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Abstract

Over the past decade, the field of L2 motivation research has begun to turn its focus toward what Dörnyei and Ushioda (2010) have termed “socio-complexity” approaches, following recent trends in the wider field of SLA that incorporate discursive and usage-based methodologies (Atkinson, 2011; Cadierno & Eskildsen, 2015; Firth & Wagner, 1997; 2007; Ortega, 2013). These socio-complexity approaches, including Ushioda’s (2009) “person-in-context” perspective, Dörnyei’s (2005; 2009) “L2 motivation self system” and various Complexity/Dynamic Systems Theory (CDST) approaches (Dörnyei, 2014; Dörnyei, MacIntyre & Henry, 2015; MacIntyre, 2012; MacIntyre & Legatto, 2011), though eclectic in focus and methodology, have all begun to step away from the assumptions of context as background variable and individual differences as psychological traits that have dominated much of the previous L2 motivation research, to instead view motivation as dynamically changing and socially contextualized on multiple timescales, and more importantly, have come to recognize that “L2 learner” is just one of many potentially relevant situated identities (Zimmerman, 1998) for those interacting in their L2s (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Ushioda, 2009).

This study contributes to this dynamic and contextualized perspective at the interactional time scale by utilizing EMCA (Ethnomethodology/Conversation Analysis) as it has been applied to second language acquisition (or CA-SLA; see Kasper & Wagner, 2011; 2014) – including sequential analysis (Schegloff, 2007), membership categorization analysis (Fitzgerald & Housley, 2015; Stokoe, 2012), discursive psychology (Edwards & Potter, 1992; 2005) and a focus on embodied interaction (Streeck, Goodwin & LeBaron, 2011) – to analyze mundane Japanese as a Second Language interactions. The data follows Peony, an L2 speaker of Japanese, in video recordings of interactions between her and her L1 speaking friends and family collected.
over the course of 13 months. The analysis focuses on the actions and interactional projects that Peony and her co-participants undertake and co-construct, and takes into account the linguistic, embodied, and material resources that they employ, in order to develop a perspective that focuses on motivation as socially viewable, accountable, and accomplished.

In particular, this study focuses on three aspects of motivation-in-interaction: 1) *persistence*, or the sustained orientation (often through interactional difficulty) toward an interactional goal, 2) *initiative*, or engagement and participation at points where it would not be noticeably absent or accountable to not engage, and 3) *motivation as topic*, focusing on Peony’s self-assessments of her Japanese ability and her accounts regarding the efforts she makes towards studying the language. The analysis reveals that while there are indeed times that Peony’s effort is oriented toward specific learning objects, much of her effort is exerted towards other situated identities such as being an attentive friend or family member. Furthermore, the sequential nature of persistence and engagement, and Peony’s relationships with her co-participants on one hand, and the relationships with others that are invoked in her conversations, with their concomitant category bound rights and obligations on the other, make clear that motivation at the interactional level is very much a matter of mundane morality (Jayussi, 1984; 1991).
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_Glossing Conventions_

**COP**  Copula
**COND** Conditional marker
**CONT** Continuative form
**HON** Honorific
**IP** Interactional Particle
**LK** Linking particle
**NEG** Negative
**NOM** Nominalizer
**OBJ** Object particle
**POL** Politeness marker
**PST** Past tense
**Q** Question particle
**QT** Quotative marker
**SUB** Subject particle
**TOP** Topic marker
* Non-target like form

_Conversation Analysis Transcription Conventions_

, continuing intonation
. final intonation
? rising intonation
¿ slightly rising intonation
↑↓ sharply rising or falling intonation
/ \ gradually rising or falling intonation
wo:rd lengthening of the previous sound
= latching (no space between sound before and after)
[ overlapping talk
(0.7) pause timed in tenths of seconds
( ) micropause, shorter than 0.2 seconds
°word° speech which is quieter than the surrounding talk
WORD speech which is louder than the surrounding talk
>word< speech is at a quicker tempo than the surrounding talk
<word> speech is at a slower tempo than the surrounding talk
Special conventions for embodiment

Hands and Arms
R  right
L  left
B  both
H  hand
A  arm

Fingers
IF  index finger
MF  middle finger
RF  ring finger
PF  pinky finger
T  thumb
2F  index and middle finger, unless otherwise noted
4F  four fingers, not including thumb
5F  all five fingers

Palm Positions
PRD  prone down  (palm facing ground)
PRV  prone vertical (palm facing out, i.e. “stop”)  
PRVF  prone vertical flex (palm facing out, wrist flex)
SPU  supine up  (palm facing up)
SPV  supine vertical  (palm facing in)
SPVF  supine vertical flex  (palm facing in, wrist flex)
NT  neutral  (palm at 180°)
NTV  neutral vertical  (palm at 180°, arm vertical)
OBU  oblique up  (palm diagonal facing up)
OBD  oblique down  (palm diagonal facing down)

Movement
GZ  gaze
>  “to” – direction of gaze shift or movement
+  onset of change (gaze or movement)
----- continued movement or hold of gesture
/  beat
Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

Motivation. A concept that surely belongs in the pantheon of things that are in the eye of the beholder, or that we recognize when we see it. Educators and parents often describe students or children as “motivated” or “unmotivated”, or any of the many more-or-less synonymous terms that exist in our everyday mundane lexicon. We use the concept as if it is something that people have, or as if it is a state of being. Yet at the same time, our only access to the concept, at least when it comes to others being motivated, is what they say and do, things that are observable. Granted, we have access to our own feelings and can describe them in terms of motivation – I am certainly among the many who do not feel particularly motivated in the morning until after my first cup of coffee. But even stated from the first person perspective, that feeling of motivation is not very meaningful unless acted upon or made visible or tangible in some way, regardless of how that coffee makes us feel.

However, for the sake of understanding the importance of motivation as it relates to language learning and use, the amorphous sense of “I recognize it when I see it” is neither sufficient, helpful, nor satisfying. Some form of definition, based upon the very aspects of motivation that make it recognizable to us as laypersons or experts, as teachers, parents, or peers, is necessary. Let us start with a sampling, albeit a sampling that is admittedly far from exhaustive (all emphasis added):

- Keller (1983): "Motivation refers to the choices people make as to what experiences or goals they will approach or avoid, and the degree of effort they will exert in that respect" (p. 389).
• Bandura (1991): “Motivation is a general construct linked to a system of regulatory mechanisms that are commonly ascribed both directive and activating functions. At the generic level it encompasses the diverse classes of events that move one to action. Level of motivation is typically indexed in terms of choice of courses of action and intensity and persistence of effort. Attempts to explain the motivational sources of behaviour therefore primarily aim at clarifying the determinants and intervening mechanisms that govern the selection, activation, and sustained direction of behavior toward certain goals.” (p. 69)

• Crookes and Schmidt (1991): “We have adopted here a definition of motivation in terms of choice, engagement, and persistence, as determined by interest, relevance, expectancy, and outcomes.” (p. 502)

• Rothbart and Hwang (2005): “the energization (instigation, activation) and direction (focus, aim) of behavior,” (p. 170)

Examining these definitions, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011, p. 4), conclude that “[p]erhaps the only thing about motivation most researchers would agree on is that it, by definition, concerns the direction and magnitude of human behavior”, including: 1) “the choice of a particular action,” 2) “the persistence with it,” and 3) “the effort expended on it,” seems to be particularly apt. They also point out (ibid) that no existing motivation theory to date has managed – or even attempted – to offer a comprehensive and integrative account of all the main types of possible motives, and it may well be the case that devising an integrative ‘supertheory’ of motivation will always remain an unrealistic desire. After all, motivation theories intend to explain nothing less than why humans
think and behave as they do, and it is very doubtful that the complexity of this issue can be accounted for by a single theory.” (p. 4)

This state of affairs presents both a challenge and an opportunity; a challenge because the various research approaches may conceptualize what counts as motivation so differently that there is no guarantee that they are indeed researching the same thing or even different facets of the same thing, an opportunity because it allows us to take concepts such as choice, effort, and persistence and flip them backwards, upside-down and inside-out, and consider them from new perspectives. This study aims to do just that.

Preliminarily, then, this study works from a loose definition of L2 motivation as being a matter of effort, both in action and in reflection, engagement, initiative, and persistence. As such, it shares at least some basic interests with other L2 motivation studies. However, as will be clear from the remainder of the chapter and the study, the conceptualization of motivation taken here diverges significantly from how it is often conceptualized in the field.

Impetus for this study

The seeds of this study come from two Conversation Analytic (CA) studies that look at young people doing homework. While neither study was explicitly about motivation, they both piqued the “I recognize it when I see it” aspect of motivation mentioned above. They also both led me to question why they were recognizable to me as involving motivation, or perhaps more appropriately, the lack of motivation.

The first of these studies comes from Talmy’s (2009) work on a high school English as a Second Language course. As Talmy notes, this is a “first year” class, into which students have been placed based upon how long they had been at the school, regardless of their language
proficiency, age, grade level, or formal schooling experience. The focal participants in this segment are Mr. Day, a first year teacher, and Jennie, a 9th grader from Korea. The students were reading and doing homework based upon the book *Sadako and the thousand paper cranes* (Coerr, 1977), a novel intended for 3rd – 5th graders, and were expected to work ahead on the bookwork when finished with their classroom tasks. Jennie and her group members, instead of doing this work, were playing cards, and a few minutes before this excerpt, Mr. Day had asked them to stop and get to work. Of particular interest here is Jennie’s responses, or lack thereof.

Excerpt 1.1 Talmy (2009) (Modified)

01  Mr. Day:  Jennie where’s your work.
02     (0.9)
03  Jennie:  I don’t know.
04    (2.5)
05  Jennie:  I’ve been doing it.
06  Mr. Day:  ♠where’s your book.
07    (1.1)
08  Jennie:  at home.
09    (2.0)
10  Mr. Day:  ♠what do you expect to do ♠in class.
11  Jennie:  no[thing.
12  (Computer):   [play.
13  Mr. Day:  and you think that’s o|kay.
14    (1.2)
15  Mr. Day:  what do you do in your other classes.
16    (0.5)
17  (Computer): play.=
18  Jennie:        =work.
19  Mr. Day:  so how come in my class you don’t ↓work.
20    (2.7)
21  Jennie:  I did. I did the grammar (and the quiz).
22    (0.7)
23  Mr. Day:  ↑yeah, I know, ↓but we’re supposed to be
24    doing other works yae, it’s a long
25      period, ((states extended duration of
26      class session)).
27    (0.6)
28  Mr. Day:  you have to get bookwork done, class work,
29      all this type of stuff. you should be
30      reading the book, yae.
31    (3.3)
32  Mr. Day:  so you need to do five assignments.
33    (2.3)
34  Mr. Day:  one vocabulary,(.) two summaries, (.) and
The first things to notice here are 1) how Mr. Day’s questions relate to expectations that teachers can be expected to have of their students, that is, to do classwork and to have the required materials, and 2) how Jennie’s responses are uncooperative in regards to these expectations. She claims to not know where her work is, but that she has been doing it (line 03 and 05), and that her book is at home (line 08). Mr. Day treats these answers as problematic, and asks Jennie explicitly what she expects to do in the class. Jennie, again uncooperatively in regards to institutional expectations, answers “nothing” (line 11), which Mr. Day challenges with “and you think that’s okay.” (line 13). Receiving no response during at 1.2 second gap, he then asks her what she does in her other classes, to which she answers “work”, claiming that the problem is not with her own work ethic. Mr. Day further challenges this by asking why she does not work in his class, making it clear that he views her effort as insufficient. Even after Jennie claims that she has completed the work, and he provides a pro-forma agreement (“yeah, I know”, line 23), he continues on in a series of longer turns about the work he expects her to do, which further reinforces that he treats her effort as insufficient and not meeting these expectations. It is also noteworthy that despite opportunities to respond (lines 27, 31, and 33), Jennie remains silent.

Neither Mr. Day nor Jennie explicitly mention motivation, and Talmy does not analyze it as such (focusing instead on how Mr. Day and the students co-construct pairings of “good teacher/bad student” and “good student/bad teacher”). However, both the simplified analysis here and Talmy’s detailed analysis rely heavily on one of the key components of motivation
discussed in the previous section: effort. Jennie claims to have made the effort to complete the work, and treats this effort as sufficient, while Mr. Day makes it clear that Jennie’s effort is insufficient and that he orients to her as being uncooperative in regards to classroom expectations. Thus, even without explicit reference to motivation, this spate of talk is recognizable (to some degree, at least) to be about her motivation.

The other study that similarly makes motivation recognizable, though not explicit, is Goodwin’s (2007b) work on family interaction. Here, Sandra, an 11 year old girl (who happens to be coming down with a cold) is laying on her parents’ bed with her mathematics workbook and some scratch paper, and her father is there to help her with this homework. What is of particular note here is how Sandra and her father co-construct and contest the way this help will be conducted.

Excerpt 1.2a Goodwin (2007b) Fig.7 (Modified)

01 Sandra: How do you do that.
02 (1.1)
03 Father: Where’s your pencil.
04 (1.8)
05 Sandra: Nope. ↑ Daddy tell me how I- how you [do it ((Sandra picks up pencil but then withdraws it))
06 Father: [I know
07 Give me your pencil
08 en I’ll, show you on a piece of paper.
09 (1.0) ((Sandra makes no move to hand him the pencil))
10 Father: Is that your work paper.
11 Sandra: No. Just tell me, how do you do that.
12 (1.4)
13 Father: Can I write on this.
14 Sandra: Yeah.
15 (1.0)
16 Father: [Sandra you know what
17 Sandra: [But Daddy just tell. I [don’t (feel good).
18 Father: [Sandra
19 I just can’t tell you.

1 We could go further and discuss Mr. Day’s motivation as well; as a teacher, with institutional rights and obligations as a teacher, he makes visible efforts here toward getting Jennie to do the work. A detailed analysis would be fruitful, but will be left for another discussion.
If I’m gonna- also do this you have to be nice to me okay.
Don’t talk to me in that tone of voice.

This segment starts with Sandra orienting to a specific problem, asking her father how to do it. Instead of answering how to do the problem, father asks where her pencil is, orienting to necessary conditions for demonstrating how to solve the problem. Sandra picks up the pencil, but then withdraws it, answering negatively and asking him to tell her how to do it; this makes it clear that she wants an explanation rather than a demonstration, and the self-repair from “I” to “you” (line 05) further clarifies her expectation. Father’s response, starting with an “I know” and then offering to show her on a piece of paper, treats the action of demonstrating to be a method of explanation, but Sandra does not immediately respond, either verbally or physically. When Father then asks about Sandra’s work paper, she responds with a “No” (line 11), orienting not to the question but to the whole course of action Father is suggesting. She then attempts to specifically limit the course of action with “Just tell me”. Father maintains this course, however, by asking if he can write on the scratch paper (line 13), but Sandra again challenges the action with “But Daddy just tell.” (line 17), adding an account for why by claiming that she doesn’t feel well. Father then explicitly disagrees with Sandra’s proposed method by saying “I just can’t tell you.” (line 19), and further takes a stance towards her lack of cooperation up to this point by saying that she has to be “nice” to him and can’t speak to him in “that tone of voice.”, setting requirements for any further action on his part.

In this segment, it is not whether the participants are making effort, but a disagreement over how that effort is realized. Both Sandra and her father treat each other as uncooperative with the other’s suggested courses of action. The following segment, from a few moments later, illustrates the escalation of this dispute.
Here, Father asks Sandra if she wants him to do a specific problem, maintaining the course of action he had embarked upon in the previous segment. After receiving a minimal and rather equivocal response, he accounts for this course of action: it is for her to “understand it better.” (line 04). Sandra’s response is a terse “No.”, displaying her commitment to her own course of action as well. It is at this point that Father moves to disengage, by getting up, handing her the workbook and moving to leave, saying “Forget it” (line 07) and “Do your homework” (line 11), making clear that requirements for continued help that he laid out in the previous segment have not been met. However, he leaves open the possibility of further assistance by telling her to let him know if she changes her mind, orienting to his requirements and expectations that will continue to be operative\(^2\).

Here, again, neither the author nor the participants explicitly mention motivation. It is clear, however, that effort – specifically effort towards cooperative course of action – is a key factor in this interaction. And, just as in Talmy’s (2009) data, lack of cooperation and meeting oriented-to-expectations is an accountable matter for all of the participants. This introduces two further

\(^2\) Father leaves for 17 minutes, but does indeed return and the further interaction is much more cooperative.
aspects of what makes motivation recognizable in these excerpts: 1) a moral dimension, in the sense that a lack of effort, or lack of the “right kind” of effort, is potentially sanctionable (as both Mr. Day and Father demonstrate), and 2) a relational dimension, in that the oriented-to expectations are based on the relationships between a teacher and student or father and daughter, and particularly the rights and obligations that come along with being a teacher, student, parent or child.

The analysis presented here is admittedly simplified for the sake of introducing the inspiration behind this study. However, this simplified analysis points the way towards the more fine-grained approach taken to the data that comprise Chapters 4 through 6 and demonstrates that motivation can indeed be studied by drawing our attention to details of interaction in which it has been made relevant by the participants.

Background epistemology: What is language for?

This study takes the perspective that the goal of learning a second or foreign language, barring extrinsic institutional or educational goals such as foreign language requirements, is to use the language, whether it be to interact with others who speak the language, to read literature, watch movies or listen to music (still forms of interaction, although they are quite different from the interaction discussed in this study), or to conduct business. To be sure, this is far from being a controversial stance, as it seems to be taken for granted in much of the L2 motivation literature, ranging from the early of work of Gardner and Lambert (1972) on integrative orientations to more recent work that takes a Complexity/Dynamic Systems Theory (CDST) approach (Dörnyei, MacIntyre & Henry, 2015 inter alia). That it is taken for granted, however, can arguably be said to leave it unquestioned, or at least under-questioned. Sociality is part of being human,
interaction with others is a part of this sociality, and language is a key resource for interaction 
(Enfield & Levinson, 2006; Joaquin & Schumann, 2013; Lee, Mikesell, Joaquin, Mates, & 
Schumann, 2009; Schegloff, 2006). It is therefore worthwhile to consider what underlies this 
sociality; an understanding of L2 motivation, motivation to both learn and use a language, most 
certainly requires (at the very least) a recognition of what it is we do as humans when we interact 
with others.

Recent interdisciplinary work that draws from the fields of Conversation Analysis (CA), 
linguistics, anthropology, cognitive science and neuroscience have led to formulations of this 
understanding (Enfield & Levinson, 2006; Joaquin & Schumann, 2013; Lee, et al, 2009). One of 
these, Levinson’s (2006) Interaction Engine, lays out what the properties of interaction are (pp. 
45 – 46), summarized here:

1) **Responses are to actions or intentions, not to behaviors.** Interaction requires an ability 
to interpret others' behavior, and this interpretation involves “mapping intentions or goals 
onto behavior, to yield component actions (emphasis in original), bundles of behavior 
and mental instigations.” This means that there is simulation of the other's mental world.

2) **In interaction, a simulation of the other's simulation of oneself is also involved.** We 
take into account what we expect the other to know or feel about us, as manifested in 
recipient design (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). This can be further extended to an 
expectation on the part of the recipient that another person’s action has been designed for 
them.

3) **Although human interaction is dominated by the use of language, language does not 
actually code the crucial actions being performed – these are nearly always inferred, 
or indirectly conveyed.** Language, as a set of linguistic systems (phonological,
morphological, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic) amplifies the potential of interaction, but is not always required, as demonstrated by Levinson’s (2006) own interactions with a deaf home sign user on Rossel Island with whom he shared no common linguistic background, or the emergence of Nicaraguan Sign Language from varied and unrelated home sign systems (Lee, et al., 2009).

4) **Interaction is by and large cooperative.** “Interactants intend their actions (a) to be interpretable, and (b) to contribute to some larger joint undertaking.” I would add that there are certainly cases where this is not true (as in deceit), but even these cases are built upon an expectation of cooperation.

5) **Interaction is characterized by action chains and sequences governed not by rule but by expectation.** This is a key understanding of CA, and will be discussed further in Chapter 2. As an example here, questions make answers conditionally relevant, but there is no *rule* that a question must be followed by an answer, only a normative expectation that it will be. Furthermore, the trajectory of an interaction is something that no participant can fully plan for in advance; it is contingently constructed as the interaction unfolds.

6) **Interaction is characterized by the reciprocity of roles**, for example, speaker-addressee, and these roles generally alternate over time. In other words, turn-taking happens (Sacks et al. 1974), as the speaker at one moment becomes the recipient in the next (cf. Zimmerman, 1998 on “discourse identities”). There are times however, such as in storytelling (Mandelbaum, 2013) or in institutional contexts such as courtrooms (Heritage & Clayman, 2010) where turn-taking can be suspended for a period of time.
7) **Interaction takes place within a participation structure** that also shifts over time, (i.e. who is participating, and in what role). This generally requires “ratified mutual access” (cf. Goffman, 1981; Goodwin, 1981). Co-presence is not sufficient to create a participation structure, as anyone who has ridden any form of public transportation can attest to. Participation must be cooperatively entered into by the participants.

8) **Interaction is characterized by expectation of close timing.** Actions produced in interaction generally set up expectations for immediate responses, and lack of immediate response can make other inferences available (Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013). This can be suspended for a time, however, in states of “incipient talk” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), especially in cases where there are other concurrent activities.

9) **Face-to-face interaction is characterized by multimodal signal streams.** We see, hear, move and touch in interaction, all of which work together to co-construct mutual understanding (Streeck, 2013; Streeck, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011). Furthermore, we often utilize and act upon materials or objects in the world as part of our courses of (inter)action (Kasper & Burch, 2016; Murphy, 2005).

10) **Interaction appears to have detailed universal properties.** Although specific comparative studies are rare (though see various chapters in Sidnell (2009) and the cross-linguistic study of open class repair initiation conducted by Enfield et al., (2013), and on turn-taking by Stivers et al., (2009) for examples), it is clear from many years of CA research on different languages that many interaction phenomena, including turn taking, adjacency pairs, and repair organization, are very similar. Even given possible cultural variations, people throughout the world by and large have to concern themselves with the
same kinds of interactional projects and problems, including managing turn taking and achieving and maintaining intersubjectivity (Schegloff, 2006).

A further notion from Levinson (2006) is that of *bricolage*, the drawing together of various resources (including, but certainly not limited to linguistic, environmental, cultural and historical resources) in order to co-construct, achieve, and maintain intersubjectivity. This does not mean that interaction is an “anything goes” melee; interaction is characterized by “order at all points” (Sacks, 1992, p. 484), and is highly structured (Schegloff, 2007). Participants, however, do draw upon a wide variety of resources and often build upon them as they co-construct their interactions (Goodwin, 2013).

These ingredients of the *interaction engine* provide a foundation upon which the data and phenomena analyzed in this study are understood. However, although these ingredients are presumed to be potentially relevant at any point, they are not taken for granted. Levinson uncovered and collected them together as a result of empirically driven analysis, and the same is done here. The collection of resources that make up the *bricolage* underlying the participants’ interactions, and thus their motivations in interaction, are co-constructed anew in any given interaction, and remain to be analyzed as such.

The approach taken in this study must also be understood in relation to a separate but related epistemological foundation: the EMCA (Ethnomethodology/Conversation Analysis) stance on cognition. Garfinkel (1963) famously stated that “there is no reason to look under the skull since nothing of interest is to be found there but brains” (p. 190), a rather extreme and perhaps controversial formulation, but one that makes a clear point. This study focuses on interaction, and the socially visible methods that participants use to achieve intersubjectivity. While participants can and often do make reference to psychological predicates (Edwards & Potter,
1992; 1995), there is no reason to speculate on what they might be thinking or feeling, because it will always remain merely speculation (barring some technological advancements in neural imaging techniques). The analyst has access to the same phenomena that the participants have access to: their actions, responses, physically embodied behaviors, accounts, descriptions, and ascriptions. These are the resources that participants use to co-construct their understandings of each other, and they are the resources that the analyst relies upon in order to explore their methods for doing so. This point will be expanded further in Chapter 2.

**Objectives**

There are two, interconnected, objectives that underlie this study. The first is to explore ways that EMCA can be used to study L2 motivation. This, of course, was not a foregone success. The original processes of transcribing and analyzing the data presented in this study was fraught with frustration and self-doubt, especially as there is very little extant work that has attempted to do so. I must leave it to the reader to decide whether the study has succeeded in meeting this objective.

The second objective is to shine some light into aspects of L2 motivation that have heretofore been left under-examined, and to take those that have been examined and explore them from a different angle. More specifically, the study focuses on the resources, activities, identities and relationships, and stances and accounts that are intertwined in how an L2 speaker of Japanese persists towards interactional goals, engages in and initiates courses of action, and accounts for her efforts in learning and using the language.

It is imminently necessary to emphasize here that this project is to propose a *complementary*, rather than respecified or alternative, approach to L2 motivation. There have been many
successful research agendas relating to L2 motivation (see Chapter 2), and each has led to important insights that ought not be set aside or undervalued. Ushioda (2009) and Larsen-Freeman (2011; 2015) have called for methodological and theoretical eclecticism – I see this as an invitation to take a seat at the table, and intend to offer EMCA as a meaningful and valuable addition to the conversation.

Overview of this Dissertation

This study is organized into seven chapters. *Chapter 2* provides a broad overview of recent L2 motivation research as it has arisen through the discursive and dynamic turn over the course of the last decade, introduces some critiques of the dominant methodologies in the field, and introduces the key phenomena and focal interests of the wider field of EMCA (including Conversation Analysis, Membership Categorization Analysis, Discursive Psychology, and Embodied Interaction. It also details the specific research interests that drive the analysis presented later in the study. *Chapter 3* then introduces the participants, settings, data collection methods, and the transcription innovations devised to illustrate the multimodal complexities of the interactions under scrutiny.

There are then three analytical chapters. *Chapter 4* explores the notion of persistence as made visible through sustained orientations towards solving interactional difficulties and towards interactional goals. *Chapter 5* examines initiative, the initiation of courses of action or the continuance of courses of action after points where they could reasonably and unaccountably be moved beyond, as an EMCA-based analogue to the construct of Willingness to Communicate (MacIntyre, 2007; MacIntyre & Doucette, 2010; MacIntyre & Legatto, 2011). Thus, Chapters 4 and 5 are concerned with the participants’ efforts towards interactional goals. *Chapter 6* shifts
focus somewhat to detail how the participants orient to motivation as a topic, how they describe, account for, and take stances towards efforts regarding language learning and use. Throughout the analytical chapters, attention is focused on the activities conducted by the participants, and how the participants orient to relationships and identities, and especially the normative rights, obligations and expectations that are made relevant by these relationships and identities.

Finally, Chapter 7 summarizes the overall findings of the analytical chapters and details the implications the findings have for the recent discursive and dynamic approaches to L2 motivation. It also suggests possible paths forward for an EMCA approach to L2 motivation, including in other settings and with other focal phenomena.
Chapter 2: Background

Introduction

The notion that EMCA, a framework that eschews intra-psychological explanations for interactional phenomena (Markee, 2011; see also the debates presented in te Molder & Potter, 2005) can be used to study motivation might seem at first blush to be a quixotic or misguided endeavor. After all, motivation has generally been researched under the purview of social- and educational psychology as internal traits or states related to intentions, goals, desires or self-concepts (Dörnyei, 2009 inter alia), while EMCA trades in observable phenomena that are first and foremost relevant and consequential (Schegloff, 1996) to how the participants come to understand each other through interaction. This is not to say that EMCA denies the existence a “rich inner life” (Kasper, 2009), but rather focuses attention on the “rich surface” of interaction (Edwards, 2006).

Indeed, as discussed in the quick examples from Goodwin (2007b) and Talmy (2009) in Chapter 1, there are aspects of interaction, especially orientations towards activities or materials, that parents see in their children or teachers see in their students that they will chalk up to motivation or a lack thereof. Parents or teachers may talk about these orientations as if they were psychological, but that they become relevant or consequential at all derives from their occurrence as observable action, contextualized in and occasioned by interaction. Likewise, goals and intentions need not be conceived of as internal either, but as unfolding and contingent (Burch, 2014; Markee, 2011; Markee & Kunitz, 2013; Murphy, 2005). Lucy Suchman (1987) illustrates this vividly in her description of traditional Trukese and modern “western” navigational practices. The Trukese, in navigating between islands that are not visible from their standpoints, traditionally did not chart out and plan their voyages, per se, instead relying upon the stars, ocean
currents, cloud formations and patterns of bird flight behavior in order to reach their destinations, making adjustments to their course in dealing with the contingencies nature presented them with. Western navigators, in theory, do not leave so much to chance, with their reliance upon detailed maps and technologically advanced navigational equipment; in practice, however, even the most technologically equipped ships are still subject to the whims of nature and other unexpected occurrences, and these sailors are no less likely to find themselves having to handle contingencies than are their counterparts in the Pacific. This applies to anything that a person may put efforts towards. As Suchman (*ibid*) states, we are, in the end, all Trukese navigators\(^3\).

Our goals and intentions, and all of the aspects of motivation that are bound up with these, unfold through the trajectories of our interactions or our work on other observable projects, and like much else in interaction, are subject to repair and negotiation (Murphy, 2005). Furthermore, intentions, goals, and motivations are not socially observable and are arguably irrelevant and inconsequential when appropriate action or reference to them through accounts are absent, something to which every parent and teacher can attest.

Research in SLA and L2 motivation has recently taken a turn toward exploring context and contingency, taking a greater interest in the lived experiences of second language learners and users, and it is with this turn that EMCA can be used to contribute to the study of L2 motivation. The remainder of this chapter is dedicated to exploring recent developments and trends within the field of L2 motivation, focusing on the shifts toward the “socio-complexity” perspectives (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011) that I feel can be conversant with the EMCA approach taken in this

\(^3\) Hutchins (1995) provides a much more detailed comparison, and further hammers this point home with a description of a dangerous situation in which a navy ship finds itself without power, at night, in a crowded harbor with multiple obstacles (including a sailboat on a collision course that could not see them), making the situation even more dire. The crew’s motivations to solve this conundrum were rather clear.
study. These include shifts toward more contextualized and dynamic theoretical frameworks, developments in how individual differences such as persistence and Willingness to Communicate (WTC) are conceptualized, as well as methodological considerations. The discussion then moves on to the aspects of EMCA that can be employed to research motivation, including both possible points of connection and contention, before wrapping up with an overview of the specific research foci that guide the rest of this study.

**The Discursive and Dynamic Turn**

Although it has not always garnered a lot of attention, the social and contextual has always been part of SLA research, reaching back to Schumann’s (1978) work on the acculturation model, Canale and Swain’s (1980) adoption and adaptation of Hymes’ (1972) definition of communicative competence, and Schmidt’s (1983) work which addressed both. Viewing the language learner as a *language user* who interacts with others, forms relationships, and gets on with their daily lives is nothing new, and never went away. However, while the “social turn” (Block, 2003) arguably did not represent a sudden birth of interest that did not exist before, it did represent a renaissance of sorts. In the wake of Firth and Wagner’s (1997; 2007) call for bringing the language use back into focus in SLA research, there has been an extensive bloom (cf. Lantolf, 1996) of theoretical frameworks and methodologies that do so, including (but certainly not limited to) CA-SLA (Gardner & Wagner, 2004; Hall, Hellermann, & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Kasper & Wagner, 2011; 2014; Markee & Kasper, 2004), Language Socialization (Duff & Talmy, 2011; Duranti, Ochs, & Schieffelin, 2012), Sociocultural Theory (Lantolf, 1996; 2011), Usage Based Linguistics (Cadierno & Eskildsen, 2015; Eskildsen, 2009), and Ecological (Kramsch, 2002a; van Lier, 2004) and Sociocognitive (Atkinson, 2002; 2011) approaches. To
borrow another metaphor, the currents (Ortega, 2013) within SLA as it now flows are intermingled with multiple approaches that place social interaction, human relationships, and the lived-in environment at the fore.

Research on L2 motivation has followed a rather similar path (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009; 2011). The social has always been placed at the center of the field, with the recognition that a learner’s relationships with others and their cultural environment play an integral role in their motivation to learn and use a language. Indeed, a key component of Gardner’s *Socio-educational* model of motivation (1985; 2010; Gardner & Lambert, 1972) has been an *integrative orientation*, the attitudes a learner holds towards the target language community and its speakers. Again, the social turn in L2 motivation (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011) does not represent the sudden emergence of interest in language learners as social beings, but a renaissance in terms of how this sociality is to be accounted for and researched.

This renaissance came about, in part, through critiques of Gardner’s model. One early critique was centered on educational applicability (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991), particularly (at least for our interests here) that it ignored learners and teachers in the classroom context, and how classroom activities and relationships help to shape aspects of the learner’s motivation such as persistence. The applicability of integrativeness to contexts that differ greatly from the cultural milieu of Quebec where Gardner’s early studies were conducted was also called into question, especially in foreign language contexts in which learners were not afforded regular contact with the target language speakers or culture (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004)⁴. A third critique, particularly germane to the current study, is that the model

---

⁴ To be fair, however, Gardner (2010) reports on research from a wide range of countries in Europe and Asia, suggesting at least some cross-cultural applicability.
portrays integrative orientations as more-or-less stable traits, obscuring dynamic changes, the contextually situated nature of motivation, and especially the necessity of “crossing the Rubicon of action” (Dörnyei & Otto, 1998). These critiques helped to open new agendas and approaches for researching L2 motivation, especially for those that focus on contextuality and complexity, or what Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) have called the “socio-complexity” approaches.

Arguably the most influential of these approaches is Dörnyei’s (2005; 2009) *L2 Motivation Self-System*. Drawing upon the theories of possible selves from Markus and Nurius (1986) and Higgins (1987), this conceptualization focuses on 1) the *ideal L2 self*, the goals the learner has, reflecting who they want to be as a language user, and which function as motivational factors to reduce the discrepancy (cf. Higgins, 1987) between current abilities and desired goals, 2) the *ought-to L2 self*, relating to meeting socially imposed expectations and avoiding possible negative consequences, and 3) *L2 learning experiences*, in particular the immediate contexts, relationships with teachers and peers, the curriculum, and experiences of success and failure. A further layer, particularly regarding the relationship between the ideal L2 self and the ought-to L2 self (Dörnyei, 2009) is the degree to which norms and expectations have been internalized by the learner. This draws upon Deci and Ryan’s (1985) *self-determination theory* which describes four stages: 1) *external regulation*, essentially based upon what are commonly considered extrinsic concerns such as reward or punishment, 2) *interjected regulation*, which is based upon the personal acceptance of imposed norms in order to avoid feelings of guilt, 3) *identified regulation*, in which learners identify with and value behaviors related to these norms and view them as useful, and 4) *integrated regulation*, which represents full assimilation of these norms with the individual’s values and identity, and individual agency in behaving in accordance with the norms. Finally, Dörnyei (2009) points out that success is dependent of the learner both
having a fully formed image of their possible selves and taking the appropriate actions in order to achieve the goals represented by these possible selves.

MacIntyre, MacKinnon and Clément (2009) provide commentary on Dörnyei’s conceptualization of the L2 self, pointing out that it addresses the critiques of Gardner’s model by being a more “educator friendly approach” (p. 51, cf. Crookes & Schmidt, 1991), by addressing language contexts that can differ greatly from Gardner’s Canadian milieu (cf. Dörnyei, 2005), and by addressing the variety of motivation factors that arise, including possible competing factors such as the discrepancies between how influence from teachers and parents on one hand and peers on the other can impact the learner’s ideal and ought-to L2 selves (p. 52). However, they also enumerate a number of cautions regarding the model, including 1) how to develop a valid, reliable, and generalizable measurement, 2) working toward consistent nomenclature for the various related constructs, 3) accounting for potentially very different conceptualizations of the self across cultures, 4) accounting for how goal-oriented actions are actually implemented, 5) addressing how possible selves change over time, and 6) attending to the relationship between possible selves and identity, particularly in situated contexts. For the purpose of the current study, cautions 2 through 6 are of particular importance. I would argue that not only do we need to be aware of possible cultural variations regarding views of self, but also be cautious to not assume that a specific cultural conceptualization of self is necessarily relevant to individual members of that culture, and that if it is, that it may not always be. Furthermore, from an EMCA perspective, identities and goals, in order to be relevant and consequential in interaction, are co-constructed accomplishments that are situated and occasioned by the ongoing activity. While the L2 Motivation Self-System model has certainly
brought to light certain aspects of how context, relationships, and identity relate to motivation, this situated and occasioned nature has been, for the most part, left in the shadows.

The application of Complexity/Dynamic Systems Theory (Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2006; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008) to the study of L2 motivation, though still in its early stages, has also taken up critiques of the earlier dominant approaches to motivation, particularly the tendencies to treat motivation and other individual differences as static (Larsen-Freeman, 2015) and to treat context as a background variable that can be controlled for (Ushioda, 2009; 2015). There are a number of key assumptions behind a CDST approach to motivation that stand in contrast to the assumptions behind models such as Gardner’s. The first set of assumptions regards change, in particular that changes occur over time at various timescales, ranging from the microsecond level of neurochemical process through to the interactional level, and up to longer units of months, semesters, years, lifetimes, and beyond (de Bot, 2015). While these changes may be recursive across timescales, they are not assumed to be linear, and major changes at one level cannot be assumed to have an impact on other timescales (de Bot, 2015; Larsen-Freeman, 2011; 2015). Similarly, systems, or contexts, also exist at various scales, including intra-individual biological processes, immediate interactional and institutional contexts, macro-level socio-historical contexts, and the natural environment. These systems interact with each other, again in non-linear and often multi-directional ways (Larsen-Freeman, 2011; 2015), which undergirds an understanding that while the context can constrain an individual within it (Al-Hoorie, 2015; Giddens, 1984), the individual also has an impact upon the context (Ushioda, 2015). The recognition of these complex relationships in and across multiple chronological and spatial scales, as well as the recognition that human action works within the affordances and constraints of their contexts but is not determined by them (Al-Hoorie, 2015) led to the
problematization of predictive approaches, and the adoption of “retrodiction” (Chan, Dörnyei, & Henry, 2015; Dörnyei, 2014), the process of working backwards to pinpoint factors that led to the current state or outcomes (Dörnyei, 2014, p. 85), though with the understanding that such a current state is not necessarily a finite end state (Larsen-Freeman, 2015).

Though still in the early stages of empirical development, or perhaps because of being so new, the range of L2 motivation topics addressed through CDST has been markedly eclectic, as have been the methodologies employed in these studies. One of the earliest researchers to adopt this perspective was MacIntyre (2012; MacIntyre & Legatto, 2011), who used an “idiodynamic” approach to WTC. This approach utilized a variety of tools including a quantitative survey to measure variables such as WTC or anxiety, a video-recorded task, a software-based graphing system that participants used to record ratings of the variable as they watched the video of their own task performance, and an interview about their ratings. Such an approach, though subject to critiques that will be discussed in the methodological considerations section below, is certainly in keeping with the theoretical assumptions of CDST as it aims to track nonlinear changes in affect across the course of a task, taking into account the learners’ stances and beliefs. CDST and idiodynamics have also been applied to Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self-System, as demonstrated in Dörnyei, MacIntyre and Henry’s (2015) edited volume (Chan, Dörnyei, & Henry, 2015; Irie & Ryan, 2015; Mercer, 2015; Nitta & Baba, 2015; You & Chan, 2015), using a variety of quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches in a variety of settings, thus illustrating the commitment of researchers participating in this developing paradigm to opening up avenues of inquiry that focus on the contextualized and dynamic nature of L2 motivation.

The final socio-complexity approach to be discussed here, Ushioda’s (2009) “person-in-context” perspective, seems to have yet to generate a robust research program, but is in many
ways the most compatible with the current research project, not least because of her explicit recognition that for any person learning and using a second language, that “language learner” is only one of many potentially relevant situated identities (cf. Zimmerman, 1998). Ushioda summarizes the approach in this way:

I mean a focus on real persons, rather than on learners as theoretical abstractions; a focus on the agency of the individual person as a thinking, feeling human being, with an identity, a personality, a unique history and background, a person with goals, motives and intentions; a focus on the interaction between this self-reflective intentional agent, and the fluid and complex system of social relations, activities, experiences and multiple micro- and macro-contexts in which the person is embedded, moves, and is inherently part of. My argument is that we need to take a relational (rather than linear) view of these multiple contextual elements, and view motivation as an organic process that emerges through the complex system of interrelations. (p. 220)

This view, which aligns very much the CDST perspective while also making clear that the dancer should not be lost from view when observing the dance (to misappropriate a turn of phrase from Kramsch, 2002b), also encourages theoretical and methodological eclecticism. Ushioda specifically calls for discursive approaches that are equipped to deal with motivation in a contextually grounded fashion, including sociocultural theory (Lantolf, 2011; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), language socialization (Duff & Talmy, 2011; Watson-Gegeo, 2004), situated learning and community of practice approaches (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Toohey, 2000), sociocognitive approaches (Atkinson, 2002; 2011), social theory (Sealey & Carter, 2004), and
post-structuralist and critical perspectives (Norton, 2000); although she did not explicitly include CA-SLA among this list, she does cite Preston’s (2009) and Richards’ (2006) work as examples of how a “person-in-context” approach can be employed.

The EMCA approach taken in this study, with its fine-grained analysis of the participants’ actions, embodiment, stances, and environment, very much speaks to a number of Ushioda’s concerns, particularly in taking a relational view of motivation as emergent in context, both shaping and shaped by the interactional trajectory the participants co-construct, and the situated identities (Zimmerman, 1998) that they make relevant and consequential. Before going into further detail regarding points of theoretical overlap between EMCA and the “person-in-context” perspective, however, some further discussion on the conceptualization of individual differences may be beneficial.

Individual Differences

The topics discussed in this study, persistence through interactional difficulty and working toward interactional goals (Chapter 4), engagement, participation and initiative (Chapter 5), and the way motivation and efforts towards learning and using the language are described and accounted for (Chapter 6), could all arguably be considered under the rubric of individual differences (IDs). Dörnyei (2005) offers a definition of IDs as referring to “dimensions of enduring personal characteristics that are assumed to apply to everybody and on which people differ by degree. Or, in other words, they concern stable and systematic deviations from a normative blueprint” (p. 4). Researchers differ on which characteristics are included, but broadly speaking, intelligence, aptitude or ability, personality, temperament, attitudes, and motivation are generally considered as IDs, and Dörnyei (ibid) further includes learning styles and language
learning strategies, as well as anxiety, self-esteem, creativity, WTC and learner beliefs. In the interactions under scrutiny in this study, many if not most of these could be said to be relevant.

However, with the discursive and dynamic turn in SLA and L2 motivation research, the notion that IDs are stable and enduring characteristics or traits is undergoing “theoretical restructuring” (Dörnyei, 2010a, p. 252; see also MacIntyre, 2012; Ushioda, 2009). Dörnyei (2010b) provides a very cogent reflection on the shifting perspectives on IDs when he says

I have come to a new understanding of individual differences and argued (Dörnyei, 2009) that the seemingly comprehensive and straightforward picture of IDs being stable and monolithic learner traits that concern distinct learner characteristics is part of an idealized ‘individual differences myth’ (emphasis added) that may not hold up against scientific scrutiny. As far as I can see, the basic problem is that if we take a situated and process-oriented perspective of SLA – which I think we ought to – we simply cannot fail to realize that the various learner attributes are neither stable nor context-independent, but display a considerable amount of variation from time to time and from situation to situation. (p. 252)

This reflection echoes Ushioda’s (2009) call to step away from treating IDs as variables, which she argues “depersonalizes” the learner (p. 216), and instead study L2 motivation in a contextualized fashion. It also resonates with the general turn toward socio-complexity approaches as a whole. Interactions and relationships between people, and between people and their environments, are not just major factors in how language users work through difficulties, initiate and maintain engagement, and describe and account for their efforts, but are co-constitutive with these activities.
Additionally, however, there is a further aspect regarding IDs that deserves some degree of caution: the *a priori* assumption that a pre-conceptualized ID category is relevant and at play at a given point, especially when the data is interactional (as opposed to quantitative survey methods). Just as identity is situated, occasioned and co-constructed (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Benwell & Stokoe, 2006; Zimmerman, 1998), as are emotions, stances and attitudes (Edwards, 1997; Goodwin, 2007b; Peräkylä & Sorjonen, 2012; Roulston, 2010), there is a strong possibility that other actions and orientations that might also arguably fall under the rubric of IDs are as well. Furthermore, what may at first blush appear to be a case of some particular ID, for example a negative evaluation of one’s own language ability, may actually be used for some other bit of interactional business (Burch, in press; see also Chapter 6). While *a priori* assumptions about the relevance of IDs may be integral to the design of certain research instruments such as surveys, they run the risk of blinding the researcher to other relevant factors that may emerge.

**L2 Motivation Research Methodologies**

The field of L2 motivation, as noted by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011), has largely been dominated by quantitative methods. This is not surprising, of course. An interest in IDs as stable and enduring traits, and an interest in findings that are generalizable across groups (however these groups may be defined and delimited) necessitates methodologies that can be used with large numbers of subjects and are more amenable to statistical analysis such as surveys and questionnaires. This has certainly been the case with research on integrativeness (Gardner, 1985; 2010; Gardner & Lambert, 1972), which has been conducted with the expansive Attitude and Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) across a large number of cultural and national contexts. The
approach has also proven fruitful for the research that led to the formation of the L2 Motivation Self-System (Dörnyei, Csizér, & Németh, 2006), which involved administering surveys to 13,000 teenage language learners in Hungary across three successive waves of data collection in 1993, 1999, and 2004. Research designs come about in relation to research interests, and quantitative methods are an important tool set for collecting such wide-ranging data. Such methods, however, do obscure the “person-in-context” (Ushioda, 2009), and researchers interested in a relational and contextualized perspective on L2 motivation have turned to qualitative approaches in order to fill this gap.

The primary qualitative methodology for studying L2 motivation has been the use of interviews. Such work has been successful in exploring learner beliefs and attitudes, including work on attribution of success or failure (Ushioda, 1996; 1998; Williams & Burden, 1997), educational experiences and how they shape L2 motivation (Shoaib & Dörnyei, 2005; Ushioda, 1998), the dynamics of WTC during tasks (MacIntyre & Legatto, 2011), and the L2 Motivation Self-System (Mercer, 2015). All of these studies captured aspects of the participants’ experiences and motivation that would fall between the cracks in a quantitative study. But for all the light shone into the gaps by these interview studies, other areas remain in the shadows. Broadly characterized, these relate to the interactional context and structure of interviews on the one hand, and how the data is analyzed and represented on the other.

While these interview studies have certainly illustrated the contextuality and dynamics of learner experiences and attitudes, they are of necessity decontextualized from the activities that bear out these experiences and attitudes. Interviews are interactional activities in their own right (Prior, 2016; Roulston, 2010), generally conducted at a temporal and spatial distance from the experiences in question, and are thus apt to miss some of the “messy little details” (Larsen-
Freeman, 2006) of those experiences. Furthermore, interview responses are accounts and descriptions, used for the interactional, relational and identity work that accounts and descriptions are used for (Edwards & Potter, 1992; 2005; Prior, 2016). This does not mean we must treat interview responses in an ironic (Garfinkel, 1967) fashion, as if the interviewees are potentially deceitful. It does mean, however, that caution must be taken in how we interpret responses, and explore the interactional work for its impact and import.

The interactional roles and structures that make interviews recognizable as interviews also have an impact. Although deviations are certainly possible, in general, interviewers ask the questions and interviewees answer them. Since answer are fit to the content and format of the questions (Hayano, 2013; Lee, 2013, Pomerantz, 1984 inter alia) and respondents may have to do extra interactional work to provide an answer that goes beyond this content and format, the interviewer has some degree of control over the agenda that interviewees do not necessarily have. This is not a fatal flaw, per se – interviewers have research agendas, thus providing a reason for conducting the interview in the first place. However, it also means that the categories, descriptions, and accounts that arise are in part constrained and made relevant by the interviewer’s agenda, and perhaps less so by the interviewee’s own experiences.

This also relates to tendencies regarding analysis and representation of the data. It is not rare for the interviewer’s questions (and therefore their contribution to the co-construction of the data) to be underspecified or completely ignored and obscured (Roulston, 2010). Without the details of the content of the questions or how they are formatted (i.e. yes/no interrogatives, multiple questions, negative interrogative syntax, among many other possibilities), the analysis risks a bleaching out of potentially relevant nuance that can shape our understanding of the responses as researchers. A respondent’s “uhm, well…” at the beginning of an answer not only
relates to the upcoming content (such as in a word search), but also potentially displays a stance toward the question itself (Davidson, 1984; Pomerantz, 1984), and without representation of the question in such cases, the analysis of the answer may remain impoverished.

A further concern is that interview studies often obscure or omit a variety of other stance displays and interactional details as well, phenomena that generally require a fine-grained transcription system in order to be made visible to the researcher and the reader alike. These include verbal interaction features such as pauses, perturbations, tempo and intonation, embodied actions such as facial expressions, gesture, posture, gaze direction, and physical actions, and materials in the environment that can be oriented to or utilized for interactional purposes; in other words, the resources that constitute the *bricolage* (Levinson, 2006) that participants draw upon in going about their interactional work. Attention to such detail gives the researcher and reader access to not only what is being said, but how it is being said, and the actional and interactional context in which it is said, and more importantly, co-constructed.

This section has not been meant as a diagnosis of various ailments afflicting L2 motivation research with suggestions for their treatments or cures. As this study is proposing a complementary approach, rather than an alternative approach or respecification, I happily embrace the methodological and theoretical eclecticism of the recent discursive and dynamic turn in L2 motivation research. Every methodology and framework shines a light on certain aspects of its focal phenomena while leaving others in the dark. Nevertheless, I feel that the current trend towards a relational and contextualized perspective on motivation will benefit from a very fine-grained approach to interaction and the environment.
In the following, and final, section of this chapter, I turn the focus toward just such an approach, EMCA, and how its broad and varied methodological approach to interaction can be applied to a relational and contextualized examination of L2 motivation.

**EMCA**

EMCA, here used as shorthand for *Ethnomethodology* (Garfinkel, 1967), *Conversation Analysis*\(^5\) (Sacks, 1992; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Sidnell & Stivers, 2013), *Membership Categorization Analysis* (Hester & Eglin, 1997; Fitzgerald & Housely, 2015; Stokoe, 2012), *Discursive Psychology* (Edwards, 1997; Edwards & Potter, 1992; 2005) and *Embodied Interaction* (Streeck, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011), broadly characterized is a framework which examines the observable methods and resources that participants use to conduct interaction, and to achieve and maintain intersubjectivity. As a whole, EMCA’s bread and butter, so to speak, are the microanalysis of interactional details in context, dealing first and foremost with phenomena that are observable to the participants themselves, and are oriented to, made relevant and procedurally consequential (Schegloff, 1996) by and for the participants in the interaction. This means that while participants may talk about psychological topics such as motivation, and ascribe motivations and intentions to themselves and others (Bilmes, 1986; Edwards, 1997), EMCA maintains its focus on what is accomplished with these ascriptions and descriptions in interaction (Edwards & Potter, 2005) and the socially visible accomplishment of

\(^5\) *Conversation Analysis* can further be divided into work on *Sequential Organization* (Sacks, et. al., 1974; Schegloff, 2007), *Repair Organization* (Schegloff, et. al., 1977; Hayashi, et. al., 2013) and *Preference Organization* (Levinson, 1983; Pomerantz, 1984; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013).
actions and interactional projects, remaining generally unconcerned about psychological traits or states.

This general stance towards psychological topics may make EMCA seem like an odd fit as an approach to L2 motivation especially with the latter field’s tradition of conceptualizing motivation in terms of psychological constructs. However, given the recent turn towards relational and contextualized perspectives on motivation, particularly Ushioda’s (2009) “person-in-context” approach, I feel EMCA has a great deal to offer in terms of deepening our understanding and filling drawing attention to aspects of motivation as a participant’s concern that have not yet been explored. Here, I would like to introduce and outline some of the key concepts from CA, MCA, DP and Embodied Interaction that are recurrently drawn upon throughout the remainder of this study.

**Sequential Analysis**

Of primary concern for the topic of this study is that the turn-taking and sequential structure of interaction provides for the co-construction of courses of action and achievement and maintenance of intersubjectivity. At the heart of this co-construction, at the most fundamental level, lies the adjacency pair, a pair of turns (greeting - greeting, question - answer, invitation - acceptance/refusal) where the first pair part makes the second pair part conditionally relevant or noticeable and potentially accountable if absent, with each turn displaying the participants’ understanding of the previous talk (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007). This basic sequence can be expanded upon through pre-expansions (i.e. pre-invitations that check for

---

6 See Markee (Markee, 2011) and Hopper (2005) for discussions of an agnostic position on cognitivism, as well as Drew (2005) and Potter (2006) for further arguments.
the availability of the recipient before making the invitation-proper), insertion sequences (i.e. other initiations of repair; see below), and post expansions (i.e. assessments of the second pair part) which constitute the trajectory of the interaction (Schegloff, 2007). After the initiation of a sequence, either through a first pair part or pre-expansion, all turns tend to be responsive to the prior turn, and if absent or not responsive, can be examined by the participants for why they are absent or not responsive. This provides for a moral component, as such cases are potentially accountable and sanctionable.

Responses can be formulated in preferred or dispreferred ways, which can also be consequential and accountable. Preference organization, as it is understood in CA (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013) does not refer to internal states, but instead to normative response practices that are sensitive to context. In general, preferred responses are provided straight away with no hedging or delay, and are often upgraded, while dispreferred responses are often delayed, hedged, and prefaced with pro-forma preferred responses (i.e. responding to an invitation with “I would love to, but…”). It is important to note that actions that constitute preferred responses in some contexts are not preferred in all contexts; while an upgrade agreement is generally preferred after some assessments (i.e. responding to an assessment of how good the weather is with “it’s lovely”), it could be dispreferred in other cases such as in response to a compliment (Golato, 2005) or negative self-assessment (Pomerantz, 1984; see Chapter 6). Each case must be examined for how the participants treat it as preferred or dispreferred.

The turn-taking system also provides for structural opportunities to repair potential interactional trouble (Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, 1977), which are also organized according to preference, as well as by who initiates the repair and who conducts it. The most preferred and
most common type is *self initiated self repair*, which often occurs either near the trouble source (within the turn) or after the completion of the turn but before the recipient responds. *Self initiated other repair* often arises in cases where the speaker seeks assistance from the recipient in order to resolve the trouble source, such as in collaborative word searches (Hayashi, 2003). *Other initiated self repair* occurs when the recipient orients to a trouble source in the speaker’s turn with varying degrees of specificity ranging from open class repair initiations (Drew, 1997) such as “huh?”, which leave it to the speaker to identify the trouble source, to the use of repetition which locates the trouble source explicitly. The least common, and most dispreferred, are *other initiated other repair*, which often take the form of correction (Jefferson, 1974).

Repair organization relates to another preference as well, the preference for progressivity (Stivers & Robinson, 2006), in ways that are particularly germane to this study. While any bit of talk is potentially repairable (Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, 1977), not all trouble sources are oriented to or repaired. Participants can let these trouble sources pass (Firth, 1996) as long as they do not impede intersubjectivity. Furthermore, in the interest of progressivity, repair sequences are often minimized and moved beyond rather quickly. This means that any sustained orientation to a trouble source can threaten progressivity and is potentially accountable, and as such, often relates to something that one of the participants treats as particularly pressing.

*Membership Categorization Analysis and Identity*

From an EMCA perspective, identity is not something that a participant is or has, but is an active, and co-constructed, achievement (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Benwell & Stokoe, 2006). MCA (Fitzgerald & Housely, 2015; Hester & Eglin, 1997; Stokoe, 2012) provides an excellent toolkit for illuminating how identities and relationships are co-constructed and oriented
to in interaction. One of the key concepts in MCA that is relevant throughout this study is the
*standardized relational pair* (Sacks, 1972b; Stokoe, 2012). Just as actions are coupled in talk
through adjacency pairs, relationship categories also often occur in pairs as well (Silverman,
1998), such a husband and wife, teacher and student, or friend and friend. These relationships
often entail category-bound predicates (Watson, 1978; 2015), actions, activities or descriptions
that relate to normative rights, obligations and expectations regarding incumbents of these
categories. And, much like how absent or dispreferred second pair parts are potentially
accountable or sanctionable, the absence of orientation to such category-bound activities or
obligations is potentially problematic and requires accounts, which introduces a further moral
dimension (Jayyusi, 1984; 1991).

Furthermore, these co-constructed and accomplished identities are occasioned and situated
(Zimmerman, 1998) within the interaction, and their relevance can shift from moment to
moment. A participant can be treated relevantly as a language learner at one moment, and the
next moment be oriented to as a language expert (Kasper & Burch, 2016), or, as will be shown in
Chapter 4, identity as a language learner can be made relevant momentarily for the sake of
dealing with a trouble source then set aside in the interest of instantiating professional
relationships. Lastly, while some aspects of one’s identity, such as race, gender, or nationality,
can be transportable or carried across situations (Zimmerman, 1998), their relevance still remains
to be oriented to and worked up in the interaction, and therefore analytical claims about the
relevance of such transportable identities should be treated with caution and backed up through
empirical evidence based upon the participants’ observable orientations.\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) While Peony, the focal participant in this study, was recruited as a language learner, and the study focuses on her
motivation as an L2 learner and user, it is often the case that this identity is not the most relevant identity at any
particular moment in her interactions.
Discursive Psychology

Discursive Psychology (DP), broadly speaking, uses the analytical methods of sequential CA and MCA\(^8\) to analyze psychological topics as discursive practices (Edwards, 1997; Edwards & Potter, 1992; 2005). This includes taking topics such as causal attributions and studying how participants report, explain or describe events or actors as part of their mundane interaction, as well as looking at the occasioned and situated use of psychological or emotion words or phrases (the “psychological thesaurus” in Edwards and Potter’s (2005, p. 241) terms) as they are employed in interactional work. DP also explores how accountability and implications are managed through talk. As such, the interest is not in the veracity or psychological reality of descriptions or ascriptions, but in how these descriptions and ascriptions are used as resources by the participants. Furthermore, these descriptions and ascriptions are co-constructed and worked up through the interactions, drawing upon sequential organization, preference organization, and categorical practices, as well as the notion that identity is an interactional achievement.

Embodied Interaction

In face to face interaction, our bodies play an important role in organizing talk and provide a resource for displaying stances (Kendon, 2004; Streeck, 2009; Streeck, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011). Gaze direction functions in a multitude of ways, including establishing recipiency (Goodwin, 1981; 1986) or as a resource for avoiding recipiency (Preston, 2009; Sert, 2015), drawing attention to an object in the environment (Goodwin, 1994; 2000), and as a resource for displaying that one is undertaking a solitary word search or re-engaging for a collaborative word

\(^8\) Some strands of DP (i.e. Billig, 2006) also draw upon Critical Discourse Analysis.
search (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hayashi, 2003). Gesture and other body movements also function to draw attention to objects (Goodwin, 1994; 2000; 2003) and to display word search behavior (Hayashi, 2003), but are also powerful resources for displaying stance (Goodwin, 2000), and for depicting actions (Burch & Kasper, in press) or objects (Enfield, 2004). Facial expressions similarly function to display epistemic (Goodwin, 1987) and affective (Ruusuvuori & Peräkylä, 2009) stances. Our bodies are often as much a part of what we say and how we say it as our talk is, and therefore play a role that cannot be easily dismissed in a discursive approach to L2 motivation.

Many activities also involve interactions with materials and objects in the environment (Goodwin, 1994; 2000; 2003; Hutchins, 1995; Nevile et al, 2014). Often, the materials or objects organize or shape the activities themselves, making the activities recognizable for what they are, such as a hopscotch grid (Goodwin, 2000), a blueprint (Murphy, 2005), a map (Hutchins, 1995), or educational materials (Markee & Kunitz, 2013). Materials and objects can also function as a form of distributed cognition (Hutchins, 1995), as inscriptions (on paper or on a screen) provide for points of future reference (Murphy, 2005) or help to keep information organized (Heath, Hindmarsh, & Luff, 2010). Although much of the research cited here draws upon data from institutional contexts, work on mundane family contexts (Goodwin, 2007b; Goodwin & Goodwin, 2012) demonstrates that materials and objects play important interactional roles in the everyday tasks that people engage in as they go about their lives.

Stances in Interaction

I would like to end this section by returning to Goodwin’s (2007b) work on participation, stance, and affect. Recall from the data and quick discussion in Chapter 1 that, as the father is
helping his daughter with her mathematics homework, she does not cooperate and he leaves the room, claiming that she did not want to do the work. This ascription, essentially an ascription of lack of motivation (although Goodwin does not describe it as such), is made possible through a combination of many of the various resources discussed in this section, including sequence, category bound rights and obligations, ascriptions of psychological states, and the participants’ embodied orientations toward each other and the materials they were working with. Through his discussion of the data, Goodwin details five categories of stances that are displayed through interaction (pp. 70 – 71), including:

1) **Instrumental Stance**: “The [physical] placement of entities in the ways that are required for the sign exchange processes necessary for the accomplishment of the activity in progress;”

2) **Epistemic Stance**: “Positioning participants so that they can appropriately experience, properly perceive, grasp and understand relevant features of the events they are engaged in;”

3) **Cooperative Stance**: “the visible display that one is organizing one’s body toward others and a relevant environment in just the ways necessary to sustain and help construct the activities in progress;”

4) **Moral Stance**: “acting in such a way as to reveal to others that the actor can be trusted to assume the alignments and do the cognitive work required for the appropriate accomplishment of the collaborative tasks they are pursuing in concert with each others [sic];”

5) **Affective Stance**: “emotions by the individual and toward others that are generated … by the organization of participation in interaction.”
Throughout the data presented in this study, these stances play a recurrent role in shaping the interactional trajectory, and are very much part of motivation as observable and made relevant and consequential by the participants themselves.

**Looking Forward**

The primary and underlying argument in this study is that an EMCA approach to L2 interactional data can contribute to a broadening understanding of L2 motivation within the current contextualized, relational, and dynamic conceptualization as it has been developed by Dörnyei (2009; 2014), Ushioda (2009) and others (Dörnyei, MacIntyre, & Henry, 2015; MacIntyre, 2012; MacIntyre & Legatto, 2011 *inter alia*). While Chapters 4 through 6 are organized by the topics of persistence, engagement and initiation, and motivation as topic, there are four research foci that draw from the wider EMCA field (CA, MCA, DP and Embodied Interaction) that remain relevant throughout:

1) The *actions* and *activities* that the participants engage in, which make sustained orientation, engagement, initiation, stance displays or accounts relevant.

2) The various *resources* (verbal, embodied, material) that the participants use in their interactions in order to sustain orientation, engage or initiate, and make accounts and display stances.

3) The *identities* and *social relationships*, and their concomitant *category bound rights and obligations* that the participants co-construct and make relevant as they go about these activities.

4) The *stances* (as detailed by Goodwin, 2007b) that the participants take towards the activities and social relationships, and their *accounts* for them.
In exploring these four foci, I will argue that they constitute the resources and methods participants utilize to do motivation as a set of socially observable phenomena that are both made relevant and consequential for and by the participants. As such, the study contributes to the field of L2 motivation by illuminating aspects of L2 learners/users activities and identities that have thus far remained underexplored.
Chapter 3: Data and Methods

Introduction

This chapter will introduce the participants and settings, and discuss how the data were collected, transcribed and analyzed. Table 3.1 provides a brief overview of the data. Note that the name of the data, which will also be referenced in the extracts, includes the date of recording (4 digits for year, 2 digits for month and 2 digits for day), as well as initials for who participated.

Table 3.1: Overview of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Approx. Length</th>
<th>Setting and Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20130412PY</td>
<td>1 hr 29 min</td>
<td>Café, eating snacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20130501PJMD</td>
<td>1 hr 33 min</td>
<td>Mom &amp; Dad’s home, eating dinner, watching TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20130601PY</td>
<td>1 hr 28 min</td>
<td>Café, eating snacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20130809PJA</td>
<td>0 hr 42 min</td>
<td>Asako’s home, eating snacks, listening to music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20131104PJ</td>
<td>0 hr 33 min</td>
<td>Peony and Jiro’s home, eating dinner, watching TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20131130PJ</td>
<td>0 hr 27 min</td>
<td>Peony and Jiro’s home, eating dinner, watching TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20131228PA</td>
<td>0 hr 32 min</td>
<td>Peony and Jiro’s home, eating snacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140110PK</td>
<td>1 hr 14 min</td>
<td>Café, eating snacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140207PK</td>
<td>1 hr 20 min</td>
<td>Café, eating snacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140510PJMD</td>
<td>1 hr 2 min</td>
<td>Mom &amp; Dad’s home, eating dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total approx. Length)</td>
<td>10 hr 20 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants

In this study, there were two types of participants. Peony (introduced below) was the primary participant. As the language learner in the study, it is her language use that provides the academic foundation for this work. However, as has already been discussed, talk-in-interaction is inescapably co-constructed, all of the participants are of interest, and her status as the primary participant should not be confused with her being the only empirical focus of the analysis.

The secondary participants were those people that Peony chose to interact with, including family members, friends and colleagues. All are introduced below in the order of when they appear in the data, including some biographic information that may be worth keeping in mind while dealing with the analyses.

All names, of course, are pseudonyms.

Primary Participant

Peony is Taiwanese and is a native speaker of Mandarin. Having spent time in the United States as an exchange student during her Bachelor’s degree, and completing both a Master’s degree and PhD in the U.S., she is highly proficient in English. Japanese is her third language, which she studied for a couple of years as an undergraduate student, and then again for three semesters as a graduate student.

She lives in Japan, is married to a Japanese man (Jiro, introduced below), and teaches English as a Foreign Language at a university there. At the time of the first recording (April 2013), she had lived in Japan for approximately a year. She mentions in the data (especially February 2014, discussed in Chapter 6) that outside of the recordings she does not speak a great deal of Japanese. However, it is easy to get the impression from the data that this may be a bit
of an exaggeration, as her Japanese ability, especially regarding vocabulary and grammar, seems to improve across the data collection period. At the time of the recording, Peony was not taking formal Japanese language courses, though she repeatedly mentions across the conversations that she studies by listening to podcasts (see examples in Chapter 6) – she is learning the language “in the wild” (Kasper & Burch, 2016).

Secondary Participants

The following includes biographical information about each of the secondary participants. All are first language speakers of Japanese, though the amount of English or other languages that each knows varies from participant to participant, as does the amount of their experience abroad and the length of time they have known Peony.

**Yui (Y)**

Yui is a colleague of Peony’s. They seemed to not have a long interactional history at the time of the recordings (April and June of 2013), and so the conversations center on getting to know each other, their interests and histories. Yui has some degree of competence in English, and occasionally uses English words or phrases.

**Jiro (J)**

Jiro is Peony’s husband. He is an English teacher at a local high school, and completed graduate studies in an American university. According to Peony, their primary language at home

---

9 As formal measurements of her fluency, accuracy or complexity would be incongruent with the nature of this study, none were conducted. Therefore, it is best not to overstate the impression of her improvement. This being said, even Peony notes her improvement (especially December 2013).
is English, although the data collected here (May, August and November) show that at least for the sake of these conversations they speak primarily in Japanese with occasional English.

*Mom (M) and Dad (D)*

Jiro’s parents. Both of the recordings they are participants in (May 2013 and May 2014) were taken from dinners at their house in celebration of Mother’s Day. While both seem to have some vocabulary knowledge in English (which occasionally comes up in the conversations), they primarily speak Japanese during these conversations. As will be discussed in Chapter 5, Peony’s interaction with them in the two conversations is markedly different.

*Asako (A)*

Asako is a friend and classmate from Peony’s time as a graduate student. Although she is highly proficient in English, she also primarily speaks Japanese during the conversations she participated in (August and December 2013). She is also an experienced language teacher, which we will see an orientation to in Chapter 4. Asako and Peony have a long interactional history together, and the topics they choose to speak about reflect this.

*Keiko (K)*

Keiko is another friend from Peony’s time as a graduate student, although they were not classmates. She is also quite proficient in English, and occasionally orients to the language as a common resource in the conversations she participated in (January and February 2014). Similarly to Asako, Keiko and Peony have a long interactional history, which is again reflected in their choice of topics.
**Data Collection and Settings**

Peony volunteered to participate in this prior to moving to Japan, when the research topic was still vaguely defined as “language learning and use in the wild.” The directions were simply to record conversations that were going to occur regardless of the recording, although evidence from the data itself (especially December 2013 and February 2014) suggests that she oriented to the conversations as an opportunity to practice Japanese. Peony had total control and discretion over the recording, making it not unlike Theodórsdóttir’s (2011a; 2011b) studies of a learner of Icelandic in the wild.

After obtaining Internal Review Board approval, I supplied Peony with a digital voice recorder and a flash video camera and small tri-pod, although it seems that she occasionally used her own audio/video equipment. On the occasion of each recording, Peony conducted oral consent procedures (see Appendix). After recording, Peony sent the audio and video files to me electronically, of course with full discretion over which data I would receive.

Although the settings varied to some extent, all involved meals or snacks. The conversations with Yui and Keiko were recorded in cafés, while the rest were recorded either in Peony’s and Jiro’s home (both conversations with Jiro in November 2013, and the conversation with Asako in December 2013), at Asako’s home (August 2013), or Jiro’s parents’ home (May 2013, May 2014). These settings influenced the interactions to some extent, as café employees occasionally approached Peony and her co-participants, or the participants were watching television or listening to music during the interaction.
Analytical Frameworks

Although discussed in regards to epistemological backgrounds and influences in Chapter 2, some description of how the analytical frameworks impact on data analysis is necessary here. In this study, I use the term EMCA (Ethnomethodology / Conversation Analysis) to represent a broad range of analytic interests that trace back to Harvey Sacks’ (1992) work. This includes analytic concerns that were of early interest in the field such as Sequence and Turn Taking Organization (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007), Repair Organization (Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, 1977), and Preference Organization (Schegloff, 2007; Pomerantz, 1984). This study also draws upon the cognate fields of Membership Categorization Analysis (Fitzgerald & Housely, 2015; Hester & Eglin, 1997; Stokoe, 2012), Discursive Psychology (Edwards & Potter, 1992; 2005), as well work on Embodied Interaction (Streeck, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011). As such, this work is EMCA writ large, including focus on what the participants say, how they say it, and what embodied or environmental resources the participants use in their achievement and maintenance of intersubjectivity.

Transcription

The spoken data were transcribed, for the most part, using the common conventions presented in Jefferson (2004), though some new conventions were adopted for depicting gradually rising or falling pitch and nasal voice (see the list of conventions in the front matter). The non-verbal data (embodiment, gaze, posture, etc.) is a different story, as there is currently no accepted standard collection of CA conventions for transcribing them.
As Ochs (1979) notes, there is no such thing as a theory-free transcription system, and indeed, in the system developed for transcribing non-verbal action in this project is based upon a number of assumptions found in the CA and gesture literature. These are as follows:

1) **Participants often closely attend to where other participants are looking.** Research on gaze in interaction has shown that participants can be quite sensitive to eye contact, to the extent that they time and restart utterances based upon where a co-participant is looking (Goodwin, 1980; Carroll, 2004), and that even pre-verbal children attend to the gaze direction of other children (Kidwell, 2005) or their caregivers (Lerner, Zimmerman, & Kidwell, 2011). As gaze is always potentially a resource, the transcription system used here attempts to track where the participants are looking throughout the interaction.

2) **Gesture is a powerful semiotic resource.** Research on gesture (Kendon, 2004; McNeill, 1992) has shown how ubiquitous the behavior is in interaction, and how semantically rich gestures can be (Enfield, 2004). Work in CA, such that done by Streeck (2009; 2013) and Goodwin (2007a), has shown the degree to which interactants can rely upon gesture in order to achieve intersubjectivity, so much so that Levinson (2006) considers gesture to be a key component of what he calls the “interaction engine.”

3) **Participants orient to and use materials in the environment.** Humans interact in a world of things (Hutchins, 1995; Levinson, 2006), and these materials in the environment can be talked about or acted upon (Goodwin, 1994; Goodwin & Goodwin, 2012). Of particular interest in the current data is the use of mobile technology and writing on scratch paper.

4) **Posture, bodily comportment and facial expression matter interactionally.** The way we position our bodies in relation to each other or to our environment conveys a great deal
about our stance (Goodwin, 2007b), particularly in relation to participation. And though it certainly goes without saying, our facial expressions also display our stances (Burch & Kasper, in press; Ruusuvuori & Peräkylä, 2009).

An illustration of how the transcription reflects these assumptions may be helpful. Below is an extract drawn from data presented in Chapter 4 which illustrates the various innovations used in this study.

```
22  P  watashi +wa [+like +uh::# (0.6) .tch
I TOP
“I am, like uh…”

23  Y  [+nn::]
yeah

24  P  nan +uh: (0.3) +nannen ma+#:
some some years before
“some, uh (0.3) some years ago”

25  Y  [+nn.
yeah
“yeah”

26  P  ((sniff)) chotto +kibishikatta
little strict-PST
“I was a bit strict.”
```
The assumptions discussed above are reflected in the transcription conventions in the following ways. First, the onset of gestures and changes and gaze direction, posture and facial expressions are marked in relation to the talk using a plus (+) sign (see tiers above the numbered lines in the extract). Where appropriate, the duration of the gestures are noted with dashes (line 24, Peony’s wave), and if the gestures are dynamic, especially in cases involving beats (McNeill, 2005), movements are noted with slashes (/) (lines 22 and 24). Second, in the original transcriptions, all visible behaviors that could potentially be attended to by the co-participants were transcribed. However, as we know from Goodwin (1986), we may not attend to our co-participant’s ‘body cares’ such as scratching their nose, and therefore such movements may not be interactionally relevant. For the sake of space, movements that post-analytically seem to not be interactionally relevant have been removed from the presented excerpts. Third, drawing inspiration from many of the researchers cited in this section, the transcriptions include screen shots, especially in places where a textual description would be inefficient or incapable of describing the behavior (lines 22 and 24). In many cases, both textual and photographic resources are drawn upon with the goal of providing the reader with a clearer picture of the interactional circumstances.

A description of the tier system would perhaps also be valuable. The romanized rendering of the talk is marked in bold courier new. Above the talk, marked in plain courier new, is the description of the non-verbal behavior. The identifying markers for each are presented to the left of the line, with talk marked by upper case initials, and the non-verbal marked by lower case. The non-verbal tiers were transcribed to mark time left to right (i.e., a description that starts to the left of another description on another line happened before this second description). To the extent possible, the speaker’s non-verbal behavior is marked
immediately above their talk. However, in cases where a description of their behavior is necessary chronologically prior to another participant’s actions in the same line, that description may appear further above other description tiers. The decision to place the descriptions above the talk was to minimize the interference between the non-verbal descriptions and the interlinear glosses and translations which appear below the talk tier.
Chapter 4: Persistence

Introduction

As discussed in Chapter 2, there is little consistency in the literature regarding persistence. For some, persistence draws across a long time scale (Gardner, 1985; Ramage, 1990), a question of whether students will continue to study throughout a semester or will continue on to take the next level of the language course. For others (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; MacIntyre & Doucette, 2010), persistence is more task specific, operating on a shorter time scale or through repeated behaviors. Furthermore, throughout the literature, the meaning of persistence seems to be taken for granted and therefore it generally remains undefined. One exception appears in Crookes and Schmidt’s (1991) work, drawing upon Maehr and Archer (1987), where persistence is defined as “concentrating attention or action on the same thing for an extended duration” (p. 891).

This chapter takes this definition as a starting point as it investigates four cases where Peony displays a sustained orientation toward some aspect of the interaction. This sustained orientation tends to be most observable and salient in cases of interactional trouble or other difficulty that could potentially interrupt the trajectory of the conversation. However, this persistence need not be toward a solely linguistic problem. The data presented here illustrate examples of sustained orientation toward a variety of interactional projects, including stance taking and identity management.

The analyses presented in this chapter will focus on the following questions:

- What interactional goals do Peony and her co-participants orient to as they work through difficulties?
What resources do Peony and her co-participants utilize in working toward these interactional goals?

How is persistence, as a sustained orientation, co-constructed by Peony and her co-participants, and how does it arise out of the contingencies of the interaction?

**Persistence and L2 Talk**

While persistence, in the sense of sustained effort at the interactional level discussed above, has not often been explicitly topicalized in the CA-SLA literature (though see Markee, 2007), a number of studies have explored cases that illustrate sustained orientation and effort. Gardner and Wagner (2004, p. 16) note that L2 speakers “do not easily abandon topics, but struggle for solutions” when engaged in talk outside of classroom or laboratory settings. This is borne out not only in data collected in the wild (Egbert, Niebecker, & Rezzara, 2004; Kasper & Burch, 2016; Kurhila, 2006; Theodórsdóttir, 2011a; 2011b) but also in classroom settings, be it on-task (Mori, 2004), off-task (Markee, 2007) or between classes (Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh, 2004) when intersubjectivity is on the line. As Gardner and Wagner (ibid) point out, this is not particularly surprising if one considers that when speakers are engaged in meaningful talk, “[giving] up on a topic might impinge negatively on the speakers’ identities as competent social beings” (pp. 16-17). What is remarkable, however, are the lengths to which L2 speakers will sometimes go to achieve an interactional goal, and the various resources and techniques they employ to do so.

In this section, I will draw upon a selection of research on L2 data from various contexts and settings that evidenced sustained orientations and efforts towards interactional goals to explore the three questions stated in the previous section, relating to 1) the interactional goals the
participants orient to, 2) the resources they use, and 3) the degree to which this sustained effort is co-constructed.

Sustained Orientations

Unsurprisingly, given the context sensitive nature of interaction and the wide variety of interactional projects that can be undertaken for different purposes, the interactional goals that L2 speakers orient to in the literature also vary. However, some very broad (and certainly non-exhaustive) observations can be made.

One, perhaps obvious, focus of effort is on explicitly linguistic concerns, such as pronunciation (Brouwer, 2004), grammar (Kurhila, 2006) or vocabulary (Kasper & Burch, 2016; Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh, 2004), and the literature teems with cases of repair, word searches and clarification sequences. One particularly perspicuous example of sustained effort is illustrated by Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh (2004), on L2 Finnish conversational data recorded between class periods. Abdul, an L1 speaker of Arabic uses the word ero ‘divorce’ when speaking with Juan, an L1 speaker of Spanish. When Juan makes it clear through explicit repair initiation that he is not familiar with the word, Abdul goes through multiple attempts and stages to clarify the word, relying upon Juan’s world knowledge and categories (man, woman, marriage, etc.) in the process.

Egbert, Niebecker and Rezzara (2004) provide an example that shows that the issue may be less about linguistic concerns and more about achieving recognition of a referent (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). In this German conversation, primarily focusing on Rafaela (L1 Italian), Liu and Lü (both L1 Mandarin) though other L1 German speakers are present, the participants put one topic (famous architecture in Italy) on hold in order to deal with a person reference problem
that arises when Liu mentions a man he refers to as Kalilo. The participants first orient to this as an issue of non-native like pronunciation, but various attempts at redoing the pronunciation fail. Liu then attempts to clarify by providing an example of something the referent was associated with (clocks), but this leads to an extended word search for pendel ‘pendulum’. However, this tactic also fails. After a few more attempts at redoing the pronunciation and reinforcing the pendulum connection, Lü eventually connects the referent with phesiks ‘physics’, which allows Rafael to guess Galileo, which Liu and Lü confirm, and allows all of the participants to return to talking about famous things about Italy.

These two examples illustrate cases of sustained effort through interactional trouble related to language issues. However, there are times that the trouble is related to social action rather than understanding. Markee (Markee, 2007) provides an example collected from an ESL class during off-task talk that is still conducted in the target language. Where R (an L1 speaker of German) is attempting to invite M (an L1 speaker of Sesotho) to a party in his dormitory. M withholding acceptance of R’s invitation, which leads to R attempting subsequent versions of the invitation focusing on different aspects of the party (free beer, dancing, a deejay). M eventually responds by explaining that he is busy with a project, to which R responds with an alternate invitation to a different party.

Lastly, there may be multiple goals that participants orient to within a single interaction. Theodórsdóttir (2011a; 2011b) provides the example of Anna, a Canadian woman learning Icelandic who recorded herself as she went about her daily life. In this particular case, Anna is at a bakery ordering bread and rolls. She explicitly asks the bilingual clerk to speak in Icelandic rather than English, which he generally does except in cases where he clarifies something he has already attempted in the target language. Anna works through the difficulty with her order
(including pronunciation and vocabulary issues), and also asks the clerk to count her change back to her in Icelandic after she paid, to provide her an opportunity to repeat the numbers. Thus, with the clerk’s help, Anna accomplishes two activities at once; the service encounter and creating an opportunity to practice the language.

Resources

One key aspect found in most of the research cited thus far is the reliance on various linguistic, embodied and material resources as part of a speaker’s efforts towards an interactional goal. While these can be thought of as communication strategies (Kurhila, 2006; Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh, 2004), it would be unwise to *a priori* assume that they are necessarily compensatory for some lack of ability or knowledge (Burch, 2014; Olsher, 2004). Instead, first and foremost, the resources should be examined for how they are used to achieve intersubjectivity and move the interaction forward.

We have already touched upon some of these resources. As discussed above, Abdul (Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh, 2004) relied upon Juan’s knowledge of the world in order to clarify the word ‘divorce’, essentially drawing upon categories, semantics (referred to as “script links” in the chapter as well as in Kurhila’s (2006) work) and epistemics (Heritage, 2012). In Egbert et al’s (2004) data, Liu attempts to pronounce the trouble source in multiple ways, taking the originally pronounced form *kalilo* all the way to the recognizable reference *Galileo* (with the help of Lü’s related category of *phesiks*).

There are a multitude of non-verbal resources that speakers draw upon as well. From gestures (Burch, 2014; Egbert, et al., 2004) to writing (Kasper & Burch, 2016) to reference to physical materials such as documents (Kurhila, 2006; Mori, 2004), bodies and the environment provide
affordances and constraints that can be relied upon as interactants make efforts towards their interactional goals. Often, verbal, embodied and material resources are used in concert with each other, as when Liu acts out the swinging of a pendulum with his arm as he searches for the word *pendel* (Egbert, et al., 2004).

**Co-construction**

In the majority of cases found in the literature, the L2 speaker’s sustained orientation toward an interactional goal is shared or at least supported by the co-participants. In cases where L1 speakers were involved (Burch, 2014; Kurhila, 2006; Mori, 2004; Theodórsdóttir, 2011a; 2011b), this is particularly evident, as the L1 speakers often actively engaged in assisting the L2 speakers and provided the interactional space for their efforts. Even in lingua franca settings, such as in Egbert et al. (2004) and Mazeland and Zaman-Zadeh (2004), where no L1 speakers were involved in solving the main interactional difficulties, sustained orientation and effort were cooperative achievements.

Of course, sustained orientation is plausible even in less cooperative environments. The invitation sequence in Markee (2007) is a case in point. R’s persistent invitation continued not so much in spite of, but *because* of M’s lack of a preferred response. This is less an exception to the argument about the co-construction of effort as it is a modulation; after all, M did not provide an unhedged dispreferred response (i.e., a bald “no!”) either. That is to say, while the effort may not
have been cooperative in the usual sense, neither was it blocked, and therefore it was still co-constructed by the participants.\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{Analyses}

In this chapter, I will focus on four extended examples that illustrate different interactional goals that Peony and her co-participants orient to. In Extract 4.1 (IGEN), the participants are talking about whether it is necessary for a teacher to be authoritative in the classroom when Peony encounters difficulty formulating her stance towards the subject. As such, the extract demonstrates a case of Peony working through linguistic trouble while also portraying a professional identity. Extract 4.2 (ZUSHI) again finds Peony working through linguistic difficulty as she makes multiple attempts at referring to a favorite locale. In the process, both participants must orient to each other’s local geographical knowledge, and Peony in particular must work through a relaxing of the preference for minimization (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979) in order to achieve recognition. In both extracts, we find the participants rely upon various resources, including materials and technology in the environment as tools for working through the difficulty.

Extracts 4.3 and 4.4 both illustrate orientations towards learning objects (Markee, 2008; Markee & Seo, 2009), but with different interactional goals. In AKEMASHITE OMEDETOO (Extract 4.3), Peony explicitly asks how to say “happy new year”, which as a lengthy set phrase requires sustained effort. Here, Peony orients to her obligations as a daughter-in-law as well as to a cultural practice that she feels she ought to be able to conduct. Finally, in Extract 4.4

\textsuperscript{10} One example of a truly non-cooperative persistence occurs in Hauser’s discussion of “interactional incompetence”, where one participant in an EFL classroom group pursues a response from another student who resists answering.
(TENSHOKU), Peony goes beyond a word clarification sequence (Kurhila, 2006) and beyond intersubjectivity, orienting towards greater semantic specification. By doing so, she does being a good learner, but also focuses on a possibly useful description of teachers, orienting to a category that she and her co-participants are all incumbents of.

**igen**

The first example comes from the very first conversation with Yui, providing an illustration of Peony working toward formulating a stance that has stakes for how she could be perceived as a person and as a professional. While the topic is touched off by the focus on the word *igen* (translatable as ‘authority’, ‘strictness’ or ‘poise’), Peony launches into describing how she as a teacher is generally not strict, portraying herself to be a caring and thoughtful teacher.

At the beginning (Extract 4.1a), we enter where Yui firsts uses the word *igen*, which sets off a word clarification (Kurhila, 2006) and definition sequence.

**Ex. 4.1a 20130412PY IGEN**

001 Y koi- +igen wa +tabun motanakya to * authority TOP maybe have-must QT

002 Y +omou n +ja nai? think NOM NEG

“Don’t you think you should be strict?”

003 P [nn “hmm”

004 Y [igen? +waka[ru. authority understand

“igen? Do you understand?”

59
As the extract begins, Yui asks Peony whether she feels that it is sometimes necessary to be strict as a teacher, using the word igen for the first time in the conversation and making Peony’s identity as an educator relevant. However, Peony replies with only a non-committal nn, produced with a flat intonational contour. In overlap, Yui explicitly asks whether Peony understands the word, but her physical actions project that she already anticipates a negative
response as her gaze shifts to the scratch paper Peony had laid out on the table earlier. Peony indeed treats the word as unknown, as she repeats *igen* with a question intonation (line 005)\[11\]. Thus, both participants instantiate situated identities (Zimmerman, 1998) as *expert* and *novice* regarding the language, and begin a pedagogical activity focused on the word.

Having grabbed the pen and paper from Peony (line 007), Yui says *igen tte* as she starts to write the kanji in line 010, projecting an explanation or definition of the word. However she stops, saying *matte matte* ‘wait wait’ to signal a pause in the activity, and then picks up her phone. She then notes that the first character (威) is not appearing (line 013) further projecting an extended solitary search, while Peony maintains her gaze on the paper.

Here, the sustained active orientation is primarily based upon Yui’s focus on the word. She does not simply reformulate it or provide a synonym, suggesting that she treats the word as one that Peony ought to learn. Peony supports this course of action by providing Yui with the pen and paper, while not attempting to take the floor during this time. After this segment (and prior to the next, 9 lines omitted), Yui writes the kanji for *igen* (威厳), and Peony mentions a mutual friend of theirs who is a *kibishii* ‘strict’ teacher. It is worth noting that the second character (*gen*, 厳) is also the character for *kibishii* (厳しい), suggesting that Peony may already recognize a semantic connection between the words. In the next segment, Peony begins to talk about her own teaching philosophy in relation to being strict.

---

\[11\] Line numbering references the length of the total extract; extracts with fewer than 100 lines have a two digit line number, while extracts with more have a three digit line number.
Ex. 4.1b 20130412PY IGEN

022  P  watashi +wa [+#like +uh::# (0.6) .tch]
               +GZ>Y       +GZ>left
    I         TOP
         “I am, like uh…”

023  Y  [+nn:::]
         +GZ>paper, writing
         “yeah”

024  P  nan +uh: (0.3) +nannen  ma+e#:#
               +GZ>Y      +GZ left     +GZ>Y
    some           some years before
         “some, uh (0.3) some years ago”

025  Y  [+nn.]
         yeah
         “yeah”

026  P  ((sniff)) chotto +kibishikatta.
               +GZ>Y
    little  strict-PST
         “I was a bit strict.”

027  Y  aa [+soo ↑nan +da:[].
               +GZ>phone   +GZ>paper
    oh so       NOM COP
         “oh, really.”

028  P  [+nn.]
         yeah    yeah
         “yeah, yeah.”
In this segment, Peony launches into a stance taking project, speaking as and illustrating her experience as a teacher. At line 022, Peony begins to explain that she used to be strict, but seems to run into difficulty, as evidenced by the various speech perturbations throughout the turn (Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, 1977; Wagner & Firth, 1997), and hand movements that are indicative of doing a word search (Hayashi, 2003). Her gaze, which shifts to and from Yui a
number of times, also suggests trouble. It has been noted (Goodwin, 1981; Hayashi, 2003) that solitary word searches often occur with gaze disengaged, and that making eye contact is a way of inviting participation or assistance. The shift in Peony’s gaze suggests that she is attempting to check Yui’s availability to provide such assistance, but finding that Yui is still writing, she completes the word search herself with chotto kibishikatta ‘I was a little strict’ (line 026). This formulation serves (at least) two functions here. First, by using the synonym again, she reinforces that she understands (at least to some degree) the meaning of igen. At the same time, she deals with the original question about whether a teacher needs to be authoritative in class, by claiming that she used to be so. Formulating this in the past tense also makes relevant a possible semantic contrast with the present, although Peony does not grammatically project a contrast with a marker such as kedo.

However, Yui’s attention is split at this time. While she does provide continuers (lines 023 and 025), she continues to write, maintaining an orientation toward providing the kanji for the word. Even after Peony has completed her turn, and has shown that she understands the meaning, Yui continues to write as she provides the receipt aa soo nan da:: ‘oh really.’ in line 027. At this point, Peony has returned her focus toward the paper, watching Yui as she finishes writing the kanji, and for the moment puts on hold any further work towards answering the original question.

Yui then writes the hiragana for igen on the paper (lines 029 – 030), providing the reading (see Figure 4.1 below – the hiragana are toward the top of the frame while the kanji are under), displaying her orientation toward the word as a learning object. Peony displays her recognition with nn:: oh oh oh as she nods, and Yui then points at the kanji on the paper and repeats igen with a rising intonation (032), making Peony’s confirmation of recognition relevant in the next
turn. Peony does indeed repeat the word, but also with a slightly rising intonation (line 033), but then claims that she is dokidoki igen ‘sometimes authority’, as she points at the paper with her left hand and at herself with her right, displaying an understanding of the word while reinforcing with her gestures a connection between the word and herself. With Yui’s affirmative response (line 036), the orientation to the word as a learning object is complete.

![Image of kanji for IGEN with hiragana written above]

*Fig. 4.1: The kanji for IGEN with hiragana written above*

We see in this segment that Peony begins to attempt to work through an answer to the original question but encounters difficulties doing so. However, Yui’s attention towards writing the kanji means that she does not fully orient to Peony or her talk, and the topic switches back to a focus on igen as a learning object. After she has displayed her understanding of the word (both through using the synonym kibishii ‘strict’ and making the connection between igen and herself in an embodied fashion), Peony is able to take the floor in the clear of any competing activity. In the following segment, Peony (with Yui’s help) teases out the conditions that relate to being strict, laying out a contrast between when it is necessary versus normal circumstances.

Ex. 4.1c 20130412PY IGEN

```
p  +GZ left
039  P  [+uh::]
```
You feel like you can maintain authority?

The student is bad.

If I have to, I'll like uh::

You feel like you can maintain authority?
(((BELL RINGS)))

p +GZ left +GZ>y

050 P +iranai. +irimasu (0.3) +iri toki.
need-NEG need-POL *need time

"Don’t need. Need (0.3) when I *need."

y +nod

p +head left and reset very rapidly

051 Y +;aa:

p +RH curl in then fingers up

p +RH to SPU

052 P if i +have +to,

y +RH SPU to right

y +RH SPU beat +RH to LH under chin

p +slight nodding

053 Y +okoru no ga, +hitsuyoo na +toki mo aru yo ne¿
angry NOM SUB necessary GEN time also exist IP IP

“There are times where getting angry is necessary, aren’t there.”

p +GZ down +GZ>y

p +nodding

054 P +;nn nn [+nn nn nn:.

y +nod

055 Y [+nn nn nn:.

p +GZ left +GZ down

p +RH to chin +{RH wave to right

056 P +uh: but, (0.4) +most of the times? +uh
p +GZ>Y
p RH wave
057 P +#yasashii=#
   nice
y +head up, nod
058 Y +=+[n[n:].

p +slight nod +RH to chin +GZ up left
y nodding--------------------------
059 P [+#°yasashii +des.°# (.) +#yea:h.#=
   nice COP
   “I’m nice. Yeah.”

p +head move left and right
p +RH SPU
p +LA on table, LH PRV
060 P +=("this.°")

061 (0.7)

062 P [uh:

y +GZ right
y +(BH open to right, beats down
   / reset /
   p +GZ>Y
063 Y =e- +zu:- GO:i ita- iya no:: baddo na koto=
   terrible * bad LK bad COP NOM

y {BH open to right
   /
   y +GZ>down>P +nod
   y +BH PRD mid height, spread wide
   p +nod
064 Y =shinakere+ba +yasashii tte koto da yo +ne [hǝhǝhǝ
   do-NEG-COND nice QT NOM COP IP IP
   “So you’re nice if they don’t do anything really bad- bad, right?”
As this segment begins, Peony launches into another word search, marked by her gaze direction, and elongated uh:: (line 039). Starting at the same time, Yui asks tamotsu kanji (su)ru::? ‘you feel like you can maintain authority?’, perhaps providing a candidate predicate to Peony’s dokidoki igen (line 35 in 4.1b). This seems to momentarily interrupt Peony’s word search, as she shifts her gaze toward Yui, nods and says nn::, followed by a 1.0 second gap where Peony’s answer to Yui’s question would be otherwise due. At line 043, Peony begins to describe the circumstances in which she would be authoritative as a teacher, which does not seem to be in response to Yui’s question, but as an outcome of the search she had started earlier. Perhaps encountering difficulty with formulating her turn in Japanese, she switches into English to produce the conditional phrase if- if° the student is ba:d. which although ending with a falling intonation, seems to project an upcoming completion (Lerner, 1991). At the same time, Peony also shifts her gaze to Yui, possibly to ascertain whether the switch to English is potentially problematic. Yui provides a nod and a continuer (044), at which point Peony shifts her gaze to the paper and places her left hand index finger on the kanji as she says n then (0.3) igen.

Peony then immediately starts another turn (line 045), again in English with so:, but this turns into a solitary word search as she averts her gaze and pauses, produces an uh:, and pauses again. At line 047, she again begins another conditional phrase with if I have to as she shifts her gaze to Yui, but then reverts to word search behavior with #like uh:# (0.6) #uh::# as she looks
down and pauses again. Throughout this time, Yui maintains her posture with her hands folded below her chin and gaze fixed at Peony – this inactivity, while possibly a case of Yui doing being patient and attentive, also withholds continuers or other displays of understanding. Perhaps due to the lack of uptake, Peony attempts to reformulate *if I have to* in Japanese (line 050), but encounters difficulty with finding the appropriate form, starting with *iranai* ‘don’t need’, then saying *irimas* (the polite form of *iru* ‘to need’), then after a short pause, *iri toki* (getting close to the target form *iru toki* ‘when I need’). As Peony produces this last form, Yui nods, suggesting that she understands, which is reinforced by her further nod as she says *aa::: in line 051.*

Peony then repeats *if I have to* in English again (052). However, before she moves on to the projected completion, Yui provides a candidate understanding with *okoru no ga, hitsuyoo no toki no aru yo ne¿* ‘There are times where getting angry is necessary, aren’t there.’, which Peony accepts with nods and repeated affirmative tokens (line 054). Yui then nods and provides affirmative tokens herself, seemingly confirming her own understanding as well (line 055). At this point, Peony then switches back into English and says *uh: but, (0.4) most of the times? and finishes in Japanese with *yasashii¿* ‘I’m nice’. This formulation stands in contrast with the previous *if I have to*, treating such cases as rare. However, the slightly raising intonation on *yasashii* suggests that she is testing whether this is the appropriate word at this point. Yui lifts her head back and nods as she produces a high pitched *nn::* (line 058), displaying understanding, and in overlap, Peony says *#°yasashii des.°# (.) #yea:h.#, produced in a quiet creaky voice and with a slight nod, which seems less about her own kindness and more about confirming that *yasashii* was indeed the appropriate term to use. Peony then seems to start another utterance, but stops (lines 060 – 061).
As Peony produces an uh:, suggesting that she is about to restart, Yui launches into another reformulation to confirm her understanding, providing the phrase su:-GO:i ita- iya no:: baddo na koto shinakereba yasashii ‘If they don’t do anything bad, you’re nice’ - note 1) the exaggerated pronunciation (including the glottal stop at the beginning and the cut-off after the first mora), volume, intonation and beat gestures on sugoi ‘terribly’, and 2) the self-repair from iya to a more foreignized baddo for ‘bad’12, which is also accompanied by a beat gesture. Using these resources, Yui designs the utterance to both display her understanding but to also make sure Peony can understand it so that she can confirm. Yui then completes the utterance with tte koto da yo ne, marking the previous clause as a candidate understanding that Peony can provide confirmation for. Peony indeed does so with nods and repeated affirmative tokens (lines 065 – 066).

In this segment, Peony orients toward describing that there are conditions for being strict as a teacher, but encounters difficulty formulating this and switches into English, although she refers to igen in Japanese. This tack is not particularly successful, however, as Yui at first does not display her understanding. It is only after Peony attempts to provide the conditional phrase in Japanese (line 050, with iri toki) that Yui is able to provide candidate understandings and help to co-construct the meaning with Peony. Here, then, the effort is exerted by both participants. It is also worth noting that the time contrast implied in the previous segment with kibishikatta ‘was strict’ is put on hold in the process of pointing out the conditions for being strict, possibly due to Peony having difficulty with formulating the idea in Japanese.

12 It seems likely that ita- is the first attempt at saying ‘bad’, but it is unclear what word was projected before the self-repair to iya no.
In the next segment, similar formulation trouble arises. However, the trajectory takes a different course and Peony is able to resolve the difficulty in a different fashion.

Ex. 4.1d 20130412PY IGEN

069  Y  ((clears throat))

070  Y  peony san::: +yasashisoo.< +seeto ni +naritakatta.
Name AT nice seem student to become-want-PST
“You seem nice. I wanted to be your student.”

071  (1.2)

072  P  nn:::. (0.6) +(was uh:) +(1.2) +watashi:

073  Y  +n[n:
yeah
“yeah”

074  P  [wa:: (0.4) +see:to:: (0.6) +like uh: (0.2)
TOP student

075  P  long time?
“I (0.4) student (0.6) like uh (0.2) long time?”

076  Y  +nod
yeah
“yeah”
I was a student for a long time.

“Yeah”

“Yeah”

It's difficult, in Japanese.

Why?

This part is difficult.
085  P  +i was a student, for [+a long time?]
    y                        +nod
    086  Y                        [+↑nn.  yeah
                       “yeah”
    y                        +slight nod
    087  Y                       [+nn.=
                                yeah  “yeah”
    p  +GZ down  +GZ to Y
    p  +LH retract  +{LH toward self, 2 beats out
                       {  /      /
    088  P                   =+so:  (. )  +i +understand¿
    y                        +slight nod
    089  Y                        +nn
                                yeah
                                “yeah”
    p  GZ up left, LH hold
    090                        (1.0)
    p  +LH in  +LH beat  +BH down stroke
    p  +GZ>Y
    091  P   nn:  +what it’s +like +to be a +student.
    p  {GZ hold
    {RH hold LH to pen, lifts pen, RH to pen
    092                        (1.4)
“I understand how the students feel.”

“Oh, because for a long time…”

“Yeah”

“The students…”

“Because a long time”

“You understand how they feel”

“Understand how they feel.”

“That’s what you mean?”
This segment begins with Yui aligning with Peony’s prior statement about usually being *yasashii* ‘nice’ (4.1c) by saying the Peony *seems* like a nice teacher (*yasashi soo*) and that she wanted to be Peony’s student. However, Peony does not respond immediately, and when she does, her response is a minimal *nn::*, suggesting that she may not understand Yui’s turn, that she may not know how to respond, or that she may be avoiding responding to praise (Golato, 2005; see also Chapter 6). Peony then launches into a longer turn about how she was a student for a long time (072), which seems less fitted to Yui’s prior utterance and more a return to what Peony said in the previous segments about being strict and the conditions for being so. As in the previous segments, her talk is marked by perturbations and other signs of trouble, including a try-marked *long time?* produced as she holds her arms in a kind of shrug position, (lines 074 – 075). Yui only nods as she provides a continuer, suggesting that she does not have a problem understanding at this point. Peony then switches to English for a whole TCU in line 077, which Yui again receipts with *nn* and a nod. Peony then orients to the pen and paper, and even lifts the pen, but sets it down again, orienting to difficulty she herself is facing and the possible methods she could use to work through it.
As Peony sets the pen down, she looks down and rests her right cheek on her hand, saying in English **this part is difficult**, then reformulates this in Japanese as **muzukashii ne, nihongo de** ‘this is difficult, in Japanese’. While the gaze direction, posture and quiet volume suggest that this is somewhat self-directed, the reformulation in Japanese ensures that it is on record in the flow of the conversation. Yui, also in a quiet voice, responds by asking **nande** ‘why?’, which receives no fitted response from Peony.

At line 085, Peony restarts, shifting her gaze to Yui as she repeats **I was a student for a long time**, which Yui again receipts with minimal responses and nods. In line 088, Peony drops her gaze as she says **so:** with an elongated vowel, suggesting another word search, but then brings her gaze up to Yui again as she says **I understand** while waving towards herself. Yui again receipts this with a minimal response and a slight nod. Peony pauses for a second as she again shifts her gaze away, then as she finishes her utterance, she looks at Yui and produces gestural beats as she says **what it’s like to be a student.** In the pause that follows, Peony maintains her gaze towards Yui but reaches for the pen. Yui’s elongated **nn:::** in line 93 suggests that there is a problem, so Peony then attempts to reformulate the last phrase in Japanese as **seeto no kanji ga wakaru des** ‘I understand how the students feel’.

Yui then produces a high-pitched **haa:** (line 095), and begins to reformulate parts of her turn, first with **nagakatta bun** ‘because (you were a student) for a long time’, which Peony receipts with a **nn** and a repetition, and then with **seeto no kimochi ga wakaru** ‘know how the students feel’, including an embedded correction of Peony’s **kanji** ‘sense’ to a more idiomatic **kimochi**

---

13 See also Hauser (2015) and Steinbach Koehler & Thorne (2011) on how talk that is designed as self-directed speech can serve an interactive function.
‘feeling’. In line 100, Peony repeats the phrase while nodding, accepting the correction. Yui then confirms that this is what Peony meant by asking tte koto ka, which Peony then accepts again (line 102).

Similar to the previous segment, Peony again utilizes a number of strategies, in particular the use of English to formulate her meaning. This in itself is a sustained orientation, if not to speaking Japanese, to at least expressing her stance as a teacher. However, the English formulations do not work, as Yui does not display understanding. This is where persistence through difficulty comes in at an even more meaningful level. Peony explicitly states, in both English and Japanese, that she is having difficulty formulating what she wants to say. Peony’s attempt to reformulate her utterance in Japanese, despite her explicit statement about the difficulty she is having, arises from interactional contingencies – that is, Yui does not understand, leading Peony to have to try a different tack. This is not necessarily persistence in orienting to speaking or practicing Japanese, but is certainly persistence in answering Yui’s original question about the importance of authority in the classroom, and providing detail and nuance, demonstrating herself to be a reasonable teacher who empathizes with her students. It pays off, as Yui is able to parse, reformulate and confirm what Peony meant.

In the following and final segment of this extract, Peony continues to encounter difficulty, but stays in Japanese as she deals with troubles in formulating her stance and providing greater detail about how she empathizes with students.

---

14 Both kanji and kimochi can be translated as ‘feeling’. However, when describing how a third person ‘feels’ or perceives and object or situation, kimochi is often the more idiomatic usage.
Ex. 4.1e 20130412PY IGEN

105 P "I *want to understand them."

106 Y "yeah."

107 P I *want to understand the students."

108 Y "yeah."

109 P can- succes- student *TOP can-
p LH hold +LH up +RHF to LH palm +GZ>Y

110 P nai toki wa: [(0.5) uh: +kiki +ma[s.]
NEG time TOP +GZ>Y
“Can- succee- when the students can’t, uh, I ask.”

y +nod
111 Y [nn] [+nn:=]
“yeah, yeah”

y +nod
112 Y =[+nn.
“yeah”

p +BH rest +BH move left +lean in then sit up
p [+nn. +dooshite::] yeah why
113 P “Yeah, why…”

y +head tilt right, return
114 Y “°°dooshita[ no:?°°]
what’s wrong
“What’s wrong?”

115 P [nn.] “yeah”

y nodding, head to left, return
p BH rest (0.7)
116
p +nod +nod +nod +LH to chin
p [+hn nn: (0.4) +dooshita no (.) +nn. what’s wrong yeah
“Hm hmm, what’s wrong. Yeah”

p +GZ up left
117 Y “((clears throat)) ne/\[::::
IP
“Right?”

p slight nod
118 P [+nn nn
“Yeah, yeah”
At line 105, Peony expands upon the stance illustrated in the previous segment by further explaining that she wants to understand her students, using the somewhat un-idiomatic *wakaritai* ‘want to understand’\(^\text{15}\), and then repeating and expanding the phrase to include the object (line 107). In neither case does Yui correct the usage, instead responding with minimal *nn* tokens and nods. Peony then launches into further elaboration (line 109), but the turn is marked by various displays of trouble. First, she starts with what seems like the beginning of *dekiru* ‘can’ (or, if an attempt at what she says later in the turn, *dekinai* ‘can’t’), but cuts it off at *dek-*. After a micropause, she then restarts with *seeko-* , which could be either an attempt to say *seekoo* ‘success’ or a mispronunciation of *seeto* ‘student’. She then pauses again very briefly, then produces the phrase, somewhat haltingly, *seeto wa dekinai toki wa (0.5) uh kikimas* ‘when the students can’t do it, I ask.’ Yui responds in overlap with continuers and nods. Peony then asks *dooshite* ‘why’ (line 113), seemingly reporting what she asks her students; while the grammatical markings of reported speech (such as quotative particles) are missing, her embodied action, including leaning in and her hands held out to the left, suggest that she is acting out what she does when she “asks” the students (referred to in line 110). Here, Yui provides a repair to a more idiomatic phrase, *dooshita no?* ‘what’s wrong?’ (line 114), though she produces this at a quiet volume and with a head tilt, suggesting that she offered the repair less as a correction and as more of a candidate alternative, which Peony accepts with *nn*, nods, and a repeat of the phrase. Yui then responds with a long *ne* with a gradually rising intonation, and Peony closes the sequence with another nod and minimal affirmative tokens.

\(^{15}\) By prescriptive rules, *wakaru* ‘to understand’ is a state (i.e. not under the agent’s control), and therefore not subject to the volition inherent in the suffix *tai* ‘want to’. However, an informal survey of native speakers and an online search suggests that at least some speakers accept the form, which may account for Yui’s lack of correction.
In this segment, Peony has provided more detail in portraying herself as an empathetic teacher that cares about how her students feel. In displaying her empathy here and in the previous extract, she has not only provided a full answer to the original question about igen in the classroom, she has skillfully set up a contrast between authority (which she describes as sometimes necessary) on one side and being yasashii ‘nice’ and empathetic as normal and common for her as a teacher.

Summarizing the analysis of the whole excerpt, while it started off with a focus on a vocabulary word that the participants treated as a learning object (igen), the focus on the word provided the foundation for a sustained orientation on Peony’s part toward explaining her stance towards being strict as a teacher. As such, the persistence displayed here is not toward learning or even speaking the language as such, but toward answering a question that has stakes regarding her identity as a teacher and portraying herself to Yui as kind and empathetic person. She employed resources that have been already been thoroughly illustrated in CA work on repair (Schegloff et al, 1977) and word searches (Hayashi, 2003), as well as contrasts between her stance most of the time and the conditions for when being strict is necessary, and between authority and empathy. Furthermore, her persistence through this is largely based upon Yui’s involvement, providing an example of how persistence in an activity that is co-constructed will also be co-constructed itself.

**ZUSHI**

Many of the cases where Peony persists through difficulty center around vocabulary that she does not know, words that by their very nature lie more within the epistemic authority of her co-participant than in her own. Indeed, knowledge of and about a language and culture are
normatively associated with being a native speaker (Nishizaka, 1995; 1999), and cases where nonnative speakers of Japanese display in-depth knowledge (sometimes more so than a native speaker) can lead to ascriptions of being a *hen na gaijin*[^16] ‘strange foreigner’ (Nishizaka, 1999; Suzuki, 2009). Furthermore, certain types of local knowledge, such as the geography discussed in the following excerpt, entail membership as well (Drew, 1978; Nishizaka, 1999; Schegloff, 1972), both in terms of epistemic authority and what one may be expected to know, and in terms of designing a formulation or description for a recipient. Locals are expected to know about local things, and demonstration of such knowledge characterizes the speaker as a local, and lack of that knowledge may mark one as a non-local.

The extract presented here illustrates just such a case where knowledge of local geography is at play. Prior to this extract, Yui and Peony were listing places around Tokyo that they like, and as the topic develops, Peony refers to a town called *Zushi*. Although Peony encounters difficulty in making the reference, this is only one aspect of her persistence; even after making the reference clear, we find that Yui does not immediate recognize it, and achieving recognition becomes the goal of Peony’s sustained effort.

Ex. 4.2 20130601PY A10640 Zushi

| 01 | P | <asakusa> (0.6) e:t- (0.4) +nn:/:: |
|    |   | Asakusa uhm hmm |

| 02 | P | hoka ni *nani*? (0.7) +nn:/:: |
|    |   | other in what hmm |

“*Asakusa, uhm, hmmm. What else is there, hmm.*”

[^16]: While both Nishizaka (1999) and Suzuki (2009) romanize this as *henna gaijin*, I will maintain the practice exemplified in my transcriptions of treating *Na*-adjectives and their enclitics as separate words.
It's not in Tokyo, but how about Kamakura?

“I love Kamakura.”

It’s great, isn’t it.

Yeah. I like Izu.

You like Izu.

No.”

+Sushi.
85

y +picks up phone
y +nod
16 Y +*(jushi.)*
   ((Attempt at repetition))

17 P zushi?
   Zushi
   “Zushi?”

18 (0.5)

p +GZ up
19 Y +"zushi."
   Zushi
   “Zushi”

y GZ at phone
20 (1.2)

21 P zu:shi (0.2) e ikitai.
   Zushi to go-want
   “I want to go to Zushi”

22 (0.4)

y +lifts phone higher
23 P +kamakura< no chikai.
   Kamakura LK close
   “Close to Kamakura.”

24 (0.9)

y GZ at phone
25 Y °zushi.°
   Zushi
   “Zushi.”

y GZ at phone
p GZ left
26 (1.4)

p +GZ up left
27 P +"zushi."
   Zushi
   “Zushi.”

p GZ>Y
y GZ at phone
28 (3.4)
p +GZ>paper
p +LH>paper, RH grabs pen
29 P +"zushi.° (0.5) °°are¿°°
     Zushi         huh
     "Zushi. Huh?"
p writes 逗子
y GZ at phone
30 (3.3)
y GZ at phone
p +GZ>Y
p +pushes paper toward Y
31 P [+>zushi-<=
     Zushi
     "Zushi."
32 Y [nn. =nn:::
     yeah     yeah
     "Yeah, yeah."
y GZ>paper
y holds phone out toward P
p GZ>phone
33 (1.5)
y GZ at paper
34 Y zushi.
     Zushi
     "Zushi."
p GZ at phone
p +nod
35 P +nn:::
     yeah
     "Yeah."
36 (0.3)
y GZ at paper
37 Y nn:::
p pen>paper
38 (0.3)
p +underlines 逗子 2x
39 P +ikita:i.
     go~want
     "I want to go."
The extract begins with Peony closing the previous sequence about Asakusa (a famous area in Tokyo) in line 01. She then does a “thinking face” (Goodwin, 1987) by putting her hands together by her right cheek as she closes her eyes and faces slightly left and asks hoka ni nani? ‘what else is there?’, which given the lack of eye contact seems to be self-directed and employed to display that she is still considering other recommendations in Tokyo and thus maintaining the trajectory of the talk up to this point. Yui then offers up Kamakura17 as another place worth visiting, though she explicitly orients to it being outside of the geographical limits within which they had been choosing places to list (lines 03 and 04). Peony nods and says how much she likes Kamakura, and Yui responds with ii yo ne ‘it’s great, isn’t it.’,

In line 07, Peony expands her answer by seemingly going well beyond the newly widened parameters by mentioning Izu (an area much further away from Tokyo than Kamakura, to the southwest), assessing it as a good place, and saying that she wants to go. Yui responds with izu

17 Kamakura is a city in Kanagawa Prefecture, south of Tokyo and Yokohama. It was the seat of government for the first Shogunate (1192 – 1333 C.E.), and is currently a popular area for tourism. It is reasonably close to Tokyo, which may account for its mentionability, as a slight relaxation of the previous geographical constraints.
ga ii n da ‘You like Izu’, which simply treats Peony’s addition as another recommendation and does not orient to it as inappropriate, as she herself had already expanded the geographical limits. However, in line 12, Peony displays that there is a problem, as she holds her hands palms down in the air, essentially putting the talk on hold as she initiates a side sequence with a self-repair of not izu. Yui responds with a quiet repetition of izu? as she turns her gaze to her phone. In overlap (line 14), Peony says sushi. While the relevance of this candidate is not readily apparent at this point, and the sudden apparent topic shift from geography to food could cause confusion, Yui does not orient to it as problematic – her attention is still on her phone as she nods and produces what sounds like an attempt at repetition (line 16).

After the previous attempts, Peony is able to produce the name of the place, zushi, which she says with try marked intonation, both displaying lack of certainty and inviting Yui to display recognition (Koshik & Seo, 2012; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). However, a display of recognition is not forthcoming – Yui repeats zushi quietly but her attention is still on her smart phone (line 19). After a 1.2 second pause, during which Yui is still attending to her phone, Peony says that she wants to go to Zushi. With no recognition forthcoming, she elaborates by saying kamakura no chikai ‘it’s near Kamakura’, a strategy reminiscent of Sacks and Schegloff’s (1979) work in which speakers start with the most minimal form when seeking recognition and gradually elaborate with greater detail (relaxing the preference for minimization). This place formulation also ties the reference to Yui’s previous reference to Kamakura, building upon information that has already been established to be within Yui’s epistemic territory. However, Yui still provides minimal response, by quietly repeating zushi and continuing to attend to her phone, suggesting that she may be searching for information.
At line 26, during a 1.4 second pause, Peony looks to the left, then looks up as she again repeats *zushi* quietly, in a move that may be checking or confirming the name of the place. She then silently gazes at Yui for 3.4 seconds while Yui continues to look at her phone. At line 29, Peony switches tack – she repeats quietly *zushi* again as she grabs the pen and paper, and produces *areː* ‘huh’ under her breath, again displaying concern with whether the name she said was correct. She then writes the kanji for Zushi (逗子), then pushes the paper toward Yui while saying *zushi* again in a bid for Yui’s attention and to attain recognition. Yui, in overlap, provides affirmative tokens, though she is still attending to her phone (line 32).

During a 1.5 second pause (line 33), Yui shifts her gaze to the paper and holds out her phone for Peony to see, apparently showing Peony the results of an internet search she has conducted. Yui then repeats *zushi* as she looks at the paper, and as they look at the media each has shown the other, they both produce affirmative tokens (lines 35 and 37), suggesting they have arrived at mutual understanding. Peony then repeats that she wants to go to Zushi as she underlines the kanji two times, treating the reference problem as resolved and making a move toward closing the expansion sequence. Yui then repeats *ikitai* as she turns her attention back to her phone and provides an assessment of the place as *kiree* ‘pretty’ while Peony closes the sequence with an affirmative token and a repetition of the place name again.

Peony faces two problems in this extract. The first is that she notices that her first attempt at naming the place, by calling it *Izu*, was in need of self-repair, and she uses resources available to her (including try-marking and writing) to conduct the self-repair and further it until she and Yui had achieved mutual understanding. The other problem that she faces is Yui’s *seeming* lack of attention – evidenced by Yui’s display of information on her phone (line 33), it is clear to the analyst that she was indeed involved in a cooperative activity, but this was not made explicit to
Peony at the time, and it is only after the sharing of visual resources that it becomes clear that both Yui and Peony were working toward the same referential goal.

This extract provides a further illustration of how persistence is a co-constructed achievement. Furthermore, this cooperatively sustained orientation necessarily entails membership knowledge and epistemic asymmetries (Heritage, 2012). While in Extract 4.1 this asymmetry related to 1) knowledge of Japanese as regarding the word *igen*, and 2) Peony’s experience as a teacher, in Extract 4.2 it relates to geographical knowledge and place reference. This geographical knowledge could potentially implicate native and non-native membership (Nishizaka, 1999), or local and non-local membership (Schegloff, 1972), especially considering it is Peony who is more knowledgeable about the place she is referring to, but in this extract such issues do not arise. Instead, the sustained orientation toward achieving a mutually understood reference is based upon co-membership in a category that could be (in an admittedly clumsy fashion) glossed as ‘people who are knowledgeable about interesting places to visit in or near Tokyo’. At the same time, in order to do so, Peony demonstrates that she has local knowledge, and thus constructs herself as “local” and as someone who can provide recommendations for places to visit.

**AKEMASHITE OMEDETOO**

In the following extract, which comes from data collected just before New Year’s Day of 2014, Peony asks Asako about how to say “Happy New Years.” The whole phrase, *Akemashite omedetoo gozaimasu. Kotoshi mo yoroshiku onegai shimas*, is roughly translatable as “Congratulations on the New Year. Please continue to be kind this year as well.” As the reader...
will be able to tell (and perhaps sympathize with if they were to practice the phrase), this presents Peony with a challenge.

Through their sustained orientation to this phrase as a learning object that is worthy of extensive practice, Peony and Asako instantiate the situated identities of novice and expert (or student and teacher). At the same time, Peony also orients to her standardized relational pair relationship (Hester & Eglin, 1997; Sacks, 1972b; Stokoe, 2012) as a daughter-in-law to her in-laws, and a normative expectation and obligation to be able to say this phrase to them, as an account for why she needs to learn and practice the phrase, which in turn provides a reason to practice.

Ex. 4.3a 20131228PA Happy New Year

001 P e-happy new year tte QT
   “Happy New Year”

002 A [yokatta. good-PST
   “Good.”

003 P [nihongo wa doo. Japanese TOP how
   “How is Japanese?”

004 A [nn:::

005 (0.3)

006 A uh- >happy [new yea-<

007 P [><happy new [year.<

008 A [+akemashite opening

009 omedetoo::? congratulations
   “AKEMASHITE OMEDETOO”
“AKEMASHITA?”

“AKEMASHITE”

“GOZAIMAS”

“OMEDETO GOZAIMAS”

“AKEMASHITE”

“OMEDETO GOZAIMAS, Asako”

“OMEDETO GOZAIMAS, no no, not yet, not yet.”

“Not yet.”
This extract starts off with Peony initiating a question about how to say “Happy New Year” in Japanese (lines 001 and 003; line 002 is an assessment of a turn belonging to the prior sequence), which begins the instantiation of the novice-expert pair. In line 006, Asako begins to repeat the English phrase, which Peony treats as a repair initiator (Schegloff, 1997), and thus repeats the phrase again. Asako provides the first part of the phrase akemashite omedetoo, with a try-marked intonation (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), seemingly to ascertain whether Peony recognizes the phrase. Peony then leans in closer to Asako and attempts to repeat the beginning of the phrase (line 010). However, instead of the continuative form te, she uses the past tense form ta (hearable as “opened”). Peony also try-marks her attempt to check its appropriateness. Asako repairs this by first saying te with extra stress, and then by repeating the opening of the phrase and raising the pitch on te while elongating the vowel, functioning as a rather marked exposed correction (Jefferson, 1987) of Peony’s morphological error, a practice that is often avoided by native speakers speaking with learners (Kurhila, 2004; 2006), but here further reinforces that she is doing being a teacher. After a micropause, she continues on to provide more of the phrase. In overlap, Peony displays uptake of the correction by repeating the correct form akemashite (line 012). Asako then finishes the phrase in line 013, bowing as she says it, demonstrating a pragmatically collocated action. She also embodies the completion of the phrase by sitting back as she finishes, which along with the grammatical and intonational completion gives the sense of the phrase as a single packaged unit. In overlap, Peony repeats the last two words, which Asako receipts this with nods and affirmative tokens in line 015.

Peony then re-initiates a repetition (line 016), with special intonational stress on te, which Asako overlaps with in kind, both of them orienting to and reinforcing the prior correction. Peony then continues on to complete the phrase, bowing as she completes gozaimas, imitating
Asako’s prior behavior, and ends the phrase by looking at Asako as she explicitly says her name. In overlap, Asako also completes the phrase and bows simultaneously, then sits up and assesses it as too early, which Peony repeats in line 021. This, along with Peony’s laughter, suggests an orientation by both participants to this activity being just practice rather than a real scenario, which further reinforces the novice-expert pair activity.

As the interaction continues, Asako moves on the presenting the next part of the phrase in chunks.

Ex. 4.3b 20131228PA Happy New Year

021  P  [ ((laugh))-----------------]  .hhh  [mada
       "Not yet."
       yet
       a
       +lean in

022  A  [+kotoshi ;mo
       "KOTOSHI MO"
       this year also

023  P  o  +koto[shi ;mo?
       "Oh, KOTOSHI MO?"
       oh this year also
       a
       +lean in further

024  A  [+yoroshiku:::
       "YOROSHIKU"
       nice

025  P  [ee?
       "Huh?"
       a
       +nod

026  A  [yoroshi+ku?
       "YOROSHIKU?"
       nice
       a
       +nod

027  P  [+yoroshiku:
       "YOROSHIKU?"
       nice
a +bow +sits up

028 A +<onega[i shimas]+ favor do-POL

“ONEGAI SHIMAS”

029 P [onegai shi→ kotoshi mo, favor do→ this year also

“ONEGAI SHI- KOTOSHI MO”

030 (0.3)

031 A yoro[shiku
nice

“YOROSHIKU”

p +nod

032 P [yoroshiku onegai shi[+mas.
ice favor do-POL

“YOROSHIKU ONEGAI SHIMAS.”

a +nod

033 A [+soo.
so

“That’s it.”

a +GZ>RH

a +RH up, move up>down multiple times

034 A +>akemashite omedetoo gozai↑mas=kotoshi mo
opening congratulations COP-HON-POL this year also

a +GZ>P +GZ up right

p +shakes head

035 A yoroshiku onegai shimas +{swoo.}< +{.}
ice favor do-POL

“AKEMASHITE OMEDETOO GOZAIMAS-KOTOSHI MO YOROSHIKU ONEGAI SHIMAS”

p +GZ>A

a +RH circle forward

036 A +kurikaeshite.
repeat

“Repeat.”

p +shakes head

037 P aa aa aa +aa [hhh .hh

a +RH circle forward quickly

a +RH drop

038 A [+{laugh}] repeat repeat

“Repeat, repeat.”
This segment begins with Asako initiating the next part of the set phrase with *kotoshi mo*. Peony displays recognition that the activity is continuing with a quick *oh*, then again leans in as she repeats the phrase with try-marked intonation (line 023), similar to how she attempted *akemashite* in the previous segment. In overlap, Asako provides the next word and Peony initiates repair with an open class initiator (Drew, 1997). However, both participants repeat the word *yoroshiku* in overlap (lines 026 and 027), with Peony nodding as she begins saying the word, displaying her own understanding, and Asako nodding after in affirmation.

Asako then provides the final unit of the phrase with *onegai shimas* as she bows then sits up to show completion, packaging the unit in a similar fashion as before. In overlap, Peony begins to repeat, but then cuts off at *onegai sh-* and restarts the phrase from *kotoshi mo* (line 029). However, she stops, seemingly unsure of how to continue. Asako begins to co-complete the phrase with *yoroshiku*, and Peony jumps in to finish the phrase, which Asako assesses with a *soo* ‘that’s it’ (lines 032 and 033). Then, in lines 034 - 035, Asako recites the whole set phrase,
and as she nears completion, Peony shakes her head, displaying a negative affective response. Asako then reinforces her teacherly stance by telling Peony to repeat the phrase with **kurikaeshite** (line 036). Peony upgrades her affective response with repeated **aa** tokens while shaking her head. Asako re-formulates her previous utterance by saying **repeato repeato**, ‘repeat’ pronounced in English, but with the epenthetic **o** added. This epenthesis is well attested in Japanese use of English (cf. Carroll, 2005), but is not a regular feature of Asako’s English use – here it seems to function to ‘Japanify’ the words, keeping them at least phonotactically in the language that is appropriate for the situation (Greer, 2010) while also providing Peony with an easier-to-understand phrase than **kurikaeshite**. Peony repeats this as **repeato repeat**, but does not go on to repeat the whole phrase, instead displaying that there is some sort of trouble (line 041) with an elongated **aa::h**. Asako explains that it is a ‘set phrase’ (042), orienting to it as a common cultural practice and thus important to rehearse. In response, Peony upgrades her affective display even further by codeswitching into English with **oh my god**. Asako then nods and says **uhn**, further emphasizing the epistemic stance of her previous utterance, and reinforcing the teacherly expectation that her learner properly practices. Peony yet again displays her affect toward the phrase with **ooh**, which Asako responds to empathetically by noting how long the phrase is (line 046).

This segment shows Peony displaying some hesitancy regarding the phrase, as she does not yet repeat it, but instead displays a negative affective stance at multiple points and using multiple verbal and embodied resources. Despite this hesitancy, however, Peony does attempt the phrase in the next segment.
Ex. 4.3c 20131228PA Happy New Year

047 P =kotoshite[: yoroshiku
*this year nice
“KOTOSHITE YOROSHIKU”

a +nod

048 A [kotoshi +mo?
this year also
“KOTOSHI MO?”

049 (0.2)

p +head forward

050 P [kotoshi +mo
this year also
“KOTOSHI MO”

a +nod +BH blades>table left

051 A [kotoshi +mo .hh >like< +<kyoo[nen ↑mo>
this year also last year also
“KOTOSHI MO, like…”

052 P [yoroshiku
nice

“YOROSHIKU”

a +BH blade beat down

053 A .hh [+ariga↑too=
thanks
“… thanks for last year.”

054 P [uh.

a +BH center

055 A +=kotoshi ↑mo:: .hh= this year also
“KOTOSHI MO”

a +sit up

056 P +=kotoshi mo= this year also
“KOTOSHI MO”

a +BH drop

057 A =+<yoroshi[kiku>
nice
“YOROSHIKU”

p +slow nod/bow

058 P [↑yoroshiku< one[gai shimas.
nice favor do-POL
“YOROSHIKU ONEGAI SHIMAS.”
Peony begins to repeat the phrase, but mis-repeats *kotoshi mo* as *kotoshite*, which Asako repairs with extra stress, rising intonation, and a nod in line 048. As Peony restarts (050), Asako overlaps and begins to provide some semantic elaboration (‘thank you for last year’), suggesting that she viewed *kotoshite* as a parsing problem, and thus displaying an attentiveness towards the difficulty Peony is facing. However, Peony does not attend to this extra information, and instead continues with her repetition of the phrase, though she then stops short of completing the whole phrase as Asako completes her elaboration. The competing activities (Peony’s repetition and Asako’s elaboration) here seem to throw the sequence into some confusion, making it unclear what the next course of action should be. Asako picks it up from here and takes another approach, changing from a focus on the meaning to a focus on the grammatical form, by restarting the phrase with marked intonation, volume and vowel elongation on *mo* (line 055), re-locating the trouble source in Peony’s previous mis-repeat. Peony repeats with similar stress on *mo*, displaying uptake of the correction. As Asako continues, seemingly in a clause by clause fashion, Peony goes ahead and finishes the phrase with a head movement that is ambiguous between a slow nod and a bow. Asako completes the phrase with similar embodiment, then provides an affirmative token with a nod, noting Peony’s completion. Peony closes the sequence with another affirmative token and a nod.

We see in this segment that Peony has successfully repeated the full phrase despite her previous negative affective response to it. Treating the linguistic form concerns as successfully
dealt with, she then continues on to ask about greater detail regarding the use of the expression in the next segment.

Ex. 4.3d 20131228PA Happy New Year

062  P  [kotoshi mo: (. )] > yoroshiku onegai [sh-=
this year also nice favor do-
“KOTOSHI MO YOROSHIKU ONEGAI SH-”

063  A  [°( )°] [+nn  [°( )°]

064  P  =+dake? (0.3) da- + da[me?
only wr- wrong
“Only? Is wrong?”

065  A  [nn?  “Hn?”

066  (0.7)

067  A  AA+aa\:::  + (0.9) <ii yo::¿>
good IP
“Ah. It’s okay.”

068  P  ii yo(h)o [hh ha hah
good IP
“It’s okay.”

069  A  [a ja- .hh
wel-

070  P  [+ .hh .hh

100
a  +RH up  +RA extend out
a  +RH wave in 3x----------------
071 A  [+sus- +dareka +yuu- t-@akemashite omedetoo gozaisute
*  someone say opening congratulation COP-HON-QT

a  +BH>chest  +leans in over table
a  +sits up
072  +itta↑ ra↑, @  +$kotoshi mo [+yoroshiku onegai shimas.$
say-IF this year also nice favor do-POL

p  +nod
073 P  [+aa::::::.

a  +nod
074 A  [°tte +kaeseba ok[ee.°
QT return-if okay
“If someone says AKEMASHITE OMEDETOO GOZAIS-, it’s okay to respond with KOTOSHI MO YOROSHIKU ONEGAI SHIMAS.”

p  +nod  +nod
075 P  [+>hai hai hai.< [+o- (. ) kee des.
yes yes yes o- kay COP
“Yes yes yes. It’s okay.”

Starting in line 062, what begins by seeming like Peony is rehearsing the latter half of the phrase again turns out to be a question about whether one can use only **kotoshi mo yoroshiku onegai shimas** (dropping **akemashite omedetoo gozaimas**) on its own, orienting towards details of the phrase as a cultural practice. Asako’s comments in overlap are spoken too quietly to hear, but they seem to not be oriented to the ongoing question as a question. When she does respond (line 065), Asako first produces the open class repair initiator **nn?**, but after a 0.7 second pause,
she displays recognition with an elongated **AAaa\::;** and answers the question with **ii yo** ‘it’s okay.’ Peony repeats this and laughs.

Asako then elaborates upon her answer by explaining that if someone starts with the first part of the phrase, it is okay to respond with only the latter half of the phrase (lines 071 - 074). Peony nods and responds with repeated sayings of **hai**, which display not only recognition but also move to end the action (Stivers, 2004). She then repeats **okee des**, providing closure for the sequence. Peony has now practiced the linguistic form of the phrase and ascertained further information about its use. Next, Peony accounts for why she asked for the phrase, instantiating her obligations as a family member to be able to say this phrase.

Ex. 4.3e 20131228PA Happy New Year

```
p +LH SPU up
p +RH up +BA>table
082 P jirochan +no °otoosan +okaa[san.°
Jiro-DIM LK father mother
“Jiro’s father and mother.”

083 A [a soo
[oh so

“Oh right.”

a +nod
a +RH out +RH>throat +nod
084 A [+iwanakya +iwanakya. [+nn::=
say-must say-must yeah
“You’ve gotta say it to them. Gotta say it. Yeah.”

p +nod +nod
085 P [+iwanakereba [+nn.
say-must yeah
“(I have to say it to them.) Yeah.”

a +head down
a +BH flat on table
086 A +=#koo yatte °koo [ya-°#
this do this do
“Like this, like th-”
```
103

“Like this.”

Like this.

“Like this?”

Like this, like this.

“Huh, really?”

If you can.

“If I can.”

Yeah. Bowin-”
“Japanese, yeah. Very.”

“Very Japanese language.”

“Like this. This.”

“YOROSHIKU.”

“ONEGAI SHIMAS.”

“Right?”
Here, Peony begins to explain that she needs to say ‘happy new year’ to her parents-in-law, which Asako affirms in line 083. They then co-complete the utterance, Asako with a shortened version of the phrase (iwanakya), and Peony with the longer form (iwanakereba), both orienting to the expectation that Peony as a family member ought to participate in the cultural practice. They end the co-completion by both nodding and providing the affirmative token nn.

Asako then demonstrates how Peony encounters some difficulty with the verb to bow (with her head down and palms flat on the table) as she says koo yatte ‘like this’ (line 086), reinstating her position as a cultural expert and instructor. Peony begins to imitate Asako’s bow while repeating koo yatte, looking at Asako after she finishes, and Asako then repeats the whole maneuver while saying koo yatte two more times, initiating further practice. However, instead of imitating Asako again, Peony asks hontoo? ‘really?’, displaying a somewhat ambivalent stance towards the move (line 091). Asako responds by saying dekitara ‘if you can’, which Peony receipts with repetition and laughter.

Asako begins to say something about bowing in line 096 but cuts off as Peony makes an assessment in English about the practice being very Japanese, which reinforces her position as non-member and learner. Asako agrees in both English and Japanese, and in overlap, Peony attempts to reformulate the assessment in Japanese (using a somewhat non-target like nihongo ‘Japanese language’ and not one of the various evidentials such as rashii or ppoi that could be
used). At the same time, she rehearses the bow again (line 099), displaying further effort toward being able to pull off the practice correctly. Asako restarts with *yoroshiku* while bowing (line 104), which Peony repeats, and then finishes the phrase with *onegai shimas*. Asako receipts this with an affirmative token, which Peony also repeats. Then Asako moves to close the sequence and activity with *soo da yo ne*. Peony assesses the whole thing by saying that she is looking forward to it, which Asako agrees with through repetition, thus closing the sequence and moving on toward closing the conversation.

On one level, the sustained effort evidenced throughout this extract is aimed at a focus-on-form pedagogical activity (Brouwer, 2003; Fasel Lauzon & Pekarek Doehler, 2013; Kasper & Burch, 2016), with Peony pushing through to successful repetition despite displaying a negative affective stance toward the length of the phrase. Indeed, compared to Extracts 4.1 and 4.2, this is the most pedagogical oriented example of persistence, with Peony and Asako doing being a *student* and *teacher/novice* and *expert* in regards to the set phrase and the cultural practice it is part of throughout the excerpt. However, Peony’s instantiation of the familial relationships and categorically related obligation to be a good daughter-in-law provides another level to understanding her persistence as she explicitly orients to a goal and course of action beyond the immediate interactional context (as compared to the work done in 4.1 and 4.2), which Asako, as friend and instructor-at-the-moment supports and co-constructs.

*TENSHOKU*

This final extract draws together a number of similarities and contrasts with the previous examples. The most obvious difference is the participation framework (Goffman, 1981; Goodwin, 2007a; 2007b); while the three previous examples were dyadic, the example under
investigation here involves Peony, Jiro and Asako, a state of affairs that can potentially influence the trajectory of the interaction (Egbert, 2012; see Chapter 5 for further examples of multi-party talk). Other aspects are more subtle. First, while this excerpt illustrates a focus on an object of learning (similar to Extract 4.3), this focus on the word *tenshoku* ‘calling, vocation’ is first instigated by Asako, and the sustained orientation to the object is continued by Peony beyond the point where the talk could return to the main course of action. Also, similarly to Extract 4.1, the topic of teaching arises. However, unlike 4.1, where Peony was the only teacher and therefore had epistemic access and authority to express stances about the profession, this current example occurs between three participants who are all experienced teachers, and arises because they are talking about Asako’s mother, who is also a teacher. The participants’ shared co-membership provides resources for all of the participants to negotiate possible definitions and understandings of the term. Finally, as was also the case in Extracts 4.1 and 4.2, knowledge of kanji/hánzi provide a shared resource between the participants, but this resource is oriented to in a much less concrete fashion than in the other extracts.

Prior to this extract, recorded at Asako’s home when Peony and Jiro were visiting, the participants had been speaking about calling Asako’s mother in order to arrange their plans for the following day. Asako’s mother is working late, which first leads to a negotiation of when it would be reasonable to call her, and then to the topic of how much she likes teaching. In this case, Asako uses the word *tenshoku*, which Peony pursues.

Ex. 4.4 20130809PJA Tenshoku

```
  01 A  +suki da shi ne-=
     like COP and IP
```
“She likes the job, and wants to do it and”

“Yeah.”

“My mom.”

“Yeah yeah.”

“It’s a job she likes.”

“(So-), it’s her callin- We call that TENSHOKU.”

“TENSHOKU. I don’t understand.”
+RHIF traces 天 ((heaven)) on table

+GZ>P

14 A +heaven (.) jobbu. +hh hh [heh heh
heaven job

“What do you call it- Heaven job.”

p +head slightly back

15 P [+aaaaa::[::: ah

“Ah.”

16 J [$heaven

17 J +job$ [.hhhhhhhhhhhh

18 A [.kh +.kha .kha

19 P +sits back

+$tenshoku.$
calling

“TENSHOKU.”

20 A [$literally.$

21 J [+tenshoku.$
calling

“TENSHOKU.”

22 A +hen- [heaven job

“Heaven job.”

p +GZ>down

23 P [nn:::+
hnn

“Hnn?”

24 A +GZ forward

25 J [hn hn

(0.3)
kara +sazukatta [jobbu.
from endow-PST job
“A job endowed by heaven.”

[j°°(soo °°)

+tenshoku. [+:nn::
calling hmm
“TENSHOKU. Hmmm”

+[tenshoku.=
calling
“TENSHOKU.”

[+nn:. =uhn.
yeah yeah
“Yeah. Yeah.”

(0.8)

[+nn::.
yeah
“Yeah.”

[nn::.
yeah
“Yeah.”

(0.3)

meant to be¿

+meant to be::: ya shi,-=
COP and
“Meant to be, and…”

+GZ>J

=[+]nantteyuu sore< eego de=
what-QT-say that English in
“Waddayacall it. In English.”

[uh::n.
“Uhn.”
“What there has to be (nasarī).”

“TENSHOKU.”

“TENSHOKU.”

“Yeah, that’s right.”

“Yeah.”
The extract begins as Asako explains that her mother enjoys her job, which Jiro assesses as "sugoi" ‘great’, and Peony reformulates as "suki na shigoto" ‘a job she likes’ (line 09), displaying her understanding. Asako then expands upon her description, introducing the word "tenshoku" (line 10). The way she produces this turn displays a shift in orientation towards the word; Asako cuts off her first attempt but then quickly conducts a repair and adds "tte yuu no" (translated roughly here as ‘we call that’), signaling that this is designed as an explanation for Peony, further
supported by her embodied ‘writing’ on the table with her index finger and gaze shift to Peony as she completes the turn\(^\text{18}\). Peony, however, shakes her head as she repeats tenshoku and explicitly states that she does not understand the word (line 12). Thus, Peony and Asako instantiate a novice and expert pair, similar to Extract 4.3. However, where in the previous abstract Asako was able to authoritatively demonstrate the learning object, here we find that she faces difficulty in formulating a response.

Asako begins to respond with classic word search behavior, with her gaze down as she says nan tte ‘what do you say’ (line 13). As she begins tracing\(^\text{19}\) the character for ten (‘heaven’, 天) on the table, she gives a literal translation of the morphemes – ‘heaven job’ (in this case with ‘job’ pronounced within Japanese phonotactic constraints), but then laughs, treating the translation as non-serious. Peony tilts her had slightly back as she says aa, suggesting that she recognizes the meaning through the morpheme-by-morpheme translation.\(^\text{20}\) Jiro then repeats Asako’s translation and they join together laughing (lines 17 and 18), still treating the translation as non-serious. Peony then repeats tenshoku as she sits back, still attending to the word as Asako says literally with a smily voice, which further displays a non-serious stance toward the morpheme-by-morpheme version.

In line 22, Asako mis-starts with hen- which could be heard as ‘strange’, and therefore as a further assessment of the literal translation. Peony’s open class initiator nn::? seems to be

\(^\text{18}\) Hauser (2015, personal communication) also points out that the writing may help to differentiate the word from the homonym tenshoku 転職 ‘changing jobs’.

\(^\text{19}\) This practice, called “brush talk”, was explored by Hwang (2009) who found it to be commonly employed in repair sequences by speakers of Chinese and Japanese.

\(^\text{20}\) In personal communications with three Taiwanese colleagues, where I showed them the characters 天職, all three translated the word as “calling” or “vocation” and mentioned a sense of destiny or fate, suggesting that Japanese and Taiwanese Mandarin share very similar if not identical meanings for this word. In both languages, the word seems to primarily apply to certain types of jobs, such as teaching, which entail long hours or unfavorable conditions but that lead to job satisfaction for other reasons.
oriented to this (although it is possibly oriented to the literally in line 20), but overlaps with the repeated morphemic translation and does not seem to get addressed. Instead, Asako provides a reformulated definition (lines 24 and 27) as *heaven kara sazukatta jobbu* ‘a job endowed (or given) by heaven’, while Peony traces the characters for *tenshoku* (天職) on the table. Jiro quietly seems to agree with Asako’s definition in line 28, and Peony, still tracing the kanji, repeats *tenshoku* and follows it with a nod and an affirmative token, all working to display that she now understands the word. Asako again repeats *tenshoku* with a nod as Jiro provides a couple of affirmative tokens (lines 30 and 31), and after a short pause, Asako and Peony simultaneously say *nn::.*

With the participants having displayed that they had achieved mutual understanding, this could be the end of the sequence. However, Peony initiates a new sequence related to the word, giving a candidate translation of *tenshoku* as *meant to be* (line 36) with a slightly rising intonation, suggesting that she is confirming her understanding. Asako accepts but then projects that there is more to it (*ya shi* ‘is and’, line 37) and then launches into a word search (line 38) for an English equivalent. In line 45, Jiro quietly provides a candidate translation, *gifted*, which Peony acknowledges with an *uhn*, but which Asako seems to not align with as she produces an elongated nasal sound with gradually falling intonation (line 47). Peony then, again in English, provides an elaborated candidate translation as *maybe °she° (0.4) she’s meant to do this?* (line 52), which Asako accepts with nodding and *nn. so so so so so*. Asako and Peony then enter a loop sequence (Iwasaki, 1997) of affirmative tokens, treating the issue of meaning as resolved. Asako then returns to the topic of calling her mother to arrange plans for the next day (line 61).

As the sequence focusing on the learning object arises as a side sequence, there are two activities and interactional goals that relate to the participants’ sustained orientation. The first,
overarching activity involves the decision of when to call Asako’s mother, which develops into
talk about how she enjoys teaching, and is met with little difficulty early on. However, as the
sequence develops and Asako treats the word tenshoku as an object that Peony may not know
and perhaps should learn, the focus switches to a somewhat more pedagogical activity which
places the progressivity of the main action on hold. The morphemic translation provided by
Asako early on seemed to be sufficient for Peony’s recognition, which seems reasonable
considering the shared ideographic resources between Japanese and Mandarin which both Asako
and Peony orient to through tracing the kanji on the table. However, even though the participants
have achieved mutual understanding, Peony extended the side sequence by giving candidate
translations in English, presumably to cement her own understanding of the word. This displays
a sustained orientation toward the learning object beyond what was necessary for the immediate
intersubjective concerns, and extends the instantiation of the novice and expert roles further.
Once they agree on the translation that Peony provides, however, they return to the main activity
of talking about Asako’s mother.

Discussion

Each of the extracts presented in this chapter demonstrated some sustained orientation and
effort, as well as the employment of a variety of resources, although there is some variability in
interactional focus. Here, let’s return to the questions presented at the beginning of the chapter,
to discuss some similarities and differences across the examples.

What interactional goals do Peony and her interlocutors orient to as they work through
difficulties?
Broadly speaking (and in no way claiming the findings to be exclusive or exhaustive), there were two major orientations: 1) an orientation towards achieving intersubjectivity, especially in regards to expressing stance and doing identity work (IGEN, Ex. 4.1, and ZUSHI, Ex. 4.2), and 2) an orientation towards words, set phrases or other cultural practices as learning objects (HAPPY NEW YEAR, Ex. 4.3, and TENSHOKU, Ex. 4.4). However, these are not mutually exclusive, and indeed occur together as we see in the IGEN and TENSHOKU extracts. A brief recap can help to illustrate these orientations and how they came about.

In Ex. 4.1, Yui and Peony begin with a mutual orientation toward the word *igen* as a source of trouble and a learnable, although this was touched off by Yui’s question about being authoritative in the classroom as a teacher. However, while Yui maintains a focus on writing the kanji, Peony has displayed her understanding and shifted her focus to responding to Yui’s question (contrasting how she used to be ‘a little strict’, and how she has empathy for the students). This is where Peony encounters difficulty and uses multiple resources to formulate her response and to work towards portraying herself as an empathetic teacher and person, which judging by Yui’s uptake is ultimately successful.

Ex. 4.2 finds Peony having difficulty with a geographical reference (*Zushi*). Of most importance here is that Yui does not explicitly orient to Peony’s references as problematic in her verbal responses, especially as she herself had already expanded the geographical limits beyond recommendations of places to visit in Tokyo. The responsibility to achieve the “correct” reference (scare quotes because what could be judged as correct lay entirely within her epistemic authority) was Peony’s, as Yui’s attention was elsewhere – it only becomes known later that Yui had been searching for the name of the place on her smart phone. Peony’s persistence here helps to maintain the trajectory of the current talk, particularly in terms of acting within the
geographical bounds set in the previous talk, and thus displays her as knowledgeable about local geography and capable of providing recommendations.

Unlike the previous examples, Ex. 4.3 primarily involves an orientation toward a learning object, that is, how to say “happy new year” in Japanese. As in the Zushi extract, correctness is a concern. However, the goal of being correct is not for immediate intersubjectivity concerns, but for a social and cultural obligation that Peony explicitly mentions. It is also important to note that the focus-on-form (Brouwer, 2003; Fasel Lauzon & Pekarek Doehler, 2013; Kasper & Burch, 2016) is not only on linguistic or verbal production, but also upon the pragmatics of the accompanying embodied action of bowing as one says the whole phrase, all of which instantiate Peony’s and Asako’s situated identities as novice and expert regarding language and cultural practices. This example also illustrates Peony’s most explicit affective response to the difficulty of producing the whole phrase, as she shakes her head and even responds with oh my god as she displays reticence towards repeating the cumbersome expression. Furthermore, Peony also displays an orientation toward learning more about the pragmatics of saying “happy new year” when she asks if it is allowable to only say the latter half of the expression. All of this effort, as Peony makes clear toward the end of the extract, is expended toward the explicit goal of being able to say this phrase to her parents-in-law, and fulfilling her category-bound obligations as a member of the family.

The final extract also provides an example of an orientation toward a learning object, albeit one that arises in the course of the interaction (much as igen did in 4.1). Similarly to Ex. 4.1, the focus on tenshoku here is touched off and treated as a potentially problematic form by another speaker (Asako), and also similarly, Peony displays understanding relatively early in the sequence. What is different here is that 1) the participation structure was triadic rather than
dyadic (Egbert, 2012), 2) Peony sustains an orientation toward the word beyond the point where
intersubjectivity was achieved by providing candidate translations in English, and 3) the
extended focus on the learning object, unlike Extracts 4.1 and 4.3, does not seem fitted to another
activity (stance taking, rehearsal for later use) and seems more for learning for learning’s sake.

**What resources do Peony and her interlocutors utilize in order to get beyond the difficulty?**

Interactions do not occur in physical or contextual vacuums. There are objects in the
environment that the participants orient to and utilize, and the participants have individual and
shared histories and knowledge that can be drawn upon at any moment. These can become
particularly important when the participants face interactional challenges that they must work
through. Here are some of the recurring resources utilized throughout.

*English as a lingua franca*

All of the participants involved in these examples have some degree of proficiency in
English. Furthermore, there is evidence throughout the corpus that English is the unmarked
language choice between Peony and Jiro, and between Peony and Asako.21 In the extracts
discussed in this chapter, we see English used as a resource in a few ways. First, in 4.1, Peony
uses English to formulate her turns after orienting to the up-coming turns as too difficult to say in
Japanese. Recall, however, that Yui does not understand, which prompts Peony to attempt the
formulation in Japanese. In 4.3, Peony only uses English to provide the foundation of the
question she asks, and to display her affective stance towards the expression. However, Asako

---

21 See chapter 6 for a discussion of English being the language at home between Peony and Jiro. For further
evidence, at approximately 5 minutes into the 20131228 PA conversation with Asako, the camera beeped and turned
off, and while Peony brought it back online, they spoke in English (essentially showing the activity of recording as a
framing device for practice which had temporarily been put on hold by technological issues).
uses English, often in a *katakana* pronunciation (i.e., with epenthesis) as she pursues her pedagogical goals with Peony. In 4.4, English is used in a more metalinguistic fashion, first by Asako when providing the morpheme-by-morpheme translation of *tenshoku*, and then by all three participants when discussing the meaning of the word.22

It is also perhaps worth noting, given the availability of the English to the participants, that so little of it is actually used throughout the 10 conversation corpus. Although it remains speculation, this seems likely to be due to an orientation on Peony’s part toward the act of recording for my dissertation studies and as a site for her Japanese practice. English remains a tool that is reached for only occasionally and only temporarily, but when it is utilized, it serves a variety of functions.

*Shared knowledge of kanji*

Kanji/Hànzi provide another linguistic resource shared by all of the participants. Although there are variations in written form and meaning or usage, there are enough similarities to provide for their utility when one participant or another is having difficulty understanding (Hwang, 2009; see also Kasper & Burch, 2016, for an extended example). We see an orientation to kanji as a shared resource in three of the four excerpts presented in this chapter. In 4.1, Yui looks up the kanji for *igen* (威厳) as a method for providing Peony with the meaning, while in 4.2 Peony writes the kanji for *Zushi* (逗子) when previous references had seemed not to work. The employment of kanji in 4.4, however, was somewhat different. As Asako first attempts to define *tenshoku* for Peony, she does not translate the word as a lexical unit, but instead

---

22 This metalinguistic use of English for defining is found in all of the conversations that I transcribed.
translates each character as ‘heaven’ (天) ‘job’ (職), not unlike if an English speaker were to translate “arachnophobia” as “spider-fear.” Both Asako and Peony trace the kanji on the table with their fingers, but the ephemerality of the traces as well as their positioning (i.e. in front of the person tracing and not produced for easy view by a recipient) suggest that they were not produced as other-directed. However, the examples presented here show kanji, whether written or oriented to verbally, to be a valuable shared resource in the pursuit of mutual understanding.

Technology and Materials

For the conversations conducted in cafés or restaurants, Peony often brought along scratch paper that her and her co-participants would write on. We see this here in 4.1 and 4.2 when Yui and Peony use the scratch paper for writing kanji, although there were often other drawings and maps produced as well (see Burch & Kasper (in press) for an example pertaining to Peony’s experience in Manhattan on September 11th, 2001). While decidedly low-tech, the inscriptions produced by the participants have a semi-permanency (Hutchins, 1995; Goodwin, 2000) that affords later reference, as demonstrated in 4.1 when Peony points at the kanji for igen and claims that she is sometimes strict.

A much more high-tech but equally ubiquitous technological resource was illustrated in 4.1 and 4.2, when Yui uses her smart phone to look up the kanji for igen or information about Zushi. It was not rare in the overall corpus for participants to use smart phones or tablet computers as a sort of distributed memory, allowing them easy access to information. The examples with Yui illustrate the complex relationship these technological tools have with progressivity, in how they at the same time allow for solutions to interactional problems and therefore work in progressing the interaction while also putting the interaction on hold while the participants orient to them.
These resources (English, kanji, and technology/materials) are not mentioned here to imply that they act in a compensatory function (Burch, 2014). Instead, their availability to the participants place them firmly within the weave of the interactions, consequential for the trajectory of the talk and any sustained orientation that occurs through them. An understanding of how the participants work through difficulty and sustain effort must take into account the relationship between the talk and the employed resources.

**How is persistence co-constructed or influenced by the interactants?**

It would perhaps be easy to chalk the difficulties Peony encounters up to her proficiency in Japanese, and therefore see her persistence through them as simply reflecting her individual approach to the problems. However, if we take a more situated perspective, seeing Peony and her co-participants as actors within an environment doing the mundane things that people do, a focus on persistence must take the co-participants’ influences upon the talk and each other into account. Here are a number of ways these influences are elucidated.

**Sequentiality**

As discussed in chapter 2, most talk-in-interaction is sequential in nature (Levinson, 2006; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). First pair parts make second pair parts relevant and noticeable if absent, and are potentially expandable, leading on to further developments in the trajectory of the interaction (Schegloff, 2007). Any difficulty that arises in interaction is inescapably subject to and influential upon the sequential, turn taking and repair organizations of the talk. Consider some examples from the extracts presented in this chapter.
• In 4.1, Peony’s attempt to express her stance on being strict as a teacher first comes about as a response to Yui’s question. Furthermore, her choice to reformulate her utterance in Japanese even after claiming it was too difficult to say in the language is in response to Yui’s displayed lack of uptake, showing Peony’s first attempt to have not been effective. This then leads to a situation in which Yui is able to display and confirm her understanding of Peony’s stance.

• In 4.3, Peony initiates the sequence with her question about how to say “happy new year.” This sets the stage for Asako to provide the lengthy answer, which she chopped up into manageable chunks. Asako’s pedagogical approach (including directives to repeat the phrase) sequentially afforded Peony’s further questioning and her explanation of why she wanted to learn the phrase, which in turn led to the embodied practice we find towards the end of the example.

_Epistemic Asymmetry_

Heritage (2012) describes what he calls “the epistemic engine”, the differences in knowledge between participants that “drive” an interaction forward. The sustained orientations towards expressing stances, doing identity work, or learning a word or phrase operate within these epistemic asymmetries, and in some cases could be seen metaphorically as pulling off to the side of the road in order to continue driving. Put in another way, the participants occasionally pause progressivity in order to ensure that progressivity can be maintained. To illustrate with examples:

• In 4.2, Peony has epistemic access to the geographical location she is referencing that Yui does not. Because of this, while she orients to the problematic reference in her talk (calling
Zushi as Izu), Yui does not, and their intersubjectivity is threatened. Peony takes reparative measures (including writing the name in kanji) to get the interaction back on track.

- When Asako introduces the word tenshoku (4.4), she is orienting not only to something that she expects Peony to not know (the word itself), but also to something that Peony could be expected to know (the kanji). Peony’s further work in providing candidate translations, which are framed with interrogative syntax and intonation, also orients to asymmetry, to Asako having the knowledge and rights to confirm or reject her suggestions.

Through the participants sequential actions and orientations to what other participants know or do not know, they create the context within which difficulties arise and are dealt with. Heritage (1984b, p. 242) states that interaction is both context shaping and context renewing. The orientations toward being understood or toward a learning object are sensitive to the sequential and epistemic contexts that are present in the interactions already while shaping, affording and constraining the further trajectory of the talk. Likewise, the resources the participants employ are similarly sensitive to sequential placement and knowledge while further influencing how the interaction plays out.

Summary and Looking Forward

This chapter has argued for and illustrated a perspective that views persistence in interaction as 1) cooperatively working toward an interactional goal, 2) as visible through the use of various resources, and 3) as contextually sensitive to sequential, relational, identity and epistemic concerns, and thus as co-constructed by the participants. This contextual and dynamic characterization shares some perspective with the recent developments in L2 motivation studies that make up the “socio-complexity” perspectives, which we will return to in chapter 7. First,
however, the next chapter explores a related topic: participation, and the notion of willingness to communicate.
Chapter 5: Participation and Engagement

Introduction

As discussed in Chapter 2, *Willingness to Communicate* (WTC) has been treated as one of the many individual difference variables that researchers interested in motivation have explored (Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). At its most foundational, it has been theorized to be the choice to engage in communicative action (MacIntyre & Doucette, 2010), particularly when one has the freedom to initiate or avoid communication (McCroskey, 1992). While early studies of WTC in second language acquisition treated the construct as a personality trait (MacIntyre, 1994), more recent work has taken a more dynamic perspective (MacIntyre, 2012; MacIntyre & Legatto, 2011) that views WTC as changing over time and sensitive to context. At the same time, studies that explore these changes and what may influence them at the micro-analytic level are rare. This chapter aims to address this gap in the research by looking at issues related to Peony’s initiation and engage in talk *in situ*, where the alternatives between engaging and not engaging have real time interactional consequences.

To my knowledge, the only researchers to explicitly approach WTC from an EM/CA perspective have been Preston (2009) and Sert (2015). Both researchers have 1) focused on classroom interaction, and 2) primarily focused on WTC (or as Sert is concerned with, *(un)Willingness to Participate*) in student responses to teacher initiations, which make their work quite different from the concerns dealt with in this chapter in a few ways. First, in this data, any pedagogical focus that arises comes from participants’ orientations unconstrained and undirected by institutional goals. Second, there are multiple mundane activities underway in many of the cases presented here, including eating and watching television, which is generally not the case in
the classroom data presented in Preston’s or Sert’s work (although such things are not unheard of, cf. Talmy, 2009). Third, unlike in a teacher-fronted classroom, the participation framework and turn taking organization (i.e., who is allowed to speak when) are also not institutionally constrained.23

There is, however, a key similarity between Preston’s and Sert’s classroom studies and the current research: a multimodal approach that takes into account the participants’ gaze direction, posture, facial expression, gesture, and orientation to other materials in the environment. Participation occurs within a contextual configuration that not only includes the participants themselves but also includes the features of the physical environment that the participants contingently treat as affordances through their joint actions, as well as their physical positions and orientations vis a vis each other and the environment. These are often as important as interactional orientations (Goodwin, 1994; 2007a; 2007b; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Murphy, 2005), and any initiation of engagement will by default be working within the locally emergent affordances and constraints of the interactional environment (Hutchins, 1995).

This chapter examines four different conversations with a variety of participation frameworks and contextual configurations, in order to explore how initiating engagement can be seen as an interactional achievement that both shapes and is shaped by the trajectory of the talk, and further arguing that examining participation in this way provides an emic, participant-centered approach to exploring WTC. First, however, it is necessary to briefly review three key topics, participation, sequence organization, and initiative.

23 None of this is to claim that classroom interaction, even in a teacher-fronted classroom, is pre-determined. Work on classroom talk (Jacknick, 2009; Markee, 2000; Sert, 2015; Waring, 2011) has shown that classroom talk, like all talk, is situationally contingent. What I want to focus on here, though, is that what makes classroom talk categorically recognizable as classroom talk and not just a multiparty gathering does not occur in my data.
Participation, Sequence and Initiatives

Goffman (1981) states that “when a word is spoken, all those who happen to be in perceptual range of the event will have some sort of participation status relative to it” (p. 3) and that “every utterance and its hearing bear the marks of the framework of participation in which the uttering and hearing occur” (p. 4). This is to say that every move to engage or remain engaged in an interaction is inextricably tied to the participation framework in which it occurred, and, to borrow Heritage’s (1984b) words, is context shaped and context renewing. Co-participants, both in terms of who they are and how many there are, as well as what other ongoing activities are occurring and what materials are in the environment form a contextual configuration (Goodwin, 2000; 2013) that provides affordances for and exerts constraints upon a participant’s involvement yet are also influenced by that same involvement.

As discussed in Chapter 2, Goodwin (2007b) explored embodied participation frameworks, which take into account the utterances, the environment, and participant’s physical actions, bodily comportments and positions in relation to each other and the environment. Furthermore, he illustrated how participation involves the display of stances towards the talk, activity, co-participants and materials. For the purpose of the current chapter, we will focus primarily on two: the instrumental stance, which Goodwin defines as “the placement of entities in the ways that are required for the sign exchange processes necessary for the accomplishment of the activity in progress” (p. 70), and the cooperative stance, which is “the visible display that one is organizing one’s body toward others and a relevant environment in just the ways necessary to sustain and help construct the activities in progress” (p. 70).

In a language classroom, displays of these stances are undoubtedly familiar to teachers, often in the negative, such as when students avert their gaze when addressed by the teacher (Sert,
2015) or openly take a non-cooperative stance towards an ongoing activity (Talmy, 2009). Even in a non-classroom setting, when there is still a pedagogical focus such as the case of the father helping his daughter with her math homework in Goodwin’s (2007b) data, the daughter’s positioning and lack of engagement led to an attribution on the father’s part that she was not willing to do the work (p. 62). But how about cases that are non-pedagogical, such as in the current data? Are these stances viewable when not displayed negatively? This chapter will argue that they are indeed, and that they are an inherent part of the choice to engage in interaction.

At the same time, a factor in any given participation framework that is also influential but was not discussed explicitly in Goodwin’s (2007b) paper is the number of participants involved. In dyadic talk, in the absence of other ongoing activities, lack of engagement by one participant is enough to end the interaction (Egbert, 2012), and therefore there are constraints upon a participants’ opportunities to withdraw from the interaction (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). The flipside of that coin is that there are affordances as well, particularly in regards to gaining the floor and establishing recipiency (Mortensen, 2009), which can prove to be challenging in multiparty talk (Carroll, 2004; Goodwin, 1981). When there are three or four participants involved, these concerns flip – it can be easier for a participant to disengage from the conversation while other parties are talking as long as they are not being addressed, but finding the interactional space to take the floor may be difficult.

The issues of taking the floor and recipiency implicate another concern: sequence. As discussed in Chapter 2, interaction is at its most basic organized around adjacency pairs which can undergo expansion prior to the first base pair (pre-expansion), between the base pair parts (insertion), and after the second base pair (post-expansion) (Schegloff, 2007). What is of specific
interest in this chapter are the normative expectations encountered by speakers at different sequential positions, that is, how “seen but unnoticed” (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 36) or how accountable it is to speak or not at a given time is likely to be.

This is perhaps most easily illustrated in cases where not speaking would be accountable, such as in response positions, particularly after first pair parts. Take for instance an invitation to go have a cup of coffee. Such an invitation, in the first pair part position, makes a response, especially an acceptance or refusal, *conditionally relevant* (Schegloff, 1972). Furthermore, acceptance is, in many cases, the more preferred response (Davidson, 1984; Pomerantz, 1984; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013). Immediate non-answers, such as a repair initiation or other insertion sequence (Schegloff, 1972; 2007), are possible, and it is also possible to not answer on account of an interruption such as a ringing telephone (Egbert, 2012). However, in most cases, a response will come due, and a large gap or no answer at all will be likely be treated as dispreferred, and especially as implicative of a rejection (Stivers & Robinson, 2006). There are alternatives regarding how to formulate a response (Bilmes, 2015), but the choice to speak or not is highly constrained and subject to interpretation by the participant who made the invitation.

What about the initiation of a sequence? There are certainly cases where not initiating a sequence could be accountable, or at the very least noticeable and treated as odd; a teacher standing in front of a classroom will be, in general, expected to start class at some point. Telephone calls are often a case in point as well, in that it is expected that the caller will eventually (Stivers & Robinson, 2006) put the reason for their call on record (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2002), which means they will either have to initiate a sequence or be asked why they called. But barring such institutional or contextual expectations, there is often nothing that
provides for a normative expectation that particular participants initiate a sequence at certain points, and not initiating would not be treated as accountable.

Non-minimal post expansions (Schegloff, 2007) are another case in point. When a sequence is potentially complete, there are cases where expanding talk beyond a simple receipt or assessment is not normatively expected or accountable and can be treated as initiating further action. This is not always the case, of course. After a participant tells a long story or a joke, a minimal post expansion, such as a simple “hmm” may be treated by the teller as non-affiliative, and quite possibly non-aligning and therefore dispreferred (see Stivers, 2008, for the distinction between affiliation and alignment). However, there are times that a speaker conducting a new action in the post expansion position is not projected by the sequence up until that point, and not providing an expansion there would neither be noticeable or accountable.

Such sequence initiation and non-minimal post expansions that occur in environments where they are not projected or normatively expected have been discussed in CA work on classroom interaction as *initiatives* (Jacknick, 2009; 2011; Waring, 2011)²⁴, though it has not been explicitly connected to the notion of WTC in this work. Both Jacknick and Waring look at sequential positions where student contributions do not constitute a response (R) in the *Initiation-Response-Feedback* (IRF; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) or *Initiation-Response-Evaluation* (IRE; Mehan, 1979) sequence that is constitutive of much pedagogical talk. Waring (2011) further defines initiative broadly “as any learner attempt to make an uninvited contribution to the ongoing classroom talk, where ‘uninvited’ may refer to (1) not being  

²⁴ Waring (2011), in particular, refers to such cases as “learner initiatives.” In a classroom, where students can initiate pedagogically related talk, this appellation may not be problematic. However, in the data presented here, I wish to avoid fore-fronting Peony’s status as a learner in cases where it may not be relevant to the activity at hand.
specifically selected as the next speaker or (2) not providing the expected response when selected” (p. 204).

While the notion of ‘uninvited’ is applicable in the data analyzed in this chapter, Waring’s definition is specific to the kind of interaction that occurs in pedagogical settings, with all of the relevant institutional and category-bound rights, obligations, and preference organizations that come along with such settings, particularly in regards to “not being specifically selected as the next speaker.” As such, I would like to suggest slight adjustments to account for non-pedagogical contexts. In the classroom, and indeed in multiparty talk in general, speaker selection is certainly a relevant concern. However, in dyadic talk this is much more constrained; at the risk of stating the obvious, one of the two participants must eventually take a turn in order for there to be interaction, and for it to be more than a monologue, turn taking must occur (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), regardless of whether the next turn speaker is “specifically” selected or not. In such a context, what counts as an ‘uninvited’ contribution would be one that is not sequentially expected, such as the initiation of a new sequence with a first pair part or a pre-expansion (Schegloff, 2007), or a non-projected non-minimal post-expansion. As such, the definition of initiative here goes back to the fundamental position explored by both Waring (2011) and Jacknick (2009; 2011): talk that does not constitute a response, or worded more broadly, talk that does not occur as a second pair part and is not overtly projected by prior talk.

The argument that will be made through the analyses below is that such initiation or expansion of sequences in certain environments where speaking or not speaking would not be normatively expected or accountable represents Peony’s initiative or option to engage, where alternative courses of action are not necessarily preferentially constrained. At the same time, the
initiation of engagement at these junctures must also be understood within the participation frameworks and contextual configurations that provide the environment for her engagement.

Analysis

The analysis presented here focuses on four extracts from four different conversations, each occurring in different settings and with different participation frameworks. Each provide different examples of Peony’s initiation of engagement and how this relates to ongoing activities and other participants.

SATURDAY TV

This extract comes from a conversation between Peony and Jiro at their home over dinner while they are watching television. The television helps to create a complex participation structure as it is an important element of the contextual configuration (Ergül, 2016). Throughout the dinner, it is often the locus of attention as they eat, shaping the interaction, or as is often the case, the gaps in the interaction where both Peony and Jiro attend to the television without speaking, creating what Schegloff and Sacks (1973) call a “state of incipient talk”, where the conversation can easily and unaccountably lapse into long periods of silence that is not attributable to either speaker or treated as a termination of the interaction. As such, resumption of talk in these cases requires no special action by either participant, nor is the talk explicitly closed. This is the case for approximately a minute before the first line of this extract, before Peony initiates talk assessing the quality of television programming on Saturdays.

Ex. 5.1a 20131130PJ Saturday TV

j +GZ>TV
01 J +((sniff))
“Why...”

“Why are the TV programs on Saturday not good?”

“I know. There isn’t anything interesting, is there.”

“This. You want me to change it?”

“It’s okay.”
At line 02, Peony initiates a question with *dooshite*: ‘why’, which draws Jiro’s attention from the television to her and establishes his recipiency for the projected question. He provides a continuer, and Peony restarts the question in line 05. Her question about television programs on Saturday is formulated using negative syntax (*yokunai* ‘not good’), which can be heard as an assertion of Peony’s negative stance towards the television (Heritage, 2002). At the same time, by initiating the sequence in this way, Peony creates an interactional space and shows an openness to interact, displaying her cooperative and instrumental stances.

Jiro’s response (07 – 08) displays his understanding of Peony’s question as an assessment by providing a strong agreement token while laughing. He then reformulates as *omoshiroi no nai ne* ‘there isn’t anything interesting, is there.’, aligning with Peony’s stance towards the programing. After Peony responds with minimal tokens in line 09, Jiro looks at the television and picks up the remote control as he asks *kaeru?* ‘change’ (translated in the extract as “You want me to change it?”), but also reasonably translatable as “Shall I change it?”), conducting a reasonable next action after a complaint and displaying his understanding of what action he took Peony to be initiating. However, Peony responds somewhat equivocally with *daijoobu* ‘okay’ (line 13), which could be interpreted either as a go-ahead or as something akin to “not necessary.” Jiro repeats *daijoobu* (line 14) with a slightly rising intonation and places the
remote control on the table, which taken together displays his candidate understanding of Peony’s response as the latter. Peony responds with an affirmative token, and they both return to eating and watching the television silently for the next approximately 11 seconds.

Peony’s question could be understood as an indirect request or pre-sequence leading up to a request (Levinson, 1983; Schegloff, 1988), and it seems that Jiro interprets it in just this way as he raises the remote control and prepares to change the channel. However, they come to an agreement to not change the channel and indeed return to watching the television as they eat. It seems the purpose of the original question was less about changing the situation and more about Peony making a general assessment on the quality of television programming (although, she may also consider changing the channel useless, if all programming on Saturday is “not good”), and thus her initiative is aimed at engaging in interaction with Jiro rather than towards a course of action vis a vis the television.

As the conversation continues after the lapse, we see Peony initiate further talk regarding the television, asking about what her parents-in-law watch.

Ex. 5.1b 20131130PJ Saturday TV

```
j
P  toosan, gaasan itsumo <nani> o +(0.5) mieru.
   dad  *mom  always  what OBJ watch-can
   “What can Mom and Dad always watch?”

j
P  +GZ>J
   GZ down
(0.6)

p  +tilts head slightly
P  +GZ>J

21  P  +mie[ru]+  
*watch-can
   “Can watch?”

22  J  [hnn, nani [miten daroo [ne.
   what watch wonder IP
   “Yeah, what do they watch.”
```
“Watch? Watch?”

“Watch?”

“Watch,”

(0.2)

“Watch?”

GZ>food

(0.3)

“What do they watch-”

“Watch-

“What do they watch. Not-

“They probably don’t really watch anything.”

“They’ve got cable, right?”
38  (1.1)
   p +slight nod
39  P aa: +hai hai [hai hai.
oh yes yes yes yes
   “Oh, yes yes yes yes.”
   j +slight nod
40  J [+°;nn::.
   j/p eating
41  (3.7)
42  J #knn:::.# (0.5) ((sniff)) motto channeru ga
   more channel SUB
43  aru. hh
   exist
   “They have more channels.”
44  P nn::.
45  J °#:nn::.#°
46  (1.8)
47  P dono gura:i? (0.4) °channeru.° (0.3) chan+nuru?
   how much about channel °channel
   “How many? Channel. Channel?”
   p +GZ>J
   j +GZ>TV
48  J >don +gu<rai +aru n daroo ne.=gojuu channeru gurai
   how much about exist NOM wonder IP fifty channel about
   j +GZ>P>down
49  aru n ja [+nai?
   exist NOM COP NEG
   “How many do they have. About 50 channels, isn’t it?”
50  P [n;nn::[:
51  J °gojuu toka roku[juu toka.°
   fifty etc. sixty etc.
   “Fifty or sixty.”
52  P [n nn::
53  J °°nn.°°
54  (4.1)
After the longish gap where Peony and Jiro have turned their attention to the television, Peony initiates another question (line 19), this time asking about what Mom and Dad watch. Peony encounters some difficulty with the verb *mieru* (a rather unidiomatic word choice, which would normally translate to “what is visible to Mom and Dad”, but Peony seems to use as “can watch”), which after a short pause she repeats with a slightly rising intonation as she tilts her head slightly, initiating repair. However, Jiro does not orient to Peony’s repair initiation, instead aligning with her question by posing it as a question he has as well. However, Peony continues on with her repair attempt by providing more candidate repairs in overlap. Peony’s *miteru* ‘watching’ (line 23) is the appropriate verb form for her question, and is indeed a more fully pronounced variant of the form Jiro says at the same time (*miten*). Peony’s *mite* ‘watch’ in the same line and in line 25 seems to be an attempt to repeat *miten*, but again is not syntactically fit with her question. In overlap with Peony’s second *mite*, Jiro repeats *miteru*? Peony again repeats this, and Jiro begins to provide a repair in line 29 but cuts it off as Peony begins to say *doyoobi*, but also cuts it off. Jiro then repeats his utterance from line 22, this time with *miteru n* rather than *miten*, and the repair sequence comes to a close as they return to eating. The repair sequence, reminiscent of the discussion of persistence in Chapter 4, works to get the sequence initiating question out on the floor. However, the talk lapses into a 4.4 second gap as they continue to eat.

After the gap, Jiro picks the sequence back up and answers the question in line 33 with the hedged assertion that Mom and Dad do not watch anything, which Peony receipts with a minimal *nn:*. Jiro then changes his answer, mentioning that he thinks they have cable television (line 37), which Peony responds to with a change of state token and repeated *hai* tokens and a nod, in effect claiming an understanding of the upshot of Jiro’s turn (Stivers, 2004). Jiro then nods
slightly and provides a quiet minimal response in overlap before they again lapse into a 3.7 second gap as they eat.

Jiro then expands upon his answer, noting that there are more channels. At first, Peony’s response is minimal (line 44), and with Jiro’s quiet sequence closing #nn::#, the topic seems to have stalled out with a 1.8 second gap. However, in line 47, Peony initiates an expansion upon the topic by asking about how many channels there are, though she does encounter some difficulty with how to pronounce channeru using Japanese phonotactics. Jiro repeats and rephrases the question in much the same way as he did with the previous question about what Mom and Dad watch (cf. line 22) and then provides a hedged answer: gojuu channeru gurai aru n ja nai? ‘About 50 channels, isn’t it?’, which Peony receipts with an elongated n↑nn::: in line 50. Jiro quietly repairs his answer to ‘fifty or sixty, which Peony receipts in a similar way. Jiro closes the sequence with a very quiet minimal token, which is again followed by a 4.1 second gap.

To recap, after a lengthy gap, Peony initiates a question sequence based upon the previous assessment sequence (Ex. 5.1a), re-opening the interactional space that could have been unnoticeably and unaccountably left in silence. After the repair sequence that Peony initiates, Jiro answers and expands upon the topic. After another gap, Jiro expands further, which leads to Peony initiating a further question sequence. Each of the longer gaps that occurred here could potentially provide a space to change topic or activity (i.e., focus on the television), but in each case, either Peony or Jiro picks the topic up again and develops it further. Moving forward, we see a similar pattern again, with Peony initiating another question after another gap, this time in relation to the cost of cable television.
“Yeah.”

“Is it expensive? Is it expensive?”

“I think it isn’t that expensive.”

“Not expensive?”

“Hmm, about 3000 yen, isn’t it?”

“And, internet too.”

“Cable TV.”

“That’s good, isn’t it?”
Again, after a lengthy gap, Peony initiates another question on the topic of the television, this time asking about how expensive getting cable television would be (line 56). Jiro shakes his head and explains that he thinks it is not expensive, which she attempts to repeat as confirmation (line 58). Jiro then expands the sequence to state that he thinks it is about 3,000 yen (roughly $30), which Peony responds to with a high pitched uh↑::? (line 60), displaying surprise.

After a pause of 2.1 seconds (line 61), Jiro expands the sequence by mentioning that internet is included, as well as the cable television, both of which are receipted by Peony with minimal response tokens (lines 63 and 65). After Jiro quietly closes the sequence with a short °n.°, there is another gap of 2.9 seconds. Peony then assesses the information about the cable as ii n ja nai ‘That’s good, isn’t it?’, and the sequence ends with Jiro’s minimal response token. From this point on, the topic changes toward food and cooking.

The extract as a whole (5.1a – 5.1c) illustrates that in the kind of contextual configuration illustrated here, where participants are engaged in an activity like eating and where another possible locus of attention (the television) is present, there is an option between initiating talk or letting silence continue. It is not rare for Peony and Jiro to fall into lengthier silences of a minute or more while they eat and watch television. In such situations, silence need not be problematic or accountable. The talk can start and stop freely and there would be nothing strange about an interaction that consists of a single adjacency pair before lapsing into silence again (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973).

In this extract, Peony takes initiative within the state of incipient talk multiple times. The first time she initiates the topic as she assesses the television programming as ‘not good’. Jiro treats this complaint as leading to a request to change the channel, but Peony declines, suggesting that
she produced the utterance as merely an observation/assessment and not an attempt to put a
course of action into motion. The second time is the initiation of the question about what Mom
and Dad watch, which then touches off further talk about cable television. The third and fourth
times are expansions of this topic, as Peony asks about how many channels are included and the
cost. Each of these cases occur at points where previous sequences were, for all intents and
purposes, complete (fully realized adjacency pairs and sequence closing thirds) and after gaps,
points where the participants could just as easily have remained unengaged or the topic could
have shifted.

As such, we have seen Peony engaging when there is a reasonable alternative and little
consequence for not doing so. The following extract, although also dyadic in nature, illustrates a
somewhat more complex set of circumstances.

**OYAJI NO JIKAN**

This extract comes from a one-on-one conversation with Keiko which took place at a café.
The participation structure and contextual configuration is rather simple. Generally, Keiko and
Peony are the only participants, although as we see in this extract the wait staff naturally comes
to the table occasionally. There are no competing activities or loci of attention at this point,
(compared to Ex. 5.1 above), and other material resources such as the tablet computer or scratch
paper are employed in pursuit of intersubjectivity (much as in Ch. 4). Initiation of engagement is
still relevant, but unlike the state of incipient talk discussed in the previous example, longer gaps
between sequences are less likely and potentially more accountable when there are two people
speaking and there is no competing activity or loci of attention. So while alternatives relating to
initiating or expanding sequences still arise, there are also differences relating to the
ccontributions Peony makes in terms of sequence, action, and content.

This extract occurs early in the conversation as the first topic after Peony has set up the
camera and taken her seat, and begins with Peony initiating a question sequence about time.

Ex. 5.2a 20140207PK Oyaji No Jikan

```
 001 P  =+ima, ima nanji?
         now now what time
         “Now, what time is it now?”

 002   (0.3)

 003 K  nn +to[kee nai.
         watch NEG
         “hmm, I don’t have a watch.”

 004 P  [nn +nai::: [(totemo) +nai hh
         NEG very NEG
         “yeah, I don’t. I really don’t.”

 005 K   [(laugh)]+

 006 P  [(laugh)]

 007 K  [$Peony mo +mottenai ja:. [(laugh)]+
         also have-NEG IP
         “You don’t have one either, you know.”

 008 P  [(laugh)]
```
(20 lines omitted. Keiko discussing how she hasn’t worn a watch since moving to Hawai‘i and finding that she did not need it. She checks the time on her tablet computer.))

**Keiko:** Ima sanji: nijuu-sanpun da yo.  
[now 3 o’clock 23 minute COP IP]  
“It’s 3:23 now.”

**Peony:** +nodding, sits back  
+(ima nanpun)[°°(      )°°]  
[now what minute]  
“What minute now (   )?”

**Keiko:** [sanji nijuusan[pun.+  
3 o’clock 23 minute]  
“3:23.”

**Peony:** [+nn:.. °sanji nijuusan.°  
3 o’clock 23]  
“Yeah. 3:23.”

**Keiko:** °nn..°

**Keiko:** GZ at tablet  
writing

**Peony:** choodo ii ne. tea time.+  
perfect good IP  
“Perfect. Tea time.”

**Keiko:** tashika ni.  
definitely  
“Definitely.”

**Peony:** tea time.

At the beginning of this segment, Peony initiates a question about the time while 1) looking at Keiko’s wrist and 2) placing her own wrist up where it is visible, semantically reinforcing her
question through embodied action, perhaps orienting toward keeping track of the length of the recording, given that this is the first action after setting up the equipment. In response, Keiko looks to her wrist and rubs it, then shifting her gaze to Peony says *tokee nai* ‘I don’t have a watch.’ (line 003). Peony then responds with *nn nai* ‘yeah, I don’t’,\(^{25}\) then looks at her own wrist and says what sounds like *totime nai* ‘very don’t.’ This leads to mutual laughter (lines 005 and 006) as Keiko turns to her bag and brings out her tablet computer to check the time. Keiko then, seemingly treating Peony’s previous turn as about herself, points out that Peony also doesn’t have a watch, which also leads to mutual laughter. In the omitted lines, Keiko then explains that she used to regularly wear a watch, but after moving to Hawai’i and being told that she no longer needed one, lost it and never bought a new one. During this time, Keiko turns on the tablet and situates it, conducting the pre-requisite instrumental and cooperative work for answering Peony’s question.

In line 029, Keiko answers the original question and Peony responds with a nod and sits back, but what she says here is inaudible. However, Keiko treats this as a reason to again repeat her answer in line 032, to which Peony then provides an affirmative response token and quietly repeats the time as she begins to write\(^{26}\). Keiko gives a quiet sequence closing *nn*, and the talk lapses into a 2.2 second gap during which Peony continues to write. At this point, the sequence is complete, the question asked and answer given, and it would be possible and reasonable to move on to another topic. However, Peony opts to provide further assessment of the time, saying

\(^{25}\) The person reference found in the translation may be somewhat misleading. There is no grammatical subject expressed in the phrase *nn nai* (line 004), so it is possible that she is referring to Keiko not having a watch. However, taking into account her gaze and arm movements, it seems reasonable to interpret her utterance as referring to the fact that she herself does not have a watch.

\(^{26}\) What Peony writes at this time is not visible, but it is possible that she marking the start time for the recording.
choodo ii ne ‘it’s perfect’, and expands upon this assessment by mentioning tea time in English (line 36). Keiko upgrades this with tashika ni ‘definitely.’

In this segment then, we first see Peony initiate a question sequence, which after insertion sequences about not having a watch and why, Keiko answers, and the sequence closes normally with a repeat and minimal sequence closer. Then, in a format not unlike what we found in Ex. 5.1 above, Peony chooses to expand the topic with an assessment after a inter-sequence gap of silence. This sets up the development of the topic further in the next segment, with Peony commenting and expanding in a different format.

Ex. 5.2b 20140207PK Oyaji No Jikan

039 K +are da ne, nan dakke. ocha tai-
that COP IP what COP- tea ti-

040 o[cha tai(m)
tea time
“That’s it, what do you call it. Tea ti- tea time.”

041 P [ocha time?
tea
“tea time?”

042 (0.3)

043 K +nan tte yuu kana.=
what QT say wonder
“What do you call it.”

044 P =+nihongo de? (0.3) ocha [tai(m)
Japanese in tea time
“In Japanese? Tea time?”

045 K [+>oyatsu no jikan.<
snack LK time
“Snack time.”
Snack?

+smile

+nod

Snack?

Yeah. That’s it, that’s it, that’s it. 3 o’clock is called snack time.

Snack time?

Then…

Snack is…

9 o’clock is old man time?

Excuse me

+(laugh) a sore

that
This segment begins with Keiko expanding upon Peony’s comment from the previous segment by initiating a word search sequence in line 039, seemingly to find a translation of Peony’s *tea time*, which she formulates first as *ocha taim*. She cuts this short once, but then
self-repairs as Peony says ocha time\textsuperscript{27} in overlap with a rising intonation. Keiko treats this translation as insufficient by continuing with the word search with nan tte yuu kana ‘what do you call it.’ (line 043). Peony then initiates repair by asking nihongo de? ‘in Japanese?’, and after a short pause, again repeats ocha taim with a slightly rising intonation, possibly to ascertain whether this is the item Keiko is trying to translate. By doing this, she displays a cooperative stance and opts to engage in the ongoing word search activity, and to help shape its trajectory. Keiko, in overlap, produces the translation as oyatsu no jikan ‘snack time’, with a point toward Peony that seems to embody a sense of “that’s it” (line 045, see screen capture). Peony repeats the word oyatsu ‘snack’ with a creaky voice, exaggerated intonation and a slightly rising intonation, seemingly initiating repair. Keiko confirms this with an uun and a quickly produced soo soo soo, then explains that 3 o’clock is called oyatsu no jikan. Peony repeats oyatsu no jikan with a question intonation, and Keiko confirms this with soo ‘right’ (lines 50 and 51).

Throughout this segment up to this point, Peony’s engagement has primarily been responsive and supportive of Keiko’s word search. In line 052, she begins to initiate an expansion with e jaa ‘well’ but then pauses. Keiko seems to treat this as a repair initiation and begins an utterance with oyatsu wa that projects that she is about to clarify the term. However, Peony continues her turn with kuuji wa oyaji no jikan ‘9 o’clock is old man time’ as she cracks a smile, playing off of the similarities between the words oyatsu ‘snack’ and oyaji ‘old man’ (line 055). This joke represents one of many alternative courses of action, including (but not limited to) agreement and acceptance, further clarification or specification, or changing topics. Peony inserts humor here, which functions at least to shape the trajectory of the talk from this point, but also displays

\textsuperscript{27} Taim and time are transcribed differently because Keiko’s usage sounds like two mora and thus closer to Japanese phonotactics, while Peony pronounces it as one syllable with a diphthong as it is pronounced in English.
her cooperative, instrumental and affective stances in forwarding this topic, as well as her linguistic and interactional competence in her ability to play with phonological similarities.

Keiko responds with a smile and laughter, but also assesses the turn as a gyagu ‘gag’ or ‘joke’, which categorizes it as silly. Peony also laughs and provides the more neutral term dajare ‘pun’ (line 060)\(^\text{28}\).

The mutual laughter continues as the waitress comes to place the desserts and drinks on the table (omitted), further displaying their mutual affiliation. Then, in line 070, Keiko asks Peony who taught her the joke, making the assumption that Peony did not author it herself. Keiko, still laughing, then downgrades her previous formulation to oyaji gyagu ‘old man gag’ or ‘dad joke’, to which Peony responds with more laughter. Keiko then asks whether Jiro had taught the joke to Peony, which Peony confirms in line 078.

While the previous extract and the first segment of this extract showed Peony’s initiative in relation to sequence (i.e. when Peony engages), especially regarding the initiation of sequences, this segment also illustrates opting for alternative courses of action and content that drastically shape the trajectory of the talk, through expanding sequences to further a line of talk and using humor. The next segment continues exploring this line as Peony expands upon the category of oyaji.

Ex. 5.2c 20140207PK Oyaji No Jikan

080 P do, itsumo [+ne, and always IP  
And always, y’know?”

\(^{28}\) In Japanese, much as in English, puns are treated as not particularly sophisticated. Dajare is perhaps the most neutral categorization. Gyagu, based on the English word “gag”, is a slightly more negative formulation, while oyaji gyagu (literally ‘old man gag’) are often responded to with a “calling out” of sorts – it seems quite common for the recipient to explicitly name it as such, and to tease the speaker for having said it.
081 K [ukeru. uh[n.
    funny
    “Funny. Yeah.”

082 P  [+GZ>forward

083 (1.3)

084 P  “nani, nani ga.”
    what  what SUB
    “What, what”

085 (1.4)

086 P  iza+kaya::?
    bar
    “a bar?”

087 K  +nn::. i[zakaya?
    bar
    “Yeah. A bar?”

088 P  [+izakaya de  +itsumo +shojuu  +(0.9)
    bar  at  always  *shochu

089 +no[m-
    “Always drink- shochu at the bar”

090 K  [shoochuu nomu [no?
    shochu  drink NOM
    “You drink shochu?”

091 P  [+nod
    “[+shoochuu nomu.=
        shochu  drink
    “I drink shochu.”

092 K  =e,  +peony?=  
    “huh, you?”
p  +nod    +LH tap throat
093  P  =+uhn. [+oyaji mitai.
       old man seem
       “Yeah, like an old man.”

k  +eyebrow flash
k  +BH>table
094  K  [+↑EH?
       “What?”

095  (0.4)

096  K  uso[:].
       lie
       “You’re kidding.”

p  +nod    +GZ>forward    +GZ>K
p  +LH up    +LH flex down at wrist
097  P  [+uhn. ko-    +and then, (0.4) +umeboshi (hi)
       pickled plum

p  +LH>chin
098  issho[(h)ō.+
       together
       “Yeah, and then, with a pickled plum.”

k  +sits back, puts napkin down
099  K  [+((laugh 1.8))

p  +GZ>forward    +GZ>K>forward    +nod
p  +LH forward    +RH>LH, drop, repeat
100  P  +umeboshi hh +haite +((laugh 1.9)) +nn::.
       pickled plum enter
       “the pickled plum goes in... yeah.”

p  +GZ>K
p  +nodding
101  [++(to) oyaji ne.
       (and) old man IP
       “An old man, right?”

102  K  [+‘are?
       “Huh?”

103  (0.5)
At line 080, Peony initiates a new sequence, using the particle ne to draw Keiko’s attention to the shift. Keiko, in overlap, assesses the pun as ukeru ‘funny’, and then marks the new sequence with an uhn. Starting in line 082, Peony engages in a solitary word search with an ee as she looks forward, pauses, then says nani, nani ga very quietly. This functions, as solitary word search behaviors tend to (Hayashi, 2003), to maintain the floor while also displaying that she is still looking for the word. After another pause, she try marks izakaya ‘bar’\textsuperscript{29}, displaying some uncertainty about the word. Keiko receipts this with an nn:: and repeats the word with a rising intonation, inviting Peony to continue.

Now that the word search is complete, Peony continues with her turn, saying that she always drinks shochu (a distilled liquor) at the izakaya. As Peony’s turn comes to a close, Keiko asks for confirmation, which Peony provides with a repeat. Although her surprise was starting to show with her raised eyebrows in line 088 as Peony first mentions that she drinks shochu, it is openly displayed in 092 when Keiko asks e, Peony? and points. Peony confirms this with an uhn, a nod and by tapping on her throat, and aligns with Keiko’s surprise by mentioning that it is oyaji mitai ‘like an old man’, displaying membership knowledge of the category bound nature of drinking shochu at an izakaya and that it is behavior that she generally would not be expected to engage in. In overlap, Keiko continues to display surprise by producing a loud and high-pitched EH? with an eyebrow flash, then with uso:: ‘you’re kidding.”

\textsuperscript{29} ‘Bar’ is an approximate translation at best. An izakaya serves both drinks (especially beer, shochu, and shochu based cocktails called chuuhai) and food.
Peony again confirms with an uhn (line 097), and continues with further elaboration, explaining that she drinks it with umeboshi ‘pickled plums’, another oyaji-like behavior, which Keiko responds to with laughter as she sits back. Peony continues the elaboration by acting out how she places the umeboshi into her drink and laughs (line 100), then repeats the categorization of oyaji, this time with a ne to invite Keiko’s agreement. In overlap, Keiko continues to display surprise with a high-pitched are? ‘huh?’, to which Peony responds by re-confirming that she is talking about herself (line 104).

Peony’s initiatives in this segment go beyond just initiating questions. Instead, she elaborates and volunteers further information, first by mentioning that she drinks shochu, and second by further elaborating how she drinks it, two elements that would not necessarily be noticeable or accountable if absent, and also further display her competence and knowledge about Japanese cultural practices and categories. Here again, this provides an illustration of both when and how Peony engages and keeps the talk moving forward.

The following segment begins after 13 lines of omitted talk where Keiko and Peony talk about their alcohol preferences, and illustrates how initiative and persistence (Ch. 4) can come together in achieving intersubjectivity and doing category/identity work.

Ex. 5.2d 20140207PK Oyaji No Jikan

117  k+GZ>right
117  K +atashi mo (0.4) bii::ru (0.5)
    I      too       beer
118  nomu kedo,
    drink but
    “Me too. I drink beer, but…”
119  p GZ>napkin, reach for napkin
    (0.3)
120  P [nn::]
k +GZ>P>down
121 K [+wain no hoo ga suki.
    wine LK way SUB like
    “I like wine more.”

p picking up napkin
p +nodding
122 P e- +wain no hoo ga suki.
    wine LK way SUB like
    “You like wine more.”

123 K nn::. (0.9) [°(atashi/oishii.)°
    I delicious
    “Yeah, (I do/It’s good.)”

p dealing with napkin
p +nod
124 P [+nomu kedo, wain no hoo ga suki.
    drink but wine LK way SUB like
    “You drink but, you like wine more.”

k +lean in
125 K +biiru, biiru [mo non(detta yo)
    beer beer also drink-PST IP
    “I also drank beer.”

p +GZ>K +GZ>napkin
126 P [+aka wain ga suki.+
    red wine SUB like
    “You like red wine.”

k +nod
k +RH>P
127 K +soo.=
    right
    “Right.”

128 P =nn::.
    “yeah.”

129 K [soo yoku [shitten ne.
    right well know IP
    “Right. You know me well, huh?”

130 P [°soo.°
    right
    “Right.”

p dealing with napkin
131 P (2.2)
This segment begins as the omitted sequence about drink preferences comes to a close, with Keiko mentioning that she drinks beer but prefers wine, which Peony repeats in line 122 and
again in 124. In line 126, Peony notes that Keiko likes red wine in particular, information that had not been mentioned yet but which displays a strong affiliative stance and interpersonal knowledge, and through which Peony does *being a good friend*. Keiko confirms with a nod and holding her right hand out toward Peony as she says *soo* ‘right’ (line 127), then in overlap with Peony’s sequence closing *nn::*, Keiko comments upon how well Peony knows her (line 129), before the sequence ends and lapses into a 2.2 second gap.

In a format reminiscent of the post-gap assessment in Ex. 5.2a, Peony initiates a new sequence by commenting that Keiko’s tastes are *otokoppoi* ‘manly’ (line 132), which proves rather surprising to Keiko; she responds by repeating the word quickly in a high pitch (undermining the categorization as *otokoppoi*) while raising her eyebrows. In line 135, Peony begins to attempt repair by repeating *otoko* ‘man’, producing a number of perturbances, and after a short pause, again repeating *otoko* with a question intonation. She then reaches for the paper to write the characters 大人 *otona* ‘adult’ (lines 136 and 137). Keiko reads Peony’s writing and then asks *otonappoi*? ‘adult-like/mature’, analyzing the trouble source as having been with *otoko* versus *otona* ‘adult’, with the suffix ~ppoi being appropriate in the context. Peony repeats *otona*, laughs, says *(not) otoko* while continuing to laugh and then puts her face into her hands, suggesting a recognition of the nature of the problem and perhaps a little embarrassment. Keiko responds jokingly by repeating *otoko* and pointing out that they are both women, then asking if that is okay. Peony continues to laugh, and repeats the corrected form in line 143. This assessment, despite the reparative detour, continues Peony’s *doing being friends* course of action by assessing Keiko’s tastes positively.

There are two points in this segment at which Peony’s initiative is visible. The first is with her knowledgeable comment about Keiko’s drink preference, which was not sequentially
projected or required in that position, but did present Peony as affiliative and attentive both in the immediate interactional context and across their interactional history. The second is similar to some of the other examples, where after one sequence has closed and the talk has lapsed into a gap, Peony initiates a new sequence with a comment. Unlike some of the other examples of this pattern, the assessment is problematic and needed to be repaired, but Keiko and Peony work through the difficulty with humor. Both points display Peony’s cooperative stance and her effort to move the conversation forward and do work to portray herself as a good and attentive friend.

This extract as a whole illustrated how in a dyadic interaction where there is no competing locus of attention (i.e. the television in Ex. 5.1), where talk is more or less continual and without longer gaps of silence, initiative is still visible. Furthermore, this initiative can be involved in the expansion of sequences, visible in cases where non-minimal post-expansions are not made conditionally relevant by the ongoing action and the sequence is for all intents and purposes complete. Also necessarily implicated in these initiations and expansions are issues of alignment and affiliation, identity, and cooperative and instrumental stances, particularly in how Peony’s choice to initiate or further engage are displays of such. The situation, however, can become somewhat more complex in multi-party interactions, as we will see in the following two extracts.

**DENSHA**

This following extract is taken from the first of two Mother’s Day conversations at Jiro’s parents’ house. The family (Peony, Jiro, Mom and Dad) are gathered around the table, and the television is on, creating a contextual configuration that shares some features with the dinner time conversation discussed in Ex. 5.1, with its competing activities and loci of attention. However, with four participants, the participation structure is noticeably more complex, and it is
not rare for one or more of the participants to become less vocally active for stretches of time. This also means that the choice to engage is potentially more complicated as well.

We enter the conversation within the first minute of recording, at a point where Dad is asking Jiro about his and Peony’s plans for the next day.

Ex. 5.3a 0130501PJMD Densha

```
001 D  +ashita +nanji ni +(uchi deteku:)¿
       tomorrow what time at house leave
   “What time are you (leaving the house) tomorrow?”

002 P  +a[shita
       tomorrow
   “Tomorrow”

003 J  +ashita wa ne, densha de ikoo to
       tomorrow TOP IP train by go-VOL QT

004 p  +GZ>food
005 M  omo+[tta kara
       think-PST since
   “Tomorrow yeah, we were thinking about going by train, so…”

006 D  [aa densha [densha.
       ah train train
   “Ah, train, train.”

007 P  [densha=
       train
   “Train.”

008 P  =[(kuji)
       nine
   “(Nine)”

009 J  =](kuji no< densha ni noritai [kara,
       nine LK train on ride-want since
   “We want to take the 9 o’clock train, so…”
```
“Nine o’clock?”

“9 o’clock.”

“I guess that, generally, if you don’t line up about 8:30 you can’t get in, so…”

“(that much) ( ) where?”

“Maybe.”

“All the seats on the Odori are reserved, right?”

“There are free seats too.”
Dad initiates this sequence by asking Jiro about what time they will leave the next morning – Dad’s gaze direction suggests a selection of Jiro as the one to answer. As he asks, though, both Jiro and Peony shift their gaze toward Dad. Peony repeats ashita ‘tomorrow’ as she shifts her gaze towards Jiro, suggesting that she also expects him to answer or to at least co-construct the answer, and that she is not self-selecting to answer. As Jiro answers (lines 003 – 004), Peony maintains her gaze at him until near the end of his explanation that they were thinking of taking the train, when she then looks towards her food. Mom and Dad overlap at the same time (lines 005 and 006), both commenting on the decision to take the train. With her gaze still down, Peony in overlap confirms by repeating densha ‘train’.
In lines 008 and 009, Peony and Jiro simultaneously begin to answer. However, Peony drops out after seemingly saying (kuji ‘9 o’clock’), as Jiro explains that since they want to take the 9 o’clock train that they must line up at 8:30 (lines 009, 011 and 013). As Jiro’s first clause nears its end, Dad confirms with kuji ka ‘It’s 9 o’clock?’, which Peony seems to respond to with kuji in line 012, in overlap with Jiro’s continuing response, while she attends to pouring her soy sauce. Mom responds to Jiro’s turn with an agreeing nn nn nn and tabun ‘maybe’ (line 016), while Dad, in overlap, asks about where. All the while, Peony continues to attend to the soy sauce and does not shift her gaze to any of the other participants. Mom seemingly (if perhaps with a strange fit) answers Dad by mentioning the train that Jiro and Peony will take (line 017) then continues on to ask whether the train is completely reserved seating. During Mom’s turn, Peony at first continues to deal with the soy sauce, but then turns her gaze to Mom as she says shitee ‘reserved’ and then toward Jiro as Mom says deshoo ‘right?’, displaying attentiveness if not outright active engagement.

In line 019, Jiro begins his response with a head shake before he mentions that there are non-reserved seats as well. Beginning in overlap, Mom asks confirming questions, during which Peony looks towards Mom, away to the left and back to Mom as the question ends. Jiro provides a minimal confirmation (024), and as Mom asks another question about how limited the seating on the train is, Peony looks toward her food.

At the beginning of this segment, we see attempts by Peony to be engaged in the trajectory of the conversation. However, aside from some attempts to be involved in responding to questions, her participation is limited to being attentive to what the others are saying, as visible through gaze and placement of her occasional verbal contributions. The following segment develops this further, as Peony continues to monitor the talk but rarely engages.
Ex. 5.3b 0130501PJMD Densa

030 D  =\>doko- doko hatsu<\<  
where where start  
“Where does it start from?”

031 p  attending to food

032 J  >tokyoo.<  
Tokyo  
“Tokyo.”

033 M  tokyoo eki [kara ja nakya +norenai yo=  
Tokyo station from COP-NEG-if ride-can-NEG  
“If you don’t take it from Tokyo station, you won’t be able to get on.”

034 D  [tokyoo  
Tokyo  
“Tokyo.”

035 M  ={+[jiyuu seki wa +ºne°.=  
free seat TOP  
“The free seats.”

036 D  [u::h.

037 J  ={nn::.

038 p  GZ at M

039 M  ={+(konnaida)]  
this time  
“(The other day)”

040 D  ={+de ocha-] ochanomizu made okutte +kya ii n da.  
and Ocha- Ochanomizu until take if good NOM COP  
“So, we should take them as far as Ochanomizu.”

041 p/m  attending to food

042 D  °nn°.=

163
p attending to food
043 J =iya. mitasen:: de
no Mita line by
“Nah. By the Mita line…”

p attending to food
j (GZ>D)
044 (1.0)

p +GZ>J
045 D +nn nn nn nn. [aruiteku n +(nara)
walk-go NOM COND
“Yeah yeah yeah yeah. (If) you go by foot.”

046 J [nn.

047 M [hn hn hn

p GZ at J
j slight nodding, GZ at D>P>D
048 (3.2)

049 P °°°nn.°°°=

p GZ at J
j GZ at D +GZ>P
050 J =maa sonna ni ookunai +kara.
well that much many-NEG since
“Well, there shouldn’t be that many people.”

051 (0.8)

052 J [“ashita.”
tomorrow
“Tomorrow.”

p GZ at J
053 P [“sonna ni ookuna ka”
that much many-NEG Q
“Not that many?”

j GZ at P
p +nod
054 J uhn. o- +ookunai. (0.3) [ookunai.
many-NEG many-NEG
“Yeah, not many. Not many.”

055 D [(ookunai.)
many-NEG
“Not many.”
In line 030, Dad asks **doko hatsu** ‘where does it start from?’, which seems to be a restart of his earlier question (line 015). Jiro answers that the train starts from Tokyo station, which Mom comments upon, noting that if they do not catch the train from Tokyo station, they will not get a non-reserved seat. In overlap, Dad receipts Jiro’s answer with repetition, and both Dad and Jiro receipt Mom’s comment with minimal tokens (lines 036 and 037). During this sequence, Peony does not speak, and in fact is attending to her food during the base pair between Dad and Jiro. As Mom makes her comment, Peony nods after **tookyoo eki kara ja nakya** (literally ‘If it is not from Tokyo station’), displaying that she is at least to some degree attending to Mom’s talk while she is also attending to her food. In line 035, in overlap with Mom’s incremental topic phrase **jiyuu seki wa ne** ‘The free (non-reserved) seats’, Peony looks towards Mom, then to Jiro and back to Mom, but does not provide any response, verbal or non-verbal.

In lines 039 and 040, Mom and Dad initiate turns simultaneously, but Mom cedes the turn to Dad as he suggests taking Jiro and Peony as far as Ochanomizu station. At first, no one responds
– during the 2.2 second pause, both Mom and Peony are attending to the food while Jiro seems to be watching Mom stirring the hotpot. After Dad provides a quiet nn, Jiro begins to reject the suggestion by mentioning the Mita-sen, another train line. Jiro does not syntactically or prosodically finish his turn, and there is a 1.0 second gap before Dad nods and accepts Jiro’s implied suggestion with nn nn nn nn, suggesting that he recognizes where Jiro was heading (Stivers, 2004). Dad then displays his understanding by adding aruiteku n (nara) ‘(if) you go by foot’, which Mom agrees with in line 047. Throughout this sequence, Peony has continued to orient toward her food, giving no hint of whether she is attending to the talk at all. However, after Dad says aruiteku, Peony shifts her gaze toward Jiro, and maintains it through a 3.2 second gap while Jiro nods in response to Dad’s understanding and looks back and forth between Dad and Peony. This sustained gaze suggests that Peony has noticed an issue that needs to be dealt with, but what that issue is remains unclear.

Jiro comments that there will not be that many people the next day (line 050), reinforcing the idea that they can walk to Tokyo station after taking the Mita line. As he says this, he shifts his gaze from Dad to Peony and maintains it there as Peony attempts a repetition in line 053 (compare Peony’s ookuna ka to Jiro’s ookunai kara), and he then confirms and repeats ookunai ‘not many’ two times. Peony nods as Jiro produces his first repetition, and then again as she receipts his turn with nn nn (line 056). Jiro’s comment and Peony’s acceptance suggest that the problem Peony oriented to during the 3.2 second gap was the sequential disconnect between Mom’s concern about seating and Jiro’s decision to take the Mita line. Peony’s gaze then shifts towards Dad as he begins to talk about the Mita line and Tokyo station30, but then looks at the

---

30 A little local geographical knowledge is helpful in understanding what is happening, given that Jiro, Mom and Dad are not explicit. As shown on the map here (courtesy of OpenStreetMap.org), Otemachi Station on the Mita
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hotpot and towards her food. During the 14 omitted lines immediately after this, Peony primarily maintains her gaze at her food, only occasionally glancing at the others as they talk about going to the station via the underground mall area (*chikagai*).

During this segment, Peony’s active talk is quite minimal – only a repetition and some affirmative tokens. Furthermore, until the disconnect arises in the talk between Jiro and his parents, she maintains a focus on her food. While this suggests a lack of active engagement, it also suggests that she continues to attend to the talk as she focuses on her food, maintaining an instrumental and cooperative stance even when does not initiate engagement. The following segment, as they return to the topic of the Mita line, finds Peony as somewhat more actively involved as the subject of time arises again.

*Ex. 5.3c 0130501PJMD Densha*

```
086 D mitasen +ka[ra
Mita line from
“From the Mita line…”
```

---

line (in the square) is a short walk from Tokyo Station (in the circle), although the Mita line does not go directly to Tokyo Station. As natives of Tokyo, Jiro and his family would likely know this information well and not have to be explicit when discussing taking the Mita line and then catching a train at Tokyo (Hauser, personal communication).
走るけど、早いほうがいいと思いますよ。

“You could walk it, but you’d need to go earlier, y’know.”

“Yeah.”

“Hmm.”

“Maybe it’d be best to leave about 8 o’clock.”

“Yeah 8:30.”

“Yeah yeah.”

“That’s right.”
At line 086, Dad returns to the topic of the Mita line, but Mom overlaps to say that they had better leave early if they are going to walk (i.e., the distance from Otemachi Station on the Mita line to Tokyo Station). Peony’s gaze is still on her food and the hotpot until after Mom says hayame ni ‘earlier’ (line 087), when she briefly looks at Mom before returning her gaze to the hotpot as Mom’s talk continues, again displaying some degree of attention. However, after a 0.5 second gap at line 090, Peony provides a rather non-committal response with nn: : : : : . In overlap at line 092, Jiro responds to Mom’s point by saying that it may be best to leave around 8 o’clock. Peony nods and responds with an nn, but then initiates repair with hachi(ji) han ‘8:30’ as she brings her gaze to Jiro momentarily before she returns to looking at the hotpot. Jiro counters by saying that if they want to arrive at 8:30 that they should leave about 8 o’clock, which Peony accepts with a nod and an uh uh before she returns her gaze to her food. Jiro adds an incremental tabun ‘maybe’, and Dad agrees with a soo ‘that’s right’ as the sequence closes.

We see in this segment that for a few moments the participation structure changes to being an exchange between just Peony and Jiro as they come to an agreement about the time that they ought to leave, a sequence touched off by Mom’s concern about seat availability. It may also be worth noting that content-wise, the time that they have to leave the house may be of greater consequence and import to Peony than questions about which line they will take, perhaps providing an impetus for slightly more active engagement in this segment. The following segment closes the extract with more involvement from Peony.

Ex. 5.3d 0130501PJMD Densha

104 M [kawanakatta no shitee.
buy-NEG-PST NOM reserved
“You didn’t get a reserved seat.”]
There weren't any reserved seats, they were sold out.

“They were all sold out,”

“We were able buy seats for the way back.”

“Well, right?”

Yeah. From when is it?”

“From 2 o'clock, right? Yeah.”

((phrase used when beginning to eat))
"Ochanomizu or someplace..."

“It maybe okay.”

“But wouldn’t going by the Mita line be quicker?”

“It looks like tomorrow will be cold too.”

“Cold. Why?”
This segment begins with an exchange between Jiro and Mom that returns to the topic of reserved seats. Of particular interest to us here is that throughout this exchange (lines 104 – 109)
and the 2 second pause after it, Peony attends to her food with no visible orientation to the ongoing talk. However, as Dad says shichiji ‘7 o’clock’ (line 111), Peony once again turns her gaze toward Jiro, who in overlap summarizes the prior talk about the reserved seats in English, perhaps treating her gaze shift as a request for translation. Peony provides a short affirmative response and nod (line 113), and after a 1 second pause, initiates a clarification sequence by asking itsu kara aru? ‘From what time is it?’, again displaying concern about time issues. While it is unclear what the grammatical subject of her question is here, it is clear that Jiro understands as he answers that he thinks the activity in question starts at 2 o’clock, closing the sequence with a quiet nn. From this point, Peony returns her gaze to the hotpot, and Jiro begins eating.

In the intervening 12 omitted lines, Dad mentions the times he needs to take Jiro’s niece and nephew to school or activities. While Peony does occasionally look toward Dad and nod, she does not verbally engage during these turns. Then in line 128, Dad returns to the topic of which train line to take, with Jiro and Mom responding. As the exchange unfolds, Peony again orienting towards the food, especially reaching for the dressing bottle, with only one quick glance toward Jiro in line 134. However, Dad changes the topic to the next day’s weather in line 135, which leads to a shift in participation structure. While the prior talk about train lines was essentially a triadic structure between Jiro and his parents, now all four participants are verbally engaged. Dad mentions that the following day will probably be cold, which Jiro agrees with. As Peony continues to deal with the dressing, she laughs and quietly repeats samui ‘cold’, laughs some more and raises her gaze to Jiro, smiles and asks dooshite ‘why’ (line 137). This displays a similar type of initiative as in Extract 5.2, as Peony expands a sequence through a humorous contribution, which shapes the trajectory of the subsequent talk. Dad aligns by laughing and
saying **dooshite daroo ne:::** with extra emphasis on the interactive particle, showing strong affiliation and alignment (Sugita, 2012). Mom also aligns through laughter as well (line 140). Peony then attempts to further expand upon her comment, but runs into difficulty as she attempts to say the month (line 141), which Jiro provides and Peony repeats. Although she does not use a particle such as **demo** or **noni** ‘however’ to mark the incongruence of the weather and the month, Dad and Mom both align with her. Mom even uses English to assess the weather as **very strange**, displaying her understanding of the upshot of Peony’s turn. After a sequence closing **nn:::** from Peony, the group lapses into a 4.6 second silence that centers around Peony and Mom taking food from the hotpot. Dad then returns to the topic with the assessment **okashii ne** ‘it’s strange isn’t it.’, which Jiro accepts with an **nn::**, and Peony repeats, closing the sequence.

Again in this segment, we find that Peony’s initiatives relate to the issue of time (line 113), as well as the issue of weather. This suggests that an impetus to engage in the ongoing talk may relate to issues of personal relevance, while issues surrounding the train line and the niece’s and nephew’s schedules are not under her control and thus do not require her attention or involvement. At the same time, it also shows that she remains attentive to the ongoing talk, displaying a cooperative and instrumental stance, which allows her to take the floor when she does engage.

In a conversation such as this with four participants, it would not be particularly notable or socially accountable if Peony were to remain silent, especially considering the fact that Mom and Dad do not address any first pair parts towards her, and even Jiro only directs talk towards her a couple of times throughout the extract. The triadic participation structure may also potentially not allow for her involvement in terms of initiating sequences, as they could be intrusive (as
compared to the dyadic structure in Exs. 5.1 and 5.2). At the same time, throughout this talk, her engagement relates to points where the topic touches upon time and the weather, issues of relevance to decisions that would have to be made (what time to wake up and leave, what to wear), while the topics of which train lines to take and what time Dad must take the children to school do not have such direct bearing. Seen in this way, Peony’s initiatives during this extract are related to concerns that can influence her own future decision making. The following, and final, extract provides an example from the same participants but illustrates a pattern that both converges and diverges from those we have seen in Extract 5.3.

**NIECE AND NEPHEW**

This final extract comes from a conversation that occurred roughly a year later than the previous Mother’s Day extract, and again the participants include Peony, Jiro, and his parents. Peony’s participation is somewhat similar to the previous extract in that she only occasionally engages actively and otherwise focuses on her food. However, the type and extent of engagement is noticeably different, especially as regards the topic of Jiro’s and Peony’s niece and nephew and how they are doing with school work.31

Ex. 5.4a 20140510PJMD Niece & Nephew

001 P sara [+ima
Sara now

002 J [((sniff))

---

31 A note about how school grades are discussed in Japanese is in order. First, as we see in the first segment, students are referred to with the number + nensee format (i.e. yonnensee is 4th grader). Grade levels are counted starting from one when students enter each level of school, at elementary school, junior high school and again at high school. Therefore, the students at the level roughly analogous to American 7th grade are chuugaku ichinensee “junior high 1st graders”, which is often abbreviated to chuuichi “middle one”.

175
“Sara’s a 4th grader?”

(Isn’t she?)

Sara’s ( )

5th grade.”

“5th grade.”

5th grade”

She’s a 5th grader.”

“5th grade.”

Cute.”

Ah, that’s right, that’s right.”

“She’s a 5th grader.”
The extract begins with Peony taking initiative and asking a question about their niece, Sara, asking "Sara’s a 4th grader?" (lines 001 and 003). While her gaze suggests she is directing the question toward Jiro, the answer is epistemically available to Mom and Dad.
as well, and each says something, though the only clearly audible answer comes from Dad, who says *gonensee* ‘5th grader’ (line 006). Between lines 004 and 006, Peony is out of view (obscured by Mom’s position), but when she is visible again she is looking forward, and maintains a forward orientation as she repeats the answer (line 007), then shifts her gaze to Jiro as she repeats it a second time (line 009), and says *aa soo soo soo*, treating it as an answer that she had already known. Jiro responds by quietly repeating *gonensee*, and as Dad reiterates his answer (line 014), Peony quietly repeats *gonensee* while shifting her gaze forward, and comments upon the answer as *hayai* ‘quick/fast’ (i.e., that Sara is growing up quickly). This closes the question sequence.

After a 1.9 second pause, Jiro expands upon the sequence by commenting on when Sara will be taking entrance exams for junior high school (line 017). While Jiro and Dad are disagreeing on when Sara will take her exams, Peony participates only once, with a quiet affirmative token (line 022) after Jiro asks *ima gonensee desho?* ‘She’s a 5th grader now, right?’. From this point, Peony disengages from active participation as Mom initiates a topic about their nephew, Hiroki.

In this segment, we see Peony display initiative by asking a question and following through on the answer until she provides a sequence closing assessment. She is also displaying interest in family members, an affiliative move that also displays her cooperative and instrumental stance within the participation framework. However, as the topic expands beyond the sequence she initiated, she “fades out” of participation and focuses on her food until the next segment almost a minute later. In the intervening time, Mom has gone to the kitchen and returned to the table with a bottle of wine.

Ex. 5.4b 20140510PJMD Niece & Nephew

| j | (in kitchen) |
| m | (in kitchen) |
| D | *chuu::ichi da mon neeEE, hiro[ki* |
| 082 | *junior one COP IP IP Hiroki* |
| “Hiroki’s a junior high 1st year student, huh?” |
“Yep.”

He returns to the table with a glass.

“Hiroki.”

He is dealing with a wine glass.

He is pouring wine.

“Junior high school?”

“Junior high school 1st year student”

“He’s studying English (really hard).”

Heh heh heh heh

Heh heh heh heh
During the omitted 64 lines, Jiro, Mom and Dad discussed how Hiroki looked in his school uniform. Throughout, Peony does not verbally participate and when she is visible, her focus is on her food or on the wine bottle. At line 082, Dad mentions that Hiroki is a first year junior high school student, which is receipted with an agreement token from Mom, which leads to minimal
affirmative tokens from Dad, Jiro and Peony. Jiro then says Hiroki’s name quietly, which Peony responds to with a nn:... .

After a 3.5 second pause, Peony attempts a turn regarding Hiroki being chuuiichi ‘junior high first year’, but has difficulty with the utterance, producing multiple misstarts and mispronunciations (line 091). The action undertaken by this turn is somewhat unclear, possibly a question or a simple confirmation of Dad’s previous turn, though it is clear through Peony’s gaze direction that Jiro is the recipient. Jiro then conducts repair with a question intonated chuugaku? ‘junior high school?’ (line 093), which Peony accepts with a repetition, then quietly saying ichinensee ‘first year’. This suggests that she was struggling with how to say the abbreviated form chuuiichi.

Dad then informs them that Hiroki is studying English, a topic which may be of interest to both Peony and Jiro as they are both English teachers. Jiro responds with a confirmation question asking if Hiroki is studying English (line 100), and Peony laughs and says ima ‘now’ as she shifts her gaze to Jiro and smiles (perhaps in reference some prior lack of interest on Hiroki’s part). From here, the topic develops between Jiro, Dad and Mom, and Peony again disengages from verbal participation, shifting her attention back to her food.

Here, Peony attempts to involve herself in a participation framework that for some time had included only Jiro, Mom and Dad and that she had only been peripherally involved in. As such, this segment is somewhat different from others discussed so far as she is not initiating a new sequence here, but engaging in part of a sequence that she has the option not to engage in. However, this does not lead to sustained engagement, as her turn dealing with Hiroki’s grade level does not spawn any further talk, and her comment upon his English study yields no uptake. From here, the talk moves into the quality of schools for the next 54 omitted lines, during which
Peony is only minimally involved with gaze and occasional minimal response tokens. We re-
enter the conversation just prior to Peony’s next substantive turn.

Ex. 5.4c 20140510PJMD Niece & Nephew

165  D  "sara wa n."
    Sara TOP
    "Sara."

166  M  hn hn hn hn

167  D  hhshh

168  M  .knn .knn .kn[n .knn

169  D  [ongaku* to .hh
    music and

    d  +GZ>M

170  [ongaku to +nantoka (tte no ga yatte)=
    music and something else QT NOM SUB doing
    “Doing music and, music and what not.”

171  M  [((laugh))

    d  +GZ>down

172  D  [=+(tsu)teru kedo.
    saying  but
    “they’re saying, but…”

173  M  [($ongaku$)
    music
    “Music

174  J  ongaku.
    music
    “Music.”

    d  +GZ>P

175  P  [+ongaku¿
    music
    “Music?”

176  M  [↑hfnn

    p  +GZ>D

177  D  [ongaku taiken yoi.+  
    music very good
    “She’s really good at music.”

178  (0.5)
"uh huh?"

"Everything else is bad."

"For Sara."

"She's okay at music."

"Yeah. ( )"
ongaku is good.
“Music is good.”

What else?”

“What do you say ZUKOO?”

“How do you say ZUKOO?”

“Art?”

“Art. Yeah that’s it.”
Starting at line 165, Dad initiates the topic of Sara being good at music, which Mom and Jiro receipt with repetitions of **ongaku** ‘music’. Up until Jiro’s repetition, Peony has not verbally participated in the conversation for quite some time. However, at this point (line 175), Peony repeats **ongaku** with a questioning intonation as she shifts her gaze first to Dad and then to Jiro. Dad treats Peony’s turn as a repair initiator and reformulates his previous turn as **ongaku taihen**
yoi ‘she’s really good at music.’ (line 177), and Peony shifts her gaze to him momentarily then shifts her gaze to some place in the middle of the table. After a short pause, Peony produces a quiet uh huh? (line 179), but receives no related response. Instead, Jiro comments upon Sara’s issues beyond music, saying ato dame ‘everything else is bad’, which Dad laughs at. Jiro then clarifies that he is talking about Sara (line 183). At this point, Peony produces a quiet oh:::, and Jiro treats this as Peony displaying that she is having difficulty, and switches into English to briefly explain about Sara’s grades in school, at which point Peony shifts her gaze to him, provides a minimal affirmative token, then shifts her gaze forward again.

Mom expands upon Dad’s previous utterance and says that Sara is good at music and zukoo ‘art’ (line 191). Peony briefly looks at Mom, then shifts her gaze to Jiro to ask ongaku okee? ‘music is okay?’. Jiro confirms with a repetition and a nod as Peony shifts her gaze forward (line 195) and Dad responds with two affirmative nn::s (lines 194 and 196) and an inaudible comment that likely mentioned zukoo again. Peony responds with a minimal nn:: in line 197, and Jiro reformulates, saying ongaku is good. Peony then initiates a further sequence by asking hoka ni? ‘anything else’, suggesting that she had understood that Mom had added another category of things Sara is good at but had not understood what that category was. Jiro initiates a search for how to translate zukoo (202), and Peony looks forward, and repeats Jiro’s zukoo tte, which could be a repair on the word itself or on the phrase and action. As she repeats this, Mom provides a candidate translation in line 205 (aato, ‘art’), which Jiro accepts with a repetition and a soo da ne ‘that’s it.’. Peony repeats the word, but maintains her forward gaze (207) until after Jiro again repeats art and she produces a high pitched change of state token, looks at Jiro and provides an assessment in English (good, uhn.), suggesting that she now understands. Peony and Jiro then enter a short loop sequence (Iwasaki, 1997) in lines 211 through 213, during which
Peony again shifts her gaze forward. Then after a 1.1 second pause, Peony provides another assessment as she looks at Jiro, saying *ii n ja nai:* ‘Isn’t that good?’, which Jiro and Dad receipt with minimal affirmative tokens.

Jiro then expands with *dakedo* ‘but’ (line 220), projecting a negative assessment. Both Peony and Mom repeat this while laughing, mutually aligning with the projected assessment. Jiro also laughs and inaudibly produces something that sounds like *the rest*, and all of the members laugh together.

In this segment, we see that after some time of not being verbally engaged, Peony “latches on to”, so to speak, the word *ongaku* ‘music’, and in a way not dissimilar to the persistence through repair sequences discussed in Chapter 4, works through her difficulty in understanding. Unlike the examples in Chapter 4, however, the trouble here was not initially part of a participation framework that she was actively engaged in, and thus by pursuing her own understanding in this environment, she is taking initiative and inserting herself into the conversation. This insertion into the participation framework in this case is ultimately more successful than the example in the previously discussed segment, where her participation did not result in much uptake.

The next extract picks up where the last ended, and further illustrates a similar pattern of Peony’s engagement in the participation structure at this point.

Ex. 5.4d 20140510PJMD Niece & Nephew

```
230 D [ sara *teego wa, *
Sara  English TOP
   “Sara’s English…”
231 J  *zan[nen.*
      regretful
      “too bad.”
232 D  *(dekiru *kamo yo  *)
      can    maybe IP
      “(Maybe she can do it.)”
```
“Too bad?”

[study

“But actually she does well in English right?”

“She hates studying?”

“I think she’s doing fine at English.”

“English is okay.”

“Just a little more.”
189

"Ma- she seems to have a problem with math and language arts."

Math is a problem, isn’t it."

"Math is a problem, isn’t it."

Language arts is a problem."

"Math is a problem."

Even though Hiroki’s like a genius."

At math."
“Hiroki’s math is…”

“He’s good at math.”

“Yeah, he’s strong at it.”

“At math.”

“Even at math, he got good scores.”

“Yeah, it’s too bad.”

“She doesn’t seem to be, right?”

Dad initiates an assessment of Sara’s English in line 230, which Jiro co-completes with zannen ‘too bad’ (also translatable as ‘it’s a shame about her English’, or some other sympathetically negative response), although it seems this was not the direction Dad was going –
his own inaudible completion sounds like dekiru kamo yo ‘maybe she can do it’. Peony repeats Jiro’s zannen with question intonation (line 233), initiating repair, but receives no uptake.

The sequence and participation structure then becomes somewhat chaotic, with Mom laughing and Peony, Jiro and Dad all speaking in overlapping turns. Jiro attempts to confirm that Sara actually does well with English, but no answer is immediately forthcoming (lines 236 and 238). Peony, building upon her previous repair of Jiro’s zannen, asks benkyoo ga kirai? ‘she hates studying?’ (line 239), which also receives no answer. Dad says eego wa dekiru to omou yo? ‘She’s doing fine at English’ (lines 240 - 241), possibly reformulating his previous inaudible turn. Jiro receipts this with an nn:: as Peony produces an open class repair initiator uh::n? (line 244). The whole group lapses into 1.0 second of silence, and Jiro looks to Peony and says eego wa daijoobu ‘English is okay’, treating her repair initiation as being in reference to Dad’s turn. Peony receipts this with a high pitch hnn:: (line 248) as she quickly shifts her gaze to Jiro then forward, as Jiro then hedges his previous turn with (moo) chotto dake ‘just a little (more)’, which Peony responds to with nods and repeated affirmative tokens (line 251).

Dad then mentions two more categories, sansuu ‘math’ and kokugo ‘language arts’ which Sara apparently has difficulty with. Both Mom and Jiro agree with this through repetitions. Peony also repeats sansuu dame ‘math is a problem’ (line 256) then produces an elongated change of state token with gradually rising pitch, suggesting that she has come to an understanding of what has been said. Mom makes a further assessment, joking that Sara’s difficulties with math are bad enough that one would wonder why they are that bad (i.e., they are remarkable), which Jiro and Peony receipt with laughter (lines 258 through 261). Dad then contrasts Sara’s difficulty with Hiroki’s skill (lines 262 and 265), and Peony provides an upshot
formulation of **sansuu ga joozu** ‘he’s good at math’, (line 267) which displays her understanding. Jiro agrees in line 268 and upgrades the assessment to **tokui** ‘strong’.

From this point, however, Peony’s engagement again wanes. Dad makes another comment about Hiroki’s math abilities, and both Jiro and Peony respond with minimal response tokens. Peony then returns to eating during a 3.1 second lapse in the talk, and continues to eat and maintain a forward gaze as Mom initiates another turn about Hiroki. From this point, for approximately the next 2 minutes, Peony does not verbally engage with the ongoing talk beyond a couple of minimal response tokens.

In this segment, Peony has continued to attempt to participate in the conversation, particularly through repair sequences and pursuits of understanding, maintaining her instrumental and cooperative stance as well as continuing to affiliate with the topic despite not always receiving uptake. However, her participation fades out again. The next segment re-enters just prior to Peony’s re-engagement in the talk.

**Ex. 5.4e 20140510PJMD Niece & Nephew**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>J °°°iya demo are°°° +motte umareta nooryoku ga no but that have born mental ability SUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>M [+“aru” ne: exist IP “Yeah, but y’know, there is aptitude that you’re born with.”]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>J °°°aru to +omou are wa.” hhh (0.8) exist QT think that TOP “I think there is something like that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>((sniff)) °°°dekinai ko ikura yattemo dekinai can-NEG child how much do-even can-NEG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"The kids who can't do it not being able to do it no matter how hard they try…"

p smiles
m +face down

"That's..."

"Can't."

khah khah .hhh=

=dekinai ko wa , kawaii-so >mitete kawaii-so can-NEG child TOP pathetic looking pathetic

"The kids who can't do it, it's kind of sad- you look at them and it gets sad, right?"

GZ forward

"Sad."

+zuu:+tto mai:kai , +maikai hoshuu ni all the way every time every time extra-lesson in

[nokosarete. stay-making

"The whole way, everyyyyytime, everytime making them stay after in extra classes."

[((laugh)) [((laugh))

(((laugh))

+GZ>M>forward

+dekinai.
do-even do-even can-NEG

"they try and they try and still can’t."
J ((clears throat))

P +GZ>J

j +nod

393 P +yattemo? +sara:¿ yatte[mo,
do-even Sara do-even
"Try? Sara? Trying..."

j +shakes head

394 J [+uh mo, sara (0.2)
also Sara

j +shakes head slightly

P +GZ>forward

395 sara wa +so:ko made (0.3) +dame j-
Sara TOP that until wrong

396 da[me ja nai [(ne).
wrong COP NEG IP
"Yeah, well, Sara, Sara isn't having that kind of pr- problem."

M +nod

397 M [+nn:\:\:\:\::¿

398 P [+$dame eh he he$
wrong

"Problem."

399 [.hhhh

P +GZ>M>food

400 M [yareba (. ) +de[kiru n da to omo[u kedo ne
do-COND can NOM COP QT think but IP
"I think she can if she tries, but y'know..."

401 J [uhn. [((sniff))

402 (. )

403 J °hnn.°

P +GZ>down

404 M yaruki naru to are nan dakedo, nanka +koõ ,
motivation become when that NOM but something this

M +deep nod

405 shu+cchuuryoku ga dame,
concentration-ability SUB wrong
"When she gets motivated she can, but like, her concentration is a problem."

406 (0.5)

407 J [dame?
wrong
"A problem?"
In the intervening 93 lines of omitted talk, Mom, Dad and Jiro had discussed the degree to which effort affects school performance, both specifically in relation to Sara and Hiroki, and in a more general sense. Throughout, Peony is only minimally engaged, providing only a couple of minimal response tokens and only occasionally looking toward one of the other participants. The current segment begins after a 6.7 second gap after Dad had mentioned that there are some people who do not do well regardless of the amount of effort they put in.

Jiro initiates what at first is formulated as a disagreement, with a quiet *iya demo are* ‘no, but that’, but then produces a turn that aligns with Dad’s prior comment about effort, stating that there is an innate ability some have (lines 370 and 371), which Mom agrees with. As Jiro produces the turn, Peony shifts her gaze to him, but then looks back down as he nears the projected end of the utterance. Jiro then begins to expand by providing the topic phrase *dekinai ko ikura yateemo dekinai (no) wa* ‘the kids who can’t do it not being able to do it no matter how hard they try is…’, which leads to Peony smiling and Mom laughing before Jiro says *are wa* ‘that is…’ (line 379). Dad laughs, and Peony repeats *dekinai* ‘can’t’ quietly, displaying that she has been attentive toward Jiro’s utterance.

Jiro then restarts, rephrasing the topic phrase as *dekinai ko wa* ‘the kids who can’t’ (line 383), begins to say *kawaiisoo* ‘pathetic/sad’, then self-repairs to *mitete kawaiisoo naru yo ne:* ‘you look at them and it gets sad, right?’. Peony, still looking forward, quietly repeats *kawaiisoo*, again displaying attention and affiliation. Jiro then continues to expand, first mentioning keeping such students for extra classes, then upgrades this to *yattemo yatte mo (.) dekinai*. ‘they try and
they try and still can’t’ (line 390). Here, Peony shifts her gaze to Jiro and asks *yattemo? sara?:* *yattemo,* ‘Try? Sara, Trying…’, displaying an interpretation of Jiro’s talk as having been about their niece. Jiro shakes his head and says that Sara is not having quite that level of difficulty (394 – 396). As he produces the predicate *dame j- dame ja nai (ne)* ‘not a pr- not a problem’, Peony shift her gaze forward, but after he finishes, she repeats *dame* and laughs. As Mom enters with a further comment about Sara’s effort, motivation and concentration (lines 400 – 408), Peony shifts her gaze first to Mom, then quickly to her food, and eventually to the neutral forward position shown in prior segments, again disengaging from participation for much of the next four minutes as Mom, Dad and Jiro continue the conversation, and eventually the topic wraps up with some minimal assessments from Peony before they move on to another topic.

Peony’s participation during this segment is primarily limited to displays of attentiveness to Jiro’s argument, although she does initiate reparative action when she displays her interpretation of Jiro’s comments as being about Sara. As such, she is not necessarily acting as a full participant in the conversation during this segment by initiating sequences, but does display affiliation and a cooperative stance through her displays of attention. Furthermore, as her turns occur in positions where they are not normatively expected, they still represent initiative and engagement.

While the larger participation framework of this Mother’s Day conversation includes four participants, a close examination of the whole excerpt (Exs. 5.4a – 5.4e) shows what can be conceptualized as a smaller participation framework within the larger one. When Peony opts to speak, Jiro is most often the recipient, as selected by her gaze direction. Even when her gaze shifts elsewhere, it is often to an undefined middle space, and her utterances are still functionally and sequentially directed at Jiro rather than at the room as a whole. This, of course, is co-
constructed by the other participants as well. The only participant who directly orients to Peony as a recipient throughout this excerpt is Jiro, and responses to Peony’s sequence and repair initiations from Dad are few and from Mom, non-existent.\(^{32}\)

However, the topic and her initiations of engagement with it, illustrate a different point. In contrast to the previous Mother’s Day excerpt, where her participation was limited to topics relevant to personal concerns and decisions, she participates here in sequences about family members, displaying interest in their scholastic experiences and progress, which enacts a much more actively affiliative stance towards the family as a whole. Furthermore, even while her instrumental stance was oriented primarily toward Jiro, her initiative to ask questions about Hiroki and Sara and to work towards maintaining her own understanding of the ongoing talk displays cooperative, affective, epistemic and moral stances that affiliate with Mom and Dad, which illustrates Peony’s *doing being part of the family*.

**Summary and Looking Forward**

The extracts in this chapter have all focused on cases where Peony takes turns in sequential positions where a turn or non-minimal expansion has not been projected or made relevant by previous talk. That is to say, in places where Peony initiates sequences (see especially Ex. 5.1), there is a reasonable alternative between speaking and not speaking and neither option could be treated (sequentially, at least) as accountable or inappropriate. Similarly, in the 3\(^{rd}\) position where a non-minimal post expansion is not projected by the previous action (i.e. troubles telling, a story, or a joke), expanding beyond a minimal sequence closing third (Schegloff, 2007) is also a

\(^{32}\) This is not to say that this is always the case. In both sets of Mother’s Day data, there are times where Dad, in particular, enters into sequences with Peony. However, these tend to start when Mom and Jiro are out of the room, and will continue for some time after they have returned.
non-required option. Following Waring (2011) and Jacknick (2009; 2011), these are cases that I have referred to as initiative throughout the chapter, but that I will later connect to the notion of WTC in Chapter 7.

Initiating engagement, however, is not simply a sequential phenomenon, and any understanding of it must also take into account participation and stance (Goodwin, 2007b). Is the interaction dyadic or multiparty? What activities beyond talking, if any, are the participants engaged in? What is the topic, and do the participants take stances towards the talk? Are there issues of identity and interpersonal relationships such as friendship or family involved? Each of these aspects plays a role in shaping the trajectory of the talk, and therefore afford and constrain the environments for initiatives by particular participants at particular points.

Comparing the dyadic examples (Extracts 5.1 and 5.2) with the multiparty examples (Extracts 5.3 and 5.4), we find the amount and type of Peony’s participation to be quite different. In Extract 5.1, she easily takes the floor as the talk often lapsed into silences between sequences of talk as they ate and watched television, and through her initiations of these sequences she managed the trajectory of the talk. In 5.2, with only two participants and no other locus of attention present, the option to not talk is more constrained and possibly accountable. However, she initiated the sequence in the extract and kept it continuing through non-minimal post expansions and humorous assessments, with the latter examples displaying her work at being a good and attentive friend. In the multiparty examples we find a participation framework within a framework, where Peony’s engagement was often specifically with Jiro while the talk was still embedded in the larger four person structure. We do, however, see some difference even in these cases regarding the topic, where Peony’s engagement was primarily related to issues that could influence future decisions in Extract 5.3, but was much more focused on family members and
doing being a family member in Extract 5.4. Throughout, even with the variety of participation structures in each of the extracts, Peony’s initiatives and engagement is bound up with her relationships to others, both in the sequentially situated sense of her on-going interaction with Jiro, Keiko, and her in-laws, but also in the categorical sense of the category bound rights and obligations of those relationships.

Furthermore, initiating engagement in talk necessarily entails stance taking. By initiating or non-minimally expanding sequences, Peony displays a cooperative stance (Goodwin, 2007b) towards the talk and other participants by opening and maintaining the interaction. At the same time, in the Mother’s Day data (5.3 and 5.4), we find that even when Peony is not verbally involved, she is often attentive to the ongoing talk, which further displays her cooperative stance. Her participation in the extracts discussed in this chapter also often relate to issues of affiliation and alignment (Stivers, 2008), although it is possible that this is not always required (i.e., in an argument where one can choose to engage but not be particularly affiliative).

In Chapter 7, I will return to these issues and attempt to connect them to recent developments in the study of motivation, particularly as regards the importance of the relationships that shape the trajectory of the talk.
Chapter 6: Motivation as Topic

Introduction

In the previous two chapters, the focus has been on Peony’s persistence and willingness to communicate as viewable in her actions and orientations in interaction, illustrating the effort she exerts to deal with interactive trouble or an object of learning, or to do the social work of being a friend, a family member or engaged learner that engaging in interaction does. This chapter takes a different tact, and instead looks at Peony and her co-participants talk about her efforts toward learning Japanese. As such, this chapter may seem the most “traditional” of the analytical work done here, as it shares a focal interest with much of the interview-based literature within the field of motivation (for example, Shoaib & Dörnyei, 2005; Ushioda, 1998). There are two significant differences between the current study and interview research, however: 1) Peony’s talk about her orientation toward the language and the efforts she puts forth arises naturally out of the conversations with her friends and thus is not determined by my research interest or direction, thus framing these topics as truly participant concerns that are first and foremost relevant to them, and 2) in keeping with the constructionist approach to data in CA and DP (Prior, 2016; Roulston, 2010; te Molder & Potter, 2005), the talk is not treated as representative of the participants’ cognitive or affective internal states but is instead examined for how talk about Peony’s attitudes and efforts arise contingently in the talk and are used for interactive purposes.

Before delving into the data, it may be useful to briefly review the specific and inter-related approaches that are used for the analysis in this chapter, Discursive Psychology (DP) and

---

33 Parts of this chapter (Extracts 6.1 and 6.2, as well as parts of the accompanying analysis) also appear in Burch (in press) as an illustration of how Peony’s negative self-assessments and her management of the interactional outcomes of these assessments are an illustration of her interactional competence.
Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA). Furthermore, an ethnographic caveat is also necessary, lest the reader arrive at a conclusion that I do not intend to convey. As will be shown in the extracts, Peony tends to assess her own progress in the language negatively, and at least on a couple of occasions, describes herself as lazy. However, we must also take into account (as illustrated in Chapter 3) that Peony went well beyond the 9 months and 1 hour / month amount of data that I asked of her, something that she did of her own accord and that I am grateful for. Furthermore, the previous two chapters have shown how she worked through difficulties and demonstrated her efforts to engage and keep conversations going. Peony’s negative self-assessments notwithstanding, I believe it is not unfounded to say these are not the behaviors of someone who could be described as unmotivated. Instead, the findings presented here can be understood in the light of the above discussion to illustrate the complexity of her attitudes and efforts towards the Japanese language.

Constructing Motivation

As mentioned above, the analysis in this chapter draws upon Discursive Psychology (Edwards & Potter, 1992; 2005; Kasper, 2009) and Membership Categorization Analysis (Fitzgerald & Housely, 2015; Jayyusi, 1984; Stokoe, 2012), two fields that draw upon Conversation Analysis, and particularly upon Sacks’ (1972a; 1972b; 1992) work on how speakers utilize categories and descriptions as resources for doing interactional work. These were chosen, after an initial analysis of the data used in this chapter, for a number of reasons.

The first is that Peony actually topicalizes her proficiency in the language, her desire to improve and her efforts (or lack thereof) towards that goal a number of times throughout the
corpus, displaying that it is a recurrent concern for her. At the same time, the formulations of these concerns do interactional work, particularly in managing how her co-participants understand her orientations toward them. As Edwards and Potter (2005, p. 242) point out, DP examines discourse for how psychological themes are handled and managed, without necessarily being overtly labelled. We explore how agency, intent, doubt, belief, prejudice, commitment, and so on, are built, made available, or countered ‘indirectly’, through descriptions of actions, events, objects, persons and settings.

As discussed in Chapter 2, DP uses sequential and categorical analysis to explore the psychological themes that Edwards and Potter note, and as will be demonstrated by the data presented in this chapter, Peony’s discussion of her language abilities and what she does or does not do to improve them are amenable to such an analysis. Furthermore, the initial analysis also made it clear that these psychological themes are often spoken of through categories that connect to or contrast with each other, including personal relationships, settings, and the types of activities Peony does or can engage in. As work in DP has often drawn upon categorical analysis (Edwards, 2005; Edwards & Potter, 1993; 1995; Hepburn & Wiggins, 2007; Stokoe & Edwards, 2009), this is also a natural connection to make here as well, especially as invocation of these categories often implicates responsibilities and evaluative stances (Jayyusi, 1984; 1991).

Data

The three examples presented in this chapter come from three different conversations, stretching across almost a year. The similarities between the examples were striking, as Peony negatively evaluates her Japanese ability in each of the conversations and her co-participants
(Yui in Extracts 6.1 and 6.2, Keiko in Extract 6.3) suggest that she speak with her husband in Japanese. However, in each case, her responses to these suggestion and the trajectories they set in motion are very different, as are the interactional conditions that lead to the suggestions.

**NAMAKEMONO NO TSUMA**

This first extract occurs just a couple of minutes into the first conversation between Peony and Yui. Just prior, Peony is describing another couple, where the husband is an L2 speaker of Japanese and the wife is an L1 speaker. When Peony says that said couple speaks Japanese at home, Yui describes the situations as being ‘the opposite’ of Peony’s case, in terms of which spouse is a native speaker of Japanese. We start here with Peony’s response as she sets up a contrast between the situation in her household and what she had described earlier.

**Ex. 6.1 20140412PY Namakemono no Tsuma**

01 P but shujin wa itsumo eego:: e.  
husband TOP always English  
“But my husband always speaks English.”

02 (0.6)

03 P eego [o?  
English OBJ  
“English?”

04 Y [nn nn nn.=  
yeah yeah yeah  
“yeah yeah yeah.”

05 P =+hana:su n: des.  
speak NOM COP  
“He speaks”

06 Y +*hanasu n +da.° ((sniff))  
speak NOM COP  
“He speaks.”
07 P °dakara: °(.) +sonna ni +joo:zu ni
therefore that way well
“so () I haven’t ((become)) that good…”

08 (0.7)

09 Y ↑nn[:]
“hmmm”

10 P +squints
+shakes head, LH to right
[nari, +(0.4) ↑nari↑
become become
“become (0.4), become”

11 Y [naranai?
become-NEG
“You haven’t gotten ((good))?”

12 P +shakes head
+naranai. ↑naranai.
become-NEG become-NEG
“Haven’t gotten, haven’t gotten.”

13 Y +head up and down
+[n::
“hmmm”

14 Y +tilt head left
nihongo de +onegai shi:masu; tte
Japanese in please QT

15 Y +iwanai no.
say-NEG Q
“You don’t ask him to speak in Japanese?”

16 P .hh hh:: [+ee:: (demo) (.) chotto- namakemono no
but litte lazy person LK
In lines 01 – 03, Peony begins by contrasting Jiro (her husband) with the husband in the other couple, saying that Jiro always speaks in English. The extreme case formulation *itsumo* ‘always’ (line 01) sets this statement up as a possible complaint (Edwards, 2000; Pomerantz, 1986), treating the language situation at home as unchanging and problematic, while the formulation also invokes the standardized relational pair (Sacks, 1992; Stokoe, 2012) of husband and wife, and makes visible category predicated features (i.e., norms that are implied by the participants but not explicitly worked up in the interaction; Reynolds & Fitzgerald, 2015, p. 102) that are involved in the relationship between spouses who are L1 speakers of different languages. That is, here (and elsewhere in the data covered in this chapter, as we shall see), the spouse who is the L1 speaker of the language that the other spouse is learning is treated as bearing some degree of responsibility to...
be a resource for language learning, though Peony’s claim that her husband always speaks in English suggests that this expectation is not met in her household.

Peony then begins to formulate what turns out to be both an upshot and a self-assessment, with *dakara sonna ni joozu ni (0.7) nari (0.4) nari* ‘so I haven’t (become) that good’, projecting the polite negative form *narimasen* ‘not become’ but not reaching a completion point. Yui provides a candidate completion (Lerner, 2004) with the plain form version *naranai*, which Peony repeats twice while shaking her head, aligning with Yui’s completion through physically embodying the negative semantics. By formulating this negative self-assessment with *dakara* ‘so/therefore’, Peony explicitly attributes responsibility for her self-ascribed lack of language ability to her husband at this point, and describes what makes the situation a complaint-worthy matter.

In lines 14 – 15, Yui responds by asking *nihongo de onegai shī↑masu↑ tte iwanai no* ‘don’t you ask him to speak in Japanese,’ as she tilts her head to the left in a quizzical fashion. Framed with the final particle *no*, which treats the presupposition behind the question (that Peony does not ask her husband to speak in Japanese) as surprising or counter to expectations (Hayano, 2013, p. 182), the question places some degree of responsibility upon Peony herself for whether Peony’s husband will speak Japanese with her. By doing so, Yui’s negatively formulated question takes a very strong stance (Heritage, 2002) and functions to strongly suggest that Peony indeed *should* make such a request of her husband. However, as Yui says *iwanai* ‘don’t say’, Peony grimaces, projecting that the forthcoming response will be negative.

Peony responds to the question with *(demo) (.) chotto- namakemono no tsu- tsuma des* ‘but, I’m kind of a lazy wife’ as she shakes her head. This self-deprecatory formulation accomplishes at least three things. First, it essentially skips the type-conforming yes or no answer to Yui’s question, but puts an account for it on record by providing a reason for why she does not ask her
husband to speak in Japanese. At the same time, it aligns with the implication behind Yui’s question by accepting responsibility through claiming that she is a namakemono ‘lazy person.’ Lastly, by instantiating the category of wife, which is not grammatically obligatory here, she re-invokes the category used earlier when she blamed her husband for her lack of progress in the language, thus using the standardized relational pair as a resource to walk back her previous explicit attribution of responsibility. It is, in a sense, reparative (though not a repair in the canonical sequential sense) of her previous talk, as it mitigates against the upshot of her previous talk.

In overlap with the end of Peony’s turn, Yui sits back, claps, and laughs (line 19), which while affiliative, neither agrees nor disagrees with Peony’s formulation and treats the self-deprecation as non-serious. Peony then almost immediately provides a much more neutral alternative formulation before the sequential slot for a full response can really open, saying eego ga benri des ‘English is convenient’ in line 20, which sidesteps the earlier question of who is responsible and accounts for why they speak English at home. It also functions to delete the space in which Yui’s agreement or disagreement with Peony’s negative self-assessment would come due. Yui’s elongated aa in line 21 indexes a change of state (Heritage, 1984a), claiming understanding but still non-committal in terms of agreement or disagreement with Peony’s neutral assessment. Peony then repeats that English is convenient, which receives a stronger receipt with Yui’s naruhodo ne ‘I see.’ This response, if taken with the previous change of state token, not only claims understanding, but also treats Peony’s neutral formulation as “just what [Yui] was waiting for” (Morita, 2005, p. 146), and therefore accepts the formulation as reasonable and appropriate.

Thus, in this extract, we see Peony formulating a problem with her language skills, and a negative self-assessment regarding the effort she is willing to put forth to improve. On the surface, this can be interpreted as a claim of lack of motivation. However, digging into how this doing
being unmotivated arises in the interaction and is used for interactional purposes illustrates that her self-categorization as a namakemono no tsuma is not merely an externalization of a psychological state. By assessing herself as lazy, she mitigates the previous blame attribution and aligns with the implication of Yui’s question by taking responsibility for her lack of action. Furthermore, by then claiming that English is convenient, Peony does further work by providing a neutral formulation and deleting the interactional space in which Yui would be expected to respond to her self-assessment as lazy, essentially taking it and her prior blame attribution off the record.

**PODCAST**

Extract 6.2 is taken from the next conversation Peony had with Yui two months later, and also arises very early in the conversation. Prior to this segment, they are talking about Peony’s recent activities, which involve Peony studying Japanese by listening to language related podcasts that explain grammar points and expressions. We pick up where Peony begins to provide examples of expressions she had learned from that day’s podcast.

Ex. 6.2a 20140601PY Podcast

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Teaching. (0.3) Japanese (0.7) today…"

"The lesson, what was that, will ((hazu)) (0.5) it will such and such.”
In line 01, Peony launches into talking about the topic of the lesson she had listened to earlier in the day, but then does a solitary word search (Goodwin, 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hayashi, 2003), as evidenced by her lowered volume and gaze direction, regarding what the topic was. She does a visible display of remembering by bringing her gaze to Yui and her hands
together in a quiet clap at line 4, as she says **hatsu**, a mispronunciation of ‘hazu’ (which is an evidential marker for expectation, roughly translatable as “supposed to”). She then provides it within the grammar display format **nani nani** (‘blank blank’ or ‘something something’, a common format for discussing grammar points in Japanese language classrooms). However, Yui only provides a continuer, and after a 1.6 second gap of silence, indicative of a further word search, Peony attempts an example with **ashita wa: (0.5) ame: ga (.) furu hatsu** ‘It will rain tomorrow,’ continuing to mispronounce the target form. As she finishes the example, she breaks into laughter (line 08) then leans forward with her face down toward the table, suggesting that she finds something problematic about her example. After some mutually affiliative laughter (Glenn, 2003; Jefferson, 1974), Peony closes the example and laughter by sitting up, looking at Yui, and saying **to yuu koto** ‘as an example.’ Yui displays her recognition by smiling and swiping her left hand index finger up and down in rhythm with **naruhodo** ‘I see’ (line 13), and then provides her own example, **aa ee:to: ashita wa:: (.) nn::: (0.8) raibu ga aru hazu** ‘oh, uhm, tomorrow, there will be a concert,’ which she marks with a head tilt and **toka** ‘et cetera,’ treating it as a candidate understanding and leaving other possibilities open. In line 17, Peony receipts this with repeated change-of-state tokens (Heritage, 1984a), and closes with an accepting **hai** ‘yes.’

From this point, during the 36 lines of talk omitted, Peony provides three more evidential markers: **ka mo shirenai** ‘maybe’, and **deshoo** and **daroo**, which are forms of the copula (polite and plain) which, in the examples Peony provides, index probability. While she produces **ka mo shirenai** and **deshoo** without difficulties, she again faces pronunciation problems with **daroo**, which leads to a similar exemplification sequence as with **hazu**. The exemplification of these learning objects displays persistence through working through her difficulties (cf. Chapter 4) and
initiative by volunteering multiple examples that go beyond what is necessary in the current activity (cf. Chapter 5). Further, and much like the data in the previous two chapters, the exemplification does identity work as it provides a vehicle for Peony to display being a diligent language learner.

Extract 6.2b re-enters the talk after the exemplification sequence has concluded, and Peony launches into a negative self-assessment.

Ex. 6.2b 20140601PY Podcast

55  P °yeah but−° (.) .hh senshuu− (.) senshuu:: no

      last week  last week LK

56  shuuma#tsu::#
          weekend
“yeah but (.) last week (.) last weekend”

57  Y n[nn

58  P [ka(h)r(h)a(h)a[ (h)a
          from
“since (last weekend)”

59  Y [nn.

      p  BH>ears

60  (0.8)

61  y +BHIF PNT>ears

62  Y [+]>kikinagara<]
          listen-while
“while you listen”

63  P [ki-       ] kiku #n::#: (.)[°nn°
          listen NOM
“listening”

64  Y [°nn::°

      p  +RH 'so so’ +smile

65  P de +sonna ni joozu ja +na(h)i(h)i [.hh
          and that way good NEG
“so, I’m not that good”

66  Y +RH wave

      [°moo +daijoobu da
          already fine COP
This segment begins with Peony initiating a new sequence with *yeah but* (. ) *hh senshuu-* (. ) *senshuu no shuumatsu:: kara* ‘since last week- last weekend’ (lines 56 – 59), but she stops and moves her hands to her ears, projecting a completion related to listening. Yui also moves both of her hands to her ears as she provides a candidate completion with *kikinagara* ‘while you listen,’ picking up on Peony’s trajectory. At the same time, Peony attempts to provide a predicate but
experiences some difficulty as she says kiku ‘listen’ then in a creaky voice stretches out n::: (which, at least as it starts, seems to function as the nominalizer, but then comes to signal trouble).

Peony then provides a negative self-assessment about her lack of improvement in Japanese, formulated in a very similar fashion to the case two months earlier: sonna ni joozu ja nai ‘I’m not that good’ while producing a ‘so so’ gesture which reinforces the negative evaluation. However, unlike the previous case, which was a general assessment not orienting to a specific assessable, this formulation seems to be both specific and general. Regarding specific assessables, it can be seen as an account for both her current difficulties and the errors that she made in providing the examples of hazu and daroo earlier. As a general negative self-assessment, given the number of examples she has just provided and her display of doing being a diligent language learner, it also mitigates against an interpretation of her actions as having been a form of self-praise (Pomerantz, 1978).

However, as self-deprecation tends to lead to preferred disagreements (Pomerantz, 1984) that praise the speaker, they can also be treated as fishing for compliments (Golato, 2005). Indeed, this is how Yui responds to Peony’s formulation, by saying moo daijoobu da to omou ‘I think you already do okay,’ while waving her hands, as if she is waving off the negative self-assessment. In overlap (line 68), Peony reformulates that she has not improved (seemingly in a somewhat non-standard form as joozuku), while laughing, which Yui repeats through laughter as well, treating the negative self-assessment as non-serious (not unlike her response in Extract 6.1 to the assessment as a ‘lazy wife’). After the laughter, in line 72, Yui provides another, upgraded compliment which further disagrees with the self-deprecatory formulation – joozu da to omoimas kedo ‘I think you’re good though’.
Such compliments risk raising an interactional dilemma. While agreement with an assertion is preferred, self-praise is generally avoided (Golato, 2005; Pomerantz, 1984). A common strategy is to deflect or return the compliment (Golato, 2005; Shimizu, 2009). Here, Peony refuses the compliment by first waving her hands in front of her (line 74), and then by saying *tomodachi* ‘friend’ while smiling and holding her hands together near her face (see screen capture, line 76). By this, she is seemingly saying that ‘you are complimenting me because you are my friend,’ orienting to category bound predicates and obligations (Stokoe, 2012; Watson, 1978) inherent in the standard relational pair *friends*. This refusal also mitigates against an interpretation of Peony’s self-deprecatory formulation as fishing for a compliment. However, the implied assertion here also runs the risk of challenging the sincerity of Yui’s compliment. Yui responds unclearly but with rising intonation and raised eyebrows, which can function as a repair initiator (Hosoda, 2006) and as a display of surprise (Peräkylä & Ruusuvuori, 2006); because of the inaudibility of her response, the action is also unclear, but speculatively it could range from being a simple repair initiation all the way to treating Peony’s account as problematic (i.e., as questioning the sincerity of her compliment). Speculation aside, Peony responds to Yui’s inaudible turn by putting her face in her hands, doing ‘being embarrassed’ (line 78).

It is here that Yui then orients to Peony’s negative self-assessment in a similar way to the way she did in Extract 6.1, with a reference to Peony being able to practice her Japanese with her husband. However, as we see in Extract 6.2c, the trajectory unfolds in a very different fashion.

Extract 6.2c: 20140601PY

78 Y go[shujin to nihongo de hanaseba ii °jan°. husband with Japanese in speak-if good IP “You should speak Japanese with your husband.”

79 P °nn°

80 (0.6)
But that’s impossible.

“It’s impossible. We’re always in English.”

“uh, in English, I don’t know uh, when we also watch TV?”

“We talk about stuff I don’t understand.”

“mm you ask.”

“I ask questions.”

mm you ask.
In line 78, Yui provides another suggestion about Peony speaking Japanese with her husband. Similarly to the case two months prior, this suggestion is touched off by the negative self-assessment and carries the implication that Peony has at least some responsibility for the state of affairs. Unlike the case two months prior, however, this is produced as a strong suggestion with no smile:  

**goshujin to nihongo de hanaseba ii jan** ‘You should speak to your husband in Japanese’ (line 78). Furthermore, as this is the first time in this conversation that Peony’s husband has been mentioned, this suggestion seems to be based upon a prior understanding of Peony and her husband speaking English at home (quite likely the discussion
that occurred in Extract 6.1), and thus coming from a position of greater epistemic access than her previous question/suggestion. The stern tone of the suggestion also seems to be in response to Peony’s prior attribution of the reason for Yui’s compliment as having to do with friendship.

While Peony’s grimace (line 81) as an embodied response to the suggestion is not unlike Extract 6.1 in projecting a dispreferred response, her answer takes a different, and less self-deprecatory tact. Here, rather, she asserts that it would be *muri* ‘impossible,’ which Yui receipts with laughter. Peony repeats this formulation in line 83, and proceeds to provide an account, which claims that she and her husband use English to clear up cases of misunderstanding that arise when they watch television; the implication being that it is not that there is no Japanese in the home, it is that English is a resource for dealing with Japanese that she does not understand. This account reinforces Peony’s negative assessment of her Japanese ability and the invocation of her identity as an L2 speaker, though it is interesting to note that she elaborates upon her activity rather than again describing herself as *namakemono* ‘lazy’, here treating it not as a matter of her lack of effort or of convenience, but of necessity in going about her mundane activities.

Yui responds by asking about whether Peony’s husband answers these questions. Peony nods and provides repeated affirmative tokens (lines 101 and 102), and Yui receipts this with an elongated and gradually rising *nn::?*. After another pause, Peony then grimaces again and repeats *muri* ‘impossible’, and adds *nihongo de* ‘in Japanese’, formulating a summary of her response to Yui’s suggestion. After this point, Yui provides another, much more humorous suggestion of going to a *gookon* (similar to a blind date, but with multiple participants) in order to meet people with whom to practice Japanese, thus providing an alternative (and not
particularly serious) suggestion and closing down the talk about Peony speaking with her husband.  

In this extract, we again see a formulation of Peony’s lack of improvement, this time possibly for the sake of managing interpretations of her actions as bragging – indeed, the listing of grammar points she has learned can be seen as a display of “doing being a diligent/motivated learner”. However, as it touched off compliments in response, it leads to a dilemma where Peony needed to manage the possible inference of her having been fishing for compliments. This leads to the another negative self-assessment, her attribution of Yui only making the compliments because she is Peony’s friend, which, in turn, touches off Yui’s strong suggestion, reminiscent of 6.1, about speaking Japanese with Jiro. Peony’s response in this case, however, is different. Where she responded in the previous conversation with a negative assessment of herself as a lazy wife, here she provides more concrete detail about why speaking Japanese with her husband is muri ‘impossible,’ and provides an account of the mundane details of watching television and using English to clarify difficulty understanding as a reason for this “impossibility.”

KYOOMI

In the following excerpt, from a conversation between Peony and Keiko, both participants topicalize their own concerns about improving their respective L2s. Much as in the previous examples with Yui, we see some familiar categories and activities; self-categorizations about

34 The topic of the gookon seems to be an inside joke between Peony and Yui, as it arises in all of the conversations between them. The suggestion is always made humorously, playing off the fact that it would be unlikely and untoward for a married person to engage in such an activity but that it would be a good way to practice the language. On another occasion, Yui even suggests that Peony take her husband along to the gookon as part of a game.
being lazy, suggestions for Peony to speak with her husband in Japanese, and the podcast that Peony listens to are all topics. However, this extract is much more extensive than the previous two, and the orientations and categories are explored more deeply by the participants.

It is important to frame this extract with a discussion of an activity that occurred earlier in the conversation, concerning the word *modokashii*, which Keiko translated as the feeling one gets when they feel that they are on the cusp of being able to do something but then cannot, and is glossed throughout as “frustrating/frustrated”. For approximately 17 minutes, Peony asks many questions about the word, and provides candidate understandings and candidate examples. This is doubly relevant for the following extract in that 1) Peony uses the word a number of times, practicing it and displaying herself to be an active and attentive language learner, and 2) she eventually references the activity of asking questions about a learning object as integral to how she learns and uses Japanese.

Ex. 6.3a 20140207PK Kyoomi

```
001 K sugoi kedo, watashi mo +hayaku soo fun
    great but I also quickly that way

002 +naritai.
    become-want
    “That’s great, but I want to get that way quickly.”

003 +nn:::. hayaku ne.
    quickly IP
    “Yeah. Quickly, right?”

005 °nn::\:. [::.
```

219
You want to get good.

You want to get good.
“AAAGHHH, yes. It’s frustrating.”

“That’s right, that’s right.”

“Frustrating”

“I also Japanese.”

“Me too. Japanese is like that.”

“Really?”

“Yeah.”

“Even though it feels like you can speak …”
In line 001, Keiko provides the upshot of a story she has just told about a friend who is successful at English, saying that she wants to quickly be able to speak like them, which Peony aligns with through reformulation (lines 003 and 008). Keiko accepts this in line 009, then continues on with her post-story assessment, talking about her own feelings, in particular the feeling of not being able to do something when you thought you could (lines 012 – 013). As she does this, she points at the paper, possibly pointing at the word *modokashii*, which had been written earlier. Peony provides an assessment with *AAAGHHHH* (line 015), and then says *modokashii* (line 018, 020), displaying an understanding of the connection between Keiko’s formulation and the prior topic.

At line 022, Peony begins to explain that she feels the same way about Japanese, which Keiko registers with *hontoo*; ‘really?’ (line 025). Keiko then starts to reformulate the feeling as *shaberesoo na kanji na noni* ‘even though it feels like you can speak’ (line 027) while creating a grapollo (Kendon, 2004) hand gesture near her mouth and then opening her hand outward (see screen captures), embodying in a mimetic (Streeck, 2009, p. 144) or iconic (McNeill, 2005, p. 24) fashion an attempt to say something, and the frustration of not being able to do so. Peony provides an affirmative token, then co-completes Keiko’s utterance with *dekinai* ‘can’t’ (line 028), which she repeats in line 030.
This segment illustrates how the topic of Peony’s Japanese arises, through assessments of the story Keiko had just told, and through mutual affiliation. It also initiates the connection between the talk about language ability and negative affect, through the formulation of the experience as modokashii. The following segment picks up immediately where the last left off, with a question about the degree of Peony’s interest in Japan and the Japanese language.

Ex. 6.3b 20140207PK Kyoomi

031 K peony wa sa, ni hon:: (0.5) ni +kyoomi wa aru °no°¿
  Peony TOP IP Japan to interest TOP exist Q
  “So, are you interested in Japan?”

032 p GZ>forward (0.9)

033 P nn:::h?

034 K +nihon:go ni taishite kyoomi ga aru¿
  Japanese to regarding interest SUB exist
  “Do you have an interest in Japanese?”

035 p +nod

036 P ch- +aru.
  exist
  “Yes.”

037 K aru n da.=
  exist NOM COP
  “You do.”

038 P =nn:: nn [nn.

039 K [nanka +aru hito- (0.2) aru n- +(.)
  like exist person exist
“Like, there’s this one person, that… a person who is learning a second language, right?”

“That… that person befor-… she was learn- studying Japanese, but like, when she was interested, she lost interest and, like…”

“It seems she kinda distanced herself from Japanese.”
+slight nodding

GZ>forward up

+shifting posture

+GZ>down  +GZ>K

da yappa- (0.2) kitto tte +kyoomi ga nai +to:: (0.2)

COP of cour- surely QT interest SUB NEG if

“So of cour- definitely, if you're not interested, like…”

“You can’t keep going, y’know.”

“Yes, yes.”

“So”

“I was able to keep going.”

So that so like that IP
"Right. So, like y'know, of course, I think the way we learn and stuff can be different..."

“So, yeah, I wondered if you have any interest in Japanese or what.”
“I’m interested (0.5) but…”

“Not that much?”

“I don’t have time.”

“Hmm. (1.2) Yeah. I’m lazy, y’know.”

“You’re like, well that’s enough.”
This segment starts with Keiko explicitly asking whether Peony is interested in Japan (line 031), but then self-repairs in line 034 to being more specific about an interest in the Japanese language. Peony responds minimally with an affirmative aru ‘exist’ and a nod (line 035), and Keiko responds with the news receipt aru n da. Keiko then launches into a longer turn, telling a story about a person she knows who studied Japanese but lost interest (039 – 046), which leads to the upshot formulation kyoomi ga nai to:: (0.2) #nanka# tsuzukerarenai jan. ‘If you aren’t interested, like, you can’t keep going, y’know.’ (lines 049 – 052), relating back to the question she asked at the beginning of the segment. Peony receipts this with hai hai (line 053), and as Keiko begins her next turn with dakara ‘so’ (line 054), Peony shakes her head and says tsutsuke-(.)rareta ‘I was able to keep going’ (line 055), categorizing herself as not like the person in Keiko’s story, and displaying that she understands the upshot of Keiko’s story. By doing so, she not only claims to be able to persevere, but also reinforces that she is indeed interested in the language by negating the categorical tie that Keiko has invoked between interest and persistence.

However, Keiko treats Peony’s claim of being able to continue as already understood (056 - 058) with a nod and noting that different people learn in different ways (perhaps mitigating against the dispreferred nature of the implication of her story). She then formulates an explicit account for why she asked the question, claiming that she had wondered whether Peony was interested in Japanese. Peony nods and provides affirmative tokens (064), then produces an elongated ne::, suggesting that she is about to launch into a longer turn. After a 1.2 second pause in line 065 (suggesting that she is conducting a formulation search), Peony sets up a contrast by
saying *kyoomi ga aru.* (0.5) *demo,* ‘I’m interested, (0.5) but…’ (lines 066 – 067). Keiko provides a candidate completion with *soko made,* displaying an expectation that Peony was going to hedge the degree to which she is interested in the language. With a nod, Peony seems to agree (line 069), but her elongated non-lexical sounds suggest another word search and more to come. Peony then repeats *kyoomi* (line 072) then tilts her head to the left, suggesting even more strongly a formulation search before claiming *jikan ga n (0.3) nai* ‘I don’t have time’ as she laughs in line 075. After a short pause, she nods and says *uh:::n* (line 077), then after another pause, she says *yeah,* demonstrating that her formulation of the problem is complete. However, she then claims that she is *namakemono* ‘lazy’, which she formulates with *ne,* seeking agreement from Keiko and treating the negative evaluation as evident in relation to her claim that she doesn’t have time. Keiko, in overlap, provides a less severe formulation with *ma ii kana tte* ‘you’re like, well that’s enough’, in line 078. Peony nods in response, but repeats her assessment of herself as *namakemono,* and closes with another *yeah.*

While the segment begins with Keiko’s formulation of it being interest that matters when trying to improve one’s language abilities, Peony counters first with it being a matter of opportunity (i.e., having the time), and then offering through her self-assessment as “lazy” that it is a matter of effort. By doing so, she creates a contrast between *kyoomi* ‘interest’ and *jikan* ‘time’ that, though it gets modulated through further talk, remains operative through the rest of the discussion of her efforts toward the language. The next segment illustrates how Peony modifies and unpacks this contrast.
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k
081 K [tte+yuu koto wa sa, nihon de mo QT say thing TOP IP Japan in also

229
“You mean, in Japan, English isn’t that, aghh (0.4) what’s that, even without using Japanese, you can liv- it’s easy to get by?”

“Youah. Aah, us- (0.3) us- us Japanese, can use?”

“I don’t have the situation”

“You don’t have occasion to use it?”

“Yeah.”
p +GZ>slightly forward
p +shakes head
p +GZ>K
096 P nn::. (0.6) chansu ga + (0.9) mm + nai.
chance SUB NEG
“Yeah (0.6) I don’t have (0.9) hmm the chance.”

097 (0.6)

098 K nn[::.

p +GZ>forward down
p +LH PRD>out
p +GZ>K +LH arch left
099 P [+shigoto +de: +zenbu eego.
work at all English
“At work, it’s all English.”

100 (0.4)

101 K soo [da yo.
that COP IP
“That’s right.”

102 P [nn.

103 K [hontoo soo da ne,] really that COP IP
“That’s really it, isn’t it.”

104 P [ +ie de, ] +eego.
home at English
“At home, English.”

105 K tashika ni.=
definitely
“Definitely.”
p  +nod +LH>down

106  P  =+uhn.+

107  (0.6)

p  +nod +GZ forward, head tilt left
p  +BH SPU waving in-----  +BH down

108  P  jaa +ima- (. ) ima nihongo (. ) [+demo,
well now now Japanese but
“Well, now- now it’s Japanese, but…”

109  K  [soo ne:.
right IP

“True.”

p  GZ forward, shakes head
(1.0)

p  +GZ>K

111  P  +<sonna ni::>=
that much
“That much…”

112  K  =;ne- ah[:;
*
“( ) aaaaah”

113  P  [tsukawanai.
use-NEG
“...I don’t use it.”

114  (0.4)

k  +sit up +GZ>up right

115  K  +e demo, +doo >na no<, tatoeba saa::, >sore< demo::, (0.6)
but how COP NOM example IP that but

k  +GZ>P

116  jibun:: +(0.2) ga >yappa sa< +kyoomi ga attara sa,
self SUB of course IP interest SUB exist-if I
jibun de yaru ja(n).
self by do IP

“But, how can I say this, for example, right? Even with that being the case (0.6)
if you’re interested, y’know, you’d do it by yourself, wouldn’t you?”

p

nod

(0.3)

p

nooding

119 P

nn nn nn. jibun de yaru. (.) dya_. (0.3)
self by do *

“Yeah yeah yeah. Do it by myself.”

p

+BH>ears

120 +pod[ k e s u t o ]

podcast

“Podcast.”

121 K

[>are demo yap-<]

that but of co-

“Even with that, of co-”

p

BH>down

(0.3)

k

+GZ>up

123 K

+>demo are yappa sore demo< yappa ;sono: (0.8)

but that of course that but of course that

k

+GZ>P

+slight nodding

124 ee::, +nihongo kankyoo wa +daiji tte koto; (0.3)

Japanese environment TOP important QT thing

125 "nan [tsuttara ii no."

COP-NOM say-if good NOM

“But you know, that, you know, hmm do you mean a Japanese environment is
important? What should I say.”

p

+nod

126 P

[+nn.

k

GZ>down

127 (0.8)
k +GZ>P-------------+forward->P
k +RH out>return>out+RH down

128 K +tsukaeru ba ga: +(0.8) +nai to dame °tte koto¿°
use-can opportunity SUB NEG if wrong QT thing
“You mean, you have to have ((LIT: it’s bad if you don’t have))
the opportunity to use it?”

129 (0.7)

p +head slightly up

130 P +°↑nn↓::.° dame?
wrong
“hmmm… it’s bad?”

131 (0.5)

k +head dip

132 K dame na +no?
wrong COP NOM
“Is it bad?”

p GZ>slightly forward

133 (1.1)

p +GZ>K

134 P +daijoobu.
okay
“It’s okay.”

135 (1.3)

136 K °°hn??°

137 (0.5)

138 P tsukaenai?
use-can=NEG
“Can’t use?”

k +GZ>up +GZ>P +RH out & drop

139 K +nn. sono ni:hongo tsuka+u (. ) +chansu¿ ga
that Japanese use chance SUB

k +head dip

140 [nai +to::=
NEG if
“Yeah. If you don’t have that chance to use Japanese…”

234
You will not learn Japanese?

I will not learn.

Seriously?

Mmm. I don’t... don’t learn.

Huh.
Starting at line 081, Keiko asks if what Peony meant by her previous formulation is that she can easily get by without speaking Japanese in Japan. This essentially provides Peony an alternative formulation of being *namakemono* ‘lazy’, one that is not as negative, and Peony initially responds affirmatively through nodding (lines 084 – 086). However, she then starts to change tact and instead says *nihongo:: dzu::: (0.3) <dzukaeru>… baai ga: (0.4) nai* ‘I don’t have a situation to use Japanese.’ (lines 086 – 090), which Keiko repairs in line 092 to *tsukaeru ba ga nai?* ‘You don’t have the occasion to use?’”. Peony briefly switches into English to say *ooh the chance*, and then self-repairs with *chansu ga (0.9) mm nai.* ‘I don’t have the chance.’ Through these formulations and reformulations, Peony and Keiko have now drawn categorical connections between time, situation, occasion and chance, all of which are glossable as *opportunity*, situational factors that are out of Peony’s control.

Peony then begins to unpack what she meant by having no chance, first by claiming that English is spoken at work (099) and at home (104), the two places where she is likely to spend most of her time, and that could be expected to afford her with opportunities to speak. In line 108, Peony concedes that while she is speaking Japanese at that point (i.e., in that immediate conversation), she generally does not use Japanese ‘that much’ (line 111 and 113). These
formulations step back from the responsibility implied by her calling herself namakemono and further frame the circumstances as out of her control.

However, Keiko then launches into a disaffiliative turn, marked by multiple delay tactics (line 115) before saying kyoomi ga attara sa, jibun de yaru ja(n) ‘If you’re interested, you’ll do it yourself, wouldn’t you?’, challenging how Peony has framed the issue and re-introducing the topic of responsibility. Peony responds first with affirmative tokens and nodding, and then by saying that she does (line 119) and refers to the podcasts discussed previously in Ex. 6.2 as being a tool for Japanese study. Keiko begins another disaffiliative turn (line 123), but then reformulates with nihongo kankyoo wa daiji tte koto¿ ‘Do you mean a Japanese environment is important?’, and then rephrases this as tsukaeru ba ga: (0.8) nai to dame tte koto¿ ‘You mean have to have the opportunity to use it?’ (line 128). Peony has some difficulty with this and repeats dame ‘bad’ in a question intonation, which Keiko responds to with dame na no? ‘Is it bad’ (i.e. ‘do you have to have the chance to use the language’) in line 132. Peony responds, unexpectedly, with daijoobu ‘okay’, which Keiko initiates repair on in 136. Peony then repeats tsukaenai? ‘Can’t use’.

All of this difficulty in understanding each other leads Keiko to reformulate the question by recycling words Peony had used earlier: nihongo tsukau chansu¿ ga nai to… ‘if you don’t have a chance to use Japanese’ (lines 139 – 140), and then to explicitly ask nihongo oboe- (.)masen ka? ‘You will not learn Japanese?’ (line 143), providing a candidate understanding of the upshot of Peony’s claim that she doesn’t have a chance to use the language. Peony responds with a repetitional oboemasen ‘I will not learn,’ confirming this upshot. When Keiko then asks maji¿ ‘seriously?’, challenging the premise that has now been settled through the reformulations. Peony again repeats oboemasen while shaking her head, further upgrading and reinforcing her
stance that she cannot learn the language without the opportunity to use it. Peony then reformulates the premise in a more positive manner by attempting to say that she learns by using the language (lines 155 - 156), further reinforcing the importance of having the opportunity to do so. By invoking and reinforcing the categorial ties between having no chance and not improving on the one hand and using the language and learning it on the other, Peony reinforces the previous implication that given the opportunity she would make the effort (or put another way, her effort is influenced by circumstances that are not under her control).

Thus, in this segment, Keiko challenges Peony’s claims that she does not have the chance to speak Japanese, essentially upgrading the implications made available in her original question about whether Peony is interested in Japanese. At the same time, Peony creates and reinforces a categorical link between learning the language and having the chance to use it. Furthermore, Peony and Keiko negotiate the degree of responsibility Peony has for creating these opportunities. The following segment continues with Keiko providing another challenge to Peony’s stance.
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k +GZ>P>forward
161 K soo °°°ka°°° ne,=+ikura:, °sono° jibun de that Q IP how much that self by

k {+RH mime ‘writing’
{---------

k +GZ>P
162 +renshuu +ja dame na °↓no° ka↓↓na. practice COP wrong COP NOM wonder
“I wonder. I guess no matter how much you practice by yourself, there’s still a problem.”

163 (1.4)

p +slight nod
p +lower lip slightly out
164 P +nn::::

165 (1.8)
There's a problem. Yeah.

"There's a problem. Yeah."

By practicing by yourself, uhm, being able to use it is different."

By practicing by yourself, uhm, being able to use it is different."
+LH wave near head +LH drop
+slight nod

+oboe- (0.4) "ru." + (0.7) "nn[::.

remem-ber

"Uhm, use... use... uh, using uh::
when I use it, I remem-ber. Yeah."

[mhm::[::::

[+like

+[like +sono:: uh, +dango wa +do- (0.3) doo tsukai+mas ka?:

ho- how use-POL Q

"Uh ho- how do you use it?"

+like +sono:: uh, +dango wa +doo chigau,
that *vocabulary TOP how different

"Like, how are those, uh, words different,"

(0.3)

+k +nod

+n[::.

+[doo tsukaemas ka? (. ) de
+oboemas.

how use-can-POL Q by remember-POL

"How can I use it? I learn it that way."

+k +nod

+nn[::

[+nn.

+LH>down

(0.5)
241

but use-NEG *all? *all?

But not using, ( ) I forgot that, ( ) (1.1) I forgot that word.”

“Really…”

English is the same.”
Assessing Peony’s previous comment about having to use the language to learn it, Keiko says soo°°°ka°°°ne, epistemically challenging Peony’s categorical link between learning and use (line 161). She then says ikura:, °sono° jibun de renshuu ja dame na °↓no° ka↓↓na. ‘I guess (or wonder if) no matter how much you practice, there’s still a problem (i.e., you won’t learn).’, while miming writing as she says renshuu, creating a categorical link between practice and writing. While this statement is formulated as epistemically hedged (kana, ‘I wonder’), the sharp intonation drop displays an intensified affective stance, making it sound like a challenge as well. After a 1.4 second pause, Peony provides a slight nod and an elongated nn::::: (line 164), seemingly less a response than a method for holding the floor for a moment. After another pause, Peony repeats da↑me:: ‘wrong/bad’, followed by a level intonated nn::, which coupled with the head tilt in line 168 suggests ongoing difficulty with Keiko’s utterance.

Peony then begins to respond by creating a contrast between renshuu ‘practice’ and tsukaeru koto ‘being able to use’, claiming that they are different and embodying this difference with hand gestures (lines 169 and 170, see screen captures). She then reiterates that she learns the language when she uses it (line 174 – 176). She conducts multiple restarts leading to the phrase tsukau toki ‘when I use’, each time making a downstroke with her left hand, emphasizing the word ‘use’, perhaps reinforcing the contrast with renshuu.

Peony then starts to list off questions that she asks when using the language, including doo tsukaimasu ka? ‘how do you use it?’ (line 179), sono:: uh, dango wa doo chigau ‘how is it different from that vocabulary?’ (line 181) and doo tsukaemasu ka¿ ‘how can I use it?’ (line 184)35, then finishes the turn with de oboemas, retrospectively framing the questions as the way

---

35 It seems likely, with Peony using different forms of the verb tsukaimas and tsukaemas, that she is making a distinction between them, thus creating a three part list (Jefferson, 1990; Lerner, 1994), though it is unclear what the specific distinction may be.
she works on the language. The implication here, through the contrast she has already constructed, is that practicing on her own does not afford her the possibility to ask such questions that she deems necessary for the goal of learning the language, but that using the language with another speaker does.\(^{36}\)

Then, starting from line 188, Peony begins to formulate the flipside, that when she doesn’t use the language, she completely forgets vocabulary. She describes this through some difficulty and non-target like grammar (i.e. the past tense on wasurechatta ‘I forgot completely’), and it is unclear whether Keiko understands, as her responses (lines 191, 193 and 196) are minimal. However, the categorizations are clear: use involves being able to ask questions and leads to learning, practice does not afford the chance to ask such questions, and not using, which through the contrast between use and practice that Peony has developed comes to be equated with practice, leads to forgetting.

The contrast between renshuu and tsukau koto in this segment then can be seen to relate to Peony’s previous comments about not having opportunities to use Japanese at work or at home – if English is all that is spoken in those contexts, then she does not use the language and she forgets (or at the very least does not improve). During the 31 lines that follow (omitted), Keiko notes that she has found the same thing for her English. We reenter the conversation as Peony abruptly shifts topic to concerns she has about speaking with her in-laws, adding a third social setting that could potentially afford her an opportunity to use the language.
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232 P to jirochan no ryooshin to
*and Jiro-DIM LK parents with
“*And with Jiro’s parents*”

\(^{36}\) As mentioned at the beginning of this section, Peony had done exactly this earlier in the conversation as she asked many questions about the word modokashii, which we see her using throughout the extract.
233 K  ええっ？
yeah
“Yeah.”

  +GZ>down
  +BH>scratch head

234 P  [+uh:::

  scratching head
  (1.4)

  +GZ>K
  +BH up, shake  +BH down
  +GZ>tea

235 P  +ishho ni:: hana-  +0.2) hanas
together  ta-  tal-
“Ta- tal- with them”

236 P  +ishho ni:: hana-  +0.2) hanas
together  ta-  tal-
“Ta- tal- with them”

237 K  hanasu?
talk
“Talk?”

  +nod  +GZ>down
  +GZ>P

238 P  +hana+su+?
talk
“Talk?”

239 K  nn::.
drink

240 (0.8)

  +RH shake  +BH up  +BH>chest
  +GZ>K

241 P  +dokidoki:m +modokashii. +kono kanji. (0.4)
  *sometimes frustrating this feeling

  +BH drop +BH>chest +BH circle out, drop
  +grimace  +GZ>K

242 +nn:::  [+jaa motto+
  well more

“It's frustrating sometimes. This feeling.
Yeah. Well, more…”
243 K  [hanashiteru toki:]  
talking  
time
“When you’re talking with them?”

k  nod
244  (0.5)

245 P  motto hanashita[i:].  
more  talk-want
“I want to talk more.”

246 K  [wakaru.]  
understand
“I understand.”

p  +nod
247 P  +uh:::  [motto hanashitai.  
more  talk-want
“Uh. I want to talk more.”

k  +GZ>down  +GZ>forward
248 K  [ee +soo- eego de choo atta +mon na.=  
so  English in very exist NOM IP
“Yeah, I had a lot of that in English.”

249 P  =uhn.
“Yeah.”

k  drinking
250  (2.3)

p  GZ forward
251 P  demo s- (0.4) °°nn:.°° (0.6)
but

k  +GZ>P  +GZ>K
252  +°dekinai° + (0.9) °kanji.°
  can-NEG  feeling
“But s- hmm... I feel like... I can’t.”

253  (0.4)

254 K  nn[:::

p  +nod
255 P  [+°nn:.°

256  (0.5)
Like (1.2) (strange), you want to communicate your own thoughts, right?"

"Yeah, yeah yeah."

"There's this."

Well…"

"Hmmm, what should I do?"

"How about making yourself speak to Ji- Jiro in Japanese"
k +eyebrows raise
270 K +suru?
do
"Do you?"

p GZ>up>K, shakes head
271 (0.4)

p shaking head
272 P °nn:o.°

p shaking head
273 (0.7)

k +shakes head slightly +slight nod
274 K ja +shaberu yoo ni- (0.5) +tameshite miru;
well speak like to try out- see
"Well, speaking (0.5) how about you try and see?"

p nodding
275 P nn nn nn.

k nod
276 (1.2)

p +GZ>forward +GZ>K
p +RH circle forward +RH>chin
277 P eh- +(0.7) +shaberu:: (0.5) de- +↑huhn?
speak
"Eh- speak… huhn?"

p +nod
278 K °nn?° jiro: (0.3) +jiro[chan
Jiro Jiro
"Hn? Jiro (0.3), Jiro"

p +nod
279 P [+jiro do
Jiro *and
"With Jiro"

k sitting back
k +nod
280 K +to::, jiro to shaberu toki wa ˚moo nihongo de
and Jiro and speak time TOP now Japanese in
With... When you speak with Jiro, speak, speak, how about if you speak in Japanese?”

Peony changes the subject slightly, away from talking about her lack of opportunities to use the language and towards people with whom she has an opportunity to speak – her parents-in-law. She states that she sometimes feels *modokashii* when speaking with them (lines 232 – 240), and that she wants to speak with them more (lines 242, 245, and 247). This implicates a vicious cycle based upon the ties between opportunity, using and improving illustrated previously. Speaking with her in-laws *should* provide her a chance to use the language (in the way she defined earlier). However, without improvement otherwise, she feels frustrated when speaking with them, even though she claims to be willing to speak more with them. Keiko aligns with *wakaru* ‘I understand’ in line 246 and explains that she feels the same way regarding her English. Peony then expresses that it feels like she can’t (*dekinai kanji*, line 252). Keiko builds upon this, reformulating it as *jibun no omoi o chanto tsutaetai yo ne*; ‘You want to communicate your own thoughts, right?’37, to which Peony agrees with repeated affirmative tokens and continued nodding (lines 259 – 262). This, in retrospect, provides an explicit reason for feeling *modokashii*.

Subsequently, Keiko and Peony momentarily compete for the next action space. Peony rests her head on her chin, looks forward and says ↑*#nn:::# doo sh(y)oo.* ‘what should I do’ (lines

---

37 The ‘you’ in the translation does not actually occur in the Japanese and is only included for making the translation sound natural. The formulation is much more general, as something that anyone who speaks another language would likely feel.
265 - 266), demonstrating both exasperation with the circumstances while at the same time formulating them as actionable. In overlap, Keiko suggests a course of action that is familiar from Exs. 6.1 and 6.2 when she says *jiro to <nihongo> (.*) shaberu yoo se:ba* ‘How about making yourself speak to Jiro in Japanese?’ (lines 267 – 268), which, as in the previous extracts, treats the situation as one that Peony has some control over and responsibility for. However, the sequence structure gets somewhat confused, as Peony comes in early in line 269 with a repetition of *shaberu* ‘speak’ and nodding, suggesting that there is a misunderstanding. Keiko then challenges her by asking *suru?* ‘Do you?’ while raising her eyebrows, displaying a stance of surprise (Peräkylä & Ruusuvuori, 2006) and possibly incredulity. Peony begins to shake her and quietly responds with a *nn:0*, the volume and language choice suggesting that the answer is somehow problematic.

Keiko then reformulates the question in line 274 as *shaberu yoo ni- (0.5) tameshite miru¿*, suggesting that Peony try to speak to Jiro in Japanese. Peony nods and provides affirmative tokens (275) and begins an attempt to answer (277), but cuts it off. Starting in line 278, Keiko redoes the question yet again, as *jirochan to::, jiro to shaberu toki wa ↓moo nihongo de suru yoo ni- (*) +suru- (*) sureba¿* ‘With Jiro, when you speak with Jiro, how about if you speak in Japanese?’, to which Peony responds with a non-committal *nn::* (283). Each of these reformulations reinforces that Peony can do something about the situation, and further pursues a clear affirmative response that displays recognition of this, though such a response is not forthcoming at this point.

In this segment, then, we have an invocation of a third social setting that should provide an opportunity for Peony to use the language but does not. However, Peony’s account for this is not the same as other two settings (work and home), where English is the primary language. Instead,
it is formulated as a problem with frustration at not being able to express herself. This leads to Keiko making the now familiar suggestion that Peony could do something about the situation by speaking Japanese with her husband. Unlike in Extracts 6.1 and 6.2, however, Peony does not have an immediate or simple account for why she doesn’t.

The next segment finds Keiko taking a different tact in pursuing Peony’s recognition of her agency over the situation.
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k sitting back
k +nod
280 K +to:::, jiro to shaberu toki wa moo nihongo de and Jiro and speak time TOP now Japanese in

P +nod
281 suru yoo ni- (. ) +suru- ( .) sureba¿ do as do do-if
“With… When you speak with Jiro, speak, speak, how about if you speak in Japanese?”

282 (0.5)

283 P nn[: :.

k +LH SPU out +LH>head
284 K [(gakkoo) wa:::, +(.) minna (.) daigaku:: (.)] school TOP everyone university

P +nod +LH out
285 wa nanda.=eego +oshieru (reru) kara, +minna TOP what-COP English teach since everyone

k +LH>chest>drop
286 ee+go?
English
“As for (school), everyone at the university is, what. Since they teach English, everyone speaks in English?”
“Yes, everyone speaks in English.”

“But, at home…”

“At home…”

“How about trying to go with Japanese?”

“I tried. I tried doing that.”

“Really?”

“You didn’t continue”
"It failed."

"It failed?"

"Why?"

"It failed. Uhm..."

"It's okay, but, uhm, just, only once or twice."
“Uhm, and then I forgot. English, English, English.”

“That…”

“Always English.”

“Even though you make mistakes, speaking in Japanese (0.2) you don’t keep going.”

“You go right back to English.”
(0.5)

+GZ>forward
+LH out ‘tapping’ +LH toward K
+GZ>K>forward

+kaejava, +dokidoki, + like uh, +(0.4)
change-*completely *sometimes

+GZ>K
{+LH downstroke +LH>chest +LH tap chest
   / /}
+head forward, squint

+nihongo dan+go +(0.4) tsukaimas.[+atashi.
Japanese *vocabulary use-POL I
“Go back to English, sometimes, like uh (0.4) I use Japanese vocabulary. I do.”

+slow nod
+closes eyes

(0.2)

+shakes head

et- +a:m (0.2) mukatsuku[: : wa.
uhm annoying TOP
“Uhm, ahm, it’s annoying.”

+head^ [+nn:::

+GZ>forward

[+eto:: (.]

uhm

+GZ>LH>K +GZ>LH>K
+LH forward {+LH downstrokes
/
/

a- +kore suki: +(ko de) <kantan na> +(0.4)
this like easy
p  +LH downstroke
332 [+kantan na
easy
“Uhm, I like this ( ), easy (0.4) easy…”

333 K [nn:::

p  GZ>down
334 (0.4)

p  +GZ>K
p  {+LH downstrokes------------
   /       /       /

k  +nod
335 P uh, .hh +kotoba o +(tska:) (.) dake, (.)
   word OBJ *use only

336 [tsukaeru.
use-can
“(use easy) words only, can use.”

k  +nod
337 K [+ūh uhn. hn[ff

p  +GZ>forward
p  +LH>eyebrows
338 P [+nn::: (0.8) °yeah.°

339 (0.5)

p  +BH out---------------------------------

p  +GZ>K  +shakes head
340 P °eto:° +na+;ga:i (0.3) uh sentence +ga dekinai. (0.3)
   uhm  long  SUB can-NEG

p  +BHF toward chest
341 [+watashi.
I
“Uhm, I can’t do long sentences.”

k  +slight nod
342 K [+nn:::

255
In line 284, Keiko returns to the setting categories Peony used earlier, first by asking if everyone at work speaks in English, and after receiving confirmation, asking *ie de wa:: nihongo ni shitemitara?* ‘At home, how about trying to go with Japanese?’ (lines 288 and 290), reinforcing the contrast between the settings Peony had invoked, but in doing so she again treats the home category into one Peony has more control over. This time, Peony answers by saying that she has tried (line 292). Keiko responds with *hon↑tou?* ‘really?’, expressing surprise in light of her previously unsuccessful pursuit of a stronger response from Peony. She then asks *doo datta¿?* ‘how was it?’ (line 295), but Peony responds with *demo* ‘but’ and shakes her head as she laughs, projecting a negative response. In line 298, Peony crosses her arms in an X shape as she continues to laugh and shake her head, and claims that it failed. When Keiko asks why (line 301) and provides a candidate answer in English with *uncomfortable?* (line 305), Peony nods slightly but says *daijoubu dakedo* ‘it was okay, but’ (307), but then says that she tried it only once or twice and then forgot (lines 308 and 312), then says that she always speaks English (lines 313 – 314). Her response illustrates a rather equivocal state of affairs. Although she has provided the strong response Keiko had been pursuing, and thus has displayed recognition of the responsibility Keiko’s question had implied, Peony’s account downgrades this claim of effort.

Keiko then reformulates Peony’s response, starting in line 316 with *machigaeru kedo:, sore demo (.) nihongo de hanshi- (0.2) >tsuzuketari wa< shinai n da.* ‘You make a mistake but, even with speaking in Japanese (0.2) you don’t keep going’, which Peony accepts with nods and affirmative tokens. Then Keiko provides another reformulation with *moo eego ni kaechau n da.* ‘You go right back to English’, which again Peony affirms. Keiko repeats *kaechau* as a question, which Peony reaffirms with a repetition. Peony then claims that she sometimes uses Japanese vocabulary (324 – 325), and that she can only use *kantan na kotoba* ‘easy words’ (331 – 336),
but that she cannot use long sentences. This provides some nuance about her use of Japanese at home, claiming that she has made some effort but that it has been for naught, and thus maintains a downgraded stance regarding the status of these examples as “use”.

Keiko’s use of the same setting categories that Peony used earlier creates a contrast – work as a place that Peony can’t necessarily do anything about in terms of speaking Japanese there, and home as a place where she can. This leads to Peony providing more detail about her language use at home. These new details portray home as not just eego dake ‘only English’ in the strictest sense, but the downgraded formulations regarding ‘easy vocabulary’ and such creates an impression of home being, for all intents and purposes, a place where Peony does not use Japanese.

EX. 6.3g 20140207PK Kyoomi

```
364 P nihongo +tsukau::: uh (0.3) +chansu ga (0.5)
Japanese use chance SUB

365 +RH circle out +RH circle out
+motto (0.7) eh? (0.5) [+mo- more? more
“Uh… The chance to use Japanese, more (0.7) eh? (0.5) mo- more?”

366 K +slight nod

367 (1.0)

368 K >motto<= more
“More”

369 P +RH circle out
+hoshii.
want
“I want more.”
```
“You want more?”

“Yeah. I want more. Yeah. Yeah.”

Really?”

“But”

“The Japanese class?”

“Las- last week?”

“La- uh, last semester?”
k  +nod
382  K  +nnnn.

p  RHIF hold-------------------------

p  +GZ>forward  +GZ>K

383  P  +nihongo no kurasu:-i- (.) itta.
   Japanese  LK class  go-   go-PST
   “I went to a Japanese class.”

k  +nod
384  K  +nnnn.

p  RHIF hold-------------------------

p  +GZ>forward
p  +shakes head

385  P  +uhm:: °ss° (0.6) su:ki ja nai.
   like COP NEG
   “Uhm… I didn’t like it.”

p  +GZ>K
k  +eyebrows raise
386  K  +eh?

p  RHIF hold
387  (0.8)

p  +RH drop
388  P  °i-° (0.2) +sensee wa
   teacher TOP
   “The teacher…”

p  closes eyes, shakes head
389  (0.7)

p  +GZ>K>forward
390  K  +°hh[hhhh°

p  +grimace
p  +shakes head
391  P  [+°°joozu°°
   skillful
   “Good”

392  (0.5)

393  K  .hhh
394  (0.6)

p  +begins to smile
395  P  joozs +s s j(h)[a
   *skillful COP
   “Good…”
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“Not good?”

“Not good. Yeah.”

In the 21 omitted lines prior to this segment, Peony described the language that she uses at home as machigae tango dake ‘only mistaken vocabulary,’ and evaluates herself as heta ‘unskillful,’ and her language as having further to go. Peony then reiterates, in lines 364 through 369, that nihongo tsukau::: uh (0.3) chansu ga (0.5) motto... hoshii. ‘I want more chance to use Japanese’. By implication, Peony again reinforces that home is not a place that affords the opportunity to use the language, furthering her previous claims that she has no place to use the language. Keiko seems poised to challenge this categorization; in line 374, she looks at Peony out of the left corners of her eyes, and says hon↑↑too? ‘really?’ with a very sharp high rise in pitch, displaying an extreme affective stance. However, Peony immediately says demo ‘but’ (line 375) and Keiko abandons this course of action and instead simply provides a continuer.

Peony then launches into talk about the Japanese class she took the previous semester, adding to the list of places already discussed (work, home, with the in-laws) where she could be expected to use Japanese. However, she shakes her head and says suki ja nai ‘I don’t like it.’ (385). Keiko treats this as surprising in line 386 as she raises her eyebrows and asks eh?. Peony then explains, with some help from Keiko, that the teacher was joozu ja nai ‘not skillful/good’, thus framing school as yet another place that does not afford the chance for her to use the language, another setting that is beyond her control. The conversation then continues on into
more complaints about the teacher, and then eventually develops into a discussion about Peony’s
relationship with her own students and her experience as a teacher.

Perhaps the most efficient way to summarize the breadth of this excerpt is through
visualization of the relationships and the situated logical connections between elements in
Keiko’s and Peony’s talk regarding Peony’s stance towards Japanese and the efforts she puts
towards improving. These visualizations (Figures 6.1 and 6.2 below) are inspired by a method
used by Bilmes (2008; 2011; 2015) to represent categorization and formulation in talk as
taxonomic relationships. However, these visualizations presented here are not meant to be
understood as proper taxonomies, particularly because vertical movement through these maps, as
I will call them, is not meant to imply metonymic, hyponymic or partonomic relationships in the
way explicated by Bilmes (2015). Furthermore, the types of relationships represented
horizontally are not consistent across levels. Instead, these maps lay out the contrasts and
connections that Peony and Keiko make sequentially and categorically relevant throughout this
excerpt.

Figure 6.1 maps out a fundamental contrast constructed first through Keiko asking about
whether Peony is interested in Japan and the Japanese language, then by Peony claiming that her
problem is not an issue of interest but about time and opportunity. While the kyoomi branch and
its ties to responsibility seem to end at this level, as the first category to emerge in the talk it
remains relevant throughout as Keiko invokes it again on two occasions and Peony’s account is
built in response to it. The opportunity, chance and time category gets dealt with in two ways.
One is a discussion of external situational factors such as interactional settings and who Peony
interacts with, which gets developed further as the conversation continues (represented in Figure
6.2). The other is Peony’s self-categorization as being namakemono ‘lazy’, which places the
responsibility for her lack of progress on herself. However, as Keiko’s reformulation of ‘lazy’ as regarding the necessity of speaking Japanese in Japan quickly moves away from and nullifies this category, it is not explicitly invoked any further.

*Fig. 6.2 Interest vs Opportunity*

Figure 6.2, nested below the chance/time node in Fig. 6.1, is much more detailed. Keiko and Peony construct a category of *renshuu* ‘practice’ that is done by one’s self, and entails writing (mimed by Keiko) and listening to the language podcasts. Peony then contrasts ‘practice’ and ‘use’, the latter of which entails being able to ask questions about words, which in turn implicates a recipient who could answer. She then mentions two of the places where this use could occur, work and at home, and later adds talking with her in-laws and the Japanese class she had taken the previous semester as further sites that should afford the opportunity to use the language.

Peony notes problematic aspects with each of these places that essentially block them from providing this affordance. When Keiko challenges her on how she problematizes home (by asking if she tries to speak to Jiro in Japanese), Peony concedes by saying that she has tried a couple of times, and she even formulates the degree to which she uses Japanese at home (‘easy words’, ‘mistaken vocabulary’, et cetera), but these are done in a way that minimizes them, and
thus still frames home as a place that for all intents and purposes does not afford her the opportunity to use the language.

*Fig. 6.3 Practice and Use in Settings*

![Diagram](image)

**Discussion**

Across the three extracts presented in this chapter, two overarching and interrelated psychological topics related to motivation were talked up between the participants recurrently. These are roughly glossable as 1) Peony’s *negative self-assessments* of her Japanese language ability, and 2) the *efforts* she does or does not make toward improving this ability. Although these topics are by no means discreet or separable from each other, this discussion will approach each of them in turn.

What is perhaps most notable about Peony’s negative self-assessments is how they are occasioned, and the interactional trajectories that arise from them. In Extract 6.1, Peony’s
evaluation arises as part of a complaint sequence, attributing responsibility for her lack of improvement to her husband for “always” speaking English at home, while in Extract 6.2, a similarly formulated self-evaluation arises in regards to ongoing linguistic troubles and as a way of mitigating against a possible interpretation of her prior exemplifications of grammar points that she had recently learned as bragging. In Extract 6.3, the negative evaluation arises implicitly at first as an affiliative response to Keiko’s talk about wanting to improve her L2, and then explicitly as part of her accounts of how settings that should afford her the opportunity to use Japanese for all intents and purposes do not do so. It is worth noting that all of these negative self-assessments fit the definition of initiative presented in Chapter 5 in that they are not projected responses and would not be noticeably absent if not provided.

The trajectories put in motion by Peony’s negative evaluations share some aspects across cases but also illustrate the rich and contextual nature of responses and accounts. In Extract 6.1, Yui responds to Peony’s negative self-evaluation with a question about whether Peony asks Jiro to speak in Japanese, which then leads to Peony’s self-ascription as a “lazy wife,” and then to the neutral formulation regarding English being convenient. In Extract 6.2, Yui responds to Peony’s claim that her Japanese hasn’t improved with a compliment, which Peony accounts for by claiming that Yui is complimenting her as a friend, and thus mitigates against the implication that she had been fishing for compliments (Golato, 2005; Pomerantz, 1984). It is here that the suggestion that Peony speak with Jiro in Japanese arises again, this time leading Peony to account with a description of a mundane activity which requires her to ask questions in English since asking such questions in Japanese would be “impossible”. While Keiko’s responses and Peony’s accounts in Extract 6.3 are much more complex and detailed (as illustrated by Figures
6.1 and 6.2), they follow a similar pattern of negative self-assessment and accounts, and in particular again includes a suggestion that Peony speak with Jiro in Japanese.

These trajectories thus involved the second set of psychological topics; the efforts Peony claimed to put forth toward learning the language and her accounts of where and why such efforts were not made. These necessarily entail language use and study activities, settings, and her relationships with others.

Regarding the efforts Peony made towards studying Japanese, it is interesting to note that the one recurrent positive account, the podcasts, generally arises outside of post-negative assessment trajectories. As illustrated in Extract 6.2, Peony lists off a number of grammar points she has just learned through listening to the podcast, doing being a diligent language learner, in response to a question about what she had been doing recently38, which of course is part of what led up to the negative self-assessment in that extract. The only time the podcasts are topicalized as part of a post-assessment trajectory is the quick reference made to them as a type of practice in Extract 6.3, but Peony immediately disqualifies their meaningfulness by contrasting such solo practice activities with her occasioned definition of “use” as requiring being able to ask questions about the language or learning objects. Thus, it seems that for Peony, positive formulations of her effort and demonstrations of being a diligent language learner (including the examples of persistence from Chapter 4 and initiative from Chapter 5, as well as the extensive topicalization of the word modokashii that occurred prior to Extract 6.3) are not resources for her accounts when the talk turns to her concerns with her linguistic ability, but are certainly demonstrations of her efforts towards improving her Japanese ability.

38 Similarly, in the same conversation from which Extract 6.1 was taken, and on numerous other occasions, Peony often topicalized the podcasts as part of her mundane activities.
Still, to complain or negatively assess something so tied to one’s own experiences and efforts raises the possibility of a challenge from other participants – that is to say, the recipient of such a complaint can relevantly respond by asking the complaint-speaker what he or she is doing to remedy the situation. This is what we find in the post-negative assessment trajectories throughout the extracts in this chapter. Considering Peony’s definition of use as requiring asking questions about the language, it is not surprising that these trajectories were all strongly shaped by references to setting and relationship categories. What was surprising, at least initially to me as an analyst, was the recurrence of one specific relationship category: the standardized relational pair of spouses.

The nature of this particular relational pair and its categorically related predicates is intriguing. For Yui and Keiko, who invoke this pairing in suggestions to Peony that she speak Japanese with her husband, his availability for language practice is treated as natural or categorically predicated (Reynolds & Fitzgerald, 2015). This seems derived from two aspects. The first is that spouses and other significant others bear a categorically bound obligation to be supportive, and lack of such support would be accountable and sanctionable39. The second is related to linguistic expertise, with Jiro as an expert and Peony as a novice. These two sets of relational pairs seem to merge in an expectation on Yui’s and Keiko’s parts that Jiro be available, especially as this expectation is demonstrated so unproblematically as an unquestioned assumption (Kitzinger, 2005)40 each time it is invoked. It is clear from Peony’s repeated rejection of this, however, that she does not share the same interpretation of the categorical

39 This is somewhat reminiscent of Sacks’ (1972) finding that suicide hotline call takers regularly ask callers about the availability of spouses, parents, friends or other significant others for the callers to turn to, with their lack of availability providing a reason for the call in the first place.

40 In work on heteronormativity in interaction (Kitzinger, 2005 inter alia) notes that assumptions about other’s heterosexuality often surface in talk in taken-for-granted ways.
boundedness of such an expectation. In Extract 6.1, she does complain that Jiro’s use of English at home is the reason her Japanese has not improved, but she then mitigates this through her self-deprecation as a “lazy wife”, then with the neutral account that English is convenient. In Extract 6.2, she rejects it with an account of an activity in which using Japanese would be impossible for her, thus negating any responsibility Jiro would have for speaking Japanese. In Extract 6.3, Peony admits that she does use Japanese with Jiro (which we also have evidence of in Chapter 5), but her description of this use is downgraded and treated as not truly “use” by her definition, again mitigating his responsibility. Through these accounts, she rejects the merger of the relational pairs of husband/wife and expert/novice, and with them, any expectation that Jiro bears any responsibility to be available for language practice.

The other settings and relationships invoked by Peony in Extract 6.3, though not recurrent, also illustrate category bound obligations and expectations that shape her accounts. Working as an English teacher in a department where English is the medium of interaction, Peony’s coworkers (whatever their other category bound obligations may be) are not subject to categorical expectations to be available for Peony’s Japanese language practice. Peony’s Japanese language class, on the other hand, certainly could be expected to afford such opportunities. However, her negative assessment of the instructor not only accounts for why the setting does not provide these affordances, but also treats this as sanctionable.

Peony’s invocation of the relationship between her and her parents-in-law is categorically more complex. Although it is feasible to say that the standardized relational grouping of parents-in-law/daughter-in-law entails category bound obligations of support (albeit probably weaker than in the spousal pair), it seems just as unlikely that they would be expected as incumbents of
this category to be available as language teachers\textsuperscript{41}. Nevertheless, given their limited English proficiency, conversations with them are primarily conducted in Japanese, which provides for her invocation of the setting as a place that should afford her opportunity to practice. These categorical complexities call for a different type of account, one that focuses on her frustrations with not being able to express herself clearly.

Peony’s negative assessments of her Japanese ability, the descriptions of her efforts toward the language, and the invocation of setting and relationship categories throughout, all implicate Peony’s responsibility for working towards improving the state of affairs that she negatively assessed in the first place, which I suggest here is reasonably glossed as \textit{motivation}. Seen in this way, Peony’s responsibilities, or motivation, are an inherently \textit{moral} matter in the sense put forth by Jayussi (1984) when she concludes that the

\begin{quote}
valuations of goals that people have, beliefs they hold, character, interests, attitudes, the \textit{manner} in which they do things (sincerely, efficiently, promptly, honestly, etc.), what people routinely do, how the spend their time, etc., are all subject to the kind of scrutiny we call moral (p. 205, emphasis in original).
\end{quote}

Peony’s negative evaluations of her Japanese ability, Yui’s and Keiko’s questions and suggestions, and the category rich accounts that are built up in their wakes, all relate to evaluative stances that Peony and her co-participants take toward her efforts and accounts. In this way, motivation as a topic in interaction is bound up in mundane morality, subject to evaluation by self and others, and potentially accountable (and even sanctionable) when found to be problematic or lacking.

\textsuperscript{41} Although I have data, particularly from same conversation that Extract 5.3 was taken from, that demonstrates Mom and Dad taking it upon themselves to teach Peony vocabulary, it would not be accountable or noticeably absent if they were to not do so in most circumstances.
Lest this discussion end with only a focus on the talk involving Peony’s Japanese language skills not improving and not having opportunities to use the language, we must briefly return to the topic of the podcasts, as well as the persistence and initiative illustrated in the previous chapters. On these occasions, she actively displays herself as *doing being a learner* and *doing being interested in the language*. This suggests, at least to some extent, that while her *talk* about her language abilities and the efforts she makes toward improving focuses on negative assessments and accounts, her *actions* in this regard paint a much more positive picture, portraying a complex illustration of motivation that is related to both effort and her stances toward that effort.
Chapter 7: Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

In this final chapter, I would like to outline some implications the findings in Chapters 4 through 6 have for current trends in the field of L2 motivation, including theoretical implications regarding the “person-in-context” perspective (Ushioda, 2009), the “L2 motivational self system” (Dörnyei, 2005; 2009), and current developments in Complexity / Dynamic Systems Theory (CDST) as it is applied to L2 motivation (Dörnyei, MacIntyre & Henry, 2015). Further, CA’s microanalytic approach has implications for methodological developments in these socio-complexity (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011) perspectives on motivation as well. Finally, I will suggest ways of moving forward which can work towards filling gaps in the current study. First, however, I will summarize and discuss the major findings of the previous three chapters.

Summary

The data presented in Chapter 4 demonstrated persistence, or sustained orientation toward, working through various sorts of linguistic difficulty. Here, two interrelated aspects regarding Peony’s efforts towards solving interactional troubles and orienting to learning objects are of particular importance: 1) the resources she and her co-participants employed, and 2) the interactional projects that her persistence was instrumental in accomplishing. I feel that these two points can contribute to a more nuanced and specified view of persistence, at least as it can be understood at the micro-interactional level.

Throughout the extracts, Peony and her co-participants relied upon a variety of resources, including 1) verbal linguistic resources such as synonymy and translation between Japanese,
English, and occasionally Mandarin, 2) reliance upon kanji/hanzi knowledge (drawn from both Japanese and Mandarin), which were sometimes written on paper, traced on the table, shown electronically, or referred to verbally (i.e. “heaven job” for tenshoku ‘vocation’ or ‘calling’), 3) material resources such as the aforementioned paper or smart phones, which often acted as a form of distributed memory, and 4) pragmatic gestures such those used to mark a solitary word search, or those such as bowing that are part and parcel of the pragmatic actions that Peony and her co-participants were practicing. Although these resources can be seen as communication strategies (Burch, 2014), a more important point is that as part of the interactional bricolage (Levinson, 2006), their use demonstrates the participants’ interactional competence (Hall, Hellerman & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Kasper & Burch, 2016). Resources such as these are integral threads in the weave and weft of all interaction, and as such, any understanding of persistence ought to take them into account, in order to uncover how such persistence plays out across the interactional trajectory.

Which brings us to the interactional projects that the participants accomplish throughout the data. An understanding of talk as action necessarily implicates persistence as being oriented toward some interactional goal, though in this sense the goal needs to be understood not as intra-psychological but as co-constructed across time (Burch, 2014; Suchman, 1987; te Molder & Potter, 2005). In some cases, the goal relates to a learning object; we find this regards to the word tenshoku, but this is also explicated rather clearly by Peony herself in Extract 6.3 as she formulates her definition of using the language as requiring being able to ask questions about the learning object. In other cases, however, there is more at stake, such as in Peony’s work to portray herself as a kind and sympathetic teacher, or as knowledgeable about culture and geography, or as a considerate daughter-in-law who can conduct pragmatically appropriate
practices such as New Year’s greetings with her parents-in-law. L2 persistence in the language at the microanalytic level is not merely about the language itself, but about what can be done with it.

Though sequentially quite distinct from persistence, and generally less oriented toward troubles, Peony’s engagement and initiatives are no less goal-oriented. Recall from Chapter 5 that initiatives were defined as engagement at sequential points where the absence of such engagement would be neither noticeable nor accountable, such as at sequence initiating turns (pre-sequences or first pair parts; cf. Schegloff, 2007) or non-minimal post expansions where a minimal post expansion would suffice. Here too the interactional projects matter, as Peony’s initiatives do interactional work ranging from assessing the quality of television programming to showing herself to be both culturally knowledgeable and an attentive friend (at the same time as displaying a humorous side), and from being attentive to information that is necessary for practical decision making to being attentive to family matters and thus doing being an involved and caring member of that family.

These initiatives also work as stance-taking practices, not only epistemically, affectively and morally, but more importantly for our purposes here, instrumentally and cooperatively (cf. Goodwin, 2007b). By initiating or furthering talk at points where it would not be accountable to not do so, Peony demonstrates that she is instrumentally available to engage in and maintain talk, and that she is co-operatively working towards interactional goals with her co-participants. This is a key aspect of engagement and a willingness to participate (cf. Sert, 2015). By displaying these instrumental and cooperative stances, she is not only engaging in talk, but actively participating in the co-construction of further opportunities to maintain engagement, undertake further interactional projects, and continue doing being a friend or family member.
The relationships implicated in Chapters 4 and 5 also play a role in how Peony talks about the efforts she makes towards improving her ability in the language, as seen in Chapter 6. The standardized relational pairs of husband/wife and daughter-in-law/parents-in-law, and the related settings such as home and work, make relevant category bound rights, obligations and expectations which were used as resources for Peony’s accounts regarding opportunities for her to learn and use the language. These further foregrounded her responsibilities to make efforts toward improving her Japanese skills and her displays of recognizing these responsibilities as they were talked up in the interactions.

It is not trivial or coincidental that the invocation of these relationships occurred in conversational trajectories set in motion by Peony as she negative assessed her Japanese language abilities, and that these negative self-assessments were all occasioned within the flow of the interaction. Whether as a response to a comparison with another bilingual couple, as a way of mitigating against possible implications of bragging or account for ongoing linguistic difficulty, or as an affiliative move after her friend has assessed her own second language ability, these negative self-assessments bring into focus two related points: 1) that concerns about language ability and efforts toward improve them are mundane participant concerns that can arise in the course of talk between social intimates (i.e., not only for research purposes or with researchers who have specific agendas), and 2) that these topics are resources for doing the mundane interactional work of being a friend, a colleague, a spouse, or any other of a number of possible situated identities (Zimmerman, 1998).

Two further threads run throughout the data presented in this study. The first relates to the inescapably moral and accountable nature of interaction. This was made quite explicit in Chapter 6 as the participants invoked Peony’s responsibilities for her language learning and use.
However, it is equally relevant to the topics of persistence and engagement. While the analysis in Chapters 4 and 5 rested upon the notion that Peony had the option to engage or maintain engagement in each instance without the likelihood of opting not to being treated as noticeably absent or accountable, we must also recognize the flip side of the coin. That is, in many if not most mundane interactions, an ongoing or recurrent refusal to engage or maintain engagement could be potentially treated as uncooperative, accountable, and subject to ascriptions regarding one’s moral character42. This did not occur in my data (though it is possible that if it had, I likely would not have had access to it), but as an alternative course of possible action that could be described as unwillingness to participate (Sert, 2015), it helps to frame the moral affordances and constraints of exercising the option to participate or not.

The second thread is related to the always co-constructed and contextually embedded nature of interaction. Any understanding of effort, persistence, engagement, the stances participants take, and the assessments participants make must take into account what is achieved through interaction (cf. Levinson 2006 on the “interaction engine”, and Schumann, Güvendir & Joaquin 2013 on the “interaction instinct”), and that interaction itself is a cooperative achievement. It is irrevocably co-constructed between participants and contextualized within the affordances and constraints of the environment. These are not background noise that can be filtered out as we try to understand the efforts and goals entailed in L2 learning and use, they are the building blocks of those efforts and goals. Peony’s motivation (and the motivation of her co-participants) is both the product of and resource for her interactions. Furthermore, the co-construction and cooperation evidenced throughout the data in this study provides a clear illustration of the

42 I must reinforce that this potentially accountable. There are no doubt countless exceptions, especially in states of incipient talk (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; see also Chapter 5 here), and in institutional settings or with competing activities, in which this would not be the case.
importance of taking a relational perspective on motivation (Ushioda, 2009) that does not locate motivation in the mind of the individual, but instead in the embodied doing of the interaction.

Implications

In this section, I would like to discuss some of the implications this study has for recent theoretical developments in the field of L2 motivation, particularly those that Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) call the “socio-complexity” approaches. Furthermore, as EMCA differs radically from the dominant methodologies used in motivation research, implications for how motivation is researched can be drawn as well.

Recall that Ushioda (2009) called for an approach to L2 motivation that steps away from the concern with individual differences (which would include constructs such as persistence and willingness to communicate) as psychological traits and variables, and instead view the “person-in-context” as someone for whom “language learner” is just one of many relevant situated identities as they go about their lives. In this view, context is not merely a background variable – indeed, Ushioda recognizes that motivation is always necessarily contextually bound. The data presented in this study, and the arguments posed in Chapters 4 through 6 and in the previous section, very much align with a “person-in-context” perspective, and (I believe!) provide empirical ground for what started off as a programmatic proposal.

Ushioda (2009) calls for a theoretically eclectic approach to this “person-in-context” perspective, noting explicitly (amongst many) sociocultural theory, language socialization, sociocognitive approaches, and (obliquely through references to Preston 2009 and Richards 2006) conversation analysis, all of which share some affinity for contextualized approaches and
(more or less) microanalytic methods. She further states that “a person-in-context relational view of motivation need not (and perhaps should not) privilege any particular theoretical framework over another, and that different approaches to the analysis of relevant discourse data are possible and potentially illuminating” (p. 224). On a programmatic level I would agree; each of these frameworks is likely to bring to light aspects of motivation as a contextualized, lived phenomenon (or constellation of phenomena). However, I also feel some degree of caution is warranted, lest an eclectic approach find itself on a slippery slope to promiscuity. Following Hauser (2011) and Kasper and Wagner (2011; 2014), it is advisable to analyze the data according to the framework one is using, and make connections to exogenous theories only post-analytically as called for by the findings. Conducted in this way, letting the framework do what the framework does best, EMCA and other discursive approaches to motivation may indeed prove enlightening.

Another recent and influential theoretical trend in L2 motivation research is Dörnyei’s (2005; 2009) “L2 motivation self system,” which draws heavily on Higgins’ (1987) notions of the ideal and ought to selves. The microanalytic interactional approach taken in this study has implications for how these constructs can be conceptualized at the interactional level, in particular regarding their temporal and moral aspects.

The ideal and ought to selves are conceived of as “future self-guides” (Dörnyei, 2005; 2009), orientations toward hopes, aspirations or wishes on the one hand, and duties, obligations, or responsibilities on the other. From a CA or DP perspective, three interrelated points can be made. The first, if it is possible to gloss these orientations generically as “goals”, is a matter of time scale. Such goals need not be distal, though they certainly can be (Suchman, 1987; te Molder & Potter, 2005). Goals can, and do, unfold in the trajectories of the interaction (Burch, 2014;
Markee, 2011; Markee & Kunitz, 2013), as was illustrated in Chapters 4 through 6. As such, the “future guides” may be much more temporally close at hand as the participants work up relationships and situated identities in their talk. The second point is that psychological topics such as hopes or a sense of responsibility are 1) discursive resources (Edwards & Potter, 2005) used for making accounts and displaying stances and can be explored for the interactional work that they do without concern for their psychological veracity or viewing them as determinants of action, and 2) discursive projects that are accomplished, often for the sake of doing relational and identity work and managing accountability. The third, building off of the first two, is that accounts and descriptions are inherently moral (Jayussi, 1984; 1991) and co-constructed. Chapter 6 can arguable be said to illustrate this point, as Peony and her co-participants invoke her responsibilities for her efforts, and the social relationships, settings, and actions that are entailed by these responsibilities. This suggests that when taking an interactional approach to notions such as the ideal or ought to selves, or any description or assessment of efforts or motivation, that the interactional work that is accomplished through their invocation be taken into consideration. This is not to argue that distal goals are not relevant to participants, but to argue for recognition of how such orientations play out in mundane interaction and are used as resources for that interaction.

The third and final recent development to be discussed here is the growing amount of research with the framework of Complexity/Dynamic Systems Theory (CDST), as evidenced by the recent edited volume by Dörnyei, MacIntyre and Henry (2015) and individual work by MacIntyre (2012; MacIntyre & Legatto, 2011) and Dörnyei (2010b; 2014). A microanalytic approach speaks to at least two focal interests within CDST. The first is with timescales (de Bot, 2015; Ellis, 2008). The data presented in this study illustrates how the complexities of the
participants’ actions and their unfolding goals can be explored at an interactional timescale, taking into account the co-constructed nature of social action and the resources that participants employ. Though not explicitly covered in this study, EMCA is also well equipped to investigate changes over longer term longitudinal timescales as well (Ishida, 2009; Nguyen, 2012), potentially affording the opportunity to describe motivational dynamics that occur over time (see next section).

The amount of descriptive detail required to do this brings us to the second focal interest: retrodiction. The field of CDST has moved away from a concern with predictive statistics, instead drawing its focus on detailed accounts of motivation in the life experiences of L2 learners (Dörnyei, 2014; Larsen-Freeman, 2015). CA’s microanalytic approach, especially given recent trends in the field that also take into detailed account embodiment and interactions with objects (Streeck, Goodwin & LeBaron, 2011; Nevile et al, 2014), can help to provide this level of contextualized detail, allowing researchers to keep track of the moment by moment complexities and dynamics of the interactions where motivation becomes relevant.

Which leads to implications for methodological approaches. As Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) note, the study of L2 motivation has been largely dominated on one hand by quantitative approaches, many based upon survey/questionnaire protocols such as Gardner’s Attitudes and Motivation Test Battery (2011; Gardner & Lambert, 1972), and by qualitative interview studies on the other hand (cf. Shoaib & Dörnyei, 2005; Ushioda, 1996). My purpose here is not to argue against these methodologies: they are dominant precisely because they address questions that many L2 motivation researchers are interested in. However, given the expanding scope of L2 motivation research, particularly as regards context and complexity, there are a number of lacunae left by these methods that a microanalytic approach can help to fill.
Quantitative approaches, in their search for large samples that are amenable to statistical analyses and modeling, must obscure the individual and the context – the “messy little details” (Larsen-Freeman, 2006) that are integral to interaction, and thus to development and motivation. This is not a flaw, so to speak, as such studies are not necessarily interested in these aspects. But for researchers who have an interest in the ebbs and flows of motivation, who want to examine motivation as experienced by a “person-in-context” (Ushioda, 2009), a microanalytic approach illuminates many of the interactional details obscured by surveys and other similar quantitative methods. Peony’s persistence, engagement, and motivational accounts were all embedded in their interactional contexts and were occasioned within their interactional trajectories, all co-constructed with co-participants through using various linguistic, embodied and material resources as they went about the mundane projects that their interactions afforded. In other words, the very phenomena that researchers interested in contextualized and dynamic approaches to motivation are likely to find interesting. While the degree of generalizability sought after by quantitative studies is often not a priority for CA research, building large collections of practices (larger than that done here) will likely uncover common and recurrent practices related to motivation, much in the same way has been done for sequence organization (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007), repair organization (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977), membership categorization analysis (Hester & Eglin, 1997; Fitzgerald & Housley, 2015) and discursive psychology (Edwards & Potter, 1992; 2005).

Obscuring detail can also be an outcome of qualitative interviews, albeit in ways that differ significantly from quantitative approaches. In particular, interview research often obscures the interviewer’s participation, and thus the co-constructed nature of the interview data (Prior, 2016; Roulston, 2010), which in turn has implications for how the interviewee’s responsive actions and
accounts will be interpreted. Even when the interviewer’s contributions are fully represented, two further concerns endemic to interview methodology remain. The first is the sequential organization that makes the interview an interview – that is, in general, the interviewer initiates question and answer sequences and therefore has a great deal of (but not total) control over the agenda and trajectory of the interaction, while the interviewee’s responses will always be somewhat shaped by how they fit to the questions. This means that while the respondent’s accounts are still co-constructed with the interviewer, they will be fit to the researcher’s agenda and etic categories. In the data presented in this study, especially in Chapter 6, the categories are the participants’ emic categories, unconstrained by my research agenda, and could thus be argued to be more ‘wild’ or ecologically valid.

The second concern is that interviews are generally, and perhaps inescapably, decontextualized from the actual practices they are concerned with. Interviews are often conducted in settings removed from the interaction environments (i.e., mundane interactions at home, work or in social settings with intimates) that make up the interviewee’s lived experience. Further, even when conducted in such settings, the interview as action and activity is not the same as the mundane actions and activities people conduct in those settings. This also influences how interactions and motivational accounts will be analytically interpreted. The data presented throughout this study represents activities that Peony herself opted to engage in with friends and family, the mundane interactions of a person going about her life, only relevantly an L2 learner when she and her co-participants invoke the relevance of L2 learner as a situated identity. As such, the data illuminates at least some of the contexts in which Peony uses the language and directly illustrates the complexity and dynamics of her interactions, the resources she and her co-participants use, and mundane morality that undergirds the interactions.
Shortcomings and Future Directions

While I feel the current study goes some distance toward illustrating motivation as a participant’s concern in context, and thus demonstrating a new perspective and filling some gaps in the recent socio-complexity approaches in the field of L2 motivation, it must be acknowledged that this is only a start. There are still gaps that need to be addressed through future research, which I would like to propose here.

One of these gaps relates to changes in motivation over time. Due to the nature of the data collection methods, which were dependent upon Peony voluntarily sending data of interactions she voluntarily participated in, I did not have access to instances of avoidance (Markee, 2011) or other “demotivated” (i.e., uncooperative or disengaged) behavior such as those illustrated in Goodwin’s (2007b) work on family interaction or Talmy’s (2009) work on ESL classrooms. Indeed, it would have been unreasonable to expect such data, as it likely would not have been recorded in the first place due to its personal, moral and accountable nature. This means that evidence of motivational ups and downs, so to speak, are missing (assuming that they occurred at all!). Further research that can explore such dynamics without relying upon participant recall is certainly necessary. Collection of such data, however, would likely prove challenging and would likely require some trade-off in regards to voluntary recording and submission on the part of the focal participants.

Another gap regards actual learning practices. While there are many examples of Focus-on-Form in the wild (Kasper & Burch, 2016) throughout the data, I did not have access to data demonstrating other learning practices such as the podcasts Peony refers to on multiple occasions. Therefore, an area of L2 motivation that researchers and educators alike are interested in, the motivation to study, has not been addressed as thoroughly as might be possible. I do feel,
however, that applying the findings of this study to classroom CA research (Markee, 2015; Seedhouse, 2004; Sert, 2015; Walsh, 2006; Waring, 2011 *inter alia*), especially if done longitudinally, would be fruitful. Such research could make great strides towards filling both of the gaps discussed here, and to continue to illuminate the interactional and microanalytic aspects of a contextualized and dynamic approach to L2 motivation.

**Concluding Remarks**

This study, by taking an EMCA approach, including sequential analysis, membership categorization analysis, discursive psychology, and analysis of embodied interaction, has explored how persistence, engagement and initiative, and accounts regarding effort are all participants’ concerns that are co-constructed and occasioned through mundane interactions. In doing so, it has shown that CA-SLA can be fruitfully applied to the topic of L2 motivation by focusing on interaction in context and the interactional projects that participants undertake in mundane situations. This, in turn, lends rich, empirically based detail that helps to flesh out recent trends in L2 motivation research that have come to focus on context and dynamic change. As an EMCA approach to motivation and the socio-complexity approaches are quite new, it remains to be seen where such a partnership may lead, but I foresee that it will likely be a long, productive, and complex, relationship.
Appendix

Consent Procedures

Detailed outline of participation format
In particular, you will be asked to participate in the following ways:

1. Record yourself (video and audio) talking with native speakers of Japanese for at least 1 hour minimum every month (it doesn’t have to be all at once, it can be split up).
2. Send the researcher the data by one of the following means:
   a) Upload the data to your computer, and use a service such as UH File Drop or Dropbox
   b) Save the data to a storage medium (SB card, CD-R, etc.) and send by post. Please send receipts for buying the storage medium and for postage so that you can be compensated for all associated costs.
3. *You will return all equipment to the researcher at the end of the study.*

Instructions for Gaining Oral Consent for Permission to Record
Before doing a recording, it is necessary to inform the other participant(s) that they will be recorded. This means that you should ask the other participant(s) if it is okay to record them speaking and interacting with you. Additionally, please ask them again once the recording device is running, so that I have their consent recorded for my records. When obtaining consent, please make sure to explain that (1) the purpose for making the recording is to collect data to be used in a PhD dissertation, (2) their privacy will be strictly protected, (3), they may withdraw consent at any time, and (4) if they have any questions or concerns that they can contact the researcher by e-mail (to be provided on the business card).

Sample script for obtaining oral consent from Secondary Participants

(English)

I am participating in a PhD research project that involves making audio/video recordings of my daily conversations with various people in order to track the development of my ability in Japanese daily conversation. The researcher will guard the privacy of all of the participants in these recordings. If at any time you decide that you do not want to participate, I will stop the recording. If you have any questions or concerns, you can contact the researcher at the address on the business card. Would it be alright if I record our conversation now?

(Japanese)

日本語の日常会話能力の発達を調査する博士論文の研究に参加しているため、多くの人との会話を録音（もしくは録画）することを頼まれています。研究者はこの様な会話に参加する人々の個人のプライバシーなどを保護します。録音最中に参加拒否をされた場合は、録音を停止いたします。ご質問がある際は、名刺に記載されている研究者のEメールアドレスにご連絡ください。これから、私たちの会話を録音（録画）しても宜しいでしょうか。

(Romanization)

Nihongo no nichijou kaiwa nooryoku no hattatsu o chousa suru hakushi ronbun no kenkyuu ni sanka shiteiru tame, ooku no hito to no kaiwa o rokuon (moshiku wa rokuga) suru koto o tanomareteimasu. Kenkyuuusha wa kono yoo na kaiwa ni sanka suru hitobito no kookoo no purubashii nado o hogo shimasu. Rokugasaichuu ni sanka kyohi wo saretai baai wa, rokuga o teishi itashimasu. Goshitsumon ga aru sai wa, meishi ni kisai saretairo kenkyuuusha no e-meeru adoresu ni gorenraku kudasai. Kore kara, watashitachi no kaiwa o rokuon (rokuga) shite mo yoroshii deshoo ka
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