

8

Resisting ESL: Categories and Sequence in a Critically “Motivated” Analysis of Classroom Interaction

Steven Talmy
University of British Columbia

Introduction

The following data, from Sacks (1992), come from an adolescent boys' group therapy session:

Sacks (1992, p. 461; cf. p. 597)

- 1 Ken: Did Louise call or anything this morning?
- 2 Therapist: Why, did you expect her to call?
- 3 Ken: No. I was just kind of hoping that she
- 4 might be able to figure out some way of
- 5 coming to the meetings. She did seem like
- 6 she wanted to come back.
- 7 Therapist: Do you miss her?
- 8 Ken: Oh in some ways, yes. It was nice having
- 9 the opposite sex in the room, ya know,
- 10 having a chick in the room.
- 11 Roger: ((sarcastically)) Wasn't it nice?
- 12 Ken: In some ways it was. I really can't say
- 13 why, but it was.

Sacks's analysis of these data concerns how the substitution of a locational category such as “in the room” for “in the group” (line 9) and the use of “opposite sex” (line 9) for “Louise” work to weaken any interest or “compliment” about the adolescent girl, Louise, that may be implied by Ken's inquiry into her absence. As Sacks makes clear, Ken's choice of categories here allows for

his “safe” reply: Louise’s absence is a *categorical* loss (i.e., as a member of the “opposite sex”), not a personal one (p. 464; cf. pp. 597–599).

Missing from Sacks’s analysis, however, is a consideration of sexism (cf. Edwards, 1998). This is perhaps unsurprising because neither the boys nor therapist appear to orient to it in the data, and a defining characteristic of conversation analysis (CA) and membership categorization analysis (MCA), is an insistence on participant orientations rather than those of the analyst. Arguably, however, consideration of sexism could advance Sacks’s analysis of “weak and safe compliments” here. As he notes, use of “opposite sex” is key in downgrading Ken’s implied compliment such that it is not a specific member (Louise) who is missed; it is any member. The replaceability attributed to women—like interchangeable parts, one member easily substitutes for another—signifies an unexamined objectification that could warrant a claim of sexism. Further, if one considers that “chick” serves as a second downgrade—from “Louise,” to “opposite sex,” to “chick”—one can see that the “safety” of Ken’s reply comes not just through the categorical substitutions, but from his objectification and disparaging reference, that is, from the sexism these substitutions are imbued with. This provides added insight into why the boy’s reply might be considered “weak and safe” in the context of an audience of adolescent male peers and allows analysis beyond the local situation to matters of wider sociological significance, including, for example, how sexism is achieved in talk, why it might serve as a *resource* for an adolescent boy on an occasion such as this, as well as why, crucially, *it remains unoriented to* in this interaction.

This discussion recalls an ongoing debate between scholars in CA and in branches of feminist and critical discourse studies (see, e.g., Billig, 1999a, 1999b; Blommaert, 2005; Fairclough, 1989; Kitzinger, 2000; Schegloff, 1999a, 1999b; Wetherell, 1998; Wooffitt, 2005). As I discuss in more detail below, the debate concerns criticisms that conversation analysts have made about “politically motivated” discourse research suffering from the “imposition” of analysts’ critical/feminist “agendas.”¹ Many of these studies, they maintain, lack rigor and warrants for claims and tell more about the analyst’s politics than how sexism, for example, is achieved in talk. Conversely, critical and feminist researchers argue that *no* analysis can be free of the analyst’s interests, however explicitly political or implicitly “neutral” they may be. CA’s insistence on “unmotivated looking” (Sacks, 1992), they claim, speaks to CA’s scientism and “naïve epistemology” (Billig, 1999b) and results in analyses that are overly focused on the details of talk rather than on matters of greater analytic consequence to critical researchers, such as social injustice, discrimination, and inequality (but see Wooffitt, 2005).

This paper joins an emergent line of enquiry that works to transcend these differences by harnessing the powerful methods of CA and MCA (M/CA) for “openly ideological” (Lather, 1986), or explicitly “motivated” discourse research. The paper concerns the “cultural productions of the ESL student” (cf.

Levinson, Foley, & Holland, 1996) in an English-as-a-second-language (ESL) class at Tradewinds High School.² I undertake, from a critical/cultural studies framework,³ an analysis of membership categories and sequential organization in classroom talk. Specifically, this work examines two back-to-back interactions involving "oldtimer" (Wenger, 1998), "generation 1.5" (Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999) or "Local ESL" students (Talmy, 2008),⁴ and their teacher, in which Local ESL students were ascribed and resisted membership to the category of "ESL student" (cf. Day, 1998).

Before undertaking that analysis, I first consider some of the challenges that attend the use of ethnomethodological approaches in a critical analysis of discourse. Afterward, I briefly describe the critical ethnography that the data I analyze below are drawn from and then use the bulk of the paper to engage these data. Following this, I discuss how the analysis works to substantiate and elaborate several "political" arguments from the larger study, before concluding with reconsideration of certain benefits that M/CA can bring to critical discourse research.

Of (in)compatibilities and oxymorons: CA, MCA, and "motivated looking"

Billig (1997, p. 205) has asserted that despite its broad interests in the intersections between power, ideology, and cultural and social (re)production on the one hand, and race, class, gender, and sexuality on the other, that critical/cultural studies research often appears "depopulated," with analyses involving "manufactured artifacts, such as magazines, films, or academic books" rather than the social actions of "recognizable women and men" (see, e.g., Fairclough, 1989; Grossberg, Nelson, & Treichler, 1992; cf. Barker & Galasiński, 2001). Even in "populated" critical/cultural studies research, however, claims may not be clearly and accountably drawn because these studies often do not include analyses of social interaction. As Wetherell (1998, p. 35) has argued:

[p]ost-structuralist theorists, with their more global view, rarely have their noses pressed up against the exigencies of talk-in-interaction. Rarely, are they called on to explain how their perspective might apply to what is happening right now, on the ground, in this very conversation. Theoretical concepts emerge in abstract on the basis of often implicit assumptions about the nature of interaction, language, or social life.

However, Widdicombe (1995, p. 107) maintains that even in critical discourse studies that do include analyses of social interaction, the "pressure to produce political conclusions" can have "unfortunate conceptual, methodological and practical consequences." Although critical researchers argue that all conclusions are political, not just those that aspire to be (see, e.g., Kincheloe & McLaren,

2000), Widdicombe (1995, p. 111) makes an important point: “by elevating their own political agendas as the pre-established frame, [critical] researchers may actually undermine the practical and political utility of the analyses they undertake.” Put another way, an overriding commitment to an agenda—*any* agenda—can obscure analysis.

One way forward that Widdicombe (1995) suggests for critical/cultural studies analysts is through M/CA, which shifts focus away from the broad sweep of macro-abstraction to the detail of everyday talk. As she argues, “it is precisely in the mundane contexts of interaction that institutional power is exercised, social inequalities are experienced, and resistance accomplished” (p. 111). However, just as cultural studies has been criticized for its more “global view,” ethnomethodological approaches to analyses of discourse have been condemned for not adequately dealing with issues of “social relevance” (van Dijk, 1985), and in CA’s case in particular, for being too narrowly focused on the mechanics of talk.⁵ As Wetherell (1998, p. 402) puts it, “the problem with conversation analysts is that they rarely raise their eyes from the next turn in the conversation.” Thus, bringing a cultural studies perspective to M/CA would appear to offer potential for an analysis concerning the ways that, for example, homophobia or sexism is achieved in interaction: cultural studies might address criticisms concerning M/CA’s overly microanalytic orientation, its restricted view of “context,” its formalism, and its objectivism as evident in the insistence on approaching data with a “clean gaze”; and M/CA could help critical discourse studies, and cultural studies more generally, answer criticisms concerning analytic inattention to social interaction, *a priori* contextualization, theoretical “imperialism,” and inadequate warrants for claims.

It is, of course, more complicated than simply “mixing and matching” theories and methodologies, particularly in terms of the paradigmatic tensions and epistemological incommensurabilities that arise when attempting to integrate scientific methodologies into a “political” theoretical framework. However, an increasing number of efforts, particularly (but not exclusively) by feminist psychologists, have successfully overcome the apparent “oxymoron” (Speer, 1999) of what might be called a “motivated M/CA.”

Before reviewing several recent feminist M/CA studies that demonstrate how M/CA could benefit critical/cultural studies research, it may be useful to consider feminist M/CA (or any “motivated” M/CA) as a form of so-called “applied CA.” In remarks that signpost some of the difficulties of integrating CA with a political agenda, ten Have (1999, p. 162) notes that “CA was originally developed as a ‘pure’ science, motivated by the wish to discover basic and general aspects of sociality.” In contrast to its “pure” predecessor, “applied CA,” which developed in earlier CA studies of institutional talk (see, e.g., Heritage, 1984), “denote[s] the implicit or even explicit use of CA...to support efforts to make social life ‘better’ in

some way" (ten Have, 1999, p. 162; see also 2001). Stokoe and Smithson (2001) advance this contrast in their paper on M/CA and gender when they argue that although CA provides the tools to explore in fine detail how issues around gender are occasioned in talk, a Schegloffian [or "pure" CA] is of limited use if one wishes to comment on the wider social significance of such occasioning... [In a "pure" CA, we] can point to speakers shifting between gender categories, repairing their use of gendered terms, challenging each other on the upshot of invoking gender and resisting 'sexist' identities, but we cannot draw upon our background knowledge as feminists to produce commentary on such matters... [This] leaves a gap between technical analysis and that which is relevant socially for speakers. (p. 238)

Kitzinger and Frith (1999) offer one example of how the "tools" of CA can be used to warrant observations of "wider social significance" when they apply insights from CA's extensive literature on refusals to complicate the "just say no" maxim prescribed in date rape prevention training seminars. Kitzinger and Frith argue that "just say no" is in fact "counter-productive" because it privileges a "conversationally abnormal action" (just saying "no") and derogates other, more common but indirect ways of refusing that include delays, mitigations, and accounts. They also note that this simplistic saying, which is intended to "empower" women, "allows rapists to persist with the claim that if a woman has not actually said 'NO'...then she hasn't refused to have sex with him" (1999, p. 310). Kitzinger (2000), too, uses CA for her analysis of gay and lesbian students' "coming out stories" in university seminars. She traces other students' lack of uptake to these stories to how they are embedded in extended turn-constructional-units, arguing that the storytellers' use of turn-taking organization allowed them to avoid topicalizing their sexuality. Kitzinger extends these conclusions to comment on homophobic social attitudes, such as negative ideologies about "flaunting" one's gay/lesbian sexuality. In their CA-informed analysis concerning class and gender, Stokoe and Smithson (2001) illustrate not only how interviewees oriented to these "abstract" topics but also constructed them in interaction. However, in arguing for the need to go beyond participants' displayed orientations, they also illustrate the importance of a feminist analysis even when gender was "not oriented to except by us as analysts" (p. 233). In addition to CA, they undertake an MCA analysis concerning ascription of and resistance to gender categories and similarly demonstrate the need for analysis that moves beyond the local interaction since neither CA nor MCA helped to problematize unoriented-to sexism in their data (e.g., the unproblematic binding of "ironing" and "washing" activities to the category "wife"). Similarly, Ohara and Saft (2003) use M/CA to examine how the interactional structure of a call-in TV show facilitated a shift in responsibility for problems that women callers noted about their husbands' behavior from the men to the women. They note

that such shifts were evidence of particular gender ideologies in Japan, which were reproduced in these calls. As well, in her reanalysis of an earlier, non-CA feminist interview study, Widdicombe (1995) uses the same data the author did to undermine the original analysis and arrive at demonstrably different conclusions concerning an interviewee's account of an aspect of her sexual history.

This selective review hints at the potential for a critical/cultural studies analysis that examines in detail the competing cultural productions of a stigmatized institutional identity category: "ESL student." As Speer (1999, p. 476) notes, "there is nothing intrinsic to...CA...that would prevent feminists—and others with a critical agenda—from using it to ask politically motivated questions, or to reach politically efficacious outcomes." In fact, Kitlinger (2000) concludes, M/CA "offers a *method* for...social constructionist, postmodern and queer" research that treats abstractions such as race, class, gender, and sexuality "as *accomplishments* rather than as pre-given categories" (p. 170, my emphasis; also see Cameron, 2005).

This study

The data come from a 2.5-year critical ethnography (Talmy, 2005) concerning two broadly competing "cultural productions of the ESL student": one "official," or school-sanctioned, manifest in curriculum, instruction, and policies regulating ESL, which constructed ESL students as an undifferentiated group of exotic newcomers; and the other generated by a Local ESL student "community of practice" (CoP; Lave & Wenger, 1991) that was evident in each of the eight ESL classes I observed in the study.⁶ The "joint enterprise" of this CoP, produced as Local ESL students "mutually engaged" in a "shared repertoire" of oppositional social practices (Wenger, 1998), was the subversion of the "official" cultural productions of the ESL student.

Mr. Day's ESL class

The interactions I analyse took place in a first-year "ESL-A" class, which I observed for 64 hours and audio-recorded for 29 hours over an academic year. This was a large, diverse class, attributable in part to a school policy that mandated that ESL course placements be determined by how long students had been enrolled at the school, rather than, for example, L2 English expertise. Thus, Mr. Day's class was for ESL students in their first year at Tradewinds, regardless of age, grade-level, formal schooling experience, or L2 proficiency. Significantly, despite the substantial differences in student backgrounds in this class, there was only one curriculum, which was centered on novels written for an L1-English audience of 2nd–6th graders. The interaction below concerns the "bookwork" assignments for one of these novels.

Participants

At the time of these interactions, Mr. Day was in his first year teaching at Tradewinds. An industrial arts instructor with no experience or education in teaching ESL, he had reluctantly agreed to teach the ESL-A class only days before the school year began. The two students in the interaction, Jennie and CJ, were both Local ESL students. Jennie, a 9th grader from Korea, had been in school in the US for 2.5 years; CJ, also a 9th grader, was from the Philippines and had lived in Hawai'i for 7 years. Also co-present were Computer, a Korean boy who had lived in the US for 6 years, and Iwannafuckalot (IwannafAL), a 9th grader who had moved to Hawai'i from Vietnam when he was 5 years old and who was carrying the machine that recorded these interactions. I have argued elsewhere that each of these students was a member of the Local ESL CoP in this class, although Jennie's participation in it was more peripheral.

Analysis: “Work”ing it in ESL

The interactions occurred midway through the final quarter of the school year. Jennie, CJ, Computer, and IwannafAL were among the approximately two-thirds of the students who had not brought to class their copies of *Sadako and the thousand paper cranes* (Coerr, 1977), an award-winning novel intended, according to the publisher's estimation (printed clearly on the cover), for readers in the 3rd–5th grades.

The lesson to this point had consisted of a 15-item cloze vocabulary quiz that students had been given 45 minutes to complete and a 21-item cloze grammar exercise on negative forms of “have to” (e.g., “1. He has to work late tonight. (does not have)”; Dixon, 1956, p. 34) that had been allotted 30 minutes. Students were then to have been “working ahead or behind” to complete one of a number of “bookwork” assignments from *Sadako*. Five minutes prior to this interaction, Mr. Day had specifically directed Jennie, IwannafAL, CJ, and Computer to stop playing cards, as they had been, and to (finally) get to work on this “bookwork.”

Excerpt 1, ELA42XmdS15: 1972–1996

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 {yeah},⁷ it's a long
25 period, ((states extended duration of
26 class session)).⁸
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 {yeah}.
31 (3.3)
32 Mr. Day: so you need to do five assignments.
33 (2.3)
34 Mr. Day: one vocabulary, (.) two summaries, (.) and
35 two ((sets of comprehension)) questions.
36 five assignments. on Tuesday ((i.e., next
37 class)). and bring your book.
38 (1.2) ((Mr. Day turns to address CJ,
39 sitting next to Jennie))
40 Mr. Day: so how are you=
41 CJ: =awesome.
42 Mr. Day: where's your folder?
43 (0.5)
44 CJ: I put it back there.
45 Mr. Day: did you do any work today?
46 CJ: yeah.
47 Mr. Day: (how much work?)
48 CJ: the:: (.) quiz?
49 Mr. Day: quiz? yeah you had to do the quiz. did you
50 finish the grammar?
51 (0.2)
52 (Computer): no.
53 CJ: no.
54 Mr. Day: did you do any bookwork?
55 (0.7)
56 CJ: my book is at home.
57 (0.5)
58 CJ: I do it at home.
60 (.)
61 Mr. Day: you bring your book to class everyday.
62 (1.6)
63 Mr. Day: fits in the pocket. real small. you put it
64 right here. ((gestures to a pocket on CJ's
65 backpack))

Lines 01–14: “Good teacher/bad student” version

In line 01, Mr. Day invokes his situational identity (Zimmerman, 1998) of teacher, making the standardized relational pair (SRP) of “teacher/student” relevant to the interaction. His question calls attention to an evident problem: that a student who 5 minutes earlier had been told to do “bookwork” has none on her desk, with the utterance thus implicative of a negative assessment. The silence in line 02 is attributable to Jennie, as the question in line 01 is both directed to her and has made conditionally relevant an account of not having “work” on her desk. This silence displays Jennie’s orientation to her reply in line 03 as dispreferred (Pomerantz, 1984a), and thus projects potential disaffiliation with Mr. Day’s question. Jennie’s reply in line 03 is indeed nonaligning because it does not provide the information that the question seeks, even though such information would quite reasonably be available to her (cf. Pomerantz, 1984b). The absence of an account here, following “I don’t know,” is also disaffiliative, as accounts are the preferred or aligning action following a “no” answer or its equivalents (Ford, 2001). Jennie treats the line 04 delay as a lack of uptake by Mr. Day and thus an apparent rejection of her line 03 response as adequate (cf. Davidson, 1984), as she formulates (line 05) a “remedy pursuit” (Pomerantz, 1984b), revising the position she asserted in line 03 to “I’ve been doing it.” The contrastive stress on “doing,” however, also suggests she has oriented to the evaluatory implication in Mr. Day’s question and is protesting it.

Excerpt 1a

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.

However, in line 06, Mr. Day again provides no uptake to Jennie’s reply and instead makes relevant another apparent problem when he asks Jennie where her copy of *Sadako* is. Following the lengthy delay in line 07, another apparent display of disaffiliation, Jennie offers a second unelaborated disagreeing action, this time by minimally stating that her book is “at home.” Jennie once again gives her answer as if no further account is needed. This is in contrast to the disapproval Mr. Day has displayed toward Jennie’s actions, both by making relevant the absence of materials needed to carry out the “(book)work” he had earlier assigned, and his lack of uptake to Jennie’s “answers” about it.

From the first few lines in this extract, Mr. Day has constructed a particular “version” (Cuff, 1993) of the SRP “teacher/student.” Included among the predicates

constituting the teacher category are the rights, obligations, and competencies that warrant the category bound activities (CBAs) of assigning “work” to students, monitoring classroom performance, making assessments about that performance, and if deemed problematic, requesting accounts to pursue some form of remedy. Mr. Day has tied to the student category the implied CBAs of following the teacher’s instructions and doing whatever work has been assigned; specifically, here, bookwork, which necessarily entails reading the book.⁹ That both of these CBAs are implied by the absence of the materials needed to carry them out implies a negative evaluation of this absence and by extension, the person responsible for it. Thus, in addition to demonstrating Mr. Day’s association of these CBAs to the “student” category, the questions in lines 01 and 06 also embed two morally-qualified versions of it: a (default) “good student” category for those who are reading their books and doing bookwork, and a “bad student” category for those who are not.¹⁰ Of these two categories, Mr. Day is evidently constructing Jennie as an incumbent of the latter, and at the same time, formulating a moral construction of himself as a “good teacher,” rightly engaging in the CBAs he has attached to the “teacher” category (cf. Baker, 2004). Jennie, for her part, has displayed a disaffiliative stance to this point, with delay-prefaced turns, evasive answers, and an absence of elaborating accounts. She has, in other words, displayed nonalignment with Mr. Day’s actions that is *consistent* with his candidate categorization of her as a “bad student”: she apparently refuses to orient to the problemat�city that Mr. Day has implied of her actions.

Excerpt 1b

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.

The emergent dispute becomes more explicit in the next series of turns as Mr. Day intensifies his challenge of Jennie’s actions with the question, “↑what do you expect to do ↓in class.” This question appears to be a “*wh*-question challenge” (Koshik, 2003), a class of “reversed polarity questions” (RPQ) also known as rhetorical questions. *Wh*-question challenges are formatted as *wh*-questions but do not make answers relevant because they are implicative of a challenge to a prior utterance, generally in talk characterized by disagreement. These questions are often used disaffiliatively and “are able to do challenging because, rather than asking for new information, they are used to convey a strong epistemic stance of the questioner, specifically a negative assertion... [about] the utterances they challenge” (p. 68).

A case can be made for the candidacy of Mr. Day’s question as a *wh*-question challenge. The talk to this point has been characterized by conflict, with Mr. Day indexing an affective stance of disapproval about Jennie’s violation of the predicates he has attached to the “good student” category, violations which centrally figure in his developing categorization of her as a “bad student.” The extended, 2-s pause that prefaces Mr. Day’s question, its intensified pitch and intonational contour, and the contrastive locational formulation (Schegloff, 1972) of “↓in class” (line 10) with “at home” (line 08) also signal disapproval of Jennie’s unelaborated answer in line 08. With her book “at home,” and her ability to do the required CBAs constituting the “good student” category “in class” thus compromised, Mr. Day ups the interactional ante by challenging Jennie about what she expects to do there.

Despite the evidence that Mr. Day has formulated his utterance in line 10 as a *wh*-question challenge, Jennie does not appear to treat it as one. As Koshik (2003; see also 2002) points out, although answers to *wh*-question challenges are not necessarily relevant, they can be given. However, Koshik continues, answers to candidate *wh*-question challenges must be in terms that display the answerer’s orientation to the implied negative assertion, the epistemic stance of the questioner, and to the question as “doing a challenge” (2003, pp. 57, 68). That is clearly not the case with Jennie’s line 11 reply, “nothing.” In fact, this answer is precisely the “negative assertion” that the question in line 10 implies. However, regardless of whether Jennie treats the question as a challenge or as information-seeking, her answer is disaffiliative: “nothing” is hardly an aligning response from a student to a teacher in a classroom where students are expected to be doing classwork, particularly when “doing nothing” (as implied by an absence of bookwork) has just been characterized as problematic. Through this answer, Jennie further exhibits her disaffiliative stance toward the “good student” category that Mr. Day has implied is desirable, and displays alignment with her incumbency as a “bad student.”

I have attributed the overlapped utterance of “play” in line 12 to Computer.¹¹ Mr. Day and Jennie do not orient to this utterance, which suggests that they treat it as irrelevant. Regardless, “play” works as an important denotative counterpoint to Jennie’s “nothing.” As I discuss below, it also signals the co-presence to this interaction of other Local ESL students: IwannaFAL (carrying the recorder), who moments earlier had himself been queried by Mr. Day about what he was (not) doing; CJ, who was sitting next to Jennie and is similarly questioned by Mr. Day moments later (see lines 40 on); and possibly, Computer, whose *sotto voce* asides are interspersed (though apparently ignored) throughout this extract.

Excerpt 1c

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)

In line 13, Mr. Day utters another RPQ, this one formatted as a yes-no question: “and you think that's o↓kay.” “That” refers anaphorically to Jennie's answer in line 11; given the context and the sequential position of the question, the polarity of the question is clearly reversed. Thus, the negative assertions implied in this question and the preceding *wh*-question challenge “formulate a failure” on the part of the student and can thus “be heard as a complaint” (Koshik, 2002, p. 1863). Further, this question is prefaced by the conjunction “and,” which as Heritage and Sorjonen (1994, p. 5) have detailed, “play[s] a role in constituting and sustaining a joint orientation to the larger activity-focused courses of action which [such ‘and-prefaced’] questions implement.” Interestingly, Mr. Day's intonation here falls, too, when more commonly it rises for yes-no questions, even when their polarity is reversed (Koshik, 2002). This may be an example of Mr. Day accommodating to Pidgin, which he increasingly did over the course of the year,¹² though it may also have been a falling intonational contour in standardized English, which would signal stronger expectation regarding the anticipated answer (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Goodwin, 1996, p. 202). With this question, Mr. Day continues to challenge Jennie about her nonaligning classroom behavior and her disaffiliative stance toward it.

However, rather than reply, Jennie remains silent throughout the 1.2-s pause in line 14. Koshik (2002) has noted that the preferred response to a reversed polarity yes-no question would, in contrast to non-RPQs, be “no” or its equivalents. Thus, Jennie's lack of response here is somewhat ambiguous: it could, on the one hand, be a “no equivalent” and thus be an aligning move. However, and perhaps more likely given the trajectory of the interaction to this point (also see line 18), it could also be another display of Jennie's nonalignment to the negative assertion implied in Mr. Day's RPQs.

Lines 15–20: “Good student/bad teacher” version

Mr. Day appears to treat the silence in line 14 as Jennie's and as a nonaligning nonresponse because he continues in line 15 to pursue elaboration about her apparent alignment with the “bad student” category. With this next question (“what do you do in your other classes.”), Mr. Day invokes another contrastive locational category, now making relevant what Jennie does in her “other,” that is, mainstream and content-based ESL classes, versus what she does (not do) in his dedicated-ESL class. This allows for a concomitant “category contrast” (Hester, 1998), with the morally-qualified categories of “good/bad student” discussed to this point now delimited to *Mr. Day's ESL class* (i.e., “good/bad student in ESL class”), which thus opens up the possibility for a *new teacher/student SRP* version specific to “other classes.” Sequentially, the opportunity

for such a formulation falls to Jennie, placing her in a delicate position since Mr. Day has now projected at least two new candidate categories that her answer must somehow respond to: “good student in other classes” and “bad student in other classes.” This latter category in fact implies a sort of *über* “bad student in *all* classes” category and is arguably the candidate categorization Mr. Day is pursuing: “good student in other classes” would conflict with the categorization of Jennie as a “bad student in ESL class.” This conflict would be consequential—and accountable—because it would raise questions about her “bad” performance in ESL.

Excerpt 1d

13 Mr. Day: and you think that's okay.
 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)

Following Mr. Day's question in line 15, a 0.5-s pause occurs, then “play” is repeated, an utterance I have also attributed to Computer. As in its first voicing, it is *sotto voce* here and is not oriented to by either Jennie (cf. the latching and contrasted content of her reply) or Mr. Day (cf. line 19). As well, the answer “play” is consistent with and corresponds to the “bad student” category that Mr. Day initially formulated: “bad students” do not have their work out, have left their books at home, and so must either be doing “nothing” (Jennie) or “playing” (Computer) during class time. Although consistent with the original “bad student” category, however, the activity “play” here follows the category contrast made relevant in line 15, and so binds to the *new* “bad student” category specific to “other classes.” In other words, Computer's utterance in line 17 implies precisely the candidate categorization of Jennie as a “bad student in all classes” that Mr. Day appears to be pursuing with his question in line 15.

Significantly, however, Jennie rejects this categorization, indicating instead her incumbency as a “good student in other classes” when she states that she does not “play” in them but does “work.” Including the 0.5-s pause in line 16 and the unoriented-to utterance in line 17, a 0.9-s pause occurs between the completion of Mr. Day's question in line 15 and Jennie's answer in line 18, indicating Jennie's likely orientation to her answer as nonaligning. Significantly, by maintaining that she “works” in other classes, she has suddenly and remarkably shifted the “problem” of doing “nothing” in ESL from herself to the *ESL class*. That is, any inference that Jennie is “deficient” is transformed in line 18 as she implicates instead

- *the activity of “work”* as it is differentially realized in “other classes” versus ESL and/or
- *the contexts themselves* that allow for the generation of the contextually specific category (and predicate) iterations of “student in ESL class” and “student in other classes.”

Both points suggest that Jennie’s actions to this point are indexes of resistance to her categorization as a “good student in ESL class,” to the desirability imputed to the category, and to the activities that are bound to it (cf. Day, 1998). Further, by shifting the problem of doing “nothing” from herself to the ESL class, Jennie makes relevant at least two other candidate sources of that problem:

- *Mr. Day*, who as a member of the “teacher” category mediates the instantiation of social structures, ideologies, and beliefs about ESL as codified, for example, in policy and curriculum, through his own particular pedagogical practices (first bullet above),
- *ESL* as a class, a program, or an institution (second bullet above).

For the first point, Jennie has implied a new morally-qualified SRP version of “good *student*/bad *teacher*,” the latter of which Mr. Day is an obvious incumbent. For the second point, she has implied that no matter the teacher, something about ESL “work”—specifically the bookwork she is to be doing currently—would lead her instead to do “nothing.” All of this speaks to the power that Jennie has claimed, as it was made available sequentially by Mr. Day’s question in line 15, both to subvert her candidate categorization as a “bad student in all classes,” and instead implicate alternative trouble sources, either in terms of a new “bad teacher” category, or ESL itself as an institutional or programmatic category.

Excerpt 1e

```
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 {yeah},7 it's a long
25              period, ((states extended duration of
26              class session)).8
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 {yeah}.
31              (3.3)
32 Mr. Day:     so you need to do five assignments.
33              (2.3)
```

34 Mr. Day: one vocabulary, (.) two summaries, (.) and
 35 two ((sets of comprehension)) questions.
 36 five assignments. on Tuesday ((i.e., next
 37 class)). and bring your book.

In line 19, Mr. Day pursues an account from Jennie about working in other classes, but not in ESL: "so how come in my class you don't ↓work." Whereas in line 10, he queried Jennie about what she expected to do "in class," here, following the contrast made relevant in line 15, he introduces the determiner "my": it is no longer a generic class, it is Mr. Day's. This also suggests he has oriented to the implication that Jennie not doing work in ESL is attributable not to her but to the class or perhaps even him. Significantly, this question also includes an expansion in Jennie's accountable "bad student in ESL class" behavior: whereas at the beginning of the interaction, Mr. Day was pursuing an account concerning a specific instance of Jennie doing "nothing," the accountable topic has morphed, as evident in the question's habitual-factual present tense format, into Jennie *never* working in his class. I consider the implications of this next.

Lines 21–64: "Friendly, facilitative teacher/forgetful student" version

Jennie remains silent throughout the extended, 2.7-s pause in line 20. When she does finally reply, she does not provide the account that Mr. Day seeks, but instead orients to and rejects the underlying expansion in accountable behavior that the question encompasses: instead of never working in the ESL class, she states, "I did. I did the grammar (and the quiz)." This reply returns Jennie to her earlier asserted position (line 05) that she has in fact done "work" in Mr. Day's class. Thus, the protest that was implied there is here resumed: Jennie appears to be resisting her incumbency as a "bad student in ESL class" after all.

Or is she? Jennie's "nonanswer" in line 21 is, on closer analysis, a highly skilled piece of interactional work. By rejecting the underlying expansion of "bad student" behavior in Mr. Day's line 19 question, Jennie is not only released from having to account for it, but the accountable topic is returned to the more narrowly circumscribed matter of what she was doing earlier. What is of significance here is which particular earlier period is being referenced.

Excerpt 1f

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 {yeah},⁷ it's a long
25 period, ((states extended duration of
26 class session)).⁸

Returning momentarily to the beginning of the interaction, Mr. Day's line 01 question seeks an account about where Jennie's "work" is *now*, which is implicative of the bookwork she has been assigned that she is *not now doing*. However, Jennie exploits the referential ambiguity of "work" and instead implies the grammar exercise and vocabulary quiz (cf. the present perfect progressive in line 05), that is, the "work" assigned *earlier* in the class. In line 06, Mr. Day rejects this answer as acceptable for what Jennie is to be doing *now* though, evident in his lack of uptake and explicit query about the absence of her book. However, in line 21, Jennie effectively recycles the same account, with a much different result, as Mr. Day's affirmative response in line 23 indicates. This difference is attributable to the expansion of and thus, shift in accountable topic, from why Jennie is not doing bookwork *now* to why she does not do *any* work *ever*; this shift allows the same account to accomplish much different interactional and categorical business: it not only works to interrupt Mr. Day's candidate categorization of Jennie as a "bad student in ESL class" and to restore her incumbency as a "good student in ESL class," it interrupts *his* candidacy as a "bad teacher" because she indicates that she does some work that he assigns. Thus, Jennie's utterance in line 21 signals what the trouble source of her doing "nothing" apparently is: the children's bookwork. However, the shift in accountable topic removes from consideration the problematicity of the bookwork (because Jennie is "accounting" for a different topic), even though this was implicated as the accountable problem in the first place. It is ironic that Jennie recycles the very account that was in part constitutive of Mr. Day's earlier categorization of her as a "bad student in ESL class" to restore her incumbency as a "good student in ESL class," to implicate the bookwork rather than Mr. Day as the trouble source of doing "nothing," and perhaps most important, to remove

from accountability the fact that she is *still* not doing the bookwork she is to be doing *now*.

Excerpt 1g

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 {yeah},⁷ it’s a long
 25 period, ((states extended duration of
 26 class session)).⁸
 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 {yeah}.
 31 (3.3)
 32 Mr. Day: so you need to do five assignments.
 33 (2.3)
 34 Mr. Day: one vocabulary, (.) two summaries, (.) and
 35 two ((sets of comprehension)) questions.
 36 five assignments. on Tuesday ((i.e., next
 37 class)). and bring your book.
 38 (1.2) ((Mr. Day turns to address CJ,
 39 sitting next to Jennie))

Mr. Day’s acceptance in line 23 of Jennie’s account marks a distinct shift in the interaction, one attributable both to the initial candidacy of Jennie’s “good student/bad teacher” SRP version and its subsequent termination as Mr. Day now formulates a new candidate SRP version of “friendly, facilitative teacher/forgetful student.” In terms of the “friendly, facilitative teacher” category, his talk before this point was characterized by interactional features that displayed disapproval of Jennie’s actions. Though similar features are still evident—for example, the higher pitch at the beginning of the turn in line 23, the directive in line 37—other, more aligning features are also present. Primary among them is his acceptance of an account he had previously rejected; beyond this, Mr. Day mentions (and extends) a list of CBAs Jennie should be engaged in for her to be considered a “good student in ESL class,” two of which (the bookwork and reading) he indicated earlier she should have already been doing. These CBAs take form as mitigated directives (lines 23–24, 28–30, 32), with the latter two prefaced by an account (“it’s a long period . . .”). Mr. Day uses the plural pronoun “we” in line 23, adds a colloquialism in line 29 (“all this type of stuff.”), and does not hold Jennie accountable for her subsequent silences (lines 27, 31, 33, 38). A final indication that Mr. Day is “doing being” a different sort of teacher here from the one earlier comes with what I interpret to be his use of the Pidgin discourse marker *yae* [yeah], which as Sakoda and Siegel (2003, p. 92) assert, “soften[s] a comment.”¹³ In fact, Cashman (2005) and Gafaranga (2001, 2005) argue that codeswitches

such as this (also see line 30; cf. the intonational contour in line 13) can be analyzed as membership categorization devices in their own right, with Mr. Day talking into relevance his membership in a new candidate category in which standardized English and Pidgin, the language of Local identity and culture, are spoken. However, Jennie provides no uptake to it.

Mr. Day's "friendly, facilitative teacher" is relationally constructed against a candidate "forgetful student" category that Jennie is made an incumbent of: this teacher, instead of reprimanding a student who has no work on her desk, now appears to interpret this absence as a manifestation of her having forgotten it. Thus, Mr. Day in lines 23–37 "reminds" Jennie of the work she is to be doing. Although I provide only a brief analysis of the remainder of the interaction between Mr. Day and CJ (lines 37–64), Mr. Day appears to maintain an orientation to this particular version of the teacher/student SRP, which has important interactional consequences for CJ, the student he addresses next.

Excerpt 1h

```
38          (1.2) ((Mr. Day turns to address CJ,  
39          sitting next to Jennie))  
40 Mr. Day:  so how are you=  
41 CJ:      =awesome.  
42 Mr. Day:  where's your folder?  
43          (0.5)  
44 CJ:      I put it back there.  
45 Mr. Day:  did you do any work today?  
46 CJ:      yeah.  
47 Mr. Day:  (how much work?)  
48 CJ:      the:: (.) quiz?  
49 Mr. Day:  quiz? yeah you had to do the quiz. did you  
50          finish the grammar?  
51          (0.2)  
52 (Computer): no.  
53 CJ:      no.  
54 Mr. Day:  did you do any bookwork?  
55          (0.7)  
56 CJ:      my book is at home.  
57          (0.5)  
58 CJ:      I do it at home.  
59          (.)  
60          you bring your book to class everyday.  
61 Mr. Day:  (1.6)  
62          fits in the pocket. real small. you put it  
63 Mr. Day:  right here. ((gestures to a pocket on CJ's  
64          backpack ))  
65
```

CJ's and Jennie's actions have evident parallels in these interactions: like Jennie, CJ does not have any "work" on his desk. He has done no bookwork; the work he has done consists only of what was assigned earlier—in fact,

he has done just one of those activities (the vocabulary quiz), not both (the quiz and the grammar); and his book is "at home." CJ also displays similar disaffiliation regarding the queries about his classroom performance, through delay-prefaced replies, minimal answers, and lack of accounts. Yet, although CJ has committed comparable violations of the "good student in ESL class" predicates that led to Jennie's earlier incumbency as a "bad student in ESL class," Mr. Day treats him differently, starting with how he greets him (line 40; cf. line 01). The differential treatment becomes particularly plain after Mr. Day pursues answers from CJ about the "work" he has (not) done in class (lines 45, 47, 49–50, 54). After CJ replies in line 53 with a delay-prefaced, unelaborated "no" to the question regarding the grammar assignment, Mr. Day utters no rejoinder or pursuit of elaboration. Instead, he continues by asking about the "bookwork" but with a different affective stance than with Jennie (cf. the higher pitch and stress of line 06).¹⁴ When CJ replies in line 56 that his book is at home and provides a minimal elaboration, there is little in Mr. Day's talk approaching the strong disapproval he displayed earlier: there is no pursuit of an account, no RPQs, and little evidence of negative affect. In fact, Mr. Day's lone directive (line 60) is mitigated and formulated as a reminder: CJ needs to bring his book to class every day, and Mr. Day even helpfully points out where to carry it in his backpack. Thus, following Jennie's ultimate rejection of the initial SRP version of "good teacher/bad student" and the candidacy of her "good student/bad teacher" SRP version, the "friendly, facilitative teacher/forgetful student" SRP version prevails, despite CJ's disaffiliative interactional work. This is suggestive, certainly, of the power that categories have in shaping the trajectories of a given interaction; it also indicates that the power to make such category formulations does not necessarily fall along lines of institutionally-ascribed status.

"Motivating" the analysis

Next, I consider how the analysis above provides warrants for and elaborates several critically-oriented arguments in the larger study from which the data are drawn. My goal is not to provide an exhaustive account of these arguments or how the analysis above supports them but instead to point to ways that "applied M/CA" might benefit a critical/cultural studies analysis, and vice versa, how a critical/cultural studies perspective can amplify a sequential and categorization analysis. Note that although my claims concerning the scope of these phenomena (i.e., across the ESL program) cannot be supported by analysis of two interactions, M/CA helps to warrant these arguments by elaborating the interactional dynamics of (at least) two instances of their occasioning (cf. Moerman, 1988).

The cultural productions of the ESL student

As mentioned above, the study these data are drawn from concerns two competing “cultural productions of the ESL student.” One I glossed as school-sanctioned or “official,” manifest, for example, in ESL policy, curriculum, and instruction, which constructed ESL students as an undifferentiated group of cultural and linguistic newcomers. The other I called “oppositional,” produced by Local ESL students as they variously resisted accommodating the production of this “official” student identity. Both productions are evident in the interactions between Jennie, CJ, and Mr. Day.

Perhaps the clearest way that the “official” cultural productions of the ESL student were instantiated in these interactions is in terms of the predicates that Mr. Day and the students bound to the “good student in ESL class” category, which Jennie’s (“bad”) behavior was evaluated against. This was a student who brought his or her work to class, completed the grammar and vocabulary exercises, and did the bookwork associated with the children’s novels that formed the centerpiece of the ESL curriculum. More to the point, this was a student who accommodated the language (learning) ideologies about ESL and ESL students as determined most immediately by the teacher¹⁵ but also the ESL program and the high school. These beliefs were variously instantiated, from the undifferentiated ESL curriculum and the ESL placement policy, which implied that ESL students were more or less the same, to the use of below-grade-level juvenile fiction, which signified an evident conflation of L2 proficiency with cognitive capacity and chronological age as it essentially positioned ESL students as co-members of *Sadako’s* 3rd–5th grade audience.

Just as students who brought their books and did bookwork produced the “good student in ESL class” category and their memberships in it, not bringing books and not doing bookwork served as important resources in students’ resistance to it. By refusing to accommodate the production of the “good student in ESL class” category, Jennie indexed her lack of “investment” (Norton, 2000) in the class, signaling that the range of symbolic and material resources made available for learning did not have and would not contribute to the sorts of cultural, linguistic, and symbolic capital she desired or needed (Bourdieu, 1991). Thus, predicate violations of the “good student in ESL class” underscored the fundamentality of student agency and power in classroom processes as well as the limits of the power of the institution: that the material and symbolic manifestations of educational, societal, and language ideologies about ESL education and ESL students required for their realization these students’ participation.

At the same time, withdrawal of participation from these predicates and the occasionally direct conflict between the teachers and students that resulted from it meant that Local ESL students at Tradewinds who engaged in opposition were often ascribed incumbency as “bad students in ESL class.” My data indicate

that although Local ESL students would at times align with their incumbency in this category (cf. Jennie in lines 01–14 above), most often they would signal that they were not lacking, but the ESL teacher and/or program was instead lacking (cf. lines 18–20 above). Thus, as the data above suggest, Local ESL students' cultural productions of the ESL student involved delicate interactional work in at least three senses: in terms of violating predicates associated with the production of the "good student in ESL class" category, in terms of explaining and justifying these violations, and in terms of casting the ESL teacher or program as deficient rather than the students themselves. Such work was made all the more delicate because it occurred within a setting that cast them as members of a category ("student") that was ascribed less institutional power and fewer rights, privileges, and competencies than teachers.

Local ESL students' exercise of power in their oppositional cultural productions of the ESL student thus involved considerable L2 interactional competence (J. K. Hall, 1995, 1999). This is indicated in the interaction above, in Jennie's (and later, CJ's) exploitation of the ambiguity of "work." Data from the larger study (Talmy, 2005) include scores of instances in which Local ESL students similarly exploited some imprecision in talk, from referential shifts such as Jennie's, to uptake to locutionary rather than illocutionary meanings of utterances (and vice versa), to recourse to the students' status as L2 speakers, in which the potential omnirelevance for "misunderstanding" (e.g., of a teacher's instructions) was made use of. Each of these communicative practices allowed for what I call "defensible fall-back accounts" such as Jennie's in lines 05 and 21 and CJ's in lines 46 and 48, whereby Local ESL students could "justify" their resistance and nonaligning actions by pointing to some evidence for their potential alignment: for example, by doing one aspect of an assignment and/or indicating that they would have done more had they simply understood the instructions to do it.

When considered together, the Local ESL students' cultural productions of the ESL student indicate that these students were not so much "bad students in ESL class" as fundamentally *different kinds of students* in ESL class. These were students who signaled in myriad ways, in their classroom behavior, in their interactions with classmates, teachers, and me, and in their schoolwork, that they did not like ESL, did not need ESL, were aware of the low prestige associated with the category, and had the L2 English expertise required to make this clear, either indirectly (e.g., in terms of justifying nonaligning behavior) or directly (e.g., in explicitly stating their negative assessments of ESL). In this respect, then, the public displays of difference that constituted Local ESL students' oppositional cultural productions of the ESL student worked to *disrupt* the monolithic homogeneity connoted by the "official" productions of ESL. At the same time, however, these public displays wound up *reproducing* the negative ideologies about ESL that constituted the stigma of the category "ESL student."

Contingency and multidirectionality in L2 socializing processes

Related to these competing cultural productions of the ESL student, the analysis above warrants and elaborates arguments that I have made concerning contingency and multidirectionality in L2 language socialization (LS) (see Talmy, 2008). Although LS is commonly asserted to be contingent and “bidirectional” (see, e.g., Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986), the focus in much LS research on “successful” first language socialization of children by caregivers has, according to some scholars, obscured these themes.

However, the fundamental contingency of LS is clearly exemplified above in terms of the (lack of) accommodation of the “official” ESL student category. Mr. Day, Jennie, and CJ orient to a network of “good student in ESL class” predicates, some of which the two students participated in and several others of which they did not. By indicating that they had done the earlier-assigned vocabulary quiz (Jennie and CJ) and grammar exercise (Jennie), the official version of the category appears to have been at least partially accommodated. However, completion of such comparatively “simple” work as cloze vocabulary and grammar exercises and similar sorts of worksheet assignments served as important resources for the production of the “defensible fall-back accounts” mentioned earlier. Thus, although the official ESL student category appears to be partially accommodated, it was less accommodated than transformed, becoming a constitutive feature in Jennie’s and CJ’s oppositional cultural productions of the ESL student. Jennie’s and CJ’s actions above, in short, highlight how contested socialization can be (i.e., in terms of the categorical ascription of “ESL student”; cf. Day, 1998): that it never proceeds straightforwardly or linearly along lines, for example, of hierarchical standing.

Multidirectionality in socialization is exemplified above as well. Jennie’s cultural productions of the ESL student were in part constitutive of the broad-based Local ESL CoP in the high school’s ESL program mentioned above. In this respect, Jennie’s actions are of interest because she was a comparative apprentice in the Local ESL CoP, while CJ, IwannaFAL, and Computer were all “oldtimers.” Keeping in mind the co-presence of these latter three students to the interaction, Jennie’s performance in it can be seen not only in terms of her participating in Local ESL community practices but also as an instance of a Local ESL apprentice demonstrating her developing L2 interactional competence and oppositional identity to oldtimer peers. Thus, Jennie’s participation in the interaction above, and CJ’s as well, not only served to (re)produce the Local ESL CoP but worked as socializing resources for each other, Mr. Day, IwannaFAL, Computer, and any other students who were proximate to it.

Multidirectionality in socialization is also suggested in terms of Mr. Day’s actions above. Whereas I have argued that Jennie and CJ ultimately did not accommodate the official cultural productions of the ESL student, Mr. Day arguably accommodated theirs. This is most clearly indicated in Mr. Day’s acceptance

of Jennie’s account in line 21, which he had previously (line 06) rejected. It is also suggested in the aligning interactional features and codeswitches in lines 23–37, which were constitutive of the new “friendly, facilitative teacher/forgetful student” SRP version, a version Mr. Day remained oriented to as the interaction with CJ unfolded.

When considered in the wider context not just of this particular class session, but of the course as a whole, the interaction above signals multidirectionality in socialization of much broader significance. The interaction occurred during a “study hall” session, in which students were to be “working ahead or behind” on coursework that had previously been or would soon be assigned. As increasing numbers of Local ESL students withdrew participation in the predicates attached to the production of the “good student in ESL class” category—for example, by not completing the bookwork, leaving materials “at home,” and doing only a minimum of the simplest assignments (cf. the vocabulary quiz and grammar exercise above)—first-year ESL teachers such as Mr. Day made adjustments to their curricula and teaching practice. These adjustments included extending deadlines, reducing the amount of and requirements for assignments, eliminating homework, and adding study hall sessions such as this one (see Talmy, 2005, pp. 534–585; 2008).¹⁶ This had important implications for what was and was not made available for learning in these classes: as the official curriculum slowed down and became increasingly restricted, a space in the formal schooling enterprise opened up, which allowed the development of an “unofficial” curriculum, in part constituted by and constitutive of Local ESL community practices.

ESL as a low-prestige category

The M/CA analysis also warrants arguments I have made (Talmy, 2005, 2008, forthcoming) regarding the (re)production of “ESL student” as a low-prestige identity category. The comparatively few applied linguistics studies that concern K–12 ESL as an institution in North America have overwhelmingly asserted the status of ESL as a “dummy program” (McKay & Wong, 1996, p. 586), with ESL students deemed in various ways to be “candidate[s] for cognitive overhaul and rescue” (p. 590). Much of this research has usefully located the stigma of ESL in broader discourses and social processes, for example, in terms of contemporary language and educational policies that reflect a monolingual English bias, in negative social attitudes toward minority languages and their speakers, in popular discourses concerning the putative “problems” that result from bi- and multilingualism, in linguistic nationalism, linguistic prejudice, and more. However, equally important is seeing how these broader phenomena are or are not (re)produced in the details of everyday life, for example, in classroom interactional conduct.

The analysis above thus complements arguments concerning the stigma of ESL by examining instances of its local occasioning. These include,

certainly, the assignment and expectation for completion of the children's bookwork and the vocabulary and grammar worksheets, that is, the "work" around which the interaction between Jennie, CJ, and Mr. Day centered. They also include Jennie's orientation toward the nonproblematicity of her incumbency as a "bad student in ESL class." They include, too, the contrast she made between doing "nothing" in ESL class and doing "work" in "other classes," an activity contrast that suggests a category contrast between "student in ESL class" and "student in other classes." In fact, this category contrast makes relevant what I have characterized as a "mainstream/ESL hierarchy" in evidence at Tradewinds, both in and outside of the ESL program (Talmy, 2005, 2008, forthcoming). "Mainstream student" at Tradewinds, was, as its appellation connotes, indicative of the category's normative status in the social universe of the high school; conversely, "ESL student" was "marked" (Bucholtz & K. Hall, 2004), relationally defined by how it diverged from the "mainstream" norm. As Jennie's turns in line 11 ("Nothing.") and line 18 ("Work.") suggest, "ESL" was located in a hierarchically subordinate position to "mainstream"; in this respect, Jennie oriented to and reproduced this hierarchical relation. Each of these points—the conflict concerning "work," the comparative nonproblematicity of a candidate categorization as a "bad student in ESL class," the category contrast that made reference to wider linguistic prejudice as manifest in the mainstream/ESL hierarchy—illustrates in different ways how the low prestige of ESL was collaboratively achieved in these interactions.

The analysis above has implications beyond the cultural reproduction of the stigma of ESL. An estimated 20% of secondary ESL students have missed at least 2 years of formal schooling, while 27% are acknowledged to be enrolled in grade levels 2 years or more below age/grade-level norms (Fleischman & Hopstock, 1993). In addition, secondary ESL students are among the most likely school-age populations to drop out and/or be "pushed out" from school, with rates ranging from twice the national average for selected groups in the US (Ruiz de Velasco, Fix, & Clewell, 2000) to a staggering 74% of ESL students at one large urban school in Canada (Watt & Roessingh, 2001). Considering that ESL students as a group are far more likely than non-ESL students to come from families living in poverty (by some estimates, as high as 75%; August & Hakuta, 1997), the social reproductive potentiality of the cultural productions of the ESL student at Tradewinds becomes apparent. Although the analysis above is limited in that it considers two interactions in one ESL class at one school only, it does provide some indication why the alarming numbers cited above just might be. As uninvested students such as Jennie, CJ, and other members of the Local ESL CoP in Mr. Day's and other ESL classes subtly disengaged from "official" L2 literacy and academic language learning, even of the restricted kind associated with the bookwork assignments, little official

curricular business beyond grammar and vocabulary worksheets came to be done in these classes over the course of a school year. As a result, ESL became precisely the easy, academically inconsequential program that Local ESL students all along claimed to dislike about it. What is more, many of these students remained, in the words of IwannaFAL, "stuck" in the program, even as they undermined it, caught in a cycle of diminishing academic achievement and declining grades; they thus continued to be denied access to language and literacy practices, and subject-area content, that was made available to their "mainstream" peers.

Finally, the analysis above can be seen as a (small) step toward interrupting this social reproductive potentiality, in part because it sheds light on curriculum and classroom processes in a context (high school ESL) and involving a population (Local ESL or generation-1.5 ESL students) that remain notably underrepresented in the research literature. Regarding the former point, Faltis (1999) has cogently argued that a continued lack of empirical attention to secondary ESL will only contribute to the reproduction of an inequitable status quo: when we ignore "what is happening in secondary schools where there are immigrant and bilingual students, the school benefits by our silence" (p. 4). This study is one attempt to break such silence so that the students might "benefit" instead. This leads to the latter point: the M/CA analysis has provided evidence to support the primarily anecdotal reports in the research literature about ways that generation-1.5 ESL students differ from their lower-L2-proficient and newcomer classmates: for example, in terms of their advanced L2 interactional competence, their generally negative representations about ESL, and their evident affiliations with mainstream (and in this instance, Local) communities beyond ESL. In addition to developing researchers' and educators' understandings of these students, the analysis above thus provides an empirical base upon which curricular and pedagogical recommendations for them can be made. Such recommendations might include developing specialized curricula that utilize as a resource what these students bring to school: for example, that make use of their L2 interactional competence for the development of metalinguistic awareness and for their apprenticeship into academic literacies; that centrally address issues implicated by their negative assessments about ESL, about the status of the category "ESL student" in a North American high school, and about linguistic prejudice as a frequently unexamined form of discrimination; in short, curricula that are specifically designed with these students' diverse needs, interests, affiliations, and experiences in mind (see also Harklau et al., 1999). These are, of course, tentative recommendations; much more research concerning this context and population is needed. I hope to have made a case for including in this research endeavor studies (critical and otherwise) that closely examine the details of talk-in-interaction.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have analyzed categories and sequence to explicate a “motivated” analysis of interaction that occurred between Local ESL (generation-1.5) high school students and their teacher. I have argued that although many critical researchers eschew M/CA as being incompatible with a critical agenda, M/CA can in fact powerfully substantiate and elaborate a critical analysis of discourse. As the analysis of the interaction between Mr. Day, Jennie, and CJ suggests, M/CA can work to ground and expand claims that are made in a critical analysis of discourse, thereby addressing criticisms about analytic accountability and warrantability of assertions in critically-situated empirical research. Attention to sequential organization and membership categorization also expands methodological options for a critical analytic repertoire, yielding rich and novel insights into precisely those matters of most consequence to a critical agenda. Indeed, M/CA can expand the *critical* agenda itself as these approaches provide the analytic frame and methodological means to investigate how racism, sexism, classism, homophobia, heterosexism, and ageism are variously instantiated, resisted, accommodated, reproduced, and/or transformed in the unfolding details of everyday life, that is, how power is interactionally achieved rather than an *a priori* given or foregone conclusion.

Analyses of sequence and categorization do not simply benefit critical discourse studies; sequential and categorization analyses are benefited from being critically situated as well. As many critics of M/CA have argued, such analyses can seem overly “micro,” leaving robust, if technical analyses of the structures of talk that add little to understandings of how talk may or may not relate to matters of social justice, inequality, or hegemony as they pertain to race, class, gender, age, and sexuality. In other words, critically situating sequential and categorization analyses expands and enriches the potential for empirically-grounded, theoretically-driven answers to the “why this now” question that guides ethnomethodological research, beyond the so-called “naïve epistemology” of ethnomethodology to, in this instance, a poststructuralist critical theoretical framework. As Kitinger (2000) argues, critical researchers should not reject CA based solely on prior work that has not addressed issues of inequality and oppression to the extent they believe is necessary. Instead, she challenges them to investigate for themselves its utility in (further) grounding such analyses. In doing so, she joins with Schegloff (1999b, p. 563), who argues, somewhat exasperatedly, that “those committed to analyzing forms of inequality and oppression in interaction might do better to harness [CA]...as a *resource* for their undertaking than to complain of it as an ideological distraction” (emphasis in original). In this respect, and as I hope to have demonstrated in this paper, M/CA can work

as a powerful methodological support to critical researchers interested in explicating cultural production and the potentialities of social reproduction in the micropolitics of social interaction.

Acknowledgements

The research reported in this article was supported by the Spencer Foundation and The International Research Foundation (formerly, TESOL International Research Foundation). I am grateful for this support and for comments made on the earlier draft of this paper by the editors and two anonymous reviewers. The views expressed and any remaining errors are my own.

Notes

- 1 This critique is commonly made of all kinds of critical research, including, and of relevance to this paper, critical ethnography (see, e.g., Hammersley, 2000). It can thus be seen as part of a broader rift between ostensibly "value-free" forms of empirical research and those that are "politically motivated" in some way. This paper should in no way be construed as an argument for the former position.
- 2 The names of the school and the research participants have been changed; the students chose their own pseudonyms.
- 3 By "critical/cultural studies," I refer broadly to poststructuralist critical theories common in contemporary cultural studies (see, e.g., S. Hall, 1996a, 1996b; Williams, 1977) and critical applied linguistics (Pennycook, 2001, 2005).
- 4 "Local" (with a capital "L") is a widely known identity category in Hawai'i, and it refers to Asian/Pacific Islanders who were born and raised in the Islands (see Okamura, 1994). "Local ESL," an analyst's category, signifies those oldtimer ESL students at Tradewinds who displayed cultural knowledge of and affiliation with Local culture, cultural forms, and social practices, and the L2 interactional competence needed to participate in these social practices (see Talmy, 2008).
- 5 This latter criticism has also been made of CA by scholars in MCA. See Hester and Eglin (1997) and Watson (1997).
- 6 Note that my 2005 study did not use CA or MCA, nor did it make the arguments of this paper regarding the use of M/CA for critical discourse research.
- 7 Utterances in Pidgin (Hawai'i Creole), the Local language of Hawai'i, are transcribed using Odo orthography (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003) followed by an italicized English gloss in {curly brackets}.
- 8 Revealing the duration of this class session could compromise the confidentiality of the site (and participants).
- 9 Although in line 01 Mr. Day utters only "work," rather than "bookwork," in line 06 he refers to Jennie's "book," implying that to do "work" Jennie needs her "book." Also, as mentioned above, as recently as 5 minutes before this interaction, Mr. Day had

specifically told Jennie, IwannaFAL, CJ, and Computer that they were to be doing “bookwork,” just as he iterates to Jennie in line 28 and CJ in line 54.

- 10 “Good” and “bad” here are meant in terms of moral assessments that indicate “how [participants] might be assessing and thereby specifying the incumbents of the general categories contained in [a ‘base’] SRP” of “teacher/student” (Cuff, 1993, p. 53). By “bad student,” I do not necessarily mean a student who earns poor grades, but rather, one who does not engage in the CBAs locally bound to the “good student” category. This is a category that can be heard as collecting activities that the latter one would not; that is, incumbents of it would not be accommodating the “official” cultural productions of the ESL student.
- 11 Although I cannot be sure that Computer is responsible for the utterances in lines 12, 17, and 52, he was sitting nearby; also, the comments in these turns are consistent with those that he often made in class (when he was not asleep).
- 12 Whereas the intonational contour for yes/no questions in standardized English generally rises, with questions ending on a high pitch, in Pidgin it falls, with questions ending on a low pitch (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003, p. 30).
- 13 Confirming whether this is a switch to Pidgin is impossible because this feature could be acrolectal Pidgin or standardized English, and neither Jennie nor Mr. Day orient to it either way. However, based on my observations, I believe that this is evidence of Mr. Day’s (language) socialization (see below).
- 14 CJ seems to attempt to exploit the ambiguity of “work” here as Jennie did earlier. By inquiring specifically about “bookwork” (cf. line 06), Mr. Day appears to have oriented both to this referential ambiguity and the attempt to make use of it.
- 15 By speaking of Mr. Day’s role in instantiating the “official” productions of ESL, I do not implicate him personally but consider ways that social structures regulating ESL students, ESL learning, and the Tradewinds ESL program were realized (or not) through his orientations toward them and situated actions as a member and agent of the “ESL teacher” category. Implicating Mr. Day personally would presume a radically individualist perspective on social action, with agents divorced from context and agency synonymous with “free will” (Ahearn, 2001). This would locate the sources and consequences of social action squarely in the teacher, which would not only be unfair to Mr. Day but would reduce any analysis to, for example, finding fault with or valorizing his conduct. Such a theoretically impoverished accounting of these data would deny inquiry into precisely those matters of most concern in a critical analysis.
- 16 Note that with the exception of the vocabulary quizzes, the list of assignments that Mr. Day mentions in lines 32–37 represents the *full number* of bookwork assignments that had been given in this quarter. At the time of this interaction, neither Jennie nor CJ (nor several other Local ESL students) had done any of them.

References

- Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 109–137.
- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Baker, C. (2004). Membership categorization and interview accounts. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice* (2nd ed.), (pp. 162–176). London: Sage.
- Barker, C., & Galasiński, D. (2001). *Cultural studies and discourse analysis*. London: Sage.
- Billig, M. (1997). From codes to utterances: Cultural studies, discourse, and psychology. In M. Ferguson & P. Golding (Eds.), *Cultural studies in question* (pp. 205–226). London: Sage.
- Billig, M. (1999a). Conversation analysis and the claims of naivety. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 572–576.
- Billig, M. (1999b). Whose terms? Whose ordinairiness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 543–558.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Language and identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 369–394). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Cameron, D. (2005). Language, gender, and sexuality: Current issues and new directions. *Applied Linguistics*, 26, 482–502.
- Carroll, D. (2000). Precision timing in novice-to-novice L2 conversations. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 67–110.)
- Cashman, H. (2005). Identities at play: Language preference and group membership in bilingual talk in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 301–315.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Goodwin, J. M. (1996). *Teaching pronunciation: A reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Coerr, E. (1977). *Sadako and the thousand paper cranes*. New York: Putnam.
- Cuff, E. C. (1993). *Problems of versions in everyday situations*. Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology & Conversation Analysis/University Press of America.
- Davidson, J. (1984). Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 102–128). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Day, D. (1998). Being ascribed, and resisting, membership of an ethnic group. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 151–190). London: Sage.
- Dixon, R. J. (1956). *Regents English workbook, book 2: Intermediate-advanced*. New York: Regents Publishing Company.
- Edwards, D. (1998). The relevant thing about her: Social identity categories in use. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 15–33). London: Sage.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Faltis, C. J. (1999). Creating a new history. In C. J. Faltis & P. M. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 1–9). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fleischman, H. L., & Hopstock, P. J. (1993). *Descriptive study of services to limited English proficient students*. Arlington, VA: Development Associates.
- Ford, C. E. (2001). At the intersection of turn and sequence: Negation and what comes next. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics* (pp. 51–79). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gafaranga, J. (2001). Linguistic identities in talk-in-interaction: Order in bilingual conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 1901–1925.
- Gafaranga, J. (2005). Demythologising language alternation studies: Conversational structure vs. social structure in bilingual interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 281–300.
- Garrett, P., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Grossberg, L., Nelson, C., & Treichler, P. A. (1992). *Cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Hall, J. K. (1995). “Aw, man, where you goin’?”: Classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 37–62.
- Hall, J. K. (1999). A prosaics of interaction: The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching* (pp. 137–151). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, S. (1996a). Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. In D. Morley & K. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 262–275). London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1996b). Gramsci’s relevance to the study of race and ethnicity. In D. Morley & K. Chen (Eds.), *The Stuart Hall reader: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 411–440). London: Routledge.
- Hammersley, M. (2000). *Taking sides in social research: Partisanship and bias in social enquiry*. London: Routledge.
- Harklau, L., Losey, K. M., & Siegal, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to US-educated learners of ESL*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- He, A. W. (2003). Novices and their speech roles in Chinese heritage language classes. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 128–146). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel & ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

- Heritage, J., & Sorjonen, M. (1994). Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: And-prefacing as a feature of question design. *Language in Society*, 23, 1–29.
- Hester, S. (1998). Describing 'deviance' in school: Recognisably educational psychological problems. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 133–150). London: Sage.
- Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (1997). Membership categorization analysis: An introduction. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis* (pp. 1–23). Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 279–313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kitzinger, C. (2000). Doing feminist conversation analysis. *Feminism & Psychology*, 10, 163–93.
- Kitzinger, C., & Frith, H. (1999). Just say no? The use of conversation analysis in developing a feminist perspective on sexual refusal. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 293–316.
- Koshik, I. (2002). A conversation analytic study of yes/no questions which convey reversed polarity assertions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1851–1877.
- Koshik, I. (2003). *Wh*-questions used as challenges. *Discourse Studies*, 5, 51–77.
- Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange*, 17(4), 63–84.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, B. A., Foley, D. E., & Holland, D. C. (Eds.). (1996). *The cultural production of the educated person: Critical ethnographies of schooling and local practice*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- McKay, S. L., & Wong, S.-L. C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 577–608.
- Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. London: Longman.
- Ohara, Y., & Saft, S. (2003). Using conversation analysis to track gender ideologies in social interaction: Toward a feminist analysis of a Japanese phone-in consultation TV program. *Discourse & Society*, 14, 153–172.
- Okamura, J. Y. (1994). Why there are no Asian Americans in Hawai'i: The continuing significance of local identity. *Social Process in Hawai'i*, 35, 161–178.
- Orfield, G., Losen, D., Wald, J., & Swanson, C. B. (2004). *Losing our future: How minority youth are being left behind by the graduation rate crisis*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil

- Rights Project at Harvard University & The Urban Institute. Contributors: Advocates for Children of New York, The Civil Society Institute.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pennycook, A. (2005). Critical applied linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 784–807). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984a). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984b). Pursuing a response. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 152–163). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruiz de Velasco, J., Fix, M., & Clewell, B. C. (2000). *Overlooked and underserved: Immigrant students in US secondary schools*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation* (Vol. I). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Sakoda, K., & Siegel, J. (2003). *Pidgin grammar: An introduction to the creole language of Hawai'i*. Honolulu, HI: Bess Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 75–119). New York: Free Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1999a). Naivete versus sophistication or discipline versus self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 577–582.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1999b). Schegloff's texts as "Billig's data": A critical reply. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 558–572.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163–191.
- Speer, S. A. (1999). Feminism and conversation analysis: An oxymoron? *Feminism & Psychology*, 9, 471–478.
- Stokoe, E. H., & Smithson, J. (2001). Making gender relevant: Conversation analysis and gender categories in interaction. *Discourse & Society*, 12, 217–244.
- Talmy, S. (2005). *Lifers and FOBs, rocks and resistance: Generation 1.5, identity, and the cultural productions of ESL in a high school*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI.
- Talmy, S. (2008). The cultural productions of the ESL student at Tradewinds High: Contingency, multidirectionality, and identity in L2 socialization. *Applied Linguistics*, Advance Access published June 9, 2008, doi:10.1093/applin/ann01
- Talmy, S. (forthcoming). Forever FOB?: Resisting and reproducing the Other in high school ESL. In A. Reyes & A. Lo (Eds.), *Beyond Yellow English: Toward a linguistic anthropology of Asian Pacific America*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: Sage.

- ten Have, P. (2001). Applied conversation analysis. In A. McHoul & M. Rapley (Eds.), *How to analyze talk in institutional settings: A casebook of methods* (pp. 3–11). London: Continuum.
- van Dijk, T. (1985). Introduction: The role of discourse analysis in society. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis, Volume 4: Discourse analysis in society* (pp. 1–8). London: Academic Press.
- Watson, R. (1997). Some general reflections on 'categorization' and 'sequence' in the analysis of conversation. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis* (pp. 49–75). Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Watt, D., & Roessingh, H. (2001). The dynamics of ESL drop-out: Plus ça change... *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(2), 203–222.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9, 387–412.
- Widdicombe, S. (1995). Identity, politics and talk: A case for the mundane and the everyday. In S. Wilkinson & C. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Feminism and discourse: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 106–127). London: Sage.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. London: Sage.
- Zimmerman, D. (1998). Identity, context, and interaction. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 87–106). London: Sage.