose that she might not understand the joke, and the stories are
purposely structured so that her understanding can be scaffolded. One of the strategies
that Ray uses is a repeated story format through telephone call storytelling (the
storytelling of a telephone call??). Ray explains the background of the upcoming story in
Tagalog and then initiates the "somebody called me one day..." story. This is a
hypothetical story in the form of a joke, and Ray exaggerates the voice to present a lady
who will come on to him in this story world.

Excerpt 5.8. "Hello, this is Mrs. tahong"
1  Ray:  someone called me at the house
2      (2.0)
3   Rau::l Rau::l
4   this is (.) first mortgage loan=
5  Sunja:  who did bring this this is goo:d
6  Ray:  call call Mrs. tahong, you know, Mrs. tahong
7  hello (.) can I speak to Mrs. tahong?
8   who’s this?
9   this is manila clams
10 R,A:  hahahahahahahaha
11 Sunja:  what? (.)Taho:ng?
12 Lucy:  ((XXXX))
13 Sunja:  um
14 Alyssa:  is that true?

After Ray initiates this story in Tagalog, in line 3, he switches to English to
continue his story. His choice of this shift of language serves as an invitation to Sunja.
While all other members understand Tagalog, Sunja does not. To animate the telephone
conversation, Ray exaggerates and elongates the vowel in his name in line 3, to imitate
calling. His falsetto-like voice quality shows Ray's shifting of code, as well as shifting his
role to be the reporter or animator of the story. Sunja, however, does not get involved in
Ray's story and just makes comments on the food in line 5. In line 6, Ray continues his
story, and plays a double role: the caller and the recipient of the phone call. In line 9, Ray offers the punchline of the story to shift to English, *manila clams*. In the following line, line 10, everyone but Sunja laughs at Ray's joke, but Sunja does not understand the meaning and finally asks about *tahong*, which she thinks might be the key to comprehending Ray's story. Sunja's question is not taken up by the other members, but Alyssa instead questions whether this story is true or not. This excerpt shows how Ray kicks off a story by considering the target audience, and makes the story accessible to others, although it is not taken up by Sunja. The telephone call story comes up often in this group, and the following excerpt a few months later also shows how the participants orient to this type of story.

A few months later, Ray's telephone joke was retold in this group. The following excerpt presents how Ray brings this story into the ongoing interaction again, and reserves space to make this story told to Sunja. During a lunch break, the participants talk about what they are eating for lunch. The story and joke in this excerpt were triggered by someone saying the Tagalog word *baho*, which means both *lunch box* and *foul odor*. The conversation centers on a play with the words *mabanglo* (“pleasant smell”) and *mabaho*, which means the opposite.

Excerpt 5.9. "There is one lady called me mabanglo."

1 Ray: hey, there's one lady called me
2 mabanglo her last name, and she said
3 "Raul this is Mrs. mabanglo.
4 this is regarding about your gas and car."
5 and I call her this is Raul mabaho
6 A,L,R hahahahahahaha
7 Lucy: she don’t understand she don’t understand XXX
8 ((she means Sunja))
9 Alyssa: yeah
10 Lucy: let him talk
11 it’s just like=
12 Alyssa: talking nonsense to her
13 Lucy: yeah.
14 Ray: you should you should come to the Philippine and you
15 can be like an artist Bang
16 like Bang
17 you know Bang?
18 Korean Bang?
Sunja: yes. you told me last time.

Ray again uses a question-and-answer format paralleling that of a telephone conversation in this excerpt. However, unlike the previous telephone story, Ray initiates the story in English to set up the context of the target story. By switching the frame (Goffman, 1974), Ray plays with the Tagalog language and creates a joke. Sunja does not get the meaning of the joke, and the other participants ask Ray to stop telling further stories. Ray's attempts to include Sunja in the group are thwarted by other members. Other members claim that Sunja would not understand the story and that the familiarity of the story structure may not be the source of trouble. In the lines that follow, Lucy and Alyssa explain that the joke is not accessible to Sunja.

Interestingly, once the joke is not taken up by Sunja, Ray suddenly changes the topic to Bang (Ryan Bang), the aforementioned Korean celebrity, and makes an attempt to bring Sunja into the ongoing story. Ryan Bang is very famous in this group and comes into the conversation over and over when Filipino workers change the topic for Sunja and draw her attention to assist her in joining the ongoing conversation. The reference to Bang is a shared story. It shows a way of including Sunja, and even acknowledging that Sunja does not understand the ongoing conversation. "Artista" means celebrity in Philippines, and Ray and other co-workers call Ryan Bang “Artist Bang”.

It seems that Ray's attempt is not quite successful; nonetheless, his telephone call story shows how Ray's joke is rehearsed and repeated with particular interactional goals. Ray holds his story tellership, and this excerpt shows that his endeavor to include Sunja in the interaction is also closely related to him being included in this group of women. Last but not least, at the same time, in the telling world, Ray constructs himself as a popular man who often receives phone calls from many women, but does not take these calls seriously. Ray's telling of hypothetical stories in this group also functions as a way of being included and staying in the group, as well as of constructing his position in this community.

5.7. Summary
In this chapter, I examined the participants' everyday interactions surrounding a range of topics, and looked into how the participants use their linguistic repertoires and cultural resources to manage social relations with one another. The analysis shows that the strategically used humor in this group is derived from the participants' shared linguistic and cultural resources, and they play a central role in telling stories. In addition, the resources found in their stories are repetitive and ritualized (e.g., foods, the way of using shared story structure), which are the prevalent features of small stories that often emerge based on the close-knit participants' interactional histories. I also want to note that these shared resources play a central role in their interaction, which includes stories, but they are not limited to stories alone. In the analysis, the shared resources are considered in a broader way.

The participants' stories are based on the local realization of Koreaness through the dynamic process of 1) contextualization (local Korean events), 2) typification (typical Korean food), and 3) evaluation based on their shared knowledge. The Philippine-ness also comes up in the participants' interaction as seen in the cases above, but it is not shared by all the members of the group. This is partly because the workers make an effort to include Sunja to their group through the discussions of Koreanness.

The findings illuminate that attending to diverse social dimensions of the participants' language use, and focusing on their daily interaction, are indispensable for expanding our understandings of the particular CoP. However, the examination also shows that not all CoPs are available or accessible to all the members at this context. The analysis exemplifies that participants' communication is strongly rooted in their shared local and global knowledge. Particularly, they utilize different jokes to reaffirm their relationships, but at the same time, they exercise their shared resources to draw lines, to challenge, and to create distances among themselves. The participants' jokes are strong examples of this. The jokes served as devices to invite Sunja into ongoing conversations, or into the community, but certain jokes did not turn out to be shared, or sharable. As shown in the case of the manila clams or the language play with Mabanglo, the joke is seen by members as too opaque for Sunja to acknowledge. The Filipino workers might
acknowledge Sunja as an L2 speaker, a non-Filipina, or even an older person in this group.

Further, the analysis uncovers that these participants jointly accomplish meaningful interaction, while agreeing upon and co-constructing the main ideas of their interaction. It specifically shows how shared stories serve as resources to integrate different facets of social relations, and how these stories also create tension among the workers. Ray tries to invite Sunja into the group by making various discursive choices including seeking and offering shared cultural knowledge, making jokes, and even teasing. However, the tension between Ray's and other members' invitation and Sunja's resistance or inability to join has been seen in analysis. Sunja avoids being categorized: she discursively resists the identities imposed upon her by Ray. Instead, she desires to be considered a local women, or as a nurse, her professional identity.

The analysis also offers evidence that humor energizes this group by contributing to the construction of friendly workplace relationships. Among these group members, humor provides a legitimate means of challenging each other's ethnicity or gendered identities. Humor thus promotes the creation and maintenance of social relations amongst this group of people in socially acceptable and linguistically sophisticated ways.

Humor also enhances their social relations by inviting into the group the participant(s) with relatively less shared knowledge on a specific language and culture. In this respect, considering the position 3 question that is discussed in Chapter 2, so "who am I" (Bamberg, 1997), Ray is the only male participant in this group and his attempts to join the group might be realized as positioning himself as a joker or humorous character. However, it seems that Ray's attempts to invite Sunja, who is a relative novice to this group, may also arguably be efforts for himself to be included in this group of women.

In Ray's jokes, the repetitive or ritualized components play important roles in the process of collaborative storytelling. They not only contribute to building a familiar space to share stories, but also offer shared bases for further story deployment. Ray's telephone story joke presents the ways in which these participants engage differently with his recycled story and story structure, as well as the consequences that this joke brings to the group. This chapter also highlights how the global phenomenon of multilingualism varies
in its local realization, and how these participants achieve and negotiate a mutual understanding with respect to their languages and cultures. Workplace social relationship is locally realized and shaped by context-specific knowledge, culture, and linguistic backgrounds (Smit, 2010). In the process of constructing their community, these participants exploit their shared resources, and they constantly (re)calibrate or (re)formulate their identities, while accomplishing their interactional goals.
CHAPTER 6: SPEAKER ROLES AND POSITIONING

6.0. Introduction

In previous data chapters, the break time of a language class and of a workplace were explored. Unlike these two institutionally assigned contexts, social gatherings also occurred within the time and space that the participants decide to co-create. The two previous data chapters illustrate two different story features, (1) story dimensions (chapter 4) and shared story resources (chapter 5) in telling. These chapters show how the women's story participation and their use of shared repertoires are linked to the ways that they build a strong sense of community across different social contexts. To extend the scope of investigation, in this chapter, I will examine different speaker roles as another prominent aspect in analyzing the women's stories. Analyzing speaker roles in telling presents a dynamic process of positioning self and others. In particular, I am interested in investigating how the participants draw upon different characters in a narrated world to refer to out-group members (e.g. different types of husbands), how they borrow others' voices in their telling, and how they evaluate characters in their telling. By using routinely invoked characters in their storytelling (Positioning Level 1), the women construct their own identities in the narrating world, that is, Positioning Level 2 (Bamberg, 1997). The analysis in these two levels also has implications on Level 3--positioning that is related to wider cultural "D"iscourses. Capital D discourses are defined as "socially accepted associations among ways of using language, of thinking, valuing, acting, and interacting, in the "right" places and at the "right" times with the "right" objects' (Gee, 1999, p.17). The three levels of identity analysis were originally proposed by Bamberg (1997), and they show that identities are viewed as being played at different levels and being negotiated in relation to each other.

This chapter illustrates how the participants construct and shift different footings (Goffman, 1974) in a tale world, and how these are connected to the way that they construct their identities and social relations in the interactional world. The analysis highlights how the "other" can be discursively constructed in storytelling and how the construction brings consequentiality for the participants, both in terms of gender and L2
identity construction. I also emphasize that identity claims are inevitably linked to the participants' social relations at play. In the following, I first discuss speaker roles in a story world and how these offer a ground for identity analysis in narrative.

6.1. Different Speaker Roles

Goffman’s notion of *footing* refers to shifts of stance or alignment which tellers take up with regard to themselves and their audiences (Goffman, 1981). He proposes three different positions that the speaker can take: “animator” is the perspective of one who utters a sequence of words; “author” is that of one who selects the sentiments being expressed; and “principal” is that of the person whose standpoints are established within the utterance. Narrators adjust their retellings and reported speech (Goffman’s animator/author) to strategically provide evaluative comment (Goffman’s principal) to shift their alignments for the purpose of othering, voicing, and repositioning. These shifts of footing are found, for instance, in changing pronouns, changing registers, borrowing others’ voices, and presenting expertise. The following excerpt shows how footings are used in the conversation. Ribeiro's (2006) example below is from two brothers' telephone talk on their parents' failing health. The unfolding conversation between two brothers (John and Louis) in the excerpt indicates how they use footings in their conversation.

Example 2.1. (Ribeiro, 2006, p. 53)

(a) JOHN he believes that by any number of neurologists' standards

(b) [speaking very slowly]

(c) that mom has mild ['hhh] cognitive decline ['hhh]

(d) LOUIS ['hhh] it's ::: absolutely, positively not

(e) JOHN Alzheimer's.

(f) yeah.

(g) based on what he has seen, he had seen between him and Dr. Smith,
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that there is likely to be improvement in her condition. (pause)

John partially animates the doctor's words and beliefs in this excerpt. He takes a footing as animator of the expert's report. He rewords doctor's opinion as an expert in the form of indirect speech. By animating doctor's saying, John offers a medical evidence (line (a) and (f)), and discards doubt of a major neurological disorder (line (c)), and wraps up with a hopeful evaluation in line (g).

Drawing on Goffman's notion of footing as shifts of stances or alignments, Koven (2002), in her study of a tripartite model of speaker role inhabitance, examines how tellers take up different speaker roles with regard to themselves and their audiences, by analyzing two tellings of the same event by the same speaker. Her study illustrates how the three speaker models, a storyteller (author), a character in the story (character), and a conversationalist (interlocutor), are selected by the storyteller in their personal narratives, and she investigates not only how the speaker roles are shifted but also how they are simultaneously constructed in stories. Koven (2002) writes,

“"The person who tells a story has multiple role perspectives or footings from which she can utter a stretch of narrative discourse. Narratives of personal experience are a clear example of how the same speaker must shift between, and simultaneously take up, multiple ‘footings,’ or embedded one ‘footing’ within another” (Koven, p.173).

The complexity of footings is also investigated in studies of interactional footings or speaker roles. Goodwin (2007) emphasizes the interactional level of analysis in narratives, and expands the idea of footing to the interactional level, which is called "interactive footing." He moves beyond the domain of scrutiny of Goffman's footing (which focuses on a single speaker's speech), focusing instead on multi-party sequences of talk. Goodwin (2007) points out that Goffman's deconstruction of speakers does not capture listeners’ participation. A story is constructed not by a single speaker, but instead through the collaboration of different participants. In this sense, "mutual reflexivity" (p.28) is absent in Goffman's models of footing. The emphasis on interactive construction
of meaning and action in analyzing the storyteller's footings is also found in Higgins (2011), and Higgins and Stoker (2011). In her work on Swahili L2 women's stories (Higgins, 2011) and Korean adoptee returnees' narratives (Higgins & Stoker, 2011), Higgins employs footing analysis to explore how the participants show their stances towards certain culture and language, or how the participants claim their social belonging. By examining participants' discursive movement from what happened (storyteller) to reported speech (evaluator), these studies show how the evaluative comments serve as devices to respond the tellers' social positioning.

In the next section, I examine the complexities of participants' speaker roles in multiparty storytelling, and investigate what these imply regarding the women's interactional world and their larger identity claims. I focus on how the participants adjust their tellings or reported speech (Goffman’s animator/author) to evaluative comments (Goffman’s principle) in order to strategically shift their alignment for distancing, voicing and repositioning. In addition to changing footings, I also examine how speakers can embed one footing within another.

As these examples show, the participants convey their perspectives and evaluative stances, and call for empathy and affiliation by shifting their footings in telling. I also discuss how analysis of footing offers evidence for participants' identity claims. In the following, I will discuss the ways in which these concepts are realized in storytelling by explaining reported speech in storytelling.

Excerpt  Dialogic Voicing: Menard-Warwick (2007)

Laura: And my mom ↓ “we are not going to…we are not going to throw her out in the street, nor say anything to her.” and she said “and how are we going to give her the street:?” And my dad said, my dad went for days without talking to her? And he always felt very ba:d, really hi:ding his face (breathy one), and ba:d and ba:d? And then my mom said “ohhh: no, the people say that I am ashamed of my daughter,” she said, “On the con:trary, from this day forward I am going to bring her with me ↑ wherever I go ↓.”
This example from Menard-Warwick (2007) shows how the speaker uses different voices to highlight the contrary voices of the characters in the narrated world. The speaker demonstrates that family unity (mom in this case) has a strong voice, which is contrary to Her dad or people in town (public opinion) who are focusing on sexual morality.

In the following section, I discuss quoted speech. Wortham (2001) uses the term "quotation" referring to intended reproduction of what other people actually said, but reformulated in the process of retelling. I will look at quoted speech in stories and how it functions as an evaluative device.

6.2. Quoted Speech

To make the investigation of the notions of speaker roles more tangible, I will single out the case of quoted speech in analyzing the participants' stories. First, one of the predominant devices that the participants use in their storytelling is animating others’ voices by borrowing a character or characters in the story. This is related to what Bakhtin (1981) calls "voicing." In studies of interactional narratives, this notion is often adopted as a device to investigate storytelling roles. Drawing on Bakhtin (1981), Wortham highlights the importance of analyzing characters’ voices in the storied world, and analyzes ‘voice’ in order to refer to different positions that tellers enact locally. Wortham (2001) explains that, "a voice is a recognizable social type, associated with a character primarily through indexical cues in a narrative" (p.321). Telling a story through a characters' mouth, a storyteller has an opportunity to assign a specific voice to the character though various types of cues.

Functions of quoted speech have been researched widely in narrative studies. Quoted speech provides direct access to other contexts and to non-present events (Holt, 2000), and quoted speech is also used as an indirect way of evaluating or assessing others (Günther, 1999), as a form of mockery, mimic, or parody other parties, and positioning oneself vis-à-vis others (Sacks, 1995). It also carries interactional authenticity to claim an account (Stokoe & Edwards 2007). A variety of functions of quoted speech uncover how storytellers construct certain types of persona for themselves or others. The function of quoted speech in relation to narrating and narrated worlds is also illustrated by
Georgakopoulou and De Fina (2012) in their recent discussion on narrative analysis. They explain that:

"(w)hen speech is reported, the different interactive meaning-making contexts related to narrative are activated. Tellers are situated in a storytelling world in which they evoke a story world. However, they also animate the story world in which the interaction of the characters occurs. Tellers (and listeners) thus shift from one world to the other, creating multiple relations between themselves and the story world they are evoking" (Georgakopoulou & De Fina, 2012, p.169).

I also underscore that adopting quoted speech encompasses not only citations of what an actual person did say in a particular circumstance, but also citations of what any kind of person or group could have said in a real, typical, or hypothetical situation. The participants enact multiple identities to produce an utterance that functions simultaneously as a quotation. In the following section, I will investigate how and what storytellers glean from borrowing other's voices and shifting speaker roles.

6.3. Animating the Other

The participants in this study animate other people and borrow other people's voices, and (re)enact those voices in telling, in order to produce forms of evaluation in their interaction. For example, in representing men (i.e., husbands and sons) in the following excerpts, quoted speech (carried out as a form of exaggerating the others’ voices) serves as a crucial resource that the participants mobilize in their telling. The enactment of different speaker roles, exaggerated and performance-based quotations, and animations of others’ voices conveys shifts to "codes" which are marked in the participants' stories. Researchers of narrative have investigated storytellers' accounts of interaction with antagonists in the telling (e.g. Bruner, 1991; Mandelbaum, 1993; Briggs, 1996; Ochs & Capps, 2001; Georgakopoulou, 2007), and these accounts appear to contrast with particular storytellers' expectations (e.g. Bruner, 1991; Goffman, 1974; Tannen, 1993). Particularly, in the case of story characters, the stories of antagonists are closely related to the tellers' position themselves as moral and normal, which is in contrast to the antagonist character in the narrated world (Goebel, 2010). For this reason,
constructing others serves as a means of identifying oneself, and the construction of one’s own identity in the process of collaborative storytelling is also linked to the group's expectation. The tellable stories that get attention are unusual ones, and they often run counter to personal or community expectations (Ochs & Capps, 2001). Turning to my data, the women in this study, by constructing story characters who are not present in ongoing conversation, construct their own identities and a sense of belonging in their community. In the following section, I will analyze the women's stories about complaints. These stories are related to the data in my earlier chapter, chapter 4. Complaining about their husbands, sons, or in-laws are very commonly circulated acts in this group of women, and certain characters including Helen's son, Tae's husband, and Keiko's husband and their stories are shared resources in this group of women.

6.3.1. Analysis 1: The Case of Tae's Husband

In the following data, Aya, Helen, Keiko, Tae, and the researcher (Lee) are sharing what each had done the previous night, and the talk centered on their relationships. The physical context where this interaction occurred was Aya's home. Aya invited us for tea and dessert after all the members had lunch together. After Keiko explains that her L1-English speaking husband helps her learn English, Tae initiated her story about her L1-English speaking husband who usually does not help her study English.

Excerpt 6.1. "Shut up" (Aya, Helen, Keiko, Tae, and Lee)

20 Keiko: sometimes I ask to him, for then he explain
21 Tae: mmhm oh↑ oh
22 Keiko: yeah I understand
23 Lee: mm
24 he’s maybe nice guy right? explaining yeah?
25 KHL ahahahahah
26 Lee: my husband when=
27 Tae: =my husband 'oh shut up'
28 Lee: oh yeah? Oh that’s not
29 Tae: 'be quiet'
30 Lee: be quiet yeah
31 Tae: 'you're gonna listen'
32 Lee: yeah
Keiko, as shown in the previous chapter (chapter 4), is often considered a newlywed woman in this group. In this excerpt, Keiko initiates a story about her husband and tells the group that her husband helps her learn English at home. Tae displays her surprise in the following line and Lee evaluates Keiko's husband, saying that he is a nice guy because he explains something to Keiko. This implies that a guy who does not explain is not qualified as a nice person. Lee's evaluation in line 24 is based on the women's shared experiences and previously told stories, which brings laughter to this group. Based on this evaluation, in line 26, Lee brings in her own story about her husband, but is interrupted by Tae's launching into a dramatic quotation of her own husband. Tae's three quotations from the interaction with her husband, 'shut up' --> 'be quiet' --> 'you're gonna listen' are presented respectively as forms of decreased intensity. These forms are presented with different intensities.

These repeated forms gradually get more attention from the other women in this group. Tae's reported speech and her choice of footings show that "repeated performances lead to increasing stylization as people expect a limited set of features to index a relatively limited repertoire of ways of using the same variety" (Johnstone, 1999, p. 514).

In the following excerpt, which took place after her story was interrupted, Keiko initiates another story which is contrary to her story about having a "nice husband."

Excerpt 6.2. "go school" (Aya, Helen, Keiko, Tae, and Lee)

33 Keiko: sometimes it
34 we saw the news ne, important news,
35 then I asked
36 oh 'shut up'=
37 Tae: =shut up
38 ?: shh
39 Lee: yeah yeah yeah
40 Keiko: and I listen
41 Lee: yeah yeah yeah my husband he doesn’t like when I
42 ask
43 when he watching something. So yeah.
44 he just say >I don’t know<
45 he knows but he said >I don’t know<
46 KTL: [ahahahaha
47 Helen: [just like my son. I think guys is always like
48 that.
This excerpt shows how the women speak through other's voices and importantly, how they are influenced by other tellers' quoted telling. After Tae's story and Lee's supportive back channels, in line 33, Keiko initiates a different story which appears to contrast to the one in the previous excerpt. In this story, Keiko aligns with the stories in the previous lines. However, she sets up her case as unusual, by framing it with 'sometimes' and 'important news.' This shows that Keiko's husband is not always unkind, but only when there is an important event going on.

Her changing topic and quoting her husband have interactional functions. The women do not just report, but assess and editorialize the original idea and character (Buttny, 1993). In addition, this example shows how evaluation becomes part of positioning in the group (Wortham & Gadson, 2006). The participants create different characters in stories as a means of being able to evaluate one's positioning.
Lee also tells her story about her husband. Lee resumes her story, which is cut off in line 26, and takes on her husband's voice to elaborate her story. By doing this, she emphasizes her husband's indifference regarding the case of asking a clarifying question. Though the women here tell different stories, their stories have in common that they are related to husbands, and the women construct their husbands as antagonists in the story world. In their setting up antagonists in this context, Helen, who rarely participates in these interactions, initiates a story about her son in line 47. Helen often initiates her stories by mentioning, "I don't have husband but..." By providing the story of her son and extending it to the general category of men -- which includes sons as well as husbands -- Helen joins the ongoing story and holds the story floor. Expanding the domain of the topic to a more general case offers a space to Helen to add her story. In line 47, Helen generalizes the antagonist category in the narrated world from husband to "guys", as groundwork for her subsequent story about her son. After providing the general feature of "guy," in line 52, Helen deploys her story in a form of dialogue between her and her son. By quoting the two characters in the story, herself and her son, she not only animates the story, but her telling also works as a tool to come into alignment with other women in this group.

Tae, after Helen's story, tells her another story about her husband in a more concrete way; it is about the case of asking questions regarding filling out tax forms. Tae reports that her husband assigns the responsibility of teaching her how to fill out tax forms to Tae's school. This brings laughter to the group, most likely due to Tae’s exaggeration of her husband’s voice, and because the women all know that filling out tax forms is not something they learn from their school. To provide broader context, in this group, Tae often told stories about her husband, and her husband had earned the reputation of "unkind husband" amongst the group members. When she told about her husband, she often positioned herself in a disadvantageous position. Her stories about her husband, across different times and contexts, showed high tellability and thus they carried a higher likelihood to be retold in the group.

Particularly, in this excerpt, Tae constructs the dialogue between Tae and her husband in an exaggerated way by using elongation of speech with a change of tone of
voice. Tae creates a hypothetical story about her husband in line 73. She animates herself in this imaginary story world with a quiet and gentle voice quality; in contrast, she constructs her husband with an exaggerately loud voice. Tae's evaluation towards these two contrasting characters is also embedded in her animation of the voices. Tae thus puts her husband on stage as a character in the story, and by animating him in a vivid and exaggerated way, she makes her story tellable and holds her tellership in the group.

With different ways of animating others, which includes emphasizing (line 27 & 29), elongating (line 66), and exaggerating (line 74) the women enact characters in the narrated world. The women's quoting of their husbands or son's speech is the way in which they collaboratively construct an antagonist in the story world. However, the joint manner of telling is not limited to reporting what happened to them with their husbands or sons, but rather it links to how they construct story characters and share their evaluations of those characters. In the storytelling world, by opening a slot for sharing and filling that slot with their stories, they share their experiences and claim their identities in a collaborative and entertaining way.

The participants' enactments of voices of husbands and son illuminate the ways others are constructed in their storytelling. The analysis demonstrates that the performative construction of husbands and son in the participants' stories is a fundamental process for the participants themselves -- for constructing their own identities and forging shared ground in this group. In other words, by representing others, the participants become acquainted with themselves and each other in this group. Moreover, the ways in which Keiko's and Helen's stories are introduced in this group demonstrates that stories are not only heard by the other members, but also influence each others’ telling. In addition, these practices are connected to constructing (female) friendship on one hand and heterosexual relationships (e.g. husband-wife relationships) on the other.

Thus, this excerpt also shows how these participants construct their narrating world. For example, Helen's manner of initiating her story (i.e., by generalizing and expanding categories) and Keiko's contribution of stories to the ongoing conversation (despite limiting and specifying her case with specific word choice, 'sometimes')
‘important news’) reveal the way in which the women construct their story world, and the ways this links to their involvement in this group. Telling stories is not limited to just constructing story characters and reporting the event, but rather it is clearly the way that the women participate in the group and construct their social relations. Further, those social relations do not exist only with the group members at present, but also with the characters in the stories.

The following interaction occurred when only Keiko, Masako, and Helen were near the recorder, and the other women were busy doing something else. Helen seems like a person who mainly tells her story as a form of answering Masako's questions, and Keiko's involvement in this interaction seems very limited. Tae was not present during this interaction. The story is about what happened between Helen and her son recently. Helen is a single mom who lived with her youngest son in college at the time of this research. She often talked about her son and explained how he helped (or did not help) her English study of English or computer use. At the time of data collection, Helen had just started to take a computer class at school. When she got together with other women at lunch, she explained the reason that she decided to learn computer at school as a response to Masako's question, "How's your computer class?"

6.3.2. Analysis 2: the case of Helen's son (Helen, Masako, Keiko)

Excerpt 6.3. "I put you good school."

1  Helen: you know I have experience my first time
2         using the computer cause I don't knowledge about
3         computer
4  Helen: we have computer at home
5  Masako: um
6  Helen: But my son always using the computer
7  Masako: you can ask your son
8  Helen: oh my son is different, he's kinda of busy
9            ah:: ahahaha
10         everytime I ask him
11  Masako: uh
12  Helen: make him ma:d
13  Masako: ahhah
14  Helen: He always says 'mom y can you can you learn in
15         your school?
16  Helen: I don't have time'
17  Masako: hehehe
Helen reports her recent experience of using computers since she began taking an additional computer class at school. After Helen expounds on the reasons she recently started learning computer, and her son appears in the ongoing story, Masako provides one possible alternative way to learn -- which is learning computers from her son. Helen explains to Masako that her son is busy, which is a circumlocutionary way of expressing the impossibility. Helen further deploys her story about how her son treats Helen in the following lines.

Helen animates the characters' voices in the story. To demonstrate contrasts, she constructs an extreme case by animating her son's voice by selecting words, 'every time', 'mad', and 'always' in the following lines. In line 14, she constructs her son’s character in the story world: he is very busy person who does not have an extra time to help Helen. After she sets up the character in the story, Helen elaborates the story about her essay in line 18. In lines 20-22, she animates the two characters in the story. By using different tones and speeds of speech, she performs the characters in the storied world, and at the same time takes the role of author and principal in this reported event. In the following
lines, she shifts her speaker role of author to directly evaluate the event as a form of expressing her emotion. She directly appeals to other the group members, using emotion. This shows how Helen moves between two different story worlds: the narrated and narrating worlds. In line 22, Helen's quote of her son brings laughter to the group. In line 33, Helen repeats her son's quoted speech on 22, which again carries an evaluation of the school. Her reuse of her own story in this interaction reveals that she is building ground in order to show her "hurting" emotion; she also does this by borrowing her son's voice and immediately changing footing from an animator to principal. Her shift of speaker role from animator to principal which carries evaluation on her son's behavior shows its impact on her. Helen's use of emotion category "hurt" is not neutral, but personal and objective expression of her inside state. It also reveals her relationship with her son.

According to Edwards (1997), emotion categories "provide a flexible resource for situated discourse, including the potential for rhetorical opposites and contrasts" (p.173).

Just like Tae's story in excerpt 6.1.2 in the previous section, Helen also borrows her son's voice to give an assessment of the school. This assessment is not just about what the characters said about the school; it also shows how the husband and the son make excuses to evade their responsibility of teaching English to the women. Therefore, the women take the role of principal and evaluate their husband’s and son's attitudes, by animating their own evaluation about the husband’s/son’s evaluation about the school. This brings laughter to the group, as it is based on the women's shared experiences.

In the following excerpt, Masako, Helen, and Tae got together -- and Helen told the group that her son had recently received a scholarship from his college. Helen constructs her son as a busy working and studying student.

Excerpt 6.4. "Mom, can you give me some tea?"
(M: Masako, H: Helen, and K: Keiko)

88 M: that's why he working hard for that
89 H: he's busy he can't (. ) teach me
90 ahahahah
91 M: and you know everytime h::e he has has some work
92 H: He do the homework and then he ask me
93 "mom, can you give me some tea?"
and then I said “no. I am tired.”

and “please your son is very busy.”

I know i can't uh say no

I just make the tea
everytime nighttime ten when I come home
everytime nighttime Becuase
I come home every time because
My computer and it's not computer XX, to the
already when I come home about 9:30 (.). around 9:30
and ten o clock
and he waits already
>where is my tea< >where is my tea<

yeah I give him tea everytime and the:n
now he says he like uh stay uh:
stay alone he go find another place to live
he is already 21 years old
he is still stay with me haha
cannot
[may be the
no because he stays with me because he goes school
yet=
M =um
and then [working
[even he finish school if he get jo:b
why don’t you live with him?
[You dont'
M: [No no
he cannot bri::ng
may be likes some like go with you know
already teenager
ah:::
(1.5)
he likes bring some maybe some girl friends
cannot hahahaha
M: ah:::
and but I said yeah you can go
but he asks me if I can go another place,
'would you wash laundry for me'?
said no you have to do it by yourself.
MK: hahaha
By animating how her son requests something from Helen in lines 93, 96, and 109, and by formulating extreme cases in lines 91, 102, 103, 104, she constructs her son as a character who is busy and dependent on his mother. To construct the character, Helen uses different devices. For example, in line 96, she quotes her son’s quoting himself "please your son is very busy." This has two functions. First, "your son" is a relational term, which helps construct his pitiful or helpless situation. Also, this construction brings the source of laughter to the group. Moreover, in line 109, the fast speed of speech that Helen uses in her quote of her son shows his busyness, which further highlights the son's unavailability but also justifies why Helen has to accept the son's request. Helen repeats, exaggerates, modifies, and escalates what and how her son says and she responds.

The footings that Helen adopts in the above excerpts are not limited to constructing contrastive identities, but are also related to larger discourses. Related to these points, Bamberg (2011) explains, when people tell stories, they refer to how they anchor their position -- from where and how they want to be understood by others. Helen constructs a certain point of view for others to take regarding her relationship with her son. She recounts a story and her story carries her moral views and values. This excerpt also shows that her perspective shifts during her telling from helpless or ignorant mom to powerful mother. Interestingly, this shift happens along with a transition of the type of story, a hypothetical world.

It is interesting that Helen tells a story where and when she triumphs. For example, when she tells her son that she will not wash his laundry if he moves out, she is asserting arguably "a strong mom" identity. This stands in contrast to the other women who tell stories about their husbands turning them out or saying mean things to them when they need help. They do not show any types of triumph. Instead, the women seem to be eliciting and gaining sympathy and understanding from their friends. This shows that there are different types of "empowerment" are discursively constructed among the women. However, no matter what types of empowerment occur in each of the woman's story, these are limited to discursive forms, but possible in the imaginary world or hypothetical story world as a story of what could happen or should happen, rather than what happened (Sandhu, 2010).
In the following section, I will look at the ways in which Keiko and Helen find their own ways to get into the group. In this excerpt, the women talked about who in the group gets their family's support for studying English.

Excerpt 6.5. "I have a headache" (Aya, Helen, Keiko, Lee, Tae)

1 Lee: what about you? Do they support you?
2 Tae: never teach me.
3 Lee: he like
4 Tae: never teach me.
5 Lee: no?
6 Tae: never teach me
7 Lee: yeah
8 Tae: if I ask you, I have some question about English, “Oh, I’m headaches.” He said.
9 Keiko: ohohoho
10 Helen: sometimes uh (.) that (.) doesn’t mean they don’t sup-um
11 they don’t teach you-they do not support.
12 sometimes they don’t teach you because
13 Lee: they want you to learn your own.
14 Tae: mm
15 [mm I think so hmm.
16 Helen: [just like my son. I ask him, how how to do it the essay,
17 can you read my essay and then tell me what’s wrong?
18 and he said,
19 ‘I can uh tell you what’s wrong, but I cannot write [everything.
20 Lee [oh, that’s very good. mm mm that’s good.
21 that’s good way to give you a hint right?
22 Helen: he’s just uh check the mistake or something
23 Lee mm mm
24 Helen: but you still do it because that’s yours
25 Lee: mm
26 Helen: I cannot teach you. If I do it, you cannot learn.
27 I think that’s the reason.
28 (2.0)
29 Aya: mother and the son that good, but husband and wife,
30 different situation.
31 All: ahaahaha

Before this excerpt, Aya talked about what happened the previous day between her and her husband. They argued because of a misunderstanding, and Aya's story encourages Tae to tell a story about her husband. Tae uses extreme formulation to
emphasize her husband's unsupportive attitude toward her learning. As she does in excerpt 6.3.1., here Tae again uses reported speech to explain that her husband does not help her at all. After Tae's story, Helen presents her different perspective: not providing direct help does not necessarily mean that the husbands are not supportive. Tae does not mean that he does not support. Helen continues her interpretation: it is more like her husband offers her a chance to learn by herself.

As if speaking for the others, which is unexpected in this group, Helen holds her floor in this interaction. Tae rejects Helen’s opinion, which overlaps with Helen's continuing story of her son and how he explains things to her by offering an opportunity at learning. What Helen does in telling this story is construct her son as a logical and reasonable character. He does not offer direct help, but he is still supportive. Helen's story does not receive much support from other group members, excerpt for Lee who shows her agreement toward Helen's opinion and aligns with Helen's son's idea. However, Aya, who originally brought this topic to this group, objects to Helen's claim that a mother and son relationship is different from husband and wife relationship.

This excerpt shows that Helen attempts to contribute to the narrative as it proceeds by giving her own example and bids for the floor, but is not very successful. Helen creates a character in her storytelling, and takes a neutral position when speaking for her son who also is not teaching English to her, just as the husbands are not teaching English to the wives. However, Helen’s story does not get much attention from the other group members and her claim is challenged by other women. In this excerpt, Aya seems to be wanting supportive sympathy from her friends, but Helen is not providing this. This points to the overall purpose of the participants' telling their complaint stories: building and maintaining relations and forming a space for belonging and mutual understanding are the goals of this interaction.

The analysis of Keiko and Helen's stories also shows that the participants' positioning is also related to what would have been appropriate and/or ways of coping with the problem (Ochs, 2004). This consideration is about who fits such a category and in what ways. Davies (2005) notes that “[b]arriers to entry and legitimate peripheral participation entail a process of gate-keeping” (p.571). The gate-keeping which does
occur in response to Keiko's lack of knowledge is undertaken by other members in different ways. Like Helen in the previous section, Keiko's participation both in the narrated and narrating world also shows the boundaries that do not allow her inside the group.

For the following except, the first few lines were briefly discussed in Chapter 4 when I presented the habitual aspect of story participation and identity. In the following excerpt, Keiko is the same participant from the earlier chapter (chapter 4) who could not complain about her husband because there was not anything to complain about. The following excerpt shows how Keiko tries to join the group by taking and keeping her position as a novice member in this group.

Excerpt 6.6. "Is ten years okay?" (a story about a future event and shared event)

1  Keiko: my-my husband support me.
2  Lee: mm
3  Keiko: we have a-I have a qu-question
4  Lee: mm
5  Keiko: yeah he explain=
6  Tae: [=eh only five years
7  Keiko: [(xxx)
8  All: Hahahahah
9  Keiko: [(xxx) and then
10 Tae: [more than ten times ahahahaha
11 Lee: what?
12 ? do it ten years ahahahaha
13 Lee: yeah
14 Keiko: I cannot. Hhhhh
15 Lee: yeah
16 maybe that's right yeah so he was nice before?
17 I mean he was nice when he was-
18 Tae: before, yeah.
19 All: aahahahaha
20 Tae: nice before
21 Lee: yeah
22 Aya: [long time
23 Tae: [no yeah long time ago mm-mm
24 (2.4)
25 Keiko: 10 years okay?
26 Lee: 10 aha
27 Keiko: ah 10 years okay
28 Tae: [mm still okay
29 Keiko: [after 10 years (. ) change?
30 Tae: ah little bit, little bit
Keiko emerges as distinct from the other women in this group because of her newlywed status. Keiko's newlywed status and happy marriage life worked as a bid of interaction or shared resource that the women often use in their stories. Tae is an established member of the group partly because she is the oldest group member and she has expertise in many aspects of life. In this excerpt, Keiko's supportive husband is challenged by Tae in line 6. Tae's small story in line 6 shows the women's shared knowledge and it also implies future projection. As a form of mocking, Tae jokingly tells everyone how long Keiko has been married, and contrasts this with her own long marriage. This prevents Keiko's further telling and gives her a tenuous position in this interaction.

Lee highlights whether the number of years matters in this case by asking if Tae's husband was nice before. It is confirmed by Tae that her husband was good a long time ago. Tae emphasizes that it was a long time ago by elongating and stretching the word to emphasize her long marriage life. After a quite long pause in line 24, Keiko asks a question: whether ten years would be okay. In other words, will a husband remain kind and supportive even after (up to) ten years. Keiko's projected story on a hypothetical future event offers a space to her to position herself as someone who seeks advice or knowledge on marriage from others. However, the women who receive Keiko's question have been telling stories about their unhelpful husbands, so Keiko's question does not really require an expert's answer. However, Keiko picks up on a question about Tae's past experience to contribute to the ongoing interaction, and resumes her own story tellership by doing this.

Keiko explicitly acknowledges her lack of entitlement in relation to the story constructed by the other women, having failed to get her own story onto the floor. She immediately makes one last effort to gain entitlement and story floor as a form of asking a question and seeking advice. This shows that Keiko explicitly assigns ownership of the
story to Tae. In addition, this question appeals to Tae's expertise surrounding long marriage life. Tae offers advice to Keiko that her husband will change gradually. By recommending that the other women in this group have to learn by themselves, she constructs herself as an independent person in this story. Tae constructs her husband as an unkind and uncaring person in the story world, which highlights her construction of herself as an independent person. She creates an identity of "marriage expert" in the group of and of a savvy woman who knows how men are.

Overall, excerpts 6.4. and 6.5 show that Helen's and Keiko's stories do not get much attention from the other group members, and arguably they fail to hold tellership in this interaction. In particular, Keiko took on the role of "novice" and was treated as such in a genuine way. She asked questions to the 'experts' (in this case, other women), and she was given the related role accordingly. Helen and Keiko's stories were often cut off and discontinued by other members. Their attempts to stay neutral in a storied world do not fit well with the other women's ways of building protagonists in their stories and the group's expectations. In particular, Keiko's case shows that the women also construct normality not only to hold the story floor but also to stay in the group. In other words, being normal gives entitlement to the teller but at the same time it offers membership in the community.

The investigation of narrated worlds is also related to the interactional level and the narrators' positioning. In this respect, the question of "how do linguistic and paralinguistic cues position the narrator and the audience interactionally?" (Wortham, 2001, p.15) is pursued in analyzing these women's stories. In the following sections, I will also illustrate how the process of constructing self and other is realized as a form of creating and developing different speaker roles in telling. Based on the data analysis in the following section, I further discuss how the participants construct their storied and storytelling world in relation to their positioning and identity claims.

6.4. Positioning Self and Other

In line with the concept of identities-in-interaction (e.g. Androutsopoulos and Georgakopoulou, 2003; Antaki and Widdicombe, 1998), the following analysis shows
"what people (they) do being in a specific interactions for specific purposes and through specific language choices (Georgakopoulou, 2008, p.598)." Georgakopoulou & Finnis (2009) extends this notion and explains identity-in-interaction as follows:

"how identities become locally occasioned discursive projects that interrelate with language forms in indirect and mediated ways as opposed to one-to-one correspondences. This emphasis on the constitutive role of language in social identities, coupled with the recognition that identities can be multiple, fleeting, and irreducibly contingent, has precipitated a shift of interest from category-bound research with a demographic basis, to practice-based research. (Georgakopoulou & Finnis, 2009 p.467)"

An interactional approach to narrative views a story is situated in various discursive involvements including justifying, complaining, and giving and receiving advice, which are fundamental reasons for telling and listening to a story. This perspective is also related to the construction of self and other. In this respect, the issue of self and other positioning is not only about representation of other parties, but rather it is also considered a situated action. People use ways of speaking that index social positions, contexts, assessments, and ideological stances, all of which have become associated with linguistic choices through previous social usages.

The analysis of identities-in-interaction also discursively invokes solidified (known or habitual) roles that go beyond local occasions. In line with researchers who strove to document habituality -- often constructing self and other while remaining committed to line by line, language focused micro analysis of identities (e.g. Wetherell, 2007; Wortham, 2006) -- the notion of continuity in constructing self has been a crucial issue in the studies of narratives.

Similarly, the current study takes identities-in-interaction as a key manner of analyzing stories and examines how the participants construct themselves and others, for example, themselves, their husbands and sons. The women in this study focus on the behavior or modes of conduct involving the qualities of a "good husband" or a "good mother." This is related to the discussion on level 3 analysis which will show how local micro acts of positioning in narration relate to larger macro, more enduring structures of
identities, which are relevant for participants beyond the recorded interactional episode (De Fina, 2008 & 2013).

6.4.1. More Discussion on Positioning Level 3

In analyzing level 1 and 2, people display local understandings of positions, which is a reciprocal and dialogical process. By looking at footings and quoted speech, the women not only take but also attribute and negotiate each other's positions in narrating world. The storytellers take different speaker roles in their storytelling. They construct others by borrowing their voices, which serves and works as a way of constructing the self. The positive and negative attributions of certain characters emerge in the participants' stories and are used in their identity claims. On the interactional level, the women tell stories to receive sympathy from one another, and these stories are often complaint stories about the men. The women in this group find topics that they can complain about together and often times it is about the husbands or sons.

Here, I will discuss further how it is that the relations between local processes and more macro process are complex, rather than a straightforward distinction between macro and micro social structures. In her recent study, De Fina (2013) underscores the importance of examining level 3 positioning analysis since it offers "middle ground" (p.45) between micro and macro analysis of identity. This middle ground perspective considers identities as a process that connects what people said at the local level to Discourses in a wider social context. In her analysis, she emphasizes the examination of individual stances beyond the level of particular interactions, and the linking of Discourses to local identities.

De Fina (2013) theorizes Bamberg's (1997) level 3 positioning as middle ground for observing micro (a talk-in-interaction approach to identity) and macro (socio-cultural processes and ideologies) analysis. De Fina (2013) emphasizes that focusing on level 3 allows us observe who we are, for example, participants' membership in social identities or moral identities. In De Fina's (2013) analysis of narratives from Latino immigrants, she discusses that the participant constructs her identity in relation to Discourses about language and migration around them, and these discourses are linked to how they construct their identity at the local level.
Bamberg & Georgakopoulou (2008) focus on how the storytellers position a sense of self with regards to dominant discourses or master narratives, and how they build themselves as a particular kind of person. Bamberg’s level 3 analysis is also closely related to Georgakopoulou (2012) discusses the continuity and consistency of identities, and people regularly orient to as being stable. She asserts that iterativity of positions are found in recurrent patterns of identity formation. Looking at iterativity in an ethnographic context might also lead us to uncover how positions are regularly tied to certain sites and interactional occasions of story-telling within communities of practice (p.11). In my data, the larger social identities and discourses surrounding them (i.e., the identities) include English as second language and gendered identities. The excerpts analyzed above show how gendered identities and L2 experiences are at play and impact on the women's here-and-now interaction.

6.5. Summary

In this chapter, I investigated how different speaker roles are found in the participants' stories and how, by taking different speaker roles, the interactional goals the participants achieved in their storytelling. Goffman's deconstruction of the concept of speaker shows different production roles: author (the person who created the utterance), animator (the person who physically produces an utterance), figure (someone who belongs to the story world, a character), and principal (someone who is committed to what the utterance says). Goffman (1981) proposes 'footing' to refer to different production formats speakers can use them in their telling; footing captures "participant's alignment, or set, or stance or projected self" tied to "a strip of behavior" (p.128).

The speaker role analysis illustrates that the participants creatively and strategically utilize characters in the storytelling world. When talk is reported, it may not represent what was actually said, nor how it is said (Berman, 1998; Errington, 1998; Holt & Clift, 2007), but the women's quoting of others and presenting a variety of linguistic resources that are typically associated with the characters serves to construct their own social identities. Furthermore, the characters in these women's stories are not random, but rather have been developed as the participants' interactional history evolves. These
resources (i.e., characters) repeatedly occur in the participants' storytelling activities (Keiko's case, for example).

This analysis also illustrates how invoking other people's voices may provide evidence for a teller's view and their positioning (Georgakopoulou, 2008). By doing this discursive work, the women also construct themselves as particular types of people, in this case, a particular kind of mother or wife. The analysis also illustrates how telling about others and borrowing others’ voices serve as dynamic ways of constructing their own L2 identities. The women in this study construct others (including a son and husband who are not in their L2 community) by bringing their voices into their storytelling world. This shows that the participants construct not only their gendered identities -- including mother or wife -- but also construct themselves as L2 users/learners. Investigating how the women adopt other people's voices in their stories demonstrates how the process of positioning self and other is manifested. The analysis provides descriptions that relate to a category of personhood within the idea of binary opposites or other members of these categories. The analysis also shows that, the women also construct what is considered normative in this group in telling stories.

The use of different speaker roles contributes to the dynamic nature of multiparty storytelling, and it is also related to the construction of shared communicative knowledge and history among the group members. Speaker role analysis also shows how the participants manifest their identities and positioning in a larger social world. This analysis supports the idea that the participants’ continuity and consistency of identities matter for participants themselves in addition to the ways in which they construct and maintain their group (Georgakopoulou, 2013). Discursive construction of characters in the storied world is not limited to their stories, but also links to the ways the characters are evaluated in the women's storytelling world. The analysis also shows that "participation is the essence of the constitution of the multi-party interaction. Footing includes a framework for the analysis of participation. This gives an alternative view of participation" (Goodwin, 2007, p.44).

When we look at Helen's stories, Helen constructs herself as a responsible parent by embracing her domestic responsibility. In Helen's story, she voices her son by
constructing him as a busy, unhelpful person in the story; however, the way the character (Helen's son) is constructed in the story also helps her positions herself as a devoted, responsible, and caring mother. Helen constructs herself as a relatively traditional "old-fashioned" responsible and caring mother, which is also relevant to her moral stance (Ochs & Capps, 2001) in the story world and her identity as a caring mother. However, hypothetical small stories offer a discursive space to Helen to empower herself as a strong mother.

In Tae's case, she often quotes her husband in her story and constructs him as a "unkind and uncaring man" who does not support her at all. This positioning is also related to her way of building her identity as an independent and hard-working woman. In addition, both Helen and Tae not only construct their son and husband (respectively) as the "other" gender, but also construct them as "others" who have more linguistic knowledge but are unhelpful. Interestingly, even in the process of constructing themselves as particular people in the narrating world, they do not highlight their linguistic deficiency or difficulties in L2 communication in a serious way, but rather they construct these cases in an amusing way.

They are oriented to shared and repeated claims of their identities as L2 users or as a woman who has happy marriage life (e.g. Keiko) in this chapter. The analysis shows how the women's identities are regularly coupled to certain types of stories, or certain types of characters in the stories, and interactional context of storytelling within communities of practice. In this sense, over time, repeated appropriation and recontextualization by participating in interaction not only form particular social relations, but also convey ways of speaking, acting, and feeling, which can be explained with the notion of CoP (Wenger, 1998). The women in this study find fault with men and sympathize with each other in order "to belong" -- even if one does not feel similarly as the others internally, as we can see Keiko's and Helen's case.

In the storytelling world, not all participants have the same role; some have/do not have the right to tell and some have/do not have the right to evaluate. Participants' roles, along with the story structure, emerge in the context of ongoing conversation, and these are also related to who is telling and the interactional histories of the participants.
(Georgakopoulou, 2007). Furthermore, participant role, prior interaction, and interactional histories may become sedimented, which may index a specific participant and her participation. In addition, regarding the women's storytelling participation, this analysis also shows that, just because a woman attempts to engage with a CoP at some level, it does not necessarily follow that she desires a trajectory to central group membership: her peripherality or staying out may be an intended stance (Goebel, 2010).

Moreover, the analysis in this chapter further pushes the discussion on investigating L2 interactional storytelling. Examining the women's use of speaker roles and quoted speech in storytelling prompts us to consider certain questions, including: what the women gain from borrowing other's voices in their L2 storytelling, and whether the women's selection is relevant to their linguistic skills or cultural knowledge. I will continue this discussion in the next chapter, chapter 7, when I take up an overall discussion of this study.
CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

7.0. Introduction

Stories play a crucial role in everyday conversation. We continually tell stories and listen to other people's stories. This study has sought to demonstrate how people share their stories in a group and how they construct their identities and social relations by telling stories. I analyzed everyday L2 storytelling in relatively informal contexts and investigated how participants (re)constructed their social networks based on their day-to-day experiences. Specifically, I explored transnational women's stories in various English-speaking contexts. This study shows that the participants’ collective way of (re)defining their identities and (re)constructing their social relations through storytelling is a form of discourse that became a rich site for the study of L2 use. L2 speakers' friendship networks based on the participants' close-knit relationship is relatively unexplored area of the research. However, just as we have studied gendered identities and L2 speakers' experiences at work and in other contexts, we also need an understanding of who they come to know in and through their L2, and what kinds of relations they may form by using the language.

I explored how participants' collaborative process of storytelling allows us to observe complex social relations alongside the process of identity construction -- and how the practice of telling different stories contributes to form CoP(s) and memberships in L2 women's communities. Storytelling is meaningful to these women, for it allows them to take part in linguistically and culturally dynamic practices, and refigure their identities in regard to their community in a new social context.

By synthesizing the results of my data analysis, in this final chapter, I summarize the findings and further discuss the implication of the findings. I also present how the results contribute to the fields of second language research, particularly to immigrant education. Last but not least, I will describe future directions for how studies of this nature might be further developed.

7.1. Overview of the Chapters and Summary of the Findings
In Chapter 1, I explained the motivation of my study, and how I situate this research within the existing literature. I presented a map of the major framework, CoP, and a key construct, Gender, which are the foundation for this study. Gender is highly relevant throughout and it largely constraints the types of stories that the women find tellable in the group and how they share stories with one another as well.

Not only did I investigate each concept, but I scrutinized the interconnected and multilayered aspects of these different theoretical concepts. I explored overlaid areas between the different concepts that are useful to this study, because the nexus where L2 use meets CoP turn are a crucial part of my framework. I also discussed key constructs for this study including participation, practice, and membership. I emphasized how these theoretical constructs form a basis for further data analysis. I examine how the women mutually engage in their community of practice, how they achieve their interactional goal in a collaborative way, and how they construct their shared repertoires and use them as resources in storytelling. These foci of the investigation are captured by analyzing the women's stories to see how storytelling practice impact the community and the participants' community membership.

The theme of Chapter 2 is the idea of narrative as an analytical tool and goal. I explained my definition of story, and how and why I used narrative analysis for this study. Specifically, I investigated the ways in which the women in the study create a space for sharing their life concerns and for practicing English. Among the different functions of narratives, I focused on how the narrative finds its way into the participants’ lives and creates a discursive site for community formation.

I highlight that even though it is hard to easily identify a single 'CoP' in strict terms, the women did indeed form a community amongst themselves that was largely created through narratives, and through a particular type of story, small stories. In their recent work, De Fina (2013) and Georgakopoulou (2013), explicitly discuss the micro-macro connection and emphasize the Level 3 positioning. De Fina (2013) theorize Bamberg's (1997) level 3 positioning as middle ground for observing micro (talk-in-interaction approach to identity) and macro (socio cultural processes and ideologies) analysis. De Fina (2013) emphasizes focusing on Level 3 allows us to observe who they
are, for example, participants' membership into social identities or moral identities. In De Fina's (2013) analysis of narratives from Latino immigrants, she discusses that the participant constructs her identity in relation to Discourses about language and migration and how that impacts identity construction at the local level.

In her discussion on continuity and consistency of identities, Georgakopoulou asserts that iterativity of positions can be found in the recurring patterns of identity claims that people orient to as being stable (Georgakopoulou, 2013). Looking at iterativity in the ethnographic context also might lead us to discover how positions are regularly tied to certain sites and interactional occasions of story-telling within communities of practices.

In this chapter, I introduced my focal analytical concerns related to story features: 1) story dimensions and storytelling participation, 2) shared repertoires and iterative story elements, and 3) different speaker roles in narrated worlds to investigate the construction of self and other. These three story features were introduced respectively in the following data chapters.

The data analysis chapters are organized into three different chapters based on the analytical focuses described in Chapter 2. I presented my analysis of the interactional data collected from three different contexts 1) break time interaction in an ESL class 2) a workplace, and 3) various social gatherings outside the language class. Each context was chosen to explore different aspects of the participants’ interactional storytelling though some common ground was also present in terms of gendered identities and cultural knowledge. The women across different time and spaces use their gendered identities to establish common ground with each other. The workplace explored in chapter 5 shows how cultural knowledge (see also iterativity in Georgakopoulou, 2013). Overall, the analysis shows the emergence of a story, as well as how the participants make use of social spaces for social purposes and language use.

Chapter 3 is about how I conducted this research. I first explained the research questions and described the three research contexts, which are the break times in the ESL class, social gatherings, and workplace interactions. Another goal of this chapter is describing the data. I explained the background of the key participants, the types of data
collected, and the ways that the data were collected. Participants' detailed profiles and observation of their language use are also explained to provide the background of this study.

In Chapter 4, I investigated three different storytelling dimensions. These were embeddedness (how a story is embedded in a certain social context), tellership (how people achieve a telling right and maintain it in multiparty storytelling), and tellability (how people tell something that enables it not only to be told, but the teller also to be heard). The data analysis showed that it is important to consider context issues, as stories are anchored in a specific context. Break time in different contexts (i.e., school and workplace) offered space and time for the women to share particular stories, including their pregnancies, mothers-in-law, daughters-in-law, and husbands, etc. These may be universal topics for complaints among women, but at the same time, they are also locally shared resources for the participants in this study. The finding reveals that tellership and tellability are not given, but rather achieved in the process of collaborative storytelling.

From teasing co-workers into sharing personal experiences, a myriad of shared interactional resources were found in the participants' stories, including shared humor and repeated story structures. These linguistic features are practiced in the group over and over with particular interactional purposes. Chapter 5 took up this topic of shared interactional resources in stories. By investigating shared repertoires in the regularly interacting group, I specifically sought to answer, 1) what resources do the participants bring to engage in their interactions? and 2) in what ways do the women utilize these resources in constructing their identities and social relations? In that chapter, by analyzing the participants’ stories, I underscored how they manage sophisticated social relations with their co-tellers and built a discursive community of practice. A number of other salient features came to the fore in the analysis. First, the analysis illustrates how shared repertoires as a product of community of practice over time (Wenger, 1998) work in the group. Shared repertoires work as rapport-enhancing markers or boundary drawing markers. The women's intercultural knowledge from their own experiences came into and circulated in the telling and they negotiated cultural norms and practices in telling stories. Both the contents of the story and the repeated story structures were examined in chapter
5. The repeatedly practiced stories in the group of close co-workers can also be important interactional resources for maintaining and reinforce the women's social relations. Analyzing repeated components in the stories have important implications on identity and belonging, even though it does not seem very successful for the case of Ray in Chapter 5. For instance, Ray's uses of repeated story structures and jokes served as tools to invite Sunja into ongoing stories, but they also offered the space for him to rehearse his identities, as well as providing him access to the group. Furthermore, this chapter illustrated, despite the sharing of resources, how Sunja is engaged, but not in a way that takes up the structures offered to her by her co-workers. She sometimes refuses categories imposed by other members; one of these is "Korean woman." Her refusal to be a Korean woman at work is different from her positioning as a Korean woman or Korean mother when interacting with her classmates. She chose to exclude herself from the group.

Investigating Sunja's interaction at her workplace draws attention to her participation in two other contexts. She takes on a certain identity and rejects other identities in her storytelling. Thus, creating social relations while building social inclusion or distance shows that the participants selectively involve themselves in one particular community, not in all the communities around them. When we look at Sunja's participation during the ESL class break time in chapter 4, the way that she involves in the interaction is different from her interaction with the co-workers. When she talked about mother-in-law's characters with her friends in the break time, she more actively involved in constructing storylines, suggesting ideas, and sharing her experiences, besides proving backchannels and continuers to signal her listenership.

Last, in Chapter 6, I investigated the participants' collaborative ways of constructing positioning in the narrated world by attending to their use of footing and voicing in the storytelling. With close linguistic observation, I examined how the participants constructed themselves and others, both in the storied and storytelling world. The main theme of that chapter is the participants' stories of family life and motherhood. This is also related to De Fina's (2013) discussion for a larger identity or Positioning Level 3. The question of "who they are?" has been answered by investigating the
participants' membership, social identities, or moral identities. This points to the Discourses of L2 language and migration around them.

This chapter examined how the women take different speaker roles in their collaborative storytelling, whose voices they borrow, and in what ways they construct narrated and narrating world. They construct characters in their stories based on their experiences of marriage life and child rearing. They draw on and contribute to telling a story and construct shared knowledge and history among the group members. They are not just sharing their personal experiences but they are also constructing group culture, membership, and out-group members' identities in dialogic and performative ways.

The analysis highlights the ways in which the participants create characters in the storytelling world and animate them by utilizing different linguistic devices. It also presents how they construct themselves in larger discourses. One of the significant findings in that chapter is that animating other voices in telling reveals how participants position themselves in relation to the characters they animate. A participant telling about a son, daughter-in-law, or husband, and animating those characters in a storied world, is also constructing her identity as a devoted, responsible, and domestic mother and housewife. Thus, this process is also related to how the participants construct their moral stances in the process of collaborative storytelling.

Overall, the analysis in this study illustrates that participants' identity claims appear as habitual formulations or iterativity (Georgakopoulou, 2013) in their storytelling. For example, a recycled story component does not only include the repetitive use of certain terms or expressions, but it also includes habitually formed ways of communicating. In other words, iterative features are linked to shared interpretative repertories, which are “systems of signification and building blocks used for manufacturing versions of actions self and social structures in talk” (Potter & Wetherell, 1995, p. 85). These available resources are then used for making evaluations and performing particular actions (Potter & Wetherell, 1995). The benefit of investigating identity claims with the perspective of habitual formulation is its traceability to the recurrent identity claims in a specific context.
In sum, across the data presented in these chapters, the participants create comfortable and safe discursive spaces to enact practices to share their life experiences and to belong in, though the women construct spaces where they do not want to belong (Sunja's case) and spaces where there are boundaries that do not let certain people inside (Keiko's case). and.

The women in this study actively participate in co-constructing stories so that they can take up their tellership, and achieve their personal and social goals. Such aims include setting up an atmosphere of companionship, having an impact on people’s sense of identity, and building intimate relationships. For instance, Tae’s role as a teller creates an identity for her in the group as a “marriage expert” and a savvy woman who knows about the nature of men. Her stories have high tellability in the group so that they have a higher chance to be retold in the group. This also shows the way in how she constructs her sense of self in relation with other women.

The purpose of the data analysis, however, is not to generalize samples of female talk, but rather, to focus on how the discursive collaboration of storytelling provides a space for belonging and identity-making among the participants.

7.2. Implications of the Study

By investigating the diverse social contexts in which these participants engage, the primary goal of this project is to have an overall picture of L2 women’s experiences of language use and learning, and their construction of L2 and gendered identities. In pulling together the results of the data analysis, it is clear that these women create a space for themselves to practice English, and craft social relationships based on their desire to build local social networks. The women's act of maintaining a community has two goals. First, it serves to construct solidarity and mutual liking. Second, they voluntarily create their own safety zone for using and practicing language. They sometimes used their L1 in side discussions. For example, Sunja and Yeon share their L1 and sometimes talked in Korean. However, their use of L1 is very rare and restricted to the case of clarification since most of the data involves women of different L1 backgrounds. This is also related to how the women construct and keep their L2 community.
One of the most important aspects of this study is the investigation of L2 users' informal interaction out of school settings including a workplace and several social gatherings. By examining the participants' stories in informal communities across different social contexts, I argue that CoPs are created and maintained through the regular practices of storytelling. In other words, the process of creating and maintaining the community is realized in telling stories. The women develop and expand their repertoires of shared practices, and these activities strengthen and enrich the community. In the following sections, I will elaborate the implications of the findings with a different focus.

7.2.1. Analyzing L2 Interactional Narratives

Among several implications of this study, I first want to highlight that this study deals with L2 interactional narratives, which are still relatively uncommon with reference to life history narratives. The analysis gives a different perspective to the area of L2 identity research, an area where interview elicitation remains a dominant method of investigation. A benefit of analyzing interactional narratives in a group of women is that we can closely see how stories are told in a collaborative and dynamic way among the participants. The benefits of using narrative analysis in investigating L2 language use is also supported by the following statement.

“The function of social strategies is to produce pathetic talk by seeking commonalities and building a rapport which can be achieved through small talk or indirect complaint. Informing explicitly learners about the social function of language important as such activity is at the root of much of the negotiation of relationships that is inherent in making friends’ according to Boxer and Pickering (1995) who also report that the social strategy of seeking commonalities is not discussed in a number of text books” (Lo Bianco et al., 1999, p.154).

As this quote explains, it is important to explore how L2 users manage their telling as a social function and as a formal property of how they intertwine place, time and characters (orientation) into the story. How they initiate a story, manage to hold the floor throughout their storytelling, keep their audience engaged, and end their storytelling activity to return to the here-and-now of the story-telling situation are the crucial elements that language users need to practice in making and negotiating their social relations.
In this vein, investigating the participants’ stories make us rethink the notion of competence; whether an ability to tell a story is dependent on their level of linguistic skill. How do we answer this question? To answer, it is crucial to observe how the participants dialogically organize their language and action in their storytelling. In this sense, L2 interaction need not be limited to the idea of mastery of a steady and standardized code or form of agreement, but instead ought to include the achievement of strategies for the accomplishment of mutual understanding of diverse practices and modes of meaning. It also has implications for rethinking the meaning of L2 learning and use, and how these are tied to contextual issues. Investigation of language use outside of language classes brings the complex issues of English language learning and use closer to the real world (Gupta, 2006). We need to concentrate on language learning and use in contexts outside of educational institutions to holistically understand people’s linguistic and cultural practices, and their methods of engaging with certain communities. My study complicates the idea of learning a language (in this case, English). English learning is probably done to some degree for practical and instrumental purposes, but also integrative in the way of forming a community with others.

By analyzing story features (including story dimensions: embeddedness, tellership, and tellability), the use of shared linguistic and cultural resources in the women’s stories, and speaker roles in storytelling, I investigated the dynamic aspects of multi-party storytelling; the participants' story participation also shows how they use their L2 in their daily interactions. I largely seek to answer: what does a closer analysis of linguistic practices in this community tell us about the participants' identities and social relations? In the following section, I will delve into the implication of investigating narratives in researching L2 communities.

7.2.2. L2 Narratives and CoPs

I want to emphasize the fact that L2 narrative research is still under examined in the field of applied linguistics and this study claims that L2 small stories are important to investigate how CoP works in details in the contexts of informal social settings. In addition, the data analysis shows that how the stories are linked over time as they develop.
The interactional narrative analysis pushes the concept of Community of Practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder 2002) further at the methodological level by way of narrative analysis: a more concrete, visible, and discursive method for examining participants’ daily interactions with other members in a closely established group. The investigation on interactional storytelling opens a new discursive space for L2 where multi-party storytelling is considered a rich resource for observing what people do in their specific spatial and temporal contexts.

The findings of this study also shed light on the use of interactional narrative analysis in CoP research. Given that the interactional narratives provide the participants a means of organizing their experiences with others, by examining narratives, we understand the process of how individuals actively negotiate their relationship with others in the community and social contexts in which they interact. The analysis also shows that it is not just a negotiation of narrative entitlement and tellership that the participants seek for in their community, but also a negotiation of individual and group identity or the connection between the two. This is also related to the concept of community. My study argues that a community is a set of discursive practices that people engage in. Similarly, Holmes' study on workplaces demonstrates how the participants' humor serves as a discursive practice through which everyone created a sense of community. The discursively-based CoPs are also found in studies of communities in social media including Facebook and fan fiction, too, which are arguably almost entirely discursive community. These examples are distinctive from Lave and Wenger's interests in people at work.

As Norrick (1997) emphasizes, the act of joint-telling aligns speakers with one another which then offers the participants the opportunity to articulate their mutual status as the members of the community who not only share social events, but also "share their perception of what is storyable" (Shuman, 1986, p.54) as a community practice. Shared stories can contribute to the "coherence of community grouping" (Johnstone, 1990, p.641), and a participant positions themselves and others by constructing herself as a protagonist of the story. However, sharing life experiences does not always coincide with the corresponding narrative status.
7.2.3. Implications for Big/Small Story Distinction

I discussed the use of small story in analyzing L2 multiparty storytelling in the previous sections. As small stories are represented as the fleeting moments of narrative orientation that can be easily missed, we can use small stories to capture L2 use in the participants' stories which occur in personal, private, and social spaces. This study deals with interactional narratives but it is not difficult to find canonical story features and structures in participants’ stories (see excerpts 4.2. and the analysis). Therefore, I discuss big and small stories and the need for both to be further elaborated in order to more fully capture the features and goals of these two kinds of stories. There will be an area where these two different types of stories complement one another. The difference between big and small stories, beyond their metaphorical meaning, is how they view the notion of social construction; what drives and what guides construction process are dealt differently in these two types of stories (Freeman, 2010). Small stories find construction in interactional and situational dynamic while big stories focus more on a narrator. A synthetic approach (Freeman, 2010, p.7) which encompasses both micro and macro aspects of a story rather than considering small story as an alternative ways of understanding narratives and identities such as practice-based approach to narratives (Bamberg, 2012; De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008) needs to be considered. Both interactional practices and reflective acts should be considered since it is impossible to depart completely from big stories when considering one's identity. This claim is also supported by the idea of "more or less rather than all-or nothing views" in what constitutes a story (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012, p.117).

7.3. CoP, Gender, and Shared Knowledge

This study captures the complexities of the participants' language use and learning within the frame of CoPs. I use this framework to examine the dynamic nature of multiparty interaction by analyzing both the vertical (i.e. temporal, historical) and the horizontal (e.g. spatial, locational) dimensions of language use among participants. This effort not only expands and enriches paradigms commonly used in L2 research, but also responds to gaps in unexplored areas of our research. The close examination of
participants’ interaction during the break time of a language class, workplace, and social gatherings provided rich data. I did not limit the analysis to comparing or contrasting different contexts, but rather illuminated how each context offers a unique space for building a particular CoP and social belonging in its own way.

7.3.1. CoP and Gender

The themes that circulate throughout the data are women’s complaints, teasing and humor, and experiences related to the L2. These female participants complain about their sons, husbands, and mothers-in-law. They share their experiences and points of view, which entails negotiating spaces for belonging. My intention is not to draw on stereotypes of female talk, but rather to focus on how discursive collaboration among women functions as a site of belonging and identity-making among L2 speakers.

Many studies on gender in transnational spaces assert that women in a new space can be liberated from their traditional or conservative gender roles. The context surrounding their gender roles has shifted over time in this study as well as their needs to learn English (e.g. their husbands' ignoring of them). In addition, their cross-cultural marriage life impacts their gendered identities. However, there are also some coherent aspects of identities including

The women chose to utilize self-imposed, arguably traditional, gender identities in their telling of stories in order to build shared ground for maintaining their group. For example, the women found shared topics together such as motherhood, their mothers-in-law, their husbands, and what they consider to be a wife’s or mother's role – in order to construct common ground in which to share their interactions. This is different from previous studies on L2 learners’ gender identity or identity studies in general, which emphasize that participants necessarily experience a transformative process of constructing new identities in new contexts, challenging and resisting their socially or culturally-given gender identities. However, the women in this study often use their relatively traditional identities including helpless daughter-in-law (Mayumi, Masako, Sunja in chapter 4) or caring mother (Helen in chapter 6) and not take just these identities but also use them as resources to make a ground for sharing their experiences.
In this sense, my study also presents unique findings based on the analysis that the women’s stories are discursive spaces in which we can observe in what ways they are aligned with and choose to anchor their gender roles. This study also finds that gender can be a very universal topic for complaints among women, while at the same time serving as a local resource for the women to find belonging with each other in their communities. Their stories were culturally and socially embedded, and they used contextualized interactional resources to make jokes or to project future events. In the following section, I will delve into the discussion on the participants’ shared knowledge and how this works as resource in telling and sharing their stories.

7.3.2. Shared Knowledge as Interactional Resources

The participants mutually define each other’s identities across gender and ethnicity based on their knowledge of what others know, what they can do, how they can contribute to an enterprise, and their ability to assess the appropriateness of actions and products. This mutual definition entails a shared discourse, which in turn reflects the groups’ shared view of the world. The groups’ shared worldview can be seen in the participants’ local knowledge, shared stories, inside jokes, knowing/known laughter, and certain styles of communication. These shared features are recognized as participants’ ways of constructing their identities and social relations; it shows who belongs and how they belong their community. One of the shared aspects is the women’s motivation of language learning, others are private and personal spheres of language use, which will be discussed in the following section, use, and language learning as a leisure activity.

7.3.3. Language Learning as a Social Networking

The participants, who have been attending publicly-funded ESL classes in Hawaii for several years, are willing to characterize themselves as "forever ESL students," since learning English to them has social meaning for constructing their networking. In contrast to previous studies that found some adult ESL learners who were not willing to attend the class, resisted coming to class, or refused to be identified as language learners, the participants in this study keep coming to their class with strong motivation. The short stayers (see chapter 3 for more information) in class, not many of them are qualified to work in the U.S. and some relatively older women are retired from their work. Some
participants do not need to work because their spouse has a job. While immigrants’ second language learning is often justified or explained as the acquisition of cultural capital or socioeconomic mobility, this study calls attention to social dimensions of language learning.

The findings of this study shed light on additional meanings of learning English; specifically, taking an English class provided the learners with a feeling of satisfaction derived from forming and maintaining their social networks and friendships. From my observation, while the immigrant language program emphasized the development of competence and socialization into the target society, the learners valued creating a safe space for learning and for using language with a strong sense of community (Goldstein, 1996), as well as for legitimating their membership in this community. By observing ESL learners’ desires and needs for learning English from a hobbyist perspective (Kubota, 2011), I also pinpoint a mismatch between learners’ emphasis on social function and inherent values of language learning and teachers' or schools’ focus on linguistic and cultural achievement of language learning. Moreover, the school or teachers might be constrained by the top-down employment-oriented requirements (and discourses) that come along with receiving government funding. By uncovering the hidden corners of language learning, this study challenges the roles of English learning and use, which often link to economic opportunities, cultural capital, and survival skills. I assert that ESL learners should be viewed as active consumers of English who pursue important social networking opportunities.

This perspective is related to the idea that one’s language use in everyday life is considered important, rather than the idea that a participant is an incomplete communicator who tries to achieve a target like competence or native rules. This highlights how participants negotiate meanings given the various resources available to them, and how they locally construct and ratify meaning in their storytelling. It also brings language learning closer to the real world by breaking down monolithic notions of language learning and offering alternative pedagogic goals.

The findings of this study also have implications on the immigrant educational practices. From a practical point of view, the close analysis of the participants' interaction
in diverse social settings shows what the immigrant language learners' needs are and how
the formal language learning can help their social lives which are as important as their
formal language learning experiences in an educational setting. Furthermore, this
discussion helps the immigrant language educators find possible ways to connect
language learning in class and the one outside of language class. For example, one of the
practical implications in this study is rethinking about the meaning of break time in a
language class and how we can make this time and space useful for the learners.

7.4. Directions for Future Research

In this section, I discuss how this study might be further developed. First, I would
like to expand the scope of this study by analyzing a wider variety of data sources. It will
be meaningful to further investigate male participants' roles and involvement, which did
not receive enough attention in the current study. As I explained in Chapter 3, the male
participants were present at the various gatherings, but took part in the interaction only on
a limited basis. I am wondering how their participation would influence the overall
interaction in this group, and how the male participants' identities are formed and
performed in this group. Pursuing this direction would offer a fuller discussion on
gendered identities. As for the male adult ESL learners and their participation in language
learning and use, Menard-Warwick (2004) has investigated gender in language learning,
and she argues that Spanish speaking men in California seem to need English less than
women partly because of the types of occupations that they tend to get in the society.

Susan Ehrlich (1997) also argues the influence of gender identities on L2 learning,
arguing that men and women have different attitudes towards their L2 learning and
unequal chances to learn and use language, "depending on the particular way that gender
identities and gender relations are constituted in that community" (p.430). However, this
argument also carries the implication that we need to investigate more various social
contexts to observe locally constructed identities. I would like to suggest that researchers
examine groups of L2 women in other contexts which are different from Hawai‘i. Now
that Hawai‘i is a linguistically and culturally unique place in the U.S., the local context of
Hawai‘i shapes the learners' idea about language learning and use, and the concept of L2
and C2, differently from other contexts. One of the examples can be found in the interaction in chapter 5. How the participants at work come to build their knowledge about each others' ethnic foods may not be easily seen universally. Another example in chapter 4 (excerpt 4.6.) also shows how the participating women in the interaction use their knowledge of each others' ethnic foods in discussing the helpful foods for breastfeeding. The wide exposure of various intercultural knowledge impacts the women's construction of shared knowledge. This might not occur in a same way in different contexts.

Furthermore, investigation of different communities from ELS class can be the crucial direction for future research. The group of L2 women in this study is formed from their attendance of ESL class. I suggest we also need to focus on many other transnational communities formed in a myriad ways of social interactions and in diverse contexts. For example, there is much to explore when we discuss how L2 users make friends and become members of a community in online communities (E-pal, Facebook, Twitter, or different types of messenger), religious communities, or professional meetings, etc. To capture the overall picture of the people's L2 use in their social world and to have profound understanding of their lives, we need to investigate more diverse L2 communities across different culture and languages.

Turning to my work, more in-depth analysis of diverse data sources would be another possible direction I could take in the future. How the participants construct insiders' linguistic and cultural knowledge needs to be further explored. The researcher's lack of access to certain cultural or linguistic factors, such as understanding Tagalog (see Chapter 5 for more discussion) does not allow to access to an important analytical lens. For future research, I will consider incorporating additional methods of data collection, which may include interviewing primary participants as well as their co-workers, and administrators in the immigrant language program.

This study raises questions regarding the roles of transnational communities. I specifically hope to develop this study with attention to concerns of practical applications and benefits to transnational populations. By incorporating the needs of immigrant community education, and the concerns that arise from actively drawing upon
students’ experiences, I would like to expand the results of this research to the broader scope of immigrant language education. Immigrant language programs including family literacy or ESL need to be contextually designed and determined for a local group of people, and their specific needs (Glowacki-Dudka, 2005). By analyzing various practices that community learners engage in, I further investigate (see also Lyn Tett, 2010) how immigrants access the opportunities of language learning and use and share their concerns and draw on their experiences in telling stories as a means of constructing their communities.

Research on community-based language education has gained little attention from second language researchers, since teaching and learning a language outside of educational institutions seems beyond our attention. I, however, claim that in terms of improving curriculum, instruction, and materials, it is vital to investigate learners' language use, needs and desires in wider contexts. This is how we can fully understand second language learning in and outside of the language classroom. The current study concludes with questions for reflection about how immigrant educators and researchers might integrate diverse immigrant ESL learners’ needs and desires in language learning and teaching. My future study will be investigating these issues along with instructional activities that initiate a critical dialogue on the meaning of language learning.

7.5. Conclusion

Stories are anchored in a specific context, and they are relevant to the people within that context. I have investigated the participating women’s stories that were told during break time across various social contexts. Break time is an institutionally assigned time and space, but the women in this study use that time and space for constructing belonging. The participants spontaneously construct their own group to practice their L2 and to build social relations during break time both inside and outside of language class. The participants also actively make use of their gathering as a social space for language use. The participants’ intimate relations over a period of regular socializing and mutual engagement in activities led to the formation of in-group discourses.
This study contributes to the body of knowledge in L2 studies and gender and places an emphasis on analyzing second language interactional narratives. Throughout this study, I pursue the meaning of being included in this group of women, and where, why, and how the participants want to belong. The participants not only participated, but also actively created a space that they wanted to be a part of the group, by discursively claiming belonging in a particular CoP. I want to emphasize the fact that L2 narrative research is still under-examined in the field of applied linguistics and this study claims that L2 small stories are important to investigate how CoP works in the contexts of informal social settings.

To conclude, I would like to borrow Hall’s (2008) explanation of identity, that it is represented by "routes" rather than "roots" (p.200). As his quote highlights, in this study, I placed an emphasis on investigating the journey of transnational peoples' lives by analyzing their stories. The participants construct their identities in relation to other members in a community and they maintain their social belongings in a specific time and space, or somewhere in between the different contexts. In this respect, the story Aya told in a social gathering with people from an adult ESL class becomes very compelling. I want to conclude this section with sharing Aya's stories in the following excerpt. This conversation occurs when the women planned a year end party right after Aya just came back from Japan. All the women waited for Aya’s return to celebrate the end of the year or new year together. The women in this excerpt shared their experiences of gaining weight because of the many gatherings in the holiday seasons.

Excerpt 7.1. "Back and forth" (Aya, AH(Aya's husband), Keiko, Lee)

1 Aya: my life is all all all all all back and forth.
2 AH: aha
3 Aya: The lifestyle is back and forth
4 Aya: my English is back and forth
5 Keiko: aha
6 Aya: and my weight is back and forth
7 All: hahahahahahaha
8 Aya: only my age is >go ahead go ahead go ahead<
9 All: ahahahahahahaha
10 AH: never go back hahahaha
11 Lee: so funny ahhahahaha
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Aya told this story to the group when she shared her experiences of going back and forth between Hawai‘i and Japan, due to some family still living in Japan. When she compared the two different life styles, she jokingly said that everything in her life is "back and forth." As in Aya's case, many participants in this study are oriented to more than one root and various life routes, and they bring these into their storytelling to construct their gendered or L2 identities, to find connections, and to build a community. The women zoom in on their common concerns and complaints, and use their stories to build a familiar, safe, and comfortable environment in which to practice their English. Telling stories thus allows the women to create space to belong, and they construct and maintain their social identities and relations. They are not just telling and sharing their personal experiences but they are building friendship, membership, and group culture. In this process, they are constructing what is normative and legitimate. This study, therefore, captures the complexity of the phenomenon in multiparty L2 storytelling and the manifold ways where a story permeates our lives, communication, and communities, by illuminating richness and the ways it is (re)constructed in our daily lives.
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APPENDIX

CONSENT FORM

Date_________________________

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

Immigrant Women’s Storytelling in Multilingual Contexts

Hakyoon Lee
Primary Investigator
Department of Second Language Studies
University of Hawai‘i at Manoa
808-956-2797
hakyoon@hawaii.edu

This research project is being conducted as a component of a dissertation for a doctoral degree. The purpose of the project is to learn about the nature of interactional storytelling among immigrant language learners in Hawai‘i. You are being invited to participate because you have many chances to interact with your classmates, co-workers, and/or friends who do not share your first language.

Participation in this project will consist of letting the researcher observe your interactions with other people in your daily life and take part in a short interview with the researcher. The interactions and interview will be audio-recorded for the purpose of transcription. As for the recording, approximately 30 minute interactions will be recorded over several days, and during the interaction, the researcher will be away from the research site.

No personal indentifying information will be included with the research results, and pseudonyms will be used to protect your identity. Recordings will be stored in a safe place and the data will be used only for the current project. Research data will be confidential to the full extent allowed by law. However, agencies with research oversight, such as the UH Committee on Human Studies, have the authority to review research data.

It is believed that there is little or no risk to participate in this research project. Participating in this research may lead to your greater understanding of the ways in which you communicate with others in various contexts in your daily life. It is also believed that the results of this project will help researchers and educators understand immigrant communities in Hawai‘i, the nature of second language interaction, and immigrant language education, which may benefit your education in the future.

Participation in this research project is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from participation at any time during the duration of the project with no penalty, or loss of benefit to which you would otherwise be entitled.
If you have any questions regarding this research project, please contact the researcher, Hakyoon Lee at (808) 956-2797. You may also contact Hakyoon Lee’s supervisor, Dr. Christina Higgins at (808) 956-2785.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the UH Committee on Human Studies at (808)956-5007, or uhirb@hawaii.edu.

**Participant:**
I have read and understood the above information, and agree to participate in this research project.
☐ I agree to participate in this project.

Name (printed)  ____________________________________
Signature _________________________________________

_Immigrant Women’s Storytelling in Multilingual Contexts_

Hakyoon Lee (ID:1639-6247)  
Primary Investigator  
Department of Second Language Studies  
University of Hawai’i at Manoa  
808-956-2797  
hakyoon@hawaii.edu

**STUDY SYNOPSIS**

This study will investigate how transnational women construct their social relations and identities by telling stories in English as a lingua franca (ELF) environments. My main interest lies in naturally occurring and interactionally achieved stories (Bamberg, 2004; Georgakopoulou, 2006, 2007) told in various social contexts, such as during adult English as Second Language (ESL) classes, at work places, and in social gatherings. In exploring the stories that women tell in these contexts, I will investigate how the women find opportunities to use English with each other as they co-construct their gendered identities (Menard-Warwick, 2009) and common ground for belonging by telling stories.

This study, which will be supported with ethnographic information, will treat multi-party storytelling as a rich resource for observing what people achieve in their specific spatial and temporal contexts. The women locate common concerns and complaints, using their stories to build a familiar, safe, and comfortable environment in which to construct their identities and practice English in multilingual contexts.

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT**
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The present research will be conducted as a significant part of my Ph.D. dissertation research in Second Language Studies, which is being supervised by Dr. Christina Higgins in the Department of Second Language Studies. This project will investigate the nature of immigrant women’s interaction in various social contexts such as community language classes, work places, and social gatherings in Hawai‘i. The project aims to investigate how immigrant women build their social relations and create cultural belonging with classmates, co-workers, and friends by telling and sharing their life stories. I expect the data will also show that women’s storytelling works as a resource for second language learning and use and creates cultural and social spaces for belonging. Ultimately, through the investigation of real-life interactions and participants’ language use in different contexts, this research seeks pedagogical implications for immigrant language education. By showing how immigrant language learners construct their gendered identities and how they make their social relations in and outside of the language class, I argue immigrant language class must aware learners’ language use and their identities.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

For this study, ethnographic information will be gathering by site observation. In addition, two different types of data, naturally occurring interaction and interview data will be collected at three major research sites: break time in ESL language classes, work place interactions, and social gatherings. In the following section, I will describe the research design, methods, and procedures of this research.

A. Naturally occurring storytelling
First, naturally occurring interactional narratives will be recorded under the participants’ permission. The research sites will be immigrant language classes, work places, and social gatherings. Participants are very familiar with the research sites and they have quite dense interactional histories with each other. Audio recording will take place in approximately 20-30 minute periods over several sessions. In order to capture natural interaction, the researcher will not give any specific topic to discuss. Rather participants select their own topics to start and continue their interaction, based on their shared experiences. To capture multiparty interaction, there will be two digital recorders and one of them will get used as a supplementary device. The exact starting and ending point of the recording will be determined by the focal participants, and I will inform them that they can discuss anything they want to talk about. However, contextual factors or institutional factors such as institutional time restrictions (class or work hour) may affect the recording period.

Recordings will be collected at an adult ESL class during break time. Two different work places will also be investigated: a hair salon and florist. Interactions among co-workers who are regularly interact in these work places will be collected, avoiding the interactions with their customers. My primary interest is how the core participants tell stories and use languages rather than their co-workers’ stories.

B. Interview with participants
Besides recording interactional storytelling among participants, individual interview data will be collected as well. Interviews will be conducted after collection of interactional data. From the interview, the participants’ cultural or linguistic background will be directly provided, which is sometimes difficult to emerge in non-interview interaction. This data will work as supplementary resources. In addition, participants will be asked questions related to their storytelling when there is a long enough interval between interactional data collecting and the interview. In this case, the goals of interview are following up on the participants’ stories. Analyzing storytelling and individual interviews will not only allow to triangulate findings, but also has an implication how different types of stories work in complementary relations beyond comparing and contrasting them.

C. Interview Protocols
Here are some possible interview questions for focal participants.

Background information:
1) What is your first language?
2) What language do you usually speak for your daily life?
3) Briefly explain your language learning experience?
4) How long have you been in Hawai‘i?
5) How long have you known each other?
6) What are the common topics you usually share in this group?
7) Clarification question will be improvised based on participants’ answers

Follow-up questions:
1) What helps and does not help your interaction with your classmates (or co-workers, or friends)
2) Clarification question will be improvised based on participants’ answers, such as “what did you mean by____?”

DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPANT POPULATION
Participants in this study will be recruited at one of the community based immigrant language schools in Honolulu, Hawai‘i. Nine participants who attend an ESL class in this school will be involved in the research. Participants are women in their early 30s to early 60s. As a primary researcher, I have a contextual familiarity to this research site. Although the research will begin at the school, it will extend outside of the class to the participants’ work places and social gatherings, with study’s participants remaining focused throughout. The participants will be informed that this research is investigating their social interactions in their language class and outside of the class and how they tell stories with their classmates, co-workers, and/or friends.
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