

CONSTRUCTING MEMBERSHIP IN THE IN-GROUP: AFFILIATION AND RESISTANCE AMONG URBAN TANZANIANS

Christina Higgins

Abstract

This article examines how a group of Tanzanian journalists co-construct their identities as members of the same culture by producing talk that aligns them with several shared *membership categories* (Sacks 1972, 1979, 1992). The speakers propose and subsequently reaffirm, resist, or transform the categories 'Westernized' and 'ethnically marked' in order to align or realign themselves as co-members of the same group of white collar workers. In the first excerpt, the participants critique Tanzanian youth who dress like rap singers, providing turn-by-turn slots for co-affiliation, thereby establishing an intercultural difference between themselves and their fellow Tanzanians who adopt Western ways uncritically. In this excerpt, the participants employ interculturality for affiliative positioning by drawing a boundary between themselves and those Tanzanians whom they identify as 'outsiders' through their talk. The disjunction between the two groups is accomplished through codeswitching, shared humor, and pronoun usage. The second excerpt demonstrates how the recently-established shared insider identity is re-analyzed by the group when one of the participants in the office is constructed as uncooperative, and his ethnicity is named as the source of his inability to work with his colleagues in a suitable manner. Thus, his status as an 'outsider' becomes made real through explicit categorization of him as a non-member due to the interculturality of ethnic difference. This participant resists the *ethnification* (Day 1998) he receives, however, and through this resistance, he succeeds in reintegrating himself into the group. This reintegration is accomplished through affiliative language structures including codeswitching, teasing, and the nomination of new shared categories by the ethnified participant. My analysis provides further documentation that interculturality is a continuously dynamic production of *identities-in-practice* (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998), rather than a consequence of fixed social characteristics.

Keywords: Ethnicity; Membership categorization; Codeswitching; Swahili.

1. Introduction

This article investigates whether and to what degree language alternation¹ is used as a tool for constructing social identity categories in and through conversation. Specifically, the article examines how multilingual Tanzanians use the resource of language alternation in collusion with *membership categories* to establish their own and others' social identities. The analysis presented here contributes to studies of talk-in-interaction that show the complex ways in which speakers use categorial language to construct

¹ I use the term *language alternation* instead of the more common term *codeswitching*, as *codeswitching* typically carries the implication that a switch in language has taken place. Conversation analytic studies of language alternation (e.g. Auer 1998, 1999; Li Wei 1995, 2002) have shown clearly that not every case of language alternation is indeed oriented to by participants as a switch in language.

identities for themselves and for their co-participants (e.g., Antaki and Widdicombe 1998; Hansen 2005; Maynard and Zimmerman 1984). Categorization involves the positioning of speakers with various *discursive identities*, such as hearer, speaker, and ratified overhearer, and also with a variety of *social identities*, such as woman, professor, and American (Goffman 1981; Zimmerman 1998). Within Sacks's (1972, 1979) framework of *membership categorization analysis* (MCA), these identities are established in part through *categorization sequences* that serve to characterize a participant as a member of a certain social group, and through *category-activity sequences*, which categorize participants indirectly by indexing typical activities bound to categorizations (Maynard and Zimmerman 1984; Sacks 1972).

This study investigates how speakers use language selection and alternation to order the world into *collections of things* (Sacks 1972, 1979, 1992). In examining several excerpts of bilingual English-Swahili conversation, the analysis will rely heavily on Sacks's *membership categorization analysis* (MCA), and it will also incorporate Antaki and Widdicombe's (1998) conceptualization of identity as *identities-in-practice*, or speakers' dynamic production of themselves and others. The studies of identities-in-talk that draw on Sacks's work have yielded many insights into the nature of identity, but few studies have been conducted on bilingual conversation within this framework, as far as I know. Only Gafaranga (2001) and Torras and Gafaranga (2002) have treated language selection as a way to index membership in social categories, and namely, the social category of 'doing being bilingual.' In his work on multilingual Rwandans living in Belgium, Gafaranga (2001: 1916) treats language choice as practical social action, "not in terms of the identities society associated with the languages involved, but rather in terms of the locally relevant linguistic identities participants have adopted." In his research, the focus is on how speakers negotiate the medium of talk as they perform their multilingual linguistic identities through language selection and language alternation.

In a similar vein, this article examines how Swahili-English bilingual speakers employ language alternation as one resource among many for constructing their identities-in-talk. I will illustrate how, in conjunction with other resources, the participants use two different forms of language alternation as a strategic device to propose, display, accept, resist, and reject membership in certain categories. In addition to *insertional* and *alternational codeswitching* (Muysken 1995), the speakers (journalists) use *ethnification* (Day 1998) and *crossing* (Rampton 1995) to manage their positioning in talk. Through these four processes, the journalists create a set of discursive and social identities, thereby forming constellations of 'ingroup' and 'outgroup' categorizations for themselves and others. In effect, they talk into existence the phenomenon of *interculturality* (Mori 2003; Nishizaka 1995, 1999), a means by which various ingroup and outgroup categories can be established. In addition to language alternation, they use social critique of the outgroup and humor to establish cultural differences. The participants show a strong preference for unified group memberships, however, so when individual participants become categorized as members of the outgroup, the journalists work together to reenlist that participant in the ingroup, thus maintaining the social order in the office.

2. Conceptual framework

2.1. Interculturality

I follow Nishizaka's (1995) and Mori's (2003) use of the term *interculturality* to mean cultural affiliations that produce cultural differences which are made relevant through conversation. As Nishizaka (1995: 302) proposes, we should not take different cultures for granted when analyzing talk, but rather, explicate "how it is that the fact of being intercultural is organized as a social phenomenon." Nishizaka's research examines the ways that 'being a Japanese' is achieved interactively in the same way that 'being a foreigner' is achieved through talk. Nishizaka (1995: 305) explains, "For instance, that I am a Japanese is correct, but the category "Japanese" is not always relevantly applicable to me; whether I am Japanese or not might be irrelevant when I talk to students about Structural-Functionalism in a sociology class."

Mori (2003) continues this line of research, examining question-answer sequences in a study of participation frameworks. She focuses on the description of interculturality by examining moment-by-moment shifts of participation structures for the next-speaker selection, and she also shows that interculturality is treated as irrelevant for some interactions altogether. By examining talk based on the membership categories displayed and made relevant by participants, both Nishizaka and Mori are interested in examining sequences of talk to see how the participants show whether or not their cultural differences are salient. Many other researchers have examined intercultural communication from a social constructivist perspective, including Cheng (2003), Gumperz (1982), and Scollon and Scollon (2001), but perhaps because none of these researchers has used MCA as the primary framework for analysis, their work tends to take cultural difference as a starting point, rather than a phenomenon which remains to be empirically located in talk.

2.2. Membership categorization

Sacks's (1972) interest in how members categorize themselves is rooted in the traditions of ethnomethodology, an approach to sociology most often associated with Garfinkel (1967) which was established to investigate people's methods for accounting for their own actions and the actions of others. For example, Garfinkel asked his students to investigate everyday activity of greetings by asking unusual questions and pursuing answers which would be considered common-sensical to most people, thus thwarting normalcy, and hopefully revealing the structure of these activities and members' reasons for doing them (1967: 44):

(1)

S: How are you?

E: How am I in regard to what? My health, my finances, my school work, my peace of mind, my . . .

S: ((red in the face and suddenly out of control)) Look! I was just trying to be polite. Frankly, I don't give a damn how you are.

By organizing experiments such as the one above, Garfinkel sought to understand how people describe their mundane activity, and how they construct a shared sense of reality, particularly when they are faced with abnormal circumstances such as in (1).

Sacks drew on Garfinkel's interest in understanding when and how members describe their activities, and he extended the study of members' productions of their activities to the study of talk. Sacks was interested in formulating descriptions of people's actions, not from relying on his own perspective as the analyst to describe the activity, but by seeing how the members themselves described the activity. His interest in the ways that people use language to arrange and rearrange the objects of the world into *collections of things* formed the basis of MCA, or the ways that members organize activities and actions in their talk.

Sacks's collections of things are what he calls *membership categorization devices* (MCDs). He describes MCDs as "any collection of membership categories, containing at least a category, which may be applied to some population containing at least a member, so as to provide, by the use of some rules of application, for the pairing of at least a population member and a categorization device member" (Sacks 1972: 332). Examples of MCDs include 'the family,' in which the categories might be mother, father, and child; 'middle-class occupations,' in which the categories might be teacher, lawyer, banker; or 'woman,' which might include the categories mother, grandmother, niece, and sister. Of course, a person can be correctly described as being a member of different categories. From the set of applicable categories, a particular category may be selected as relevant by an individual or by his or her co-participants in the course of a developing interaction.

In his work, Sacks sought to make use of emic categories which were produced by the participants themselves in their activities. His purpose in pursuing MCA was to critique much sociological research that was more analyst-driven. He writes,

Suppose you're an anthropologist or sociologist standing somewhere. You see somebody do some action, and you see it to be some activity. How can you go about formulating who is it that did it, for the purposes of your report? Can you use at least what you might take to be the most conservative formulation - his name? Knowing, of course, that any category you choose would have [these] kinds of systematic problems: how would you go about selecting a given category from the set that would equally well characterise or identify that person at hand? (1992, vol. 1: 467-468).

The significance of relying on members' categories, and not those of analysts, becomes clear when the subjectivity of interpreting the same 'reality' is unveiled. In order to understand categorization from the members' views, it becomes necessary to restrict analysts' conceptions of what categories ought to belong to specific MCDs. For example, Silverman (1998: 79) points out that societal sexism should not be assumed, but shown to be oriented to as real by speakers through using MCA. He explains that women, but not men, tend to be identified by their marital status, number of children, and hair color, while men are identified by what they do for a living. He asks us to compare the categories of "shapely, blonde, mother of five" with those of "thirty-two-year-old teacher," and argues that while both could refer to the same person, we hear 'mother' as a category from a different collection than the collection of things that 'teacher' belongs to. The explanation for why we hear these lexical items as belonging to particular collections of things is related to the socialization process through which children learn names for things, and members' categorizations can help analysts to see

what groupings reflect that socialization process, and hence, what categorizations are 'real' for them. Silverman (1998: 80) explains how very young children in Western contexts learn the groupings which form MCDs: "First, children learn single names ('mommy', 'daddy'). Then they learn how such single categories fit into collections ('family') and come to understand various combinatorial tasks (e.g. man = daddy or uncle). So, even at this early stage of their lives, say before they are two years old . . . children have entered into society/been 'socialized'."

2.2.1. Being ascribed and resisting membership in interculturality

The idea that ethnic identity is dynamic, rather than static, has a long tradition in critical studies rooted in the frameworks of post-modernism, post-colonial studies, and cultural studies. The notions of race and ethnicity, among other categories, have been illustrated to be dynamic, shifting, and dependent on perspectives and context. Similar to MCA, these approaches to categories such as ethnicity take the view that all identities are performed, rather than fixed (Bhabha 1994; Butler 1999; Hall 1997, Kristeva 1974; Rampton 1995). To illustrate, Ibrahim (2003: 172) explains his own personal experience with shifting ethnic/racial categories, based on his different affiliations and self-conceptualization as a 'Black' person:

As a continental African, for example, I was not considered 'Black' in Africa; other terms served to patch together my identity, such as tall, Sudanese, and basketball player. In other words . . . my Blackness was not marked, it was outside the shadow of the Other - North American whiteness. However, as a refugee in North America, my perception of self was altered in direct response to the social processes of racism and the historical representation of Blackness whereby the antecedent signifiers became secondary to my Blackness, and I retranslated my being: I became Black.

Studies of face-to-face interaction within ethnomethodological approaches have shown that categories such as ethnicity are made relevant among speakers by way of explicit category naming, and through CBAs (category-bound activities; see e.g. Hansen 2005). However, the naming of these categories alone does not make them 'real' for all parties. For example, a person may be categorized as 'White' or 'African American' by another, but the person initially categorized that way may react against such membership altogether, or as relevant for the immediate conversation. Moreover, the person may react against the categorization altogether, since these categories and who they apply to are contestable in themselves. In his study of talk-in-interaction among ethnic minorities in Swedish factories, Day (1998) shows how 'ethnic group' categorizations were often treated as inappropriate and contested categorizations by the participants. In his study, he sought to determine ethnicity not as a category pre-existing the conversational interactions he encountered, but rather, to look for "ethnification processes . . . through which people distinguish an individual or collection of individuals as a member of members respectively of an ethnic group" (Day 1998: 154). He gives the following example as an illustration, which is translated from Swedish. In the excerpt, three speakers who work together at a factory in Sweden are engaged in planning a party to which they will invite all of their co-workers, and they are discussing what kind of food to prepare:

(2) Dismissing the relevance of the ethnic category:

- 51 L: don't we have something that, one can eat
 52 that, China or
 53 R: Chinese food is really pretty good
 → 54 X: ha ha () it doesn't matter, I'll eat anything
 55 R: ah (that's [what I that)
 56 L: [yeah, but this concerns everyone,
 57 doesn't it?

In (2), Lars has suggested Chinese food for the party in line 51, and Rita upgrades the suggestion, stating her positive opinion of Chinese cuisine, but neither accepting nor rejecting it as the choice. In his treatment of the data in (2), Day explains that Lars' suggestion, and Rita's confirmation, project the next turn as belonging to Xi, and it is a turn which is projected to take the shape of either an acceptance or refusal. Day explains that their talk thus far makes relevant Xi's ethnicity as Chinese, and he argues that Xi's response as the next speaker confirms this idea. In her response, Xi does not accept the suggestion, but instead, expresses her willingness to eat any type of cuisine. Day argues that her response on 54 indicates that she heard the suggestion as particularly relevant for her, as someone who would be knowledgeable about Chinese food, thereby producing her identity as 'Chinese' by virtue of the CBA ('eating Chinese food') associated with the ethnic category 'Chinese'. Day argues that her response would not make sense without this inference, and he explains that Xi's denial of the relevance of the ethnic category via the CBA of eating Chinese food resists the relevance of the ethnic categorization produced by the co-participants. Day explains that Xi's denial of the relevance of her ethnicity can be seen as her intent to be viewed as a member of the social group jointly pursuing the social activity at hand, rather than to suffer the fate of 'exteriorization'. He explains that her ethnicity here may prevent her from fully participating as an equal member in the group, and so her aversion to being marked as culturally-specific here is resistance of the implication that she is "not due the trust one needs to be a member of the social group constituted in the social activity" (Day 1998: 168).

Example (2) does not display language alternation, but it does provide a basis for comparison with the bilingual data I will present below in the ways that speakers go about displaying their acceptance or rejection of categories which mark them as 'ethnified' or otherwise culturally-marked. Moreover, this excerpt offers an indication of where language alternation might emerge in rejections or downgradings of categorizations. In (2), the rejection of the relevance of Xi's ethnicity is preceded by a laughter token, a means by which dispreference can be said to be marked for the way it delays her rejection. The laughter is similar to the use of pauses and token words before other dispreferred actions such as 'well', as in (3) below:

(3) Dispreference shown through well (from Pomerantz 1984: 72)

- 1 C: . . . 'hh a:n' uh by god I can' even send my
 2 kid tuh public school b'cuz they're so god
 3 damn lousy.
 → 4 D: We:ll that's a generality.

In my examination of the Swahili-English data below, I will discuss how language alternation might get used as a way to propose, reject, or accept membership categorizations made by others, in a parallel manner to the laughter tokens in (2) and the token 'well' in (3).

2.3. Identities-in-practice

In recent work on MCDs, Antaki and Widdicombe (1998) establish five principles for the analysis of identities in practice (Table 1). My own analysis makes use of these principles in determining whether the participants employ language alternation to help produce, accept, and/or reject MCDs.

Table 1. Five Principles for the Analysis of Identities-in-practice (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998)

-
1. For a person to 'have an identity' - whether he or she is the person speaking, being spoken to, or being spoken about - is to be cast into a *category with associated characteristics or features*;
 2. such casting is *indexical and occasioned*;
 3. it *makes relevant* the identity to the interactional business going on;
 4. the force of 'having an identity' is in its *consequentiality* in the interaction; and
 5. all this is visible in people's exploitation of the *structures of conversation*.
-

The first principle is based on Sacks's idea that categories are bound together as belonging to *collections of things*, or categories which are grouped together because of associated characteristics. Antaki and Widdicombe (1998) give the example of a 'flight cabin crew,' with the categories 'bursar,' 'first-class steward,' and 'flight attendant' as the associated features of the MCD 'cabin crew.' These categories may be enacted through explicit reference to the MCD, or to CBAs, the actions which indirectly group categories into MCDs. Using Antaki and Widdicombe's example of a flight crew as a MCD, CBAs might be 'being knowledgeable about aircraft safety,' 'being polite,' and 'well-traveled.' For the flight crew, however, is important to realize that this very same group of people could be classified under various MCDs, such as 'British,' 'Caucasian,' or 'female' (Principle 1). Antaki and Widdicombe (1998: 4) emphasize that the converse is also true since CBAs can also imply the categories; they write, "if you look and act a certain way, you might get taken to be a flight attendant; if you have certain legal documents with certain appropriate authorizations, you can be taken to be British". In this view, one can do 'being a flight attendant' while in one's own home, perhaps for charades, and the actions will be recognizable as such even if the person doing 'being a flight attendant' is not really in that line of work. The MCD 'British' might be *indexed* when passing through immigration checks, when the crew files to the counter labeled 'domestic' rather than 'foreign arrivals' while in the U.K., and *occasioned* by the context of the immigration procedures (Principle 2). In another context, their status 'female' might be *occasioned* by which bathroom they enter in the public domain, or

when they referred to as “ladies” by a fellow co-worker, and their ‘female’ MCD becomes marked through the use of the gender-specifying label.

MCDs are made *relevant* (Principle 3) because they are *oriented* to by the participants themselves, rather than the analyst. In the cabin crew scenario, for example, the crew may orient to one another as ‘good friends’ while off the job, but as ‘formal colleagues’ while passing one another while moving down the aisle of the plane, or during a work meeting. In work meetings, we can see the ‘formal colleagues’ identity only if it has *procedural consequentiality* (Principle 4) for the speakers. In other words, the identity is real only if it has a visible effect on the interaction. Finally, the above four principles are made visible in *structures of conversation* (Principle 5), the locus of interaction where participants produce and display their interpretations of one another’s identities moment-by-moment.

By making reference to the above principles, I will first show the MCDs which participants can be seen as making relevant through their conversational structures, either through explicit reference or through CBAs. I will then show how language alternation, one of the *structures of conversation* (Principle 5), is employed by participants as a means to produce identities-in-practice.

3. Data analysis: Interculturality among the ‘same’ people

The data presented here is drawn from a larger study of Swahili-English conversation that took place in a newspaper office in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania (Higgins 2004). Sixty hours of data were recorded, and 53 workers participated in the original study. All of the participants may be considered bilingual in Swahili and English, as their work at an English-medium newspaper office requires that they be able to attend press conferences, carry out interviews, and read documents in both Swahili and English. Most of the participants speak at least one ethnic community language as well, such as Chagga, Nyakyusa, Haya, or Iraqw. While many Tanzanians who have graduated from high school have quite limited English proficiency, the participants in this study can be described as highly proficient in English and Swahili and of a relatively affluent socioeconomic status. All of the participants in the data presented have obtained a post-secondary degree in which English is the medium of instruction, and all of them use English in their daily work.

In this section, I will present two excerpts of talk-in-interaction which reveal how participants at the newspaper office constructed MCDs concerning interculturality through explicit mention of particular categories as well as CBAs indexing these categories. The transcripts follow conversation analytic conventions (e.g. Atkinson and Heritage 1984) and are produced so that the first line represents the actual utterance, the second line is a morpheme-by-morpheme translation, and the third line is a gloss in conversational English (see Appendix for abbreviations).

The data show how the participants employ MCDs to establish ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ groups, but in this case, this dichotomy is established to first construct a shared culture among the journalists. This shared culture is based on the journalists’ rejection of ‘uncritical Westernization,’ which contrasts with what they name as “traditions.” Their shared membership is then disrupted by the instantiation of interculturality minutes later, however, when CBAs not associated with the culture of ‘doing being journalists’ are carried out by one of the participants.

3.1. Westernized and traditional identities in talk

In the first excerpt, the participants use MCDs and the conversational structure of *insertional codeswitching* (Muysken 1995), a very hybrid code involving English and Swahili, to align themselves as members of the same group. Insertional codeswitching is akin to borrowing in that it involves the insertion of a lexical or phrasal category into the matrix language.² Using this code, the journalists make interculturality relevant in the first excerpt, but only as a means for drawing a boundary between themselves and those Tanzanians who they identify as ‘outsiders’ through their talk. Interculturality is thus established between the speakers in the newspaper office and those Tanzanians who follow Western ways uncritically, such as the Tanzanian youth who dress like rap singers. In the excerpt, the participants are discussing the phenomenon of young Tanzanians who follow fashion trends that they see on television without consideration of how the trends might be inappropriate due to their local tropical weather. Through the talk, an ‘insider’ MCD becomes established through CBAs which organize all those present in the office within the same group. The journalists achieve ‘insider’ membership by jointly criticizing the youth that enthusiastically follow these styles, and they tease one another for not being fashionable since they do not follow the hip-hop trends. Prior to the excerpt, the participants have been looking at a photo of a popular soccer team. The photo has prompted a contentious debate in which the journalists argued whether a team of Tanzanian soccer players were wearing their cleats while boarding a plane. The journalists had been disagreeing with one another over whether or not the cleats are visible, and also over who is to blame for the soccer team’s ignorance regarding appropriate footwear on planes. The conversation continues in this theme, and Leonard’s first line below refers to people such as these soccer players:

(4a)

- 1 Leonard: *Sasa unajua wanavyoona kwenye television yule kwa vitendo*
 now you-pres-know they-pres-see on television that-person by act
 ‘Now you know that when they watch television and see a person doing something’
- 2 *hawamwelewi hh. wanasema nini kwa hiyo hao wakimwona mtu*
 they.neg-obj-understand hh. they-pres-say what for that they they-if-obj-see person
 ‘that they don’t understand and they say what, therefore, they when they see someone’
- 3 *amevaa gloves anafikiri hh. ni style kumbe wale wamevaa gloves*
 s/he-has-wear gloves s/he-pres-think hh. it.is style wow they-there they-have-wear gloves
 ‘wearing gloves, they think that it’s a style to follow, and all of a sudden they decide to wear gloves too’.
- 4 *wakati wa wakati ..hh bari- wa winter kule kuna baridi hh.*

² Examples of insertional CS are more like borrowings than cases of codeswitching that have any pragmatic function. In the examples provided, the instances of insertional CS are very similar to what Auer (1999) calls *language mixing*, the ungrammaticalized use of alternate languages which yield no pragmatic effect at the sequential level. In the transcript, I have chosen not to format the instances of insertional CS as a distinct language from Swahili because these ‘insertions’ do not represent another language, but rather, index the use of a mixed code as a legitimate language in its own right.

time of time cold- of winter over.there there.is cold
 ‘During, during the cold peri- during winter it is cold there (in Europe).’

5 ((Everyone laughs; everyone is smiling))

6 *Sasa mchezaji wetu hapa akija hh. uwanja wa kimataifa na jua*
 now player our here s/he-if-come hh. field of dj-countries and sun
 ‘Now our player here, when he comes out onto the international field and the sun’

7 *linawaka degree thelathini na mbili hh. anavaa gloves,*
 it-pres-blaze degree thirty and two hh. s/he-pre-wear gloves
 ‘is blazing at thirty two degrees (Celsius) and he’s wearing gloves,’

8 Fikiri: *Anapachika daluga.*
 S/he-pres-pierce spikes
 ‘He’s sticking the spikes in (to the ground).’ ((F is examining the photo))

9 Leonard: *Yeah.*
 ‘Yeah.’

In lines 1-7, Leonard is criticizing Tanzanian soccer players for what he characterizes as their provincial nature. On lines 1-7, he expresses his disdain for how members on the team apparently misunderstand Western soccer players’ need to wear gloves during winter as a fashion statement. Using the journalists’ unmarked hybrid code involving insertional codeswitching, he says, “*wakimwona mtu amevaa gloves anafikiri ni style kumbe wale wamevaa gloves*” (‘when they see someone wearing gloves, they think it’s a style, and all of a sudden they wear gloves too’). Leonard is laughing and smiling throughout these turns, but it is clear that he is being critical of the soccer players’ gullibility or ignorance. The laughter on line 5 marks the others as sharing the same understanding, and their laughter indicates that it is comical for this group of educated and well-traveled journalists to imagine misunderstanding gloves as a fashion statement instead of a means to keep warm during European winters.

The conversation had already covered the topic of the players’ wearing cleats while boarding a plane, so Fikiri’s comment about the matter again on line 8 marks his preoccupation with the choice to do so as particularly ignorant or foolish. Leonard, Fikiri, and others had already shared many minutes discussing whether the shoes were cleats or running shoes, and at this point, Fikiri’s comment indicates his continued incredulity towards the idea that anyone could ever make the conscious decision to wear cleats on a plane. Leonard’s “yeah” on line 9 confirms this incredulity, and groups Leonard and Fikiri together as people who share the same sentiments.

In the remainder of this excerpt, we see how the other participants engage collaboratively in the conversation while using insertional codeswitching, thus ratifying their membership in the group of ‘insiders,’ or people who do not blindly follow Western ways.

(4b)

10 Peter: *Hilo wala si kwa wachezaji tu sema majority wa Tanzania.*
 it-dem nor neg for players only say majority of Tanzania
 ‘This isn’t for sports players only; admit it, it’s the majority of Tanzania.’

11 Leonard: *Ni wengi yes mpaka vijana unakuta wana wanafanya.*

- it.is many yes including youths you-pres-find they-pres they-pres
 'It is many, yes, even the youth. You will see them doing, doing it (too)'.
- 12 Frankie: *Mbona wale (.) wanaoimba rap wanavaa makofia ya winter yale.*
 Why they (.) they-pres-sing rap they-pres-wear pl-hat of winter dem
 'Why do those people who sing rap wear winter hats (and)'
- 13 *yale majacket.*
 dem pl-jacket
 'those jackets?'
- 14 Peter: *Hiyo ni kwa Watanzania wengi . Isipokuwa Mosi.*
 dem is for pl-Tanzanian many except Mosi
 'That (style) is most Tanzanians. Except Mosi.'
- 15 Frankie: *Mosi yeye ameamua kubakia traditions.*
 Mosi he he-pfc-decide to-remain traditions
 'Mosi has decided to remain in the traditions.'
- 16 Jongo: *Mo:si::.*
- 17 Peter: *Mosi n [(circumstance tofauti) xxx.*
 Mosi is circumstance different
 'Mosi is in a different circumstance.'
- 18 Frankie: *[Kuna vijana (.) wachache born with their traditions first.*
 There-are youths pl-few born with their traditions first
 'There are few youths these days born with their traditions first.'
- 19 Peter: Traditions first.
- 20 *Eh, umema liza.* ((to another journalist, Noreen, regarding the computer))
 hey you-have-finish
 'Hey, are you done?'

On line 10, Peter confirms this insider-outsider grouping and further clarifies the members of both groups, and, making use of the hybrid English-Swahili insiders' code, he declares the outsiders to be "*majority wa Tanzania*" ('the majority of Tanzanians'). Leonard's confirmation of his statement on line 11 jointly constructs Leonard, Peter, and Frankie as people who are not of 'the majority.' The CBAs of being 'Westernized' here involve 'dressing according to outsiders' standards,' and 'being unduly influenced by cultures outside of Tanzania'.

The MCD of 'Westernized' becomes more clear when the journalists polarize it with what they explicitly call "traditions" later in the excerpt. In lines 12-13, Frankie asks about the practice of youth who wear winter hats and coats in Tanzania while rapping, which can be taken as another critique of youth culture which does not examine the appropriateness of winter clothing (and hence, Western ideals) for the Tanzanian context in which a Northern type of 'winter' does not exist. On line 14, Peter marks his understanding of this 'insider' group identity of which he is a member by teasing another journalist, Mosi, for not being like the majority of Tanzanians youth who embrace Westernization, at least in terms of fashion. By teasing him, Peter places Mosi into the 'insider' group, i.e., those who are 'traditionalists,' when he says he says 'That (style) is most Tanzanians, except Mosi.' The tease is actually a compliment,

based on the pejorative comments that have been made about the soccer players who blindly follow the Western trends they see on television.

Peter's comment on line 14 can be taken as praise for Mosi's (and by group-association, his own) resilience which rejects Western fashion trends and thereby, promotes Tanzanian values instead. These positive sentiments are echoed by Jongo and Frankie (line 15). Interestingly, Frankie uses the English word "traditions" in his hybrid code, even though the Swahili choices such as *mila* ('custom') *desturi* ('tradition') or *kienyeji* ('indigenous') would have been available to him, as these words are very common lexical items. Frankie's next turn in line 18 makes use of "born with their traditions first," which contrasts with the medium of the surrounding talk. Unlike the previous turns of talk that involve hybrid language mixing, this turn is comprised of *alternational codeswitching* (Muysken 1995). Unlike insertional codeswitching, alternational codeswitching typically involves the use of a different code at levels higher than the morpheme or word boundary. This type of language alternation is starker than insertional codeswitching, and it appears to have a much more clearly pragmatic function in talk.

This contrast seems to emphasize traditions or Tanzanian life as different from the surrounding talk's content (CBAs involving 'Westernized' activities). Furthermore, the English word 'traditions' arguably takes on the voice of the *other* (Said, 1978, Spivak, 1987), as it categorizes traditional ways as noticeably different or marked, in reference to modern (or Westernized) ways. In other words, cultural practices only become traditions when perceived through the eyes of the other.

At this point in the conversation, the group shares 'insider' status through their mixed code, and through sharing the MCD 'traditionalists,' marked by the CBAs 'dressing appropriately for their local context,' 'rejecting Western trends,' and 'critiquing other Tanzanians for their provincial ways.' In terms of conversational structures, the use of Swahili-English establishes an insider group in collusion with these MCDs. It is relevant to note that these English insertions index normative speech among these journalists. In my six month period of field work, I observed that Swahili-English talk was their regular mode for communicating with one another, and it was clear that their daily language practices rarely involved either 'pure' English or 'pure' Swahili.

3.2. *Doing (and not doing) being a journalist*

The second excerpt, taken from moments later in the talk, demonstrates how this recently-established shared culture is re-analyzed by the group when Mosi, who has just been praised for his insider-status, is removed from this status and re-oriented to as an outsider. Throughout the talk, CBAs deemed appropriate for the identity of 'doing being a journalist' emerge, and Mosi's activities are characterized as inappropriate and uncooperative for this categorization through the use of alternational codeswitching.

At the start of Excerpt 5a, Peter asks Mosi (who is working on a project with Jongo, an intern) whether he is writing a story or doing some other kind of work. Peter has been waiting for a computer to become free for quite a while at this point:

(5a)

- 75 Peter: *Aah nyie mnaandika stori au mnafundishana?*
ah you-pl you.pl-pres-write story or you.pl-pres-teach-each.other
'Ah, are you writing stories or are you teaching each other?'
- 76 Mosi: *Ah ah,*
'no,'
- 77 Peter: *Sisi tunataka kompyuta bwana.*
we we-pres-want computer sir/friend
'We want the computer, buddy.'
- 78 Mosi: *Aisee uta- tutaenda wapi?*
I-say you-will we-will-go where
'Hey, you'll- where will we go?'
- 79 Peter: t! ((alveolar tongue click, indexing aggravation))
- 80 Frankie: *Wewe kama nanii: hiyo page unamali- umeshamaliza kutype*
you like um this page you-pres-fin- you-presperf-finish to-type
'Um, when you fin-, once you have finished typing that page,'
- 81 *mwambie Peter akusaidie kuondoa ile [pale.*
him-tell Peter he-you-help to-remove that there
'tell Peter to help you to take it out there.'
- 82 Peter: [This is not a computer lesson.
- 83 Mosi: *Nimeshamaliza.*
I-pres.pfc-cpl-finish
'I have already finished.'

In line 75, Peter uses the journalists' hybrid code of insertional codeswitching when he asks Mosi and Jongo whether they are engaged in what he characterizes as 'legitimate journalism activity,' with his question, 'Are you writing a story or are you teaching each other?' Mosi responds minimally, choosing neither option, which prompts Peter to complain, 'We want the computer, buddy'. At this point in the conversation, Peter has been waiting for a computer to become available up so that he can write his news story. His choice of "sisi" ('we') in line 77 is interesting, since he is the only one on queue for a computer. However, what this pronominal choice may be doing is marking him as one of the people with a legitimate activity, i.e., the activity of typing a story for the newspaper. Mosi's response on line 78 concedes his activity as outside the bounds of 'writing stories,' as he asks where he and Jongo will go to finish their task of creating forms. Peter responds with an alveolar tongue click, which in Tanzania, indicates disdain for what someone has just said.

Frankie joins the conversation on line 80, confirming Peter's characterization of Mosi's activity as inappropriate for the setting, and tells him to hurry his task. Peter interrupts in line 82, declaring in English, "This is not a computer lesson," a turn which clearly labels the activity that Mosi and Jongo are engaged in as outside the boundaries of what journalists should be doing in the office. This turn marks their activity as belonging to 'others,' those who are not engaged in journalism, and its medium of

expression, English, helps to construct the ‘otherness’ of the activity by virtue of its disjunction with the previous talk. The stark use of alternational codeswitching here contrasts greatly with the prior use of insertional codeswitching and consequently becomes a forceful way to contest Mosi’s activities. Mosi complains that he is about finished on line 83, but he remains in his chair, continuing with his action of ‘not doing being journalist’.

In excerpt 5b, the conversation continues, and Frankie repeats his advice to Mosi to hurry up by asking Peter to help him edit the forms so that he can free up the computer for Peter.

(5b)

84 Frankie: *Kweli >mwambie jamaa akusaidie kurekebisha forms na*
really him-tell person he-you-help to-adjust forms and
‘Really, you should tell the guy to help you to correct the forms and’

85 *kufanya virekebicho vingine< (.) uondoke.*
to-do corrections other you-sbj-leave
‘to do other corrections so that you can leave.’

((omitted talk: Mosi and Frankie discuss how Mosi might do the alterations on his form, and whether or not Fikiri is coming back to use the computer that Mosi is using))

91 Mosi: *Sasa unasema (.) unapiga kelele.*
Now you-pres-say you-pres-hit noise
‘Now you say, now you’re making racket (complaining).’

92 (1.0)

93 *Kama utakuwa mstaarabu unakuja kukaa hapa lakini kama*
if you-fut-be peaceful.person you-pres-come to-sit here but if
‘If you are reasonable/decent, then you’ll get to sit here, but if’

94 *utaamua kuforce mambo ndiyo hivyo.*
you-fut-decide to-force things indeed are-this-way
‘you decide to force things, then that’s it.’

Between lines 85 and 91, Mosi responds to Frankie’s advice with a complaint, and he mentions that another journalist had told him that the person previously using the computer was finished, therefore providing a rationale to his rights to the computer. Peter did not agree with this logic, probably because Mosi’s activity has been characterized by several people as outside the bounds of writing a story, which is what this group of journalists orients to as the priority activity for the computers. On line 91, Mosi orients to Peter’s disdain as a complaint, and he characterizes Peter as ‘making racket’.

In lines 93-94, Mosi offers his perception of legitimate activity and behavior in the room, as he explains “*kama utakuwa mstaarabu unakuja kukaa hapa*” (‘If you are reasonable/decent, then you’ll get to sit here’), but continues, “*lakini kama utaamua kuforce mambo ndiyo hivyo*” (‘but if you decide to force things, then that’s it’). Here, Mosi’s strategic juxtaposition of “*mstaarabu*” and “*kuforce*” creates a disjunction with

how he views Peter's behavior, and the way that his own behavior is being treated by others in the office such as Frankie and Peter. "*Mstaarabu*" means 'civilized person,' and is a term which would not be grouped with the activity of being 'forceful,' as in "*kuforce*." Moreover, the language choice indexes opposition, as Mosi's pairing of these two words shows the discontinuity between his desires and those of Peter's, and also shows his view of Peter's actions as negative. While such language use might be categorized as insertional codeswitching, I propose treating it as alternational for the way in which it establishes a clear contrast in the interpretation of activities among the participants.

After line 94, Peter turns his attention to the whereabouts of Fikiri, the person responsible for handing over the computer to Mosi in the first place. His effort to resolve the problem this way does not succeed, however, and another journalist who has been sitting in the office the entire time, Mbwilo, joins the conversation. Mosi's activities continue to run counter to the on-task journalist identity, and Mbwilo names his ethnicity as the source of his inability to work with his colleagues in a suitable manner. Hence, by way of association, his ethnicity becomes one of the features of the MCD 'doing being uncooperative' or 'being off-task in the office'. His status as an outsider becomes made real through explicit categorization of him as culturally marked, and his response shows his rejection of this ethnic marking.

(5c)

- 98 Mbwilo: *Sasa wewe maliza acha [uone atakayekaa au ataxxx.*
 now you finish leave you-sbj-see he-will-who-sit or he-will-xxx
 'Now, you finish and leave, and see who will sit there or who will'
- 99 Frankie: [*Wewe maliza uondoke uende zako=*
 you finish you-sbj-leave you-sbj-go yours
 'You just finish and get on your way'
- 100 Peter: =*Kwa hiyo wewe huondoki mpaka [Fikiri aje.*
 for that you you.neg-leave until Fikiri comes
 'So you aren't leaving until Fikiri comes?'
- 101 Mbwilo: [*Kwa yeye ataruhuswa-*
 for him he-fut.allow-psv
 'For him to be allowed (to use the computer)'
- 102 Frankie: *Huyo nani yuko nani (.) hamna monitor.*
 he who he-loc who neg.loc monitor
 'That guy, um, he's um. There's no monitor there.'
- 103 Mosi: *Wala haitoki.*
 nor it.neg-go.out
 'And it doesn't work.'
- 104 Mbwilo: *Wewe unaleta mambo ya Kikurya huku.*
 you you-pres-bring things of adj-Kurya here
 'You bring this Kurya stuff here.'

In line 98, Mbwilo tells Mosi in no uncertain terms to leave the computer and to hand it over to Peter. Frankie's voice becomes part of the directive on line 99, where he uses the expression "*uende zako*" ('get on your way', or even, 'get lost'). Everyone in the office (Peter, Frankie, and Mbwilo) is telling Mosi that his activities are not legitimate, and that he needs to abandon his computer. He is characterized as not behaving appropriately, and his activities are not oriented to as belonging to 'doing being a journalist' in this context. Peter asks him to leave again (line 100), and Frankie looks around to find another computer that Mosi might use for his non-journalistic task (line 102). Still, Mosi remains seated at the coveted computer, and this appears to prompt Mbwilo to say 'you bring this Kurya stuff here,' on line 104, referring to Mosi's ethnic group, a Bantu group in Northern Tanzania that is often portrayed in the media as stubborn and hostile, with a preference for careers in the police and military. Mbwilo's line 104 groups Mosi outside the boundaries of the 'insiders', those who are engaged in journalistic tasks, as it makes salient his ethnicity, which is not shared by any other member of the group. His use of the word 'here' marks the context as one in which "being Kurya" is inappropriate since it creates obstacles for the other journalists to do their job. In other words, being an outsider here is evaluated negatively. In excerpt 5d, we then see how everyone orients to the disturbance that this othering creates in the office, and we see various efforts to reenlist Mosi as an insider who is 'doing being a journalist':

(5d)

105 Frankie: *Halo njoo wewe njoo ukae hapa. Usipoteze muda wa mwenzio.*
hello come you come you-sit-sbj here you.neg.sbj-lose time of your.colleague
'Hey, come, you, and sit here. Don't waste your colleague's time.'

106 (.)

107 *Njoo.=*
'Come here.'

((Mosi stands up but remains at the computer))

108 Mosi: *=Sasa unanilazimisha.*
now you-pres-me-force
'Now you are forcing me.'

109 Frankie: *Haya ma- nanii madiskette mabovu haya. Hallow nanii, (.)*
enough pl.- um pl-diskette pl-corrupt dem hello um
'Okay, these, um these disks are bad, these (ones). Hey there, um,'

110 *>Kijana< njoo:.*
young.person come
'Youngster, come here.'

((Mosi moves towards the seat Frankie offers))

111 Mosi: *Kijana wa hapo xxx wana tabia.*
young.person of here xxx they-have (bad) characters.
'The young people here have bad attitudes.' ((creaky voice mimicking an elder))

((Peter takes Mosi's seat))

Frankie echoes Mbwilo's sentiments on line 105 by saying 'Don't waste your colleague's time,' clearly marking Mosi's activities as illegitimate and contrary to what 'colleagues' should be doing for one another. At the same time, his turn on this line attempts to return Mosi back to the 'insider' group, as it asks for cooperation. Frankie tells him 'Come here' and politely requests that he sit next to Frankie using subjunctive, rather than imperative form.

At this point in the interaction, Mosi stands up and says "*Sasa unanilazimisha*" ('Now you are forcing me'). By moving out from behind the computer, and allowing Peter to use it (line 111), Mosi becomes a cooperative member of the insider group of journalists once again, and his utterance in line 108, in 'pure' Swahili this time (as opposed to "*kuforce*", line 94), marks the end to the disjunction created earlier in the conversation. Mosi moves towards Frankie in line 110, and in a creaky voice mimicking an *mzee* ('elder'), he says 'The youth here have bad attitudes,' and then smiles. Through *crossing* (Rampton 2005) into the voice of the *mzee*, he rectifies the discord which he has created, and he displays his interest in cooperating with the group so that he can be treated as an insider once again. Through crossing, he takes up the categorization he has been offered – not a Kurya person, but rather, a *kijana* ('a young person') whose bad manners might be excused by his youth. In other words, through this language alternation into the voice of another (but not into another language), he resists the identity selected for him as a Kurya person, and he asserts his primary identity as that of a young person, rather than remaining in the 'outsider' position of a Kurya. In doing so, he rejoins the group as an 'insider,' making the interculturality which emerged irrelevant for any activities that follow. Figure 1 summarizes these moves.

Identity-in-practice	CBA/MCD
Excerpt 4: Insertional CS 15 <i>Mosi has decided to remain in the traditions.</i>	insider: 'not a Westernized youth'
Excerpt 5a: Alternational CS 82 This is not a computer lesson	outsider: not doing being a journalist
Excerpt 5b: Alternational CS 93 <i>If you are reasonable/decent, then you'll get to sit here</i> 94 <i>but if you decide to force things, then that's it.</i>	resistance to others' CBAs of how to be a journalist; 'force' in English
Excerpt 5c: Ethnification 104 <i>you are bringing Kurya stuff here</i>	not doing being an insider through ethnicity
Excerpt 5d: Crossing 105 <i>don't waste your colleague's time</i> 108 <i>now you are forcing me ((co-occurs with getting up from seat))</i> 110 <i>Youngster, come here</i> 111 <i>The young people here have bad attitudes</i>	not doing being an insider by not being empathetic/ cooperative with insiders' work move towards cooperation with insiders; 'force' in Swahili re-instituting 'insider' membership disalignment with self as 'Kurya' in favor of alignment with self as 'young person'; doing being a journalist

Figure 1. Mosi's transformation from insider (4) to outsider (5 a-c) back to insider (5d)

4. Discussion

This article has examined the ways that participants use bilingual conversation to produce and resist MCDs which are contingent upon the notion of interculturality. Data analysis has shown that interculturality can be used as a means to achieve shared experience through participants' alignments or disaffiliations as 'insiders' and 'outsiders.' In the data examined, participants were seen to employ a variety of

strategies, including two forms of codeswitching, to create disjunction between participants deemed 'insiders' and those who they characterized as 'outsiders.'

In examining extended excerpts, it was possible to see how participants employed language alternation as a means to align themselves and others with specific MCDs. In the first excerpt, the participants used the discursive practice of language alternation in a very hybrid fashion to mark off identities-in-practice which aligned the entire office as 'insiders' in their rejection of 'uncritical Westernization.' Here, a code described best as either insertional code-switching (Muysken 1995) or *language mixing* (Auer 1999) was used to emphasize the differences between the insider and outsider groups, thereby creating a shared culture among the hybrid-language using journalists in the office. Minutes later in the conversation, however, that very same shared culture, or shared 'insider' status, was reanalyzed when Mosi's activities were evaluated as 'outsider' activities by the other participants. This reanalysis became apparent due to language alternation of a different sort, alternational code-switching (Muysken 1995), when Peter used a purely English utterance to challenge the legitimacy of Mosi's activities (line 82, "This is not a computer lesson").

Interculturality became salient for the participants in the second data set when the CBAs which Mosi was engaged in were evaluated by the rest of the office as being an uncooperative journalist. Through alternational codeswitching, Mosi resisted this characterization through positioning his colleagues as people who were forcing him (line 94) to act in certain ways. In response, his fellow journalists used the category of ethnicity to construct an intercultural and tense social order. The Kurya ethnicity became part of the MCD of 'outsider' when it was used in association with the MCD 'off-task journalist.' Mosi's subsequent use of Swahili in "*unanilazimisha*" ('you are forcing me'), along with his physical movement away from the computer, marked his re-entry into the 'insider' group, the MCD of 'doing being journalists.' This language alternation signaled Mosi's own self-positioning as a cooperative member, and it had the effect of 'erasing' his previous language alternation ("*kuforce*") along with his previously antagonistic stance. Mosi further identified with the in-group by crossing, when he took on the identity of an elder Swahili in order to critique his own behavior.

Finally, it is possible to link the journalists' use of language alternation and their establishment of interculturality to more macrolevel observations about the divisive effects that English has had on Tanzanians. As Blommaert (1999) has argued, in spite of Tanzania's radically socialist past which eschewed the formation of social classes, the use of English-interfered Swahili among educated elites in Tanzania has created sociolects by which socioeconomic classes have become apparent. Those who are able to mix English into their Swahili index their social positioning among one another, thereby reifying and reinstating their identities as educated, white-collar workers through talk. In making use of this and other varieties of speech in the newspaper office, the journalists establish cultural sameness and difference with one another through constructing membership categorizations along linguistic lines. Moreover, in using these varieties of language, they instantiate intercultural difference among themselves and others in Tanzania who have not experienced the same degree of access to English, and therefore, remain in the outgroup.

Appendix

Transcript symbols

.	falling intonation
,	continuing intonation
?	rising intonation
<u>underline</u>	emphasis
[overlapping talk
:	sound stretch
hh.	outbreath/laughter
.hh	inbreath
(.)	micropause
talk-	cut-off
TALK	loud volume
((comments))	transcriber's description of events

Abbreviations

adj	adjectival marker
cpl	completed action marker
dem	demonstrative
fut	future tense
loc	locative
neg	negative marker
pf	perfective tense
pl	plural marker
pres	present tense
pst	past tense
psv	passive voice
sbj	subjunctive mood

References

- Antaki, Charles, and Sue Widdicombe (eds.) (1998) *Identities in talk*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Atkinson, J.M., and John Heritage (1984) *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, Peter (ed.) (1998) *Code-switching in conversation: Language interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Auer, Peter (1999) From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3.4: 309-332.
- Bhabha, Homi (1994) *The location of culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Blommaert, Jan (1999) *State ideology and language in Tanzania*. Cologne: Köppe.

- Butler, Judith (1999) *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Cheng, Winnie (2003) *Intercultural conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Day, Dennis (1998) Being ascribed, and resisting, membership of an ethnic group. In Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in talk*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 151-170.
- Gafaranga, Joseph (2001) Linguistic identities in talk-in-interaction: Order in bilingual conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33.12: 1901-1925.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1967) *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Goffman, Erving (1981) *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gumperz, John (1982) *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, Stuart (1997) *Representation: Cultural representation and signifying practices*. London: Sage.
- Hansen, Alan D. (2005) A practical task: Ethnicity as a resource in social interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38.1: 63-104.
- Higgins, Christina (2004) Swahili-English bilingual conversation: A vehicle for the study of language ideology. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Ibrahim, Awad (2003) 'Whassup homeboy?' Joining the African diaspora: Black English as a symbolic site of identification and language learning. In Siffree Makoni, Geneva Smitherman, Arneetha F. Ball, and Arthur K. Spears (eds.), *Black linguistics: Language, society, and politics in Africa and the Americas*. London & NY: Routledge, pp. 169-185.
- Kristeva, Julia (1974) *Revolution in poetic language*. Paris: Lautreament et Mallarme.
- Li Wei (1995) Code-switching, preference marking and politeness in bilingual cross-generational talk: Examples from a Chinese community in Britain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 16.3: 197-214.
- Li Wei (2002) 'What do you want me to say?' On the conversation analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society* 31.2: 159-180.
- Maynard, Doug, and Don Zimmerman (1984) Topical talk, ritual and the social organization of relationships. *Social Psychological Quarterly* 47.4: 301-316.
- Mori, Junko (2003) The construction of interculturality: A study of initial encounters between Japanese and American students. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36.2: 143-184.
- Muysken, Pieter (1995) Codeswitching and grammatical theory. In Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 177-198.
- Nishizaka, Aug (1995) The interactive constitution of interculturality: How to be a Japanese with words. *Human Studies* 18.2-3: 301-326.
- Nishizaka, Aug (1999) Doing interpreting within interaction: The interactive accomplishment of a "henna gaijin" or "strange foreigner." *Human Studies* 22.2-4: 235-251.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1984) Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of referred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.), pp. 79-112.
- Rampton, Ben (1995) *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. New York: Longman.

Sacks, Harvey (1972) On the analyzability of stories by children. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, pp. 325-345.

Sacks, Harvey (1979) Hotrodder: A revolutionary new category. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington, pp. 7-14.

Sacks, Harvey (1992) *Lectures on conversation*, G. Jefferson (ed.) 2 vols, Oxford: Blackwell.

Said, Edward (1978) *Orientalism*. New York: Random House.

Scollon, Ron, and Suzanne Wong Scollon (2001) *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Silverman, David (1998) *Harvey Sacks: Social science and conversation analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Spivak, Gayatri (1987) *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics*. New York: Methuen.

Torras, Maria-Carme, and Joseph Gafaranga (2002) Social identities and language alternation in non-formal institutional bilingual talk: Trilingual service encounters in Barcelona. *Language in Society* 31.4: 527-548.

Zimmerman, Don (1998) Discourse identities and social identities. In Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in talk*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 87-106.