

Shifting of “expert” and “novice” roles between/within two languages: Language socialization, identity, and epistemics in family dinnertime conversations

1 Introduction

As in various theories of human learning and development (e.g. situated learning, Lave and Wenger 1991; sociocultural theory, Vygotsky 1978), the roles of “expert” and “novice” have long been considered as important concepts in language socialization (e.g. Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). It is only relatively recently, however, that researchers have examined their discursive construction by documenting ways in which these roles are interactionally achieved (e.g. Pontecorvo, Fasulo and Sterponi 2001; cf. Jacoby and Gonzales 1991). This research has provided a more nuanced picture of the expert-novice roles by examining ways in which they are relative and multifaceted rather than fixed and one-dimensional. While research has primarily focused on monolingual interaction, a potentially valuable site for examining the construction of linguistic and cultural expertise is bi- or multilingual family interaction (e.g. Kheirkhah and Cekaite 2015). In immigrant families, for instance, parents (and other older members) often display knowledge and assumptions to children about the world that are grounded in their divergent linguistic and cultural experiences (e.g. Bolden 2013, 2014). Yet, knowledge about norms and values can be conveyed not only from parents to children, but also from children to parents, as part of a bidirectional process of socialization in which family members are agents who socialize each other (e.g. Baquedano-López and Kattan 2007).

This paper explores the interactional achievement of expert and novice roles in relation to two languages (Japanese and English) in everyday family conversation that is mediated by beliefs and ideas concerning the heritage language (Japanese) and the society’s dominant language (English). We consider the roles of expert and novice as heuristic categories—as two points on a continuum—that are linked to linguistic and cultural knowledge and expertise, as well as to power and hierarchical relations (cf. Howard 2012) within the family. Taking a language socialization perspective while drawing upon insights from conversation analysis on identity and epistemics, we focus on dinnertime conversations in a Japanese-speaking immigrant family with a young adult daughter living together in Australia. Dinnertime has received a great deal of attention as a site of socialization (e.g. Blum-Kulka 2008; Paugh 2005; Pontecorvo,

Fasulo and Sterponi 2001), including as a ritual that augments familial ties (Ishige 1982), a social, linguistic, and cognitive event (Ochs and Taylor 1992), and an activity for constructing identities (Aronsson and Gottzén 2010; Ochs and Taylor 1995). Building on the notion that dinnertime is a site of identity construction we analyze how family members engage in a mutual process of language socialization in which they use language in ways that ‘position’ (cf. Davies and Harré 1990) themselves and other participants as possessing or lacking specific linguistic or cultural knowledge. We will then relate what our analysis of epistemics in an immigrant family’s interactions at the dinner table reveals about language expertise, agency, bidirectional socialization, and family relationships.

2 Language socialization, identity, and epistemics

Language socialization is concerned with the process of socialization to and through language across the lifespan (e.g. Ochs and Schieffelin 2011; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). Research focuses on how more competent members (or “experts”) socialize less competent members (or “novices”) to use language and how they socialize them through the use of language into familiarity with the ways of thinking, acting, and feeling that are characteristic of members of their social group. The expert and novice roles are a central concept of language socialization where they are viewed as dynamic and flexible (e.g. Lee and Bucholtz 2015). As Ochs and Schieffelin (2011: 4) have observed, “while many socializing situations involve older persons as experts and younger persons as novices, the reverse is also commonplace.” Recently, Duff (2008: 115) has problematized the roles of expert and novice in language socialization by pointing out that, “not all so-called experts are consistently good socializing agents, and newcomers have their own valuable prior experiences.” This observation suggests there is more to these roles than novices simply trading places with (or becoming) experts in the sense that expertise is always partial and negotiable.

In their examination of language socialization in Italian families with preschool and elementary school-aged children (three to ten years old), Pontecorvo et al. (2001: 347) have observed a ‘mutual apprenticeship’ in which parents and children socialize each other to linguistic and social norms. This kind of bidirectional socialization may be especially observable in families with: (i) adolescents and young adults, who bring a wide range of experiences and expertise to interactions with parents, and (ii) heritage

language learners (i.e. those speaking a non-English language in the home within an English-dominant society) (see He 2011). In immigrant families, parents often directly teach their children language and transmit to them social norms about the heritage culture in implicit ways through various activities (e.g. He 2011; Meyer Pitton 2013). However, as agents in the socialization process relative “novices” (e.g., children, adolescents, young adults) may work not only to foster their own socialization but also to hinder it, such as by refusing to speak in their heritage language, which may contribute to language shift to the society’s majority language (e.g. Gafaranga 2010). They may also play an agentive role by shaping their parents’ communicative competence in the society’s dominant language and their understanding of the society (e.g. He 2012; Tuominen 1999: 73).

In relation to the roles of expert and novice, a concept of language socialization theory that is central to the present study is that language forms index (Silverstein 1976) socio-cultural meaningful realities, such as social identity, social actions, activities, and affective and epistemic stances (Ochs 1996). Among these, Ochs (1993: 288) considers social identity as, “a cover term for a range of social personae, including social statuses, roles, positions, relationships, and institutional and other relevant community identities one may attempt to claim or assign in the course of social life.” She argues that there is rarely a one-to-one mapping between any language form and social identity. Rather, social identities are constituted through an indexical process in which language forms directly index affective and epistemic stances and social actions, which in turn indirectly index social identities (Ochs 1993). Thus, similar to gender and other dimensions of identity, the social identities of relative expert and novice are constituted on a moment-by-moment basis in interaction through the use of linguistic forms (e.g. prosody, grammar, lexicon) and non-linguistic resources (e.g. gestures) that index an epistemic stance (i.e. qualities of knowledge, degrees of certainty) towards some focus of concern (Jacoby and Gonzales 1991).

Recent work in conversation analysis (e.g. Heritage 2012; Mondada 2013; Stivers, Mondada and Steensig 2011) has discussed epistemic stance within a framework of epistemics in interaction, which refers to “participants’ orientation towards the relevance of who knows what in conversation” (Mondada 2013: 599). In this work, researchers distinguish between: (i) epistemic stance, or the expression of knowledge that is “managed through the design of turns at talk as well as the format of specific

actions” (Mondada 2013: 600), and (ii) epistemic status (represented by +K [knowing] and –K [unknowing] that reside on a gradient from high to low), or the positioning of participants “with reference to their knowledge distribution and knowledge access towards a given epistemic domain” (Mondada 2013: 599-600). Hence, this research considers epistemic status as the ascription of knowledge status to participants, and epistemic stance as the attitude and evaluation displayed by participants in relation to a particular focus of the talk. Similar to language socialization, researchers in conversation analysis argue that these epistemic aspects of interaction may vary and shift across a conversation. For instance, as Heritage (2012: 4) has observed, epistemic status “can be altered from moment to moment as a result of specific interactional contributions.” Thus, degrees of expertise, such as who is the ‘epistemic authority’ (i.e. possessing a higher degree of knowledge) with regard to some domain or topic of interaction, are not only displayed and affirmed, but also negotiated and contested by participants in interaction (Mondada, 2013).

In our analysis, we draw upon the above research on indexicality, identity, and epistemics from language socialization and conversation analysis in analyzing how the roles of expert and novice are constituted in relation to two languages (Japanese, English). Before proceeding to the analysis, we present the data, participants, and methods.

3 Data, Participants, and Methods

This case study is part of a larger project conducted primarily in 2010 by the first author examining identity construction among Japanese-English bilingual female speakers in interactions with family members, peers, and acquaintances residing in Sydney, Australia. Data collection consisted of audio-recorded conversations (without the researcher present), conversation diaries¹, and interviews with three focal subjects (one in high school and two attending university) and their family members. All of the families in the study can be considered, in our opinion, “successful” cases of heritage language maintenance (Schwartz and Verschik 2013) in Japanese, in the sense that the three focal subjects displayed a high or superior proficiency in speaking the language with family members. We analyze seven hours of the audio-recorded conversations of

¹ Participants wrote down information on the recorded conversations, including the date and time, setting, and speakers.

one focal participant, Maki (22 years old, a third year university student), and her parents. Maki's family was chosen for the present analysis because Maki was the most proficient of the focal subjects, who also (as self reported) read and wrote the language with a high proficiency. Moreover, as we observed in their dinner conversations, Maki and her parents not only spoke almost entirely in Japanese, but also frequently talked about the spoken and written language (and at times about English). This observation regarding the family's metalinguistic and metapragmatic discourse (discussed below), in our view, separated Maki's family from the other families in the study, who did not engage in nearly as much talk about Japanese or English.

Maki was born in Japan, but moved with her parents to another Asian country when she was one-year old and then to Australia when she was seven. In interviews with family members conducted by the first author, Maki's mother conveyed that she and Maki's father decided to leave Japan in order to avoid educating Maki in the Japanese educational system, which they viewed as being too heavily oriented towards entrance exams. At the same time, they hoped to give Maki an opportunity to be educated in English (first in the other Asian country and then in Australia), as they viewed English as an asset for her future. Maki had no formal training in reading and writing Japanese until the age of 13 when she attended a local Japanese 'tutoring school' (*juku*) for two and a half years. While Maki considers Japanese to be her fluent mother tongue—even though her mother conveyed to the first author that Maki is not a "native speaker" of Japanese at the same level as native speakers in Japan—she views English as her stronger language. Maki's father is self-employed in a Japanese-related setting, and her mother is a Japanese language teacher. For Maki's parents, English is a fairly strong second language, having lived outside of Japan for more than 20 years. In our discussions below, we treat Japanese as Maki's heritage language and as her parent's first language, and English as Maki's first language and as her parent's second language.

Also in these interviews, Maki's mother shed light on her understanding of Maki's path to Japanese proficiency. She implied that they had a 'family language policy', or "explicit and overt planning in relation to language use within the home among family members" (King, Fogle and Logan-Terry 2008: 907), in which she and Maki's father spoke to Maki only in Japanese at home from the time Maki was born. Contributing to this language policy, Maki's mother implied they had a 'language

ideology' (i.e. ideas and beliefs about language use) of "purity" (e.g. Riley 2011; Woolard and Schieffelin 1994), by relating that they encouraged Maki to not mix English into Japanese in talking with them at home. Although Maki went through a period in childhood (particularly from the ages of seven until twelve) in which she resisted speaking in Japanese, currently the family communicates also entirely in Japanese, and code-switching and code-mixing are infrequent (an exception is examined in excerpt 4 below). Maki's mother cited the parents' constant efforts in speaking only in Japanese to Maki in achieving this desired situation, as well as Maki's own motivation to speak and read/write Japanese since adolescence.

In the following section, we draw upon the data recorded during dinnertime, which the family reported to be the only time during a typical day in which they conversed with each other for an extended period of time. After the first author transcribed the data, the authors played back the recordings in order to make collections of recurring communicative practices. The excerpts were re-transcribed by both authors in order to elucidate paralinguistic features that informed the analysis, such as overlaps, pauses, and prosody (transcription conventions appear in the appendix). Some of the unclear utterances and accompanying non-verbal behavior (to the extent possible) were clarified in interviews and e-mail exchanges with participants.

4 Practices in constructing and challenging the roles of "expert" and "novice"

These parents and their young adult daughter used a range of communicative practices and language resources in constituting the roles of relative expert and novice in relation to linguistic and cultural knowledge. In what follows, we structure our analysis around three key practices that we have identified in the recordings: word definitions (Section 4.1), repair (Section 4.2) and metapragmatic talk (Section 4.3), and discuss some of the key linguistic (and non-verbal) resources within these practices.

4.1 Defining words and relating their cultural connections

A recurring practice in this family for constituting the roles of expert and novice in relation to linguistic and cultural knowledge was defining the meaning of words for others (cf. Bilmes et al. 2015). Defining words represents a 'metalinguistic awareness', or the ability to reflect on and talk about language (e.g. Silverstein 1981), and is an explicit means of informal instruction at the dinner table (e.g. Ely et al. 2001).

Definitions minimally involve the introduction of a lexical item followed by an explication of its meaning, and they can be either proffered or requested from another.

Excerpt (1), which is divided into two parts (1-a and 1-b), illustrates a parental definition of a Japanese word that becomes an extended definitional activity driven in part by the daughter's (Maki's) questions. Just prior to the excerpt, Maki had pointed out a dish of various raw fish on the dinner table, and asked if one of them was *huri* (a mature yellowtail fish), which displayed her knowledge of Japanese fish as an attempt to claim a degree of expertise regarding it (rather than by simply asking, 'What fish is this?'). In response, Dad hesitated to label the fish as *huri* (saying *huri to yuu ka hamachi to yuu ka* 'should it be called *huri* [a mature yellowtail fish] or *hamachi* [a young yellow tail fish]'), which did not ratify Maki's displayed knowledge and thus positioned her as having a lower epistemic status in this domain of talk. Dad's response to Maki continues in line 1.

(1-a) Promoted fish: Part I

- 01 Dad: *huri made ika- ittenai na.*
'It's not up to (the quality of) *huri*.'
- 02 Maki: *u:::n.*
'Yeah.'
- 03 (0.2)
- 04 → Dad: *shusseuo tte yuu n da yo.*
'It's called a promoted fish *yo*.'
- 05 → *omae shitteru?*
'Do you know (this term)?'
- 06 (0.2)
- 07 → Dad: *namae ga gokai gurai kawa n da yo.*
'The name changes about five times *yo*.'
- 08 Mom: ((*sniffing*))
- 09 Maki: *nande?*
'Why?'
- 10 (0.8)
- 11 → Dad: *nihon de wa ne.*

'in Japan, at least.'
 12 (0.3)
 13 Maki: *nande?*
 'Why?'
 14 (0.4)
 15 → Mom: *chicchai [toki kara]*
 'From the time it's small'
 16 Dad: *[chicchai] toki kara (kawaru.)*
 'From the time it's small, it changes.'
 17 → Mom: *un (chicchai toki kara) namae ga kawaru no.*
 'Yeah, from the time it's small, the name changes.'
 18 (0.8)
 19 Dad: *un.*
 'Yeah.'
 20 → Mom: *sore o (.) shusseuo °tte iu no.°*
 'It's called a promoted fish.'
 21 Dad: *soo da yo.*
 'That's right *yo*.'
 22 (0.6)
 23 Dad: *soo iu no ga (0.7) aru n da yo.*
 'There's that kind of a thing *yo*.'
 24 (0.3)
 25 Maki: *u:::: n.*
 'Oh.'
 26 Mom: *un?*
 'Hm?'
 27 Dad: *un.*
 'Yeah.'
 28 (0.2)
 29 Maki: *otamajakushi ga kaeru ni naru yoona*
 'It's like when a tadpole becomes a frog?'
 30 Dad: *[maa sonna mon da na.]*

‘Well, kind of like that.’

31 Mom: [*nihon no hamachi yori*] (0.9) *assari shiteru* [(0.5)] *kara*.
‘It (=this fish we’re eating) is lighter in taste than the *hamachi* in Japan, so.’

32 Dad: [*un.*]
‘Yeah.’

33 Mom: *un.*
‘Yeah.’

34 (1.5)

35 Dad: *dakara:* (1.2) *soo ne* (0.5) *hamachi::::: gurai da na.*
‘So, right, it (=the fish we’re eating) is about the same as *hamachi*.’

36 (1.5)

37 Maki: *e? hamachi to buri to onaji sakana no- sakana na no?*
‘Huh? *Hamachi* and *buri* are the same fish?’

38 Dad: *un, issho da yo.*
‘Yeah, they’re the same (fish) *yo*.’

39 (0.6)

40 Maki: *hee::::::::::*
‘Wow.’

41 (0.8)

42 Dad: *un.*
‘Yeah.’

43 (1.3)

44 Maki: *imaichi wakannai n da yo, sakana no namae.*
‘I don’t know the names of fish very well *yo*.’

45 Mom: ((*to Dad*)) *suzuki no kodomo wa nan na no, kodomo tte yuu ka.*
‘What’s the name of the child of a *suzuki* (=Japanese sea perch)? I say, child or something.’

46 [()]

47 Dad: [(*jidoro*)] (0.5) *kotoba, seigo toka.*
‘(), language, *seigo* (=name of a small *suzuki*) etcetera.’

48 Mom: *aa [soo]*
‘Oh, really.’

In responding to Maki's query about whether the fish they are eating is *huri*, Dad produces an 'assessment' (e.g. Goodwin and Goodwin 1992) that indexes an epistemic stance of certainty that the fish they are currently eating is lower in quality than Maki's proposed *huri* (line 01: 'It's not up to [the quality] of *huri*'). As an alternative to providing (or taking a guess at) a precise name of the fish they are eating, Dad introduces the term *shusseuo*² 'promotion fish' into their conversation (line 04: 'It's called a promotion fish *yo*'), and then asks Maki whether she knows this term (line 05). In its sequential position, Dad's question functions as the first turn of a 'pre-sequence' (Schegloff 1988), or a preface to a main social action, namely, an explication of the meaning of the term *shusseuo*. That is, he uses this question to check Maki's epistemic status (+K or -K), as the definition of this term might not be needed if she already knows it. Following a brief pause in which Maki does not provide a verbal response (line 06), Dad displays his understanding that Maki is unfamiliar with this term by explicating it for her (lines 07 and 11: 'The name [of the fish] changes about five times *yo*...in Japan, at least.'). As do speakers of other languages, Japanese speakers have a range of linguistic resources for packaging information in ways that index their affective and epistemic stances towards their talk and recipients. For Japanese speakers, pragmatic particles are an especially important resource. In this excerpt, Dad tags both his offering of the word *shusseuo* and his definition of it with the interactional particle *yo*—similar to the English expressions, "I tell you" or "I'm sure" (Minami 2002: 133)—in conveying his knowing epistemic status (and Maki's unknowing epistemic status). Similar to Hayano's (2011: 60) findings that the particle *yo* "is typically used when the speaker knows the referent better, has first-hand experience with it or has prior knowledge of it", Dad uses *yo* to index a relationship between his knowing and Maki's unknowing epistemic status regarding the meaning of the Japanese word *shusseuo*. Dad's use of *yo*, furthermore, displays affective stances of emphasis and assertion (Minami 2002: 133) within this definitional activity. In this way, Dad offers the word *shusseuo* and provides Maki with a definition of it in socializing her to specific linguistic knowledge.

As is typical in this family's dinnertime conversations that we have observed,

² According to an etymological dictionary (Yamaguchi 2008), *shusseuo* 'promoted fish, refers to the name of a fish changing, or being "promoted" (usually three to five times), over its development from the time it is a 'fingerling' (*chigyō*) to the time it is a 'fully developed adult' (*seigyō*).

both parents participate in the definitional activity by displaying their linguistic expertise. Specifically, Mom aligns with Dad's display of linguistic knowledge by repeating and elaborating upon Dad's utterances (lines 15, 17 and 20). Mom's utterances, however, are not tagged with the particle *yo*, which refrain from conveying her epistemic status in an emphatic and assertive way. As a kind of 'spouse talk' (Sacks 1992), in which one spouse monitors the other spouse's talk about co-experienced events to a third party and may align or elaborate upon it, hence in defining a Japanese word for Maki, Mom co-constructs the definitional activity with Dad and displays their shared linguistic knowledge but with a lesser degree of authority and assertiveness. Dad's epistemic authority is also evoked through his responses to Mom's contributions to the definitional activity (for instance, in lines 20 and 21 when Mom repeats Dad's introduction of the term by saying, 'It's called a promoted fish,' Dad responds with an evaluation, 'That's right *yo*'). Also, when Mom makes an assessment of the quality of the fish they are eating in which she compares it to the *hamachi* in Japan (line 31: 'It [=this fish we're eating] is lighter in taste than the *hamachi* in Japan')³, Dad aligns with Mom's assessment (line 35: So, right, it [=the fish we're eating] is about the same as *hamachi*'). Following this assessment sequence, Mom further positions Dad as having expertise in the names of Japanese fish by posing a question to him about the name of a 'child' of another Japanese fish called *suzuki* (line 45), which is not among the fish on the dining table. This question exposes Mom's lack of knowledge while giving Dad the opportunity to further assert his knowledge and expertise in relation to fish names (line 47). This interaction between Mom and Dad reveals ways in which a "knowing" epistemic status among experts regarding their first language lies on a gradient in which Dad positions himself and is positioned by Mom as being the higher authority in socializing Maki within this domain of talk.

4.1.1 Fostering one's own language socialization in the heritage language

The excerpt (1-a) presented above, and continued below as excerpt (1-b), also reveals ways that the more novice member in Japanese (Maki) is often an active participant who fosters her own language socialization in her heritage language. In particular, in the

³ Similar to other research on family dinnertime interaction (Ochs, Pontecorvo and Fasulo 1996), such assessments about the food may be an important communicative practice for "socializing taste" in family interaction.

above conversation, she aligned with the parents' roles as experts in Japanese, such as by asking 'why' the names of fish change in Japan (lines 09 and 13 above). This question conveyed that for Maki the explanation was not sufficient, and thus represented an attempt to challenge her access to knowledge in Japanese. Moreover, when Maki's inquiries as to why the names of fish change in Japan are not initially responded to by her parents, Maki finds an interactional space later on in this conversation in which to ask her question again (line 49 below). This persistence leads to Dad providing Maki with an analogy in relation to the word *shusseuo* that he grounds in his knowledge of Japanese history, as shown in excerpt (1-b).

(1-b) Promoted fish: Part II

- 49 Maki: [nan]de namae ga kawaru no?
 'Why does the name change?'
- 50 (0.9)
- 51 Dad: u::::::::::::::::::n.
 'Hm.'
- 52 wakannee.
 'I don't know.'
- 53 (2.2)
- 54 Maki: a ja aji anma kawannai jan.
 'Ah well, even though the taste (between the two fish) doesn't change much.'
- 55 (1.5)
- 56 Dad: ni- datte na- nande
 'Why- ah why'
- 57 Mom: ((coughs))
- 58 (2.0)
- 59 Dad: iya dakara (2.2) >are ja nai ka na<
 'No, so, I'm wondering if it's that'
- 60 ano:: are da yo.
 'Um, it's like that yo.'
- 61 → yoomei toka aa iu no to issho da yo.
 'It's the same as a (human) birth name yo.'

- 62 (0.6)
- 63 → Dad: >datte seiyō nanka mo< saisho kara (0.2) shinu made issho daro? namae.
 ‘In the West, names stay the same until death, right?’
- 64 (0.5)
- 65 → Dad: ni(0.4) nihon wa dondon kaeru jan. (0.5) namae.
 ‘In Japan, names constantly change.’
- 66 (0.6)
- 67 → Dad: ieyasu datte (0.2) chicchai toki wa takechiyo tsu tte ittete (0.5) na.
 ‘Ieyasu (=a famous shogun) was called Takechiyo when he was a child.’
- 68 (0.5)
- 69 → Dad: motoyasu toka nantoka toka sa hideyasu toka saa dondon kawatette °shimau°.
 ‘And then his name gradually changed to Hideyasu and Motoyasu, and so on.’
- 70 Maki: un sorya wakaru.
 ‘Yeah, I know that much.’
- 71 (0.5)
- 72 → Dad: nda sono (0.6) shusse suru ni (0.4) shitagatte saa [(0.3)] (0.3) kawatte ku n da yo.
 ‘Um, (the name) changes in line with promotion (to a higher rank) *yo*.’
- 73 Maki [un.]
 ‘Yeah.’
- 73 (0.8)
- 74 Maki: un.
 ‘Yeah.’
- 75 (0.5)
- 76 Dad: erasoona namae tsuken no.
 ‘They’re given a distinguished-sounding name.’

Although he initially displays an “unknowing” epistemic status in response to Maki’s questions as to why the names of fish change in Japanese (lines 51-52), Dad conveys a shift in this status (from –K to +K) by making an analogy using the word *shusseuo*

‘promoted fish’ in relation to name changes in Japanese history. More specifically, after introducing another word, *yoomei* ‘(human) birth name’ (line 61), he compares the practice of naming in the West, where ‘names stay the same until death’ (line 63), to Japan, where ‘names constantly change’ (line 65). In this way, Dad displays his linguistic and cultural knowledge of different naming practices in Japanese and the West. He then provides an example of a famous Japanese shogun (named Ieyasu⁴) by conveying that this shogun had a different name (Takechiyo) when he was a child (line 67), and then brings up two earlier names of the same shogun (line 69).⁵ He further elucidates the analogy by relating the practice of name changes of shogun to ‘promotion (to a higher rank),’ which implies that earlier names were associated with a lower status, and latter names were associated with a higher status, or, as Dad says, ‘a distinguished-sounding name’ (*erasoona namae*) (line 76). Similar to excerpt (1-a), in this portion of their conversation Dad’s utterances are also tagged with the particle *yo*, which indexes an epistemic stance of certainty regarding this aspect of Japanese history (lines 60, 61, 72). Maki positions herself within the realm of having Japanese language and cultural expertise, however, by saying that she ‘knows that much’ (line 70) in response to Dad’s explanation that the shogun Ieyasu’s name changed several times over the course of his life. Thus, in responding to Maki’s queries with a historical analogy to convey that *buri* and *hamachi* are actually the same fish (with different names that correspond to different stages of development), Dad socializes Maki to the specific linguistic and cultural knowledge that older and bigger fish, such as *buri*, are more prestigious than younger and smaller fish such as *hamachi*. This socialization occurs within an interaction in which Maki is an active participant who, among other social actions, requests an explanation (line 49: ‘Why does the name change?’) and displays her non-understanding of the relationship between changes in the name of fish and their quality or ‘taste’ (line 54: ‘even though the taste between the two fish doesn’t change much’).

⁴ Prior to and during the Edo period (1603-1867), it was common for the names of ‘warriors’ (*bushi*) to change at various stages of their lives, such as the ‘coming-of-age ceremony’ (*genpuku*) or upon getting married. For instance, Ieyasu (or Tokugawa Ieyasu, 1543-1616), the founder and first shogun of the Tokugawa shogunate, was originally named Takechiyo (or Matsudaira Takechiyo) when he was a child, and then changed his name to Motoyasu (or Matsudaira Kurandonosuke Motoyasu) when he got married.

⁵ Although Motoyasu correctly refers to an earlier name of the shogun Ieyasu, Dad’s use of the name Hideyasu in this sequence seems to be in error, as Hideyasu was a son of Ieyasu, rather than an earlier name of Ieyasu.

In excerpts (1-a) and (1-b), we have examined ways in which defining words and engaging in definitional activity is an important communicative practice in this family for constituting the relative roles of expert in relation to Japanese as the adult daughter's heritage language and the parents' first language in ways that contribute to the process of language socialization for the daughter. Definitional activity also occurs in relation to English, such as when a definition has been solicited by the parents to the daughter that positions her as having more expertise (and the parents as having less expertise) in English, as we will discuss next in relation to conversational repair.

4.2. Repair in constructing and shifting roles of expert and novice

Another recurring practice in our data for constituting expert and novice roles in relation to linguistic and cultural expertise is 'repair' (cf. Bolden 2012; 2013), which refers to "practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding talk conversation" (Schegloff 2000: 207). In their typology of repair, Schegloff et al. (1977) discuss four types: (i) self-initiated, self-repair (i.e., current speaker both initiates and repairs trouble); (ii) self-initiated, other-repair (i.e., current speaker initiates repair and another speaker repairs the trouble); (iii) other-initiated, self-repair (i.e., another speaker initiates repair and the current speaker repairs the trouble); (iv) other-initiated, other-repair (i.e., another speaker both indicates repair and repairs the trouble). While all four types are observed in the data analyzed here, the next two excerpts show types (ii), (iii), and (iv) in relation to positioning the self and others as having or lacking expertise in Japanese or English (for an example of the first type [self-initiated and self-repair], see excerpt 4, lines 10 and 16 below).

4.2.1. Repair of lexicon: Shifting of expert-novices roles within a topic and between languages

A primary target of repair in this family's conversations is lexicon, which relates to both Japanese and English, as illustrated in excerpt (2). In the first half of this excerpt (lines 08-25), Maki's parents are positioned as having a greater degree of expertise in Japanese, whereas in the second half (lines 21, and lines 26-36), Maki is positioned as having more expertise in English. Prior to the dialog shown, the family had been talking about the origin of the word 'menthol' (pronounced as *mensooru*, an English loanword), and Mom and Maki had brought up that they heard/saw an elderly Japanese-speaking

woman use a similar sounding word, *mensoore* (a similar-sounding word to *mensooru*, but is actually a greeting in the Okinawan language meaning ‘Welcome’). This talk prompted Dad to ask a question about where they heard/saw this woman (line 01).

(2) Hunchback

- 01 Dad: *doko no obaachan ga?*
‘An elderly woman where?’
- 02 (0.7)
- 03 Maki: [*terebi*]
‘(On) television.’
- 04 Mom: [*koohii*] *ya no.*
‘A coffee shop (commercial).’
- 05 Maki: *koohii* [*ya no: ↓ chotto*] *senaka ga (.) oreta;*
‘A coffee shop one, her back was a little broken.’
- 06 Mom: [() *obaachan* ()]
‘() an elderly woman ()’
- 07 (0.7)
- 08 → Mom: *@oreta ja nai* [@ [*h h h h h*]
‘It’s not broken.’
- 09 → Maki: [*@oreta [ja nai na, orimagat* [[*teru*] @ *h h*]
‘It’s not broken, it’s bent.’
- 10 Dad: [[*h h h h h*]
- 11 → [*oretara shinjimai.*]
‘If (her back) breaks, she would die.’ ((*sarcastic/humorous tone*))
- 12 Maki: [*h h h*]
- 13 → *.h h .h o* [*rima*] *gatteru.*
‘It’s bent.’
- 14 Dad: [()]
- 15 *fufufu*
- 16 (0.2)
- 17 → Mom: *semushi.*
‘hunchback.’

- 18 (0.2)
- 19 → Mom: *un (.) se- sebone ga magatta hito [(.)] obaachan.*
 ‘Yeah, a person who has a bent backbone, an elderly woman.’
- 20 Maki: [un]
- 21 → [nee] *hanchibakku tte yuu n da kedo, °nan da kke°.*
 ‘Hey, (in English) it’s called hunchback, but what was it called (in Japanese)?’
- 22 Mom: [()]
- 23 Dad: [[ee?]]
 ‘Huh?’
- 24 → Mom: [[a::::]] *so so so, semushi ne.*
 ‘Ah, right, right, right, it’s hunchback *ne*.’
- 25 Maki: *semu[shi?]*
 ‘hunchback?’
- 26 → Dad [nani] *bakku?*
 ‘A what back?’
- 27 → Maki: *hanchibakku.=*
 ‘Hunchback.’
- 28 Dad: *hanchibakku tte iu no?*
 ‘It’s called a hunchback?’
- 29 Maki: [un]
- 30 → Dad: [hanchi] *tte nani?*
 ‘What’s a hunch?’
- 31 → °*doo iu koto°?*
 ‘What does it mean?’
- 32 → Maki: *kooyatte yaru koto.*
 ‘It’s a thing that goes like this’ ((*makes hand gesture*))
- 33 (1.4)
- 34 → Dad: *sore hanchibakku tte iu no?*
 ‘That’s called a hunchback?’
- 35 Mom: ((*coughs*)) [(*coughs*)]
- 36 Maki: [dakara,
 ‘So, (that’s why it’s called a hunch).’

- 37 Mom: un.
‘Yeah’
- 38 (1.4)
- 39 Mom: un.
‘Yeah’
- 40 (0.4)
- 41 → Dad: *semushi da yo.*
‘It’s hunchback *yo.*’
- 42 (0.9)
- 43 Maki: (*no ga kuruma no: [ano:::]*)
‘(A car’s, um)’
- 44 Mom: [ii no ka na] *semushi tte, ima.*
‘I wonder if it’s okay to say hunchback nowadays.’
- 45 (0.6)
- 46 Maki: *semushi.*
‘hunchback.’
- 47 Mom: *tte yuu no ka na:*
‘I wonder if it’s okay to say it.’
- 48 Maki: a: [::]
‘Ah.’
- 49 Dad: [>ii n ja nai<]
‘It’s fine, right.’
- 50 Mom: *chinba toka [to issho de °iccha ikenai.°]*
‘It’s the same as crippled, which musn’t be said.’
- 51 Dad: [datte semushi no nanto]ka tte.
But, one says something, something hunchback.’
- 52 ((talk on this topic continues in which Dad aligns with the understanding that hunchback might be a discriminatory word in Japanese that is not to be used in front of others))

In the first half of this excerpt, Maki’s use of a specific Japanese expression becomes the object of other-initiated repair. In particular, when Maki responds to Dad’s question by describing the woman that she and Mom had seen on television as someone whose ‘back was a little broken’ (line 05), Mom laughs while performing an ‘unmodulated

other-correction' (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977: 379), by negating Maki's word choice (line 08: 'It's not broken'). Although this correction is performed with laughter (which continues on beyond the utterance) that mitigates its pragmatic force, it positions Maki as a somewhat deficient speaker and the parents as monitors and gatekeepers of "correct" use of the heritage language. In responding to this correction, which overlaps with Mom's laughter and Dad's sarcastic comment (line 11: 'If [her back] breaks, she would die'), Maki attempts to escape from this lower epistemic positioning by initiating self-repair (lines 09 and 13). Maki's self-repair displays an epistemic stance of certainty that this is the correct expression, and presents herself as someone who simply had made a 'slip of the tongue' (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008: 61). But, this self-repair is not ratified by Mom or Dad, suggesting that it too is "incorrect." Specifically, Mom offers an alternative word, the noun *semushi* 'hunchback'⁶ (line 17), as the appropriate lexical choice, and then explicates its meaning for Maki (line 19: 'a person who has a bent backbone'). Mom's definition is sequentially and functionally different from Dad's word definition as examined in excerpt (1-a) in that it functions as an error correction, or other-initiated/other-repair (lines 08, 17 and 19). Such word definitions, moreover, are a form of explicit socialization to use language (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986).

Seemingly not having attended to Mom's proffering of the word *semushi*, Maki performs self-repair in a different way, by drawing upon her English expertise in conveying that the semantic equivalent in English of her previous "incorrect" Japanese word choice is *hunchibakku* 'hunchback' (line 21 '[in English] it's called hunchback'). Immediately following this display of English expertise, Maki makes a request for the Japanese word to her parents (line 21: 'but what was it [in Japanese]?'). In these utterances, Maki produces an English nominal descriptor (referring to 'a person with a bent back') and makes a request for its Japanese equivalent in attempting to foster her language acquisition. As frequently observed in her conversations with her parents, Maki pronounces an English word according to the Japanese phonology, making it "sound" Japanese. Mom displays her understanding of this word (*hanchibakku*) by saying the Japanese word *semushi* for the second time (line 24: 'Right, right, right, it's *semushi ne*'), which is prefaced with several tokens of *soo* (shortened to *so*), meaning as

⁶ While the word *semushi* is not widely used in everyday conversation and is thus not necessarily a well-known word, according to several undergraduate students (in the second author's class) this word has become more well-known through the animated Disney movie, *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*, which is available in Japanese.

‘right/correct,’ ‘yeah/yes,’ or ‘that’s so,’ depending on the context (Kushida 2011: 2721). In the above conversation, Mom uses *soo* to confirm and acknowledge Maki’s use of the English word *hunchibakku* as an alternative formulation of the Japanese word *semushi*. Mom’s use of the word *semushi* is tagged with the interactional particle *ne*, which is similar to the English tag-like question markers, ‘you know’ or ‘right.’ In contrast to the particle *yo* (discussed in this section and in Section 4.1), the use of *ne* displays different epistemic and affective stances. In our excerpt, Mom uses *ne* as an ‘alignment marker’ (Morita 2005: 149) to index her and Maki’s collaborative orientation to the definitional activity and shared knowledge of the English word *hanchibakku*, which Maki can now be expected to have registered as being the same as the Japanese word *semushi*. In response, Maki displays her understanding of the word *semushi* by repeating it as a confirmation check (line 25). Mom does not respond to Maki, however, due to Dad’s breaking in on their exchange in which he initiates repair in relation to Maki’s earlier use of the word *hunchibakku* (line 26: ‘A what back?’), which we will discuss next.

When Maki breaks off the exchange with Mom to respond to Dad’s initiation of repair by repeating the word *hanchibakku* (line 27), Dad asks two questions to Maki that seek a definition of the first part of this word (lines 30: ‘What’s a hunch?’ and line 31: ‘What does it mean?’). By asking Maki for a definition—as a form of other-initiated repair—Dad exposes his lack of knowledge in English that momentarily shifts the expert-novice roles between the two languages. Maki responds by using a deictic expression to define the word for Dad (line 32: ‘It’s a thing that goes like this’). This definition is different from previous examples of her parents’ word definitions (such as excerpt 1-a) in that it is not a dictionary-like one, as the verbalization alone does not explicate the meaning of the word. Rather, as queried in a follow-up e-mail exchange, Maki reported that she used a hand gesture to explicate the meaning of the word *hanchibakku* for her father. In responding to Maki’s definition, however, Dad uses his acquired knowledge of English in order to reestablish his expertise in relation to Japanese, by confirming the previous word offered by Mom (*semushi*), which he again completes with the epistemic stance marker *yo* (line 41). The sequential effect of this series of utterances is that Dad momentarily casts himself as a relative novice in English, but then checks the definition of the English word in order to judge the appropriateness of the Japanese word, therefore indexing his epistemic authority in Japanese. Similarly,

in relation to family interaction in the U.S., Ochs and Taylor (1995) refer to the ideological (gendered) dynamic of the father's position in dinnertime interaction as an ultimate judge as 'father knows best'; a dynamic that can be applied here in relation to Dad's position in the family as an epistemic authority of some domains of talk in Japanese (as also observed in excerpts 1-a and 1-b).

In this excerpt, we have shown how repair was a communicative practice and activity for constituting and shifting the roles of relative expert and novice in this family's dinnertime conversations. More specifically, these native Japanese-speaking parents used other-initiated and other-repair aimed at their young adult daughter's use of Japanese (as her heritage language) in displaying expertise and epistemic authority in their first language. It also showed ways in which participants used self-initiated repair to position themselves as having competence in their language of comparatively less expertise (Japanese or English), such as when Maki attempted to correct her Japanese lexical error by offering another formulation in Japanese (line 13), and when Dad initiated other-repair in relation to Maki's use of an English word ('hunchback') by asking for a definition of part of the word (line 30).

There is one more aspect of this excerpt in relation to linguistic and cultural expertise and language socialization that deserves to be discussed but resides outside the domain of repair. Specifically, at the end of this excerpt, after Dad repeated the word *semushi* 'hunchback' to Maki (line 41), Mom built on this talk by displaying an uncertain stance on the use of this word in current Japanese society (line 44). Notably, Mom hinted that the word might not be pragmatically appropriate by relating it to another word, *chinba* 'crippled,' which she said, 'mustn't be said.' This led to Dad aligning with the stance that *semushi* too may be derogatory and thus better not uttered in front of others (line 52). While the issue of 'metapragmatic talk' (Silverstein 1993), or talk about language use, will be taken up again later (see Section 4.2.3), suffice it to say here that as these immigrant parents were distant from their core group of Japanese speakers residing in Japan, on occasion they displayed epistemic stances of uncertainty as to whether certain words and expressions were still used among members of that group. In this way, linguistic and cultural expertise among these native-speaking Japanese parents was relative, flexible, and negotiated in ways that socialized the relative novice participant. A sequential effect of the negotiation in the above conversation was that Mom and Dad implicitly conveyed to Maki to refrain from using

the Japanese words *semushi* ‘hunchback’ and *chinba* ‘crippled’, as a form of explicit socialization on what not to say in polite conversation (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986).

4.2.2 Repair of “written” *kanji* ‘Sino-Japanese characters’

A second target of repair on Japanese in this family is related to “writing” or, in this case, talking about how to write *kanji*, or ‘Sino-Japanese characters.’ Japanese has three writing systems: i) *hiragana* (a phonetic script, primarily used for writing native Japanese words and grammatical elements), ii) *katakana* (another phonetic script, primarily used for writing foreign loan words other than Chinese), and iii) *kanji*, which are adapted from Chinese characters (a logographic system in which each character represents meaning). In particular, *kanji* are composed of one or more components, or ‘radicals’ (*bushu*), and each character has multiple readings. A number of characters can have the same reading (for example, 複 and 復 are both read as *fuku*), and two characters (or *kanji* compound) can be combined to form a word (e.g. 複写 *fukusha* ‘duplicate’).

Although Maki is highly proficient in reading and writing *kanji* having attended tutoring school several years ago (as mentioned in Section 3), on occasion she makes errors in talking about how to write them. These errors become a target of parental other-initiated repair, as illustrated in excerpt (3). Similar to other instances we have observed, Mom typically takes on a larger role than Dad in correcting Maki’s “written” Japanese. Just prior to this excerpt, Mom had brought up a topic of the ‘problem’ (*mondai*) of the ‘excessive use of *katakana*’ (*yatakana katakana*) in Japanese society, which was recently presented on Japanese television (the family subscribes to Japanese cable). The underlying problem is that while foreign loanwords are incorporated into Japanese at a breakneck pace, in some cases they are replacing native Japanese words and thus changing the language and society in the process. Although Mom did not take a position either way towards this presented problem, Dad aligned in a humorous and positive way to it by providing an example of personal experience. Specifically, he related that when he first entered a company in Japan (about 30 years ago) his boss told him to ‘duplicate this’ (*kore fukusha shite*), which he positively assessed as representing a ‘wonderful tradition’ (*subarashii dentoo*). Without explicitly saying so, the parents share the knowledge that the boss’s use of the word *fukusha* ‘duplicate’ (written with

two Sino-Japanese characters: 複写) is outdated and has been replaced by the English loanword *kopii* ‘copy’ in referring to making photocopies. Excerpt (3) immediately follows this talk. Maki responds to her Dad by claiming that she knows the word *fukusha* (line 01).

(3) Copy machine

- 01 Maki: >demo wakaru wakaru<
‘But, I know, I know.’
- 02 datte fuku fuku ni sha desho?
‘Because (the Sino-Japanese characters for it) are *fuku* and *sha*, right?’
- 03 >wakaru wakaru fu[kugen] [fuku ni s-]
‘I know, I know, the *fuku* of *fukugen* (= restoration)’
- 04 Dad [iya honto]
‘No, really’
- 05 Mom: [iya] [fukuccha]
fukushaki[>tte no wa<]
‘No, *fukushaki* (=copy machine) is a....’
- 06 Dad: [iya]
[kopii]kopiiki no ko[to ()]
fukusha[ki]
‘No, *fukushaki* is a copy machine.’
- 07 Maki: [wakatteru yo.]
‘I know.’
- 08 [fuku]gen no fu ni::: (.) fuku ni: [sha] de-
[shashin no sha janai no?]
‘Aren’t (the characters for *fukusha*) the *fuku* of *fukugen* (=restoration) and the *sha* of *shashin* (=photograph)?’
- 09 Dad: [fuku]
‘*fuku*’
- 10 Mom: [() fuku tte]
‘*fuku* is ().’
- 11 (.)

- 12 → Mom: *fukugen* [*no fuku janai.*]
 ‘It’s not the *fuku* of *fukugen*.’
- 13 Maki: [*chigau no:?*]
 ‘It’s not?’
- 14 → Mom: *fukusei no fuku, hidari ga shimesuhen.*
 ‘It’s the *fuku* of *fukusei* (=reproduction), the left side (of the Sino-Japanese character) is the *shimesu* radical.’
- 15 (0.8)
- 16 Dad: [*un*]
 ‘Yeah.’
- 17 Maki: [*asso*]o nan [*da.*]
 ‘Is that so.’

In response to her father, Maki claims that she ‘knows’ (*wakaru*) the word *fukusha* ‘duplicate,’ which displays a knowing epistemic status in an attempt to position herself as an epistemic equal to her parents. Maki then provides evidence for this knowledge by relating how the word is written in Sino-Japanese characters. Specifically, she deconstructs this word into its two Sino-Japanese characters (*fuku* + *sha*) (line 02), by stating that *fuku* is the same as the *fuku* in another word, *fukugen* ‘restoration’ (line 03), which becomes the object of other-initiated and other-repair. Her parents initiate repair in a way that conveys to Maki that the *fuku* of *fukusha* and the *fuku* of *fukugen* are not written with the same characters. In comparison to excerpt (2) earlier, in this conversation Maki’s parents do not respond with laughter or humorous comments regarding this error in “writing.” Mom’s unmitigated other-correction indicates that Maki’s understanding is only half correct (line 12: ‘It’s not the *fuku* of *fukugen*’). As mentioned previously, several Sino-Japanese characters can have the same reading. The *fuku* of *fukusha* is written as 複, whereas the *fuku* of *fukugen* is written as 復. The difference between these two is in the left radical (𠄎 and 彳). In orienting Maki’s attention to this difference, Mom conveys that the *fuku* (of *fukusha*) is the same as the *fuku* of another word, *fukusei* ‘reproduction,’ and seeks to clarify this difference by saying that the *fuku* in *fukusha* ‘duplicate’ is written with the *shimesu* radical (on the left

side).⁷ In this way, Mom evokes a shared understanding of Sino-Japanese characters that has been acquired (largely) through formal education, namely, that these characters are composed of various radicals, or component parts, which have particular names associated with them (such as the *shimesu* radical). Similar to the way Mom joined in Dad's definitional activity observed earlier (see excerpt 1), Dad joins in Mom's other-initiation of repair by displaying agreement (line 16), to which Maki responds by indicating a change in her epistemic status (line 17: 'Is that so'). However, in contrast to excerpt (1) in which Mom had positioned Dad as an epistemic authority of fish names, in excerpt (3) Dad does not do any special interactional work to position Mom as an epistemic authority of "written" Japanese, as he remains minimally engaged.

In these ways, excerpts (2) and (3) illustrate how these parents repaired their adult daughter's utterances in socializing her to linguistic knowledge in the heritage language (Japanese). This socialization was made relevant in relation to the daughter's displays of competence in attempting to correct her own lexical error (excerpt 2) and talking about how to write a particular Sino-Japanese character (excerpt 3). Thus, in excerpt (3), in attempting to display her knowledge of writing, even when writing was not the specific focus of attention of the family's conversation, the less competent member (Maki) fostered her own socialization in literacy (e.g. Sterponi 2011). But, at the same time, she also exposed her lack of knowledge and was treated as a non-expert by her parents.

4.3 Metalinguistic and metapragmatic talk about English and identity

A final cluster of practices we will analyze is metalinguistic talk, including talk about language form or meaning (as in excerpt 1 above) and metapragmatic talk, including talk that displays stances about the ways language is used in society. In examining this family's dinnertime conversations, we have already pointed out how metalinguistic and/or metapragmatic talk relates to both Japanese (as in excerpt 3 above, lines 44-51) and English (as in excerpt 2 above, lines 26-34). In developing this analysis further, here we discuss how such talk about English is often related within and in response to storytelling of personally experienced events (e.g. Mandelbaum 2012). Thus, in comparison to other kinds of practices, such as word definitions and repair, we will

⁷ This is actually a slight error by Mom, but it is not attended to or corrected by anyone. The error is that the *fuku* of *fukusha* is actually written with the *koromo* radical (衤), rather than the *shimesu* radical (衤), which are similar except for one additional stroke in the former.

suggest that metalinguistic and metapragmatic talk is an especially valuable site in this family's conversations for constituting identities (e.g. Bamberg 2011) in relation to the society's dominant language.

Prior to the portion of the excerpt show below, Mom had launched a personal story about a recent visit to a nearby hospital where an unfamiliar man in the waiting room had struck up a conversation with her. At the beginning of excerpt (4), Mom is 'replaying' (Goffman 1974) part of this interaction by using English in reporting (e.g. Holt and Clift 2007) the man's speech.

(4) 'Aussie' slang

- 01 Mom: Wh- (0.3) Which ye:- year (.) you were born tte i[ttā n]
 da to omou n da kedo,
 'I think he said, Which ye:- year (.) you were born? but,'
- 02 Maki: [n]
 'Mm.'
- 03 Mom: *yoku kikoenakute sa:*
 'I couldn't really hear him well and,
- 04 *nikai gurai kiitara sa: (0.3)*
 'when I asked him about twice (to repeat himself),'
- 05 *When (0.2) When were you born tte iu kara sa (0.5)*
 'he said, When (0.2) when were you born? so,'
- 06 *nanda koitsu [tte omotte sa:]*
 'I thought, what's wrong this guy?'
- 07 Maki: [h h]
- 08 Mom: .hhhh °*nande iwankya ikenai- iwanakya ikenai no.°*
 'Why do I have to tell him (when I was born)?'
- 09 (1.8)
- 10 → Maki: *m- maa [(0.6)] guramatikarii inkorekuto desu kara ne °sore*
 ne° hhh=
 'Well, that's grammatically incorrect.'
- 11 Mom: [((cough))]
- 12 =*nani*

- ‘What is?’
- 13 → Maki: e: Which year you born.
‘Um, Which year you born.’
- 14 (0.7)
- 15 Dad: n a:
‘Mm, ah.’
- 16 → Maki: <oojii ga yu:u> [yoku tsu]kau: .h etto bunpoutekini
machigatteru iikata.
‘It’s a way of speaking ungrammatically, which Aussies often use and say.’
- 17 Mom: [aa soo]
‘Oh, really.’
- 18 ((cough)) (0.9) a: (0.8) juubun- >yoku kikitorenakatta.<
‘Ah. I couldn’t understand (what he said) very well.’
- 19 Maki: dakara oojii ja nai to wakannai yo fu[tsuu wa]
‘So, you can’t understand unless you’re an Aussie **yo**, usually.’
- 20 Mom: [a↑:__]
‘Ah’
- 21 (1.0)
- 22 → Maki: oojii wa kiite a a a tte omou ke[do: ,
‘If an Aussie were to hear it, they’d think, Oh I got it, but,’
- 23 Mom: [nikai gurai
kiichatta.
‘I ending up asking him about twice (to repeat it).’
- 24 → Maki: =datte[(.)] n tabun (0.2) igirisujin to amerikajin ga
kiitara, saisho saisho kikinaosu yo=
‘So, probably if a British and American person were to hear it, they’d ask him to
repeat it **yo**.’
- 25 Mom: =wakannai.=
‘They wouldn’t understand.’
- 26 → Maki: =wakannai [yo.=
‘They wouldn’t understand **yo**.’
- 27 Mom: [n

‘Mm.’

- 28 → Maki: *da- datte bunpoutekini machigatten ja.n*
‘Because it’s grammatically incorrect.’
- 29 (1.1)
- 30 → Maki: *Which ye::ar y- you born.*
‘Which year you born.’
- 31 (2.0)
- 32 → Maki: *We::re ga nai jan.*
‘There’s no were (in his sentence).’
- 33 (0.3)
- 34 Mom: *Why (3.0) Were tte itta no kamoshirenai [kedo:*
He might have said, why- (I mean) were, but’
- 35 Maki: [de:
‘And’
- 36 → *Whi[ch we- year] were you born to wa iwanai.*
‘you don’t say, Which year were you born.’
- 37 Mom: [()]
- 38 → Maki: *.h In which year were you born daka[ra:*
‘Because it’s, in which year were you born.’
- 39 Mom: [so: [da ne:]
‘That’s right.’
- 40 Maki: [()]
- 41 → *so: dakara: bunpou[tekini] machigatteru oojii ni shika*
tsujinai: surangu no yoona kotoba dakara:
‘Right, so it’s like a slang language that only Aussies who use grammatically incorrect English understand.’
- 42 Mom: [((cough))]
- 43 Maki: *.h [ano: igi]risujin to amerikajin ga kiite mo wakannai to*
omou yo.
‘Um, even when British or Americans listening I don’t think they would understand *yo.*’
- 44 Mom: [((cough))]

45 *watashi wa paadon tte kiita no wa tadashikatta n da yo ne.*

‘Then it was correct that I said, Pardon, right?’

46 Maki: *un soo da yo.*

‘Yeah, that’s right *yo*.’

In replaying the man’s speech by directly quoting him (lines 01 and 05), Mom conveys that since she could not hear the man very well she asked him to repeat himself (lines 03 and 04). In these utterances, Mom’s use of English dialog marked with the Japanese reported or represented speech marker *tte yu/yutta* (‘She/he said’) is a kind of ‘intrasentential code-switching’ (Myers-Scotton 1993), in which two codes are juxtaposed within the same speaker’s utterance. Similar to bilingual talk in which code switching is used for various purposes such as to mark quoted speech (Gafaranga 2007; also see Auer, 1995 on code-alternation), Mom’s code switch provides a representation of the original English dialogue that allows Maki to position herself as an expert in English in a way that helps Mom understand the quoted speaker’s (Australian man’s) use of English. In particular, when Mom hints through her own reported or represented thoughts that she found the man’s questions to be rude/impolite due to their personal content (line 06: ‘I thought, what’s wrong this guy?’), Maki responds in a way that takes Mom’s concern regarding the man’s personal questions (as rude/impolite) in a different direction. Specifically, Maki highlights the form of the man’s speech by making a negative assessment that his speech was ‘grammatically incorrect’ (line 10). In this utterance, Maki produces the English term ‘grammatically incorrect’ using Japanese pronunciation that makes it “sound” Japanese (as we have also seen earlier in excerpt 2, line 21 with Maki’s pronunciation of the word *hanachibakku* ‘hunchback’). However, in the present excerpt, Maki self corrects this English term to the Japanese equivalent term *bunpoutekini machigatteru* ‘grammatically incorrect’, in line 16) that displays her knowing epistemic status of English and Japanese within this domain of talk. She then repeats Mom’s reported English dialog (line 13: ‘Which year you born’), but, in making her point, leaves out the word ‘were’. In other words, Maki transforms Mom’s reported speech in pointing out an aspect of the man’s speech that is independent of Mom’s displayed concern (i.e. that his questions were rude/impolite). She then goes beyond this metalinguistic analysis to link the form of the man’s speech to his identity as part of a larger project of identity construction involving Maki and

Mom in relation to speakers of Australian English (line 16: ‘It’s a way of speaking ungrammatically, which Aussies often use and say’). Similar to the notion of ‘membership categorization’ (e.g. Sacks, 1974; Schegloff 2007), which refers to practices that identify and describe people in society as certain kinds of members of a social group (e.g. politician, mother, jock), in this utterance Maki ties the use of ungrammatical English to the category of persons that she refers to as ‘Aussie’ (line 16). This utterance has the effect of conveying her expertise on the ways some Australians speak English—even when her utterance could be heard as implying that most Australians speak this way—and at the same time functions to position herself as being outside the category of ‘Aussie’ as a “correct” speaker of English who is able to also recognize the particularities of Australian English.

Maki further makes her point by contrasting ‘Aussie’ recipients, who she claims would respond to an ‘Aussie’ speaker by displaying understanding (line 22: ‘If an Aussie were to hear it, they’d think, Oh, I got it’), with British and American recipients, who, she implies, would respond by displaying non-understanding (line 24: ‘So, probably if a British or American person were to hear that, they’d first ask him to repeat it *yo*’). Maki and Mom then display a congruent understanding that British and American recipients would not understand the man (lines 25 and 26). In her utterances (lines 19, 24 and 26), Maki uses the interactional particle *yo*, which emphatically displays a knowing epistemic stance in conveying her knowledge about English and some of its varieties. Thus, similar to her parents’ (especially her father’s) use of *yo* in the context of defining words for Maki (as discussed in excerpt 1), here Maki uses the particle *yo* as a linguistic resource to socialize Mom into linguistic knowledge concerning the society’s majority language (Australian English). This knowledge can be considered her personal knowledge as somewhat of an “outsider” in Australian society, rather than as knowledge widely shared among members of that society. Moreover, by comparing ‘Aussie’ recipients to British and American recipients of the Australian man’s speech, Maki also effectively aligns Mom with these other “correct” English speakers, who it can be ascertained speak “better” English than ‘Aussies.’ Thus, Maki’s way of disqualifying the man’s English helps her to construct Mom as being non-faulty in the reported event (i.e. Mom’s non-understanding of ‘Aussie’ English is, in fact, “normal”). Mom aligns with Maki’s positioning of her as a competent English-speaker by confirming with Maki that her (polite) response to the man was indeed appropriate

(line 45: ‘Then it was correct that I said, Pardon?’), which Maki ratifies in an emphatic way using the particle *yo* (line 46: ‘Yeah, that’s right *yo*.’). This exchange helps Mom reclaim a status as a competent English speaker, and may help Mom in her future conversations with Australian English speakers, at least in mollifying her frustrations towards them.

This excerpt has revealed how the young adult daughter used her mother’s represented English quotation to position herself in the family as an English speaker who is highly attuned to the peculiarities of English spoken in Australia (as well as in other countries). While Maki could have answered Mom’s concern with something like, “‘Aussies’ like to ask personal questions,” it is notable that for Maki the observation that the man’s speech was ungrammatical served to build a larger identity project involving herself and her mother in relation to Australian English and society. In our data, while metalinguistic and metapragmatic talk about the ways in which others in society speak was initiated by both the parents and the daughter, such categorization was typically initiated by the daughter in relation to Australian English as an index of her linguistic and cultural expertise in the society’s dominant language, and her tacit knowledge of other varieties of English (in this case, British and American English). Thus, more than just being a site for constituting the expert and novice roles in relation to language and society, such talk about how others’ use language was a site for positioning the self and family members in relation to speakers of the society’s dominant language, and suggests that young adults play an integral role in socializing immigrant parents to the society’s majority language (e.g. He 2012; Tuominen 1999).

5 Concluding remarks

This paper has explored processes of language socialization within dinnertime conversations in a Japanese immigrant family with a young adult daughter residing in an English dominant society (Australia). Our analysis has revealed ways in which the roles of relative “expert” and “novice” are situated and negotiated among participants. It has illustrated the dynamics of language socialization in a bilingual/immigrant setting in which issues of linguistic and cultural expertise, power, hierarchies, ideologies, and identity are arguably more complex and challenging than is typical in many monolingual/non-migrant settings. For instance, in the conversations we recorded, the participants’ varied forms and degrees of expertise depending on the language being

used or talk about served to challenge other hierarchical relations in the family (such as parent and child) (excerpts 2 and 4). Also, the parents' long-term residence away from their country of origin (Japan) presented a complex situation in relation to degrees of expert status, such as "knowing" whether or not certain words were still used in that current society (excerpt 2). Further, the parents' status as immigrants who used their second language (English) in the society led to interactions at the dinner table focusing on identity among family members, heritage solidarity, and integration into the majority society (excerpt 4). In these ways, we argue that the expert and novice roles are useful heuristic categories in analyzing family interaction from a language socialization perspective particularly involving older "children" (e.g. adolescents, young adults) conversing with parents in their heritage language.

Our analysis suggests that various features of identity, such as age/generation and gender, and power dynamics within a couple and family, contribute to constituting the roles of expert and novice in an immigrant family living in an English dominant society. For instance, while the daughter often attempted to display her expertise in Japanese (as her heritage language) in explicit ways, her parents in turn served to check her knowledge and monitor her use of Japanese, which associated their expertise with being a generation older and having prior experience living in the country of origin. Also, while both parents displayed a higher expertise in Japanese in relation to the daughter, the father was often constituted as the epistemic authority of Japanese language within the couple (except in cases of written Japanese, which was often the mother's domain). This revealed a hierarchy of expertise in some domains of talk based on traditional gender roles, in which the father was positioned as the ultimate judge of language (cf. Ochs and Taylor 1995). Yet, we also found that linguistic and cultural expertise among experts was partial and relative, as the parents sometimes displayed trouble in answering the daughter's questions or in determining whether certain language is still used in their country of origin, which reveals some limitations to the category of "expert" (Duff 2008). In these ways, communicative practices that function as explicit forms of language socialization, such as word definitions, repair, and metalinguistic and metapragmatic talk, also participate in the process of more implicit socialization into family relationships, power dynamics, and the rights to knowledge.

Our analysis also suggests ways in which relative "novices" are agent who foster their own socialization in the heritage language (Japanese) and second language

(English) in contributing to the process of language socialization. While the daughter often attempted to foster her acquisition of the heritage language, such as by asking questions and pressing for answers when an answer was not immediately forthcoming, the parents also attempted to foster their acquisition of English, such by asking the daughter the meaning of English words (excerpt 2) and replaying English dialogues with English speakers that were treated as puzzling (excerpt 4). This process of bidirectional socialization as revealed in our study relies not only on “novices” becoming “experts” between languages, but also assuming a degree of agency within a language in ways that encourage their own language socialization.

Finally, our analysis also sheds light on views of language and actual communicative practices within immigrant families (King, Fogle and Logan-Terry 2008). In particular, in our study, interviews with family members initially suggested to us that the parents encouraged an environment for speaking in the heritage language and not mixing English into Japanese at home as part of a language ideology of “purity”. While this view mediated the family’s conversations in various ways (e.g. pronouncing Japanese words in English [daughter] commenting on changes/overuse of loanwords in Japanese [mother and father]), English took on an important role in this family’s conversations at the dinner table. This was observed, for example, when the father asked the daughter for a definition of part of an English word (excerpt 2), and the mother replayed an English conversation with a native English speaker in displaying frustration with not being able to fully understand him (excerpt 4). The role of English in this family’s Japanese conversations served to relieve the daughter from the positioning of relative “novice” in her heritage language (Japanese), positioning her as an epistemic authority over her parents in the society’s dominant language (English). Moreover, the family’s conversations revealed that the heritage language (Japanese) was given a higher social status, whereas the society’s dominant language (Australian English) was given a more mixed status (as at times it received a negative evaluation) through talk about the language and its speakers (excerpt 4). This mixed view of the society’s dominant language (and some of its speakers) may have contributed to the daughter’s motivation to speak and learn Japanese in maintaining it as her heritage language in the home.

In conclusion, our findings contribute to understanding the roles of expert and novice as heuristic categories for examining language socialization processes in an

immigrant/bilingual setting. In this regard, more attention to epistemics in interaction in bi- and multilingual contexts could shed light on the dynamics of expert and novice roles in the process of bidirectional language socialization.

Acknowledgements

A part of this research was supported by an Osaka University Scholarship for Overseas Research Activities (2015) to the first author. We want to thank the Japanese family members who participated in this study, and Dr. Catriona Elder (The University of Sydney) for her help in conducting the fieldwork for this research. We would also like to thank the three anonymous reviewers for their incisive comments that helped improved the paper. We are responsible for any errors.

References

- Aronsson, Karen & Lucas Gottzén. 2010. Generational positions at a family dinner: Food morality and social order. *Language in Society* 40. 405-426.
- Auer, Peter. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In Lesley Milroy & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 115-135. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Bamberg, Michael. 2011. Narrative practice and identity navigation. In James A. Holstein & Jaber F. Gubrium (eds.), *Varieties of narrative analysis*, 99-124. London: Sage.
- Baquedano-López, Patricia & Shlomy Kattan. 2007. In Peter Auer & Li Wei (eds.), *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication*, 69-100. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bilmes, Jack, Gabrielle Kasper & Richard Fitzgerald. 2015. Definition in interaction. Organized panel at IPrA conference, Antwerp, Belgium, 26-31 July.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 2008. Language socialization and family dinnertime discourse. In Patricia A. Duff & Nancy H. Hornberger (eds.), *Language and education, 2nd edition vol. 8: Language socialization*, 87-100. New York: Springer.
- Bolden, Galina. 2012. Across languages and cultures: Brokering problems of understanding in conversational repair. *Language in Society* 40, 97-121.
- Bolden, Galina. 2013. Unpacking “self”: Repair and epistemics in conversation. *Social*

- Psychology Quarterly* 76(4), 314-342.
- Bolden, Galina. 2014. Negotiating understanding in “intercultural moments” in immigrant family interaction. *Communication Monographs* 81(2), 208-238.
- Davies, Bronwyn & Ram Harré. 1990. Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 20(1), 43-63.
- Duff, Patricia. 2008. Language socialization, participation and identity: Ethnographic approaches. In Marilyn Martin-Jones, Anne-Marie de Mejia & Nancy H. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, 2nd edition, volume 3: Discourse and education*, 107-119. New York: Springer.
- Ely, Richard, Jean B. Gleason, Ann MacGibbon & Elena Zaretsky. 2001. Attention to language: Lesson learned at the dinner table. *Social Development* 10(3). 355-373.
- Gafaranga, Joseph. 2007. *Talk in two languages*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gafaranga, Joseph. 2010. Medium request: Talking language shift into being. *Language in Society* 39, 241-270.
- García-Sánchez, Inmaculada M. 2014. *Language and Muslim immigrant childhoods: The politics of belonging* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goodwin, Charles & Marjorie Harness Goodwin. 1992. Assessment and the construction of context. In Alessandro Duranti & Charles Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, 147-190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayano, Kaoru. 2011. Claiming epistemic primacy: yo-marked assessments in Japanese. In Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada & Jakob Steensig (eds.), *The morality of knowledge in conversation*, 58-81. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- He, Agnes. 2011. Heritage language socialization. In Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs & Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *The handbook of language socialization*. 587-609. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- He, Agnes. 2012. The role of child heritage language speakers in family discourse. Paper presented at the Sixth Heritage Language Research Institute (June), UCLA. Abstract retrieved on line (May 27, 2016) at: <http://nhlrc.ucla.edu/nhlrc/events/Institute/2012/abstract/124616>
- Heritage, John. 2012. Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of

- knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(1). 1-29.
- Holt, Elizabeth & Clift, Rebecca (eds.). 2007. *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howard, Kathryn M. 2011. Language socialization and hierarchy. In Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs & Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *The handbook of language socialization*. 341-364. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hutchby, Ian & Robin Wooffitt. 2008. *Conversation analysis (2nd Ed.)*. Cambridge UK: Polity Press.
- Ishige, Naomichi. 1982. *Shokuji no Bunmeiron* [A theory of civilization of mealtime]. Tokyo: Chuokooronsha.
- Jacoby, Sally & Patrick Gozales. 1991. The constitution of expert-novice in scientific discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 2(2), 149-181.
- Kheirkhah, Mina & Asta Cekaite. 2015. Language maintenance in a multilingual family: Informal heritage-language lessons in parent-child interactions. *Multilingua* 34(3). 319-346.
- King, Kendall A., Lyn Fogle and Aubrey Logan-Terry. 2008. Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2(5), 907-922.
- Kushida, Shuya. 2011. Confirming understanding and acknowledging assistance: Managing trouble responsibility in response to understanding check in Japanese talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43. 2716-2739.
- Lave, Jean & Wenger, Etienne. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Jin S. & Mary Bucholtz, M. 2015. Language socialization across learning spaces. In N. Markee (ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction*, 319-336. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mandelbaum, Jenny. 2012. Storytelling in conversation. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 492-508. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Meyer Pitton, Liliane. 2013. Russian language maintenance through bedtime story reading? Linguistic strategies and language negotiation in Russian-French speaking families in Switzerland. In Nadine Thielemann & Peter Kosta (eds.), *Approaches to Slavic interaction*, 295-315. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Minami, Masahiko. 2002. *Culture-specific language styles: The development of oral*

- narrative and literacy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2013. Displaying, contesting and negotiating epistemic authority in social interaction: Descriptions and questions in guided visits. *Discourse Studies* 15(5), 597-626.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Morita, Emi. 2005. *Negotiation of contingent talk: The Japanese interactional particles ne and sa*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1993. Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26(3). 287-306.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1996. Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In John J. Gumperz and Stephen C. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, 407-437. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, Elinor, Clotilde Pontecorvo and Alessandra Fasulo. 1996. Socializing taste. *Ethnos* 61 (1-2), 7-46.
- Ochs, Elinor & Bambi B. Schieffelin. 2011. The theory of language socialization. In Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs & Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *The handbook of language socialization*, 1-21. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ochs, Elinor & Carolyn Taylor. 1992. Science at Dinner. In Claire J. Kramsch & Sally McConnell-Ginet (eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study*. Lexington, MA: DC Health.
- Ochs, Elinor & Carolyn Taylor. 1995. The 'father knows best' dynamic in dinnertime narratives. In Kira Hall & Mary Bucholtz (eds.), *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*, 97-119. New York and London: Routledge.
- Paugh, Amy L. 2005. Learning about work at dinnertime: Language socialization and dual-earner American families. *Discourse and Society* 16(10). 55-78.
- Pontecorvo, Clotilde, Alessandra Fasulo & Laura Sterponi. 2001. Mutual apprentices: The making of parenthood and childhood in family dinner conversations. *Human Development* 44, 340-361.
- Riley, Kathleen C. 2011. Language socialization and language ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs & Bambi B. Schieffelin, *The handbook of language socialization*, 493-514. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1974. On the analyzability of stories of children. In John Gumperz &

- Del Hymes (eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*, 325-345. New York: Rinehart and Winston.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 1988. Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12. 55-62.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 2000. When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics* 21(2). 205-243.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 2007. Categories in action: person-reference and membership categorization. *Discourse Studies* 9(4). 433-461.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel A., Gail Jefferson & Harvey Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53. 361-382.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B. & Elinor Ochs. 1986. Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15(1). 163-246.
- Schwartz, Mila & Anna Verschik, eds. 2013. *Successful family language policy: Parents, children and educators in interaction*. Dordrecht and Heidelberg: Springer.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Shifters, linguistic categories and cultural description. In Keith H. Basso & Henry A. Selby (eds.), *Meaning in Anthropology*, 11-55. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1981. The limits of awareness. *Sociolinguistic Working Papers* 84. 1-31.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1993. Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic functions. In John Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, 33-58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sterponi, Laura. 2011. Literacy socialization. In Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs & Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *The handbook of language socialization*. 227-246. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stivers, Tanya, Lorenza Mondada & Jakob Steensig, eds. 2011. *The morality of knowledge in conversation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuominen, Anne. 1999. Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 140, 59-76.
- Vygotsky, Lev. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. & Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23, 55-82.

Yamaguchi, Yoshinori. 2008. *Kurashi no Kotoba: Shingogen jiten* [Everyday words: New etymological dictionary]. Tokyo: Kodansha.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

:	Colon indicates lengthened syllables or speech sound (Each colon is equivalent to approximately 0.1 second).
.	Period indicates falling intonation.
,	Comma indicates continuing intonation.
?	Question mark denotes rising intonation contour.
¿	Indicates rising intonation that is less than a question mark, and more than a comma.
(.)	Period in parenthesis marks a micropause (less than 0.2 second)
(1.0)	Longer pause in seconds and tenths of a second.
↓	Sharp falling intonation.
.h	Indicates an audible in-breath.
h or (h)	Laughter or laughter within a word.
@ @	Longer utterance produced with laughter.
° °	Low volume.
< >	Decreased tempo.
> <	Increased tempo.
(())	Transcriber comments.
[]	Overlapping utterance.
=	Latched utterances with no gap.
()	Uncertain hearing of utterance.
→	Line in transcript denoting phenomenon of particular interest.
wo-	Cut off.
<u>word</u>	Indicates emphatic stress.