# IDENTITIES AND LINGUISTIC VARIETIES IN JAPANESE: AN ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AS PARTICIPANTS' ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Chie Fukuda

**Abstract**

This study explores categorization processes of people (identities) and language (linguistic varieties) in interactions between L1 (first language) and L2 (second language) speakers of Japanese and the language ideologies behind them. Utilizing Conversation Analysis (CA) in combination with Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA), the present study focuses on how participants apply these categories to self and other where identities and language ideologies emerge in the sequences of ordinary conversations. The study also illuminates how the participants react to such ideologies, which is rarely documented in previous studies of L2 Japanese interactions. It is controversial to use CA and MCA as methodologies for inquiries into ideology due to different epistemological and theoretical frameworks. Yet, joining the emerging trend of CA studies that address ideological issues, this study will also demonstrate the compatibility between them. Methodological integration of CA and MCA has been proposed since the 1970s, but has started to be adopted only recently. Because few studies employ this combination in the area of language ideologies, it serves as a novel analytic tool in this body of research. Thus, this study makes a methodological contribution to the study of language ideologies, illustrating the production of language ideologies and reactions to it as participants' accomplishments.

**Keywords**: Identity construction; Language ideologies; Linguistic varieties; Japanese; Conversation Analysis (CA); Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA).

## 1. Introduction

Language is a fundamental resource as well as a medium for identity construction (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998; Benwell and Stokoe 2006; Hall and du Gay 1996, among others), in which not only categories of speakers but also categories of languages come into play. When these categories are applied to represent self and other(s), identities emerge. The production of identity also depends crucially on ideology to render identities recognizable and legitimate (Bucholtz and Hall 2006: 381). This study explores such categorization processes of speakers (identities) and language (linguistic varieties[1]) in talk-in-interaction between L1 (first language) and L2 (second language)

---

[1] According to Crystal (1997: 408), several classifications of intra-language distinctions have been proposed, such as "variety," "register," "dialect," "medium," and "field." Yet it remains hard to clearly define and distinguish these, and their usage seems to vary among linguists. This study adopts "variety" to express intra-language difference in forms, styles, and usage, including categories such as "standard language," "men's language," and "slang."

speakers of Japanese,[2] and the language ideologies[3] (Kroskrity 2006; Silverstein 1979; Woolard 1992) behind these processes.

In the area of Japanese studies, an ideological link between identity and language has been problematized for its essentialist and exclusive nature (e.g., Befu 2001; Creighton 1997; Yoshino 1992). The same issues have also been explored by several studies of linguistic anthropology and applied linguistics, utilizing empirical data and analyses (Iino 1996, 2006; L. Miller 1995; Nishizaka 1997, 1999; Ohta 1993). Following the latter empirical works, this study analyzes naturally-occurring conversations to explicate how the ideological link between identity and language is instantiated in daily lives, using Conversation Analysis (CA) in combination with Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) as a novel analytic tool for investigating language ideologies. Unlike other approaches, ethnomethodological approaches such as CA and MCA emphasize emic perspectives and consider social interactions, including practices of language ideologies, as participants' accomplishments. Utilizing these methodologies clarifies how language ideologies are oriented to, used, and (re)produced and how participants react to such practices from their own perspectives. In particular, participants' reactions, such as resisting, negotiating, challenging, or acquiescing to language ideologies are not much examined in previous studies. Most of them have analyzed phenomena of language ideologies that L1 speakers hold about L2 speakers and do not shed light on how L2 speakers react to them in interactions.  One of the contributions of this study is to provide data and analysis of such resistance, negotiation, and/or acquiescence that is interactionally achieved.

It is controversial to utilize ethnomethodological approaches for inquiries into ideological issues due to differences in epistemological and theoretical frameworks, as discussed in detail below. Yet this study considers it important to document language ideologies and responses to them as participants' accomplishments in the real world with data and analysis at a micro-level, thereby complementing macro-oriented studies of language ideologies and identity construction in Japan. Thus, the contributions of this study in the area of language ideologies are as follows: (1) suggesting CA combined with MCA as a novel methodology in this body of research; (2) providing empirical data and analysis of language ideologies and participants' reactions to them; and (3) joining the trend of studies that advocate the compatibility of CA (and MCA) with inquiries into ideologies.


## 2. Language as a boundary marker: The case of Japan

### 2.1. *Challenge to the conventional link between identity and language*

In the area of Japanese studies, there is a great deal of scholarship on identity construction in relation to language. The traditional *nihonjinron*[4] 'theory of the

---

[2] This study utilizes the labels "L1 and L2 speakers" rather than "native and non-native speakers."  However,  when cited literature employs the latter terms, this study follows the author's use. Also, the labels "Japanese" and "non-Japanese/foreigners" are used interchangeably depending on the context, due to the tendency to identify the former with L1 speakers and the latter with L2 speakers.

[3] A "language ideology" (or "linguistic ideology") can be defined as a "set of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (Silverstein 1979: 193).  The definition, however, varies depending on the researcher.

Japanese' often utilizes fluency in the language as a resource to establish the identity of the Japanese in contrast to non-Japanese/*gaijin* 'foreigners'. Stimulated by the rise of poststructuralism, academia has recognized the multiplicity and fluidity of identity and its link to language (e.g., Higgins 2011; Ueno 2005), and many anti-*nihonjinron* have challenged the essentialist link between identity and language that is widely shared in Japan (e.g., Befu 2001; Komori 2000; Sakai 1996; Yoshino 1992). In an extreme case, R.A. Miller observed that fluent Japanese spoken by non-native speakers offends many Japanese[5] and stated that this phenomenon was due to "invasion of sociolinguistic territorial interests" (1977: 82). About two decades later, L. Miller problematized media use of *gaijin tarento* 'foreigner celebrity' as "linguistic clowns who amuse by speaking strangely and who make mistakes that leave ethnolinguistic boundaries intact" (1995: 198). According to her, Japanese people reassure themselves that only Japanese people speak the Japanese language properly by listening to awkward Japanese spoken by foreigners. In a similar vein, Creighton also analyzed the Japanese language spoken by foreigners in TV commercials and made a similar claim, that "projections of their [foreigners'] awkwardness with Japanese customs, or in using the Japanese language, reinforce a sense that there is something about these cultural identity markers that is solely for the Japanese" (1997: 221). All of these studies point out the ideological use of language as a resource to establish and maintain Japanese ethnonational identity, formulating foreigners as its other. This notion is also applicable to the term *henna gaijin* 'weird foreigners' often heard in Japan, which means foreigners who do not fulfill the image of foreigners in Japan, such as those familiar with Japanese language and culture. These treatments of foreigners reveal language ideologies that are often uncritically accepted and taken into practice in Japanese society.

## 2.2. *Language ideologies in actual interactions*

Several studies have discussed the issue of language ideologies and identity in Japan, utilizing empirical data from naturally-occurring conversations between L1 and L2 speakers of Japanese. Iino (1996, 2006) used ethnographic microanalysis to examine conversations in homestay settings in Japan and found different norms between situations where only native speakers were present and those involving both native and non-native speakers, represented by foreigner talk; the host families do not use regional dialects and slang when talking to the guest students, even if they do so among themselves. The host families consider that some linguistic varieties, such as regional dialects and slang, are not appropriate for the guest students and they code-switched to so-called standard Japanese when talking to the students. Iino observed that through these practices the host families impose their norms on the guest students and formulate the students as "ideal" foreigners who are not familiar with Japanese language and culture and called this process *gaijinization* 'foreignerization'. The finding that speaking

---

[4] *Nihonjinron* is usually understood to refer to propositions about Japanese people, culture, society, and Japan itself (Befu 2001: 2). Here, *nihonjinron* is not limited to such propositions as discussed hitherto in academic books and studies, but includes those that appear in any type of discourse on the nature of Japanese people, culture, and society, such as statements that occur in non-academic books, TV programs, newspapers, and so on.

[5] In fact, R. A. Miller's assertion has been criticized by several later studies (e.g., Befu and Manabe 1989; Ohta 1993) that present evidence that counters it.

like a native can be considered "inappropriate" for non-natives/foreigners, regardless of their linguistic ability (Iino 2006: 160)[6] raises questions about native speakers and Japanese society. Thus, Iino highlighted ideological aspects of L2 interactions in Japan where non-native speakers are not allowed access to some linguistic varieties.

Likewise, Nishizaka (1999) illustrated the construction of *henna gaijin* 'weird foreigners', in which linguistic varieties are utilized as a resource in a radio show interview with a foreign student in Japan. When the guest student mentions his preference for *kango* 'Chinese-origin Japanese words' over *wago* 'Japanese native words', which are generally considered easier, the Japanese MC calls the student a weird foreigner. This treatment displays the MC's assumption that *kango* is "not proper" language for the student. In other words, the MC reveals his categorization of *gaijin*, whose appropriate linguistic variety is *wago*, and treats the guest student who does not fulfill it as weird. Another treatment of foreigners/non-Japanese in relation to linguistic varieties is found in Ohta's (1993) autobiographic interviews with fluent non-native speakers of Japanese. In her study, one interviewee claims that her Japanese friends do not feel it is proper for foreigners to use colloquial forms, such as slang and men's language (1993: 219).

All of these studies suggest that some linguistic varieties spoken by or to non-native speakers/foreigners are taken as "not proper" and "weird" by the Japanese participants. It follows that these Japanese people assume that there are "proper" linguistic varieties for foreigners/L2 speakers. Agha calls such phenomena "metapragmatic stereotypes" (2006: 26),[7] and discusses how such stereotypes may express ideological distortions of reality. The studies discussed here demonstrate various instantiations of metapragmatic stereotypes that connect certain categories of speakers with certain categories of languages.

These previous studies, however, have mainly discussed how Japanese participants put their language ideologies into practice, as seen in their non-use of regional dialect as well as their metapragmatic talk. They do not for the most part illustrate the reactions of the non-Japanese participants – how they resist, negotiate, and/or acquiesce to such ideologies in interactions is not explored.[8] In order to see how language ideologies are interactionally achieved and negotiated by participants, the present study utilizes Conversation Analysis (CA) in combination with Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA), which is a novel analytic tool in the area of language ideologies.

---

[6] For another example, Iino (1996) describes one host mother laughing at pragmatically appropriate utterances of the guest student (e.g., *tsumaranai mono desu ga* 'this is something small' in gift-giving), as if the student were a young child mimicking what adults say.

[7] Although Agha's theme is register, this concept is also applicable to linguistic varieties.

[8] Some studies, such as those by Cook (2006) and Suzuki (2009), discuss resistance by non-Japanese against *nihonjinron* ideology. But these studies concern ideologies about food and blood types, not language.

## 3. Methodology, research questions, and data

### 3.1. *Integration of CA and MCA*

CA explores the sequential organization of conversations, whereas MCA seeks people's use of categories and their attributes. Both of them pursue participants' local sense-making practices in reference to social norms. Although they were both initiated by Sacks (1972) in his ethnomethodological work, CA and MCA are distinct methods. Most CA works exclusively describe the sequential organization of talk-in-interaction, and MCA practitioners prefer to regard MCA as a different enterprise from CA (Hester and Hester 2012). However, participants do in fact make certain categories relevant in the development of interaction, and their orientation to such emerging categories may also determine how they act in the local context. Thus, categorial and sequential analyses are mutually informing, and both enrich our understanding of social interactions. Since the 1970s, the benefits of integrating CA and MCA have been insisted upon by several researchers (Psathas 1999; Silverman 1998; Stokoe 2012; Watson 1978), and studies employing both of them have started to appear (Fitzgerald and Housley 2002; Gafaranga 2001; Greer 2012; Talmy 2009). Nevertheless, due to their long separation, the number of such studies is still small (Stokoe 2012).

For inquiry into language ideologies, MCA especially provides useful analytic concepts, such as Membership Categorization Devices (MCDs) and Category-Bound Predicates (CBPs), the latter of which is seldom used in the previous studies of L2 Japanese interactions. An MCD is a collection of categories and the rules by which they are applied (Sacks 1992, cited in Greer 2012: 374). For example, the categories of father, mother, and baby are collected in the MCD of family. Sacks also proposed the concept of Category-Bound Activities (CBAs), which means certain activities considered to be specific to a category, such as crying as a CBA of babies. Watson (1978) further extended this concept to Category-Bound Predicates as a cover term of particular properties or predicates specific to a certain category, including not only actions but also rights, entitlements, obligations, knowledge, attributes, and competences (Hester 1998: 135). As discussed further below, an important characteristic of categorization is that it exerts power that imposes categorial norms on people. Thus, both CA and MCA provide useful resources to analyze language ideologies as categorization practices of people and language that is demonstrably relevant for and used by the participants in talk-in-interaction (Hester and Hester 2012).

### 3.2. *Use of CA (and MCA) for inquiry into ideologies*

Both CA and MCA are founded on ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1967), which delves into how people produce social order through meaningful interactions in their daily lives. Because ethnomethodology was born as a countertheory to top-down, deductive sociological theories, CA and MCA are bottom-up, entirely data-based approaches that inductively seek what people engage in as they act in society.

For this reason, it is controversial to utilize ethnomethodological approaches for inquiries into ideologies (see Kitzinger 2000; Talmy 2009; and Wooffitt 2005 for more detailed discussions). For many, such inquiries, which usually adopt a macro-oriented, deductive approach, are incompatible with inductive approaches such as CA and MCA.

This is because the top-down approach to studying ideologies is counter to "unmotivated looking" (Psathas 1995; ten Have 1999), a basic tenet of ethnomethodology. For CA practitioners, "motivated looking" in ideological studies reflects the positionalities and analytic interests of the researchers (the etic view) over the participants' own understandings (the emic view). On the other hand, scholars of ideological issues claim that CA ignores wider historical, cultural, and political power that may be reflected in interaction (e.g., Billig 1999), because CA would require the immediate relevance of such power to the micro-level context for the analysis to take it into consideration.

However, a new trend of utilizing CA (and MCA) for the study of ideological issues has started to appear, including "feminist CA" (Edley and Wetherell 1997; Kitzinger 2000; Ohara and Saft 2003), "motivated M/CA" (Talmy 2009), and "applied CA" (Kasper 2009). These scholars maintain that each approach offers an incomplete account (Edley and Wetherell 1999) of the phenomena at issue, hence arguments from a top-down approach should be substantiated by bottom-up analysis of actual interactions. They contend that analytic claims made by ideological studies at a macro-level should be grounded in participants' demonstrable orientations at a micro-level. Thus, top-down or macro-oriented approaches and bottom-up, micro-level ones are not mutually exclusive but mutually beneficial. Furthermore, as Moerman (1988) maintains, it is also beneficial for CA to incorporate ethnographic information (e.g., social positions of participants and their relationships) that accounts for locally managed social interaction when such interaction cannot be accounted for by the immediate context alone. This may include ideologies that influence the local context as well. Thus, inquiries into ideologies and CA and MCA mutually profit by reducing each other's limitations.

Another ethnomethodological concept beneficial to the study of language ideologies is "reflexivity," which signifies mutual constitution of the micro and the macro. People produce micro-level interaction while being oriented to social norms embedded in the macro-level socio-historical structure. At the same time, such a social structure is also (re)produced and reinforced by people's practices in their daily lives. This point is identical to what Kroskrity asserts about language ideologies. He maintains that language ideologies are also normally tacit and embodied in interaction that conforms to a cultural norm (2006: 506). Thus, the ethnomethodological concept of reflexivity is applicable to frameworks of language ideologies in that tacit and unnoticeable social norms orient members to certain actions relevant to language. Likewise, Agha calls attention to "reflexive social processes" whereby metapragmatic stereotypes are formulated and disseminated in social life and become available for use in interaction by individuals (2006: 24). According to Kroskrity (2006), language ideologies are very rarely brought to the level of discursive consciousness. Therefore, micro-level examination of interactions is crucial for studies of language ideologies.

### 3.3. *Data and research questions*

Data in this study consist of two dyadic conversation sets between L1 and L2 speakers, audio-recorded in Japan. The first is a conversation between José (from Mexico) and his friend Kumiko (Japanese), and the other is between Mike (from Australia) and the researcher (Japanese). José and Mike are graduate students studying at Japanese universities in Kyoto, in the Kansai area, i.e., western Japan. Both of them studied

Japanese at universities in their home countries for more than three years and have been in Japan for more than three years at the time of recording. The research questions that this study addresses are as follows:

1. What kind of categories of people and language do the participants orient to, use, and produce in interactions?
2. Using such categories as a resource, what do they achieve in interactions?
3. How do they deal with emerging categories that may reveal language ideologies in interactions?

## 4. Analysis

### Excerpt 1
José and Kumiko are talking over dinner at a restaurant.

1.      J:     *uma::i.*
                tasty.Col
                '*uma::i.*' ('tasty' in Japanese)

2. → K:     (0.3) *umai    tte yuu n    ya*. hhh
                   tasty.Col QT say Nom Cop
                'Oh, you say *umai*.'

3.      J:     °*umai.*°  *umee*. *hehehehehe.*
                tasty.Col  tasty.Col
                '*umai.  umee.*'

4.      K:     *umee    wa   amari iwana::i.*
                tasty.Col Top  often  not say
                '*Umee* is not used very often.'

5.      J:     *hehahahahahaha.*  hhh.

6.      Ps:    (1.8)

7.      K:     *surangu mo daibu oboeta     n    to chau?  nihongo no*.
                slang    also much remembered  Nom TAG    Japanese LK
                'You remember a lot of slang too, don't you?  In Japanese.'

8.      J:     hhhh  *nanka:* (.) *dondon dondon:*
                    FIL      more and more
                'It's like, more and more.'

9.      K:     *fuete itteru?*=
                increasing
                'Increasing?'

10.     J:     =*u:hhh:n.  wakatte kiteru.*
                       come to understand
                'I have come to understand more of it.'

After tasting a dish, José provides positive assessment, saying *uma::i* 'tasty'. Kumiko shows her surprise at his use of this word, saying *umai tte yuu n ya* 'oh, you say *umai*'

in line 2. This surprise, expressed by *n da*[9] (Tsukuba Language Group 1991) reveals her assumption that it is unexpected for José to use this vernacular variety[10] that could be regarded as rough or men's language (Takasaki 2012). José repeats *umai* and further produces *umee*, which is a rougher version of *umai*, in order to tease Kumiko.  Upon hearing this, Kumiko reprimands José for his use of *umee* in line 4, saying that the word is not very often used.

From an MCA perspective, Kumiko's surprise in line 2 'oh, you say *umai*' makes a category of L2 speakers/non-Japanese relevant, because she would not be surprised at the word if José were Japanese or an L1 speaker. Thus, her surprise displays her sense of category-incongruency between the word *umai* and José, as an L2 speaker or non-Japanese.  Given Kumiko's reaction, José's exhibition of his further command of vernacular varieties in line 3 could be taken as his resistance against Kumiko's categorization of him as a member of the category of L2 speakers/non-Japanese who do not use a vernacular variety.  Also, Kumiko's utterance *surangu mo* 'slang too'[11] in line 7 implies her categorization of language into slang and non-slang. The latter may be considered as standard Japanese that she considers José has mastered, given the ethnographic information that José learned Japanese at a Mexican university where the standard variety is taught almost exclusively (Matsumoto and Okamoto 2003).

Immediately following Excerpt 1, Kumiko mentions that Japanese people tend to start learning English slang words such as *cool* when they first start learning English vocabulary.  This serves as a preface to the question she asks José next, about whether this is the case with him for Japanese.  Excerpt 2 starts with this question.

## Excerpt 2

1.   K:   *soo yuu no     wa  aru? nihongo de=*
          so  like  Nom Top exist Japanese in
          'Is that the case with you in Japanese?'

2.   J:   *=e?  surangu de hanashiyasui kadooka?*
            huh slang   in  easy to talk   whether
          'You mean is it easy for me to talk in slang?'

3.   K:   *surangu* [*de*.
          slang       in
          'In slang.'

4.   J:           [hhh *do↑o kanaa?* hh.
                       how wonder
          'I wonder.'

5.   K:   >*demo*< *hose no   nihongo kiiteru bun ni wa*

---

[9] In the excerpt, Kumiko uses *ya*, which is Kansai dialect for the copula *da* in standard Japanese.

[10] There are no clear criteria for judging whether a word, expression, or form  is included in or excluded from intra-language categories. Hence the label "vernacular variety" is adopted here to refer to language that the participants seem to consider not to belong to so-called standard Japanese. This may include slang, regional dialect, men's language, and some of the less formal and/or rough forms.

[11] Here and after this excerpt, both José and Kumiko use the term "slang" as a folk linguistic category.  Although there is no unified definition, Crystal defines slang as follows: "Informal, nonstandard vocabulary, usually intelligible only to people from a particular region or social group; also, the jargon of a special group, such as doctors, cricketers, or sailors.  Its chief function is to mark social identity – to show that one belongs – but it may also be used just to be different, to make an effect, or to be informal" (1992: 355).

but José LK Japanese listen as far as
'But when I listen to your Japanese,

6.    *sonna  surangu wa detekonai  kara::*
    that much slang  Top come out not therefore
    I don't hear much slang coming out, so.'

7.  J:  *u:::[::n.*
    FIL
    'u::::m.'

8.  K:    *[ma, ima no umai* (.) *wa: chotto >chotto< surangu yori ya keredomo::=*
     FIL now LK tasty.Col Top kind of kind of slang-like  Cop but
    'Well, that *umai* you used just now is, kinda slang-like, but,'

9.  J:  *=u::n, doo kanaa? >tabun<* (1.2)
    FIL how wonder  maybe
    'Ummm, I wonder. Maybe.'

10. → K:  *tadashii nihongo o:::*
    decent  Japanese O
    'Decent Japanese'

11. → J:  *chan-* (*jugyoo*?) *kara benkyoo shiteru hito  <u>wa::</u>,*
        class  from study  doing people Top

12.    *surangu wa anmari °nai  ne.°*
    slang  Top (not) much not exist IP
    '*Chan-*, you don't usually hear slang from people who study Japanese from (class?)'

13.  K:  *nai.*
    not exist
    'They don't.'

José paraphrases Kumiko's question to confirm that she is asking whether it is easy for him to speak in slang. In line 4, José does not give a clear answer and displays a stance (Ochs 2002) of uncertainty. Following his reply, Kumiko offers an assessment of his Japanese. In conversations between L1 and L2 Japanese speakers, the action of assessment categorizes participants into Japanese/L1 speakers as the assessor and non-Japanese/L2 speakers as the assessee (Nishizaka 1997: 96). Accordingly, Kumiko's action of assessment categorizes her and José in this way. She says that she does not hear much slang in his Japanese. By trailing off this utterance with the conjunction *kara* 'so', she projects that her conclusion is that José does not use much slang. However, José does not align with this, as is displayed by his use of the long filler in line 7, the uncertainty markers *doo kana?* 'I wonder' and *tabun* 'maybe', and 1.2 second pause in line 9. These features indicate dispreferred action (Pomerantz 1984), signifying that José does not agree with Kumiko's assessment that he does not use much slang.

  Kumiko further assesses his Japanese, saying that *umai* 'tasty', which he used in Excerpt 1, is a slang-like expression. The phrase *surangu yori* 'slang-like' again indicates her polar categorization of language as slang and non-slang and her understanding that *umai* is closer to the category of slang. By using *chotto* 'kinda'[12]

---

[12] One of the reviewers suggests that this *chotto* may be used as a speech act qualifer (Matsumoto 1985), which mitigates or weakens a following negative speech act. However, it may also be

twice in line 8, Kumiko hearably reinforces the scarcity of José's use of slang.  Here, *keredomo::* (literally 'but')[13] in line 8 can be heard as a projection of her conclusion that José does not use much slang (although he has used a slang-like expression just a moment ago).

José does not align with her this time either, and displays his uncertainty again in line 9. After 1.2 second pause while José appears to be thinking, Kumiko launches a new utterance with the phrase *tadashii nihongo o* 'decent Japanese' followed by the object particle, but José cuts in on her turn. In line 11, he appears to abandon the adverb *chanto* 'properly', then claims that those who study from something (inaudible; hearable as *jugyoo* 'class') use little slang, and Kumiko repeats *nai* 'not exist' in line 13. Given that José has been acquiring slang (as he mentions in Excerpt 1, he has 'come to understand more of it'), as well as the ethnographic information that he no longer takes Japanese classes, along with his utterance *benkyoo shiteru hito* 'those who study' in line 11, he excludes himself from this category, namely takers of Japanese (classes) who use little slang. José also attaches the contrast/topic particle *wa* to the word *hito* 'person(s)', which can signify a contrast between this category and, possibly, himself, who has been acquiring slang in his daily life. By twice disaligning himself from Kumiko's assessments and his use of a category of (classroom) learners of Japanese who use little slang in contrast to him, José appears to indicate his identity as a user of slang (unlike members of the learner category).

After several lines where they talk about slang in comics following Excerpt 2, Kumiko launches a related topic of her own language use, which is where Excerpt 3 begins.

## Excerpt 3

1.      K:      *itte mireba::, (         )ne kitanai kotoba,  >iya<*
                say try if               IP rough   language INT
                'Let me put it like, (          ), rough language, um

2.              *atashi mo  otoko kotoba      o tsukau koto ga ooi            kara::,*
                I      also men's language O use     Nom S   many times therefore
                I use a lot of men's language, too, so.'

3.      J:      *a,  soo ka.*
                oh so  Q
                'Oh, really?'

4.   →  K:      *ichioo,* hhh   *ano, >chanto< chantoshita (.) nihongo o* [*kimi ni:*
                more or less FIL   decent   decent         Japanese O you to
                'Um, well, [I want to use] decent, decent Japanese to you.'

---

used here to signify the degree of being slang-like. This study takes the latter view, because Kumiko does not appear to take her assessment as negative.

[13] The Japanese conjunction *keredomo* is used not only as a contrast marker but also as a hesitation marker or device to wait for a reaction of the listener (e.g., *ii to omoimasu keredomo* 'I think that it is good'; Shinmura 2003). One of the reviewers offered the suggestion that line 8 can also be interpreted as expressing Kumiko's doubt about her previous categorization of *umai* as slang-like, and perhaps as signalling her intention to go on to say that *umai* is somehow marked in a different way (by being informal, rough, masculine, etc.). In this case, *keredomo* is used as a hesitation marker or device to wait for a reaction of the listener.

5.      J:                                                            [*whuhahahahaha.*

6.      K:     *nan   yaro? kii nuita    toki >kii nuita    tte yuuka:<*
                      what Cop    not careful when  not careful or rather
                      'How can I say it?  When I'm not careful, um, not "not careful" but,

7.                *<u>hito</u>     ni yorikeri::?*
                      person depend on
                      it depends on the person?'

8.      J:     *un.*
                      yeah
                      'Yeah.'

9.      K:     *yakedo::, >kitanai kotoba  de shaberaharu hito    yattara<*
                      but           rough language in  talk        person Cop.if
                      'However, when a person uses rough language,

10.              *sono, sugoi >kitanai kotoba< de kaesu kara*[*::*
                      FIL    very    rough language in  reply therefore
                      um, I talk back in pretty rough language, so.'

11.      J:                                                [*a:: a:: a::.*
                                             I see I see I see
                      'I see, I see.'

12.      K:     *are*
                      FIL
                      'Well'

13.      J:     *hanashikata ni yoru     ne.*
                      how to talk  depend on IP
                      'It depends on how they speak.'

14.      K:     *u*[*n.*
                      yeah
                      'Yeah.'

15.      J:      [*demo::, sore wa    soo, °soo da  ne.°*
                       but     that Top  so     so Cop IP
                      'But::, that's right, that's right.'

16.      K:     *dakara    hose katte dondake  no kyoyoo       hani ga aru ka tte °yuu no  wa°=*
                      therefore José also  how much LK acceptability range S exist Q  QT say Nom Top
                      'That's why.  I don't know how much of that kind of language you can accept.'

17.      J:     *=>iya, iya, iya, iya < betsu ni=*
                      no no   no no    not particularly
                      'No, no, no, no.  I don't really mind.'

18. →  K:     *=daitai oboete, wakatten  no     kana: °tte omotte.°*
                     almost learn    understand Nom wonder  QT think
                    'I am wondering how much of them you learned and understand.'

19. →  J:     *wakatteru yo::. wakatteru. >nanka < (1.7) mawari no hito     mo::*
                      understand IP    understand    FIL          around LK people also
                      'I know them, I know.  Like, the people around me, also,

20.            >*kekkoo*<    *surangu tsukatteru kara:*[:,
               pretty much slang    using        therefore
               use a lot of slang, so.'

21.    K:                                        [*aa, honto::?*
                                                  oh really
               'Oh, really?'

In lines 1 and 2, Kumiko claims that she also often uses *kitanai kotoba* 'rough language' and *otoko kotoba* 'men's language' in her daily life. José's change of state token *a soo ka* 'oh really?' in line 3 signifies that he had not heard her use rough language in her speech until then; accordingly, it seems that she does not use rough language to him.  In line 4, she appears to claim that she wants to use *chantoshita nihongo o kimi ni* 'decent Japanese to you', that is, to José. This utterance simultaneously categorizes two different objects: language (decent and indecent languages) and speaker (people to whom she uses rough language and 'you', i.e., José). She further provides a description of how she talks in daily conversations in lines 6, 7, 9, and 10.

After José shows his alignment with what she said in lines 13 and 15, Kumiko in line 16 invites José's answer by displaying her uncertainty about how much use of vernacular varieties, such as slang and rough language, he accepts. Immediately responding to this, José states in line 17 that he does not particularly mind.  However, Kumiko displays further uncertainty about how much he understands of vernacular varieties in the following line.  Given that this is a sequel to the earlier assessment in Excerpt 2, Kumiko and José are again categorized into an L1 speaker as the assessor and an L2 speaker as the assessee.  Kumiko's displays of her uncertainty assign José identity as an L2 speaker with limited expertise in vernacular varieties. Thus, this course of interaction exhibits the contrasts in her categories: Japanese or L1 speakers to whom she talks in both rough and decent languages and non-Japanese or L2 speakers to whom she talks in decent Japanese only.  What Kumiko is describing as her practice in talking with L2 speakers is what Neustupńy calls a "folk language-teaching method," that is, a certain idea about language teaching, which not only people in general but also professional language teachers may hold (1995: 208). Such "teaching methods" may be observed not only in formal educational settings but also in casual teaching opportunities in ordinary conversations. In this case, Kumiko reveals her folk language-teaching method in her selection of different linguistic varieties for different interactants.

In response to Kumiko's uncertainty, José claims that he understands the vernacular varieties, repeating *wakatteru (yo)* 'I understand' twice for emphasis in line 19. The particle *yo*, which is attached to his first utterance of *wakatteru*, also expresses the speaker's strong conviction or assertion about something assumed to be known only by him or her (Makino and Tsutsui 1989: 543). By strongly asserting his comprehension of vernacular varieties, José resists being identified as an L2 speaker with limited linguistic expertise.  In order to further convince Kumiko, José provides an account for how he has learned slang, saying that people around him use it a lot. Nonetheless, the news recipient token *aa* 'oh' and the token of disbelief *hontoo?* 'really?' in her response signify that Kumiko is not yet completely convinced.  José continues the conversation as follows.

**Excerpt 4**

1.     J:      *toku ni::,  oosaka no  hito    da  ne.*

especially Osaka   LK people Cop IP
'Especially, people from Osaka, y'know.'

2.      K:      *e?*
                huh
                'Huh?'

3.      J:      *oosaka no* [*hito.*
                Osaka LK  people
                'People from Osaka.'

4.      K:                      [*oosakajin      ne::.*
                                 Osaka people IP
                                 'People from Osaka, I see.'

5.      J:      *un.*
                yeah
                'Yeah.'

6.      Ps:     (1.8)

7.      J:      *'see'       toka::,   'chau,'              toka       ne. ahahahahaha.*
                *see* ('Do it!') and others, *chau* ('not; wrong') and others IP
                'For example, "*see*," "*chau*," and stuff.

8.      K:      *aa, chau.*
                oh *chau*
                'Oh, *chau.*'

Several lines are omitted.

9.      K:      *chau.*
                *chau*
                '*Chau.*'

10.     J:      *chau.*
                *chau*
                '*Chau.*'

11.     Ps:     (2.6)

12.     J:      *chau ka?  hehehe.*
                *chau ka* ('is it wrong?')
                '*chau ka*?'  ('is it wrong?')

13.  →  K:      *iya:::, nanka henna kanji   ya  wa.*
                INT    FIL   weird  feeling Cop IP
                'Oh, my gosh, like, it sounds weird.'

14.     J:      *whehehehe.*

15.  →  K:      *hose ga sonna kotoba    tsukattara* hh *henna kanji   ya  wa.*
                José  S   such   language use when    weird feeling Cop IP
                'Hearing you use such language, it seems strange.'

16.     J:      *whahahahahaha.*

17.     Ps:     (l.2)

18.    J:    *u::n, demo* (0.8) *wakaru    no    wa, ke-* (0.7) *kekkoo daiji    to omou yo ne.*
             FIL    but        understand Nom Top        pretty  important QT think IP IP
             'Umm, but being able to understand it is, pre- pretty important, I think.  Isn't it?'

19.    K:    *u::n* (0.8) *nani o  yutteru ka?* =
             FIL        what O saying  Q
             'Umm.  Understanding what they say?'

20.    J:    =>*soo   soo   soo   soo.*<
             right right right right
             'Right, right, right, right.'

21.    K:    >*demo*< *daibu chigau   desho, jibun  ga narattekita   koto to tsukawarete*[*ru kotoba  tte.*
              but     pretty different TAG  self    S  have learned Nom and be used     language QT
             'But the Japanese people's language use is pretty different from what you learned, right?'

22.    J:                                                             [*daibu chigau yo.*
                                                                      pretty different IP

             'Pretty different.'

23.          *zenzen chigau.*
             completely different
             'Completely different.'

24.    K:    >*demo*< *sono chigai ga wakaru    tte koto wa, sugoku* (.) *wakatteru koto ya  naa.*
              but    that difference O understand QT Nom Top very        understand Nom Cop IP
             'But, that you can tell the difference means you know Japanese very well.'

José exhibits his expertise in vernacular varieties (what he calls "slang" in Excerpt 3), by providing examples, such as *see* 'Do it!' and *chau* 'not; wrong'.[14] After several omitted lines where they talk about other Kansai dialect vocabulary, Kumiko repeats *chau*, and José also repeats after her, playing with the word. After 2.6 second pause, José utters *chau ka?* 'is it wrong?' in line 12. Upon hearing this, Kumiko provides her assessment, saying 'oh my gosh, like, it seems strange'. Her interjection *iya::* 'oh my gosh' signifies the emotional intensity of her feeling of the weirdness of José's use of Kansai dialect. After José's laughter, she repeats it, clearly referring to José as the subject with the particle *ga* in line 15.  This assessment reveals a deviation formulation (Deppermann 2005), which shows how José deviates from Kumiko's category of L2 speakers, non-Japanese, or foreigners.  Although she acknowledges that José uses vernacular varieties, her actual assessment of it is displayed by the words *henna kanji* 'it seems strange'.

José does not provide an immediate response to this assessment. After 1.2 second pause, he prefaces the upcoming contrast to her assessment with *demo* 'but' and claims that it is important to understand Kansai dialect in line 18. By so doing, he downgrades the ability from production to comprehension and solicits Kumiko's agreement with the particles *yo ne*. However, she does not align with this, which is displayed by the filler and 0.8 second pause in line 19. Then, she provides a candidate understanding with a rising intonation, thereby requesting confirmation of whether he

---

[14] In fact, *see* 'Do it!' and *chau* 'not; wrong' are Kansai regional dialect, not slang.

means that understanding what people say (in Kansai dialect) is important, and José immediately affirms it. Even after that, Kumiko does not provide alignment with what José has said and, in line 21, she prefaces the contrast by beginning her utterance with *demo* 'but'.

In line 21, she asks José whether spoken language in Japan is quite different from what he learned at school, and José affirms that it is. Kumiko's use of the auxiliary verb *deshoo* with a rising intonation, which imposes the proposition (Siegal 1996) rather than asking for confirmation, signifies her stance of certainty about the difference. This question displays her disbelief about José's expertise in vernacular varieties, by emphasizing the difference between the language spoken in Japan, including vernacular varieties, and the language that L2 speakers like José learn at school, in her words, *jibun ga narratekita koto* 'what you have learned' or *chantoshita nihongo* 'proper Japanese' in line 4 in Excerpt 3. This utterance also reveals Kumiko's folk language-teaching method, touched upon in the discussion of Excerpt 3. Although José also agrees with the difference in lines 22 and 23, Kumiko's deployment of this difference shows that she has not yet aligned with José's expertise in vernacular varieties. Her categorization as it is revealed in this sequence can be illustrated as follows:

| Category | Category-bound language |
|---|---|
| L1 speakers (or Japanese) | Japanese including both standard and vernacular varieties |
| L2 speakers (or non-Japanese/foreigners) | Japanese taught at school excluding vernacular varieties |

Although Kumiko does not clearly mention what "Japanese taught at school" is, her words can be inferred as meaning standard Japanese, given the centrality of the variety in education (Doerr 2010; Iino 1996; Matsumoto and Okamoto 2003), just like her use of the term "slang" in Excerpt 1 clearly implies that there is a standard that is non-slang. Thus, the analysis above illustrates Kumiko's categorization of José as an L2 speaker who exclusively uses the standard variety. On the other hand, José attempts to negotiate this categorization; he resists being categorized as such by not aligning with what Kumiko says (lines 7 and 9 in Excerpt 2), demonstrating use of Kansai dialect (line 3 in Excerpt 1; lines 7, 10, 12 in Excerpt 4), asserting that he understands vernacular varieties (line 19 in Excerpt 3), accounting for how he has learned it (lines 19 and 20 in Excerpt 3), and soliciting her agreement with his claim that understanding Kansai dialect is important (line 18 in Excerpt 4). Nonetheless, Kumiko does not align herself with these attempts of José's. Only after her confirmation question in line 19 and José's affirmative answer, does she finally, in line 24, admit José's expertise in vernacular varieties. Thus, José asserts his identity as an L2 speaker who uses and understands vernacular varieties and successfully changes the category that Kumiko continuously attempted to assign him. Similar categorization of L2 speakers or foreigners and linguistic varieties is also found in Ohta's (1993) and Iino's (1996) studies, as discussed above. These studies, taken together, show that the language

ideology that L2 speakers or foreigners use only the standard variety has been widely shared in Japan across time and space.

The categorization of linguistic varieties and L1 and L2 speaker identities is internalized by L2 speakers as well.  The following excerpt is from a conversation between the researcher (Japanese) and Mike (from Australia) over lunch. Prior to this excerpt, Mike mentions that he sometimes uses Kansai dialect in his daily life.

**Excerpt 5**

1.     R:    *maiku san wa demo* (.) *>sonnani shocchuu wa< tsukawanai no, yappari?=*
            Mike *san* Top but      that    often    Top  not use    Q  after all
            'But, after all, you don't use it (Kansai dialect) that often, do you?'

2.     M:    *=un.*
            yeah
            'Yeah.'

3.     Ps:    (1)

4.     R:    *tokidoki,  >ano< jooku de* (.) *tsukau kurai?*
            sometimes  FIL  joke  for    use   extent
            'Um, do you use it only for making jokes once in a while?'

5.     M:    *ano::, >tabun< 'hen'*                      *o ippai tsukau.* hhh.
            FIL    maybe  *hen* ('not' in Kansai dialect) O a lot  use
            'Well, maybe, I use "*hen*" a lot.'

6.     R:    <u>*hen*</u>*? a*[*a, aa,*
            *hen*   I see I see
            '*Hen*? Oh, I see, I see.'

7.     M:            [*>wakarehen<*                       *toka::*    *wa*
               *wakarehen* ('not understand' in Kansai dialect) and others Top
              'Like, "*wakarehen*" and stuff like that.'

8.             *shi- shizenteki ni tsukau to   omou.=*
               naturally    use    QT think
            'I think it na-, naturally comes out.'

9.     R:    *=hai hai.*
            uh-huh.
            'Uh-huh.'

10.    Ps:    (0.8)

11.    M:    *a::, ano,* °*>nan  deshoo?<*°  *a:   mise kara deru toki ni wa*
           FIL FIL     what TAG       FIL  shop  from leave time at Top
           'Well, um, what is that?  Um, like, when leaving a restaurant,

12.          *sono  ookini,*                             *toka::,*
            FIL  *ookini* ('thank you' in Kansai dialect)  and others
            for example, saying *ookini* and stuff.'

13.    R:    *un.*
            yeah
            'Yeah.'

14.    M:    *ippai yuu.=*

a lot  say
'I say that a lot.'

15.  R:  =*aa* (*soo na no*)*hahaha*[*hahaha*.]
oh  so  Cop Q
'You do?'

16.  M:                                    [(      )] *kotoshi::, no ichigatsu: no owari, kara, >sono<*
this year LK January   LK end    from  FIL
'From the end of January of this year, um,

17.       *isshuukan:: sukoshi ijoo ni, Okinawa ni itta   n    da kedo:,*
for a week   a bit    more  Okinawa to went Nom Cop but
for one week, maybe a bit more than that, I went to Okinawa.'

18.  R:  *hee::=*
wow
'Wow.'

19.  M:  =*gakkai       to   kenkyuu no tame*.
conference  and  research LK for
'For a conference and my research.'

20.  R:  *un*.
yeah
'Uh-huh.'

21.  M:  *u:,  sono toki ni, saisho no, a    ikkai dake, >boku wa sono< ookini o itta.*
FIL that time at first   LK FIL once only  I    Top FIL   *ookini* O said
'Then, I said *ookini* um, only once, at the beginning there.'

22.  R:  [*un*.
yeah
'Uh-huh.'

23. → M:  [*<ookini>* [(*sorede*)  *resutoran  kara deta*.
 *ookini*       then    restaurant from left
'I said *ookini*, and left the restaurant.'

24.  R:                [*un*.
 yeah
 'Yeah.'

25.  M:  >*mawari* (*no hito*)<   *wa,   E!? sore wa  kansai ben*,
around   LK people TOP  INT that Top Kansai dialect
'People around me, like, WHAT?  Is that Kansai dialect?'

26.       *kyooto::, >toku ni<  kyooto no  kansai  ben.  hh.huhuhu.*
Kyoto   especially   Kyoto LK Kansai dialect
'Especially it's Kyoto, Kansai dialect from Kyoto.'

27.  R:  *un*.
yeah
'Uh-huh.'

28. → M:  >*sorede< aa Okinawa de: tsukawanai hoo ga ii  to omotta  kara*=
then       oh Okinawa in  not use    had better QT thought therefore
'Then, I realized oh, I shouldn't use it in Okinawa, so.'

29.    R:       =*he:hehehe.*

30. →  M:       *sore   kara wa >sono< sugoku chuui shite, ookini wa  iwanai iwanai,*
                that  after Top  FIL  very    careful     *ookini* Top not say  not say
                'After that, I was very careful not to say *ookini*, not to say it.'

31.             *whehahaha*[*hahaha.*

32.    R:                  [*ahahaha.  soo na   no?*
                                    so   Cop  Q
                'Oh you were?'

33.    M:       *u:n.*=
                yeah
                'Yeah.'

34.    R:       =*e?  issho ni itta otomodachi::,  ga  ookini  wa   iwanai hoo ga ii    tte  itta °no?°*=
                huh  together went friend          S   *ookini*  Top not say  had better  QT  said Q
                'Huh?  Did your friend with you advise you not to say *ookini*?'

35.    M:       =*a,   a,   ano::,  soo janai.    ano:: >nan  deshoo?<*
                oh  oh  FIL      so  Cop not FIL      what  Cop
                'Oh, oh, um, no, not like that.  How can I put it? '

36.            *boku wa Okinawa ni:,  itara, so- >sono< ookini, ittara*
                I    Top  Okinawa in   if stay     FIL  *ookini*  say if
                'If I'm in Okinawa, then, um, um, if I say *ookini*,'

37. →          *cho- chotto hen     kamo shirenai ka to omotta.  whuhuhu.*
                      kinda  weird  might             Q  QT thought
                I thought it might be k-, kinda weird.'

38.    R:       *u:n.* [(*naruhodo*)
                mmm  I see
                'mmm. (I see).'

39. →  M:            [*so- sono:,  kansai ben     dakara.*
                        FIL     Kansai dialect therefore
                because it's Kansai dialect.'

40.    R:       *hai   hai   hai.  e,   jibun de nani? ano: serufu konsutoreinto shita?* =
                yeah yeah yeah  FIL self  by  what  FIL  self     constraint        did
                'I see, I see.  Um, you did it yourself, you kept yourself from using it?'

41.    M:       = *soo  desu,,  soo desu.*=
                  so   Cop   so  Cop
                'Right, right,'

42.    R:       =*whahahahaha.*

43.    M:        *jibun no* (.) *kangaeta koto.*
                 self    S   thought  Nom
                'That's what I (.) thought'

44.    R:       *hai hai hai.*  ((clear the throat))
                yeah yeah yeah
                'Uh-huh.'

45.  →  M:    *gaijin      wa  Okinawa de whehe  kansai ben     o tsukattara.*
                foreigner Top Okinawa in         Kansai dialect O use when
                'If a foreigner used Kansai dialect in Okinawa'

46.     R:     *chotto hen   te   omowarechau? hahahaha*[*hahaha.*
                a bit   weird QT be thought of
                'It might be thought of as weird a bit?'

47.     M:                                           [*aa::*  [*hehehehehe.*
                                                       FIL
                'um.'
48.     R:                                                   [*hahahahaha.*


Because Mike refers to the fact that he sometimes uses Kansai dialect before the excerpt begins, the researcher asks whether his use of Kansai dialect occurs infrequently, and Mike affirms this.[15] In line 4, the researcher makes an inference that he uses it only for occasional jokes and asks him whether this is the case.  In response, Mike claims that he often uses *hen* ('not' in Kansai dialect) naturally. In lines 11, 12, and 14, he provides another example, *ookini* ('thank you' in Kansai dialect) that he uses when he leaves shops and restaurants in Kyoto.

In line 16, Mike launches a subtopic of his trip to Okinawa and his use of *ookini* 'thank you' when leaving a restaurant there. He narrates the reaction, animating people around him at that time, <u>*E?! sore wa Kansai ben?*</u> '<u>WHAT</u>?!  Is that Kansai dialect?' Their surprise reveals that Mike who uses Kansai dialect is deviant from their category, very like the surprise of Kumiko at José's use of Kansai dialect in Excerpt 4. In line 28, Mike says that he realized that he should not use Kansai dialect in Okinawa, which is also shown by his use of the change of state token. It follows that Mike had used Kansai dialect unrestrictedly until then. He further refers to his efforts not to use it during his stay there in line 30. Being oriented to this utterance, the researcher proposes the inference that this course of action had been advised by his friend who went there with him and asks if this is so. This serves as repair-initiation to confirm whether she understands his utterance correctly. This repair-initiation is motivated by the researcher's assumption that Mike can use Kansai dialect anywhere unrestrictedly. Mike immediately provides repair, negating this inference and accounting for why he tried not to use *ookini* in Okinawa.  He states that if he did so, he thought that it might be weird, because it is Kansai/Kyoto dialect.[16] Mike clearly ascribes the weirdness to his use of Kansai dialect, after the first reaction to it in Okinawa. The researcher asks a follow-up question about whether he decided this by himself. Mike immediately affirms this, clearly claiming that it is what he thought himself in line 43.

Then, in line 45, he elaborates his prior utterance. In line 36, he uses a first person pronoun *boku* to refer to himself, but this time uses a category of *gaijin*

---

[15] When he says *un* 'yes' in line 2, Mike might be showing L1 transfer if his meaning is "Yes, I often use it"; this would explain his later utterances that he uses Kansai dialect a lot (lines 5 and 14).  In response to Japanese negative questions, when the answerer affirms the proposition of the question (in this case, that he does not use Kansai dialect very often), she or he uses "yes" (literally, "Yes, I do not use Kansai dialect very often"), which is the opposite of English.  An alternative explanation suggested by one of the reviewers is that Mike could be agreeing that he does not speak that much Kansai dialect, although he does use the few forms that he goes on to discuss.

[16] In fact, *ookini* is used not only in Kyoto but also in many areas of the Kansai region.

'foreigners' and categorizes himself as such,[17] then describes his situation in Okinawa again with the subordinate conditional clause *gaijin wa Okinawa de kansai ben o tsukattara* 'if a foreigner used Kansai dialect in Okinawa'. In line 46 the researcher co-constructs his turn, providing the main clause, by repeating what he said in line 37, *chotto hen* 'kinda weird' as a candidate understanding. Nonetheless, Mike does not provide a clear response; he just says *aa* and lets it pass, laughing with the researcher, and then the topic shifts. This dispreferred action, that is, Mike's failure to respond clearly, indicates that he does not agree with the idea that foreigners speaking a regional dialect is weird, although he said that he had thought so when he was in Okinawa.

His utterance that he was very careful not to use *ookini* in Okinawa (line 30) with the intensifier *sugoku* 'very' suggests that saying *ookini* had become his routine in Kyoto.  Also, in another part of the conversation (not in the excerpt), he claims that people at shops and restaurants he frequents in Kyoto are not surprised at his use of *ookini* anymore. This means that such people treat Mike as a user of Kansai dialect. In Okinawa, on the other hand, Mike encounters people's surprise at his use of Kansai dialect. Being oriented to this reaction, Mike changed his daily routine, by refraining from saying *ookini*.

Given that he uses the qualifier *chotto* 'kinda' to mitigate the notion of weirdness, and the uncertainly marker *kamoshirenai* 'might', his epistemic stance about the weirdness in line 37 does not appear to be very strong. This is also shown by his dispreferred manner (i.e., ambiguity and delay) in responding to the researcher's confirmation question in line 46. As demonstrated by his change of state token in line 28, his sense of weirdness and self-restriction in using Kansai dialect are caused by Okinawan people's reaction, which displays their perception of a categorial incongruency between Mike and Kansai dialect.  His story illustrates what Sacks calls "self-enforcement" of category (1979: 12). Sacks observes that any member of a category is seen as a representative of the category, so that one regularly has systems of social control built up around categories. He further states, "members go around trying to live up to the best image of that thing as provided by the enforcing culture" (13). Mike also lived up to a category of "foreigners" in Japan who do not speak in regional dialect, forcing himself to behave as such.


## 5. Discussion

### 5.1. *Language ideologies and resistance*

This study examines he categorization processes of people and language in L2 Japanese conversations where language ideologies are instantiated and reacted to. As shown in previous studies and this study, for many Japanese people, vernacular varieties such as regional dialects and slang are not considered to be part of the category-bound language of L2 speakers/foreigners, but solely of L1 speakers or Japanese. This is evidenced by Kumiko's surprise at José's use of *umai* 'tasty' (Excerpt 1), her assessment of his use of Kansai dialect as weird (Excerpt 4), and the reaction of Okinawan people to Mike's use of Kansai dialect (Excerpt 5). Mike has also internalized this normative categorization

---

[17] Mike possesses a Caucasian phenotype (blonde hair and blue eyes) that is considered in Japan to be "typical" *gaijin* (Creighton 1997).

of the host society; he realized that foreigners using Kansai dialect in Okinawa is perceived as weird, and his story of this experience demonstrates "self-enforcement" (Sacks 1979) of his membership in the foreigner category in Japan.

The sense of weirdness or surprise comes from categorial incongruency, namely, the discrepancy between the actual practices of people like José or Mike and the normative categorial expectations about L2 speakers/foreigners that are held by people like Kumiko or the Okinawans in Mike's story. As the arguments in previous studies on Japanese identity and language show, these normative expectations can be observed in Japan across time and space. As Sacks (1992) discussed when writing about the representativeness of a category, normative expectations orient people toward believing that all members in a category share an identical set of CBPs. Therefore, members who do not conform to expected behaviors are treated as deviant and marginalized. When people negatively assess actual practices in order to make sense of or justify their social norms, ideological distortion of reality (Agha 2006) is brought into being. Language ideologies are an example of the distortions that people find necessary in order to establish and maintain the legitimacy of their categorizations of people and language.

Both José and Mike offer resistance to such language ideologies. Both of them assert their identities as Kansai dialect speakers, showing or talking about their expertise in it (Excerpts 2, 4, 5). José does not align with Kumiko's identity assignment of him as an L2 speaker who speaks a standard variety alone (Excerpt 2) and asserts an identity as a person who comprehends Kansai dialect (Excerpt 3) and the importance of comprehending it (Excerpt 4). Although Mike's story demonstrates his self-enforcement of a *gaijin* category in Japan, he also shows resistance to acquiescing to such categorization by a dispreferred action. Such resistance signifies the tenacity of the category-boundedness between speakers (L1 speakers/Japanese and L2 speakers/foreigners/non-Japanese) and language. This may be called intolerance for transnationality of the Japanese language and diversity of the speakers. As in what Yoshino (1992) calls the "racially exclusive possession of Japanese culture," many Japanese presume that "ownership of the Japanese language" (Nishizaka 1997, my translation) is only partially allowed to L2 speakers/non-Japanese, as seen in the sense of categorial incongruency between L2 speakers and vernacular varieties displayed in this study. By resisting imposed categorization, José and Mike attempt to suggest a change of an MCD from ethnicity/nationality to something else, such as degree of expertise in Japanese/Kansai dialect and/or being a resident of the area when they speak Kansai dialect. This change makes ethnonational differences irrelevant to one's language use, allowing for more flexibility in the category of speakers of Japanese.

## 5.2. *Politics of the Japanese language and JSL/JFL education*

In relation to the only partial ownership of Japanese allowed to L2 speakers/foreigners, there exist language ideologies in Japanese language education. Matsumoto and Okamoto (2003) discussed the centrality of standard Japanese and the marginalization of regional dialects in JSL/JFL education as a disservice to learners.[18] Iino (1996, 2006)

---

[18] Likewise, Doerr (2010) problematized the prestigious status of the standard variety and the subordinate status of other varieties in Japanese heritage language education overseas, which originated in the language standardization movement that was one of the nation-building projects in the late 19th century.

also problematized the privilege of the standard variety in JSL/JFL education. He speculates that exclusive use of the standard variety in JSL/JFL education as well as homestay settings may result in the concept of "ideal Japanese" (2006: 170), an imaginary language consisting of the standard variety alone. This is quite far from actual language use and may reproduce further language ideologies in which the standard variety accrues more privilege both in education and learners' daily lives. In fact, Iino (1996) reported that one of the students came to regard a regional dialect as "bad" language as it was not used by his host family and was incomprehensible to him. L. Miller (2010: 241) also pointed out the same problem where learners see authorized forms of language as more "authentic" than the forms they might actually hear being spoken by native speakers.

In this study, both José and Mike familiarized themselves with vernacular varieties enough to identify themselves as Kansai dialect speakers. Extending the concept of linguistic human rights (Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas 1995), everyone unrestrictedly has access to any language. Even inadvertent actions that result in discouraging someone from using a certain language, as seen in Mike's story and Kumiko′s assessment of and disalignment with José′s dialect use, are covert exercises of power. Such practices of language ideologies are unnoticed and taken for granted, especially by L1 speakers, for whom such practices are rarely anything other than trivial in their daily lives. This is where micro-level analysis of interactions such as CA and MCA play a significant role in inquiries into ideological issues.


## 5.3. *Importance of analyzing micro-level data*

As the ethnomethodological concept of reflexivity indicates, people orient to normative expectations or ideologies at a macro-level, and this orientation is instantiated in daily interactions at a micro-level. Such interactions also reproduce and reinforce macro-level ideologies. In order to break this vicious cycle, it is important to unveil what people are engaged in in the real world and to document it with empirical data. Actual linguistic and social practices are far more complex and diverse than those imagined through language ideologies and L1 speakers' categorial norms.

According to Bucholtz and Hall, until recently, researchers often shared with community members the perception that those who do not conform to ideological expectations are somehow socially deficient, and thus unconventional social actors have been marginalized both within their own culture and in scholarly reports (2006: 373). What Bucholtz and Hall problematize is the insufficient attention directed to what is considered "unconventional," such as people who are treated as category-incongruent and their resistance. Empirical data and analysis of ordinary conversations are important because the systems of control in categorization are generally not enforced by governments or official actions (Sacks 1979: 13), but emerge in everyday interaction when participants are oriented to categorial norms. Such data substantiate macro-oriented frameworks and theories and on the whole enrich inquiry into ideologies.

## 6. Concluding remarks

In academia, poststructuralist trends have sought to highlight the multiplicity and fluidity of identity as a way of challenging fixed and static understandings of society. However, in our daily lives, these conventional, mundane understandings are still tenacious, as exemplified by the categorizations analyzed in this study. As Kroskrity (2006) points out, language ideologies are productively used in the creation and representation of various social and cultural identities, and language has long served as a key to naturalizing the boundaries of social groups. Since resistance transforms the commonsense meanings of categories (Hester and Hester 2012), studies that show such categorization processes play a role in supporting social change. It is hoped that by unveiling L1 speakers' categorial norms that they take for granted and L2 speakers' resistance, this study helps to break the cycle of reflexivity of categorization practices and language ideologies. CA in combination with MCA in this study reveals how power at a macro-level, such as language ideologies, is interactively achieved and negotiated at a micro-level, adding to the body of research that demonstrates the methodological capacity and usefulness of CA integrated with MCA for inquiring into ideological issues.

## Transcription Conventions

| | |
|---|---|
| → | Relevant to the point being made in the text |
| . | Falling intonation, declarative intonation |
| , | Falling-rising, continuing intonation |
| ? | Rising intonation |
| ! | Animated pronunciation |
| wor- | Abrupt cut-off or self-interruption of the sound in progress |
| : | Lengthening of the sound just preceding the colon |
| <u>word</u> | Stress or emphasis |
| WORD | Especially loud sound |
| = | Latched relationship (no silence at all between turns) |
| °word° | Quieter than the surrounding talk |
| < word > | Slower than the rest of the speech |
| > word < | Faster than the rest of the speech |
| [ | Starting point of overlapping talk |
| ] | Ending point of overlapping talk |
| (    ) | Talk too obscure to transcribe |
| (word?) | Transcriber's best estimate of what is being said |
| (1.2) | Length of significant pause in seconds |
| (.) | Micropause |
| ((    )) | Nonverbal behaviors |
| h | Audible outbreath |
| .h | Audible inbreath |
| Ps | Pause |

## Interlinear Gloss Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| Col | Colloquial form |
| Cop | Various forms of copula verb "be" |
| FIL | Pause filler |
| INT | Interjection |
| IP | Interactional particle |
| LK | Linking nominal |
| Nom | Nominalizer |
| O | Object marker |
| Q | Question marker |
| QT | Quotative marker |
| S | Subject marker |
| TAG | Tag-like expression |
| Top | Topic marker |

## Acknowledgements

## References

Agha, Asif (2006) Registers of language. In A. Duranti (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 23–45.

Antaki, Charles, and Sue Widdicombe (1998) Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In C. Antaki, and S. Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage, pp. 1–14.

Befu, Harumi (2001) *Hegemony of Homogeneity: An Anthropological Analysis of Nihonjinron*. Melbourne, Australia: Trans Pacific Press.

Befu, Harumi, and Kazufumi Manabe (1989) An empirical investigation of *nihonjinron*: The degree of exposure of Japanese to *nihonjinron* propositions and the functions these propositions serve. *Kwansei Gakuin University Annual Studies* 38: 35–62.

Benwell, Bethan, and Elizabeth Stokoe (2006) *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Billig, Michael (1999) Conversation analysis and the claim of naivety. *Discourse and Society* 10: 572–576.

Bucholtz, Mary, and Kira Hall (2006) Language and identity. In A. Duranti (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 369–394.

Cook, Haruko M. (2006) Joint construction of folk beliefs by JFL learners and Japanese host families. In M.A. DuFon, and E.E. Churchill (eds.), *Language Learners in Study Abroad Contexts*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 120–150.

Creighton, Michael (1997) *Soto* others and *uchi* others: Imaging racial diversity, imagining homogeneous Japan. In M. Weiner (ed.), *Japan's Minorities: The Illusion of Homogeneity*. London: Routledge, pp. 211–238.

Crystal, David (1997) *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Crystal, David (1992) *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Linguistics.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Deppermann, Arnulf (2005) Conversational interpretation of lexical items and conversational contrasting. In A. Hakulinen, and M. Selting (eds.), *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 289–317.

Doerr, Neriko (2010) Introduction, nationhood, and language. *Critical Asian Studies* 42.1: 53–62.

Edley, Nigel, and Margaret Wetherell (1997) Jockeying for position: The construction of masculine identities. *Discourse & Society* 8.2: 203–217.

Edley, Nigel, and Margaret Wetherell (1999) Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism Psychology* 9.3: 335–356.

Fitzgerald, Richard, and William Housley (2002) Identity, categorization and sequential organization: The sequential and categorical flow of identity in a radio phone-in. *Discourse & Society* 13.5: 579–602.

Gafaranga, Joseph (2001) Linguistic identities in talk-in-interaction: Order in bilingual conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1901–1925.

Garfinkel, Harold (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Greer, Tim (2012) Accomplishing multiethnic identity in mundane talk: Half-Japanese teenagers at an international school. *Pragmatics* 23.3: 371–390.

Hall, Stuart, and Paul du Gay (1996) *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage.

Hester, Stephen (1998) Describing "deviance" in school: Recognizably educational psychological problems. In C. Antaki, and S. Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk.* London: Sage, pp. 133–150.

Hester, Sally, and Stephen Hester (2012) Categorial occasionality and transformation: Analyzing culture in action. *Human Studies.* doi: 10.1007/s10746-012-9211-7.

Higgins, Christina (2011) Introduction to Part I. In C. Higgins (ed.), *Identity Formation in Globalizing Contexts: Language Learning in the New Millennium*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 21–25.

Iino, Masakazu (1996)"Excellent foreigner!": Gaijinization of Japanese language and culture in contact situations. An ethnographic study of dinner table conversations between Japanese host families and American students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Iino, Masakazu (2006) Norms of interaction in a Japanese homestay setting: Toward a two-way flow of linguistic and cultural resources. In M.A. DuFon, and E.E. Churchill (eds.), *Language Learners in Study Abroad Contexts*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 151–173.

Kasper, Gabriele (2009) Categories, context, and comparison in conversation analysis. In H. Nguyen, and G. Kasper (eds.), *Talk-in-Interaction: Multilingual Perspectives*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center, pp. 1–28.

Kitzinger, Celia (2000) Doing feminist CA. *Feminism and Psychology* 10: 163–193.

Komori, Yoichi (2000) *Yuragi no Nihon Bungaku* [The vacillation of Japanese literature]. Tokyo: NHK Books.

Kroskrity, Paul V. (2006) Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 496–517.

Makino, Seiichi, and Michio Tsutsui (1989) *A Dictionary of Basic Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: Japan Times.

Matsumoto, Yoshiko (1985) A sort of speech act qualification in Japanese: *Chotto*. *Journal of Asian Culture* 9: 143–159.

Matsumoto, Yoshiko, and Shigeko Okamoto (2003) The construction of the Japanese language and culture in teaching Japanese as a foreign language. *Japanese Language and Literature* 37.1: 27–48.

Miller, Laura (1995) Crossing ethnolinguistic boundaries: A preliminary look at the *gaijin tarento* in Japan. In J.A. Lent (ed.), *Asian Popular Culture*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 189–201.

Miller, Laura (2010) Japan-related linguistic intervention. *Critical Asian Studies* 42.2: 239–245.

Miller, Roy A. (1977) *Japanese Language in Modern Japan: Some Sociolinguistic Observations*. Washington D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Moerman, Michael (1988) *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Neustupńy, Jirˊi V. (1995) *Atarashii Nihongo Kyooiku no tame ni* [For new education of the Japanese language]. Tokyo: Taishuukan shoten.

Nishizaka, Aogu (1997) *Soogokooi Bunseki to iu Shiten* [A perspective of interactional analysis]. Tokyo: Kaneko Shoten.

Nishizaka, Aogu (1999) Doing interpreting within interaction: The interactive accomplishment of a "*henna gaijin*" or "strange foreigner." *Human Studies* 22: 235–251.

Ochs, Elinor (2002) Becoming a speaker of culture. In C. Kramsch (ed.), *Language Acquisition and Language Socialization*. New York: Continuum, pp. 99–120.

Ohara, Yumiko, and Scott Saft (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.

Ohta, Amy S. (1993) The foreign language learner in Japanese society: Successful learners of Japanese respond to Miller's "law of inverse returns." *Journal of Association of Teachers of Japanese* 27: 205–228.

Phillipson, Robert, and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (1995) *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pomerantz, Anita (1984) Giving a source or basis: The practice in conversation of telling "What I know." *Journal of Pragmatics* 8: 607–625.

Psathas, George (1995) *Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk-in-Interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Psathas, George (1999) Studying the organization in action: Membership categorization and interaction analysis. *Human Studies* 22: 139–162.

Sacks, Harvey (1972) An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. In D. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press, pp. 31–74.

Sacks, Harvey (1979) Hotrodder: A revolutionary category. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington, pp. 7–14.

Sacks, Harvey (1992) *Lectures on Conversation: Volumes I and II* (Edited by G. Jefferson, introduction by E.A. Schegloff). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Sakai, Naoki (1996) *Shizan sareru Nihongo, Nihonjin* [The stillborn Japanese language and people]. Tokyo: Shinyoosha.

Shinmura, Izuru (2003) *Kjoojien Dictionary* (5th ed.; electronic version). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

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

Silverstein, Michael (1979) Language structure and language ideology. In P. Clyne, W. Hanks, and C. Hofbauer (eds.), *The Elements*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 193–248.

Stokoe, Elizabeth (2012) Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse Studies* 14.3: 277–303.

Suzuki, Asuka (2009) When *gaijin* matters: Theory-building in Japanese multiparty interaction. In H. Nguyen, and G. Kasper (eds.), *Talk-in-Interaction: Multilingual Perspectives*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center, pp. 89–109.

Takasaki, Midori (2012) *Bimi o imi suru go no shiyoo to seisa* [On gender differences and the use of words that mean *bimi* 'good flavor' in Japanese: Focusing on *oishii* 'delicious']. *Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyuu* 8: 55–68.

Talmy, Steven (2009) Resisting ESL: Categories and sequence in a critically "motivated" analysis of classroom interaction. In H. Nguyen, and G. Kasper (eds.), *Talk-in-Interaction: Multilingual Perspectives*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center, pp. 181–213.

ten Have, Paul (1999) *Doing Conversation Analysis*. London: Sage.

Tsukuba Language Group (1991) *Situational Functional Japanese, vol. 1 (Notes)*. Tokyo: Bonjinsha.

Ueno, Chizuko (2005) *Datsu aidentiti no senryaku* [Strategies for de-identity]. In C. Ueno (ed.), *Datsu Aidentiti* [De-identity]. Tokyo: Keisoo Shoboo, pp. 289–321.

Watson, Rod (1978) Categorisation, authorization and blame-negotiation in conversation. *Sociology* 12: 105–113.

Wooffitt, Robin (2005) *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: Sage.

Woolard, Kathryn A. (1992) Language ideology: Issues and approaches. *Pragmatics* 2: 235–249.

Yoshino, Kosaku (1992) *Cultural Nationalism in Contemporary Japan*. London: Routledge.