The Construction of Native Speaker and Non-Native Speaker Identities in English Conversation
Nimabuchi

Abstract
This paper uses conversation analysis (CA) as the analytical approach to analyze a videotaped conversation among one NS and five NNSs to illustrate how the participants constructed or co-constructed their identities as a NS or a NNS through different role-construction (questioner versus questionee and tester versus testee). The analysis also focuses on laughter in talking about the linguistic knowledge of the language of the conversation. As an implication for language teaching and learning, this paper suggests that teachers implement the analysis of real conversations based on CA principles in their teaching so that their students can learn how language is used in authentic conversations for communication and identity construction.

Introduction
Each of us has identity. As Wardhaugh states, our identities are constructed "from interaction with others and it is the sense of self each of us has achieved, the result of our socialization" (2006, p. 6). This means that a person's identity can become distinctive in relation to another person with whom he or she has differences in terms of "ethnicity, gender, religion, occupation, physical location, social class, kinship, and leisure activities" (p. 6). Thus, ways of dressing, language, accent, behavior, and ways of idea expression become the indicators of identities in cross-cultural communication. People consciously or unconsciously construct their identities by using these means. For example, participants in an international conference wear different national dress in order to show their national identities and differences from the others. However, in cross-cultural communication people may use some other ways to construct their identity, not necessarily cultural, ethnic, or national identity. These identity indicators may not be as apparent as those I mentioned above, but they can be equally significant. In applied linguistics, we often refer to identities such as "native speaker" and "non-native speaker," especially when it comes to judgment of language competence.

In this paper, I intend to illuminate how being a NS or a NNS is constructed in cross-culture talk. As a theoretical framework, I will employ conversational analysis (CA) to demonstrate how participants categorize themselves or their peers as NS or NNS so as to understand how NS/NNS identities are co-constructed in the "midst of unfolding social interaction" (Park, 2007, p. 354).

Native Speaker and Non-native Speaker Identities
In a cross-cultural conversation, participants do not have equal access to the language of the exchange and the culture of each other. Thus, there is a kind of unequal relation between NS and NNS in conversations which affects how the participants come to perceive themselves and each other. This creates an "asymmetry." An asymmetric relation exists in many conversational situations. For example, in doctor - patient encounters, we may find that the doctor asks the patient the symptom of illness and gives the patient advice on how to take medicine; while the patient answers the doctor's questions and acknowledges the advice. Thus, the doctor dominates the conversation and displays his expertise through questioning and giving advice; this status of the doctor is further elevated by the patient's "compliance" to the doctor's role. Thus, an asymmetric relation is established by both the participants in the interaction.

The asymmetric relation in NS/NNS conversations is realized when the participants deal with linguistic and cultural knowledge. Kurhila mentioned that "the asym-

metry of knowledge is omnipresent in the conversation between NSs and NNSs" (2000, p. 1107). Usually, the participants will orient to their NS/NNS categories and "align themselves asymmetrically in relation to each other" (Ikeda, 2005, p. 60). The NNS will naturally regard the NS as the expert on linguistic knowledge of the language in the conversations, and the NS will take it for granted that he or she is the owner of the language and therefore has the power to point out or correct any inappropriate use of the language by the NNS. This is in line with the research by Kurhila (2000), in which she investigated how a NS demonstrates his or her identity through the activity of error correction in a NS/NNS conversation.

In the error correction activity, Kurhila describes sequences of turn-taking which involve "repairable" and "repair" turns. In CA, "repairable" is the linguistic unit which contains the trouble source and "repair" is the turn or a part of the turn where the problematic element is replaced with the correct or standard linguistic unit (p. 1086). In most cases in Kurhila's investigation, when a NNS produces a repairable turn, he or she will show hesitance or uncertainty through repetition of the repairable turn or through gaze shift. Then the NS will give direct correction to repair the repairable linguistic unit. However, there are also some examples in which the NS will initiate repair to the NNS and encourage the NNS to self repair. Thus, whether a repairable linguistic unit is corrected directly or indirectly, the point is clear that correction is a conversational activity through which the asymmetric positions of the participants can become interactionally salient. That is, the asymmetric relation in NS/NNS conversations is sustained when the NNS remains modest in the linguistic knowledge of the language of the conversation and the NS maintains the responsibility for improving the linguistic knowledge of the NNS.

However, Park states (2007), "the constitution of NS/NNS identities engenders a momentarily asymmetrical alignment" (p. 354). This means that an asymmetry may not be inherent in an interaction that in-volves NS and NNS, but rather it can be an occasional phenomenon and prone to negotiation. According to Park's investigation of a conversation between a NS and a NNS, the NS's attempts to correct linguistic deficiencies of the NNS are sometimes rejected by the NNS by saying "yes, I know" (p. 352). In another conversation investigated by Park involving two NNSs and one NS, one of the NNSs always side with the NS to correct the English pronunciation of the other NNS. On the basis of the evidence from the two conversations observed by Park, the asymmetric relation in a conversation of NS/NNS is subject to negotiation and renegotiation, especially when the NNS displays resistance to the action taken by the NS to construct the contrast between NS and NNS identities or when a NNS actively aligns himself/herself symmetrically with a NS to avoid being categorized as a NNS.

To summarize, the NS/NNS asymmetric relation might be stable or changeable, but it always exists in NS/NNS conversations due to the imbalance of the target linguist knowledge between a NS and a NNS. What is more, it seems that asymmetry may be necessary for the smooth progress of a conversation. Crawford noted that "asymmetry is not merely an external constraint on participants' actions, but it also provides resources for them to use in order to move the interaction ahead" (1995, p. 103).

Research Questions

I was motivated to collect data of NS/NNS talk and investigate how the participants constructed the identity of themselves and others as a NS or a NNS in the conversation. Specifically, through analysis of the data I have collected, I wanted to be able to answer the following questions:

1. What roles do the NS and NNS play to construct their identity and other participants' identity as a NS or a NNS?

2. Do the participants use other means, either verbal or nonverbal, to establish their identity as a NS or a NNS?

Methodology

The data analyzed in this paper were drawn from a videotaped English conversation which lasted about two hours. The conversation took place on October 14, 2007 when seven friends from four different countries had lunch together at the 6th floor Diamond Head kitchen in Hale Manoa, the student dormitory of the East West Center located on the campus of the University of Hawaii. Among the participants, Hellen (female) is a native speaker of English from Seattle. Lhamo (female), Nodren (female), and Miwang (male) are from Tibet; their first language is Tibetan. Steve (male) is from Thailand, his first language is Thai. Dieu (female) and Tuan (male) are from Vietnam; their first language is Vietnamese. All the participants except Miwang are graduate students either at University of Hawaii or Hawaii Pacific University. Since Miwang does not speak English, it can be observed from the video that participants sometimes spoke in Tibetan or Mandarin so that Miwang could understand.

The conversation was authentic and naturally occurring[1] and there were no pre-assigned topics given to the participants. Even though the data are from only one conversional situation, different topics are involved in the conversation. For example, they talked about how to make and eat pasta, how tips are calculated in America, why people from some countries or regions look older than those from other countries, and what some English words mean or how to differentiate English words with similar meanings. The data of two-hour length with various topics provided an adequate amount of information that is relevant and useful for analyzing how NS/NNS construct their identity and, therefore, helps answer the research questions for this paper.

The analytical approach used in this paper is conversation analysis (CA) which is an approach to the study of natural conversation (Nevile, 2006, p. 12). Unlike other forms of discourse analysis, "CA is a markedly data-centered form of discourse analysis" (Cameron, 2006, p. 87) because it focuses on sequential development of interaction to see how precisely talk develops in context in real time and how the participants themselves create, interpret and understand what is going on (Nevile, 2006, p. 14). Since the CA data include much more than the actual spoken words alone, I transcribed them very carefully based on the Gail Jefferson system which is regarded as "the internationally recognized gold standard" (Lerner, 2004, p. 3). I tried to note down as much detail as possible in the sequences of turn-taking in the conversation such as speech rate, volume, cut-off, lengthening, overlapped talk, laughter, non-verbal actions, and other prosodic features including variations in pitch.

On the basis of these details, the interpretation of turns in the conversation can become easier because these features can be treated as evidence in the explanation of how participants construct their NS or NNS identity in the interaction. Further more, these features present how participants take turns at talk and how the interpretation of a previous turn is supported by the following turn, which is central to the CA approach (Cameron, 2006, p. 88).

Analysis

Identity construction through different roles: Questioner and questionee

In many NS/NNS conversations, the NS/NNS identities can be displayed through the asymmetrical use of linguistic knowledge. According to the research by Park (2007), in a NS/NNS conversation, the participants undertake their discourse identities in a "word search" activity in which the NNS and the NS play the role of requestor and requestee respectively.

In my data, I have found similar instances of "word search" activities in which NNS asked the NS many questions such as what something was called in English, what an English word meant, and how English words with a similar meaning were differentiated in usage. Thus, the NNS and NS played the role of questioner and questionee respectively to construct their identity and the others' identity. Excerpts 1 through 2 illustrate the phenomenon of questioner and questionee identities. In Excerpt 1, Tuan, a NNS is asking Hellen, a NS the dif-

ference in meaning between *avenue* and *boulevard*.

In this part of the conversation (see Excerpt 1 below), Tuan asks a direct question about the difference between *avenue* and *boulevard* to Hellen, the NS, rather than to the other NNS (line1), which can be seen in Tuan's eye gaze toward Hellen (line 2) and Hellen's answer in the following turn (line 3). This indicates that Tuan treats Hellen as the only one person at the lunch table who can answer the linguistic question of the language of the conversation. Thus, Tuan not only constructs the identity of Hellen as a NS but also constructs the iden-tity of himself and the other participants as NNS. Tuan's construction of NS/NNS identities is supported by the other NNS. As it is shown in the conversation, Hellen's answer to Tuan's question is immediately followed by responses from Steve, Lhamo, Dieu, and Nodren (line 4-7). They produce the same response "ah:::" at the same time by lengthening their voices. According to Heritage (1984), this is a change-of-state token, indicating the speaker's change of understanding (in this case, from not knowing to knowing). Thus, Steve, Lhamo, Dieu, and Nodren are acknowledging a linguistic gap, thus aligning themselves as NNS.

Excerpt 1
1 Tuan: what is the difference between avenue and boulevard?
2   *T looks at H*
3 Hellen: oh. Boulevard is bigger streets=
4 Steve: =[ah:::
5 Lhamo: [ah:::
6 Dieu: [ah:::
7 Nodren: [ah:::
8 Tuan: bigger street, and avenue,
9 Steve: and sometimes, there is the-
10 Tuan: how about <u>trees</u>, how about <u>trees</u>,
11   *T gazes at H*
12 Hellen: Ehem:: I mean: I mean it-it doesn't really affect it,
13 Tuan: Ah::: bigger bigger

The asymmetric relation between NS and NNS can be further maintained when a NNS ignores another NNS's offer for explaining linguistic knowledge of the language of the conversation. In line 8 and 9, when Tuan launches a question for further information about the *avenue* and *boulevard*, Steve tries to say something about these two words (line 9). However, Tuan does not orient to him and even enters into Steve's turn space before Steve's turn-construction unit is complete and explicitly throws the question to Hellen (line 10 and 11). By refusing Steve's linguistic help and directing the question to Hellen, Tuan once gain emphases the asymmetric relation between NS and NNS and publicly ratifies the NS's "knowing recipient status" (Park, 2007, p.

345). Therefore, as it is shown in this part of the conversation, Tuan, as a NNS takes it for granted that the linguistic question of the language of the conversation can only be asked to the NS and can only be answered by the NS.

Thus, as Excerpt 1 shows, the roles of questioner and questionee are not only played between Tuan and Hellen, the other NNS also construct their identity and at the same time the other participants' identities by playing the role of questioner and ask Hellen questions about linguistic knowledge of English. In Except 2, Hellen is talking about the meaning and the usage of a phrase "I committed a blunder" to the other participants.

Excerpt 2

1 Hellen: there is a <u>Chinese</u> guy I met, I will never forget it. This is my ↑favorite example. He
2   would say-whenever he made a ↑mistake he would say I COMMITTED A
3   ↑↓BLUNDER. You know people don't say it any more that (…) maybe:::: during
4   Shakespeare's time people would say I COMMITTED A ↑↓BLUNDER.
5 Steve: so what doe it mean?=
6 Nodren: =yeah. what doe it mean?
7 Hellen: > I made a mistake.< I <u>make</u> a mistake. he said like I committed a blu:nder.
8 Tuan: I commit a blunder.=
9 Nordren: = Mhm=
10 Tuan: =yeah. right.
11 Steve: if you say commit I would say-[
12 Tuan: [it's a slang: or ::::
13 Hellen: No no. it's like an o::ld [English=
14 Lhamo: [ha ha ha
15 Dieu: [ha ha h a
16 Nodren: =it's-it's <u>Shakespeare</u> English.
17 Hellen: <u>Shakespeare</u> English.
18 Nodren: ↑ha ha ha ha
19   (0.2)
20 Steve: to commit-commit a crime is ↓ok?
21   *with a puzzling gaze at H.*
22 Hellen: yeah. you <u>can</u> say commit a crime but commit a blunder:
23   *makes a face and moves her eye balls up and down*
24   (0.2) nobody says that.
25   *N, L, D, T, and S nods heads and continues eating*

At the beginning of this part of the conversation, Hellen tells the others how a Chinese man she met would misuse the English phrase "I committed a blunder" (line 1-4). Some details in her speech vividly shows how she constructs her identity as a NS such as putting stress on "Chinese" to emphasize that the man who made the "mistake" is a NNS, using high pitch before "favorite example" to imply that she has many more examples of inappropriate use of English by NNSs, and using higher volume on the phrase "I committed a blunder" to show how funny the "mistake" is. Hellen continues to construct her NS identity by explaining why NSs do not use the phrase now. Thus, Hellen places herself in an expert position where she can evaluate a NNS's use of English. The establishment of the expert position is actively supported by Steve and Nodren when they play the role of questioners and ask Hellen the meaning of the phrase (line 5 and 6).

Naturally, as an expert or a NS, Hellen not only gives the answer but also repeats the answer (line 7), perhaps for fear that the NNS will not understand the answer after saying it only one time. The repetition of the answer reveals the NS's attitude toward linguistic knowledge of the NNS. As NNS, the other participants orient to the construction of NS/NNS identities by the NS by showing their acknowledgement or continuing to ask questions. For example, in line 20-21, Steve asks Hellen if it is correct to say "to commit a crime". The word "ok" he used and his puzzling gaze at Hellen seem to indicate that he is not confident in his knowledge and wants the NS to assess his knowledge. Thus, Steve displays his sensitivity to the uneven linguistic knowledge between him and Hellen, which emphasizes the asymmetric alignment in the NS/NNS interaction.

The data also showed instances in which a NNS acted as an expert in the discussion of English linguistic knowledge. In

line 12, Tuan asks Hellen if the phrase "I committed blunder" is slang. Right after Hellen's answer to Tuan's question (line13), Nodren gives Tuan further information about the phrase by saying "it's-it's Shakespeare English" (line 16). From this, we can see that Nodren tries to position herself as someone who has the equal expertise as Hellen to explain the English phrase to Tuan. Furthermore, Hellen accepts and supports Nodren's new status, which is evidenced by Hellen's repetition of Nodren's answer (line17). Thus, instead of remaining passive to be categorized as a NNS with the other participants, Nodren actively participates in Hellen's construction of Tuan as a

NNS. Accordingly, this example conforms to what Park (2007) reported that sometimes the symmetric relation between NS and NNS in interactions can be negotiated (p. 351).

Identity construction through different roles: Tester and testee

In addition to playing the roles of questioner and questionee as shown in the previous paragraphs, the participants also play the roles of tester and testee in identity construction. This is demonstrated in Except 3, in which Hellen engages in a test-like activity with Miwang on an English word, *mug.*

Except 3
1 Tuan: ↑did you buy it Champagnez?
2   *T looks at N*
3 Nodren: which one?
4 Tuan: Champagnez?
5 Nodren: CHAMPAGNE. my husband got the Champagne from his friends.
6 Tuan: borrowed word. right? from French. from French.
7 Hellen: what is it called?
8   *H looks at M and points to M's mug*
9 Miwang: º glass º.=
10 Lhamo: ↑CUP
11 Hellen: bu:t this is not cup. MUG.=
12 Lhamo: = ↑OH. ha ha ha
13 Miwang: [mug.
14 Steve: [mug
15 Hellen: Mug has two meanings. Mug means takes somebody's money=

In the middle of this part of conversation, Hellen asks Miwang a direct question (line 7). Unlike the NNSs' role as questioner in the previous paragraphs, Hellen asks the question here to act as a tester to test if Miwang (the NNS who does not speak English) knows the English vocabulary for the mug he is holding in his hand so that she can teach Miwang the word if he doesn't know it in English. This is verified by Miwang's response in line 9, in which Miwang produces the answer in a very low and soft voice, which displays his uncertainty and lack of confidence in his answer. This activity of tester and testee between Hellen and Miwang resembles a common teacher-student interaction, where Hellen tests Mi-

wang's knowledge of English vocabulary, Miwang gives a wrong answer, Hellen demonstrates the correct word (line11), and Miwang repeats after her (line13). In this series of actions, Hellen and Miwang establish the NS or NNS identity of themselves and each other.

In this part of the conversation, there is another interesting finding. When Miwang produces the wrong word "glass" for mug, Lhamo tries to replace Miwang's wrong word with "cup" (line 10). It seems that Lhamo is very confident in her role as an expert in front of Miwang as she utters the word in a loud voice and a rising pitch. However, Lhamo is not able to continue the role of an expert because of Hellen's inter-

ruption. As it is shown in line 11, after Lhamo utters the word "↑CUP", Hellen directly denies Lhamo's answer by saying "but this is not cup" and then corrects the answer with "mug". The NS does this kind of direct correction from the position of a knowledgeable participant. Thus, this example once again shows how the participants orient to their category as NS or NNS. This interpretation has support because the strategy of error-correction in talk among native speakers might be different as it is observed by Schegloff (cited in Kurhila, 2000) that "the correction between native speakers is often mitigated with expressions such as *I think*, partly because the correction is, potentially, to be interpreted as a disagreement" (p. 1104).

Identity construction through laughter

The construction of NS and NNS identities is not only reflected in the different roles played by the participants. Laughter is also a common phenomenon in the conversation through which the participants, especially the NNS display their identity. Excerpts (4) through (6) illustrate how the participants construct identity through laughter Excerpt 4 is a reproduction of Excerpt 3 followed by more turns in the talk.

Excerpt 4
1   Hellen: what is it called?
2   *H looks at M and points to M's mug*
3   Miwang: º glass º.=
4   Lhamo: ↑CUP
5   Hellen: bu:t this is not cup. MUG.=
6   Lhamo: =↑OH. ha ha ha
7   Miwang: [mug.
8   Steve: [mug
9   Hellen: Mug has two meanings. Mug means takes somebody's money=
10 Lhamo: ↑↓OH::: mug money means steal money.=
11   *L gazes at H with a surprising emotion*
12 Hellen: yeah. we don't say mug money. > we usually say < get mugged. that means
13   somebody stole your money.=
14 Lhamo: =Oh ha ha. Get mugged.

In line 4 Lhamo produces the word "cup" which turns out to be a trouble turn, namely the "repairable turn" (Kurhila, 2000, p. 1086). Hellen denies Lhamo's answer and then replaces the wrong answer with the correct word "mug" (line 5), which is immediately followed by Lhamo's laughter in line 6. This laughter seems to reveal Lhamo's embarrassment about providing a wrong word to Miwang and an attempt to make an excuse for her mistake. This interpretation of the function of the laughter can be supported by some details in the talk. For example, before laughing, Lhamo produces the word "oh" with a high volume and a rising pitch to show her change-of-state (line 6) (Heritage, 1984), which seems to indicate that it is her first time to know that the kind of things she calls "cup" is ac-

tually called "mug". What is more, as it is shown in subsequent turns, Lhamo becomes the most active listener and supporter of Hellen who "teaches" the word "mug" to the NNS.

During Hellen's teaching of the word "mug" (line 9), Lhamo once again produces a repairable turn in line 10 when she says "↑↓OH::: mug money means steal money". For the problematic phrase "mug money" produced by Lhamo, Hellen first gives Lhamo credit for her understanding of the other meaning of the word *mug* by saying "yeah" and then Hellen corrects the inappropriate use of the language with some further explanation (line 12-13). By actively participating in the talk as a linguistic authority, Hellen constructs her identity as a NS. Lhamo naturally orients to the authori-

tative status of Hellen by laughing and repeating the correct phrase offered by Hellen (line 14).In this part of the conversation, Lhamo laughs two times to either make an excuse for her linguistic deficiency or show her orientation to the NS's error- correction and "teaching". Hellen, on the other hand, does not laugh at all in this segment of the talk. Thus, I submit that the NS/NNS iden-

tity contrast becomes highlighted through Lhamo's laughter.

To further understand how laughter functions in the identity construction of NS and NNS, let us look at Excerpt 5, in which the participants continue the topic of *mug* and talk about the difference between *mug* and *steal*.

Excerpt 5

1   Nodren: when I hear "mug" I will think like:::take something from somebody suddenly but
2   "steal" is silently. Ha ↑ha ha ha.
3   Hellen: the <u>difference</u> between mu:g and stea:l? You get ↑↓mu:gged, that happened like
4   (0.2) in a bright day on a street? ↑somebody steals something from you? I mean
5   you could-could:-.
6   Steve: see
7   Hellen: yeah. you might not see it. but when you get mugged? you know somebody is
8   taking your stuff. Like: they come up you, they have gun and they say give me
9   your bag. […
10   *H performs the action of holding a gun and asking for bag to N.*
11 Nodren: [ah:::
12 Lhamo: [ah:::
13 Steve: [ah:::

At the beginning of this part of the conversation, Nodren tries to explain what she understands about the difference between *mug* and *steal*. Unlike a NS who might explain linguistic knowledge in an authoritative voice or tone, Nodren displays uncertainty for her explanation through her laughter (line 1 and 2) which seems to indicate that she is not confident about her explanation and to signal a need for assistance or confirmation from Hellen.[2] Hellen seems to understand Nodren's intention conveyed from the laughter because Hellen explains the difference between *mug* and *steal* in detail in the following turns (line 3 through 10). Thus, the cooperation between Nodren and Hellen in this activity is a successful construction of NS and NNS identities of each other.

Finally, in this part of the conversation, there is an interesting finding that shows how identity can be changed sometimes in discourse. In line 4-5, Hellen, the native speaker seems to be in trouble trying to come up with a word after she says "↑somebody steals something from you? I

mean you could-could:- " while she is explaining the word *steal*. Her trouble in word search can be identified through her hesitation revealed by her repetition and lengthening of the word "could." In this situation, Steve provides the word "see" (line 6) and Hellen immediately accepts the word and uses it to continue her explanation (line 7). Therefore, this part of interaction between Steve and Hellen shows that the role of NS and NNS can sometimes be changed in discourse in which the NNS offers linguistic assistance to the NS.

Discussion and Conclusion

In summary, in this paper I have presented instances of how NS and NNS construct their identities and other participants' identities when they are talking about knowledge of the language being used in the conversation. From the data I collected, the participants oriented to the identity construction through playing different roles of questioner versus questionee and tester versus testee in the discussions of linguistic knowledge. Furthermore, laughter was a means of con-

structing NNS identities by the NNS as they laughed to make excuses for their linguistic deficiency, to show their orientation to the NS, and to display uncertainty about their knowledge of English. Through their role-construction and laughter, the NS and the NNS mostly jointly maintained an asymmetric relation in which the NS was the linguistic expert and the NNS were those whose linguistic knowledge of the language of the conversation was inferior to the NS. However, it is also possible that sometimes the NNS was superior to the NS in some linguistic aspects.

Admittedly, there are some limitations in my study. First, my analysis focuses on the linguistic discussions of the language used in the talk, so the participants would always construct each other's identity on the basis of the assumption that the NS should be the authority of linguistic knowledge because of the fact that the NS uses the language of the conversation as the first language. Second, my data is from only one conversational situation and there is only one NS in the conversation, so the findings in my data may not reflect how other NS and NNS construct their identities in other conversations. Therefore, if I have a chance to do further research, I would like to collect more data of conversations between NS and NNS. In my future study, I hope to be able find more evidence to answer the question "Is the NS always regarded as the authority in NS/NNS conversations?" Could the status of authority change, for example, if participants talk about the culture of the NNS or about other topics that belong to neither the culture of the NS nor the culture of the NNS?

As for the implications for the language teaching and learning, analysis of authentic conversations can help language teachers better understand language use. Teachers often explain grammar or sentence structures out of context. However, as the conversation analysis in this paper has shown, sensible interpretation of a speaker's idea and intention is also based on many other details such as the utterance's sequential context, laughter, and non-verbal actions, which can not be explained only by grammar. For example, in the data, the NNS laughed to show uncertainty or make excuses for linguistic deficiencies. Therefore, I recommend that teachers implement the analysis of real conversations based on the CA principles in their English teaching so that their students can learn how language is used in authentic conversations as well as improve their communication skills.

Notes

[1] One might question the naturally occurring nature of the conversation (see Labov's [1972] discussion on the observer's paradox). However, people in videotaped conversations do not deviate from their routine ways of interacting because of the presence of the camera (even when people talk about the fact that they are being taped, the organization of this talk still follows routine patterns of talk), and thus, their conducts can be considered a reflection of how talk normally take place.

[2] Alternatively, one can argue that her laughter serves to soften the authoritative assertion in her turn toward the other NNS and thus making her less of a 'show-off' to her NNS peers.

References

Cameron, D. (2006). *Working With Spoken Discourse.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Crawford, M. (1995). *Talking Difference: On Gender and Language.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ikeda, T. (2005). The interactional achievement of being "native" and "nonnative" speakers: An analysis of multiparty interations between Japanese and international students. Retrieved November 18, 2007, from http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/al/clic/articlefiles/2005/ikeda2005.pdf

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an Introduction. In Gene H. Lerner (Ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-23). Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Also available at http://www.liso.ucsb.edu/Jefferson/

Kurhila, S. (2000). Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics 33,* 1083-1110.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the Inner City.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lerner, G. H. (2004). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation.* Philadelphia, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Nevile, M. (2006). Communication in context: A conversation analysis tool for examining recorded voice data in investigations of aviation occurrences. Retrieved January 30, 2008, from http://www.atsb.gov.au/publications/2006/pdf/B20050118.pdf

Park, J. (2007). Co-construction of Nonnative Speaker Identity in Cross-cultural Interaction. *Applied Linguistics 28 (3), 339-360.*

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Socialinguistics: Fifth Edition.* MA, USA: Blackwell Publishing.

Appendix

Transcript Conventions
(based on Gail Jefferson's [2004] system)

.	: falling intonation.
?	: rising intonation.
,	: slightly rising intonation.
=	: latching speech
?,	: slightly falling-rising intonation.
↑	: raised pitch in the next phrase
↓	: falling pitch in the next phrase
↑↓	: pitch rises and falls within the next word
-	: cut off word
underlined	: stressed syllable (louder, higher pitch, longer)
CAPITALIZED	: higher volume
:	: lengthened speech
(( ))	: vocal effect accompanying speech
[	: beginning of overlap of speech
>xxx<	: faster speech
<xxx>	: slower speech
(number)	: duration of silence in tenths of seconds
degree signs º	: beginning and end of quieter speech
in italics	: nonverbal actions accompanying speech
( )	: unclear talk

[This page is intentionally blank]