Working between Cultures: Expatriate's Management of the Self through Intercultural Change

A thesis submitted to The University of Manchester
for the degree of
PhD
in the Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences
2010

Jennifer Lynn Munsie

School of Psychological Sciences

Contents

Chapter Three
Toward a concept of acculturation as a member's phenomenon

Chapter Four
Self as polyphonic discursive presentation in situated narrative activity

Chapter Five
Methodology

Word Count: 121,134

ABSTRACT

Declaration

No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Copyright Statement

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank first and foremost my supervisor, Professor Ivan Leudar, without whom this thesis would never have been written. Your guidance, support, understanding and 'I-positions' of Professor, mentor, friend, reality-checker and fellow foreigner were exactly what I needed in a supervisor. You were and remain a great inspiration to me and I thank you from the bottom of my heart for having honoured the trust I placed in you.

I would also like to thank my advisor, Professor Wes Sharrock, for providing direction and aiding in broadening the realm of possibilities and the synthesis of ideas.

Thanks also to everyone who participated in data sessions at the Manchester University. A number of colleagues have helped me along the way and deserve to be mentioned and thanked outright. To Simon Goodman, Jacqueline Hayes, Pamela Fitzgerald, Feng Ying Huang I thank you for your friendship and academic support. Thank you also to my participants for opening your doors and lives to me, your stories are the backbone of this thesis.

Personal Thanks

Even with years of practice in putting words together, I am at a loss as to how I go about writing something which does justice to the debt of gratitude I owe my parents, James and Judy Munsie. The unconditional and unrelenting support you have given me in every facet of my life as well as your belief and significant investment in me throughout the years have provided me with an enduring sense of security and comfort for which I am forever grateful. Thank you for guiding me to keep body and soul together when I have not been strong on my own and for unselfishly granting me the license to celebrate "my own" successes. I know that they have always been *our* hard times and *our* successes. As this thesis explains, I am me in part because of you and you are you in part because of me. When we speak our voices join at times in a glorious symphony. We are forever inextricably linked and I would not want it any other way. You have been the best gift I have ever received. You are the loves of my life. *It was just about time...*"

Thanks to my girls Lauren Kent, Renate Reniers (and Graham Hall too!), Ruth Goodman, Alison McNulty, Caron Westwood, Anastasia Kynighou and Jennifer Williams who made life in Manchester feel like home. I miss you.

To Christine Voigt, my sister in heart, I am forever in your debt for having truly offered me shelter during the storm. My ability to see this through to fruition was made possible because you were there for me in my darkest hour.

To all my friends in the United States who I miss all the days throughout the year when I am not near to you. Specifically I would like to acknowledge David Weber, David and Beth Pennington, Dick and Jean Gawne, Rebecca, Scott, Joey, Nathan and Andrew Takacs.

Thank you to my Hamburg crew including Astrid Behrendt and Michelle Slaybaugh for the warm welcome and the tremendous support you extended to me. I am so lucky to have you in my life.

Finally thank you also to my best little friend in the world, Cody. Thank you for all the walks (or runs after squirrels!), for just being a warm and fuzzy body to come home to, in whichever country home was, and for being my silent partner through the last decade.

My blessings are more than I can ever hope to give in return.

Just for Me

To self-doubt, adversity, great challenges, insecurity, ambiguity and your accomplices -I thank you, too. This was still possible because of as well as in spite of you.

Chapter One

Introduction

"And the people who love me still ask me, 'when are you coming back to town?' And I answer, quite frankly, when they stop building roads"

Alison Krauss & Union Station from the song 'Gravity'

1.0 Overview and aims of research

With this thesis I set out to conduct a study of the complexities in personal reflexivity as a result of living in a foreign country. Evidence of this complexity is manifested through auto-biographical narrative occurring through both written texts and verbal interviews by people who have chosen to live abroad, specifically in the UK, for a protracted period of time. To help meet this aim, I study the ways in which people make contrasts between cultures (home and host) by telling stories of their experiences and how culture modulates the contrasts they make in their stories about their everyday activities and experiences. Through my analysis, I hope to show how presentation of the self in the context of acculturation is done, and indeed changes; observable through a polyphonic[1] presentation of subjective positions in interaction.

In this introduction I will establish the background for the study. I will do this firstly by providing a brief account of my arrival at this topic; resulting from my own experiences living abroad. Secondly, I will provide a brief discussion

[1] I am employing this term throughout this thesis to describe an arrangement rather than an actual entity and I will discuss later in chapter four the term more in depth and the problems associated with it. For purposes of clarity one can understand 'polyphony' as a term which is sometimes associated with musical compositions and it means that two or more melodies combine to create a single composition. This term is being used as a metaphor to describe instances in language which indicate possible variety of subjective positions.

regarding the conceptual and theoretical orientation of this thesis to the research question featured in the title; the fragmentation of self made increasing complex by exposure to the experiences of stranger hood. Next, I will provide an overview of the context of migration in order to 'locate' my study population. After having laid this foundation, I am then able through the subsequent chapters to discuss the psychological aspect of migration which is called acculturation. The chapter will conclude with a review of the chapters for this thesis.

1.1 Arrival to the topic

Through my own decision to pursue a life abroad, I have always taken a keen interest in the experiences of other people who I find have made a similar decision. Rather than choosing this life out of need, many of those I have 'interviewed', causally and formally, echoed my own sentiment and chose to move away from home, country and culture out of a desire to do something extraordinary *to* our existence. This period of time in my life has been amongst the most enriching and turbulent I have ever had. No longer do I proceed through each day with sense that all is *selbsverständlich*[2]. Rather, my mind is routinely recognizing incongruence against my inherited scheme of interpretation (Marotta, 2000) which I acquired through my family and friends, immediate locality in different phases of my life and national identity –though this occurs noticeably less frequent as time as gone on.

At each of these junctures I am, I believe, presented with the option to accept, decline or further consider the truth (of local others) which is new to me. In all,

[2] This embodies a sense of absolute certainty in German.

what I have gathered out of this period of time has been an increasingly diverse sense of self. In academic terms, it is often referred to as 'fragmented'. People who do not move abroad certainly have this, too, but there must be something unique to people like me and therefore it is this phenomenon in the context of life as a foreigner which I set out to understand better. Why is it so that sometimes, the German word wants to come out first? Why, after two years of living away from the UK, do I still sound British in certain ways?

In chapter four, I spend a great deal of time discussing the means by which people simultaneously manage this increasing fragmentation and a unified and enduring sense of who they are.

1.2 A short word on a paradox of title and method

While reviewing the literature for one of the sections of this thesis, I came across an interesting question posed by Rom Harré in his paper "The Discursive production of selves" (1991) which forced me to consider the title of my thesis. I had developed the title well before I had done much of the writing. In consideration of the content and arguments I present over the course of the following pages, I would be remiss in not acknowledging the (humorous) paradox which I have created.

Harré's paper opens with a question which came to him as he attended a symposium entitled, 'Managing Self before others' to which Harré responds rhetorically, "Who does the managing and who is managed? To which category of beings, managers or managed, do the 'others' belong?" (1991, p. 51). Good

questions. The title of this thesis suffers from a similar problematic in that I have created a paradox between theoretical and methodological constructs and the title under which they reside. As the thesis unfolds, the reader will notice this for themselves. With the title, "Working Between Cultures: Expatriate's Management of the Self through Intercultural Change" I have imposed a categorization, Expatriate, upon the participants of my study because they fit certain criteria I had yet the argument and methodology of this thesis makes a strict policy against imposing *anything* and aims to show acculturation (adjustment to a new culture and the associated changes –assumingly with the self- which accompany this) as a phenomenon which is owned by members of this group. Therefore, it is up to them to determine what to call themselves –for example. Furthermore, just as Harré pointed out, who (or which) self is doing the managing and who are the others which are being managed? In the case of this thesis, how can I assume that it is the expatriate self who is managing the other selves or, in the way which it reads, that the expatriate self, a sub-category of self, i.e. one of the many possible selves, is able to manage the rest of the selves or, as it reads, a unified and singularly self? Self is both variable and constant with some aspects being socially reflexive and situated and others being omni-present; simultaneously continuous and changing.

The title is indeed problematic but it was chosen for a purpose; namely to be marketable to those outside the academic realm.

1.3 Conceptual and theoretical orientation to the research question

Goffman's work on 'performative sociology' whereby he asserts that people in interaction are always "engaged in a variety of situation-specific performances" (Ross, 2007, p. 314) remains a popular perspective. These situation-specific performances are referring to people's ordinary activities in interaction. This thesis looks into the details of some of these activities and the empirical problems of the people involved; people who are *strangers*[3]. These people find themselves in a foreign environment which creates unique problems for them and their performances as the standards and associated rules they have acquired through their native socialisation processes may be interpreted differently. Further problems for the stranger ensue. Even if the stranger prepares and goes into the interaction somewhat informed, i.e. through a cultural preparation or language course, "...the stranger cannot assume that his interpretation of the new cultural pattern coincides with that current with the members of the in-group" (Schutz, 1944, p. 504). All of these difficulties and incongruence are reflected back and inevitably woven into the concept of self and this is most easily managed through reflexive narrative in conversation whereby it becomes a part of the person's autobiography and therefore a part of the person's sense of self. Schutz asserts, once a person has "...collected a certain knowledge of the interpretative function of the new cultural pattern may the stranger start to adopt it as the scheme of his own expression" (ibid., p. 504) and therefore the incongruence becomes congruent and accountable to the person. The adaptation of new cultural patterns as one's own scheme of expression resonates with the

[3] People who are living as foreigners in a new majority culture whereby they are not the rule but rather the exception and the reality of this position within a society is something which is conscious to them and reflected back to them by members of the majority culture.

increasingly popular Bakhtinian sentiment of multivoicedness and the metaphoric polyphonic novel. According to Bakhtin:

> The word in language is half someone else's. It becomes 'one's own' only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention. Prior to this moment of appropriation, the word does not exist in a neutral and impersonal language (it is not, after all, out of a dictionary that the speaker gets his words!), but rather it exists in other people's mouths, in other people's contexts, serving other people's intentions: it is from there that one must take the word, and make it one's own.
> (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293-294 cf. Josephs, 2002, p. 161)

Considering this perspective a change in thinking can be seen manifested through mediated action as the person then combines *their* intentions with the language from *others* –using that language and those schemes to establish their identity. These changes, as a result of cross-cultural social action are, in short, what is meant by acculturation. It is a complex process which I argue and show through my analysis as a dialogical undertaking observable through the narratives of acculturating individuals negotiating between various cultural positions (Bhatia, 2002). The premise here is the 'self' is socially-situated, constructed and re-constructed dialogically (internally or inter-subjectively and externally or subjectively). I will present extracts from data collected through message boards and narrative biographical interviews (NBI) which all provide reflexive accounts of experience of people I refer to as 'expatriates'. The data will show how the socially-situated self employs the use of categories and categorizations[4] in situated instances (Leudar, Marsland & Nekvapil, 2004) in order to do *something* to establish or deny membership incumbency in the positioning of themselves in relation to others in a foreign environment. In the context of this research it is likely to be used to establish or deny membership incumbency.

[4] Deployable formulations and the work of categorizing others, respectively.

1.4 Migration

This thesis is a closer look at the phenomena which occur as a result of migration. More specifically what the individual people from a certain type of migrant category have to say about it and what can be learned about those representations from a Psychological point of view. In order to better understand the nuances of the context, I will first begin by presenting migration generally as a social phenomenon and move toward a focus upon a specific category of migrants. In looking at the abundance of literature surrounding migration, the motivations for it and those who are caught up in it, I feel in presenting brief vignettes about these different migrant categories I am better able to provide the reader with a foundation upon which I will later discuss the phenomenon as it pertains to the participants and what they have to say about it.

Migration has always been and will always continue to be one of the universal practices of humanity (Bhugra & Jones, 2001) and is for all those who, regardless of the circumstances under which they have undertaken such a move, a significant personal experience. A collaborative report issued by The International Labour Office (ILO), The International Office for Migration (IOM) and the Office of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) states that "one in every fifty human beings is a migrant worker, a refugee or asylum seeker, or an immigrant living in a 'foreign' country" (2001, I).

Migration is a phenomenon which encompasses significant diversity among its members and the reasons for movement across borders. As the above-mentioned

authorities suggest, migration is a current and prominent phenomenon which is increasing (Dovidio & Esses, 2001) and has fundamental impact upon both the origin and receiving cultures. It is also perceived with much differentiation around the world. Some countries, such as the United States and Canada are historically known for their significant receipt of migrants (IOM, 2003). Even in light of immigration laws, the national identity and historical composition, e.g. the 'melting pot' (De Fina, 2003, p. 44), of such countries like the United States is the product of such nations' being a destination countries (IOM, 2003) for migrant populations. This can certainly be a factor in the treatment of such immigrants.

The need and ability to migrate has increased over time as a result of several phenomena including more affordable means of travel and globalisation which "...has accentuated the unevenness of development between countries and thereby [has] generated significant pressure for the movement of labour across borders" (ILO, IOM & OHCHR, 2001, p. 2). Global mobility is greater today than in recent history (IOM, 2003).

One of the more recent phenomena in the movement of people is resulting in a 'brain drain'[5] as highly skilled members opt for moves abroad in hopes of accessing greater financial rewards (ILO et al., 2001; IOM, 2003; Raghuram, 2004). This search for the perceived improved quality of life does not come with its price (Smits et al., 2004).

[5] The term *brain drain* refers to the phenomena of highly skilled persons electing to move abroad in favour of greater financial incentives often leaving developing or third world countries (Raghuram, 2004).

1.5 Motivations for migration

Having explained migration as a social phenomenon I will now explain some of the prominent reasons why people undertake such an endeavour. Daily news reveals to us the plights of hundreds of thousands of people who, as a result of such events as the Boxing Day Tsunami in 2004 or the Asian Earth Quake in 2005, are forced to flee from their homes because of natural catastrophes and people who, due to the immediacy of such events, are unable to plan their departures to new lives elsewhere. Although the numbers of those affected by such events are very large, they are but a fraction of those classified as migrants.

A great number of other migrants, however, have not been subject to forceful evictions and have decided this route in order to improve upon their existence. The more primal motivations for migration or "forced displacement"[6], related to access to food, shelter and safety remain ever-present. However, migration has now expanded to also include escape from oppressive or dangerous political environments, financial benefit, love and family reunification or just to experience something *different*.

Although there are many directions toward which I could investigate the effects of migration, as I shall explain shortly, the way in which changes upon the psychological self are represented by individual people incurred from exposure within a foreign environment will be my focus.

[6] A category of migrant movement as used by the United Nations. See presentation notes retrieved on November 5, 2005 from, http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/2005/01/migration/10.e.ppt#7.

However, to clarify the circumstances of the study population of this endeavour, I would first like to present for contrast a few migrant profiles in their proper contexts. These different profiles have been named by regulating bodies and researchers in various domains and are based upon the circumstances which prompt (or motivate) their movements.

1.5a Refugees

Perhaps the largest of the migrant categories having the greatest global impact are people classified as Refugees. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has defined a Refugee, through the 1951 United Nations Convention, Article 1A (2) relating to the Status of Refugees[7], as a person who:

> ...owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable to or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country...[8]

What is perhaps unclear is the understanding of the process in which one becomes categorised as a Refugee and the inconsistency across nations in interpretations of this statute. This can cause problems between migrants and their receiving cultures when there is disagreement regarding status. As the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) explains:

> Signatories to the Convention undertake to protect refugees by allowing them to enter and granting temporary or permanent residence status. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Executive Committee of the High Commissioners Programme have developed guidelines on the interpretation of the terms of this definition. In 1967 the Protocol

---

[7] A Document drafted in 1951 (Article 1A [2]) for the purpose of "regulating the legal status of refugees" among the United Nations. Retrieved on November 1, 2005 from, http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/ vtx/protect/ opendoc.pdf?tbl=PROTECTION&id=3b66c2aa10 which is found on the website of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

[8] Verbatim quote retrieved on November 1, 2005 from, http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/basics/ opendoc.htm?tbl=BASICS&id=3b0280294

> relating to the Status of Refugees incorporated post-1951 refugees and explicitly included those from outside Europe in the definition. Some countries, however, still define refugees by the geographic limitations of the 1951 definition and do not recognize non-European refugees. In 1969 a convention of the Organization of African Unity, applying only to African countries that have signed it, extended the definition to include as reason for refugee status "external aggression, occupation, foreign domination or events seriously disturbing public order in either part or whole" of a country. The Cartegena Declaration of 1984 broadened the scope of the refugee declaration in a similar manner for countries in Latin America[9]

Statistics from the UNHCR put the number of Refugees world wide as of January, 2005 at 9.7 million[10]. According to the IOM, Refugees are a particularly vulnerable group of forcibly displaced persons [11] and the response to their immediate and substantial need is generally an international concern. It is believed that if people who are classified as Refugees were given a choice, they would prefer to stay in their home countries (ILO et al., 2001, p. 5) rather than face the demoralisation and hardships which accompany their flight from threat (Williams & Berry, 1991).

Much research has paid attention to the devastating psychological effects of seeking refuge (see Bhugra, 2004; Williams & Berry, 1991; Dovidio & Esses, 2001). Additionally, the trauma of being forced to leave all worldly belongings, culture, language and perhaps even family members behind is only exacerbated by the need to and requirements of a receiving cultures expectation of immigrants to acculturate. When the requirements to acculturate are extensive;

---

[9] Verbatim quote retrieved on Novemer 5, 2005 from, http://portal.unesco.org/shs/en/ev.php-URL_ID=3138&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

[10] Retrieved on November 6, 2005 from, http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/2005/01/migration/10.e.ppt#6. This statistic is located within a presentation called "Training Programme on International Migration" which was organized by the UN/ECE and UNFPA in collaboration with NIDI in Geneva, Switzerland from January 24-28, 2005.

[11] Retrieved on November 1, 2005 from IOM website, http://www.iom.int/en/what/forced_migration.shtml#refugees. The IOM has this topic under the rubic of 'forced migration'.

meaning not just linguistic acculturation but perhaps the altering of several major cultural aspects noted by Bhugra (2004) such as religion, entertainment, eating and shopping habits, the inability to accommodate these acculturative requirements and perceived unwillingness to adjust to the host culture may be met with prejudice (Zick, Wagner, van Dick & Petzel, 2001).

Refugees are not tourists who have planned their trip or have a vested interest in exploring a new culture simply for the sake of that new culture. The need to flee does not allow for preparatory time. It is unlikely they have purchased traveller's guides to the said country. It is perhaps even more unlikely that they have acquired any additional language skills for the destination country. For refugees it is a rock-bottom beginning and their psychological capacity for seeking help-resources is extraordinarily compromised.

1.5b Asylum Seekers, Political and Economic Migrants

The exact composition of this group is up for debate and has, indeed, been debated. From the side of the Asylum Seeker, their needs and reasons for wishing to leave their native homes are one in the same as Refugees. They too are fleeing dangerous or inhospitable environments in fear for their lives. The acculturative experience is likely to be similar to that of Refugees and to date I have found no research in the literature distinguishing the two groups.

However, several studies (Lynn & Lea, 2003; Goodman & Spear, 2007) have revealed that Asylum Seekers are represented differently and, one can say, *more* negatively than Refugees (Van Dijk, 1992). I dare to make this last statement

because of the persistence in the British tabloid press of recent of the membership category 'Asylum Seeker' to be split (Leudar, Marsland & Nekvapil, 2004) into 'genuine' and 'bogus' (Bloch, 2001 cf. Goodman & Spear, 2007). The act of splitting this category into 'deserving' and 'undeserving' (ibid.) performs the function of casting a shadow of doubt onto Asylum Seekers. It is a way of downgrading their claim, thus 'depress[ing] the status of the membership category incumbents' (Leudar & Nekvapil, 2000, p. 489); something that is not done *to* Refugees. With this splitting of the category in this socio-cultural context, there is intent to "stratify" (Mehan, 1997) Asylum Seekers discursively.

The British Parliamentary definition of Asylum Seekers as persons who are in the act of *seeking* asylum is intended as a *temporary category.* According to a British Broadcasting Company (BBC) report in 2003[12], the UK has based their definition upon that of the United Nations which states that Asylum Seekers are people who leave their country in search of protection but do not occupy the same attributes given to Refugees. According to the UNESCO website:

> Asylum seekers are people who move across borders in search of protection, but who may not fulfil the strict criteria laid down by the 1951 Convention. Asylum seeker describes someone who has applied for protection as a refugee and is awaiting the determination of his or her status. Refugee is the term used to describe a person who has already been granted protection. Asylum seekers can become refugees if the local immigration or refugee authority deems them as fitting the international definition of refugee. The definition of asylum seeker may vary from country to country, depending on the laws of each country. However, in most countries, the terms asylum seeker/asylee and refugee differ only in regard to the place where an individual asks for protection. Whereas an asylum seeker asks for protection after arriving in the host country, a refugee asks for protection and is granted this protected status outside of the host country [13]

[12] Retrieved on November 3, 2005 from, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/3074577.stm#asylum. This information was posted on Friday, July 18, 2003 under the article heading "Asylum Day jargon buster".

[13] Verbatim quote retrieved on November 5, 2005 from, http://portal.unesco.org/shs/en/ev.php-URL_ID=3138&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

Therefore, the great negativity in which Asylum Seekers are viewed could be attributed to their being *uninvited* guests; people who the receiving country had not budgeted for.

The Migration Information Source[14] states applications for asylum worldwide in 2004 totalled 367,249. Of that number 40,202 applications came to the UK; third only to France with 61,056 and the United States with 41,667 out of a total of 39 countries' immigration data. Based upon this data, the UK received about 11% of all asylum applications worldwide in 2004. Should have all those applications for asylum been approved, this number of people would have comprised .067 % of the UK population in 2004[15].

It is interesting to observe the level of hostility toward such a small minority. Lynn and Lea (2003) point out that this could be an attempt to unify a nation once bound together by strong nationalism; a way of re-establishing national identity in an increasingly multicultural society. Both Stuckey (2004) and Lynn and Lea (2003) refer to the importance of governmental leadership rhetoric in granting or excluding people from the national collectivity.

As Asylum Seeker's motivations for migration are diverse and at times not assigned the immediacy associated with Refugees (otherwise they would be Refugees), this shadow of a doubt as to the authenticity of their claims for asylum gives rise to increased scepticism toward members of the group.

---

[14] The Migration Information Source is a web-based think-tank which compiles migration data from numerous international as well as country-specific migration authorities. Retrieved on November 9, 2005 from, http://www.migrationinformation.org/GlobalData/.

[15] Quota of UK population in 2004 of 59.8 million people retrieved from the National Statistics Online website on November 9, 2005 from, http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=6

Often, the debate around asylum seekers is interlinked with political and economic migration. The field of literature surrounding political and economical migration tries to shed light on people's reasons for migration and to sort out ways to determine *acceptable* reasons for migration versus other reasons which stretch already saturated political economies. For example, in Radnitz's study on migration within the former Soviet Union, he found that although both political and economic migration existed, it was economic factors which were the primary factor influencing people's decision to migrate and that "political factors were rarely sufficient to produce migration" (2006, p. 653). Yet this is the current debate in Europe with the influx of immigrants; many of whom are claiming political asylum. Although it should be the right of every human being to seek out a better life, governments of such receiving countries are reporting that they are struggling to deal with their increasing populations; both native-born and immigrated members. According to the signatories of UN conventions and the Treaty of Rome agreed, (Jamieson, 1999), "none of the European countries are permitted to refuse immigrants 'seeking freedom from political oppression'" (ibid., p. 342). As this is sometimes the case, members of receiving cultures hold very different views to people coming to their country out of a desire to better their lives economically rather than out of fear of persecution and it is very difficult to determine exactly who belongs in the respective categories (ibid.).

Yet not all foreigners who move to a receiving country out of economic motivation or similar are viewed negatively. In fact there are programmes established to support applicants within a certain migrant category such as the

United Kingdom's Highly Skilled Migrant Programme. In some cases, the receiving culture has a need for migrants with special skills; at times these jobs they occupy are requisite with the qualifications they hold and at other times these migrants are filling openings in the labour market which are somehow hard to fill. In the case of the latter, the receiving country benefits from filling these holes with highly-skilled foreigners.

Generally speaking, the lines between migrants who move country due to 'push' factors[16] versus 'pull' factors[17] is often very blurry for receiving or target country members. According to Jamieson, due to the Third World population explosion, Europe and North America are "receiving increasing numbers of both legal and illegal immigrants" (1999, p. 342); the natural resources (which are of course interlinked with economic resources) are reaching near capacity for the native populations.

1.5c Expatriates and highly-skilled migrants

Perhaps one distinction between those migrating for reasons of personal safety and well-being and those who are doing so simply to improve upon an already decent existence is by basing the valuation upon the contingency of distance away from country of origin. As Smits et al. (2004) mention, "long distance migration is generally considered to be an investment in human capital intended to generate returns in the form of increased income, employment prospects, and/or occupational status" and is "the dominant trigger for long-distance

[16] 'Push' factors are contingencies which, according to some migration theories, consist of such circumstances as "war, ecological disaster, unemployment or discrimination" (Radnitz, 2006, p. 654).
[17] 'Pull' factors are factors which attract migrants to countries such as "economic opportunities, family networks and welcoming immigration policies among others" (Radnitz, 2006, p. 654).

migration of individuals and families" (p. 285). Therefore, assuming that the farther the distance to migrate, the greater the capital investment must be and the presence of greater financial resources to do so. Distance, however, is certainly not the only factor in the movement of people in this category as there are numerous cases of, for example, British expats relocating to France or Spain with the desire to live in a more temperate climate.

Although the literature on expatriation is prominent in the corporate domain, e.g. Human Resources, Economics and Management Black & Stevens, 1989; Choi, 2003; Harvey, 1985; Mendenhall & Wiley, 1994; Schaffer & Harrison, 1998; Wang, 2002; Zimmerman, Holman & Sparrow, 2003; Sadi & Henderson, 2005; Shaffer, Ferzandi, Harrison, Gregersen & Black, 2005) a fair amount of diversity with how the category of 'expatriate' features in literature on acculturation; not just the reference to the category by different names.

In the abovementioned literature expatriates are not classified at all as migrants. Instead they are people who "...collect bonus[es]...and fear 'a political black eye' that would jeopardize their careers" should they leave their assignments prematurely; are evaluated by researchers on the "...degree of assignment completion... [and] non-work satisfaction" (Shaffer & Harrison, 1998, p. 89). They work on international assignments "generally constrained by time or task objectives" (Shaffer et al., 2006, p. 90) and they are in a position to "control local/indigenous employees" (Harvey, 1985, p. 84). Conditions of their migration include "living allowances, education grants, travel and relocation payments" (Harvey, 1985, p. 84).

They are categorised not just as 'expatriates' but also as 'employees' (Ledman, 2001, p. 343), 'managers' (Black & Stephens, 1989, p. 529; Ledman, 2001, p. 341; Shaffer et al., 2006), 'executives' (Harvey, 1985,p. 84; Ledman, 2001, p. 341) and 'international assignees' (Shaffer et al., 2006). The words 'migrant', 'immigrant' and 'immigration' do not feature in the literature here. Additionally, Dumont & Lemaître (2005) state that 'expatriates' and the phenomenon of emigration of highly qualified persons for job opportunities has been notably absent from the public debate" (p. 8). This suggests that 'expatriates' do not occupy as prominent a place in political consciousnesses as their other migrant counterparts. And more to the point they are not viewed as the social *problem* to solve. Kofman (2004) states that "in contrast, the lesser skilled [migrants] and their dependents are either allowed to enter with fewer rights, or prevented from entering legally..." (p. 645).

It may be why, as Weiss (2005) proposes, that highly skilled migrants "do not want to see themselves as 'migrants'...[possibly] attributed to the negative connotation of the word" (p. 707).

1.5d Tied migrants

Tied Migrants (Smits, et al., 2004) are people who for reasons related only to love, family re-unification or family preservation migrate to other countries. These people, primarily women, face difficult decisions and circumstances regardless under what auspices their families move. They face decisions about

their careers, the overall well-being of the family in a new and strange environment as it is them who are charged with domestic and child care issues.

1.5e Tourists

Although tourists (those who go abroad) are not commonly associated as being migrants or as migrating, I am including them in this section because of some initial reading which has drawn my attention to the phenomenon of the *traveller*. Cohen (1973) made a distinction between types of tourists stating that although the prevalence of research has been on the "mass tourist" (p.89), there exists also people who tend "...to make it wholly on his own, living with the people and often taking odd-jobs to keep himself going" (p.89) and believes such people to be from affluent backgrounds.

Particularly in that last decade or so, popularity in experiencing something unique by travelling far and wide has been on the up. In an overcrowded world, it seems this is the last frontier –the journey to the discovery of oneself; not unlike some of the goals shared by the participants of this study. The journeys the travellers take may be intended to be different; to *invoke* something different than 'other' tourists and yet be experientially the same (Prebensen, Larsen & Abelsen, 2003). The arrival at some truth which is distinct and private is the Holy Grail of the traveller's quest.

1.6 Overview of chapters

Having located the participants of my study within the greater context of migration, I aim to study the acculturation of expats through a theoretical and

methodological framework which seeks to understand the psychological-hybridity resulting from intercultural contact. In order to do this my project looks at two phenomena; the multiplicity of the self and that multiplicity through the process of acculturation. Simply put, I want to empirically study how aspects of inner speech and dialogue (Marková, 2006) show up in talk around the topic of adjusting to a new culture and to show how this results in changes of a person. The pursuit of empirical research on the multiplicity of the self is still in its infancy and the inclusion of acculturation as a contingency enriches the project exponentially. Thus, I was obligated in the vein of good scholarship to provide almost double the analysis in order to show the amazing variability I seek to prove.

1.6a Chapter Two: Literature review: Acculturation and psychology

This chapter discusses the impact of cross-cultural experience upon the psychology of a person through a review of the literature; presenting a critical discussion of relevant theoretical constructs and models and review of empirical literature. I conclude the chapter by bridging the review of literature and the next chapter in which I begin to present a new framework in the study of acculturation.

1.6b Chapter Three: Toward a concept of acculturation as a member's phenomenon

This chapter establishes the foundational framework of acculturation which I am using for this thesis: acculturation as an empirical problem for people who are strangers in a foreign country. I present my critique around some of the empirical studies presented in the previous chapter which hold some problematic

assumptions among them being that there is a pre-defined concept of personal agency and culture and that these concepts are in large part to some extent mutually exclusive of one another. Furthermore, much of the research based upon those assumptions look merely at acculturation as an adding and subtracting of cultural objects; there is not a focus upon the actual process. In order to understand acculturation, there was first be an understanding of what culture is and how it created, maintained and used by people.

I will discuss the debate between essentialist and constructivist concepts of culture, and begin to move toward the idea upon which the entire thesis rests- namely that acculturation and socialisation share many aspects and that understanding the fundamentals of socialisation can aid in understanding acculturation as a mediated social activity. This perspective assumes the social constitution of culture; a tool which is used to indoctrinate 'new' others within the social realm where it is *located* as well as to define the boundaries of that social realm. I conclude the chapter by combining the conceptual ideas about culture and acculturation in order to create a framework in which acculturation is understood as a member's phenomenon.

1.6c Chapter Four: Self as polyphonic discursive presentation in situated narrative activity

This chapter serves as the psychological theoretical underpinning; explicating how the psychological self is understood. I provide a concept of self with a brief distinction between the "philosopher's" concept of self. Seen as an agentive, reflexive and continuous (Harré, 1991, p. 51) entity with a sense of permanency through time, I then go about distinguishing between this conception and one

which is socially-situated and manages fragmentation through dialogical activity. I progress then to highlighting attributes of narrative which will lead into a discussion about what narrative can tell us about the self. This perspective gives primacy importance to the function of narrative as an activity of mind.

1.6d Chapter Five: Methodology

In this chapter I unpack the idiographic methodological framework I designed to accommodate my goals in studying acculturation. Few studies of interaction and language have paid attention to the internal dialogue and inner speech (Marková, 2006) which form the epistemology of the metaphorical polyphonic novel discussed at length in the previous chapter, I explain my design of a methodology which aims to help me in understanding and appreciating how language is used within and, moreover, to *create* context (Leudar, Sharrock, Hayes & Truckle, 2008) as well as an understanding of the ways in which culture modulates interactional activities. The story-telling activities of people living in a foreign culture, the United Kingdom, are examined using the research tools of conversation analysis (CA), Discourse Analysis (DA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA). Polyphony in subjective and inter-subjective communication is evident as asymmetries between the members of the minority culture are explicitly made relevant in interaction about cultural differences between the members' own cultural scheme of interpretation (native culture) and the majority culture.

The methodology benefits also from the analytical framework of narrative psychology (NP) in which stories, rather than logical arguments or lawful

formulations, are the vehicle by which meaning is communicated (Hevern, 2004) and through which a continuity of self is managed (Ochs & Capps, 1996, p. 29). As such, the language used in the telling of stories about acculturation is therefore the *topic* of my research rather than the *resource* (Edley, 2001, p.190 original emphasis; Speer, 2002).

1.6e Chapter Six: Representation of culturally-modulated mundane activities on 'expat' community message boards *Pilot study*

This first analytical chapter is a culmination of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks I have brought together. The data included in this chapter looks at internet-based Expat Message Boards. The chapter serves a few functions: firstly, it contains a detailed account of the methodology by which stories will be subsequently analysed throughout the remainder of the thesis, secondly, it aims to show empirically the existence of polyphony in interactionally-embedded story-telling and finally it aims to show the ways in which culture modulates those situated activities of participants and how culture is debated, negotiated and/or re-created among them.

1.6f Chapter Seven: What kind of expat are you? Member's activities in categorization

In this second analytical chapter I expand upon the way in which data in this dissertation would be treated; i.e. the type of 'analytical mentality' which is used. The participant data from the previous chapter was created by people who *assumed* a certain shared membership category incumbency of 'expat'. This chapter looks at interview data with my participants who were recruited to take part in this research. The goal with this chapter is to explicate the variability

among my participants regarding the understanding of their position as foreigners in the UK, done through many discursive activities among them being how they position themselves in relation to native Britons as well as other migrants who are also living in the UK. Through this, the variability of the membership category of *expat*, a name I have attributed to the group of migrants I am focusing upon, is revealed. This category has some basic assumptions which include that people have made (and have) a choice to make this move and that they have relied upon some presuppositions which informed them that this move would be something positive rather than fraught with problems. While some of the contingencies are made apparent in the data immediately following; it is distributed in the data throughout this thesis.

1.6g Chapter Eight: Contrasting reasons for leaving between *kinds* of 'expats'

This third analytical chapter uses the tools and techniques discussed and utilized in chapters five and six in order to look closer at the individual case studies of my participants. In this chapter there is a more focused interest in highlighting the unique aspects of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity in a conversational setting and the structure of stories as they arise through the interview setting. However, the goal with this chapter is to learn more about the acculturation of the participants and to extract the variability from these accounts; a process which is inextricably intertwined with the identity work of the participants.

I focus this chapter upon the participants' accounts for leaving their home country, how that gets done through their jointly-produced narratives and the ways in which the accounts differ between 'kinds' of expats. Often research in

psychology tends to place a heavy emphasis upon the generalizability of findings. The strength of a method such as that which I have undertaken here seeks to highlight the variety in accounts about acculturation –the variability of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity. This is an "approach to mental action that emphasizes diversity rather than uniformity in the processes involved, and a concern with the cultural, institutional, and historical situatedness of mediated action" (Wertsch, 1991, p. 8).

1.6h Chapter Nine: Polyphony in 'expats' stories about the cultural '*here*'

This fourth and final analytical chapter provides further extracts from the four case studies in which participants are seen discussing aspects of their experiences as minorities in new majority cultures. Data from three of the four participant couples are from their interviews in the UK whereas a fourth case, Case Study One, includes data from a new culture, Switzerland.

The purpose of this chapter is to look more specifically at the way people discuss issues or things they have noticed about a new majority culture and what positions –cultural or otherwise- they take in doing that explaining. This information is particularly useful for a conclusive understanding of the ways in which people present themselves culturally as expats, the ways they may have changed their position(s) the help of data from the previous chapters and to further expand upon the construct of polyphony as a tool for examining these situated activities.

1.6i Chapter Ten: Discussion

In the final chapter of this thesis I consider my research aims in light of my findings. I provide an overview of the things I found and discuss the implications of these findings upon the theoretical and methodological frameworks I used in my research. I discuss limitations to the research as well as future research.

Chapter Two

Literature Review: Acculturation and psychology

2.0 Chapter overview

As I concluded in Chapter One, Migration gives rise to a psychological phenomenon which is called acculturation. In this next chapter, I will discuss the impact of cross-cultural experience upon the psychology of a person through a review of the literature; presenting a critical discussion of relevant theoretical constructs and models and review of empirical literature. I will conclude the chapter by bridging the review of literature and the next chapter in which I begin to present a new framework in the study of acculturation.

2.1 Cultural adjustment

Cultural adjustment, otherwise known as *acculturation*, has long been an interest of scholars in the area of psychology (Gong & Chang, 2007). This has been defined as "...the degree of a sojourner's psychological comfort with various aspects of a host country" (ibid., p. 19).

Out of this interest a range of constructs, models and tools have been created as psychometric scales with which to understand and measure the antecedents as well as outcomes of acculturation (Rudmin, 2009). Although aspects of culture which include "...visible artefacts, for example, food, clothing, tools, architecture and landscape...visible behaviours based on inferred rules or code systems, for example, language, social roles and rituals, and fundamental attitudes, beliefs and values..." (ibid., p. 109) are objects of interest in

acculturation studies, the vast amount of research has focused upon the effects of this process upon minority groups and mental health (ibid.).

2.2 Acculturation: Fundamentally psychological

Much has been written about the impact of acculturation upon a person's mental health, in fact, Rudmin classifies it as "...a near universal inter-twining of acculturation with mental health issues" (2009, p. 106).

According to Rudmin, there has been somewhat of a paradox in understanding acculturation and mental health in which some earlier studies claimed that it was a positive process which improved the health and well-being of minorities (2009). On the other hand many "early psychiatric studies confirmed the high prevalence of schizophrenia and depression among immigrants" (Rudmin, 2009, p. 107). Studies such as Ødegaard's (1934) study of Norwegian immigrants in America suggest that people with certain personality types, such as schizoid personality or "embryonic Schizophrenics" (Bagley, 1968, p. 352), were more likely to migrate resulting in a greater percentage of relocated Norwegians with schizophrenic illness as compared to Norwegians in Norway.

The assumptions with studies such as Ødegaard's are that minority cultures with lesser resources must inevitably adapt to a mainstream culture; resulting in the relinquishing of a person's native identity and associated practices and values. While Psychological outcomes continue to hold scholarly attention, the study of acculturation has diversified to include other focuses. So is the case of this thesis where rather than aiming to make any generalized conclusions about

acculturation, I am interested in the process; acculturation as a dynamic social phenomenon as variable as the people who contribute to it. As van de Vijver and Phalet state, acculturation has a "strong social psychological inclination which includes not just attitudes and norms but has important 'cognitive ramifications'" (2004, p. 218). For example, in Breugelmans, van de Vijver and Schalk-Soekar's (2009) study the stability of majority attitudes toward multiculturalism in the Netherlands, they assert that majority attitudes toward multiculturalism are important to consider because they result in consequence for the acculturation strategies of immigrant groups (ibid. cf. Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault & Senécal, 1997). Considering this,"the extent adjustment of a person is dependent on the 'ideological climate' of the overarching society" (ibid., p. 655). In fact, Leudar, Hayes, Nekvapil & Baker (2008) found that refugees constructed their identities around hostilities expressed towards them by the media and local inhabitants.

2.3 Acculturation models

The field of psychology has contributed to the breadth of acculturation literature (Bhatia, 2002) within the past two decades (Kang, 2006) but has done so under the assumption that it is a linear progression (see Ryder, Alden & Paulhus, 2000; Flannery, Reise & Yu, 2001); this means that the subject of acculturation has been focused on the development and application of '...universal, linear models to understand the various stages of identity that an immigrant might experience' (Bhatia, 2002, p. 56). Additionally, much of the focus of this literature has been geared toward problems resulting from acculturation such as acculturative stress (Berry, 1970; Williams & Berry, 1991), prejudice (Zick, Wagner, van Dick & Petzel, 2001), maintenance of original heritage in new environments (Ng, 2007),

variance in acculturation within a family unit (Costigan & Dokis, 2006; Unger et al., 2002), potential pathological outcomes (see Ødegaard, 1932; Charalabaki et al., 1995; Bhugra & Jones, 2001; Bhugra, 2004), distinctive strategies (see Berry, 1997) as relevant to certain personality types (see Gillin & Raimy, 1940). All of these suggest that acculturation creates a situation or condition which must be dealt with.

According to van de Vijver and Phalet (2004), to date there have been two models of acculturation proposed in the literature; unidimensional and bidimensional. The best unidimensional model of acculturation was created by Gordon in 1964 which proposed that while the speed of acculturation may differ between individual people, the propensity is that eventually all adjust to the mainstream culture they find themselves within (2004). However, as van de Vijver and Phalet state, "migrants prefer other options than pursing complete adjustment, either developing a bicultural identity or by retaining the original culture without extensively adjusting to society of settlement" (p. 217). This movement has resulted in the development of so-called bidimensional models of acculturation proposed by Berry and Sam (1997). This model, simply put, is based upon two questions which every migrant asks rhetorically: *Do I want to establish good relationships with the host culture (adaptation)* and *Do I want to maintain a good relationship with my native culture* (van de Vijver & Phalet, 2004).

Whether the migrant is able to *choose* a bicultural identity or surrender their native identity in favour of a new mainstream one presents some complex

questions. While the first of these points may move more in the direction of reality, what is the process which enables us to learn what the reality is? Is that new reality fixed or dynamic? Can one ever say they have finally reached some Nirvana of consciousness (Marková, 2009)? What does a bicultural identity look like? Can any measure be given to the amount one is *this* culture or *that* culture? To the latter of these points, is it really possible to live among others, interacting with them even in some minute way and be unaffected? Doubtful.

As mentioned above, acculturation has occupied the attention of scholars in varying fields (Berry, 2001). However, the goal here is to establish a link between the phenomenon and psychology in a different way than has previously been done. A comprehensive critical history of the 68 dominant theories of acculturation in psychology was compiled by Rudmin (2003). The most prominent of these (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999; Ryder, Alden & Paulhus, 2000) which continues to underpin many studies in acculturation is John Berry's (1970) Fourfold theory of acculturation. The Fourfold theory includes (initially though this has been disputed; see Rudmin, 2003) four possible acculturative outcomes[18]: integration, separation, marginalization and assimilation. Berry and studies which have used his theory to underpin empirical studies suggest that there are four existential states which are possible for the foreigner living in a new majority culture. This framework has spawned further work into the assessment of the extent to which acculturation has occurred and these results have generally been placed upon a uni-directional (dimensional) or bi-directional

[18] Occasionally referred to also as: 'Adaptations, alternatives, attitudes, feelings, goals, identities, modes, options orientations...paths, policies, preferences, strategies or styles' (Rudmin, 2003, p. 4).

(dimensional) trajectory (Flannery, Reise & Yu, 2001; Costigan & Dokis, 2006; Kang, 2006).

2.4 Critique of Acculturation Models

In my prelude above, the unidimensional and bidimensional models of acculturation consider the extent to which a person surrenders one culture in favour of another. In the case of a unidimensional model, the extent to which an individual relates to one culture affects the commitment of the other culture correspondingly (Cheung-Blunden & Juang, 2008). Therefore, if a person adopts a new majority culture to a great extent, their commitment to their old culture will correspond. Whereas a bidimensional model of acculturation suggests that it is irrelevant the extent to which any cultural affiliation is surrendered but rather a person's acculturation to a new culture considers simultaneously a native culture and this creates "...a four-fold typology by placing the two cultural attitudes in an orthogonal arrangement" (ibid., p. 22).

While acculturation is broadly defined as 'to absorb and integrate into another culture', it is rarely adhered to in the literature from this purist perspective as this implies a blending of both immigrating culture and the receiving one; resulting inevitably in a hybrid variation constituted by both native and new cultural elements or attributes. These can include behaviours, ways of speaking as well as perhaps a change in principles or ideologies. The fundamental problem with this understanding of acculturation has long since been addressed and this outcome is, indeed, one of the many possibilities and is usually referred to as integration.

However, this model has received ample critique and it is problematic that a great deal of theorisation has been geared toward the idea 'that acculturation is a matter of adding and subtracting aspects of cultures' (Rudmin, 2003, p. 12).

While this may conceptually be the case and evidence observable; it seems impossible to generalize this process in any conclusive way. Members of a majority culture may complain that a minority group has not integrated with the presence of named ethnic quarters (Greektown, Little Italy, etc). However, members of those ethnic minorities may indeed argue in return that the retention of some old cultural attributes is still done in the context of the new; regulated by different cultural and legislative laws. For the majority culture it appears as though no integration has occurred. Within the minority group, however, the perspective is different.

Acculturation, however, is not a process which necessarily results in negative outcomes. As Rudmin states, earlier acculturation research which focused upon negative stereotypes of minorities has led to a fair amount of research which is biased and 'misdirected' (2009, p. 110). Back in 1973 Meintel argued against this trend of negativity; praising the benefits experiences as a stranger (1973). As she goes on to explain, "...discussions of 'culture shock' typically imply a reified conception of 'culture' and a correspondingly passive characterization of the individual. These theoretical difficulties do not allow consideration of what are often, for those involved, the most significant aspects of their experiences as strangers" (Meintel, 1973, abstract).

Although some scholars have begun to forge new paths in acculturative studies, a few conceptual problems still remain with their focus. For example, research on acculturation continues to view the phenomenon from a conceptually *etic* point of view. This presents three problems in my view: firstly, theory continues to be generated from a researcher's position rather than as a member's phenomenon as reported *by* members or from a conceptually *emic* (i.e. acculturating persons) point of view. Secondly, it seems problematic to assume that acculturative studies should be categorised and compartmentalised in any fashion such as with regards to any ethnic, political or migratory motivational criterion and thirdly, that it is only the widely-studied, more vulnerable migrant groups which experience conflict in the identity negotiation between 'home' and 'host' cultural aspects. This has dictated my method of ethnography.

This research aims to look at acculturation precisely in this way; not as something detrimental and negative but as a rich experience told by individuals who are not passive to their surroundings but active agents who are within those surroundings creating them and are likewise moved by them.

2.5 Chapter Summary

In this chapter I presented acculturation as a fundamentally psychological experience. I presented some of the ways in which the phenomenon as been investigated from a psychological perspective. In my review of some of the literature I identified two prominent models of acculturation which have underpinned significant amounts of further research. In my critique of these models, I argued that research predicated on merely adding or subtracting aspects

of cultures is limited. While the movement toward research which looks at individuals together with the contexts in which they are located suggests that there is a dynamic interrelationship between a person and his/her environment; it stops short of actually showing this relationship empirically through active, situated instances of people describing their experiences in situ. In order to see the way in which this process indeed results in people opting to move in one cultural direction or another or blend in some way two or more cultures, a new framework is needed. The framework I propose over the next few chapters is one which asserts that the solution to this problem is to look at language and how it is used by people to accomplish certain things in establishing themselves *culturally*. In other words, a movement toward acculturation as a member's phenomenon as defined, described and concluded by members, not researchers.

Chapter Three

Toward a Concept of Acculturation as a Member's Phenomenon

"Everybody's just a stranger, that's the danger in going my own way..."

John Mayer from the Song "Why Georgia"

3.0 Chapter Introduction

Having presented a review of literature around the psychological phenomenon that is acculturation, I will now establish a foundational framework of acculturation which I am using for this thesis. Having presented some of the popular theories in the previous chapter, I will turn my focus toward scholarship which has helped me to understand acculturation as an empirical problem for people who are strangers in a country. The empirical studies presented in the previous chapter hold, in my view, some problematic assumptions among them being that there is a pre-defined concept of personal agency and culture and that these concepts are in large part to some extent mutually exclusive of one another. Furthermore, much of that research based upon those assumptions looks merely at acculturation as an adding and subtracting of cultural objects; there is not a focus upon the actual process. In order to understand acculturation, there must first be an understanding of what culture is and how it is created, maintained and used by people.

I will discuss the debate between essentialist and constructivist concepts of culture, and begin to move toward the idea upon which the entire thesis rests- namely that acculturation and socialisation share many aspects and that understanding the fundamentals of socialisation can aid in understanding

acculturation as a mediated social activity. This perspective assumes the social constitution of culture; a tool which is used to indoctrinate 'new' others within the social realm it is *located* as well as to define the boundaries of that social realm. In closing I will combine the conceptual ideas about culture and acculturation to create a framework in which acculturation is understood as a member's phenomenon.

3.1 Acculturation as a research interest

Acculturation has been an area of interest in many research domains. Each of them has approached the problem differently and found varied significance and outcomes around the phenomenon. Areas such as "Anthropology, Demography, Economics, Political Science and Sociology" (Berry, 2001, p. 615), "Politics and Resource Management" (Dovidio & Esses, 2001, p. 376) and International Business Management have maintained cyclical, discursive debates for years as to what acculturation is, what the consequences of it are both individually and collectively, how it is accomplished and to what extent it is even possible. Interestingly, while all these domains have a basic understanding as to what acculturation is their similarity ends there. The audience for each of these domains have different vested interests and debate still ensues as to whether existing measurements and instruments are, in fact, measuring and testing what they claim to be (Flannery, Reise & Yu, 2001; Kang, 2006). Why should the questions which arise from this subject be so difficult to answer? First can the answers be universal? The problems with this question are multifarious but they predominantly lie in the concept of culture as a social phenomenon and the internalisation of such objects of social knowledge into the psychological realm; the embedment within the 'self' (Bhatia & Stam, 2005). Furthermore, as this is a

problem of cultured *others* mingling it is also essentially an issue of human relationships. As Eisner (2001) asserts, problems of this variety cannot be solved but coped with; therefore, 'research predicated on a problem-solving model of practice is, at best, itself problematic' (p.138).

The shared understanding of acculturation is that it encompasses the changes a person goes through "when [they are] exposed to the values, norms, and expected behaviours that are essential for assuming a cultural identity and for participating as a cultural member" (Ryder, Alden & Paulhus, 2000 cf. Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006, p. 174). This theorization implies that there is no 'happy medium' and that the ideal resolution is indeed the assumption of said cultural identity but as defined by whom? As I will discuss later in this chapter, the assumption of a culture as being fixed is no longer accurate. For example as the data in this dissertation show, there is great variation among people who are thought of as sharing the same culture as well as variable within themselves individually over time.

Labouring under this conception, much of the scholarship surrounding acculturation has excessively focused upon minority group's immersion into a dominant culture (Rudmin, 2003). It is this idea which has preoccupied many researchers' work on acculturation (Thompson, Anderson & Bakeman, 2000) and from which much theory has been generated.

However, acculturation is not a phenomenon relevant only to these contexts and a labelling of acculturation as a predominately a concern for minority groups is

inaccurate (Padilla, 2006). Historical assumptions about culture and cross-culturization have been rendered insufficient. As Rudmin (2003) and Hermans and Kempen (1998) have noted, the assumption of culture as a fixed state can no longer prevail as globalization has enabled, indeed forced, the hybridization of cultures and its' members:

> ...as a result of the speed and ease of world travel, global communications, and international marketing, all humans, everywhere, are subject to acculturation processes, whether they know it or not and whether they like it or not. There are no contained societies or protected people isolated from intercultural contact or exempt from cultural change.
>
> (Rudmin, 2003, p.6)

Furthermore:

> In an increasingly interconnected world society, the conception of independent, coherent, and stable cultures becomes increasingly irrelevant. Processes of globalization are drawing people from different cultural origins into close relationships, as can be seen, for example, in the unprecedented expansion of tourism, the flourishing of multinational corporations, the emergence of new geographical unities...the dissemination of pop culture, the increasing flow of migrations, the growth of diasporas, the emergence of Internet communities, and the establishment of global institutions.
>
> (Hermans & Kempen, 1998, p.1111)

Much of the research on acculturation in psychology is done predominately from an assumed Cartesian position of Self. As Shotter explains, the central idea here is that:

> ...it is the apparently self-evident *experience* that one's own *self* (one's 'I', or ego, or whatever else it may be called) exists somewhere 'inside' one, as something unique and distinct from all else that there is –and it is *that,* it's substantial existence, which guarantees one's personal identity (rather than it being a social or discursive construction...
>
> (1989, p.137)

This ontology presents some problems which extend beyond my focus but relevant to my analytical concern; a conceptual framework which holds the self in separation from what and who surrounds, it is focused solely upon grammatical first-persons (Shotter, 1989, p. 135). With this little, if any, attention is paid to how those first persons are addressed as such; i.e. through the nature and activity of second-persons in the constitution of those first-persons (ibid.)! In

other words, there is no accounting for how others impact those persons who are informing about acculturation and vice versa.

In light of this perspective, it is clear that the idea of acculturation must be revised. Previous literature has focused on an idea that acculturation is a process whereby people are changed (and need to change) intrinsically and that this change is assumed to be explicit and definite. Perhaps, as Hermans and Kempen state above, globalization is showing us that acculturation is a social phenomenon of constant flux and temporal negotiation and relevant to us all (Sandikci, Ekici & Tari, 2006). Are the problems of acculturation and socialisation of the same variety? I would argue that the context of acculturation gives rise to some recurring phenomena (relevant contingencies) unique to the context –some of which I show through the analysis in later chapters, and not just a part of 'normal' socialisation. It is these ideas which make the studying of 'expats' (sojourners on a protracted yet fixed duration abroad) so ideal. What might be revealed in a situation where one is immersed elsewhere for such a duration that it is no longer possible (or practical) to maintain two distinct identities; where one modifies to a greater extent the newly-acquired public identity while maintaining a separate cultural identity in private domains (Costigan & Dokis, 2006) yet does so with the knowledge that they may or will return back 'home' one day? This research aims to provide a unique look into a part of the *life span*[19] of acculturation.

[19] I use 'life span' metaphorically here in the sense that there is development and change. I do not assert that there is a lineal progression with a fixed beginning or fixed end.

Therefore, and rather unconventionally, I will not embed this discussion in any particular theory about acculturation cultivated from the previous literature. Instead, I will show through the data analysis how acculturation reveals itself as a dialectic construction of constant negotiation. As the subsequent analysis and discussion will reveal, participants do not construct acculturation in narrative which has a linear progression nor will I attempt to make any kind of assessment as to the *extent* someone has acculturated. By whose measures and criterion could this be done? Mine may or may not be relevant to those who I am studying. Rather, the affiliations to various (member-relevant) contingencies of the host versus home country will be mapped to show continuity or discontinuity as well as alignments as made relevant to acculturation by members[20]. It is my goal to show acculturation as a process of reconciliation my participants make between their pasts and where they find themselves in the present; between a history which is embedded in one culture and a present embedded in another.

3.2 Historical views of acculturation

Acculturation is most often a term which describes the migration across geographical cultures. The meaning of migration has changed over time (Park, 1928). Formally, migration meant invasion (though globally a persistence of this sentiment can been seen through various political and public rhetoric) (see Goodman, 2007; Van Dijk, 2000a; 2000b; Van der Valk, 2003) but its contemporary meaning does not *intend* to categorically imply this and it can be said the motivation is to seek a better life (Park, 1928) –although the negative debate around 'economic migrants' would suggest otherwise.

[20] "Members" are categorised throughout this work as those for whom acculturation is a relevant and negotiation of it a practical concern.

There are several branches of investigation into migration. Some focus upon migration as a formidable force resulting in major cultural shifts with political implications while others focus upon this human activity as a psychological concern for individuals. These ideas continue to be used in conjunction with the study of social theory and strangerhood (see Marotta, 2000) and their relevance is often drawn upon for their importance to the field of psychology. This is likely due to psychology's primary interest in outcomes rather presuppositions.

Though the following essays did not classify themselves as being concerned with psychology, they clearly focus on the phenomenon not just a social (societal) concern but also as an individual concern. While these works have often been sought to interpret and explain the social phenomenon of migration on the part of the individual, I wish to draw particular attention to the point that what all of these migrants have in common is their tendency to be mobile; meaning they are "...not settled [but are] potential wanderer[s]" (Park, 1928, p. 888). The significance here is that often studies of migrants are concerned with those people or groups who have moved but set up a rather permanent domicile. This context from it's inception to completion is en masse disparate to other migratory profiles. That is to say, the motivations to migrate, the conditions under which one does, the resources available to migrants, the climate of the receiving culture and the goal(s) for the move all provide for a unique set of circumstances yielding distinct outcomes. As Diken states, the category of stranger is not 'essentialist' and that degrees of strangerhood exist (1998 cf. from Marotta, 2000, p. 123). Making this distinction, I am looking at the experiences of just

such a person. What of the person who undertakes such an endeavour simply out of desire? What can be ascertained about them?

Secondly, I am equally interested in what these essays have to say regarding the resources people possess prior to engagement in interaction in a foreign environment. It is vitally important to understand this condition as those resources are drawn upon explicitly within the interactional unit. The people who were interviewed for this research often drew upon the past to account for the present. The narrative construction of the past plays a crucial role in what I have learned and shall present later.

These essays first began with Georg Simmel's (1908) 'The Wanderer' and the subsequent works which I am presenting here focused upon, to some extent if not wholly, the phenomenon not from the consequences of the receiving group but for the group member or potential group member who does not quite "become a fully participating member of the group" (McLemore, 1970, p. 89). For a detailed comparison and critique of the sociology of the stranger and comparative study with Simmels's term see McLemore (1970).

3.2a "The Wanderer"

People have long been occupied with the issue of having a stranger among them (McLemore, 1970). As I alluded to previously, research in this area focuses with a primary concern for what the arrival of such a person or group means for the larger collectivity. Simmel first introduced his concept of the stranger; as he coined 'wanderer', in 1908. With his essay Simmel intended to explain the

sociology of the strangerhood (McLemore, 1970); the arrival of the stranger and aspects of the personality of such a person (ibid.). More specifically, he was interested in those processes through which a newcomer fails to become a participating member of the new group.

For Simmel, the stranger is "the wanderer [not] who comes today and goes tomorrow, but rather who comes today and stays tomorrow" (1950, p. 402). The wanderer is the innovator (McLemore, 1970), the one who brings qualities into a group which are exceptional from the group itself (Simmel, 1950). Simmel displays such a person in a favourable light and credits them with economic growth. This is indeed relevant only when such a wanderer brings goods and services desirable for the group which have originated outside of it. It is apparent, however, that this classification is not indicative of all categories of newcomers and he does allude to this point in saying that such a person "stands out more sharply if he settles down in the place of his activity" (ibid., p. 402). In a situation like this, the settled newcomer is no longer the transient and furthermore, the goods and services which were once unique only to him can now be obtained or performed from members of the group. Although doing so may allow the wanderer to acculturate and acquire "...all kinds of charm and significance" (ibid., p. 402) he will forever remain a stranger if he is seen only as such through the eyes of those around him –something Cooley addresses with his concept of a "Looking Glass Self" where who the wanderer is, is reflected back to himself through others' attitudes towards him (Stonequist, 1935) as a stranger. He is thus presented with an image of himself as a stranger and comes to see himself as or be reminded as being a stranger and not a member.

Simmel shared a sentiment with other scholars (McLemore, 1970) on the personal qualities which would likely maintain one's status as a stranger; these being namely "his low regard for sentiment, his orientation toward the future, his lack of respect for tradition, and his commitment to economic rationality" (McLemore, 1970, p. 89). They provide a rubric through which the wanderer may either carry on further afield or become a "marginal man"; a person who is no longer aligned with their native culture but has also not incorporated the new. This last sentiment shares some very interesting parallels to the stories told by the participants of this study who were not moved abroad by a company but who chose to pursue a life abroad for *personal*[21] reasons.

As such the wanderer is not "...radically committed to the unique ingredients and peculiar tendencies of the group, and therefore approaches them with the specific attitude of 'objectivity'" (Simmel, 1950, p. 403). This objectivity, Simmel asserts, is a "positive and specific kind of participation" (ibid., p. 403). The problem for the wanderer is then whether or not his type of objectivity poses problems for the existing order of things (McLemore, 1970). If this is the case it can have implications upon the stranger.

In relation to expatriates -the population of the current study- this suggests that even "favourable" migrants, those that bring prosperity, innovation and those who have wherewithal or initiative will continue to be strangers so long as the

[21] Although people sent abroad by their company also have their 'personal' reasons for agreeing to such move, I am distinguishing between 'personal' and 'corporate-sponsored' participants in their decision-making practices, resources available and experiences related to the move. This becomes evident in the data to follow.

receiving culture views them as such. How does the receiving culture (country or corporate) perceive and receive this objectivity? Are these strangers continued to be viewed as such; especially when in certain circumstances their goal for coming abroad was to inject this type of objectivity? What effect does that impart upon the acculturation of such a person when it is not only about the individual going into a majority culture but also when the majority expects (or should expect) to receive something from that minority culture?

Is acculturation for the expatriate only possible when that acculturation is being recognized by the host group and reflected back to the acculturating person so that they may see a new image of themselves, one that is changing? Yet, if the presence of this objectivity is problematic for the receiving group, what happens then?

These questions can really only be addressed when they are underpinned by the irreducible dyad of self and other; the mutual constitution of all that is social (and it can be argued later on that nearly everything can be social). I will go into greater detail about this in Chapter Four but to explicate the preceding point is the ability of human beings to be reflexive. As all human beings interacting with one another have this ability, it creates moment by moment events, whereby production of objects through interaction are the result of what has immediately transpired and then, due to reflexivity, affect subsequent activities (and resulting objects) from those individuals. Furthermore, this reflection must include dialogism and through this dialogism one can ascertain if they are being spoken

to as a stranger or someone who is a member. This perspective on acculturation holds dialogism a priori.

While Simmel sheds some light onto personal attributes of a transient wanderer, he does not extend beyond that to consider the part socialisation (acculturation) plays in constituting the image of the wanderer and assumes that the members of this group (and their attributes) are rather fixed categorically speaking.

3.2b "The Marginal Man"

Park introduces the idea of the cultural hybrid; one who lives and shares intimately two cultural lives which one "may pass in and out of...several times a day" (Stonequist, 1935, p. 6) not fully breaking from one and not fully accepting the other, either through his own choice or because his environment prevents him from doing so. Living on the 'margin of two cultures' (Park, 1928, p. 892) manifests a dualism of the self; the old and the new or as Du Bois coined it, "double consciousness" (1903 cf. Stonequist, 1935, p. 6). For Park this is a moral dichotomy and the turmoil experienced is on-going but is due to a voluntary undertaking. What kind of person would choose this? However as my lengthy discussion in Chapter Four regarding the conception of the psychological self argues; we are all occupying various 'cultural' positions at given times. Park's position, however, took 'culture' in a purest sense and assumed a fixed quality to it.

Park claims it is the antagonists who we can credit them for the advances and existing differences in culture. It is the antagonists who *pollinate* other cultures (1928) –much in the same way as Simmel's 'innovators':

> Even today, do not the inventor, the preacher of a new doctrine, and the virtuoso travel from place to place in search of adherents and admirers –notwithstanding the immense recent development in the means of communicating information?
>
> (ibid., p. 882-3)

This is no less true today though perhaps the goal is not necessarily to bring one's message to the masses but is more of a matter of private concern (Park, 1928). However, in the case of the corporate expatriate, the objective can indeed be the 'bringing of a message' to the masses of a different workforce and/or returning to the original workforce with new innovations acquired from their interaction with new minds. For Park the voluntarily-migrating individual pursues such an existence without the expectation of a *mutual* exchange with others around him. He describes this type of existence as being symbiotic rather than social (ibid., p. 887): "...that a person may be a member of a group in a *spatial* sense but still not be a member of the group in a *social* sense; that a person may be *in* the group but not *of* it." (McLemore, 1970, p. 86). Though interestingly, when one considers that through socialisation – interaction in any sense- one is for even a fraction of time, through what is produced between the two, *in* as well as *of* the group; such people, be they perhaps foreigners to the group or people *on the fringe* of the group are, in Park's terms, the antagonists who reflect back to other more embedded members of the group another reality.

The two terms, symbiotic and social respectively, are related in that they imply a sharing of space and to an extent that this sharing is advantageous[22] for the breaking of home ties acts as a 'release' from the restraints of their conventional modes of thinking and acting and that this is an 'emancipation' and 'enlightenment'; but does the individual themselves feel it is so? Perhaps if one takes the stance that all people who migrate by choice possess an antagonistic personality (see Ødegaard's selection hypothesis, 1932). This would suggest that the individual would feel somewhat a stranger in their native domicile which would precipitate such action. According to Ødegaard (1932), people with Schizoid personality are more likely to migrate as they have failed to develop a level of attachment to the people and place where they were born; thus making it more likely that they would migrate. While my participants report some dissatisfaction with aspects of their home country and that they might not always share in the collective *American mentality*, there is more the tendency to report an interest in new places, new experiences and contrasting those with the old. Moreover, it is evident through the data that my participants rely heavily upon their *attachments* to aspects of their native culture of origin in order to organize for themselves in their narratives their experiences in the present.

Park however mentions that it is only following this 'emancipation', the person learns "to look upon the world in which he was born and bred with something of the detachment of a stranger" (Park, 1928, p. 888). Stonequist asserts:

[22] A question of the advantageousness for both in-coming and receiving entities will not be discussed here.

> ...the marginal individual is not identical in all his personality traits in all situations, nor even within one situation...a core of psychological traits which are the inner correlates of the dual pattern of social conflict and identification.
>
> (1935, p. 10)

Furthermore, McLemore highlights Stonequist's (1937) statement that migrants may not necessarily become marginal and that this marginality, both situationally and personally, may arise from "sources *other* than migration" (McLemore, 1970, p. 90).

The narrative biographical approach used in my research has offered an interesting opportunity to look at some of these issues through the means by which the people have constructed their past in relation to the present. At times the stories resemble something similar to what Park mentions but Stonequist's statement seems even more apt as the data reveal the fluidity of people's positions in relation to places in their pasts as well as the present. Even if they present themselves as being marginal at one point in the narrative, this can change in the next sentence. What my data show resonates with Stonequist in that people do not exhibit identical personality traits in all situations; that there are in fact no real fixed points.

3.2c "The Stranger"

Although many researchers in the past have compared Schutz's (1944) and Simmel's (1908) concept's of the stranger, their efforts have often resulted in an oversimplification of the two essays (McLemore, 1970). Schutz framed his discussion about the stranger as more of a 'newcomer', focusing upon the pre-emption to social interaction; not the *motivations* but what is assumed by the stranger, i.e. the resources available to him, as necessary to engage in interaction

with majority group members. In essence, it is among the first studies of the social psychology of the stranger (ibid.). However, while Simmel and other authors mentioned in this section speak specifically of the dilemmas faced by persons (strangers) of geographically different cultural backgrounds, Schutz does not restrict his classification of culture any these means. In fact he says:

> The applicant for membership in a closed club, the prospective bridegroom who wants to be admitted to the girl's family, the farmer's son who enters college, the city-dweller who settles in a rural environment, the "selectee" who joins the Army, the family of the war worker who moves into a boom town –all are strangers according to the definition…
> (Schutz, 1944, p. 499 emphasis in original)

Thus he suggests that these experiences are similar. This would support the idea I mentioned earlier that acculturation is another venue or type of socialization. However, as I also mentioned, while there are many similarities there are also unique qualities to acculturation as a social process. Not all participating members in socialization processes are considered strangers in a pure and entire way; e.g. a new child in a family is not considered a stranger yet that child must be socialized and not acculturated. The child has no previous scheme of culture.

While I am focusing on data which is socially-mediated and highlighting the unique tools and activities which are social in constitution (all belonging to socialization); I will focus upon those aspects of the socialization process which are specifically relevant to acculturation. These will tend to look different to just normal social processes in certain ways. For example a foreign 'newcomer' may report trouble in their effort to interact and that account will include the use of attributes related to a native world-view to explain this trouble.

Furthermore, Schutz, though he did not realize it, seemed to suggest the importance of looking at situations in the social world as members' phenomena,

i.e. from the perspective of those sharing the context. As Schutz states, "this cultural pattern, like any phenomenon of the social world, has a different aspect for the sociologist and for the man who acts and thinks within it" (1944, p. 500). As will be discussed in further detail in subsequent chapters, the emergence of such cultural patterns as constructed linguistically by the 'man who thinks and acts within it' follows the philosophy of members' practical action in social psychology.

What Schutz established with this essay was a foundation for understanding the context within which interaction for the stranger is embedded prior to its commencement. In order to understand this, Schutz needed to make clear the corpus of knowledge one processes and will deploy in normal (i.e. familiar context) situations and how that would, in a foreign venue, become insufficient. For this he drew upon James' (1890) distinction of two kinds of knowledge (Schutz, 1944).

Although Schutz acknowledges that the familiar environment within which one acquires this "thinking as usual" (1944, p. 501) interpretative scheme, such contexts are "not homogeneous ...[are] incoherent...only partially clear and not at all free from contradictions" (ibid., p. 500) it is of "*sufficient* coherence" (ibid., p. 501) for the man within it. Thus, culture is constituted by people and is therefore variable among its members as well as what is understood between members of *different cultural groups* even if this is not generally thought so explicitly in such terms. It is the scheme of interpretation which is shared

collectively by the group even when faced with such contradictions (ibid.). The scheme of interpretation or, *culture*, will be discussed later in this chapter.

As such, the stranger processes his own scheme of interpretation and approaches the new group with a scheme which places him in the position of needing to question everything which ipso facto is unquestionable for the larger group (Schutz 1944). Even in the stranger's attempt to prepare himself for social interaction with the group he does not, regardless of what preparations he has made prior to approaching the group, have the appropriate scheme of interpretation and is merely knowledge of acquaintance. As Schutz says, these scheme's are not guides "for interaction between the two groups" (1944, p. 503).

Furthermore, Schutz also made the assertion that even if interaction does take place, it is generally the people who are "in a situation analogous to that of the approaching stranger" (1944, p. 503) and who are most likely to interact with him. This scenario presents some interesting possibilities. Firstly, if this is the case, then the stranger may spend the majority if not all his time understanding the larger group from a vicarious marginalised position. Secondly, perhaps this enables the stranger to maintain his inaccurate interpretations and go on to build his knowledge about the foreign culture because his thinking remains "insulated…neither verified nor falsified by responses of members of the foreign group" (ibid., p. 503); these members of the foreign group to whom Schutz is referring to are those not in the 'analogous' position of the stranger.

I use Schutz here to aid me in building a conceptual understanding of interaction specific to people who are 'strangers'. However, I find his category and experience of the stranger somewhat oversimplified.

3.2d "The Sojourner"

Alternatively, Siu presented "another deviant type" of foreigner whom he referred to as 'the sojourner' (1952, p. 34). Siu's concept consider's the possibility that the foreigner has a choice in whether or not he acculturates and states that he is psychologically unwilling to accept himself as a permanent resident in the new country and if he does, he *then* becomes a marginal man (ibid.). Therefore Siu is making the assertion that there exists only two possibilities in acculturation. This seems to be connected to what I inferred from Schutz's earlier work in that even if the stranger found a connection with some members of the larger group, that to the greatest extent he may only reach a state of marginalisation.

This is important as Siu makes some other distinctions about this category of stranger which share great similarity with some members of one group of my participants who were sponsored by their employer in their home country. Siu isolated a few factors which make the sojourner unique; the job, the in-group tendency and movement back and forth between home and host countries.

Unlike the profiles of the stranger presented thus far and contemporary migrant categories such as asylum seeker or refugee, the sojourner knows why he migrates, i.e. not out of threat but with an intrinsic understanding that his purpose

is to do a job (Siu, 1952). Furthermore, Siu believed that the motivation was actually rooted in social status at home as such an undertaking is tied to "personal needs for new experience, security, prestige, etc" (ibid., p. 35). Thus, a great deal of concentration and concern is on the job at hand and the successful completion of its objectives; presumably leaving little time, energy or interest in private concerns of cultural adjustment (ibid.). The extent to which he interests himself in the surrounding culture is more of a choice not out of necessity. Siu does not mean that the sojourner will definitely return following the completion of the job after a certain period of time but that the *idea* that he will remains a permanent fixture in his orientation to his place within the foreign environment and affects his commitment to changing that orientation or his investment in doing so.

Yet, the protracted exposure with the surrounding group, referred to also by Siu as a symbiotic relationship (1952; Stonequist, 1935; Park, 1928), does have its effects. While the sojourner is interacted with, this interaction is done so only within the realm of his job. This creates the formation of a "cultural colony [which] reveals a symbiotic segregation, on the one hand, and social isolation, on the other hand" (ibid., p. 36). This perpetuates what Siu refers to as the 'in-group tendency' (ibid., p. 36). Within these colonies, cultural groups are able to maintain enough of their "homeland tongues, art, sentiments, and primary-group attitudes" (ibid., p. 37-8) that the need to forge new social ground is reduced. Consider, the examples of 'Chinatown', 'Greektown', 'Little Italy' in many different metropolitan areas world-wide.

This is further perpetuated by the tendency of sojourners "movement back and forth" (Siu, 1952, p. 39) and this, according to Siu, has more to do with maintaining ties and social status 'at home'. While the latter may seem far fetched, evidence of this can be seen in the organization of expatriate contracts in the area of 'home visit' allowances. In reference to the more contemporary category of sojourner which features in this thesis, it is important for both employees and employers that the sojourner maintains a presence in the arena where he is expected to reappear at some point in time. This supports an interesting point raised by McLemore in his highlighting Nash and Wolfe's (1957) study which found that "...taking the role of the stranger tends to cause a decline in the number of inventions...while the role of the returnee is associated with an increase in inventions" (1970, p. 92). Thus there is an expectation with these types of assignments not only that objectives be fulfilled abroad but that the experience and innovation generated by gaining this other perspective be later infused to some extent back at home.

Although they have made efforts to maintain their cultural heritage as much as possible, the extent of their assimilation may only be realized when they return home. While Siu maintains that this happens the longer a sojourner finds himself maintaining "...a mode of living which is totally characteristic neither of his home nor of the dominant group" (Siu, 1952, p. 42) while still living abroad and that this cycle comes to an end when he "makes his final trip home and retires" (ibid., p. 41).

Collectively, these essays have presented some social psychological considerations which are relevant to the participants of my study. These people belong to a category or *type* of stranger which is unique among other migrants. They do not come and settle permanently but may remain somewhat detached to their surroundings. In a way, they determine to some extent what their commitment to their new surroundings may be. They interpret themselves in some way as having choices in this matter. There may even be, by nature of their category and the awareness of others around them to their membership of that particularly category of stranger; different hermeneutics between these strangers and native others versus that of other migrant categories.

As I mentioned in the previous chapter, the four outcomes model of acculturation which has been popular for so long is riddled with inaccurate assumptions about the 'differences between groups or between individuals' (Rudmin, 2003, p. 5). More specifically I mean a concept which holds culture to be trans-individual, which is to say that each person of a given culture scheme prioritizes hierarchically the aspects of that culture in the same way, is problematic.

Underlying all these points is the concept in psychology of the Self which is assumed by studies such as those I mentioned above as an entity which is somehow intact and encapsulated and independent of others. This concept of Self known as the 'Cartesian Self' assumes a part of the self which is unavailable to others around it. As I argue in Chapter Four, this is a concept of a self which is not possible.

3.3 Concept of Culture

A perspective which assumes that the social recognition of the characteristics of both majority and minority groups are mutually inclusive and a priori important (Marková, 2009) is a current turn in the scholarship about self and indeed culture.

In order to properly understand the data, however, it is necessary to lay out a working concept of culture (Kompridis, 2005) which implicitly modulates and is explicitly evoked in the discursive activities of people. To do this I have chosen to highlight some aspects of the *essentialist* or *holistic* (including language, social practice, tradition, form of life, etc) (Kompridis, 2005, p. 324) versus the *essentialist anti-essentialism* (ibid.) or *sociological constructivist* (which endorses the radical hybridity and polyvocality of cultures) (Benhabib, 2006, p. 384) debate. At the end of this section I aim to show that neither of these isolated concepts are sufficient on their own and according to Anthropological theory are inseparable.

There are numerous approaches (concepts) to culture yet very few contributions in the literature on acculturation spend any significant time (Crawford & Valsiner, 1999) establishing which of those concepts it endorses. Instead culture is often presumed to be a set of self-evident prescriptors. While this thesis will not present a comprehensive unpacking of the word 'culture' and all its contemporary or historical uses, it would be remiss to omit such a discussion here.

The word culture has become increasingly problematic (Hermans & Kempen, 1998) in the area of social sciences during the previous few decades. In fact, the semantics of the word 'culture' has occupied a variety of meanings, e.g. culture as indication of high society or culture of social groups. Kompridis asserts:

> Notoriously impossible to define, culture is a concept whose semantic extension overlaps with the concepts of identity, language, lifeworld, form of life, background, horizon, tradition, and the like. When we use such concepts, we are obviously not using concepts whose meaning can be fixed or rendered fully explicit and determinate; rather, we are dealing with concepts which serve as semantic and epistemic access points for one another, and for their overlapping object domains. Just as obviously, these access points are not given to us once and for all, but must be discovered and rediscovered, for change, but are also the concepts through which we understand semantic and historical change.
>
> (2005, p. 318-319)

Culture, as it is frequently understood, contains countless assumptions, both implicit and explicit, which consider it to be '...a homogenous and static entity [when it is more of] a heterogeneous and dynamic set of practices' (Roepstorff & Bubandt, 2003, p. 15). Furthermore, these assumptions are generally considered to be shared both between members and between groups. However, with respect to the latter point, it could be argued that while a collective group's understanding of any *other* given culture might share saliency, it is likely that member's definition of their own culture is likely to be very different than any conceptions about it. Benhabib (2006) refers to this as a "crucial distinction between the standpoint of the *observer* and that of the *participant* in social theories of culture" (p. 384).

Although this debate, according to Kompridis and Benhabib, is fundamentally one about culture from critical and political theoretical points of view, there are many good contrasting points about what culture exactly *is*, i.e. what people consider culture to be. It is a widely accepted understanding that culture features

as an omni-presence within the Self (Sandikci, Ekici & Tari, 2006), however a formidable amount of research including that contained in this dissertation has observed it also as socially-situated activity.

3.3a Essentialist or Holistic v Essentialist Anti-Essentialism or Sociological Constructivism

From the perspective of discursive Psychologists, it has been said that in today's increasingly globalized world, the concept of static, consistent cultures "becomes increasingly irrelevant" (Hermans & Kempen, 1998, p. 1111) and culture must be newly conceptualised. For example, Benhabib suggests:

> ...complex multicultural dialogues...[form]...culture [which]...is the horizon formed by these evaluative stances, through which the infinite chain of space-time sequences is demarcated into 'good' and 'bad', 'holy' and 'profane', 'pure' and 'impure'. Cultures are formed...because human beings live in an evaluative universe.
>
> (2006, p. 384)

Benhabib's position acknowledges the shifting which cultures overall in an increasingly globalized world experience and that it is a "worldwide trend [where] cultural identities, and in particular cultural differences [are] evolv[ing] into sites of new forms of struggle" (2006, p. 383). Culture, it appears, is moral work. The deconstruction, re-building, reunification and creation of new nation states, the further growth of a united Europe, the outsourcing of labour across borders and the selling and acquisition of culturally-bound iconic brands are among many examples of this and has generated a need to revisit the concept of *culture* due to the frequency in which it is interchangeably used with *identity* (ibid.); a position supported above by Kompridis.

Humans seek both to unite as well as "dispose of second-order narratives that entail normative or evaluative attitudes" (Benhabib, 2006, p. 384), i.e. they wish

also to be distinguishable not just between cultures but between individuals. I will go into much greater detail in the next chapter about the constitution of self and its need to simultaneously seek "intersubjectivity and mutuality [and]...to be an independent agent..." (Marková, 2009, p. 212). So what can be called culture and where can it be found? Benhabib states that it can be found within the 'narrative constitution' of a culture by self-ascribed members or those ascribed to a culture. In all cases it is very much the concern of people who are communicating about it.

However, the questions then arise, how is cultural continuity understood and by whom is it defined? As Benhabib asserts:

> There is an important asymmetry between the standpoint of the social observer and that of the participant in the identification of cultures: the observer seeks for more unity and coherence in identifying a culture than does the participant. For members of cultures, the universe is constituted by a series of interlocking, fluid, and often competing strands of signification and argumentation. 'To be X' –a Catholic, a Jew, a Muslim, an American, a Greek- is to know and to identify with *some* strands of collective narrative through which the past is accounted for and the future anticipated...there is no *single* narrative of what it means to be a good Catholic, a good American, or a good Greek.
> (2006, p. 385)

This perspective was also held by Durkheim. The idea that all individuals from a particular culture do not possess all attributes of that particular culture but when brought together create something which constitutes the mean of all those attributes seems likely:

> ... by aggregating together, by interpreting, by fusing together, individuals give birth to a being...the whole, as Durkheim repeatedly insists, is more than the sum of its parts. Society is to be identified with the emergent component that would remain were we, in thought, to subtract the totality of individuals.
> (Ingold, 1986, p. 227)

The greater importance for observers of cultures to produce a more unified, solid definition of other cultural units seems to suggest that in defining what makes others who they are, the observers are also making a statement of who they

believe themselves to be. By assigning a prescriptive set of attributes to others, observers are at the same time defining who they believe they are and are not, thus accomplishing concurrently the need to unite as well as to individuate. According to the current doctrine of selfhood endorsed in this dissertation, people establish who they are, partly, by orienting to and participating in interaction according to who the *other* is.

However, in opposition to a concept of culture which is primarily dialogical, Kompridis says culture cannot be something which we simply make up as we go along. If there was nothing 'out there' to correspond with, a concept as such, there would be "nothing to get right or wrong and nothing deserving of the name" (2005, p. 319) *culture* or indeed no named cultures. Furthermore, culture as a concept includes the "activities, practices, and achievements we wish to affirm in some form, and wish to pass on to succeeding generations…" (ibid., p. 319); e.g. folklore (Propp, 1984). If culture is not something somewhat static, how is it that we come to get or remain attached to it (Kompridis, 2005)? How is it that people or political economies come to individuate each other?

Crawford and Valsiner argue however:

> It is widely recognized among 'cultural psychologists' that language and speech are central to culture and to any understanding of it. Language is the primary means through which the achievements of past generations are preserved and passed on to coming generations…and often through the analysis of language use, in terms of, for example, myths, voices, master narratives, social languages, discourses and cultural models.
>
> (1999, p. 263)

Considering this it cannot be denied that language and the construction of narratives embedded within cultural contexts are imperative in such a concept as they are generative of it. Furthermore, these particular points which Kompridis

says we aim to preserve, it is argued, are done primarily through narrative, e.g. Egyptian hieroglyphics.

However, Kompridis believes that a concept where cultures are whimsically constructed through spontaneous narratives perpetuates a climate where minority cultures, with minority voices, are subject to "cultural Darwinism"; and even in light of such "melting pot" (2005, p. 328) political cultures where a "complex cultural dialogue" (ibid., p. 328) may be relevant "it implicitly promotes discarding 'unwanted' or disadvantageous minority identities for far more acceptable and advantageous majority identities" (ibid., p. 328).

Our social activities are, however, not whimsical but rather quite the opposite. They are organized and aspects of recognizable stability within respective collectivities are what in fact could be described as aspects of culture; e.g. the familiar narratives which recur. But to what extent does globalization affect cultures -these points of stability?

As I mentioned in a previous chapter about migration, there are some countries, such as the United States, which have historically been destination countries for migrants. There has not been an 'increase' in globalization per se but the country was globalized through much of if not all of its history as a political economy. Stories which are considered *American stories* are about those countless immigrants who built a new life in a new world, stories which are then told to subsequent familial generations: the culturally-iconic idea of *the American Dream*. In contrast there are more static cultures where the passage of time has

resulted in only minor changes between contemporary and historical ways of life. It is very difficult to perceive change from within any given culture but the tone of narratives when studied over time and analysed thematically can aid in this. When this possibility of a concept of culture, a *narrative* concept of culture, is considered it is possible to extract those minority voices. A concept of culture based upon the understanding of social process as infinitely-mutual in constitution can not deny the presence of those minority or disadvantaged voices.

Furthermore, recent modern technology has made it even more possible for to capture and propagate dialogue. Recent research has studied internet-based communication venues where marginalized voices, those whose 'unspeakable stories' can now be 'heard' and dispersed through the safe and anonymous medium of the internet are demanding to be recognized (Mitra, 2001). Granted this is all predicated on the prevalence and availability of technology and the associated skill-sets necessary to partake in such activities.

While there may be increased evidence that culture is also produced dialogically, Kompridis (2005) reiterates several times throughout his essay that those activities, practices and achievements of culture are things members want to pass on to future generations. This is includes, of course, the presupposition that dialogues regarding those activities, practices and achievements maintain saliency through the generations. But what of the intended receivers? Do they necessarily accept these? Are these elements of the culture authentically reproduced? Certainly not categorically. As Ingold asserts,

> However much [acts of recollection or commemoration] may strain towards authenticity, such representation can never evoke the same response from

> readers, viewers or audience as did the events depicted from those who lived through them.
>
> (1986, p. 202)

Indeed. Professor Ivan Leudar gave in conversation to me the example of Greek statues which were never treated as art to be displayed in museums or libraries. If culture were static then any given culture of today would be the image of its ancestry. According to Wertsch consideration should ultimately be given to "...how cultural tools are *produced* as well as *consumed*" (1997, p. 7 emphasis in original). Juxtapose pre and post 1940's Germany and it is clear that a re-negotiation of value systems has occurred (several times); a process which has been and continues to be dialogical and includes the culling out and curbing of rhetoric associated with extreme-right movements. This leads to the principle question in the debate of culture; does language call cultural worlds into being or does culture presuppose language (Ingold, 1986)? More to the point, why must it be one *or* the other? To answer this question, Wertsch advocates for a methodology in which the unit of analysis is mediated action (Wertsch, 1997).

According to Benhabib, a self-proclaimed sociological constructivist, her position arose out of a contemporary problem, which is that "culture has become a ubiquitous synonym for *identity*" (2006, p. 383). For Benhabib, culture is what is produced in the identity work; the "double hermeneutic ... [where] we identify 'what' we do and 'who' we are through an 'account', a 'narrative' of deeds and persons" (ibid., p. 384); it is what is produced from those accounts and narratives. Kompridis takes issue with this concept of culture as he believes the idea of identities and cultures as *constructions* is synonymous with them being 'fictions' which "we cannot practically do without, but which we cannot truly

believe and which we cannot truly endorse" (2006, p. 326). However as Ingold says:

> ...to regard the human being simply as an *individual* culture-bearer is to reduce his social life to an aggregate of overt behavioural interactions, which serve to reproduce the elements of culture just as the phenotypic behaviour of an organism results in the reproduction of elements of the genotype.
> (1986, p. 293)

Therefore the individual as a social mechanism with his ability to select particular contingencies of culture and make them relevant forces a reconsideration regarding a concept of culture where people are proverbial marionette; their cultural surroundings the puppeteer.

Kompridis says that 'radical hybridity and polyvocality' of cultures does not permit one to individuate them. However, if Bakhtin's (1973) concept of polyphony, a mingling of multiple voices present within us all; a proverbial society of mind (Hermans, 2002), is considered then a concept of culture which does not include polyvocality might not exist as there would be no people to inhabit it. Bakhtin's concept of the polyphonic novel based upon Dostoevsky's novels which, according to Bakhtin, revealed a phenomenon in which the author and the characters he created, while embodied as a single person, were all "*free* people, capable of standing *alongside* their creator, capable of not agreeing with him and even rebelling against him" (Bakhtin,1973, p. 6 original emphasis). It is indeed the same for members of cultures. As such we are all 'hybrid and polyvocal', just in unique measure to one another.

The two positions occupied by Kompridis and Benhabib appear, even though they claim to both be political and critical theorists, to be approaching the problem of culture from two distinct and unrelated positions; Kompridis seems

to support more an Anthropological concept of culture while Benhabib's concept of culture is *embedded* within a Psychological or Pragmatist position. In fact both of these are necessary in any concept of culture.

Kompridis' supports his argument with the likes of Heidegger, Wittgenstein and Geertz who believed that we are bound by or dependent upon a "system of action and meaning which...sets the conditions of intelligibility upon which all sense-making necessarily lies" (2006, p. 325). Similarily Geertz states:

> There is, in brief, a human nature as regularly organized, as thoroughly invariant, and as marvellously simple as Newton's universe. Perhaps some of its laws are different, but there *are* laws; perhaps some of its immutability is obscured by the trappings of local fashion, but it *is* immutable...the great, vast variety of differences among men, in beliefs and values, in customs and institutions, both over time and from place to place, is essentially without significance in defining his nature. It consists of mere accretions, distortions even, overlaying and obscuring what is truly human –the constant, the general, the universal – in man...the trouble with this view...is that the image of a constant human nature independent of time, place, and circumstance, of studies and professions, transient fashions and temporary opinions, may be an illusion, that what man is may be so entangled with where he is, who he is, and what he believes that it is inseparable from them. It is precisely the consideration of such a possibility that led to the rise of the concept of culture and the decline of the uniformitarian view of man.
>
> (1975, p. 34-35 emphasis in original)

While Benhabib's position, although she does not explicitly state it, resonates with current work in social psychology in particular regard to theories of dialogism and polyphony.

Even though she is not advocating for the abandonment of individuated cultures, Benhabib maintains that the solid connection to *something*, as Kompridis maintains, operates within more of a "...framework of family resemblances" (Benhabib, 2005, p. 385), a statement she credits Wittgentstein with, rather than as an inflexible or impermeable entity. She aspires to a narrative view of culture where the essence of a undercurrent of culture can be recognized but allows the

"radical hybridity and polyvocality" (ibid., p. 384) to emerge. Yet are not the temporal and spatial places in which man is so entangled still a product of the work people do interactionally about them?

3.3b Mitigated Holistic Sociological Constructivism

> If the conceptual limitations of the essentialist view of culture are such that it is incapable of understanding and explaining cultural change, the conceptual limitations of the anti-essentialist view of culture are such that it is incapable of understanding and explaining cultural continuity.
>
> (Kompridis, 2005, p. 320)

This statement is a good summation of the acknowledgement that a set of (however variable they may be) principal ideologies exist which are attributable to each named cultural group and yet they cannot account for all conclusive manifestations of culture per se. Indeed, in a rejoinder to Benhabib, Kompridis advocates for a concept of culture which "is independent of essentialist and anti-essentialist frameworks and their respective limitations (2006, p. 390). Neither of these concepts should be held in authoritative independence of one another.

Reynolds asserts that "despite a seemingly shared culture, humans give different meanings to actions that, on the surface, look identical" (1992, p. 640). As the data will show, even shared terms and understandings about place, context, etc are quite variable. In his study of cultures, Hofstede impressively catalogued five cultural dimensions of more than 70 countries (1980) and these "mean scores based on self-ratings are routinely compared across cultural boundaries and it is implicitly assumed that the central tendency of those self-ratings reflects cultural characteristics" (Fischer, 2006, p. 1419). However, the questions remain, are these assumingly-shared dimensions reflections of a surrounding culture and are they truly representative of an individual's own personally-held value system

(Fischer, 2006)? Fischer claims that "...there is at best a weak relationship between self-referenced ratings and ratings focusing on the group or typical members of the group" (2006, p. 1420). Additionally, although Mason is referring to the diversity of American culture, the same principles can essentially be more broadly applied:

> ...the inconsistency of behaviour standards among diverse aspects of the culture, and by the differences in sub cultural manifestations according to sect, social class, and geographic region...[ensure that]...no contact situation is all or even a representative cross-section of...culture offered.
>
> (Mason, 1955, p. 1275)

Understanding this it is more likely that we can hope to learn merely the substrata of culture; the possibilities are infinite and cannot be terminally catalogued. When accounting for the disparity between the whole and the sum of its parts, something must also account for the changes in those ideologies and value systems; an interception of time and place. Kompridis has suggested that an approach to culture as "happily holistic and historicist" (2005, p. 324) is necessary:

> ...we have to accept that for the concept of culture to have a domain to which it can be meaningfully applied, that domain must display a sufficient *degree* of continuity and stability –continuity and stability enough to fall under its concept, to be identified as such. The identity of whatever falls under such concepts can be weak, complex, internally heterogeneous, open to change, and so on; but it must *also* be minimally identical with itself to be identified *as* itself. Thus what we are need of is a weakly holistic concept of culture that incorporates both the identity *and* non-identity of culture with itself.
>
> (ibid., p. 324)

Perhaps Kompridis' statement can be understood better when we consider individual cultures as idiosyncratic combinations of internally-constituted contradictions. What I mean is that each culture is comprised of social objects which are produced by members within. These individuals are equally able to be similar as well as contradict one another. This concurrent shared similarity and contradiction among people in a culture is a reflection of the each individual

person's own simultaneous continuity as well as contradiction. As the people from within these different groupings interact with one another, they produce collections of similarities and contradictions which are unique; producing different cultures. This process is constant, in flux and evolving.

Considering the inclusion of 'historicist' in a concept of culture, the issue of change as inevitable includes the presupposition of the passage of time. Therefore in establishing a conception, what is known or represented as the past of a culture, what is understood to be the present and what is anticipated by those in the present to be the future must be incorporated. This collection of ideas (what the past was and its influence on how the present is viewed) is relative to each person –and, furthermore, different yet again to the collective as a whole. This distinction was made by Ingold in which he defined two approaches to the past: historical and memorable; where history lies behind us and memory remains with us (1986, p. 202).

Therefore, what is being suggested now through this work is a concept of culture whereby producers of cultural information are creating culture based upon their relationship with the present as it has been influenced by the past; acquired through both lived experience or representations of others' lived experiences. This is combined with receivers of cultural information, which is *also* coloured by their understanding of the present as generated by the past. Although this 'production' of culture assumes a super-ordinate set of ideologies (only partially shared with other members), producers and receivers of this cultural information are free to construct and interpret it in any way they choose. Change the

combination of producers and receivers in any way and an infinite number of new products are possible. Thus while essences of 'something familiar' may surface, they do so unpredictably.

This is an important distinction because it accounts for the changes in culture. It is not merely the chronicling of events but the associated sensibilities of people in relation to those events in their subsequent re-telling as history later on.

Culture seems to correspond to both a practical and discursive subjective meaning (Ingold, 1986, p. 294). Essentially culture and the person are mutually constitutive. Furthermore this activity is embedded within an omni-present set of time-place contingencies.

The message seems to be that we can only understand culture as any one person makes it relevant in their accounts and it is impossible for man or those studying him to 'detangle' him from his location[23]. Therefore, we need to take at face value what that person says about culture –implicitly and explicitly- for we are not in a position to verify or contest what they make culture to be. To redirect the focus back to the overall goal of this work, I wish to introduce the idea of culture as a practically *occasioned* (Hester & Eglin, 1997) meaning-making.

I am looking at how culture is used and arises through situated discourse activity in the identity work of people talking about living abroad. It is a concept of culture with which we can see how each person employs their concept of culture

[23] Location is considered here to be a dialogical position as the dissertation focuses on the construction of identity through talk.

(the affiliations they find relevant in their accounts) and their collective (co-participant) construction of culture.

As I have argued up to this point, a logical place to start looking at acculturation is to view it as a context in which a certain type of socialization is occurring and to see what is produced through that process.

3.4 Acculturation as Socialisation

What is of particular interest to me is the 'continuity and change in the reconstruction of socialization practices in new contexts…' (Pels & De Haan, 2007, p. 71). Although I am referring to socialization here in a discussion about acculturation, it needs to be said that they are two "theoretically distinct constructs" (Reynolds, 1992, p. 639); socialization is the development of an initial world view which is a life-long process proceeding in stages. Acculturation, on the other hand, is a venue where that world view (what has been developed up to that point) is *assumed* and tested in further social encounters with others who have their *own* world views. However, that is not to say that one's worldview cannot change through exposure to alternative ones. This may manifest in a variety of ways. For example, that acculturation (or re-socialisation) takes place only in isolated domains in which acculturating people are predominately negotiating their day-to-day activities.

3.5 Formulation of the problem

The preconceived notions of what a country and its people are like are the only resources one has to start with. They are all one has in their attempt to begin to

acculturate (even predeparture). Indeed, this was Schutz's interest in concentrating on the "situation of approaching which precedes every possible social adjustment" (1944, p. 499) and how that action affected subsequent outcomes. This is an important distinction because it highlights the fact that people conduct mental planning prior to certain pursuits.

As I mentioned previously, people who will become expatriates generally undertake preparations, indeed formulate plans, for their sojourn. Planning is, I dare say, a universal practice. According to Leudar and Costall there are two modes of action: "situated and improvised...[or]...planned and then executed mechanically" (1996, p. 154). In regards to these two modes or action, debate has ensued as to planning methodologies for action people employ and if any one of these is more advantageous than the other (for detailed account of this debate see Leudar & Costall, 1996).

It is not to say that the planning people do interferes or specifically dictates what they do, but that these plans "alter and modulate peoples' orientation to the environment" (ibid., p. 159). Afterall, one can not foresee all contingencies possible in the planning phase; although contingency planning certainly exists. But of the person preparing to go into a foreign environment, what is known of such contingencies? Even with the help of intercultural trainings, books and the like, what can be said of these 'planning resources' in conjunction with the interpretive scheme of any one individual? Add into that any prior experiences they have had in the country of destination or perhaps with people from that

country? It seems, based upon these examples, that planning, as Leudar and Costall assert is a situated action accomplished dialogically (1996).

In the case of this study's population, expatriates, I will show with the help of the data how people made plans or conceptions about how life will be in that culture. What normally follows is a discussion of how, in light of new experiences and information, those plans were inadequate because of all the missing information attainable only after the execution of the plan objective; i.e. the move. What occurs here is an interesting construction of the past with its relevance to the here and now. But when they need improvising, they are then on foreign territory and all resources available to them normally are no longer there; their interpretive schemes not always sufficient.

Through their narratives people are seen bouncing back and forth between what they thought was and what they see now. Particularly in the case where they had been to the UK before as an exchange student or on holiday or maybe a native from here, they brought with them this previous knowledge which somehow no longer fits with what they are experiencing. Their plans need to be improvised and they are seen doing so in the situated action of a reflexive interview as they are being asked to account (either by themselves, their partners or the interviewer) for their interpretations and representations of those experiences.

However, this knowledge of acquaintance (James, 1890) is a corpus comprised of abstract ideas which have not yet been empirically (Schutz, 1944) verified through practical use in the social. Furthermore, it was, to a great extent,

acquired through the employment of stereotypes, mutations or other extractions from within a familiar context; through 'recipes' (Schutz, 1944, p. 501) of interpretation which are possibly incompatible with those of the context about which the interpretation is about.

This is the point of departure for problems between acculturation of behaviour and acculturation of thought. If one can maintain the knowledge which is 'insulated' (Schutz, 1944, p. 503); it can neither be verified nor falsified by responses of the members of the receiving/majority/host group. However, when preconceived ideas begin to be challenged by experience, a threat to that assumed knowledge base arises and then the individual finds themselves suddenly alone and now ill-equipped.

Park makes the assertion that the more profound effect of cross culturalization is not the breaking of 'conventional modes of action' but a releasing of the 'inhibitions of conventional modes of thought' (1928, p. 887).

3.6 Framing the problem of acculturation as a member's phenomenon

As I mentioned above, the phenomenon of globalization requires a re-evaluation of how we orient our studies of acculturation. In the previous section, I mentioned that acculturation is not being viewed as a linear progression with fixed points of departure and arrival. After all, if we consider the perspective that acculturation is on-going and, in a way, universal through globalisation, then it is possible to assume that we have been acculturating all along and for those who acculturation experience is intensified through longer sojourns abroad, that

experience can begin prior to physical departure through the formulating ideas about the move, preparations undertaken and so on.

Therefore, I am turning the focus away from previous literature which focused upon *outcomes* of cross-cultural contact and toward cross-cultural-contact *in action*. This perspective assumes constitutes and is constituted by *people*. What is culture, a man-made phenomenon (Triandis, 1980), if not a meaning-making process which is negotiated through communication? Thus I am presenting a concept of culture where it is what people make it to be and how its inception and subsequent evolution is subject to the discourses within, between and around it.

> ...people are not passive recipients of a reified entity called culture. Rather, people play an active role in making and remaking culture...and [are] subject to the intentional causal intervention in the world, subject to the possibility of a reflexive monitoring of that intervention.
>
> (Ratner, 2000, p. 413)

Therefore, I am trying to 'grasp and characterize the meaning-making process of a social group' (Akkerman, Admiraal, Simons & Niessen, 2006, p. 468) and more specifically, the social group of acculturating sojourners. Furthermore, by doing so drawing 'attention to human practices [which] highlight how [culture] is at the same time real and constructed, simultaneously independent and full of human agency' (Roepstorff & Bubandt, 2003, p. 9). As I highlighted above, acculturation is assumed, in part, to be where an individual is 'participating as a cultural member' and this is manifestly done through language (Bhatia, 2002; Sandikci, Ekici & Tari, 2006). This is seen, for example, in the way an individual formulates their identity by using a place term (such as naming a country or

region where they grew up) in attempting to express where they are now being the result of where they have come from.

Therefore, the charge is to understand the *meaning-making* of acculturation empirically from those who *make the meaning.* Recently, a few scholars have approached this challenge and begun studying acculturation as a dialogical process (see Sandikci, Ekici & Tari, 2006; Bhatia & Ram, 2001; Bhatia, 2002). The view here is that negotiation and renegotiation of acculturation is a 'dialogical process that involves a constant moving back and forth between incompatible cultural positions' (Bhatia, 2002, p. 57) and that these negotiations are 'being undertaken on several fronts: home, language, customs, food, and so on' (Bhatia & Ram, 2001, p. 305).

My goal is to show this 'moving back and forth' of acculturation as active discursive identity work which is negotiated locally in the construction and co-construction of narratives about experiences the participants chose to disclose in a conversation about their lives as expats. Acculturation is, then, the particular alignments members make to various points about *life in a foreign country* as they see relevant and how they interpret these issues. The very contingencies which members make relevant in the story-telling based in an 'interview' context are representations of acculturation by acculturating people. Therefore, acculturation is understood as a *member's phenomenon* as reported by members. I am not offering a "theoretical view" (Eglin & Hester, 2003, p. 4) of acculturation but:

> ...aim to discover *what* [acculturation is] *as far as members involved in telling its story [are] concerned*...the 'facts'...what its consequences are...are matters

> for members, and therefore discoverable in their orientations to and treatments of them.
>
> (ibid., 2003, p. 4 my emphasis)

3.7 Chapter summary

I have presented how acculturation is a topic of interest across domains and that much of the historical as well as current scholarship across those domains as well as in psychology assumes concepts of personhood and culture which are in some way isolated from others.

I have argued that this perspective is problematic as it provides an incomplete understanding of the mutual constitution of self and culture. I aim to rectify these oversights through this research by using the mediated action of people in talk as my unit of analysis. In doing so, I advocate a position in which acculturation is viewed solely as a members' phenomenon rather than being embedded in any theory of acculturation resulting in a mere adding and subtracting of cultural attributes.

Chapter Four

Self as polyphonic discursive presentation in situated narrative activity

"The Thou is older than the I"

Freidrich Nietzsche

4.0 Chapter introduction

There has been a long history in the areas of psychology and philosophy of endorsing a particular idea about the self and what it means to be a person. It is a distinction between whether or not our minds and bodies are separate. In some circles this could be formulated as whether or not people are comprised of a body and a soul where the belief is that the soul is separate and lives on in some form long after the body ceases to. However, this working concept of self –removed from any religious underpinnings- arose from the French Philosopher Descartes' now famous declaration of, "'Cogito, ergo sum' (I think, therefore I am)" (Hermans & Kempen, 1993, pg.1).

In social psychology and indeed other disciplines (Hermans & Kempen, 1993), the contemporary trend in conceptualizing the psychological self has attempted to distance it from the long-pervasive Cartesianism (Hermans, Kempen & van Loon, 1992); a concept of self which "suppos[es] highly centralized ego in full control of its own thoughts…" (Hermans & Kempen, 1993, p. 29). This shift has been one in which the focus upon consciousness as the central location of identity has been reoriented toward a focus on language where "conscious

subjectivity (the *I* aware of itself) is not seen as given at the outset of human condition, but as constituted only in and through language" (ibid., p. 31).

Yet, even in their vehement opposition toward a Cartesian concept of self and an orientation upon subjectivity as constituted in and through language which means the inclusion of others in our self constitution; scholars attempting to bridge the gap between a self and others continue to distinguish between the personal and the social –or put another way they inevitably separate a person's agentive self from the fragmented social selves.

The problem with a Cartesian conception of self and furthermore the problem with distinguishing between the personal and the social is that these ideas do not allow for an accounting of how culture, changing culture, can enter the space of a person. Therefore for the purposes of this study, I need a concept of self which can account for acculturation –a real phenomena which I have documented through the review of literature and which is evident in the data presented in this thesis.

I will go about trying to solve these problems of self by developing a concept of self which does not treat the personal and social as separate but as mutually constitutive and dialogical. With this concept of self I will then go on to discuss my understanding about acculturation through members' accounts of their experiences. These accounts will be obtained through narrative biographical interviews. This approach is based upon narrative psychology which investigates the role of narrative in the maintenance of self. Narrative is a pragmatic activity

of people which enables them to manage their identity through time. As Schiffrin states, "analysis of the language of stories shows how they reveal aspects of the story-tellers' agentive and epistemic selves" (1996, p. abstract). These activities are discursive tools; dialogical in nature and socially reflexive. I propose narrative to be a type of symbolic social representation (Marková, 2006) of self which is manifested from "interdependencies between socially and individually shared knowledge" (Marková, 2000a, Abstract).

As a result of these reflexive exchanges of 'knowledge', the mutual constitution and re-constitution of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity result in a triadic movement (Marková, 2000b, p.112) where participants and context change as a result of being part of an inter-related system without losing their individuality (ibid.) and where new objects of social knowledge (including the self) arise out of the process. This approach to the study of narratives assumes a *Bakhtinan* 'Dialogical Epistemology' (Marková, 2000b) which looks at "how people bridge their subjective worlds with others" (Murakami, 2003, p. 233) through conversational story-telling.

In my discussion about the pragmatics of narrative language, I will draw upon two psychologists William James and George Herbert Mead (Leudar & Thomas, 2000) and they ways in which they tackled the problems of managing "continuity, unity and identity" (ibid., p. 91) of self. Bakhtin and theory spawned from this polyphonic take on narrative such as Hermans' 'Dialogical Self' will be discussed.

The premise for this chapter and its implications for the remainder of this thesis is that inter-subjectivity, "the situation in which, through their mutual relations, numerous (or just two) subjects form a society or community or a common field and can speak of 'us'" (Coelho & Figueiredo, 2003, p. 196) -a feature of human communication, is situated in social interaction and is modulated by cultural constraints (Murakami, 2003,p. 234). Seeing inter-subjectivity in action can yield understanding of how people go about the process of negotiating their subjectivity reflexively in an acculturative context. This chapter provides the theoretical underpinnings for the ways in which the data will be understood empirically. Later in the methodology and analytical chapters, the means by which these phenomena can be seen empirically will be discussed and shown. It is a discussion which begins over the philosophy of subjectivity and ends with the philosophy of Language; the notable paradigm shift in the twentieth-century which endorses a position that only the study of language can manage a study of inter-subjectivity properly (Zahavi, 2006, p. 156).

4.1 Chapter overview

I begin the chapter by providing a concept of self with a brief distinction between the "philosopher's" concept of self which is seen as an agentive, reflexive and continuous (Harré, 1991, p. 51) entity with a sense of permanency through time and a conception of a self which is socially-situated and manages fragmentation through dialogical activity. I progress then to highlighting attributes of narrative which will lead into a discussion about what narrative can tell us about the self.

This perspective in studying the psychology of people has seen an upsurge during the past decade (Hermans & Kempen, 1993). Narrative and the study of it as an activity of mind is not a new academic interest. The study of narrative accounts from acculturating people and their use of language in their work to weave continuity of self with analytical attention to the polyphonic quality of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity, however, is a new approach of the narrative psychological framework in this context.

4.2 Subjectivity, inter-subjectivity and dialogism

As I briefly introduced above, narrative is an organizing principle of self and is done in an effort to address the life-long implicit question: *who am I*? Before I can address the means through which we attempt to answer this rhetorical question I would like to first discuss briefly how we come to the question in the first place. In my endorsement of a non-Cartesian self, I wish to highlight the pervasive problem which confronts scholars writing on this subject; namely even in the best attempts to explain personhood as an intact whole, the personal and the social in the conceptions of self are often still in the end somehow treated as unique entities and endorse (perhaps unintentionally) a Cartesian conception.

For example, in his work on narrative, Sarbin (2000) claims that we are all engaged in the implicit and sometimes explicit answering of the question of '*who am I*'? However, rather than assuming that who I am is constituted by both social as well as physical components –and it can be argued as I will do in a moment that physical components can in many ways also be social- he separates the self into components and refers to *them* (i.e. more than one thing) as social identity

and human identity (ibid.). Now Sarbin did not intend to try and develop a theory of the conception of psychological self per se in the manner of Harré or Marková. He was more interested in looking at the way narrative is used to unify the self.

It is not necessary to argue here that the self is fragmented. The debate is whether or not there is some *part* of self which is comprised of a collection of 'identity characteristics' which remain relatively fixed and each unique collection of these belongs only to one individual in the world (Scheibe, 1995, p. 1). What Scheibe refers to as the 'being' (1995) which is 'transcultural and persistant' (Sarbin, 2000) through time; are suggested as figurative 'coordinates' which act as a means by which we can re-orient ourselves toward in times of change (Scheibe, 1995). Harré refers to this as the 'managing self' (1991) and states that this conceptualization is often taken for granted (ibid.).

However, even with these physical identity markers such as reddish-brown hair, the freckle over my left eye and numerous other features which I recognize as belonging to me when I look in the mirror, they are not necessarily all private ideas or things which are known only unto me but visible, recognizable and possibly shared by others. My hair might be reddish-brown 'naturally' but social factors have influenced my deciding to get blonde highlights –be it out of a social conception that blonde is preferred or to hide the coming grey because elements associated with youth, e.g. absence of grey hair, should be preserved. Many things which are considered physical are still social objects which are affected by the meaning being given to them between people and may even move people to

alter what is physical. Thus, the conception of a part of self which is trans-cultural and persistent is still open to social factors.

This thesis is looking at how a person's conception of self in the context of a foreign environment is a personal matter which is highly indexical, socially contingent and malleable and "...how that emergence [of a sense of self may be different from that of the previous moment] is supported by social others" (Dodds et al., 1997, p. 484). A comprehensive review of theorists who endorse a dualism in contrast to those who try and eliminate personal agency (Dodds et al., 1997) will not be addressed here. Regardless of which theory of self constitution is endorsed, the goal is to explain "how the gap between self and other can be reduced" (Marková, 2003b, p. 250).

There has been a recent upsurge in theorizing the necessity of "recognizing otherness in the constitution of self" (Coelho & Figueiredo, 2003, p. 194). In this next section I discuss in greater detail a theoretical position on the constitution of self which is part and parcel to that of others first from the perspective of two pragmatic psychologists William James and George Herbert Mead and then move into contemporary scholarship which has extended the work of James and Mead.

The current doctrine is that the unities of personhood which we present (Harré, 1991) *arise* (Dodds et al., 1997 citing Mead, 1910) out of the social as opposed to being agentive *creations* (ibid.). Yet even this idea which privileges language and the space between people with the ontology of self still presents a problem.

The assertion that there is no *self* as a private, unique entity until significant amount of exchange in the person's environment is the current constructionist trend (Harré, 1991) but how do these countless interactions translate into personhood –a unique identity with agentive qualities? A person is both a social object and an agent who affects their social environment; not social objects without agency nor are they non-social agents. When a person is seen as a social object it is not as a passive social object but rather one with agency and when a person acts on the social it is as a social agent, not an autistic.

Social constructionists endorse a concept of personhood which is comprised of both socially-cultivated properties as well as agentive characteristics, otherwise known as subjectivity, which are put forth through the use of pronouns (Marková, 2006). Although it is often suggested that the individual has simultaneously personal and socio-cultural attributes (Marková, 2000b, p. 110), there is still a significant scholarship in the field of theory and psychology which suffers from an inability to produce sound concepts of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity ontogeny which do not inevitably split the individual and society into separate ontological units (ibid.; Dodds et al., 1997).

To elucidate theory on the constitution of self, I draw upon the work of William James and George Herbert Mead whose work, although considered historical accounts of psychology of the Self are still very relevant today. Although much of the current scholarship on dialogical conceptions of self focus on Mead because of his primary focus on the social nature of consciousness (Murakami, 2003), his work was preceded and influenced by William James.

William James set out to account for the contradictions and incongruencies of singular, unified self which are of the non pathological variety (Leudar & Thomas, 2000). He considered the self as "a multifaceted phenomenon [exhibiting]... 'rivalry and conflict of the different selves'" (James, 1890, p. 309, cf. Hermans & Kempen, 1993, p. 33) and explained the ways in which the "voices of self are situated in between the internal –i.e. personal- and external – i.e. cultural realms" (Josephs, 2002, p. 170).

> What the particular perversions of the bodily sensibility may be, which give rise to these contradictions [in the unity of me], is for the most part impossible for a sound-minded person to conceive.
> (James, 1890 cf. Leudar & Thomas, 2000, p. 91)

According to Hermans and Kempen, James created a conception of self which made the distinction between "the self-as-knower (or self as subject) and the self-as-known (or the self as object)" (1993, p. 44). However, not all commentators on James endorse the idea of his conception of self being a *dualist* one. As Hermans and Kempen as well as Josephs present it here, these voices of self are situated in a psychological space yet as Leudar and Thomas (2000) argue, the self, according to James, extends beyond the body of a person through their possessions and the recognition by others to whom one considers themselves belonging. The self is social in the recognition which one obtains from others in through their interactions. As such, the self-as-knower and the self-as-known are not separate but simply different aspects of the same person.

In practical terms the focus is upon the distinction between '*I*' and '*Me*', respectively. The 'I' is the agent which engages in social activities as the representative all the aspects of the 'Me' and is "continuously organiz[ing] and

interpret[ing] experience in a purely subjective manner" (Hemans & Kempen, 1993, p. 44); i.e the 'I' is managing the narrative of the self in which it is the author of the story about 'Me' (Hermans, Rijks & Kempen, 1993). I will return to how the 'I' participates in social activities and narration shortly.

James' conception of 'Me' is exponentially more complex. Leudar and Thomas elaborate upon James' conception of the empirical self (2000) which consists of a 'Material self', 'Social self' and 'Spiritual self'. Hermans and Kempen paraphrase James; the empirical self:

> ...in its broadest sense is described as all that a person can call his or her own, 'not only his body and his psychic powers, but his clothes and his house, his wife and his children, his ancestors and friends, his reputation and works, his lands and horses, and yacht and bank account
> (Hermans & Kempen, 1993, p. 44)

According to Barresi what James means with this statement is that "'they give him the same emotions. If they wax and prosper, he feels triumphant; if they dwindle and die away, he feels cast down, -not necessarily in the same degree for each thing, but in much the same way for all'" (2002, p.239 cf. James, 1890, p. 291-292). However, the above summation by Hermans and Kempen, while drawing from James' own words, does not explain significantly enough the social and spiritual selves. James' social self relies upon "the recognition which he gets from his mates" (Leudar & Thomas, 2000, p. 92). There is an important distinction here in that this recognition needs to come from not just anyone but from "'...distinct *groups of persons about whose opinion he cares*'" (ibid., p. 93, original emphasis) –a stance slightly different than that of Mead's 'Generalized Other' (ibid., p. 92). This ability to take on the role of the other (those of whose opinion he cares), means a self which "has the capacity of 'taking the role of the other' accounts for the fact that the perspective of the other can be incorporated

into the self, so that it becomes an integral part of the self" (Hermans & Kempen, 1993, p. 45).

This is a "sense of self [which] is experienced in relation to an audience, whether it is real or imaginary, and not in isolation. There are a host of significant others who may be considered while experiencing the self" (Chaudhary, 2003, p. 474). This audience can be likened with James' 'tribunals' (Leudar & Thomas, 2000, p. 93) whereby the social selves are not static but are "distinguished between *actual* and *potential*" selves –the latter of these being attributed to ideals (ibid., p. 93) held within a cultural realm. This is important to understand because it accounts for how changes in the self occur. Combined with our reflections and memories, the ability of the self to be reflexive allows "the present 'I' [to possibly] become a 'me' (or 'not me') in the future, and the present 'me' (or 'not me') [may have] formerly been an 'I'" (ibid., p. 95).

Hermans (2002) speaks metaphorically regarding the diversity of all that constitutes the self as a 'society of mind'. Like a society, "the self is involved in oppositions, agreements, disagreements, contradictions, negotiations and integrations" (ibid., p. 148). As James asserts, we collect the different aspects of our social self through the recognition of others (Leudar & Thomas, 2000), those aspects of self "reflect the varieties in a person's social engagements…the discontinuities in me partly reflect the discontinuities in my social life" (ibid., p. 93).

In the self's effort to present itself as a unitary and recognizable entity, only aspects of self which can aid in this endeavour are presented at any one given opportunity. James notes:

> With most objects of desire physical nature restricts our choice to but one of many represented goods, and even so it is here. I am often confronted by the necessity of standing by one of my empirical selves and relinquishing the rest.
> (James 1890, p. 309, cf. Chaudhary, 2003, p. 472)

Leudar and Thomas suggest that this understanding can be considered in contemporary terms as selves which are socially-situated (2000). These social selves are contingent upon the indexical nature of social activities.

James places the responsibility of a presentation of continuity of self with the spiritual self (Leudar & Thomas, 2000). For James the spiritual self is a private (Chaudhary, 2003) and "most enduring and intimate part of self" (Leudar & Thomas, 2000, p. 94) and not social whereas for Mead, the reflexivity of self is always socially mediated.

Although James accounts for the contradictions in personhood as a result of those sometimes conflicting social associations, he maintained that privately, i.e. *in thought*, self 'is sensibly continuous' (Leudar & Thomas, 2000, p. 94). According to Knowles and Sibicky:

> James argued that each thought, as it emerges, has a tacit awareness and ownership of the previous thoughts. Thus, what is constant and unifying in the stream of consciousness is each thought's implicit attachment to the previous ones. This continuity provides the basis for the sense of a unifying self: Each thought has the same directory of past identities, actions, and thoughts as its predecessor.
> (1990, p. 677)

It is this "passing thought [which] is itself the thinker" (Barresi, 2002, p. 237) and is ipso facto the knower of itself. The *self-as-knower* endowed with the

distinction of 'I' has the ability to look introspectively at reflections and memories as well as its current activities and determine whether or not they are 'me' or 'not me' (Leudar & Thomas, 2000, p. 95) or *self-as-known*. Therefore social selves' engagement in social activities with others and the simultaneous ability of the spiritual self of introspection of those activities and/or memories of earlier activities makes the social and spiritual self socially reflexive (ibid.). For James, the self as reflexive is both a 'spiritual' as well as a social matter (ibid.).

In his thesis, James (1890) is able to account for conflict among the parts of self (Hermans & Kempen, 1993) yet maintain its conceptual wholeness along the way. As Hermans and Kempen highlight, James says: "As a man I pity you, but as an official I must show you no mercy; as a politician I regard him as an ally, but as a moralist I loathe him" (1993, p. 114 cf. James, 1890, p. 295). Hermans and Kempen highlight this particular quote as noteworthy as they suggest that, in contrast to Mead's position on the ontology of self, James' view on self is dialogical.

> First, an individual person is speaking. The person has a voice and is expressing an utterance. Second, although the person uses the pronoun *I*, he or she is expressing the viewpoint of a group and, in Mead's terms, takes the attitude of a generalized other (e.g. as a politician, as a moralist) Third, the voices involved are in a relationship of disagreement. Two collective attitudes, coming together in the mind of the individual person, conflict with one another. Fourth, from the present perspective the most significant word in the utterance is the word *but*. This word reveals that the person is *actively relating* the two attitudes to one another. There are not simply two different statements from two unrelated persons (one from a politician, the other from a moralist). On the contrary, the two opinions are concentrated in the mind of a self-reflecting person and brought in a relation of opposition to each other. The term *but* indicates that the two attitudes function as voices that stand in a relationship of "dialogical opposition" toward one another. This dialogical opposition implies that the two voices, in their disagreement, entertain mutual relationships having the quality of an exchange.
>
> (1993, p. 114)

Mead's focus concerns the role of social forces in the constitution of the self. This included an attention toward the ways in which the cultural formulation of self evolved and how this takes place through forms of social interaction – namely through vocal communication. This latter point was of particular interest to Mead because through the use of a voice which both the self and other hear and have access to, arises the ability for the self to react to itself, i.e. the origin of reflexivity. Although Mead does maintain "the distinction between 'self as subject' and 'self as object'" (Hermans & Kempen, 1993, p. 102), this distinction does not mean they are separate objects opposite one another but rather he is concerned with the integration of the two. The human self is a particular object which can be an object to its self as well as to others. Therefore, Mead's conception of the 'generalized other' in looking at the "social origin of self-directed thought and self-consciousness" (Dodds et al., 1997, p. 485) where the individual and society are a single ontological unit (ibid.; Marková, 2000b) is the greater focus of his theory. However, contrary to Hermans and Kempen's assertion that Mead's position is not dialogical, Perinbanayagam (1975) and Leudar and Thomas (2000) point out that Mead's "'I' and 'me'...were not presented...as a dualism; they stood in a dialectic relationship –the 'me' responds to the actions of the 'I', the 'I' responds to the attitudes of the 'me', and both change in the process" (p. 101). In fact Mead focused upon "the self as a means of social control over an individual" (Leudar & Thomas, 2000, p. 99) –a self constituted by and through interaction with others; resulting in a self emerging out of dialogical tension between self and 'other' whereby the self is able to see others, interact with them and import aspects of them into itself.

Leudar and Thomas (2000) explain Mead's declaration in which individual selves are selves because there are others; distinguishing between consciousness and self-consciousness is the result of an embodied, non-Cartesian self in which the "reflexivity of consciousness develops as a consequence of the individuals involvement in social activities" (p. 99); a self which is socially-reflexive and thus dialogical.

However, others with whom the individual is involved in social activities vary between James and Mead. As I mentioned above, James does not "totalise the social self" (Leudar & Thomas, 2000) in such a conception of other whereas Mead, "with this term refers to the organized community or social group which gives an individual a 'unity of self'; the attitude of the generalized other is the attitude of the entire community" (Hermans & Kempen, 1993). The concept of 'other' in Mead's terms "is the social psychological form in which social structure is articulated and has been given expression in many categories" (Perinbanayagam, 1975, p. 501). Furthermore, "it appears as the attitude of the community in direct or indirect manifestation, as an instrument of the social control of the self" (ibid., p. 508).

The social processes of the community become a part of each individual - whether or not there has actually been any interaction. As there are countless groups in society, the possibility of countless 'generalized others' exists. For each person, the multiplicity of generalized others go on to produce selves with their own unique collectivity of generalized others.

From this point of view, the individual and society are in mutual adjustment to one another (Marková, 2000b, p. 111) and it is this way from the very beginning of a person's life. Dodds et al. (1997, p. 487cf. Mead, 1908) quote Mead stating, "the effect of every adaptation is a new environment which must change with that which responds to it." This *theory of internalization* (Hermans & Kempen, 1993) has been criticized (see Taylor, 1991 cf. ibid.) as suggesting that this account of self "...allows only for organisms reacting to environments" (Taylor, 1991, p. 313 cf. Hermans & Kempen, 1993, p. 107).While the use of this quote from Mead may suggest a constitution of culture, inter-subjectivity and subjectivity as something which *happens* to agents, this is not a fair nor complete representation of Mead's position.

But what can account for individuation? Mead attempts to address this by assigning, in mirrored contrast to James (Hermans & Kempen, 1993) the responsibility of continuity of self to the 'Me' while claiming that the 'I' is the source of innovation. As the generalized other provides the 'Me' with its "social rules and conventions" (ibid., p. 107) he says *in some cases* the 'I' is "impulsive" (ibid., p. 108). Hermans and Kempen quote Mead:

> Impulsive conduct is uncontrolled conduct. The structure of the "me" does not there determine the expression of the "I". If we use a Freudian expression, the "me" is in a certain sense a censor. It determines the sort expression which can take place, sets the stage, and gives the cue. In the case of impulsive conduct this structure of the "me" involved in the situation does not furnish to any such degree this control. Take the situation of self-assertion where the self simply asserts itself over against others, and suppose that the emotional stress is such that the forms of polite society in the performance of legitimate conduct are overthrown, so that the person expresses himself violently. There the "me" is determined by the situation. There are certain recognized fields within which an individual can assert himself, certain rights which he has within these limits. But let the stress become too great, these limits are not observed, and an individual asserts himself in perhaps a violent fashion. Then the "I" is the dominant element over against the a "me"
>
> (1993, pg. 108 cf. Mead, 1934, pg. 210)

For the most part, however, the "I" acts in an *intentional* way. For an active conception of subjectivity, significant resources are required from which the "I" can select the linguistic forms to express these intentions. Possible sources are what Bakhtin refers to as *social languages* and *speech genres*. Social languages are a discourse which is specific to any part of a given society at any time (Wertsch, 1991, p. 57). Speech genres are "decontextualised mediational means" (Wertsch, 1991; pg. 39 cf. Wertsch, 1985) linguistic units where "there is nothing in the form, such as the appearance of a different dialect or vocabulary, or the use of a unique tense and aspect forms, that distinguishes one social language from another" (ibid., p. 60). Examples of these, according to Wertsch, include: military commands; everyday genres of greetings, farewells and congratulation; salon conversations about everyday social, aesthetic, and other subjects; genres of table conversation; intimate conversations among friends; and everyday narration (ibid., p. 60). I shall go into greater detail about *social languages* later in the analytical Chapter Eight as I show how these are polyphonic.

Although "the two phenomena and the two sets of criteria may be viewed as analytically distinct...in reality they are often thoroughly intertwined.

> The "I" is the response of the individual to the attitude of the community as this appears in his own experience. His response to that organized attitude in turn changes it. As we have point out, this is a change which is not present in his own experience until after it takes place. The "I" appears in our experience in memory. It is only after we have acted that we know what we have done; it is only after we have spoken that we know what we have said.
>
> (1993, pg. 109 cf. Mead, 1934, pg. 196)

While the word impulsive is more commonly associated with a Leudar and Thomas explain, "Mead [argues] that 'the "I" of the present moment is present in the "me" of the next moment" (2000, p. 100) but that this is only realized upon reflection (ibid.; Hermans & Kempen, 1993).

James had a different view. According to him while people can indeed look retrospectively at positions they took in interaction, they are equally able to do so in the here and now; the person is simultaneously both the knower and the known.

I advocate for the dialogical position where people go about developing the constitution of subjectivity (Murakami, 2003) in which culture is presupposed and inter-subjectivity is part and parcel to any conceptualisation of self (see 2003 Culture & Psychology 9, 3; Marková, 2003b, Abstract). As time goes on and we grow up in an expanding social realm, these encounters serve as the ontologies of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity (Marková, 2003b) both interactionally and as a part of our psychology. In other words 'minds' arise through interaction (Marková, 2009) with other minds.

A conceptual framework which endorses a mutual constitution of self and society is known by many terms such as "'the dialogical self', 'the dialogical turn', 'dialogism'" (Marková, 2009, p. 209). This perspective assumes the ability of an Ego (I, me) to communicate about social realities in terms of the Alter (other, you) (ibid., p. 210). This ontology of the human mind (ibid.) is the product of an irreducible dyad (Marková, 2000; 2003b; 2006; 2009) of self and other. Such

ontology of self takes the position put forth by Mead in which self/other are a single ontological unit, i.e. one exists only through the reciprocal acknowledgement and participation with the other. This position recognizes the "...power of cultural tools to shape [mediated action but recognizes] equally...the role of the active agents who use these cultural tools..." (Wertsch, 1997, p. 6). As Schubert presents, "according to Mead, the structures of 'society' and of the 'self' are founded neither on the mind nor conscious nor on material environmental surroundings or biological conditions, but rather on social action, on the process of symbolic interaction" (2006, p. 52; Murakami, 2003). This anti-cognitivist position removes the idea of a single, autonomous consciousness. As Bakhtin points out through his analysis of the literary works of Dostoyevsky, "'no Nirvana is possible for a single consciousness. A single consciousness is *contradiction in adjecto*'" (Bakhtin, 1973/1984, p. 288 cf. Marková, 2009, p. 211) meaning that consciousness, by definition, is only possible when given to one by another. We are conscious of ourselves because another makes us known unto them. However, Marková states that there is more to the constitution of subjectivity through inter-subjectivity (2003a; 2003b) than what Mead suggests.

For Mead, this reciprocal impact yields a social object which is new in the context within which it arose (Dodds et al., 1997). The resulting newness ipso facto results in the process repeating itself indefinitely. Yet what of the new object which arose through his process? In speaking about a world of social objects of knowledge (Marková, 2009, p. 211), Marková says such a conception requires inclusion of the social object produced in conjunction with the units which were included in its conception. Rather than merely having a 'Ego-Alter'

conception of subjectivity, the equation needs to be a "triadic relation of Ego-Alter-Object" (Marková, 2009, p. 211). As such an Ego and Alter mutually impact one another as well as produce an object from which they are reciprocally impacted in some way. Marková gives an example of the mutual constitution of inter-subjectivity and social objects of knowledge:

> ...the dialogue between political dissidents and the totalitarian government takes place in the public sphere and alters public opinion shaped in that public sphere. The public opinion in turn affects the nature of the dialogue between dissidents and their opponents.
>
> (2006, p.127)

These objects of social knowledge such as those which Marková discusses, produced through the triadic movement, require the participation of two or more 'knowers' whose collective work goes on to produce said object of knowledge. Under this idea the self is also considered an object of knowledge (Marková, 2006, p. 128). This dialogical perspective of the concurrent development of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity accounts for that cultural knowledge each person feels they have and which modulates their interactional activities. Although he is only speaking of 'the stranger' and not the self specifically, Schutz's proposition can applied namely; that people who are born or reared within a locality accept ready-made schemes of interpretation and look for only a certain degree of certainty and truth about what is around them in their perimeter (1944). Their partial scrutiny of objects results in an inconsistent corpus of knowledge; "...at the same time he may consider statements as equally valid which in fact are incompatible with one another" (ibid., p. 501). In other words, Schutz believed that we take on attributes from those around us without much effort or interest to question them. As Marková (2003b, p. 253) states, this is a rather passive concept of communication, and indeed *culture*, in which our

subjectivity is *given* to us in some way. According to Trevarthen; "understanding inter-subjectivity can provide an explanation 'of how human social and cultural knowledge is created, how language serves a culture and how its transmission from generation to generation is secured'" (1992 cf. Marková, 2003b, p. 254). In essence, through an understanding of intersubjectivity we are able to understand how evolution within single cultures takes place. Even those sharing a common culture still encounter strangeness (Marková, 2003b) and this strangeness, rather than being something with which the self fuses together, is something to overpower in its struggle for social recognition (ibid.:p.,255). Marková elaborates:

> The speech of others and their thoughts contain *strangeness*, which the self tries to overpower by imposing its own meaning on the other or to appropriate by making it part of its own thoughts and speech. The constant strife between strangeness of others' thoughts makes communication meaningful and essential to the human condition. There could be no dialogue if participants were not opposed one to another through mutually experienced strangeness, which creates tension between them.
>
> (2003b, p. 257; 2009)

As Marková (2000b) states, people are not only 'certainty-seeking creatures' but are also "self-affirming, self-determining, innovating, imposing their own will on nature and others" (p. 109). This tension between participants and each of their efforts to assert their own meanings explains how people of shared culture exhibit individuality and how culture is fluid and variable as is shown in the data throughout this thesis. Yet how does the self manage this fragmentation and continuous re-orientation?

4.3 Narrative as a metaphor for psychology

Considering the kind of data I am collecting both through my narrative biographical interviews (NBI) and the type of text produced in message boards –

a form of narrative which is something between a spoken and written text, I will now discuss how this particular kind of data is relevant to studying psychology.

Narrative is said to be an "organizing principle" (Sarbin, 1986) for human cognition in which "mundane facts and fantastic creations...[distributed over] time and place" (ibid., p. 9) are brought together. In Lowenthal's terms, "'the sureness of "I was" is a necessary component of the sureness of 'I am'" (1985 found in Wertsch, 1997 p.5). Narrative as a metaphor for psychology has been widely documented (Sarbin, 1986; Hermans & Kempen, 1993). Rather than reducing the phenomena manifested both behaviourally and socially by human beings down to "the play of impersonal forces" (Sarbin, 1986, p. 10), a narrative perspective allows for the accounting of said behaviours and the creation of meaning to lie with the people to whom the making of meaning is of the greatest consequence. These are the narratives for human consciouness (Wertsch, 1997, p .11) which are cultural tools –"produced by a particular set of historical, institutional and cultural forces" (ibid., p. 7) to integrate "persons, actions and events" integrated wholes (ibid., p. 11). As such their structure is highly contingent upon social factors; who is doing the presenting, to whom as well as where the performance is taking place.

Some critics may argue that the analysis of stories yields no significant concrete or objective impetus of psychology or acculturation for that matter. All stories "are compounds of happenings and imaginings" (Sarbin, 1986, p. 12) and there exists a gap in the connections between these items where "creative narrative refinements...[and] enrichments" (Scheibe, 1986, p. 146) are interwoven with

the facts –as they pertain to the person and other stakeholders- to produce an account which "meets one or more tests of coherence" (Sarbin, 1986, p. 12) and which serves to maintain "an acceptable identity" (ibid., p. 17). This *may* at times lead to people re-writing the past "because [they] have found new empirical evidence about it, or because [they have contrived] new ways of thinking and writing about what went on" (Sharrock & Leudar, 2002, p. 98). Although Leudar and Sharrock do not mean to say that this is pervasive, it is one of the possibilities of human reflexivity.

In Ian Hacking's tackling of the conceptual changes in the history of psychiatric disorders (1995), he proposed that a contemporary representation of psychological states –and this can be extended also to events and conditions as well- from the past can, when re-presented with new descriptions which were not available at the time of their occurrence, render the past indeterminate (Hacking, 1995). This suggests that the past can be retrospectively altered (Sharrock & Leudar, 2002). Such a position as that which Hacking takes would, in terms of psychology, render a concept of a historical personhood invalid. What would then be the sense of our narrative activities? If our actions of today will only truly be ascribed intention and meaning in the future, why is it that we undertake activities to ensure a better future and, to secure the future selves we anticipate being? It is true that some of our past actions may *finally be accounted for* through a process of retrospection or may be re-formulated or changed. It is our right as human beings to make the past understandable in terms of today; to make its lessons practical for our contemporary use and what may serve us for our

future. The past and what we take from it is to serve us in some way and we are free to do with it what we like.

People are constantly managing a plurality of *parts of themselves* which move back and forth between the social and private realms of a person as well as the influence other people have on that varying sense of self.

According to Sarbin this narrative activity is done as human being's life-long work to answer the implied question 'Who am I?' (2000, p. 253; Mancuso & Sarbin, 1983) by "organizing episodes, actions, and accounts of actions in time and space… " (Hermans et al., 1992, p. 26-27). This can only be understood when a concept of identity as constituted by two distinct but cooperative constructs is endorsed. According to Chandler (2000) the two constructs of identity represent more of a corpus of variables which are on one hand "transcultural and persistent" (ibid., p. 253) and secondly are "dimensions of self" which are the result of a culmination of factors which are ever subject to change and variation (ibid., p. 253). As I discussed above this is the distinction made between a construct of self as a variable yet recognizable entity and that of a temporally-located set of ideologies or positions which move in and out of view depending upon what the context requires (or which context one or more people are building) –allowing people to employ a collage of subjectivity which suits them best at any given point in interaction. Narrative is a way in which people can organize this complexity in some way resulting in a conception of self which has a narrative structure (Hermans et al., 1993); a metaphoric polyphonic (inter-subjective) novel (ibid.) of selfhood.

William James believed a person possesses as many selves as there are others who will recognize them (1890) and therefore the answering of that question of *who I am* can varying greatly depending on who is doing the asking or, as I will present later in the Methods section, who is doing the *listening* or *reading* of said narrative. Raggatt (2007, p. 359) cites Harré and Slocum (2003, p. 127):

> Positions [a person takes in answering question *who am I*] tend to be situation-specific. Someone may be positioned as 'pathfinder' for just this journey, or 'host' for just this lunch party...Positions are ephemeral. One's rights and duties in the micro-world of small-scale episodes are always changing and shifting focus.

People are therefore assigning and being assigned different positions or selves through categorizations, either assumed or ascribed, all the time. The design and features of the narratives or stories they tell reflect an orientation to whom "the recipient(s) is, to how many of them there are, and who they are to one another and to the teller and what they can (or should) be supposed to know" (Schegloff, 1997a, p. 97).

Social identity is considerably fragmented. The Self we present at any one given time is not in its entirety (Scheibe, 1995) and as I mentioned above, has a lot to do with who is around and what is being accomplished. Furthermore, we are compelled to weave something of coherence out of the threads of possible identities one can assume and to incorporate new information into that fabric. Scheibe refers to this aspect of self as the 'being in place' (1995); a self which is socially malleable and reflexive.

Social psychologists occupy themselves with the paradox (Chandler, 2000; Sarbin, 2000) that human beings are at one point so varied and desire to be

unconstrained in the possibilities of social identity while on the other hand so hard-pressed to maintain some feeling that we are that continuous set of identity characteristics associated to them. This serves as a reminder (and further conviction against a Cartesian conception of self) of the "apparent permanence of self constructions [which arise] from the inescapable premise that selves are embodied, that a space-occupying body is the central reference for constructing inferences about self" (Sarbin, 2000, p. 254). This would be fine and easy to do if it were not for the fact that with the passage of time we are confronted with constant interactions with surrounding others. The passage of time, according to Chandler, is:

> hard at work unravelling the sleeve of whatever sort of identity one has been in the process of carefully knitting up...[while simultaneously] each of us is feverishly at work stitching back together those frayed parts of him- or herself that time as rent asunder.
>
> (2000, p. 212)

How is it that we "can embody both change and permanence simultaneously" (Fraisse, 1963, p. 10 cf. Chandler, 2000, p. 211) through time? This requires an understanding, according to Haber, of a self which is both 'self-identical' (1994 cf. Chandler, 2000, p. 211) and one which has a sort of 'diachronic' structure that allows it to be "identified and re-identified as one and the same through time" (Chandler, 2000, p. 211). Diachronic structure of a person simultaneously accounts for and constitutes a person's position -in interaction, in culture, in the social. What I mean by the diachronicity of personhood is that a person is both the creator of their position as well created *by* it (Leudar, 1991), i.e. the presentation of any given aspect of self in interaction is malleable by the context within which that aspect of self is being presented and vice versa.

According to Leudar, this conception -coordination between a person's thinking and their participation in social interaction, is the result of 'internalized language' (1991, p. 197; Marková, 2006, p. 126). It is a person's own pervasive internal discourse which is at work to determine how and what to present as the self in social interaction. As such, it is as though the various possible positions are in discussion with one another; juxtaposing aspects of the being with aspects of the being-in-place in order to produce that presentation which will be seen by surrounding others as being the coherent entity.

Hermans likens this process to the bringing together of two photographs of the same person which were taken at different points in time (2001a) although the photographs can display changes in physicality, the person is still identifiable as the same one in each photograph. Yet, there needs to be an accompanying narrative about the two photographs to bridge the person of the past photograph with the person of the more recent (and indeed the person of the present) photograph .

One such activity where this *juxtapositioning* management of self can be seen is in autobiographical story-telling. The person as author of their story is able to reconstruct the past in the present with an eye on the future (Sarbin, 1986:18). Murakami (2003) refers to this as 'discursive reconciliation'. Through telling stories, reflecting on the past and its relationship to the present, a person formulates, reformulates, adheres to or maybe abandons their various hypotheses of the world. These hypotheses are what form each person's culturally-bounded 'habitual system of relevance' (Schutz, 1944). In looking at acculturation I intend

to show those habitual systems of relevance being negotiated over time through the extended and temporally-distributed narratives of my participants.

The stories featured in this thesis are mostly recapitulated events from the past – either recent or distant. The form of the historical event, its precise chronology and content, is malleable to allow the possibility of new information in making the event relevant in that new moment of the present. My use of the artistic term *malleable* is on purpose as I intend to say that narrative is, in some way, an art and to re-present stories with new information can be considered a performance in just the same way as a historian or novelist (Sarbin, 1986) does; though their goal toward presenting truth differs semantically (ibid.) their structure is the same (Hermans & Kempen, 1993).

Furthermore as is the case with the story-telling data collected from interviews for this thesis, two of the participants for each 'case' consist of a cohabitating couple, i.e. a family. The implications of this story-telling situation –an interview as a couple about their experiences being expats- upon the formulation of the stories is not just as a result of the performance *for the interviewer* but also for each partner in the couple; the participants tell stories about each other and about themelves *to* themselves and the interviewer.

Reflexive story-telling is an act of *remembering* and remembering "is an authenticating act: rememberers publicly claim to have brought to conscious awareness a state, event, or condition that is real in their eyes; they believe it to be true" (Ochs & Capps, 1997, p. 84). Confirmation, refutation or reformulation

of the remembered state, event or condition by the teller's partner is identity implicative (ibid.).

This is not unlike Goffman's conception of dramaturgy where people occupy metaphoric roles as actors in various performances related to various contexts and Sarbin draws this comparison as well. Another theoretical construct in this vein is Davies, Harré and Van Langenhove's 'Positioning Theory' (Murakami, 2003). Positioning Theory is a way of seeing how people are "located within conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced storylines" (ibid., p. 237). This all supports one of the convictions of discursive psychology and, indeed, this thesis, that language is performative and used to present the self (Goffman, 1959). This last statement is taken from Erving Goffman's conept of 'dramaturgy' in which "the actor evokes in his public a certain image, an impression of himself, by more or less purposefully disclosing his subjectivity" (Wertsch, 1991, pg. 10). As such:

> Each agent can monitor public access to the system of his own intentions, thoughts, attitudes, desires, feelings and the like, to which only he has privileged access...Thus the central concept of *presentation of self* does not signify spontaneous expressive behaviour but stylizing the expression of one's own experience with a view to the audience.
>
> (Goffman, 1959 cf. Wertsch, 1991, pg.10)

Story-telling is a regular activity of people (Sarbin, 1986) and it "gives form to the development and maintenance of one's identity" (Sarbin, 1997a, p. 67) which includes "connectedness or coherence...and...a sense of movement or direction through time" (Gergen & Gergen, 1986, p. 25). It is how we organize our experiences and memory (Bruner, 1991). It is an apparatus whereby the person selects various character positions and through interactionally-situated telling of actions as that character opposite other character positions creates a script to

answer the reciprocal question of *who are you* between interlocutors (Sarbin, 1997a, p. 68).

Sarbin makes the argument that if story and history are "cut from the same cloth" (1986, p. x) then the story, an individual construction, can be used as a guide to understanding a individual's respective conduct (ibid.) and yields clues into the person's thinking about the context at given points in time as well as their present way of thinking regarding those past events. Considering this I am stating that the stories told by acculturating people over time sufficiently reveal the psychology of acculturation.

4.4 Dialogical self

This perspective of self as fragmented and woven into coherence through, among others, narrative accounts has been addressed by Hermans and Kempen's (1993) theorization of the Dialogical Self which sees a conception of self as a metaphorical polyphonic novel (ibid.). Such a structure of self assumes a 'self-experience' which "normally develops out of dialogues both within the individual and between the self and others" (Lysaker & Lysaker, 2002, p. 207). As Lysaker and Lysaker suggest, certain Schizo-type pathologies are evidence to this structure. In such cases, these people experience a "profound disruption in their basic sense of self" whereby the loose the ability to maintain a pervasive internal dialogue (ibid., p. 207).

These fragments are comprised of independent I-positions –parts of self- which are in an interdependent relationship with one another; they are at times in

cooperative and at other times in contradictory dialogue with one another (Hermans et al., 1993). This theory draws upon James' distinction between the 'I' and 'me' aspects within a single self and Mead's conception of self in which the 'me' is the manager of self-continuity. Hermans and Kempen have developed the I-position to cover "both the continuity and the discontinuity of the self" (1993, p. 115). They explain that "as far as the individual takes different and contrasting positions (and associated attitudes), there is discontinuity; because it is the same *I* that is involved in these changes, there is continuity" (ibid., p. 115).

According to this theory, we possess many different I-positions which can be utilised in relevant discursive contexts. Sometimes single I-positions are relevant, at other times a person may be speaking from several positions simultaneously resulting in what has often been termed 'polyphony'. It is through these evocations in on-going discourses which constitute a narrative approach to the self (Hermans & Kempen, 1993); drawing upon positions or 'voices' which may be spatially and temporally separate from the position or voice of the here and now. Narrative acts as a tool to manage this problem.

Up to this point I have periodically made reference to the concepts of 'polyvocality' and 'hybridity' with reference to possibilities within the self. The theoretical framework of the dialogical self goes beyond theory of the constitution of self by including the phenomena discovered in the novels of Dostoevsky by Russian literary scientist Mikhail Bakhtin's which he coined with the metaphoric term of the 'polyphonic novel' (Hermans & Kempen, 1993; Raggatt, 2007). This multiplicity of voices, or I-positions, cultivated through

inter-subjective exchange may result in dialogical relationships forming (Hermans, 2002) within the landscape of mind in relationship to other minds (ibid.). The self is composed of various 'voices' which are embodied autonomous and egalitarian positions (Hermans et al., 1993) each with the potential to occupy dominant or minority subjective positions (Hermans, 2002) and function as characters in a story (Hermans et al., 1993).

The theory of the 'Dialogical Self ' has proven to be quite a useful tool in the social sciences and has been applied to all sorts of issues ranging from those found in a clinical context to issues rising from globalization and cross-culturalism (Raggatt, 2007, p. 355). In Raggatt's review of the literature which employed the conceptual framework he found a common problem; the different meanings of 'voice' (Raggatt, 2007). Seeing as 'voice' is one of the central constructs of the theory (ibid., p. 357) I am careful to employ the metaphor of voice in the vein which Hermans and his colleagues originally intended; namely a Bakhtinian concept of 'voice' in narrative. I will go into greater detail of what this means in the next section.

To more profoundly clarify the significance of polyvocality and hybridity in psychology and their relevance in the context of acculturation, I will weave a couple of reflexive stories in amongst the theory.

While I lived in Germany, I was immersed in the learning of the local language and it was only by acquiring the words and phrases of the native speakers as they used them to convey their own meanings around me that I was gradually able to

reduce the gap of perceived *strangeness* between myself and the native *others*. My acquisition of 'verhandlungssicheres deutsch' was paramount to my ability to function independently in all venues of the German society. I suppose it would have been possible to scrape by with only basic German and reliance upon kind natives to accommodate me by using those interactions as opportunities to practice their English with me; but that was not my goal for the experience I wished to have abroad –otherwise I could have just chosen an English-speaking country. Yet as this progressed, my sense of self began to change. I was *made* acutely aware of this, i.e. it was reflected back to me when I would return home for visits and suddenly I felt a stranger amongst (Josephs, 2002) the people who were still so intimately familiar and in a place where I undoubtedly still considered to be home.

At this point I would find at times the German word before my native English word or subjects which I had grown more accustomed to speaking about in German with Germans resulted in a different reception when I engaged with Americans. I also had the experience of having learned about or experienced something for the first time in German and then when trying to explain this to people in English, found I did not have the words initially to accurately convey what I wanted to say. The changes were apparent as I encountered some turbulent interactional moments in ways which had never occurred before. How did this happen? I didn't physically look any different. It seemed to all boil down to mere words. I then was in the position to reflectively consider in what form the change was, from whence it came, how this contrasted with who I (and others) knew myself to be and finally to determine if I wanted to maintain my new

position or 'remember myself' and surrender this new part to *me in Germany but not me in the US*. The latter point is still one I consider even eight years into my life abroad. I feel there are aspects of me which I reserve for home in the US and aspects which are reserved for my life in Germany. While there is overlap, I am cognisant that not all of me may be appropriate at all times in either cultural surrounding.

This story's relevance can be seen throughout this dissertation, particularly in the up-coming sections of this chapter as well as in the data of my participants. It highlights the ways in which an acculturating person experiences different 'generalized others', i.e. home and host country communities, and how the values and ideologies of these groups play a role in helping them to understand where they are from, where they are and where they are going from a personal/Psychological point of view in the *here and now*.

4.4a Multivoicedness or 'polyphony'

The story I just told previously challenges the general conception that the things we utter in discourse are steadfastly and endurably fixed to a single cultural axis but are, rather, open to a mixing and moving (Hermans & Kempen, 1993, Hermans, 2001) of positions we inhabit in flux throughout any given discourse. This latest claim of mine is informed by the literature which proposes a concept of mind as a complex venue of intersubjectivity (Hermans, 2001) in which each position belongs to us yet is endowed with an equal and autonomous voice. As I advocate throughout this thesis, a great number of recognizable selves have the possibility of being embodied and presented in interaction and are evoked to

perform discursive functions however, they do not operate in isolation from one another or from *others*.

Just before I continue, I need to describe how 'voice' is operationalized here. According to Wertsch, the idea of voice is used to refer to "the 'speaking personality' or the 'speaking consciousness'" (Holquist & Emerson, 1981 cf. Wertsch, 1991, pg. 12). For Bakhtin, 'voices' and 'utterances' are inherently linked (Wertsch, 1991, pg. 51) with each utterance being from a particular point of view. Such points of view, as noted by Wertsch, are not locations but rather processes. It is a process through which infinite interactions produce variable meanings of utterances that are indexical and subject to renegotiation; "...voices always exist in a social milieu; there is no such thing as a voice that exists in total isolation from other voices" (Wertsch, 1991, pg. 51-2). As Wertsch states, Bakhtin considered that "'every utterance must be regarded primarily as a *response* to preceding utterances of the given sphere (we understand the word 'response' here in the broadest sense)" (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 91 cf. Wertsch, 1991, p. 53).

Such a concept of voice implies that the same words can have different meanings depending upon their contextually-contingent intonation (Wertsch, 1991). The data in Chapter Seven illustrates this point very well with word and meaning of 'expat'. The interlocutors are discussing their ideas about expats, activities they associate with the term and these points are all pieces of information which they have collected through interactions (as well as reading or watching television) prior to their discussion at that one particular point in time. As such, according to

Bakhtin, "...meaning can come into existence only when two or more voices come into contact..." (ibid., p. 52).

Both Vygotsky as well as Bakhtin "...believed that human mental functioning [can only adequately be understood] through some sort of generic or developmental analysis [and that] human communicative practices give rise to mental functioning in the individual" (Wertsch, 1991, p. 13). Even when the individual carries out mental action in isolation from others, it is still "...inherently social in certain respects and it is almost always carried out with the help of tools such as computers, language or number systems" (ibid., pg. 15) thus our thinking, i.e. the mental action in isolation, consists of internal dialogue.

The idea of polyphony, many voices or "social chorus" (Hicks, 2000, p. 234), arises from Bakhtin's analysis of the literary Dostoevsky in which he discovered the ability of a single mind to create characters who, although the conception of a single authoritarian voice, were in effect in possession of distinct ideologies (Hermans et al., 1992) and voices.

> The character is treated as ideologically authoritative and independent; he is perceived as the author of a fully weighted ideological conception of his own, and not as the object of Dostoevsky's finalizing artistic vision...Dostoevsky...creates not voiceless slaves...but *free* people, capable of standing alongside their creator, capable of not agreeing with him and even rebelling against him.
>
> (Bakhtin, 1973, p. 6)

Contemporary theorization in the phenomenology of multivoicedness inspired by Bakhtin (Hermans & Kempen, 1993; Hicks, 2000; Chaudhary & Sriram, 2001; Hermans, 2001, 2002; Barresi, 2002; Josephs, 2002; Akkerman et al.; 2006) has applied this phenomenon of many voices toward theorization in psychology and

discursive activity rather than merely upon literary productions and it was indeed Bakhtin's intention that this be done (Hermans, 2001a). Such a concept of voice possesses "...temporally dispersed events [which] are contracted into spatial oppositions that are simultaneously present" (Hermans, 2001, p. 246). The self contains voices which while they are omnipresent are *not always evoked* and they comprise historical as well as contemporarily-situated components; just as in a literary body. It can "contain a reference to the label of collectivities a person *feels* (rather than formally is) connected with" (Josephs, 2002, p. 162). Each voice can be the representative of a constituency within the society of mind (Hermans, 2002). But where or how do we acquire different voices? Do the voices employ components (words or phrases) which are semantically consistent? Can one predict what anyone voice might have to say? We are at times contradicting ourselves in our relationships with others whom we *know quite well* (ourselves and others) we are from time to time caught off guard by something we are confronted (or confront others) by utterances we did not expect. We are often better, however, in spotting the contradictions in others.

We know that we can be complicated and conflicted at times when it seems that some of those positions we call our own are so diabolically opposed (Hermans, 2002; Raggatt, 2007) that it seems they cannot possibly belong in an inter-subjective relationship with one another. Yet this happens. This can be understood by considering basic units of talk -words. Bakhtin proposed:

> When a member of a speaking collective comes upon a word, it is not as a neutral word of language, not as a word free from the aspirations and evaluations of others, uninhabited by others' voices. No, he receives the word from another's voice and filled with that other voice. The word enters his context from another context, permeated with the interpretations of others. His own thought finds the word already inhabited.
>
> (Bakhtin, 1973, p. 202)

Consider the following example. As anyone who has acquired a second language firstly in a classroom setting within their culture of origin followed by subsequent immersion in the culture of the language's origin knows, it is only then when one begins to grasp the true essence of the new tongue, to infuse ones own intentions with it and navigate the figurative tight rope sans safety net. At some point these words coagulate together with a person's own intentions and they use those newly-acquired words and phrases in autonomous discourse.

> The word in language is half someone else's. It becomes 'one's own' only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention. Prior to this moment of appropriation, the word does not exist in a neutral and impersonal language (it is not, afterall, out of a dictionary that the speaker gets his words!), but rather it exists in other people's mouths, in other people's contexts, serving other people's intentions: it is from there that one must take the word, and make it one's own.
>
> (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293-294 cf. Josephs, 2002, p. 161)

In short, people are using the words they have cultivated from various others. There is no "ultimate semantic authority" (Bakhtin, 1973, p. 202) of any individual word and every thought and feeling in association of that word must be "refracted through the medium of someone else's discourse" (ibid., p. 202). When we use words infused with our intentions it is both our intentions coupled with an "intense sideward glance" (ibid., p. 203) at someone else's intentions and words.

The bringing together of collections of others' words with the intentions of ourselves and others results in what has been termed 'polyphony' (Bakhtin, 1973). Polyphonies exist within each of us but what becomes of them? One way that these opposing semantic positions are dealt with is through a dialogical relationship (Hermans and Kempen, 1993) in which these points are debated or,

in another way, woven into some kind of narrative fabric in which we attempt to account, either explicitly or implicitly, for these positions, their inception, their place within our personal narratives and their implications. Since they belong to us *somehow*, we feel the need to account for them as not to threaten our continuity of self.

So what does this all have to do with the short personal account at the beginning of this section? It brought me to think about the increasing complexity of the self as it ventures into societies a bit further a field where the acquired 'I-positions' are provided by members (others) possessing in some ways even more conflicting perspectives; the affect of acculturation upon the self. A good empirical study of this was conducted by Leudar, Hayes, Nekvapil and Baker (2008) in which they traced the ways in which social attitudes of others were reflected in the self-presentational narratives of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK. It is at this point where we reach the idea of hybridity. Not only is one already in possession of a multitude of voices but now those voices include others which are understood as belonging to a distinct '*other*' societal group. As the person now possesses positions which could be said as belonging distinctly to one group or another, now the possibility exists of belonging in some way to both (or all) and no longer solely to one. That is certainly how I felt upon that first and every subsequent visit home since moving abroad all those years ago.

It seemed indeed that the words of others had become my own and through my incorporation of those words and meanings, some of my own meanings and intentions taken on alternative form. What I mean is even in conversations with

family members, the people from whom I acquired my initial language, my use of 'our' collective *familial* language seemed to occasionally result in unexpected misunderstandings or conflict. Not that there hadn't been the occasional conflict before but this time the conflict was attributed, by my family members, as being the result of my living in a culture which influenced changes in me, interpreted for example, as being more abrupt and associated with living in Germany.

Referring back to the point about 'entity' versus 'relational' self, the previous example only supports a concept of self, which is decentralized. This is possible not because the mind is a separate entity unto itself, void of influence from the external but because it, embodied, travels together *with* the body. Hermans et al. elaborate this point, "Just what and how things can be meaningful for us is shaped by our patterns of bodily movement, our spatial and temporal orientation to the world, and our interactions with the objects in the world" (1992, p. 25). The two share experiences and residual effects of those experiences. As the mind is an interpretative machine it cannot simply choose not to evaluate its surroundings. It is the job of the mind to do so if for nothing else than to direct its body out of dangerous situations. The mind is, whether it wants to or not, ordained to valuate, to interpret (ibid.) and to store this data; once obtained it is always, even if attempts to delete it are made, able to retrieve something of it. As such, this other aspect of self now resides with others we have cultivated through the years. Some of this data is more prominent than others and it is, at times, assigned an I-position (Hermans, 2002). Hermans has stated that there is no difference in the positions one takes in the self as those they take in a heterogeneous society (2002). As such, the presence of these positions within the

mind creates 'society' (ibid.) of sorts. But these positions cannot merely coexist next to one another without challenging one another; our minds do not compartmentalise separately each I-position. As I mentioned in the previous section, there is an inter-subjective tension between participants in interaction for social recognition. This tension and struggle for recognition is also an intrapersonal phenomenon. As in an external society, each of these I-positions is endowed with a voice (ibid.) which can be used to make itself heard in some fashion; they do likewise within our minds. Just as those positions engage in dialogical relationships in the external world with external others, so do the various voices within us.

4.5 Dialogism and acculturation

Now I would like to take the understanding of the Dialogical Self and metaphorically superimpose it onto the phenomena of acculturation; as according to Wertsch, an account of mediated action can be reduced neither to an analysis of agents nor to an analysis of the cultural tools they employ (1997, p. 7). With the understanding that the self is multivoiced and that it constitutes and is constituted by interaction, I can further propose that multivoiced selves constitute and are constituted by culturally-bound interaction. Josephs supports this position in saying that the voices of the self are "situated in between the internal –i.e. personal –and external- i.e *cultural* –realms" (Josephs, 2002:170 my emphasis).

The aim of this conceptual framework was to allow the self and culture to be studied empirically (Hermans, 2001). As the goal of this thesis is to study people in the context of acculturation, I aim to take up the charge issued by Hermans to

begin thinking about acculturation differently by basing such studies upon the conceptual framework of the Dialogical Self. Although Bhatia & Ram (2001) and Bhatia (2002) applied the theory in their discussion of acculturation among, most specifically, 'non-western diasporic immigrants' (p.303), both these studies did not present any empirical data per se.

This point brings me to yet another little story. As I moved to England and began to formally study issues in acculturation, one question which came to mind was whether this would also occur in a person crossing boundaries where the differences in language are not as starkly obvious. Would a native English-speaker, having moved to another English-speaking culture, necessarily acquire the words and phrases of the host culture even though they already possessed sufficient linguistic resources to communicate effectively? Interestingly, I recall meeting a woman who had moved from the United States to the United Kingdom within the previous twelve months. During a conversation one day, she used the very British phrase of 'leaving do' when telling me about a party she had recently attended. This struck me as humorous to hear a distinctly British phrase being uttered with a distinctly American accent. I drew her attention to the fact that she must be acclimating to living here in England as she had used 'leaving do' rather than 'goodbye party'. Her response was more interesting still as she uttered 'it's not that I am trying to fit in or anything'.

This vignette is a classic example of the dialogical self theory as multivoicedness is clearly observable. Recently, a few scholars have answered the challenge offered by Hermans to begin thinking about culture differently through

application of the dialogical self theory (2001). The charge was for scholars to study cross-culture-contact *in action* by trying to 'grasp and characterize the meaning-making process of a social group' (Akkerman, Admiraal, Simons & Niessen, 2006, p. 468). For example Akkerman et al. (2006) highlight multivoicedness in international academic collaboration, Gieser (2006) in a study of modifications of the dialogical self with Bhatia (2002), Chaudhary & Sriram (2001) and Bhatia & Ram (2001) who applied the theory in their discussions of acculturation and diversity of dialogical relationships among non-western cultures.

In 2002 Josephs presented a personal narrative embodiment of the Dialogical Self theory. In the rendering of her story, 'The Hopi in Me' Josephs applied the psychological theory reflexively and in so doing opened the door for the empirical application of the theory to the problem of acculturation by studying the narratives of people's acculturative experiences.

In their application of the Dialogical Self theory to the problem of acculturation, Bhatia and Ram (2002) and Bhatia (2001) have stated that 'the formation of immigrant identities in diasporic communities involves a constant process of negotiation, intervention and mediation that is shaped by issues of race, gender, sexuality and power' (Bhatia, 2002, p. 59). While I do not wish in any way to underestimate the impact of these collective factors upon diasporic immigrant collectivities who find themselves in drastically different host cultures, I am in disagreement that it is only incumbents of such migrant categories which must persistently negotiate these dialogical landscapes.

Bagnoli studied migrant identities through a dialogical 'self + other' approach (2007, p. 25). Due to the dynamic potential for change in migrant's identities over time, Bagnoli also recognized the importance of employing a model which could "account for the complex ways in which different cultures participate in the process of identity construction in the contemporary global context..." (2007, p. 25). Furthermore Bagnoli asserts that the often-cited Berry acculturative paradigm (1970; 1984; 1997; 2001) is no longer sufficient as it presumes a linear progression in cultural change where cultures are thought of as distinct and share internal saliency (ibid.).

Furthermore, König looks at "whether multicultural individuals can conduct a dialogue between two of their cultural positions to see if this dialogue plays a part in the process of self-innovation between cultures" (2009, p. 98). As she asserts, acculturation is the continuous process of "self innovation propelled by dialogues between personal and cultural positions" (ibid., abstract). König's research required participants to choose two personal cultural positions and to formulate personal position statements aligned with these two cultural positions as well as an 'in-between' position in order to, I assume, show a person's ability to construct a polyphonic or hybrid cultural position. Later these statements which were self-rated as to the extent of their 'novelty, importance and authenticity' by participants are then assigned, by König, to Bennet's (1993 cf. König, 2009, p. 100) categorizations of acculturative position, i.e. either 'encapsulated marginal' or 'constructive marginal'. Although König addresses many theoretical and conceptual points (albeit in a *very* brief and haphazard manner) regarding acculturation, constitution of self and inter-subjectivity, I feel

König's 'answer' to Hermans' (2001) call for empirical studies in acculturation employing the dialogical self as a theoretical underpinning still misses the mark even if Hermans might not agree with my sentiment.

Hermans' work (see Hermans 2001a) on the dialogical self in an acculturative context has, too, sought the explicit contributions of participants "living on the contact zones of two cultures" (p. 323) in developing a person's position repertoire in which "the method of the study of the organization and reorganization of a person's position repertoire with attention to the personal meanings...are associated with the different positions" (ibid., p. 323). While Hermans admits to "psychological interpretations and concepts [which] are a central part of the method...*the words, concepts and interpretations from the participants are reported in their original formulations so that their voices can be heard as they want to be heard*" (2001a, p. 324 my emphasis); supposedly. Yet how can a list "of approximately 50 internal positions and 40 external positions" (ibid., p. 326) given to participants to choose from be considered participants original formulations? They may be, after the fact, when one considers them reflectively. However, the call was to study culture and cross-cultural activity empirically, i.e. as *constructed* (Hermans, Kempen & van Loon, 1992).

Each of these contributions move progressively toward an attempt to illustrate the multivoiced phenomena unique to the context of acculturation but either make only suggestions to its possibility; neglecting to either provide adequate

empirical evidence and/or fail to properly operationalize the Bakhtian conception of 'voice'. This research aims to rectify these oversights.

Therefore, it is through the following analysis that I wish to show empirically that even migrants who are not confronted with these circumstances still find themselves in identity negotiation and do so even in mundane, everyday situations and that this movement is observable through an orientation toward polysemic subjective positions which at times merge. As Bhatia & Ram observed "...one sees the dialogical negotiations being undertaken on several fronts: home, language, customs, food and so on. Such forms of dialogical negotiation where one dynamically moves back and forth between opposite I-positions are very typical..." (2001, p. 305).

4.6 Dialogical self in narrative

According to Hermans et al. (1992) and Hermans et al. (1993) the conceptual characteristics of self-narrative theory as propagated by narrative theorists such as Sarbin assumes a *single* authoritarian voice. This is, however, an incomplete understanding of the content of narrative. Take for example this single voiced utterance from one of Dostoevsky's characters, Devushkin, which has been separated by two identifiers, 'The Other' and 'Makar Devushkin'.

> THE OTHER: One must know how to earn a lot of money. One shouldn't be a burden to anyone. But you are a burden to others.
>
> MARKAR DEVUSHKIN: I'm not a burden to anyone. I've got my own piece of bread.
>
> THE OTHER: But what a piece of bread it is! Today it's there, and tomorrow it's gone. And it's probably a dry one at that!
>
> MARKAR DEVUSHKIN: It is true it is a plain crust of bread, at times a dry one, but there it is, earned by my toil and put to lawful and irreproachable use.

> THE OTHER: But what kind of toil! All you do is copy. You're not capable of anything else.
>
> MARKAR DEVUSHKIN: Well, what can one do! I know very well, of course, that I don't do much copying, but all the same I am proud of it.
>
> THE OTHER: Oh, there's something to be proud of, all right! Copying! It's disgraceful!
>
> MARKAR DEVUSHKIN: Well, in fact really, so what if I am just a copying clerk!...[etc.].
>
> (Bakhtin, 1973, p. 210)

This example is to illustrate the presence of two "merged rejoinders" in dialogue (ibid., p. 210) which occurred in a single self-utterance. Bakhtin highlights this extract in order to show how Dostoevsky's characters were not one-dimensional entities with a solitary voice but rather multi-dimensional compositions with an inter-subjectivity which is polysemic (Marková, 2003b).

As I mentioned above under the section about multivoicedness, the utterances used to formulate interactional constructions are not merely representative of position which is solely located in the here and now but contains nuances which may be spatially and temporally dispersed but are present at the same time. Of course within *all that time* is the presence and interaction with others. What we end up with is, as Raggatt states:

> ...dialogical principles [which] seem to operate in both the synchronic-emergent and the diachronic-extended domains. The dialogical self can be conceived as a fluid and changing social construction...but it can also be conceived in more essentialist terms as a configuration of narrative voices, each with a story to tell...
>
> (2007, p. 358)

Therefore, a conception of self-narrative as polyphonic allows for the inclusion of the 'irreducible dyad' of 'I-Other' (Marková, 2003b, p. 250) which must assume the omni-presence of a "host of social and cultural forces" (Raggatt,

2007, p. 358) that affect the composition of a dialogical self and resulting narratives of self.

Multivoicedness is not always present, however. As I aim to show in the analysis, acculturation is a particularly suitable context in which to see the movement in and out of the phenomena as the person tries to weave some kind of continuity of self out of, at times, explicit disparity. At one point or another in the construction of a personal narrative, a particular aspect of self may occupy a dominant position (Raggatt, 2000) of the narrative, letting or forcing 'authors' of other stories of self to a position in the backdrop of mind. As Hermans et al. assert,

> The one and the same individual lives in a multiplicity of worlds with each world having its own author who may tell a story relatively independent of the other authors of the other worlds.
>
> (1993, p. 213)

Of particular interest for this study is the possible presence of "merged rejoinders" in the narrative which extrapolate the two conditions of self in the context of acculturation; namely the orientation to more than one cultural affiliation. The remainder of this dissertation will be focused on how the participants of this study, the expatriates, manage this continuity as an active achievement with a functional concept of self as multivoiced and dialogical (Hermans, 2001a; Akkerman et al. 2006) through narrative accounts of their experiences.

4.7 Chapter summary

I am suggesting that these stories are the product of the dialogism between the metaphysical selves, or various beings-in-place, of a person and surrounding

others which are separated spatially and temporally. In telling their story, they are orienting their telling to who they are telling the story too, considering to whom and how that story has been told before, piloting perhaps minor adjustments to the story in light of these considerations and also orienting to how the current telling of that story will impact their future continuity of self once the story has been told in the way it has.

Chapter Five

Methodology

5.0 Chapter introduction

This thesis uses an idiographic methodological framework to study acculturation. It employs narrative biographical interviews as well as data from internet message boards to show the polyphonic nature of narrative. To date, in studies of interaction and language, little attention has been given to the internal dialogue and inner speech (Marková, 2006) which form the epistemology of the metaphorical polyphonic novel discussed at length in the previous chapter. A methodology aiming to do this requires an understanding and appreciation how language is used within and, moreover, to *create* context (Leudar, Sharrock, Hayes & Truckle, 2008) as well as an understanding of the ways in which culture modulates interactional activities.

To accomplish this, I studied the story-telling activities of people living in a foreign culture (the United Kingdom) using the research tools of conversation analysis (CA), Discourse Analysis (DA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA). I used the data corpus to study the polyphonic aspects of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity in situated narrative accounts of people's experiences as foreigners in the UK. The variability in subjective and inter-subjective communication is evident, for example, in the ways people who are supposedly very similar in their shared cultural orientation still display differences between one another in how they view their experiences in a new

culture and draw upon their native cultural orientation to manage this. The corpus consists of twenty-six pages of message board data as well as over thirty-five hours of transcribed audio interviews which were collected over a time period of one and a half years from originally five cohabiting couples. In the end, I chose to focus more in depth on the data from four of these cases. I will explain this in greater detail in the participants section of this chapter.

The narrative perspective is embedded in the foundation that language is performative (Rapley, 2001, p.307) but also is used to 'present the self' (Goffman, 1959). This thesis is consistent with discursive psychology (DP) in that it focuses on language activities rather than on the linguistic cognitions (Goodman, 2006).

There are many approaches in psychology which the 'self' and 'other' dyad are of importance, however the majority of these begin with predefined models (Potter, 2003) of human agency. The treatment of DP as it is done in this thesis is based upon MCA and CA which "allows a broader and more culturally embedded set of possible constructions and relevancies to be identified… developing an alternative understanding of language and its role in the machineries of psychological research and assessment" (ibid., p.791).

Furthermore, I am looking at the discursive constructions of stories through the analytical framework of narrative psychology (NP) in which stories, rather than logical arguments or lawful formulations, are the vehicle by which meaning is communicated (Hevern, 2004) an through which a continuity of self is managed

(Ochs & Capps, 1996, p. 29). As such, the language used in the telling of stories about acculturation is therefore the *topic* of my research rather than the *resource* (Edley, 2001, p.190 original emphasis; Speer, 2002). From a DP[24] point of view, the jointly produced storylines allow for an assignment and ascription of "'parts' or 'roles' to speakers in the discursive construction of personal stories" (Davies & Harré, 1990 cf. Murakami, 2003, p. 237) and that includes data which is generated from the interviewer as well as the participants. In this case, the interviewer is a participant. Narrative interviews are not like other measurement tools in the natural sciences. The researcher in this case is not a detached observer, but is engaged and his or her identity is material and consequential to the trajectory of the interaction –a point I will address in greater depth shortly.

Therefore, my goal is "not to identify the participants' perceptual truth as to what the shared understanding [of acculturation] is, but to illustrate the process by which this mutual understanding evolves through discourse" (Murakami, 2003, p. 235)

I acknowledge that there is a tension here in claiming that language constructed in a situated activity of an interview having been solicited by a researcher to tell a particular type of story, is the topic rather than a resource of research. Particularly when acculturation and presentation of self as done through language is where my analytical eye glances; does not language then become the resource for understanding these issues? Methods such as those which I have engaged here, CA, MCA and DA see a

[24] DP is a tendency in the study of discourse in a variety of forms including narrative in the UK and Europe while NP or NA is more rooted in American studies of language usage specifically in narrative.

> [shift] from...traditional social scientific research methods as fairly neutral mechanisms that can be used to collect people's views and opinions...to pieces of interaction in their own right...in this sense, the 'method' is not a reified, standardized *resource* to get at something separate from it (data), but constitutes its very object, and the interaction embodied within it.
>
> (Speer, 2002, p. 512)

Just as identity both constitutes and is constituted by social interaction, interactions in an interview setting are both the "'project' and the 'product' of participants' practices" (Heritage & Greatback, 1991, p. 94; Drew & Heritage, 1992; p. 19; Duranti & Goodwin, 1992 cf. Speer, 2002, p. 518). DP is then essentially "examining the ways in which people talk about –or construct- things like attitudes, memories..." (Edley, 2001, p. 190) and stories.

Rather than understanding the following data as 'factual' representations of the reality of a given context, i.e. acculturation, the 'talk' generated through text and as a part of conversational interviews subsequently transcribed as well as the message board conversational threads are the product of the specific context within which the interaction occurred (Rapley, 2001). The talk therefore constructs acculturation as done through narratives about contingencies made interactionally relevant by participants through locally-produced talk or written text. What the participants construct or co-construct as foreigners being interviewed by a fellow foreigner in the context of an interview about their experiences or what members of an online expatriate community write is the interest here. Whether someone is integrated, assimilated, marginalized or separated based upon the popular theories of acculturation presented in chapter three will not be considered.

5.1 Geographic and cultural location of research

The situation in the UK, according to data in the report by Dumont and Lemaître (2005, p. 34) is that the UK (at time of data collection) has over 3 million expatriates[25] distributed throughout the globe, of which about 39 percent are highly skilled[26]. This means that nearly 10% of highly skilled British-born persons are living as expatriates in other OECD member countries. Dumont & Lemaître state that the UK "...has 700 000 more highly skilled expatriates in OECD countries that it has highly skilled migrants from other OECD countries" (2005, p. 11). While in the UK about 20% of the population is said to have attained tertiary levels (Dumont & Lemaître, 2005, p.32).

In an effort to recruit highly skilled talent to the UK (I am uncertain if there are efforts to *retain* it) the Home Office, the UK's governing authority for immigration regulation, has set up programmes which clear the way for certain *desirable* highly-skilled migrants to work legally here (Dumont & Lemaître, 2005) as well as provide "fiscal incentives" such as tax relief on housing and travel costs (ibid.).

5.2 Participant recruitment

As my goal was to investigate the phenomenon of acculturation as experienced by a category of individuals who have migrated under particular circumstances, the motivations and particular goals of this group are unique to other migratory groups such as refugees, seasonal migrant workers or asylum seekers. Participant

[25] ‚Expatriate' is used in this report as "all foreign-born persons living abroad, regardless of the current or eventual duration of their stay abroad" (Dumont & Lemaître, 2005, p. 23).
[26] Although not specifically stated in this report, "Highly Skilled" is understood to mean as a tertiary education.

couples were sought as through the co-construction of stories, the data would likely contain alignments as well as debates about the authenticity of the representation of the collective experience shared by the couple. This in turn would enable a study of the asymmetries between people who know one another well and could quantitatively be considered as having a similar outlook on the experiences of being foreigners together. Participants were recruited via personal association (fellow expats who were employed with a local multi-national company) as well as through the expat internet-based community and were recruited categorically as 'expats'. This becomes important later when in Chapter Seven the participants and interviewer do work on determining what kind of expats they are (Potter & Hepburn, 2005).

5.3 Participants

In total, five participant couples were recruited to take part in a longitudinal study. They were asked to participate in periodic interviews over the period of one and a half years. The participant couples included two couples from Germany, two couples from the United States and one couple where one partner was from the United States and their partner was from Switzerland but had immigrated to the United States nine years prior to their move to the United Kingdom.

Of the five participant couples, three were sent (chose to be sent) to the UK for a specific period of time under the auspices of an employer objective and that they would eventually return back to their home country and employer following the completion of the limited-duration contract. Two of the couples desired to move

abroad and sought employment independently. As such, the latter two couples undertook the move to the UK under significantly different circumstances than the previous three; namely the absence of corporate support such as cost-of-living adjustments, relocation assistance as well as the likelihood of pre-existing network of other expatriates who are also in the UK with their company among other advantages.

With the exception of the participant who was originally from Switzerland, each participant had never before lived abroad. All participants were married and three couples had one or more children. Two participant couples had children during their time in the UK and at the time of this writing two couples had returned home 'early'; one due to dissatisfaction with life in the UK and one due to the regulation of their employer. One other couple had moved onto Switzerland, the country of origin for one member of couple, through a desire to leave the UK but not to return 'home' and the last couple remained in the UK but left the employer whom had initially brought them here.

As I mentioned previously, only four couples' data sets made it into this chapter. One couple, a woman from Germany who was sent to the UK (Bentley) to work and accompanied by her German husband (a stay-at-home spouse), produced data which in the end did not allow me to represent them in the three analytical chapters which focused more on the case studies. As the interviews were very conversational in nature with limited direct questioning on the part of the interviewer, the conversation was more often about the free-time activities of the couple in the UK and comparing this with what they had done in Germany as

well as their history as a couple. Although there were a few instances in the data which could have enriched the thesis in certain ways, I felt focussing on four cases more in depth across all the topics was the right way to go. I do think, however, that while this is certainly a limitation in my research, that the four cases I present do provide enough data to help me meet my aims.

5.4 Data Collection: Ethnomethodology

It must be clarified that what can be learned through the interview and message board data of this corpus are interpretations and re-presentations of locally-produced historical accounts about the experiences of people. As such, this *emic* perspective means that the *researched* have a hand in defining the scope of what is learned. Because the data collected are the activities of ordinary people going about an everyday interactional activity –conversation and storytelling- this thesis can be considered as an Ethnomethodological investigation; a method of research initially grounded in the work of Harold Garfinkel who stated that the basic idea of this type of research was "the investigation of the rational properties of indexical expressions and other practical actions as contingent, ongoing accomplishments of organized artful practices of everyday life" (Garfinkel, 1967, p.11).

Some might take issue with this position, suggesting that by virtue of the fact that the data were collected through a 'pre-arranged' interview, that they are not completely 'naturally-occurring' and must be contrived in some fashion. I will dedicate more time to this point shortly but wish to state now that although the data were collected in a pre-arranged setting, what occurs in them can very likely

occur even if "the researcher had not been born" (Potter, 1996 cf. Speer, 2002, p. 515). In chapter Seven I show how the interview context is in flux; often shifting between a formal interview structure and a conversation between Expats or Americans who have by coincidence met one another. In some instances I am a researcher acting in a particular *researcher type way* by asking questions, orienting to research interview administration and so on. However, at other times, the researched turn the tables on me (Speer, 2002) by asking me questions about my life as an expat; the interviewees and interviewer all becoming participants with equal rights to contribution in the interaction. Later in this chapter I will discuss the nexus of unique adequacy requirement or membership in Ethnomethodolgy.

Because the data are comprised of clusters of stories –provided by both the interviewees and interviewer who share a 'mastery' of "capacities and competencies that people have *as* members of society; capacities to speak, to know, to understand, to act in ways that are sensible in that society and in the situations in which they find themselves" (ten Have, 2002a, paragraph 3.5) there are times when the distinctiveness of 'interviewing behaviour' becomes very blurred and what appears to take place is merely a conversation between three people about what it is like living abroad.

Therefore, I am saying that this data is a *type* of data; 'personal experience… [which] emerges as a 'type' of the larger class 'narrative,' a taxonomy fitted to academic and investigatory preoccupations' (Schegloff, 1997a, p. 99); my preoccupation being the representations of acculturation. The participants are

selected and interviewed because they have a certain *kind* of story to tell (ibid.). This is the only point in which I, as the researcher, attempted to *control* this research. I am also claiming that this data is 'naturally-occurring'.

The claim from my experimental counterparts is that research methods such as the ones I employ are merely subjective. My social constructivist colleagues react by debating intensely the issues surrounding whether our data can be called natural as if to say, *objective* (Lynch, 2002); in hopes of neutralizing distinctions which are feverishly argued such as those between the physical and natural sciences. The distinction I want to highlight here is that between what Lynch pointed out as being between 'natural' and 'naturally occurring' and 'social' and 'socially organized' realities (2002, p. 532). The latter is reliant on people to do something whereas the former is not (ibid.). When we make the distinction about something being *natural* or *naturalistic* we propose "that there are, or may be, underlying patterns of behaviour and social organization that are universal to the human species" (ibid., p. 532). Researchers pursuing investigations into human interaction through a conversation analytic framework assign terminology with more specific attributes such as the sequential and normative features as Sacks (1992) and colleagues discovered in the analysis of English-speaking conversation. This seems to be leaning more toward what should be considered the 'social' or 'socially organized' realities. However, in most other cases of social science research in which the researcher is not a detached observer but rather an active participant who is concurrently constructing data, the ability to prove data as naturally-occurring is rendered irrelevant as the only thing that can

be termed truly *natural* is that people are in communication with each other and they are *doing that communication* with others who share in a:

> ...natural language [and can be] somehow ...heard to be engaged in the objective production and objective display of commonsense knowledge of everyday activities as observable and reportable phenomena.
>
> (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970, p. 342 cf. ten Have, 2002, paragraph 3.5)

Furthermore, by engaging people with a certain type of story to tell, I am selecting a collectivity or group of 'members'. 'Members' are not just people. They are 'owners' of particular corpus(es) of unique knowledge (Sharrock, 1974) and as such possess associated competencies. Ten Have (2002a, paragraph 3.5) quotes Garfinkel:

> I use the term 'competency' to mean the claim that a collectivity member is entitled to exercise that he is capable of managing his everyday affairs without interference. That members can take such claims for granted I refer to by speaking of a person as a 'bona-fide' collectivity member.
>
> (1967, p.57)

People are "doing what comes naturally", i.e. telling autobiographical stories having been asked to do so by someone else and are doing so within a context which supersedes the content. It is not only the researcher who might be in the position to ask about life as an expat. Therefore, what is meant by 'natural' is an ontological issue, not a methodological one:

> Naturally organized and naturally accountable ordinary activities are 'reflexive' in a distinctive way: they are built up and made publicly intelligible through temporal, retrospective-prospective, orderings of actions in concert and in sequence. In this context of use, the word 'naturally' is not meant to connote the sense of an objective structure or process 'out there' independent of investigation. Instead, it refers to a pre-analytical source of order in, of, and as, the ordinary activities in which sociologists and non-sociologists engage.
>
> (Lynch, 2002, p. 533)

This is in mirrored contrast to ten Have's position in which he embeds his distinction regarding types of data within the topic of the research (2002b). This may be very well the case in a strictly controlled experimental design where

participants have very little involvement as to the direction their contributions take, however the Narrative Biographical Interview (NBI) and message board data meet sufficient criteria to be considered as naturally-occurring. It is this point I wanted to make clear before embarking on the significant work of unpacking the methodology I employed for this work as the trend in CA and in a sense most discourse analytical methodologies is "a preference for working with 'naturally occurring' data" (Speer, 2002, p.513).

5.4a Data sources: Internet-based message board

A component of the data corpus was collected from the internet-based community located at www.americanexpats.co.uk. This website gives an initial impression that it is a place for Americans (and those who have an interest in the U.S.) to gather and share experiences and perhaps seek support. In the 'forum', or online community spaces, members are free (within reason) to post questions, comments or stories about life as expats. Some members of this community currently consider themselves expats as they are living as foreigners in the UK, some have repatriated to the US and some occupy other categories but participate on the site as they feel some association to the US.

Data collected from this venue provided a unique opportunity to 'peek' into natural occurrences of previously-mentioned ordinary practical actions of persons reporting their experiences and impressions of living in a foreign country. This is important because topics which were raised by and discussions contributed to by other community members were what members found to be contingencies relevant to such a context.

In chapter six, I will present one such message board topic discussion thread which was found under the post heading 'Customer Service'. As will be discussed in greater detail in that later chapter, Customer Service is a part of the cultural activity of 'shopping'. Shopping is a cultural activity which exists in both the UK and the US (the two cultural norms which are being contrasted in this message board) and the discussion about differences in customer service is shown as it is modulated by culture.

5.4b Narrative biographical interviews (NBI)

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with five cohabiting participant couples over the course of one and half years. Due to the uncertainty of expatriate assignments, it was not always possible to collect the three interviews with each participant couple that had been predicted at the onset of the research. A minimum of two interviews per couple were obtained, however.

Interviews were conducted within the participant couples homes and were audio recorded in order to be transcribed at a later time for analysis. The elicitation of relevant accounts was done by beginning the interview interaction with several open-ended questions which were used to:

> ...refer to the temporal dimension of the participant's self-narrative, that is, to the past, present and future. The questions invite individuals to reflect on their life situations in such a way that they feel free to mention those events or circumstances that are most relevant from the perspective of the present situation. The participants are free to interpret the questions in any way they want.
>
> (Hermans, 2001a, p. 341)

Ethnomethodological (EM) perspective studies people within their own reality and accepts their representations of that reality as pertinent; allowing and

encouraging participants to speak freely and openly about their experiences. The usage of this 'free-associative' framework aims to avoid biases which may be covertly and unintentionally presented to the participants by means of pre-determined questions or structured interviews. The information produced in the situated activities of the NBI of the expat, are rich collections of the reflexive and socially constructed meaning.

5.4c Transcription of audio data

Interview data was transcribed with a 'Jefferson Lite' (Potter & Hepburn, 2005) transcription method. While the full Jeffersonian transcription method of representing talk as text "makes most apparent the jointly constructed, socially engaged nature of what is going on..." (ibid., p. 289), at times the "'minutae' of conversation will distract from the 'broader' ideological organization of the talk" (ibid., p. 288). The Jefferson Lite transcription method captures the words and "some of the grosser elements of stress and intonation" (ibid., p. 288). What is of greater importance for the interests of this research are the words and categories/categorizations which illuminate the "broader ideological content of talk" (ibid., p. 288). The interviews have been transcribed at a level where the 'interactional features' can be appreciated (ibid., p. 291).

5.5 'Members', 'membership', 'participants', 'co-participants'...

Before commencing the next section of this chapter about the respective methodologies, it would be of good practice to explicate the terminology I will be using in doing my own referring work of the types of interlocutors being spoken about; namely 'the speakers', 'participants', 'co-participants' and

'members' (Billig, 1997, p. 551). One of the criticisms put forth by Billig has been that proponents of pure CA claim that it is a methodology which "takes an empirical stance without a priori assumptions and that it examines participants' talk in 'their own terms'" (Billig, 1997, p. 543) yet by imposing its own rhetoric in the analysis and writing up of such research does exactly what it claims not to.

In brief, 'participants', 'co-participants', 'speakers' and 'interlocutors' are those who are taking part in an interaction. At times, I may use 'interviewee' or 'participant/co-participant' interchangeably; however, there may be occasions whereby 'interviewee' will be used when the interaction is markedly proceeding *as an interview*. I anticipate, however, that most of the time 'participant' shall be sufficient. I refer to myself as 'researcher/interviewer' interchangeably but when data reveals my orientation in the interaction as a 'participant/co-participant' then I shall refer to myself as such. The term 'member' can be attributed to anyone in the interaction as all participants "are members...perhaps...[of a] 'culture' or a 'society'" (Garfinkel, 1967 cf. Billig, 1997, p. 551).

As I will discuss later in the section on MCA, 'members' and 'membership' are not terms which people explicitly use in their descriptive or referring activities (ibid.), i.e., *I am a member of the class of Americans* or *I am a member of the category of people called 'expats'* but rather this terminology is a means of explaining the association one feels (or does not) and implicitly uses as a resource in their establishing boundaries of their identity in relation or opposite to others (Murakami, 2001; Potter, 2003). Also as I explained previously in the section about Ethnomethodology, 'member(s)' is "used in places where others

might have chosen 'person(s)' or 'individual(s)" (ten Have, 2002a, paragraph 3.5). It is the insight of "bona-fide member[s] of a collectivity" (ten Have, 2002a, paragraph 3.5) which is the core focus of EM (ibid.).

5.6 Subjectivity/reflexivity

As I am studying the language usage in story-telling activities, I need to highlight an often neglected point in the analysis of interviews regarding the production of talk jointly produced by the interviewer and interviewee(s) (Potter & Hepburn, 2005; Rapley, 2001) and should be treated as an interaction (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). More specifically this entails the influences of interviewer talk and identity work upon the context and subsequent progression and production of interview talk (Speer, 2002; ten Have, 2002b; Lynch, 2002; Potter, 2002). As I will discuss later in the chapter, the approach of Conversation Analysis (CA) prefers the usage of 'naturally occurring' materials to study the linguistic activities of people (Speer, 2002) however, there is a debate as to the extent any audio-recorded, pre-arranged interview can be considered void of any such contamination (for full debate see the 2002 4(4) issue of Discourse Studies).

Nekvapil found interviewer identity to be of marked influence in participant interview conduct predicated on whether or not they had been interviewed by a "majority member...or someone else, in particular a member of the same ethnic group as the informants themselves" (2003, p. 65). Furthermore, as Rapley asserts, "interviewees and interviewers work to construct themselves as certain types-of-people in relation to the topic of the interview and reflexively the interview themselves" (2001, p. 303). How the constructions are formulated

depends upon 1) from which subjective position from which the person is speaking and 2) to whom the information is being presented. As this interviewing method is more conversational in nature, allowing equality in rights of participation, there is a unique opportunity for the enrichment of data generated through the interview which the interviewer contributes as well as the data produced by other participants in light of who that interviewer is, i.e. a fellow member. Because I as the interviewer am in the same position as my participants, I share in some of their background, their assumptions and the ways in which they participate in this foreign culture. This can only add another dimension to understanding acculturation as it is negotiated through our interaction and which holds for us, and me particularly as the researcher whose project it is, significant importance to our experience of the phenomenon.

As I will discuss further in this chapter, the CA methodological framework is well-equipped to make explicit the points within the interview where "researcher effects" (Speer, 2002, p. 511) may exist as well as provide a rigorous framework upon which analysis of participant-generated data can laid. The art is to understand that within a biographical narrative interview there are different types of conversational turn-taking; turn-by-turn conversation with intermittent story-telling. The stories may be singly or jointly constructed by participants (depending if there is more than one) and might even prompt the telling of second stories (Sacks, 1992) from the interviewer who at that moment in the interaction is less of a researcher and more like another participant.

While the stories might be prompted by the interviewer from the presentation of an initial question which requests *a story about this*, the form they take is then the sole construction of the interviewee or co-construction of the two participants. Should the interviewer chime in with their own second story, then the question arises whether or not the interviewer is still an interviewer or an additional and equal participant merely having a conversation with other members.

What can be said then for the type of data I am using for this thesis? Since it was produced by myself, an American and a foreigner in the UK and other Americans or foreigners who are also living in the UK- from an ethnomethodological perspective I ask, what difference does it make? I invoke the image (scary as it may be) of Potter's conceptual "dead social scientist" (2002, p. 541) in which validity of the claim of certain data as natural depends on whether that data would be the same or exist at all "if the researcher got run over on the way to work?" (ibid., p. 541). I will state that in this instance that it could because what might the alternative be for a few Americans who happen to engage in conversation as they have coincidently met in a café in Cambridge, England? Furthermore, according to Hacking's (1991) (discussion about the two kinds of facts –natural and 'human'- the debate regarding any kind of human facts, i.e. facts which "require a social setting in order to be applicable at all" (p. 116) all fit with the taxonomy of facts generated in the social by people and are therefore distinct from those natural facts; i.e. those facts which do not deal with people and their behaviour such as biological facts of nature. According to this perspective, the debate is futile but good scientific practice demands that we be

clear about the ways and means by which we come across our information and discoveries.

As I mentioned toward the beginning of this chapter, the interactions I have solicited with my participants are simultaneously our project as well as what is being created.

> So, bias in interviews (and in other data collection methods) need not be regarded as a problem, but can be 'turned on its head' and celebrated. Interviewers can be active participants, arguing with members, and questioning their assumptions, just as participants can 'turn the tables' on researchers, prompting them to explain their questions and offer opinions.
> (Speer, 2002, p. 512 original emphasis)

What will be important to make explicit are the junctures in which the interview, by virtue of the participants orientations, meanings, interpretations and so on, is able to be categorised as such a 'socio-interactional reality' (Schegloff, 1997b) – an interview- or when it is something else, such as a conversation among those Americans who met coincidently in Cambridge.

As I will discuss in more detail in the section on CA, using the methodological tools of studying narrative data from a turn-taking perspective can temper the issues in claiming data as naturally occurring as CA places an "emphasis on the action orientation of talk and the local, or 'endogenous' production of context" (Speer, 2002, p. 511). Hence, relieving the analyst of the responsibility of making inferences as to what the participants were *intending* to say or do with the story they told.

It is clear that an interview situation is a particular type of interaction thus yielding a contextually-contingent type of talk, i.e. particular identity

performances and perception of those performances. Considering this I am making a statement that the representation of 'facts' as revealed in any single interview event are "contextual, improvised and performative" (Dillard, 1982, p. 32 cf. Denzin, 2001, p. 25) and the groupings of facts are idiosyncratic and particular to each interview interaction.

5.6a The unique adequacy requirement

As a member of my study population the special knowledge I possess has informed my selection of criteria which I find particularly unique to those I wish to study. My aim is to see how the participants, selected with regard to particular demographic criteria discussed earlier and their experiences within this temporary condition result in changes in the self.

Although I have already addressed the issue of subjectivity – a term, according to ten Have, which is rarely seen in research of this type (ten Have, 2002a), I wish highlight the point that EM advocates for a researcher understanding the researched before going out and actually doing so (2002b, p. 2); they are themselves *members* (ibid.). I am employing my own reflexivity regarding acculturation. As ten Have (2002a) points out, Schutz stressed that everyone relies upon their own 'thinking as usual' in guiding them in interaction. As a researcher with prior experience and knowledge of acculturation, I assume that other people who are members share in some of these membership activities and knowledge. They are therefore provided an opportunity to contest or confirm the understandings which I have collected. And indeed, I am able to confirm and contest theirs. In a sense, my participants and I are equally capable of influence

upon the other and may surely go on to create an amalgamation of those experiences through our collective work.

Because I too am a foreigner in the UK and have been a foreigner in another country previously, I possess some personal insight into a variety of potentialities of the study participants and their lives in a foreign environment. In the talk which my participants and I produce in our interviews, I am able to use this membership knowledge as an explicit *topic* for analysis rather than needing to account for it as an implicit *resource* for my research (ten Have, 2002a emphasis is original).

In the paper *Whose text? Whose Context?* (Schegloff, 1997b), Schegloff put forth an attempt to highlight the pitfalls of 'good' and 'bad' discourse analysis and establish criteria for standardization (Wetherell, 1998). The cardinal sins committed often by even the most well intentioned analyst, according to Schegloff, are considering that 1) "...the use of one...category term to refer to people by saying that they *are,* after all, such a one...is not enough to justify referring to someone as [a category] just because [they are], in fact, [one]" (1997b, p. 165) because they also occupy other category terms (ibid.); and 2) that the same thing happens in categorisation of context(s); as a multiplicity of contexts can be claimed at any one point in time (ibid.). While these points may be self-evident, Schegloff asserts that the presence of many categorisations of people and contexts does not mean that each of those are *prima facie* in the matters of those people involved and that often the matters of *the people involved* and the *analyst* do not necessarily share saliency resulting in 'positivistic'

outcomes which yield " 'findings' –repeatable, reliable, objective, significant (for some, statistically significant) observations about the world" (1997b, p. 166).

The solution to this, according to Schegloff, is to take the:

> orientations, meanings, interpretations, understandings, etc. of the *participants* in some sociocultural event on which the course of that event is predicated – and especially if it is constructed interactionally over time, it is *those* characterizations which are privileged in the *constitution of socio-interactional reality,* and therefore have a prima facie claim to being privileged in efforts to *understand* it .
>
> (1997b, p. 166-7 original emphasis)

This perspective is very likely the best way to proceed when studying a corpus of data of which the analyst is 1) not an identifiable member or 2) a part of that data corpus. What I mean is that the researcher/analyst (assuming that they are one in the same as is in the case of this dissertation) has not been there to collect the data such as in the case of a CA study of telephone conversation openings (Wise, 2004) and that researcher/analyst has not created data *along with* the participants. If these points, or an analytical mentality toward the data with this the mindset as if it existed in this way, then the analyst is able to get at what Schegloff refers to as the "endogenous orientations of the participants in those events" (1997b, p. 167). By 'disattending' (Sharrock & Anderson, 1987) to the *analyists* terms, orientations, meanings, contextual categorisations and such, what we are left with is the true orientations of the participants situated activities.

However, cannot analysis done by one who shares membership with their participants and creates data together with them be considered endogenous? I am, in accordance with the Unique Adequacy Requirement, *able* to engage with people in a particular way in which I can negotiate the indexicality in a particular way and later provide insight as to the indexicality of expressions and meaning

created because I was, at times, a part of the meaning-making process. This is more than merely accounting for my own reflexivity. As ten Have asserts, "for ethnomethodology...membership knowledge is the key issue in any discussion of its topic, but also a crucial aspect of its own methodology" (2002a, paragraph 1). This presence of implicit shared membership knowledge can be seen when participants "...design their actions in such a way that their sense is clear right away or at least explicable on demand" (ibid., paragraph 3.1). Considering this, I propose myself to be not just an analyst writing a dissertation about a participant researcher but an expat, writing a dissertation about an expat analyst who studied expats.

5.7 Investigative problems with narrative

Emphasis on the importance of discourse processes in displaying the full meaning of mundane events of people is a core component of any discourse analytic method. Discourse and what is revealed by it is most often done so through the telling of stories (White, 1995).

> Human beings are interpreting beings...we are active in the interpretation of our experiences as we live our lives. Stories constitute this frame ability ...which we use to organize and make sense of our lives
>
> (ibid., 1995, p. 13)

White also explains that the *way* stories are told, the construction of them is more revealing about the person than the person's actual experiences. In telling stories the participants become their own autobiographers. Telling a story transplants them mentally to a particular time and places them in an "ongoing and evolving social structure" (Miller, 2000, p. 2).

Denzin asserts, "reality as it is known is mediated by symbolic representation, by narrative texts...that stand between the person and the so-called real world...[and]...humans live in a second-hand world of meanings" (1997, p. xvi). In this case, that would mean that these 'lived texts' (ibid.) which we cultivate through our ethnographic research are merely "representations that are themselves embodied representations of experience...real-life experiences...shaped by prior textual representations" (ibid., p. 33) all of which are shaped by the participation of others and the analytic work they have imparted upon *their* experiences with others and *other* others.

However, Denzin's account about narrative as second-hand recapitulations of experience is only half the story. He neglects to include the indexicality of those representations and meanings –second hand or not- upon their formulation.

Current debates in DA spend a lot of time arguing for the consideration of context, i.e. the greater external realm within which the talk occurs, in the analysis of that talk; something which CA does not advocate but rather suggests that analysts tune into what participants make relevant and this may or may not involve what some might refer to as the "independent identified external features" (Leudar, Sharrock, Hayes & Truckle, 2008, p. 864). Yet 'reality as it is known' cannot be merely what is reported upon but also the ever important 'here and now'.

Denzin's position and those like it are missing what Leudar et al. (2008) refer to as "the dualism of action and context" (p. 864); meaning that those symbolic

representations and narrative texts are highly dependent upon what is going on at the time and who is involved –a point which I am about to delve into greater detail. Thus, DA can be satisfied that context is being accounted for so far as a CA framework in which members activities and use of categorical tools can show this occurring.

An interview climate like the one in which some of the data for this research was collected involves story-telling which is "a recapitulation of experience that maintains the strict temporal ordering of events as they occurred in the real world" (Mishler, 1986, p. 236); yet forms a 'narrative collage' whereby time is fractured and "speakers leap forward and backward" (Denzin, 2001, p. 29). Such voices from the past and present are intermittently present as single or co-narrators; the polyphony I spoke about earlier. These voices can be other voices of the self or voices of others (ibid.). These various "points of view and style collide, switch back and forth, co-mingle" and furthermore, when the researcher (writer) steps in to the mix by writing-up analysis and findings they "intrude…speaking directly to the reader" (ibid., p. 29) thus relaying a representation of interpretations embedded further in additional interpretations of experiences.

This has been the analytical challenge of the researcher pursing narrative analysis. How does one grasp the meaning accomplished through the telling of a story? Mishler states, "it is important to recognize that determining *the* point of a story is an investigative problem…it is not an observable piece of behaviour and requires inference and interpretation on the analyst's part" (1986, p. 236) yet how

can we as researchers be confident that those inferences and interpretations are correct? Denzin says that at best we can anticipate from research of this nature that information collected allows us to see and think about things differently (2001).

However, I believe that a meta-theoretical approach of methods whose origins come from ethnomethodology (Wise, 2004, p. 49) can address these issues collectively and provide the interpretative work *participants* have engaged in, rather than the *researcher*. As I will discuss in greater detail below, these methods focus on participant (and interviewer) orientation to what is going on through turn-taking and the utterances that were placed *there and then* can provide a more reliable analytical certainty as to what the 'point of the story' is; it is interactionally contingent and depending on the recipient's reaction to the information being relayed there exists the potential to influence the 'point' altogether (ten Have, 2002b).

5.8 Analysing Discourse: Narrative biographical interviews (NBI)

There are two primary approaches to the analysis of discursive data; namely Conversation Analysis (CA) and Discourse Analysis (DA). Up to this point, I have primarily referred to the analytical framework of CA as being the primary tool I used for analysis. At this point, however, I feel it necessary to clarify their respective positions on narrative data because I believe that with the analysis of stories through a NBI or within the message boards, both these methodologies are not sufficient to stand alone. In short, CA is interested mainly in the sequentiality and normativity accomplished in talk whereas DA focuses on the

"rhetoric and discursive manoeuvres" in both talk and text (Wise, 2004, p. 50); accounting for the context in which the discourse has occurred. Furthermore, I am looking at the usage of membership categories (MCA) in these interactions as Watson asserts that they are "inextricably relat[ed] to the sequential analysis...[entailed]" in analysing discourse (Wowk & Carlin, 2004, p. 74).

As I mentioned above, in the NBI, turn-taking conversation is interwoven with story-telling. Talk-in-Interaction can easily be analysed for its sequential and normative features because it is spatially and temporally chronological. Stories, however, are unique discursive products accounting for and re-presenting historical events. While they are sequential in the unfurling of a conversational thread and their interactional usage shows normative features (Sacks, 1992; Gergen & Gergen, 1986), a story can only be understood "when it is located in the context of *time* and *space* (Hermans & Kempen, 1993, p. 14).

Stories do not stand alone, lacking buttresses of preceding and subsequent turns in interaction, yet their temporal location along that thread of conversation will not be in the current time or space of the conversation. It is also necessary to consider the importance the part of the listener or reader plays in the trajectory of the narrative told (De Fina & Georgakaopoulou, 2008; Ochs & Capps, 1996; Ochs, 1997).

It is necessary then to analyse the data contained therein as an encapsulated single turn containing rich, contextually-relevant information until such time as the story is brought to end or –more likely, it is overlapped by the interjection of

another speaker amending the immediately preceding content or indicating toward the direction the continuation of the story should proceed.

Thus, an analytical framework solely based upon the sequential and normative features people "talking together" (ten Have, 2002a, paragraph 3) do in their transactional business is limited in accounting for the richness of reflexive work and organization of imaginings and facts (Sarbin, 1986; 1997b) as told by one person and ignores analytical attention toward possible polyphony. In the case of this thesis where the polyphonic nature of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity are of great analytical concern, a pure CA methodology would struggle with accounting for the "dynamic relationships between the individual and society in terms of their mutual change" (Marková, 2000, abstract; Marková, 2006). Furthermore attention to the categories:

> which are 'provided' in data extracts are inevitably built into analyses of that data. Particular membership categories selected are not 'simply' given by the data sequence but in addition are selected on some *ad hoc* basis precisely *so as to effectuate* the sequential analysis that is provided
> (Wowk & Carlin, 2004, p.74 original emphasis)

This is where MCA and DA can serve as useful tools for understanding the indexicality of expressions (ten Have, 2002a) in a particular story, where a particular type of discourse occurring in a particular context is equally as important as understanding the place they occupy within the sequential order. Watson believes that the categories used are inextricable from sequential analysis (Wowk & Carlin, 2004). For example, the categories used in various extracts of data in this dissertation orient to the fact that a piece of interaction is about issues in acculturation namely because mentions of ethnic groups or nationality are made or of 'cultures' and characteristics attributable to them.

The current academic climate continues to find proponents of these respective methodologies –and indeed yet others- in 'vibrant debate' (Potter, 2003, p. 784) and that these methodologies are too limited to stand alone (Hammersley, 2003) or more accurately should be divided into respective sub-disciplines which include specific analytical purposes and objectives (Potter, 2003; Billig, 1997; Watson, 1997).

Having reviewed the main arguments in discursive psychology (DA frameworks) and Conversation Analysis, I believe that a single methodology is insufficient in the analysis of NBIs as well as message board conversational thread data. Because I am looking at the polyphonic qualities of intersubjectivity in the autobiographical work constructed in an interview setting, I am pursuing an eclectic (Wetherell, 1998) methodology; marrying CA, MCA and DA. I find this possible and defensible as even staunch CA purists proceed with analysis "...from the general observation that in talk participants display to each other, as they perform their own contributions, their understanding of the setting and context..." (Wetherell, 1998, p. 391). As Schegloff has concurred, there is an "...infinitude of possible perspectives" (Wetherell, 1998, p. 392) available to 'members' with regard to subject positions and contextual occupations. I remind the reader here of what I presented at length in Chapter Four about the presence of many selves which are socially situated, reflexive and in a dialogic relationship with one another. As the interactions proceed, selves are invoked as they become interactionally relevant and make up the 'portfolio' (Antaki, Condor & Levine, 1996) or 'ensemble' (Wetherell, 1998, p.404) of subject positions (I-

positions) a person has at their disposal for future deployment when the situation calls them to the foreground.

5.8a Conversation analysis (CA)

The methodology of CA is robust (ten Have, 2005) with a rather stable set of core ideas and practices (ibid.) which have remained for the most part intact since its' inception in the early 1960s by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (ibid.). However, as proponents of pure CA advocate, it is "a detached investigation of conversational detail" (Billig, 1997, p. 544); to investigate the nature, design and "situatedness" of conversational 'objects' (Wooffitt, 2001). According to Billig, that means that CA analysts are "attending to matters the speakers do not" (ibid., p. 547). As Sharrock and Anderson (1987 cf. Billig, 1997) understand it:

> The result is that Conversation Analysis necessarily disattends to what actors may see as the business of their talk, in favour of the activities which actors engage in solely by virtue of their character as operators of a speech exchange system...CA is based based on the 'stock idea' that conversations are organized and orderly.
>
> (p. 547)

As such, CA has discovered the sequential organizations of participants in solving problems in interaction (ten Have, 2006). As I said before, CA has been interested in the normative activities of conversation; essentially the ways in which people *do* things within a given piece of interaction (Billig, 1997). Within DP and other disciplines studying discourse, there has been a crucial movement toward investigating the activities of interaction from a "radically *emic* view of objects (whether they be motives, gravity waves, social classes or whatever). That is, those things are understood in relation to their involvement in participants' practices" (Potter, 2003, p. 788). By paying close analytical

attention to what people are doing turn-by-turn, scholars like Potter say that analysts are able to break the (bad) habit of attempting to determine the motivations and intentions people have in saying and doing what they do. In this way, they tread an infinitely thin line –carefully avoiding the making of bold claims that certain activities of language can be analysed to reveal anything beyond the situatedness of language. Such a position would suppose that language was completely a product of the mind; with all meaning and intention being *figured out* prior to entering the social realm (Leudar, Sharrock, Hayes & Truckle, 2008).

Cognitivists argue that the problem with such a methodology as advocated here is that it is non-consequential because in conversation, "the minds of other individuals are not *directly* available to us" (Sharrock & Coulter, 2009, p. 58 original emphasis). However, as Sharrock and Coulter argue, is it actually necessary to have full access to the minds of others or can a look at the pragmatics of language also yield something worthwhile, meaningful and interesting?

As I show in the analysis of this dissertation, the business of participants talk, through written or spoken narratives, is a very important endeavour for people to get the meaning between them right. So while those of the 'mentalist' tradition assert that "we cannot imagine what those 'mental states' might 'look like'" (Sharrock & Coulter, 2009), people certainly do make a lot of effort in talking to explain their mental states as well as try to comprehend the mental states of others. People would not go about doing this mundane activity, i.e. engaging in

dialogue with one another, if the possibility of this nirvana were completely and permanently out of reach.

As such, I am troubled 'disattending' to the work being done by people in their interactions with me and do not wish to abandon my participants and their own terms –not the organization activities but "what actors may see as the business of their talk" (Sharrock & Anderson, 1987, p. 246 cf. Billig, 1997, p. 547, see also the literature reviewed by Housley & Fitzgerald, 2002). I shall think they would be rather disappointed in this, having laboured in producing for me such rich and interesting stories about life as expats which have implications for them and their sense of self! Billig (1997, p. 547) considers this a breach in the CA purist's claim of studying participants 'own terms' (Schegloff, 1997b, p. 171). Afterall, how can the technical 'vernacular' (Billig, 1997; Schegloff, 1997b) of CA be considered the participants 'own terms' (Billig, 1997); perhaps "participants are ostensibly to be studied 'in their own terms', but they are not to be written about in such terms; instead, analysts use their own terms to accomplish this observation of participants' own terms" (ibid., p. 546). It is these conceptual difficulties which prevent me from pursing a purely CA methodology and where I feel that the methodology is limited for, admittedly, *my* purposes; namely to investigate acculturation from a DP perspective and to show the Dialogical Self empirically. As Marková so eloquently summarises:

> ...social interaction approaches like conversation analysis, talk-in-interaction and various kinds of discourse analysis that presuppose the *I-you* interdependence, we find that in their theoretical and empirical priorities they close windows to interactions in their complexity. For example, conversation analysis presupposes that dialogical participants are involved in joint meaning-making activities; some discourse analytic approaches emphasise the interdependence between dialogue and context; and so on. Theoretically, they acknowledge that speakers mutually construct their meanings, that their speech is filled with others' speech, world views and collective opinions. They emphasise that dialogue takes place in specific contexts, that speakers perform

> different and multiple communicative activities, and so on. Empirically, however, they use extracts from conversations that are usually brief in terms of a number of dialogical contributions…
>
> (2006, p. 130)

I do find, however, that tools from CA provide useful resources which have helped me in the rigorous and methodical handling of my interviews, data and, at times, analysis. I will refer to this as a CA-type analytical mentality. What I mean with 'this type' of analytical mentality is that I employ, at times, analysis which is solely 'data-driven' and 'unmotivated' (ten Have, 2006). I look at the points in an interview where there is not a clear single-author telling of a story but rather a collaborative effort undertaken by one or more participants either in the form of joint production of talk or the joint production of a story –a story which by virtue of being a product of two or more people- inevitably is different in structure and content than had it been told by only one person.

Because of my interest in narrative psychology (NP) and the structure of stories to which I have dedicated a significant amount of time toward in Chapter Seven, I am careful not to "relate cultural artefacts to [the] so-called [expat life] context [and try] to grasp their constitution as objects in their own right" (Schegloff, 1997b, p. 170). What I mean, is that a self narrative which *sounds like* a story about experiences of that context may contain a "guiding metaphor" (Gergen & Gergen, 1986, p. 24) which "once one has selected the central metaphor, it will largely determine the subsequent account of the work one is ostensibly attempting to depict" (ibid., p. 24). As such, it might not be so much a story of all the trouble with the move abroad as contrasted with previous moves but rather one of "three prototypical or primitive narrative forms…in which progress toward the goal is enhanced, those in which it is impeded, and those in which no

change occurs" (ibid., p. 24). If, for example, the move abroad is contrasted in way with previous moves in the participant's home country which were far less troublesome, the narrative of the impediment as made attributable to *this* move *abroad* can serve as insight to an individual's understanding of their starting point in the foreign country. Then, how does that 'impediment narrative' structure compare to the narrative structures of the stories about the move abroad from other participants?

The turns taken within the telling of that story say a lot about the identity work of participants –both the storytellers as well as those to whom the story is being told. Implicit referencing takes place throughout the interaction as to who all the available parties are; perhaps to which membership categories they belong and those who are excluded from those categories as the story unfolds. At times, it is necessary to examine two or more stories which were at the time of their telling in the interaction, free-standing, but when seen as first and second stories (Sacks, 1992) (a point I address in case study one in Chapter Seven), can be considered in fact as single turns taken in the interaction as a whole.

With respect to the exchange of information (ten Have, 2006) being done within the interview, CA provides a strict and repeatable procedure by which the identity work of participants and interviewer can be examined. As the debate undertaken by Speer (2002), ten Have (2002b), Lynch (2002) and Potter (2002) highlight, interview settings produce data which is neither certainly natural nor certainly contrived. The question they are concerned with is whether or not the data produced are in fact *made of the same sort of stuff* as something that would

have occurred with or without the researcher and understanding this I propose further; what implications does that have toward claiming authenticity of identity work being done in these interactions?

It is true and demonstrable in the data that at times the interview is just that. The participants are all oriented to the mandate that the interaction *is supposed to be* an interview within which there are implicitly ascribed speaking roles (interviewer and interviewee) and statements such as "I'd like you to tell me about…" or questions like "so what do you want to know?" are prima face through the course of the interaction. When utterances such as these arise and break the current trajectory of talk participants do not find them as problematic but as par for the course *in an interview.*

Then there are also instances where the participants clearly orient to the researcher not as a researcher but as a fellow member and co-participant (this will be shown empirically in Chapter Seven). As Schegloff (1988/9, p. 215 cf. Speer, 2002, p. 519) states, "labelling and announcing an occasion of talk-in-interaction as an interview does not *ipso facto* make it one, nor does it guarantee that what began as one will remain one". In this way, CA has also been extremely useful in making those points in the interview explicit as well as exposing a considerable (and illuminating) amount of information which I co-produced as a fellow member of my study population. In fact, in my analysis I treat the data I produced in the same manner as that of the people I was 'interviewing' (Speer, 2002).

As such what is produced are data which is naturally focused on a context upon which participants in the interaction are exploring themselves with questions directed toward one another. As I mentioned previously my first interview started off with participants asking *me* the first question. The context is relevant to all and because the researcher is also a member and not a detached observer, the interest from all involved is not purely scientific. Just as the example I provided about some Americans coincidently meeting one another in a café in Cambridge was used to explicate, strangers also have the potential (and often do if they engage in interaction with one another) to act as informal interviewers of one another with questions like *where are you from?*

5.8b Membership categorisation analysis (MCA)

As I have argued up to this point, this dissertation is an EM study which views the context of acculturation "exclusively as a members' phenomenon" (Eglin, 2002, p. 819). What this means is that the social order is maintained by people of a society who are both analysts and participants in it and the resources which they employ in their practical accomplishments through interaction comprise that reality (Hester & Eglin, 1997). Some of these resources include categorizations. One of the things Sacks and his colleagues saw people doing with regards to others in their work to understand and achieve conversational interaction (Eglin & Hester, 2003, p. 9) was description or referencing (Schegloff, 2006) through deployment of categories and categorizations. In fact, when Sacks began developing his methods for studying the ethno-methods of people's interactional activities; categories and people *doing* categorizations occupied a significant place in his work.

People often draw upon linguistic membership categories in their speech as a means to convey some aspect about themselves or about someone else. During this research process, the participants (foreigners) who were being interviewed frequently drew figurative boundaries around themselves and made distinctions between members of certain groups, i.e. "them", "us", "British" and "German" - just to name a few.

Therefore, a proper EM study needs to consider the categorical as well as sequential aspects of conversation (Wise, 2004, p. 66; Hester & Eglin, 1997, p. 2). Membership categories are a part of members' own analytical work of what is transpiring in the talk they are having with others and are therefore a very important part of any analysis of people's ordinary activities. The use of categories such as those I mentioned above under a grouping which could be called 'different cultures' shows participants orientations to the fact that this interaction is about acculturation, i.e. in the sense that contrasting cultural activities using named cultures is something which *needs* to be done here.

As Schegloff notes one key site to see categorization work being done (and indeed to pursue work on categorization) is to examine the story-telling activities of people (2006).

MCA has since developed as an exclusive method of inquiry (see Eglin & Hester, 2003; Hester & Eglin, 1997; Watson, 1997; Jayyusi, 1984). I will not be, however, presenting a comprehensive overview of membership categories (MC),

membership category devices (MCD) or category bound activities (CBA) here. In short, MCDs are tools which work to "account for the sorts of hearings and understandings such usages get, and for the practices that get them produced in a fashion that achieves these understandings...a set of resources and practices" (Schegloff, 2006, p. 467) e.g. the device of 'different cultures' I used above.

Studying category usage in narrative accounts is a very useful way to analyse 'the procedures people employ to make sense of other people and their activities' (Leudar et al., 2004, p. 244). When categorizations are employed, it is typically about more than a simple utterance (Hausendorf, 2000 cf. Leudar et al., 2004) and can be seen as a way to establish or deny membership and all activities, negative connotations, rights, privileges and so forth associated therewith.

Carlin's explanation of membership categories and their relation to culture is succinct and comprehensive and is worth quoting at length:

> Membership categories are ordinary descriptions and identifications of persons and collections of persons, which are used and applied by members on a commonplace and routine basis, in order to organize the social world in which they live. The use of membership categories is culturally methodic, i.e. membership categories are known and shared within a culture. Membership categories are features of the use of natural language, constituent features of ordinary language practices, i.e. culture. Membership Categorization Analysis is an attitude towards and explication of this aspect of people's cultural logic.
> (2003, paragraph 2)

CA and discourse analysis has proceeded in such a trajectory that MCA has for the most part "faded from central attention" (Schegloff, 2006, p. 462; Housley & Fitzgerald, 2002). CAs strict adherence to studying interaction in participants own terms has led to some debate, as I presented above. Watson asserts that:

> Methodological tendency in 'mainstream' conversation analysis to highlight sequential analysis by setting 'categorization relevances' at zero, and to deal with what were hitherto deemed to be categorization phenomena in terms of

> contextualization procedures ...[is]...metaphorically speaking...a *gestalt* switch"... the fact that membership categorization phenomena have been made to recede [from the analytical agenda] does not...render them *de facto* inert or inoperative...they still operate 'behind the scenes'.
>
> (1997, p. 50)

As I discussed previously, context and action are mutually constitutive of the 'here and now' in interaction; categorizations are in large part what makes this possible. For example, Leudar et al.'s paper on 'structured immediacy' looked at how special 'talks' with children within a school environment could suddenly be transformed into psychotherapeutic occasions by therapists "modifying categorical relations of adult and child, pupil and teacher to enable them to actualise their kind of psychotherapy" (2008, p. 864).

For the purposes of this study, I am looking at categories and their implications upon the sequential organization (Watson, 1978) of the interview talk and narratives and the ways in which they are used indexically and reflexively used for the purpose of establishing, among other things, the matters of the here and now.

An interesting aspect about categories and categorizations is that they are not necessarily semantically salient. As I discussed in the previous section about Bakhtin, the word has no 'semantic authority' and it contains a fusion of other people's own meanings and intentions. There may be aspects of categories which are consistently recognizable but they also have the ability, through people's meaning-making activities, to change (Smith, 1978); making their usage and comprehension highly indexical (ten Have, 2002a). As Gergen and Gergen present, "two users of the same descriptive term could fully agree on the way in which the term should be used but hold entirely different conceptions of the

object itself" (1986, p. 23). This exact point is illustrated explicitly in the data which I present in Chapter Seven in which all the participants agree upon the fact that the term 'Expat' should be used but do indeed hold different particular category bound activities as relevant predicates to the constitution of the category.

In the discursive approach to studying categories, the focus is on their situated usage in talk (Edwards, 1991). This differs from a cognitive approach which assumes that there are pre-existing "systematic properties" (ibid., p. 517) and results in an "assembling [of] categorizations for making sense of ... experience" (ibid.).

From this framework, that would mean that the position I take "as an American" and the one another American takes "as an American" are each subjective and contain an infinite amount of possibilities within just that one categorization and people encounter (and determine) what these differences are in conceptions through their daily interactions with one another. Now multiply that by all the possible positions that people can individually adhere to with all the infinite possibilities of how those different positions can be understood and all we can do is negotiate these one interaction at a time solidifying for ourselves what we understand each of those positions to be –until someone else comes along requiring us to adjust that understanding.

Therefore, a discursive approach to categories can help illuminate the trajectory of social activities people undertake in clarifying those positions they take in

interaction. Looking at the interaction closely to see which categories are displayed by participants and the way(s) in which they are used supports the position that categories are highly indexical (Edwards, 1991).

Watson has metaphorically termed this *speaking as an* 'incumbent' of a categorical position (1978). As incumbents of categories, members assume or ascribe 'category-bound knowledge' (Sharrock, 1974; Watson, 1978) as well as 'category-bound obligations and rights' (Watson, 1978). Hermans and Kempen (1993, p. 114) propose that 'the individual speaks the words of the group, social class, or society to which the individual belongs and reflects the unity of the group, class or society' (cf. Akkerman et al., 2006, p. 466). Yet Hermans and Kempens proposition describes social positioning in an unreflexive and reified way; a concept of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity (and those assumed and ascribed categories which belong therewith) which again assumes a separate ontology i.e. the individual *gains* their words from the group, social class or society. What happens when those who share group membership contest the ideas or representations of other members?

The situated evocations of the category incumbency can be called a 'voice' and in any given interaction, it may be possible to see the very polyphony which Bakhtin describes. The questions are then, which polyphonies exists at any given point in the interaction and what does their particular structure at any given moment in the interaction tell us about the action being undertaken by the interlocutors?

5.8c Multivoicedness and categorisation

Such an empirical investigation assessing the "multivoicedness and dialogicality of the self" was introduced by Hermans as a Personal Position Repertoire (henceforth PPR) (2001a, p. 324) which aims to pay attention to the stories people tell about their lives through their orientation to varying 'internal' and 'external' positions. To illustrate this Hermans engages a 'stage' metaphor (ibid., p. 329) and explains that:

> ...a number of (internal) characters enter the stage from the left, and a number of (external) characters enter the stage from the right. The PPR is devised to study how these two groups of characters are related to each other, both within and between the groups. Positions are depicted as 'moving in space' and described in highly dynamic ways as represented by processes like 'positioning', 'repositioning' and being 'positioned'.
>
> (ibid., p. 329)

The use of this metaphor brings to mind some interesting comparisons between Goffman's dramaturgical concept of social interaction (Schegloff, 1988) and Sacks' (1992) concept of MCA. As the theory of the Dialogical Self arose from the inspiration of Bakhtin's metaphor of the polyphonic novel, there exists within us a multiplicity of voices and "as in a polyphonic musical work, multiple voices accompany and oppose one another in dialogical ways" (Hermans, 2001, p. 245). Yet Hermans' concept does not pay much attention to the dynamic ability of people to reflexively alter, negotiate and reformulate their positions all as a result of situated activity. Basically it assumes presupposed (cognitive) positions which a person brings into interaction rather than the possibility that positions may arise out of interaction and be dynamic in diverse ways depending upon who is around and what is being done.

Therefore what needs to be done here is to understand the ways in which these *positions* and the voices which speak them are compatible with linguistic categorizations and the plurality of self *as social objects of knowledge*.

Categories and their incumbents as social objects of knowledge change through interlocutor's reflexive participation in social activities. What this means is that in contrast to what Hermans is doing with his PPR, it really can not be assumed that people share their understandings entirely of positions or categorizations, i.e. what it means to be a mother. Perhaps many agree on a collection of ideas of what a mother should and should not do and one thing a mother should not do is kill her own children. Yet some do. Doctors take oaths to do no harm yet two doctors drove a bomb into the Glasgow airport in an attempt to do harm. Debates around events such as these ensue and the categorization is debated in light of examples where incumbent's behaviours go against those generally-accepted category-bound activities. In the case of the latter, they were not just doctors but also Islamic 'extremists' –a categorization ascribed to such people but certainly not so by the very people themselves. Does any one category supersede the other? As this last example illustrates, even when we are dealing with those 'internal' character positions, it cannot be assumed that this position is permanent.

The infinite possibilities of these embodied voices to create idiosyncratic conglomerations of identity affiliations or, to put it another way, to reveal themselves as being incumbents of diverse categorizations which they either align themselves to or which are imposed upon them, supports the argument that

we must be careful not to neglect people's ability to look at the past and to alter the present in its light or to alter the past in light of the present (Bruner, 1990 p. 109).

At times, whether it is actual external social interaction or dialogism within, the literal or figurative interlocutors, respectively, may be engaged in either heated debate or align with one another. What is of interest here is the I-position*ing* work that is being done and when and how polyphonies arise. I have used the word 'positioning' in order to clarify that the dialogism of these different voices is an active undertaking. This assumes that positions have an implicit content and that the resources contained therein are called upon in situated instances (Leudar, Marsland & Nekvapil, 2004) and indeed 'can be endowed with a *voice*' (Gieser, 2006, p. 444). At this point, I would like to draw a comparison between Hermans' useage of 'positions' with the 'categories' Sacks (1992) introduced in his study of conversation.

Hermans (2001a) made a distinction between 'social positions' and 'personal positions'.

> Social positions can be equalized with the traditional term 'role', and as such they are governed by societal prescriptions and expectations (e.g. father, employer, chairman). Personal positions, on the other hand, receive their form from the particular ways in which individual people organize their own lives, sometimes in opposition to or in protest against societal expectations...in everyday life, social positions are typically combined with a particular set of personal positions. For example, a mother (social position) is seen as a 'good mother' if she is a caring person (personal position) in relation to her children...as these examples suggest, the expectations of a community toward the behaviour of a person in a particular social position are based on implicit or explicit associations between a social position and a set of personal positions (ibid., p. 330)

These positions can be compared, almost exactly, with the 'categories' and 'categorizations', respectively, from Sacks' (1992) work.

> [categorizations] refers to the work of members in categorizing other members or using 'characterizations' of them, whereas...[categories] refer to the already culturally available category-concepts that members may, and routinely do, use in categorizational work and the accomplishment of various practical tasks
> (Jayyusi, 1984, p. 20)

The point is that categories and categorizations are tools used and observable in positioning one's self when conversation is studied in detail whereas Hermans' 'positions' are implicit assumptions one attributes to themselves or is assumed as having but he does provide us with empirical evidence of their actual dialogical use. While the assumption may exist that the dialogism may be a private, internal construction, the idea that a person aligns to the same positions (categories) privately as well as socially persists as Hermans (2002) asserts '...there is no essential difference between the positions a person takes as a part of the self and the positions people take as members of a heterogeneous society' (p. 148). However, as I presented above, it should be emphasized that these positions are subject to debate and change as a result of interaction. As Marková points out, "thinking and speaking are rarely determined; there can always be new interpretations of meanings depending on *who* the other *is*" (2009, p. 220 emphasis in original) and that "there could be no dialogue if participants were opposed to one another" (ibid., p. 215) in some way –no matter how minute.

The social interaction that *is* the Dialogical Self enables me to apply this idea of transient I-positions (Levinson, 1988) as different 'others' on a stage interacting and performing for one another. These roles are, however, not static nor are they exhaustively performed at any given moment and may be only partly evoked depending upon what the situated encounter calls for (Giddens, 1988) hence the displays of 'positioning', 'repositioning' and 'being positioned' (Hermans,

2001). These incumbencies or positions, respectively, are implicit (may be are made explicit at times) and situated. They modulate interactional activities and are often, from a narrative perspective, accomplishing accounting work. As I mentioned, there are infinite possibilities with respect to these positions and through my analysis I will be showing this presence of the polyphony of a person empirically.

5.8d Discourse analysis (DA)

DA consists of a wide variety of approaches (ten Have, 2006; Potter, 2003; Taylor, 2001; Wetherell, Taylor & Yates, 2001). I shall be pursuing what has been coined the 'Loughborough School' (Wise, 2004, p. 49) of discourse analysis which draws upon EM and CA as well as other approaches. This has culminated into an approach known as discursive psychology (Potter, 2003).

Unlike other approaches to the problem of acculturation which have used a 'factor-and-outcome logic' (Potter, 2003), DA's "questions are conversational and rhetorical" and are focused upon the action and construction of the context of interest (ibid., p. 786). Potter states that the goal of this type of research is to highlight things which have become "implicit and taken-for-granted" (2003, p. 786).

Yet there is a lot to be learned among those who seem to have a number of things in common. For example, in respect to this research, participants were recruited based upon the fact that they fit a prescribed set of criteria generated by the researcher for the category 'expat'. However, as the data clearly shows in

Chapter Seven, matters which are implicit and taken for granted are very much the concern for participants surrounding the accurate accounting for who can refer to themselves as an expat. Although from they do not share paradigmatic orientations, Collins and Marková (1999) and Edwards (2004) bring in Schutz and Garfinkel to explicate the point that "inter-subjective understanding *[takes] place* through and against the background of 'known in common' features" (p. 340 my emphasis). That is to say that even if there is shared knowledge, people who have more presumed 'shared sameness' possess and display a more comprehensive corpus of meaning-making resources and activities still need to go about the business of *sorting it out*.

The implicit assumptions made by the researcher about who does and does not belong in this category are met with the participants' own implicit ideas about who fits into this category. It is vital to respect the fact that each person is "working with one simple coherent picture" (Potter, 2003, p. 789) of their lives abroad. To assume or impose presumptions would "simply obscure the relevant discourse practices" (ibid., p. 789). As Collins and Marková (1999) suggest, the ways in which people go about establishing mutual understanding is often taken for granted and not necessarily overly explicit in the course of their talk. Yet through the data, it is very clearly apparent that even people who could be assumed to have a greater number of things in common with each other, i.e. all are research participants recruited through the presupposition of category-bound-activities of expats are ipso facto expats, still go about the business of constructing their 'shared knowledge' (Edwards, 2004). I have dedicated an entire analytical chapter (Chapter Seven) to showing just how important and

relevant this point was to all participants in the interaction; *so what kind of expat are you?*

This take on DA aims to show the fluidity and diversity of shared culture in action. It considers the importance this context and its related phenomena have "in terms of people's descriptions, glosses, categories, orientations and so on" (Potter, 2003, p. 787). Rather than seeing discourse as a product of cognitive processes, DP looks at the ways in which discursive objects are topicalized and formulated through the course of interaction (Potter, 2006).

This research is then a look at acculturation as a member's phenomenon; a "radically *emic* view" (Potter, 2003, p. 788 original emphasis) whereby the inter-subjectivity in constructing shared knowledge of acculturation is a practical, performative accomplishment (Edwards, 2004). The bearing this has on the psychological claims that can be made about talk activity in general is, according to Edwards, that the things people assert as being 'given' or 'definite' makes a distinction, "in some psychological sense" (2004, p. 42), between those things which are 'at stake' in the talk and those which are not.

> In other words, it may be assumed by the analyst that those devices express people's actual, realistic, most plausible, best guesses at what each other knows and thinks. That psychological assumption is sustained largely by using, as illustrative objects, decontextualized, invented examples in which, because nobody actually said them anywhere, nothing much was at stake in the saying of them.
>
> (ibid., 2004, p. 42)

Therefore, the category of expats gets done through the *performative category* (Edwards 2004, p. 43 citing Austin) of 'shared knowledge' of being an expat –a relevant discourse for the participants.

As a main focus of this research is to show acculturation as an empirical problem and its polyphonic quality, I required a methodology which highlights only members' activities, as CA and DA do, but which also contains theoretical underpinnings in examining the constitution of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity such as those proposed by Marková.

5.9 Ethics

All participants (each member of participant couples) were given a Participant Information Sheet and if they agreed to participate in the research were asked to sign a consent form. In signing the consent form, participants agreed to their interviews being audio recorded for later transcription and for those transcriptions and recordings to be kept for the duration of the project. All participants signed the consent forms.

The potential existed for the participants to be confronted with the realisation that deeper issues existed, such as problems within the relationship as a result of these differences in acculturation or the effects upon one's own functioning.

One possible concern was the potential for there to be a hierarchy of conversational dominance (Itakura, 2001) if both partners are non-native speakers of English (language of the study) and if one partner orients themselves or their partner to difficulties in second language acquisition (Wong & Olsher, 2000b). The acknowledgement of this fact by the *disadvantaged* speaker or by the partner with greater linguistic resources may cause embarrassment or result in diminished conversational participation on the part of either participant.

Through the course of the research, this was at times noticeable, however the participants seemed to regulate the issue themselves and there were never reports of distress from any of the participants.

5.10 Summary

I have advocated for an idiographic methodology from a DP perspective which includes CA, DA and MCA. I have argued that one method is not sufficient in attempting to highlight the subjective and inter-subjective qualities of utterances. This methodology assumes an ontology of self and culture which is mutually constitutive and dialogical. The method pays particular attention to members' category work and what this reveals about how they position themselves among and opposite others in shared as well as different cultures. Therefore the data are treated as members' phenomenon.

I have argued that all data, including that produced by the interview/researcher/ analyst will be analysed as part and parcel to the data of the research participants. Primary analytical focus will be upon the moments in the data which reveal polyphonic aspects of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity.

In effect CA is dealing with inter-subjectivity in talk-in-interaction while DA (DP) can illuminate the innovation and creativity of self intra-personally in narrative as well as in situated instances in talk.

Chapter Six

Representation of culturally-modulated mundane activities on expat community message boards
Pilot study

6.0 Chapter Introduction

This next chapter is a culmination of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks I have brought together. To summarize briefly, this is a thesis investigating the dialogicity of self as observable through narrative accounts of acculturative experience. While the other analytical chapters will be focusing on data which, although transcribed as written texts from audio recordings are actually spoken dialogue, storytelling and subject positioning are also done in certain forms of written text.

The data for this current chapter looks at internet-based Expat Message Boards. The chapter serves a few functions: 1) it contains a detailed account of the methodology by which stories will be subsequently analysed throughout the remainder of the thesis 2) it shows possible 'polyphony' empirically in story-telling and 3) the ways in which culture modulates those situated activities of participants and how culture is debated, negotiated and/or re-created among them.

I have now arrived at a point where the self is understood as a discursive construction in which the "uttered pronoun *I* stands for the author, the *Me* for the actor or narrative figure. A unified self which contains an *I* and a *Me* authors stories whereby the *I* can imaginatively construct a story in which the *Me* is the

protagonist" (Hermans & Kempen, 1993, p. 45) and that our encounters and engagement with others can become additional resources for the self in the form of voices which we can, in turn, invoke in later interactions; it thus both polyphonic and dialogical (Hermans, Kempen & van Loon, 1992).

Additionally, I have noted and accounted for the fact that our interactions, for most of us, are primarily with others with whom we presume to share an 'undercurrent of cultural interpretation' in the manner which Schutz (1944) described. Now I aim to show the phenomena empirically.

Many researchers have to alluded to the idea that people are the creators of culture as well as beings created by their culture. One way, according to Denzin (2001), that they (we) create culture is through writing. While Denzin may be making reference to famous works which define an author and subsequently in some way a people or an era (i.e. Shakespeare), countless literary works also exist which have achieved iconic status in various cultures (and various points in history, i.e. *Mein Kampf*) as embodying the *rhetoric* of a leader and therefore, a people (Stuckey, 2004).

Drawing upon this idea I am extending these ideas further toward contexts where culture emerges through textual compositions of people's situated activities in both their representations and active undertaking of mundane pursuits as well as issues and concerns as expressed through the usage of internet-based message

boards[27]. In essence these data are interactions mediated by writing; a person is in effect transcribing their own inner dialogue.

Denzin mistakeningly states that "we know the world only through our representations of it" (2001, p. 23). Although he employs the use of 'performance-based dramaturgical culture' (ibid., p. 26), proponents of Goffman's sociological theory in which people are, in various venues, performing (see Goffman, 1959; 1961; Williams, 1988; Ross, 2007) would take exception to his position. What we know of the world is contingent upon various things; our interpretations, the context of those interpretations, other's representations and the context of those others' representations and so on. The key point I am trying to emphasize is that *what we know* has been collected through a medium, language, which has been represented and re-represented infinitely by other people and is therefore polyphonic. Although the quote below is referring to written texts, the same can be applied to interaction.

> Real-life experiences are shared by prior textual representations. These experiences are in turn shaped by understandings gained from participating in the performances of others – performances turned into texts. These understandings, in turn, are reinscribed in the transcribed voice and dialogue of the other. These texts are dialogical, the site at which multiple voices co-mingle.
>
> (Denzin, 1997, p. 33)

With this understanding, I shall rephrase Denzin's (2001) earlier quote to say that what we know about our world is imparted through the representation of the world of others and we show what we know of our (their) world through our own representations. Just as in the rephrasing of Denzin's own text, I am incorporating his voice (and those who have influenced him), my own voice and those voices of other academics from whom I have acquired and developed my

[27] Referred to by many other names including, chat rooms, web blogs and discussion boards.

understanding of this particular context; the context of an academic discussing lived textuality. This is an example of lived textuality which is polyphonic. The concept of multivoicedness and dialecticism will be a profound focus of this section. However, for the moment I would like return the focus just upon the texts themselves and what they produce.

Historically, we are all familiar with one method in performances of culture; that of story-telling. I cite here a particularly explicit example of this through folklore (see Propp, 1984). The language of such stories is a contextual one which 'members use to bring each other together' (Denzin, 2001, p. 24) and 'in the moment of story-telling, teller and listener (or reader), performer and audience, share the goal of participating in an experience which reveals their shared sameness' (ibid., p. 25 cf. Porter, 2000).

Stories and the collective, shared language used in their production, binds people together. However, this idea can be extended beyond the all-encompassing 'living antiquity' (Propp, 1984, p. 4) of folklore. For example, this section is looking at data which consists of the story-telling and culture-creating done by American expatriates in the UK on message boards. In their textual story-telling, they are reproducing culture and seeking consensus on and understanding toward their stories about their experiences in the UK believed to be from an American perspective. In their exchange of stories, they individually attempt to interconnect events from their independent pasts (or perceptions about the current situation as informed by their own past experiences) from one another as they share sameness in this present condition of being expats. Yet a problem

arises in the assumption that there is a homogenous collective American perspective. In aligning, debating or offering alternative stories from various 'stratum of the [American] population' (Propp, 1984, p. 4) from which they hail, the diversity in these voices from a collective American culture reveal their own 'separatness in their togetherness' and now create another stratum of American culture; one of American expats sharing experiences, in this case shopping, as embedded within the UK. I will be directing my analytical attention toward the polyphonies which arise in such story telling.

The abovementioned problem encompasses the presuppositions people have as they move into interaction with others. Early work by Schutz (1944) highlighted the point that each of us approaches an opportunity for interaction with others unfamiliar to us with particular 'recipes' of interpretation and that. At times the individual's awareness that they are themselves *the stranger* is explicit due to any number of factors such as their presence in a foreign territory. At other times this awareness is not so explicit and it is later into the interaction where these interpretative schemes are called into question. Regardless of which scenario ensues, language is the catalyst of acceptance or rejection of said schemes; it '...comes to function as a means of regulating activities...[and]...regulates which stimuli are effective among those with the environment' (Leudar & Costall, 1996, p. 58).

However, there is at least initially at the onset of interaction with others who we believe to share 'cultural-sameness' with us, a belief that there is a basis upon which interaction can ensue. One way in which we establish a basis for further

interaction is through our mutual exchange of stories. For the Americans on the Expat message board, there is the:

> [assumed] ...explicit formulation of implicit narrative conventions, the local rules for telling a certain kind of story to a certain kind of audience. We would expect the rules to be different for different audiences. In order to be intelligible stories need to be adjusted to fit the conventions available to those who will listen to them or read them.
>
> (Harré, 2004, p. 1445)

I say assumed because it is observable that a majority of participants in message board communities follow the conventions of web-based communication etiquette in that they constrain their communications to the topic at hand. However, it is not always dictated how the postings should *look.* At times someone may say something like, "*...I know this is going a bit off topic but...*" Sometimes this introduction of a subject slightly off topic change the course of the thread for a period of time or even entirely while other times it may be perfunctorily addressed by a subsequent posting or ignored completely.

What the stories in these data go on to show is the implicit assumptions of the known audience and the diversity among the participants both subjectively and inter-subjectively.

6.1 Story-telling as situated action

In the methods section of this thesis, I advocated for an Ethnomethodolgical investigation into the narratives of acculturating people with an analytical eye toward the polyphonic nature of the subjective positioning. Now I would like to provide a more detailed insight to the structure and usage of stories in interaction and why cognitive theoretical constructs such as the dialogical self and polyphony can accompany a situated approach. As Harré said, "if the discursive principle that cognitive functioning is a symbolic activity, *performed according*

to norms of correctness, is generally true, then the results of the philosophical and the psychological projects should converge in many cases" (2004, p. 1438 my emphasis).

People are in a constant process of "ordering and reordering the events that they consider relevant to their own lives" (Hermans & Kempen, 1993, p.15); which is primarily done in a sort of chronology of events which must be done from time to time. Stories are not merely for entertainment or knowledge dissemination but serve a variety of social purposes. For instance, stories can be used to represent individuals' subjective experiences and coordinate them by drawing out contrasts or similarities. As lives proceed, encounters and experiences are acquired and new events require a revisiting of those personal narratives. Narratives then told about these events are representations of the past as told in light of new information. These new experiences may be incorporated into the personal narrative and interconnectedness established. One must account for the past as it paved the way for the here and now and the implications of those events on possible future action. From this perspective, the person, rather than being the product of these events is, through constant renegotiation, an updated version of itself. This is accomplished through the means in which they choose to make or emphasize particular subjective points relevant to their personal narratives.

> ...the story or narrative [is] already formed...waiting to be delivered, to fit in or be trimmed to fit the context into which it is being inserted. In this regard it resembles common conceptions of speech acts, whose constitutive conditions and properties are autonomous, which have their origins *in the psychology of the individual* (whether in intentions or experiences and memories) and which are then stitched into the occasions on which they are enacted.
> (Schegloff, 1997, p. 100 my emphasis)

Harvey Sacks (1992) studied storytelling in interaction. One thing he observed was that stories shared with others were often purposeful (Schegloff, 1997) and the exchange of stories between the interlocutors in a single interaction shared some kind of interconnectedness. The design and structure of a given story are also heavily influenced by who the recipient(s) is (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 1997). When a story is told -and stories are always *told* stories (Hermans, 2004, p. 304) upon it's '...completion the interaction and its participants have been brought to some further state of talk and [the further trajectory of that interaction] will in some fashion be related to that story's telling' (ibid., p. 97). As such, in a piece of interaction where story-telling is observable, there emerges a single 'first' story. Sometimes the interaction proceeds further through the contribution of subsequent 'second' stories contributed by other interlocutors. As Sacks discovered, the telling of 'first' and 'second' stories are means by which people seek and display understanding of those to whom they tell their story and how those experiences are publicly coordinated collectively in the course of interaction. In the telling of a first story, such as the initial posting on an internet-based community site as is presented below, the author is soliciting second stories from fellow 'community' members. Sacks referred to stories told in this fashion as being in a 'request format' in which the teller of the story is seeking information and does so by the telling of a story (ibid., p. 229). While Sacks initially looked at a piece of interaction which contained a first and second story[28], internet message boards and, indeed, conversational venues where there are many potential participants present, the possibility of infinite subsequent stories exists (i.e., 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and so on). As the conversational thread proceeds

[28] The design of an internet message board solicits the receipt of an above average number of second stories.

and each subsequent author posts their response (story), the trajectory of story plot and character positions may alter slightly.

At times, the orientation of understanding with the original poster's position is explicit, at other times; it may come in the form of a second story. In the telling of these second stories, Sacks noticed some similarity between the first and second. He suggested that this similarity was not just a random coincidence but possibly an 'achieved similarity' (1992, p. 4). This achieved similarity is noticeable in the comparison of first and second stories where parallels are able to be drawn between the topic and characters present in both stories. What is interesting to observe is the analysis of the first story, which subsequent authors make and how that informs the construction of the second stories; what contrasts are observable (Schegloff, 1997).

With second stories there seems to be "some similarities between the second story and the first" (Sacks, 1992, p. 3). As Sacks stated, "the same event in some sense may have quite different things going on depending upon who is telling about it. And depending upon what they said was going on, would also turn how they put everybody together" (ibid., p. 6); for example Sacks used the following figurative examples to illustrate his point:

> ...if I'm a victim in an accident then I may conceive of the others around as 'witnesses', but I may also conceive them as 'possible helpers' or 'gawkers', or whatever else, whereas if I'm a 'witness' then the way in which others are conceived may or may not be in exactly the same sort of way. I may see them as 'people to talk about the accident with', i.e. as possible co-conversationalists...for a bunch of people on a train, each of them may have a different way of seeing who else is there. That can be suggested in a fairly obvious way. One guy on the train could see the others as 'whites', one guy may see others as 'marks'(e.g. if he's a pick pocket)...
>
> (1992, p. 6)

The first thing one can notice in a second story is how the tellers position themselves relative to how the first story teller did. If the teller of the second story constructs a similar story to that of the first; i.e. in which it is a similar context and the character position of the first story teller is then taken up and occupied by the teller of the second story, then it is a way of seeing that the second teller agrees with the point (ibid., p. 6). By coordinating a second story in such a way which shares similarity to the first, the validity of the stories is insured and the story tellers experiences are enriched. However, second stories can take on other interesting formats and it is all reliant upon which character position the teller of that second story 'picks up' as their first character position and how the go on to organize the remaining character positions. As Sacks states, "that is to say, there is a way in which characters in stories fit together, and, as the position of the storyteller shifts, then the terms for conceiving the various other parties (characters-my emphasis) shift" (ibid., p. 6).

Character positions can be assumed here to be interchangeable with membership categories. The organization of the characters in the stories is often done so through the deployment of membership categories where characters are either categorized as being incumbents of a particular category or choose to categorize themselves. As such, members are observed deploying a set of membership categories, both explicitly and implicitly, associated with the activity around which they are speaking. Sharing the same perspective as Leudar and Nekvapil, I am concerned with how certain words, these categories and categorizations, are used as 'situated language activity' (2000, p. 489; Eglin & Hester, 1999); meaning how these words are used by members in order to accomplish

something other than simply categorizing such as allocating or denying membership in these categories (Leudar, Marsland & Nekvapil, 2004).

In the deployment of stories, the tellers and hearers (readers) can mutually establish or deny this 'shared sameness' by using or considering the categories/categorizations being deployed in the story. In the case of second stories, this informs their construction and the position work done by the authors. Additionally, categories are also invoked in responding to questions asked (Rapley, 2001). Thus, in responding to a message board poster's request for information via a story and/or question(s) about a specific context, a mix and mingling of identity construction can be seen *in situ.*

6.2 Story-telling in message boards

The data included in this corpus are texts which were taken from an internet-based community called *American Expats*[29]. The title of this website gives an initial impression that it is a place for Americans who are residing outside the United States (and those who sympathize with them) to gather in cyberspace and share experiences and perhaps seek support in areas they find are forcing them into questioning their 'thinking as usual' (Schutz, 1944, p. 501) interpretative schemes. In the 'forum', or online community spaces, members are free (within reason) to post questions, comments or stories about life as expats.

Message board data has become an increasingly popular ethnographic data resource. Furthermore, the 'communities' which are established for people

[29] www.americanexpats.co.uk

sharing a/several common interest(s) are "discursive spaces built by people who speak in the same way about the same things and possess a commonality..." (Mitra, 2001, p. 39). These "pages work as voices in cyberspace seeking acknowledgement" (ibid., p. 40). The messages posted are "often parts of on-going conversations" (Flicker, Haans & Skinner, 2004, p. 129). Although these 'conversations' are being constructed through monological textual narratives, an individual can contribute as many turns as they like, they just may not be exactly in the sequential location they would have been had the conversation been taking place face-to-face in real time (for examples of conversations separated in space and time see Leudar & Nekvapil, 2004; Leudar, Marsland & Nekvapil, 2004).

Similarly, these 'threads' not only show the multiplicity of shifting positions (Hevern, 2004, p. 321) between participants but also the same characteristics Hevern liked to James' (1890) 'streams of thought' (2004) in the polyphonic (yet from a single individual) authoritarian voice which constructs private web blogs (ibid.).

The type of writing which occurs on message boards is unlike any formal literary construction and shares properties similar to speech (Denzin, 2001). This is indeed evident by the development of such things as emoicons[30] and acronyms[31] where the author of any given text wishes to convey not only a message but an embodiment of feelings, emotions and sentiment associated with the message. Denzin refers to this type of writing as 'performative writing' and says that it is

[30] Collections of symbols used to indicate emotions and attitudes that would normally be conveyed in face-to-face interactions.
[31] For a list of computer-based-language acronyms see http://www.muller-godschalk.com/acronyms.html

'...evocative, reflexive, multi-voiced, criss-crosses genres, is always partial and incomplete' (2001, p. 36). This kind of narrative is not unlike its verbal counterpart in that within any utterance the possibility exists of it containing multiple points of view as well a transcending of time.

6.3 Categories and endowed voices

As I mentioned in a previous section, through our encounters and exchanges with others, we cultivate 'souvenirs' from which we may or may not draw upon as resources for interaction and identity conception. This is also possible through our reading of others' stories. As Hermans and Kempen (1993) report, Levin and Sarbin expanded upon an idea from French post-modernists in which the book indicates the author; the idea is coined the "Quixote principle" and describes the possibility that identity is shaped through the reading of stories (p.20). However, this vein of narrative is not interactionally-contingent but is comprised of the mere content of stories. In the message-board environment, however, the stories members are reading contain the interactionally-embedded identity work of others; essences of which can potentially be cultivated and exploited for ones own deployment later on. Yet the interaction of this type in this context has some limitations.

Firstly, the location of the message board and its theme pre-selects members (or members select themselves to be members) and is further culled by the existence of a particular 'thread' of discussion in which people self-select to participate. Participants are not funnelled into discussing this topic as a part of a natural conversational trajectory but are doing so because that topic existed as a place to enter into and within it are implicit rules for adhering to (for the most part) the

assigned conversational topic. Therefore, it can be presupposed that a person, who selects this message board and further selects to contribute to that thread is electing, in some way, to renegotiate (or confirm) a particular part of their identity –though this is not a conscious goal of participation. To put it another way, they are acknowledging their incumbency of a particular category in which they feel they have a voice, a voice which is being evoked for the purpose of participating in interaction. This opens the way for identity work to be done by the person either explicitly presenting themselves *as* a particular character position in a particular context while asserting an opinion or position *or* more implicitly through the telling of a story in which various characters and plots are told and the interpretation as to the point (and position) of the story and teller is left up to the audience. Analysis of this can show the empirical work of strangers who have assumed shared sameness in making sense and meaning of that said context.

To the present point of this thesis, I have tried to present an argument that story-telling in the context of message boards is performative and indexical and that a story's inception on a message board such as the one used for analysis in this paper is not a random occurrence but is *constructed to be* performative and indexical. In just such an instance as this self-selected interactional stage where a choice has been made to participate through a categorical voice, the stories told must be constructed to be convincing; believable footing established. One has chosen to partake in this particular thread, therefore participants must make an effort to validate their decision for participation.

With that understanding, I would like to refer back briefly to the subject of 'first stories'. As I mentioned earlier, stories in conversation can display interconnectedness and particularly in the context of a message board thread, the telling of two or more coordinated stories produces a multivoiced representation of a particular happening. As those stories go on to be produced and subsequently reformulated or extended by the contributing authors, more and more multivoicedness is apparent in the shifting, positioning and repositioning of those participating in the thread.

As such, the construction of first stories when examining story-telling on message boards requires critical analysis. As Sacks stated, when analysing the talk of stories, not only is the topical content of interest in how the participants orient to their understanding of it, their particular interests and the contingencies they attach to it but in *how* the talk is done.

> When people are doing 'topical' talk it's not so much or only that all or some of their talk is 'about something'; e.g., they're talking about cars, or each utterance is about cars, but that *how* you talk about cars when you're 'talking about' something else.
>
> (1992, p. 19)

In the case of the data obtained through this message board, the thread topic is entitle, 'Customer Service' and because of the fact that it is located on a message board called *American Expats* by default creates topical talk about the context of shopping that both modulates and is modulated by a discussion of culture.

There are numerous representations that could be made through constructing utterances. The questions which arise now are 1) how did it come to be that this topic or point was represented in a particular way and 2) what can be ascertained from the particular construction of a story? Furthermore, in analysing the

construction of a first story, what can be learned about the subsequent second story-teller's interpretations and what changes can be seen in the positioning work done by these contributors? One way to examine these questions is through the 'metaphor of voice' in expressions made in cyberspace (Mitra, 2001).

At this point I would like to extend the concept of multivoicedness which was discussed in Chapter Four. Mitra (2001) looked at the ways in which diasporic collectivities used the internet as a way of aligning themselves; transcending both geographic and social barriers. In a communication venue such as the internet, people who are '...immigrants...can also begin to renegotiate his or her identity in relation to those of others in the group...' (ibid., p. 30). Could message boards allow people to pilot new aspects of identity or formulate new cultural 'truths' by putting something out there to get feedback about before stepping out into the real world with it? In some of the data, indeed the multivoiced aspects which I will be pointing out, authors seem to be using summations of the contributions of others while in formulating their own take on the discussion at hand.

Mitra (2001) draws upon Bakhtin's idea of 'authoriative discourse' versus 'internally persuasive discourse' in the ways certain voices come to be silenced or work in cooperation allowing new voices to emerge. In cyberspace, 'identity is formed at the unstable point where the unspeakable stories of subjectivity meet the narratives of history, of a culture' (ibid., p. 30). As Bakhtin stated, what people say does not come '...from an isolated, decontextualised voice; rather individual voices are influenced by the culture of institutions, groups, and communities in which they participate' (Hermans, 2004, p. 300). Again, membership in any of these categories (and people can be members of numerous

categories simultaneously) occupy a position of 'I' in talk and these 'I-positions' can imaginatively be endowed with a voice with which to enter into dialogical relations (ibid., p. 303). I am therefore studying the 'self as a fluctuation of positionings, linked to context-related *voices*' (Ligorio & Pugliese, 2004, p. 337).

In light of this, I intend to develop Sacks' work on second stories. Rather than orienting to their sameness as Sacks had originally done –the achieved similarity or how 'finely the second story picked up at least one sense of the point of the first' (Sacks, 1992:I, p. 765) I will also be paying close attention to two things namely: 1) the variations in the 'sameness' of the stories and 2) the polyphony contained in the lines of text which appear to have been cultivated and redistributed with a new author's own intentions. Schegloff (1997b) refers to the "reappearance of the word…in…subsequent response[s]…[as] echoes [of] an element of vernacular poetics already included in [the preceding] turn…(p. 175) and "using the same words is a canonical practice for displaying or claiming that a current saying is the same as a prior saying or partial saying was *trying* to be" (ibid., p. 176).

Seeing points of '(dis)agreement or (mis)understanding…reveal if and how the multiplicity and diversity of positions towards the object at hand are being considered' (Akkerman et al., 2006, p. 469). In those second stories there may be debate on points presented but in what ways are these points formulated similarly and furthermore is the similarity recognizable from previous formulations done by others? To do this I will be looking at how the author's orient to *multiple* co-participants –rather than just one (Sacks, 1992)- in their monologue post. What I

aim to show in the final extract of this portion of the thesis is the author's orientation and very similar formulation to multiple points that were made through multiple authors' accounts in the construction of their own story.

6.4 Acculturation represented through mundane activities

The following texts were found under the post heading 'Customer Service'. My interest is not in the expats' assessment of the quality of customer service in the UK but is in the identity work of members through their contrasting customer service in the US and the UK as moderated by their American cultural identity. In fact, while these stories may appear overtly to be about customer service, analysis shows that there is more going on; specifically what the stories I am focusing on below are *about* 'have to do with the people who are telling them and [reading] them' (Sacks, 1992:I, p. 768). That is it. The data reveal that what members are doing is identity work within the context of acculturation using Customer Service as a catalyst for that.

Acculturation is normally considered to be the changes a person goes through 'when [they are] exposed to the values, norms, and expected behaviours that are essential for assuming a cultural identity and for participating as a cultural member' (Ryder, Alden & Paulhus, 2000 cf. Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006, p. 174). As such, acculturation is a problem where, as Bhatia and Ram (2002) and Bhatia (2001) have stated, 'the formation of immigrant identities...involves a constant process of negotiation, intervention and mediation...' (Bhatia, 2001, p. 59); and that this 'mixing and moving' (Hermans & Kempen, 1998, p. 1117) between

cultural positions in the construction of identity is accomplished in discourse around particular cultural activities –in this case, shopping.

Often such discourse related to 'cultural differences' is done in reference to a 'standardized relational pair' of membership categories creating a clear distinction between 'us' and 'them' (Leudar, Marsland & Nekvapil, 2004) although this distinction is not common in MCA (ibid.). Since shopping is an activity shared by both cultures (the US and the UK), we are able to see how culture, something embedded within the 'self' (Sandikci, Ekici & Tari, 2006:429), modulates mundane activities; people enact culture (Denzin, 2001). While there are major contextual differences globally in shopping rituals, protocols and behaviours, those differences between the US and the UK are subtle. For example, as the data reveals, both shopping cultures share categories and activities such as 'shop assistants', 'shop managers', 'customer service policies', 'money in exchange for goods or services', 'speciality shops' (with specific collections of products, i.e. grocery, furniture and technology stores) and 'check-out procedures' to name just a few.

The different ways in which people represent their participation 'as cultural members' can be observed through their narrative (or written narrative) of experience in activities which are typically associated with each culturally-embedded context. Moreover, we are able to see not only the distinctions being attributed to 'them' by those in the 'us' category but we are also able to see, through the diversity of second story construction, the variation of cultural representation by other incumbents of the 'us' category. Do these members with

assumed shared sameness exhibit that through their stories? This variation would attest to the possibility that the prominent conceptualisation of 'culture' is indeed not fixed but variable and in flux.

In order to begin to address this variation in representation, I will be looking at story groupings within a single conversational thread, one which is called "*customer service*" and then proceed about analysing them as story collages. These collages are made up of items of positioning work, e.g. is the author evoking any character positions which they once held in the past such as that of a shop assistant, manager or customer to illustrate their position as well as the use of ethnic mentions, categorisations, formulations and so on in order to do some kind of identity work in the context of customer service in the UK. In developing Sacks' work on first and second stories in this way I aim to show through the analysis the ways in which bit and pieces of first stories and subsequent stories (not only second stories) find their way into those stories which follow them. In effect this is looking at second stories not just as a chronologically and temporally-, i.e. always in the *second* place, located conversational item but as a generic construct intended to classify any story which arises out of interaction in which the person telling it has some business they want to take care of, based upon another's telling of their first story. Through the initial positioning work done by the first author as an 'experienced shopper' and the uptake of the second author, I will show the emerging polyphony throughout the thread as authors contrast their experiences through their stories and align or disassociate themselves with the alternatives presented by fellow contributors on the message board.

To better explain what I am looking for when I talk about polyphony in the context of the message board, I wish to use the context of a musical choir as a metaphor. The choir has many members, each with their own voice and their own parts of the musical piece for which they will contribute to the melodies and harmonies. The musical piece is the general theme and all members are acquainted with this theme but do not contribute identically throughout. Throughout the musical piece, members chime in and fade out, sing together or diverge for a time and return back together. This is, in essence, what is meant by polyphony. In the stories below, we read the individual members' parts of the 'customer service' choir and in doing so we can see synthesis of certain members where they chose to harmonize with other members as well where they maintain their unique parts. What is of interest here are the points which arise to be seen as points of harmony and how those harmonies get formulated by those members. In a sense, this 'piece of music' –although following a general theme, gets made up as it goes along.

The stories below have a basic format- they are stories about customer service. The second stories, as Sacks said, are not complete replications. While they do coordinate experiences, i.e. including similar place, context, time and sometimes character positions, those character positions which are the same still include slight variations; just like the orchestral example I used above- with all playing the same song in their own unique way.

6.5 Analysis

Now I will turn the focus toward the analysis. Although it will not present itself until later in the text, the purpose of the first author's post is to request information from other members of the board. I bring this up now because it is important to understand that she has already made some determination as to who the recipients/readers of her story are going to be, i.e. other presumably American or like-minded (as they are on the Americanexpats.co.uk website) persons who can appreciate the experiences she is about to share as they have, again presumably, similar schemes of interpretation (Marotta, 2003). As such, the story is being constructed in light of who the presumed recipients are. Of interest here is the positioning the first author makes in relation to her assessment of customer service and it's relevancy as a part of British culture and the subsequent positioning of second story tellers in their stories thereafter.

I will present the first contribution to this message board thread in its entirety which includes not only the story itself but a number of other textual discursive devices which precede the story and serve practical functions. Once I have done that, I will then present second stories with the critical analytical pieces which show the analytical focus on multivoicedness, i.e. the variability in the formulations produced within the theme of customer service which display similarity to formulations by others yet which the author makes unique to them.

Although these subsequent second stories are monologues they are highly dialogical –orienting to previous members' posts and possibly the voices of

others not in the forum but rather from the author's own interaction with others outside the virtual reality sphere.

In chapter four I discussed the conception of an arrangement of subjectivity which I referred to as 'polyphony.' Polyphony is infinitely variable. I am looking for evidence generally of this phenomena which can manifest in any number of ways such as *cultural* polyphony, *personal* or *I-position* polyphony or, in the case of the latter part of this analytical chapter, polyphony in stories whereby story components are cultivated and used to create a single story but which is, in part (some more so, some less so), actually a collage of bits and pieces of others' stories. To echo what Bakhtin said about the word having no semantic authority, as the message board thread continues on, the originality seems to be less and less noticeable and the reader is left reading the recycled words, phrases, formulations and examples of previous posts. Considering this, the data are being analysed for both the authors own subjectivity in an acculturative context paralleled with the varying degrees of inter-subjectivity in the construction of second stories about customer service.

6.5a Author 1 'tomaato_tomato'

Extract One: **Author 1 'tomaato_tomato'**

1. I know this topic has been mentioned before, but we have been shopping a
2. lot (you have to love those after Christmas Sales)
3. Now I am not having a dig of anything, but it still amazes me at the utter lack
4. of curtiosy and customer service. I mean I have grown not to expect much,
5. but sometimes it still upsets me and especially my DH (whose British, but got
6. used to the service in America, as we lived there 4 years together).

Line 1 begins with immediate identity work of a person who is not new to this forum and is therefore, something of an expert. The story takes on a complaint format as in their explaining that the topic has been mentioned before 'but' once again they are presenting it as a topic shows that to this author, the subject still has not been dealt with completely, i.e. the argument is not yet finished. However, in line 3 the author breaks in telling the story briefly to provide something which is both a disclaimer and an account; 'but we have been shopping a lot'. This disclaimer/account tool is being used as they are about to issue a harsh assessment of services in Britain and employing this tool serves to provide an explanation as to why they are in a valid position to make the harsh assessment; therefore minimizing the potential for backlash against them (Hewitt & Stokes, 1973). The way this can be seen as a disclaimer rather than part of the actual story is that immediately after the first part of line 1, the author could have given an immediate assessment similar to the one which they give in their story in the following lines (3-4). However, this is not done and the author breaks in telling the story to give this account of being a recently experienced shopper as a result of 'those after Christmas sales'. As I will address shortly, Author 1 formulates this story tentatively as though criticizing the majority culture is a risky activity as there may be others who can point out contrasting evidence. As such, she needs to provide an account with a significant corpus of *experience*.

It is uncertain to whom this complaint is being addressed. Although this is a website for Americans or those with an interest in -and presumably sympathetic to- American interests, the author presents a tentative argument. The accounting work and disclaimer are evidence to this tentativeness; the author is anticipating

that there could very well be disagreement with their position. As Marková, notes, "speakers create links to others' communications, anticipating their responses, reactions and feelings" (2009, p. 219). Thus, this tentativeness of the account is oriented and formulated toward these anticipations.

Attention to the author's accounting work should be viewed in earnest as it has been produced in the context of the message board (Rapley, 2001) and the production of this story and its supporting elements are purposeful. As I presented before, I am looking at contributions as being 'performative' and, as Rapley points out, they are used to 'present the self in a morally adequate light' (ibid., p. 307). In discussions and story-telling of cultural differences, the presentation of the self upon this moral high ground in contrast to the opposing (especially majority) culture allows us to see how a person positions themselves as a foreigner in relation to the other culture. However this can be a risky undertaking where the authenticity of what is being presented can be challenged and in a venue of anonymity this can take on extreme forms. Therefore what is presented prior to the beginning of the story, i.e. the 'pre-beginning' (Sacks, 1992, I, p. 766) in which hearers *–or readers-* are informed about how to listen to (read) the story, must be made quite explicit and contain a fair amount of accounting work as justification for the position which is about to be presented and once posted for commentary cannot (usually) be revoked. Postings on message boards are not always able to be deleted once they have been posted!

The employment of the descriptor, 'shopping a lot' is provided as it is upon this criterion that the receivers of this first story will make their assessment of the

likelihood that the actions within the story occurred (Sacks, 1992) and also accounts for the 'course-of-action' (ibid., II, p. 242) –the *how* she comes to the telling of the story. Rather than reporting it (ibid.), she was an active participant in the event and possesses therefore a sort of allowance in telling the story in the way that she does. This will have implications later for the co-participants and the analysis as within their stories the course-of-action reveals the position from which they come to tell their own stories and, as is observable, some of these are not from the position of 'experienced shopper' but from 'customer service provider'.

As I presented earlier, these stories are not so much of interest from a comparison of customer service positions but rather acculturation as represented through accounts of mundane activities.

Within these first few lines, a theme has been set and the business of contrasting cultures is going to be made through the context of shopping. Furthermore, this it is not merely an act of contrasting which occurs but an assessment of cultural practices and, therefore, a people. In lines 3-4 the author presents a clear description of a person has who has had to make a change (or has been changed) by a lower level of customer service; 'I mean I have grown not to expect much', the author is displaying having acculturated but is doing so by telling of herself as she is *now* while looking reflexively back on to who she *was*. I shall state that this sentence and the subsequent 'but sometimes in still upsets me' (line 5) is arguably the first evidence of polyphony in this thread where a person is indicating an oscillating position between an old and new identity but one which

is nearly simultaneous. This is the first evidence of a contrasting of a cultural context and one in which the host culture has lost out in preference to what the standard British shopping culture is being compared to which is American (Line 6).

The negative assessment of British people comes in a more implicit form and this is through the use of the author's ethnic mention (De Fina, 2003) in line 5 of a 'DH[32] (whose British)' who has been transformed after his time living in the US to customer who has acquired an even more extreme expectation of customer service than he once had as a result of his own acculturation to US shopping culture as he is *especially upset* by the 'lack of curtiosy and customer service'.

De Fina suggests, the inclusion of an ethnic mention, specifically one who is considered to be a member of the majority culture, is often done so that judgements and attributions cannot be falsified (2000). While this sounds somewhat plausible and could in fact be used as a discursive strategy in positioning within an argumentative story format in which opposing accounts are being *anticipated*, the use of ethnic mentions cannot guarantee that those 'judgements and attributions' will not be falsified. What the use of the ethnic mention here does is to merely strengthen the position that not only do contrasts in customer service standards between the US and the UK exist, but that this contrast is *interactionally- relevant* to the story the author is telling (Sacks, 1992). This being the case, a British husband who has *seen the light* as it were regarding how customer service can and should be, is a statement against

[32] In the context of this website, 'DH' was an abbreviation which means *Dear Husband*

ordinary Brits who are not enlightened and still somehow in the dark ages. This point is further illuminated in the next extract.

Thus far, the author's position is that of an American and an experienced shopper who finds a distinctly lower standard of customer service and that this seems to be culturally contingent and furthermore, this adjustment to culture has left them a bit worse off with a now lower level of expected customer service and shopping experiences which can still be upsetting (Line5). They are living between oscillating cultural positions and from their point of view, this is not good.

Shopping is a shared cultural activity between the UK and the US; it is a category bound activity within which exist categorical incumbents, namely shop assistants, shop managers and customers. With the this very first bit of business of setting the context out of the way as has been done with the text in Extract One, now rather than merely speaking about a context of shopping as embedded within a culture, the discussion about people begins; the contrast between British and American shop assistants, shop managers, customers and their respective (assumed) rights, responsibilities and obligations. It is these particular incumbents and their activities which will be debated and contrasted from the other authors in the forum.

Extract Two: **Author 1 'tomaato_tomato'**

1. It's not uncommon for a sales person to yell at the customer or have the
2. attitude like get out of my face, simply because they hate their job and find
3. you as the inconvenience in their day.

Although it does not begin, as most story prefaces do immediately at the beginning of a story, the above extract serves as this story's preface –seven lines into the posting on the message board. This break in typical format is due to the context within which this story is being told –an internet message board. As it is on a forum where people are for the most part anonymous, a bit of identity establishment and accounting for the post, the position the author is taking and any assessment they provide, must prelude any real storytelling. The same thing can occur in face-to-face conversation between strangers (Garot, 2007), but is most likely absent in conversations between people familiar with one another.

As such we saw that firstly it was important for the author to establish their credibility for telling the subsequent story and their dual position as both 'experienced shopper' and as a result of her being 'American' knows what good customer service is and has footing to comment further upon the topic. Having established themselves as such, the author is only *then* able to present the readers with a preface to their story which is extract two.

According to Sacks, prefaces inform the hearer (or reader in this case) of the story what they should do when the story is over (1992). By stating in line 1 that the following is 'not uncommon' the author is making a sweeping assessment that her evaluation of customer service in Britain is the norm and can be assumed to be soliciting responses. In describing the general scenario of a customer service interaction involving such hostility e.g. 'yelling' and 'hate', the author is calling for consensus. If this consensus is achieved it could suggest a number of things about British culture in contrast to American culture. In employing such

brutal and vivid descriptors, I remind the reader of the analysis above in which I referred to 'enlightenment' and 'dark ages'. Descriptors which are on an extreme end of a relative scale are referred to as extreme case formulations and are "emotionally tinged statements about our perceptions of how troubles seem to multiply or how events generally seem to be overwhelming us" (Norrick, 2004, p. 1730). Describing a common shopping scenario in this way, the author invokes a picture of an uncivil context and one which is unacceptable *today*.

Extract Three: **Author 1 'tomaato_tomato'**

1. At one shop we purchased an item and a few days later it was 10 pounds
2. cheaper, we went to the store and asked if we could have the lower price as
3. we just purchased the item[33]. They said okay but when we got to the refund
4. desk, the woman said, we don't do that. We asked if she could ask the
5. manager, she came back saying the other manager was on the phone and no
6. we couldn't. Then one of her co-workers said well would you come in and
7. pay the higher price if we raised it days after you bought it? What???? LOL,
8. anyway they didn't want to help and started shouting. We asked to see the
9. manager and they said no. Well then we spotted a manager in the store, told
10. her and she immediately gave us the 10 pounds credit.

In Lines 2 – 10 the author presents an 'argumentative story' in an effort to establish 'world relevance' (De Fina, 2000) to her claim of poor customer service in the UK. The polyphony of Author 1's cultural hybridity which briefly emerged in the very first extract (l. 3-4) has now disappeared and the author maintains a cultural position which is not British as even in light of a logical argument provided by a British shop assistant in reaction to their complaint as represented in lines 6-7, the author provides a rebuttal representative of their reflexivity in their reaction of that moment in their writing of line 7, 'What???? LOL[34]'.

[33] This policy of a customer being allowed to seek the lowered price difference within a certain amount of time after purchase was a policy openly offered by a US retailer called Kohl's.
[34] 'LOL' is an abbreviation used in online-discourse to represent someone 'Laughing Out Loud'

Their usage of 'they didn't want to help' (Line 8) places the author in the position of 'victim' further accentuated by the 'hostility', e.g. "shouting" (l. 17), and the perpetrators are customer service providers; activities which are of course contrary to the activities bound to the category of 'shop assistant'. This positioning work is used in conjunction with the fact that the opposing side's shop assistants are British –a distinction which was made previously in this author's work in Extract One.

Thus far, the author is presenting customer service in the UK not only as different from the US but as a hostile environment. Although the author did show some initial cultural polyphony –the original orientation to customer service and the one she has 'grown' to expect, they have maintained a consistent affinity to a cultural position which is incompatible with what they have described in the UK. By formulating the differences in this way which warrant the deployment of some extreme case formulations the author is then beginning to construct a position that these incongruencies belong to two distinct and opposing positions and seem to suggest that they are identity implicative of British and Americans.

However, a contradiction emerges in their formulation of this position. In line 9 the author tells of employing a strategy by seeking the assistance of 'the manager' to resolve the problem at hand. Once again, the shop assistants do not perform the associated category bound activity of acquiescing to this request. The evidence that the shop assistants are deviating from the norm can be found in possibly the British husband's (apparent) lack of objection to pursuing this method of seeking the manager, i.e. that British shoppers would proceed this

direction also, as well as the shop manager's 'immediate' giving of '10 pounds credit' (line 10). This latter point contradicts the work that has been done up to this point in trying to ascribe behaviours (Kaderka, 2008) to members of the respective cultures.

Extract Four **Author 1 'tomaato_tomato'**

1. We also had a situation at Costco the first time we went. My husband asked if
2. we could get a visitors pass just to look around before we joined. It was only
3. like for 30 minutes, the man at the door said we could. Then the woman my
4. husband talked to said no and started getting funny with him. He was like
5. we are only trying to see what the prices are like (as we have to travel a bit
6. to get there). She started shouting and was like no, no, no. Anyway he
7. asked to speak to a manager and they handled our request asap.

A second argumentative story is presented in which both the author and her husband are put into the same character position from the first story and an identical scenario is described in which a manager is called upon (Line 7) to aid in resolving the issue; leading to an equally successful result as was detailed in the first example. Essentially this is a *second* first story. This is something unique to an electronic environment and is reminiscent of the same unique turn-taking situation of a panel discussion in which a person needs to maximize the effect and argument or point within that first and perhaps only turn. I refer back to Marková where she states that, "speakers create links to others' communications, anticipating their responses, reactions and feelings. Moreover, the speakers' dialogues are filled with ideas of absent others (third parties)..." (2006; 2009, p.219). These postings on the message board are made not only with the intentions of the author but the anticipation of other *possible* contributors.

Yet both these examples seem to describe a problem not so much with shop managers but with shop assistants. In both these examples the author received

what they sought; namely recognition of the deficiency in customer service by someone, a *British* shop manager, in the position to do something about it. By detailing shop assistants who are doubly hostile (by not dealing with her initial problem and also attempting to interfere with a manager doing so) and telling of a shop manager who then refunds her money, Author 1's complaint is validated.

Extract Five **Author 1 'tomaato_tomato'**

1. Those were just a few examples, but I just can't believe it when
2. I hear the way other customers are talked to or treated. Again, I am not
3. trying to be horrible, but it does get frustrating. Is it just that shoppers
4. here aren't bothered about customer service? Do you think CS will ever
5. improve?

With lines 3-4 contrasting work between UK shoppers and US shoppers is being done and provides additional support to my analysis above in which I said that the use of the ethnic mention of a British husband served as some kind of distinction between ordinary British shoppers who 'aren't bothered about customers' (line 4) and people such as the author and her husband. The author is making the assumption that if the UK shoppers did bother about customer service, things would be different. By asking others if they feel the standard of customer service will ever improve, Author 1 is clearly presenting themselves as a person who has not acculturated to a new *British* shopper identity.

There is also something to be gleaned from this post regarding Author 1's acculturation as the presence of cultural polyphony appeared only at the beginning of the post where the initial accounting work and disclaimers had been presented. Based on the overall lack of polyphony in this post, i.e. the lack of 'mixing and moving' or 'flipping back and forth' between cultural positions, it appears that the author has not acculturated to British shopping culture. Although

the focus of this thesis is not on assessing the extent of individual's acculturation, this data extract and the orientation toward polyphony can provide insight about that point; seeing as shopping habits are a major cultural component, the possibility exists that that author encounters difficulties elsewhere as well.

In the data extracts to follow, I look at how other 'expats' took up Author 1's challenge and the ways in which these extracts are related to one another.

6.5b Author 2 'blue_rose'

Extract Six **Author 2 'blue_rose'**

1. Oh...don't get me started on customer service here. It sucks...big time!!! In
2. the six years I have been here...that is one of my biggest complaints. I can't
3. stand for a store clerk to stand over you...while you type in your chip and
4. pin number in that little machine. Find that irritating and have ask the store
5. clerk to move. All so in the grocery stores...the store helper who restock the
6. shelves...that leave those big (metal) containers out in the middle of the aisle
7. and expect everyone to fight their way around them.

In line 1, Author 2 takes up the position of Author 1 by providing an affirming *second* assessment (Pomerantz, 1984) of their own about customer service in the UK and that even after spending six years in here (line 2) it remains an issue. However, this second assessment contains more than just mere agreement- which does not automatically "...indicate endorsement" (Pomerantz, 1984 cf. Pudlinski, 2008, p. 807) but goes on to provide a set of explicit examples in support of her overt agreement with Author 1; showing a 'like-mindedness' which according to Pomerantz is a "typical conversational turn preference structure [which] is one of agreement preferred..." (1984 cf. Mckinlay & McVittie, 2006,p. 789). This line could be considered Author 2's attempt at (unbeknownst to them) polyphony in which they wish to account for their ability to make an assessment by bringing in their six years of shopping in the UK. These 'six years' is a discursive tool

whereby a person has gained entitlement to their opinion through experience; much like a person's usage of their age as a disclaimer to what they are about to say.

Author 2's contribution to the thread does not provide a true second story in Sacks' terms but the theme is retained as is the subject position in the theme but with some variation; namely a listing of problems and inappropriate behaviours by the floor staff. However, Author 2 has taken up the same character position as Author 1, one of a customer, and according to Sacks (1992) this is a way of saying *I agree with the point of your story.* Considering the achieved similarity of Author 2's story to Author 1 through the merging of Author 2's voice to Author 1's story theme and relevant characters, the first instance of intersubjective polyphony can be seen here. The following extract from Author 3 deviates from this in both format of the post and the character position.

6.5c Author 3 'squirrel'

Extract Seven **Author 3 'squirrel'**

1. I have to say, I am surprised you got the £10 back. I have never thought to
2. try something like that because it seems so cheeky. You bought it at the
3. original price but when they lower it you want the difference? If they lower
4. it again will you go after the new difference?

3 Lines omitted

5. Personally I have found bad customer service in shops in the US (not in
6. restaurants though). Waiting staff have to be nice to get tips but sales
7. assistants don't get tips so there is no incentive. In department stores in
8. Boston the assistants seemed more interested in talking to each other, just
9. like they do here. Also, I have worked in both a pub and a dept store, and
10. there are some very rude customers too. One woman was so condescending
11. to me I felt like slapping her!

Author 3 begins with an assessment not of the point of Author 1's story but implicitly of Author 1's behaviour as an individual and that they consider these

actions to be morally wrong (lines 1-2). I will address this point in greater detail in a moment. As I eluded to above, Sacks noticed that when the teller of a first story is trying to make a point with that story, the teller of a second story who has sought out their own story with in which they share context and character position has done as "...a way of seeing that [second story teller] agree[s] with the point. So, for example, in other materials a second story is prefaced with 'I know just what you mean' and then a story is told which has the same paralleling of characters" (1992, p. 6), just as Author 2 did as seen in Extract Six. However, the case of Author 3, while telling a story of shared context, customer service, there is a deviance in the positioning of characters within their story. In juxtaposition to Author 1 whose first character position was that of a customer, Author 3 presents their second story in a contrary manner in which it is being used to give a moral instruction as seen beginning later in line 9 with the character position of customer service provider; having worked 'in both a pub and a dept store'. Furthermore, the didactic tone of this story was preceded by a moral ascription to the actions presented by Author 1.

In using a story in which the second story-teller is the opposing character position to that of the first story teller, the teller of the second story can be understood as saying *I don't agree with the point of your story.* This would have been enough to make that statement but the second story begins quite late into the response –nearly 12 lines in but there is a prelude which classifies the behaviour of Author 1 as morally wrong and furthermore is identity implicative of Author 3 as in their saying that they 'never thought to try something like that because it seems so cheeky' they, a fellow American (confirmed through other

contributions by this author on the forum), do not share the orientation that this behaviour is appropriate or should be expected. Furthermore, Author 3 employs a distinctly British adjective of 'cheeky'. This is not a case of cultural polyphony in Author 3's own positioning this moment in time as these lines show a distinct orientation and support of the objections of the British shop assistants at Author 1's request. However what Author 3 (an American) is showing is that an expat, who shares ethnicity with Author's 1 and 2, is reacting in a very different way to the same situation and moreover that customer service does not differentiate the two cultures as was proposed by Author 1.

As I showed with the analysis from Author 1, an argumentative position was established with which a person attempted to make the behaviours of culturally-located members identity implicative; i.e. that is to say that Author 1 attempted to state a position in which British shoppers allowed bad service to fester while one American shopper and her British but acculturated husband would not stand for this and assumed, in seeking the affirmations from others on the American forum through her question 'do you think CS will ever improve?', that others who they assumed had a shared orientation, presumably an American orientation, would see it similarly.

Author 3 is American (confirmation obtained through other postings on the forum) and their positioning work in Lines 1-2 removes ethnicity as a catalyst of interpretation out of the context, in fact, these lines reveal the potential for variability in the subjectivity of an 'American perspective'. Furthermore, in Line 5 Author 3 takes the prevailing issue the first story of 'bad customer service in

the UK' back to the US. Also, a distinction between customer service contexts where tipping is involved is also mentioned here and which has some relevance to cultural differentiation. The US is commonly seen as a generous tipping culture whereby those working in the food service industry are generally given a wage which is significantly lower than that national minimum wage required by law[35].

While this distinction is not important for the understanding of culture, I wish to highlight it as a subjective positional resource which we will see evoked again in other second stories to follow and will be one of the examples of polyphony among stories, i.e. that tipping is picked up again and again in the formulation of responses on the tread.

Having now highlighted the presence and possibility for bad customer service in the US, Author 3 then counterbalances the two shopping cultures with a description of an event (Lines 8-9) where shop assistants 'seemed to be more interested in talking to each other' and that they have witnessed this in both US and UK shopping contexts. This witnessing as an entitlement to experience (Sacks, 1992, II) is reinforced with an adjacent account which works to further reduce the originally-proposed context of 'bad customer service' to a general context where no valuation can be placed upon it as the variability is too great – as evidenced by just one other persons' telling of a second story (Author 3). As such, this second story does not make a comparison of cultures the determining factor in good or bad customer service.

[35] The reason this is allowed is due to the common tipping practices in the US which see an average between 10-20% in tip to the service provider accompanying the restaurant bill.

6.5d Author 4 'songbird'

Extract Eight **Author 4 'songbird'**

1. I agree with [Author 3], I haven't had that many bad experiences here
2. and when I do, I complain however recently b/f and I have had major
3. problems in SC with Radio Shack and Verzion. I even made some calls
4. from here to try and sort out the problem. I wrote Radio Shack HQ and did
5. not even get a reply –disgraceful. Also Walmart –the staff there whilst
6. wishing you a nice day are as grumpy as anything…

As I presented above, the stories of Author 1 and Author 3 are explicitly contrary 1st and 2nd story-types. In agreeing with Author 3 (line 1), Author 4 is implicitly disagreeing with Author 1. However this does not remain the case entirely and I will come back to this point in a moment.

Author 4 has understood Author 3 as having said that they have not had many bad experiences in the UK (the formulation which immediately follows their statement of agreement). However, Author 3 did not say this in an explicit way. As we saw in the analysis from Author 3's post, there was merely a pointing out of the possibility for bad customer service in the US and following a example of bad customer service where the '…assistants seemed more interested in talking to each other…' (Author 3, Extract Seven, Line 8), Author 3 stated that this behaviour could be seen specifically in the US (she does not mention the UK at all).

Author 4 provides their second story in the character position of Author 1 –a customer complaining about bad customer service experiences but focuses in great detail upon those she has had in the US, not in the UK –something which Author 3 also did but Author 4 highlights specific examples. This is a polyphony

of the stories from Author's 1 and 3 where Author 4 provides a complaint of customer service yet with mirrored cultural context. Additionally, this story is also told from one of the two character positions of Author 3's dual position; that of customer and customer service provider.

As I mentioned before, Sacks stated that a person's adoption of the same character position in their second story as that of the first story teller indicates a type of agreement. This is where Sacks' work has its limitation, however, and can be expanded upon by considering polyphony; Sacks comments on common aspects of 1st and 2nd stories but not on coordinated variations. This is evidenced by the fact that Author 4 has clearly stated their agreement with Author 3 yet has taken up the character position of Author 1, a person who she has implicitly disagreed with.

What we have here then is a new second story format in which Author 4 constructs a story in the character position of Author 1, a customer, but removes cultural differences between the UK and US as a relevant matter –just as Author 3 has done. However, it is interesting to note that in line 3 Author 4 mentions a US state of South Carolina (SC) which localizes the problems they are complaining about more specifically. Later in the thread, another author does this as well.

6.5e Author 5 'Staceysk'

Extract Nine **Author 5 'Staceysk'**

1. I've had bad experiences both places. :P And I used to (in caveman days)
2. work in retail, and I've had bad experiences with customers too. People just
3. aren't right! ;) Bringing an item that goes on sale right after you've bought it
4. to receive the difference is a fairly standard store policy throughout the US,

5. Although I suppose it would seem cheeky if you weren't used to it.

There is not really any story here but a comparative assessment of some of the customer service points which have been made from different subjective positions and are polyphonically being either aligned with or contrasted against.

The polyphony in Extract Nine includes Authors 1, 3 and 5. In line 1 Author's 5 and 3 subjective positions are represented as they are in agreement in having had bad experiences in both places but from opposite character positions, customer and customer service provider respectively. Author 5 then changes to the same character position as Author 3 in their use of the discursive tool which is using past experience (lines 1-2) as a person in a customer service role who has had bad experiences with customers too. However, while Author 5 is in agreement with Author 3 initially in that bad customer service is not identity or culturally implicative, the polyphony changes between lines 3 and 5 when she acknowledges that culture does play a role in the interpretation of this practice depending upon whether someone is acquainted with the US-cultural practice or not. Author 5 also accounts their coming opinion with the use of categorical knowledge of a customer service provider as Author 3 did but is in disagreement, briefly, with Author 3 in that their experience has shown them that 'Bringing an item that goes on sale right after you've bought it to receive the difference is a fairly standard store policy throughout the US' (lines 3-4). Therefore Author 5 is demonstrating herself as a person who can take both positions.

In line 5 Author 5's polyphony harmonizes again with Author 3 in both character position and descriptor with 'I suppose it would seem cheeky' and then finally

breaks again to adopt the position of Author 1 in that it is ok to do this if you are used to it.

Considering this, it would appear that Author 5 occupies a culturally ambiguous position. While they initially presented a position in which they too removed culture from the context –just as Author 3 had done, they are now seen acknowledging that people embedded solely in either cultural context could receive the action very differently – making culture once again a relevant matter.

6.5f Author 6 'Janice'

Extract Ten **Author 6 'Janice'**

1. I've experienced reasonable customer service here so far and have been
2. impressed with how nice the supermarket clerks are. To be honest, I haven't
3. noticed that much of a difference and prefer not having the clerk put on a
4. facade of happiness and say "Thank you for shopping here Ms. So and So"
5. like they do at Safeway in the US

Author 6 presents a disagreement with Author 1's story through an explicit positive orientation to the host culture (l. 3) a standard second story format in which the second story, "like the first, seems to be about [customer service]; involves [a customer and customer service providers]" (Sacks, 1992, p. 3). Furthermore, Author 6 takes the same character position as Author 1, as customer, but provides an explicit disagreement.

In contrast to Author 1, Author 6 is presenting acculturation as a positive. With lines 2-3 they detail an aspect in which the UK is better, more honest rather than clerks putting on a façade (Line 4) like at Safeway in the US. As per definition, a facade is a deceptive outward appearance –a point which was made by Author 4 (Author 4, lines 5-6) which details activities of the facade variety being done by

staff members in a US-based store in which Author 4 states "...the staff there whilst wishing you a nice day are as grumpy as anything..."

6.5g Author 7 'Natasha'

Extract Eleven **Author 7 'Natasha'**

1. I'll put my 2p in here –in favor of Britain (although I'm sure my opinions are
2. based on regional differences). Coming from Minneapolis to Liverpool I
3. was surprised at how decent customer service was here after all the horror
4. stories I've heard. Some days I even think it's better here i.e. people are
5. friendlier! When I went back to the MN in September I was a bit surprised
6. at some of the customer experience (rudeness) I received. Having worked as
7. a waitress for many years, I'm not bothered for the most part as I know how
8. difficult it can be to work with people, but I have been pleasantly surprised
9. here. The only way I'd say the customer service is worse here is that if I
10. need something in a store, I have to be pro-active whereas in the states I
11. could just stand there and look confused (not a huge feat for me!) and
12. someone would notice and rush over to help.

Author 7 begins in line 1 with converting an American colloquialism of 'two cents' to '2p...in favour of Britain'. This is a very clear dyad of subjectivity –a hybrid of American/British identity; an American who converts an American colloquialism for a British version.

An interesting thing occurs in this data extract which shares similarity with one other author and only briefly and that is the reduction of culture from a national to a more local or regional level. In the case of Author 7, the dyad of American/British cultural differences and the position from which they are speaking is perhaps too heavy to bear and in lines 1-2 Author 7 makes an immediate move from someone speaking at a national level to a regional one. Author 4 also did this (see Extract 8, Author 4, line 3). This is possibly a discursive move to reduce any differences they present down to being isolated events rather than as culturally contingent but may also indicate a private concern

for the author. With their move in a direction more favourable for Britain, they are openly challenging Author 1's account which already gave examples of bad customer service in the UK. Therefore, lines 1-2 can be seen as a disclaimer which as a discursive tool does two things simultaneously here; first, and unconventionally for a disclaimer, it is being used to account for a contrasting viewpoint to one which *has already been presented* and secondly, can safeguard against future accounts which present stories that refute this favourable valuation. In their entirety, lines 1-2 remove culture –at least at the moment- from the context of customer service in Britain specifically.

In lines 3 and 8, Author 7 reports having been surprised by customer service experiences in the UK. In their discussion they are re-evaluating a stereotype they had come to the UK with; one which was developed through the "horror stories I've heard" (lines 3-4). Furthermore, Author 7 mentions being "a bit surprised at some of the customer experience (rudeness) I received" (lines 5-6) when they were again back in the US –a place where they should have known what to expect. This section of the extract shows the fluidity of a person's position as affected by experience and interaction with others; that acculturation is not just a process of adjustment to new cultural ideas but also a readjustment to old cultural ideas in light of new information.

In doing being 'in favour of Britain', Author 7 has simultaneously positioned themselves 'against' the US; for if one is in favour of something that inevitably results in being in disfavour of the thing opposite the favourable alternative. However, through the course of the extract, the examples of customer service

experiences are localized to "regional differences" (l. 2) and later customer service as a set of activities gets broken down into smaller units (aspects) (l. 9) whereby Author 7 then reduces even further any clear distinction between the US and the UK. Thus *culture* is made less and less the contingent factor and demonstrating the ability to do this is in itself acculturation.

In some of the extracts of data from this chapter, it is clearly visible that there is not just polyphony in the way the one extract relates to the others but may include actual formulations or reformulations used by other people. However, in the case of this extract, the polyphony in extract eleven is only in the way the extract relates to other extracts; meaning that there are character positions and context-related information which were seen in the previous extracts and it includes aspects from Authors 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Although Author 7 shares the character position of customer with Author 1, their being in favour of Britain is an explicit disagreement with Author 1 and having detailed negative experiences in both places within the text is in agreement with Authors 3 and 5. Furthermore Author 7 (line 4) is orienting with express agreement to Author 6 in that they even prefer the way things are in the UK (see Extract Ten, Author 6, line 3) some days.

6.6 Chapter Summary

This data in the chapter presented the opportunity to see through empirical evidence the ability of people to become cultural hybrids through intercultural contact, resulting at times in the transformation of their existing cultural practices (Hermans & Kempen, 1998, p. 1113). Using the framework I have established

throughout this thesis, I am able to show just how variable and infinite culture is and the ways in which people are able to change as a result of their exposure to others through social means. This is what Hermans and Kempen (1998) referred to as the mixing and moving of culture. Even among individuals whose community (virtual or real) is smaller than a single nation-where the term culture is often referred to encompass an entire nation- there is still an extraordinary amount of variety.

In the next chapter, I continue to apply this same framework in the analysis of interview data from participants who I recruited to take part in my research.

Chapter Seven

What Kind of Expat are You?
Member's Activities in Categorization

7.0 Chapter introduction

In the previous chapter, I introduced the way in which data in this dissertation would be treated; i.e. the type of 'analytical mentality' which would be adopted. The participant data from the previous chapter was created by people who *assumed* a certain shared membership category incumbency of 'expat'. The actual semantics of the term expat were not discussed, however, by the participants. As all participants were members of the web-based forum registered to the site called *American Expats*, it can be assumed that those participants considered themselves as such (or having a vested interest in them) yet what they wrote subsequently or said opened the possibility of variability in that membership category.

In this chapter, I apply the methods used in the previous chapter to transcribed interview data from my participants who were recruited to take part in this research (see Chapter Four, section 4.3). The goal with this chapter is to explicate the variability among my participants regarding the understanding of their position as foreigners in the UK, done through many discursive activities one among them being how they position themselves in relation to native Britons as well as other migrants who are also living in the UK. In the data below, certain contingencies are presented by the participants as belonging to the type of foreigner they consider themselves to be. Through this, the variability of the membership category of *expat*, a name I have attributed to the group of migrants

I am focusing upon, is revealed. This category has some basic assumptions which include that people have made (and have) a choice to make this move and that they have made relied upon some presuppositions which informed them that this move would be something positive rather than fraught with problems. While some of the contingencies are made apparent in the data immediately following; it is distributed in the data throughout this thesis.

7.1 Variability in the semantics of a membership category

As I discussed previously, there is great diversity among those categorized as migrants. This disparity exists not only *among* migrant categories but also *between* migrating individuals. One way in which the experience of migrants differs is in their reasons and circumstances which pre-empt the move. For example in order to qualify for political recognition and associated benefits in receiving countries, Refugees and Asylum Seekers' reasons for migrating presuppose their recognized status as such. People such as those who are the focus of this study are also diverse but are categorized in certain ways as well; just as the other categories of migrants, but what of the members themselves? Do they conceive of themselves as such? If they do, from where do these ideas originate? Unlike Refugees or Asylum Seekers where presentations about the members of those categories in the media make their way into members' narratives (Leudar, Hayes, Nekvapil & Baker, 2008), the parameters of other migrant category membership seem less defined. There are certainly bureaucratic regulations to manage all foreigners[36], however, these tend to *generally* operate at a more overt level in societal discourse. This means that while Refugees and

[36] I am specifically referring to those in the UK and the relevant bureaucracy in managing the different membership categories.

Asylum Seekers narratives include their own autobiographical components, they are also largely constrained and constituted by the discourses *about* 'them' as Leudar, Hayes, Nekvapil & Baker (2004) found; whereas the constitution of other migrant categories and the narratives from those members are largely autobiographical and therefore highly variable.

In the cases of migrants who seek out a move not out of fear or economic deprivation but out of a desire to do something different with their lives there is a tendency to recognize themselves as being members of a particular group; loosely referred to as "expats". Within this group, however, exists a range of predicate activities such as being sponsored through a company or having chosen to live abroad which create further substrata of distinction made by members between themselves and other members; either assigning or denying membership in their particular expat group. Constructions of a particular profile any one member deems as the *true* profile of a fellow member is something done prior to a point of social interaction around that topic (Smith, 1978). Just as Schutz said, this presumptive 'thinking as usual' model will inevitably be tested within interaction; in this case even among members who assume shared sameness. It is the empirical problem of the stranger which is the focus of this chapter; namely the individual's activities in interaction in order to determine *what kind of expat are you*? Hence the data below provide support toward acculturation being viewed as a member's phenomenon which unfolds as situated action in a conversation about being expats.

In the data which follows there is a point of demarcation being made between expats who were a part of a corporate-sponsored move abroad or one which was a personal and independent under-taking. I believe this is a very important point from which to begin my analysis of my participant data because there is a distinction being made between the resources which are available or provided and the motivation for integration and the level of commitment toward understanding the new culture. Furthermore, it can yield some understanding to the extent of the psychological adaptation (or commitment to adapt) and the changes represented by these individuals. This can be done by taking a particular interest in the ways in which people establish or deny the ascriptions of themselves or other people to various social categories. Analysis of the ways in which people use these categorisations as tools in referencing in talk reveals the relative positioning of the user opposite others; otherwise known as *identity work*. This includes not just the way they ascribe people to categories but also the way in which they describe their own activities; identifying themselves as an incumbent of particular categories. As I have explained in the Methods section, people employ a variety of tactics in their talk about themselves and others; among them being through 'person-reference', 'description', 'identification', 'formulation' and 'categorisation' (Schegloff, 2007, p. 433).

The means of doing referencing can be seen through the deployment of a range of tools including pronouns, nouns, names as well as attributes and activities (Schegloff, 2006; 2007). An example of the latter appears in the extract below. Here, I am primarily interested in the listing and describing of activities of people and the implicit categorizing that is done in bringing those descriptions of those

activities into the interaction. In support of what I said above, Schegloff notes, '...one can elude to the category membership of a person by mentioning that person's doing of an action that is category-bound...' (2006, p. 470).

Since categories are in relation to one another and are not just defined by category-bound characteristics, I need to highlight why the use of a single category or the mentioning of various attributes and/or activities is not necessarily sufficient in determining analytic certainty about their use. To highlight this point I have provide a variety of synonyms[37] and adjectives found for Expatriate. They include: *emigrant, émigré, exile, displaced person, refugee, outcast, emigrant, living abroad, exiled, banished, cast out, deported.*

Among these different categorisations, there exists a set of shared activities associated therewith which include leaving country of origin and possessing a certain cultural orientation which will not necessarily be a good fit in the receiving country. However, even among these shared attributes, the semantics of each of these individual terms are different –most of them seem to be rather negative. When people from any one of these categories are engaged in topical interaction about being expats, it should not be taken for certain that they all share the same understanding of what an expat is.

As I mentioned above, certain categories of migrants are relatively straightforward (Smith, 1978); in order to be a member (regardless of whether or not the incumbent *wishes* to be), one's personal circumstances must meet certain

[37] http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?entry=t22.e4962 retrieved on February 26, 2008

legal criteria to be classed respectively. Although there certainly exists a fair amount of diversity among those classed as Refugees or Asylum seekers, there are still a few distinct and shared assumptions about those members.

However, with the category of expat, the presumptive members (Schegloff, 2007, p. 450) of the category may not all share in particular attributes and activities and therefore the 'class-membership' is not clear (Smith, 1978) and must be/can be negotiated among members through discussing 'common-sense knowledge' about members of that category (Schegloff, 2007, p. 450). Furthermore, there are certain migrants for whom the categorization of expat is not used –such as Refugees or Asylum Seekers- even though by purest definition of expatriate[38], all people living outside their country of birth are 'expats'. As I mentioned above, the narratives and indeed categorisation of the latter are constrained greatly by discourses around them.

In the case of other categorisations where the parameters are less fixed and the recognition of membership as a *fact* involves 'complex conceptual work' (Smith, 1978, p. 26) which includes collecting experiences; namely others accounts of being abroad and circumstances of living as a foreigner in the case of this membership collectivity. In order to arrive at the conclusion that participants of this research are talking about the same kind of foreigner, such conceptual frameworks are brought into play in the course of the interaction. The starting point here is that among all the categories and descriptions I listed above as being synonymous with expatriates, all do share the same default prerequisite activity

[38] Adjective: Living outside one's native country *www.askoxford.com*

of leaving home but this activity, as we will see in the data, is not considered as the terminally-defining activity of being an expat.

Once again, the basic interest of my research is to observe the identity work and negotiation of expats in situ through narrative accounts and possible polyphony. A good example of where this takes place is in people's accounts about how it is they came to be expats in the first place and their relationship to the place from whence they come and in which the presently find themselves. The structure of such an account is narrative; it includes a past whose relevant parts are being brought forward to the present to account for the state of things now.

Through their biographical narrative interviews, the participants are recalling past events and at times reformulating them in light of new information for their telling in the present. In order to map changes in the presentation of self, I needed to understand the point of departure for my participants.

The first phenomena presented below arose ironically out of the data from the very first interview with a participant couple. It seems that it was not only a great place to start the investigation of the participant's stories but also to understanding the beginning of my story as the researcher. I wanted to study expats and although through the establishment of a set of inclusion criteria, I roughly knew who I would be getting the fact remains that people cannot really know in advance if they are the same –again regardless of whether or not there is some presumption of shared samenesss. The empirical problem rears its head for

us all as we embark upon any social interaction with strangers. As Schutz said, a 'stranger' by definition can be:

> The applicant for membership in a closed club, the prospective bridegroom who wants to be admitted to the girl's family, the farmer's son who enters college, the city-dweller who settles in a rural environment, the "selectee" who joins the Army, the family of the war worker who moves into a boom town...
>
> (1944, p. 499 emphasis in original)

What they bring to the interaction as their understanding of what an expat is and the kind of expat they are is negotiated and reformulated through an interview with another expat and can provide a good understanding of where each person *is* and can subsequently be followed to on their narrative journey.

It is tempting to think, and is indeed a common mistake made in some research, that the data produced in such a context are entirely *interview* data. However, while *research* participants go on to produce ipso facto data which they feel *expected* to produce –as research participants- it is often the case that speaker's positions change frequently throughout the course of any given interaction. Considering the data below, it is entirely possible that at times, the research participants are speaking to a researcher, at other instances, there might be two American women speaking together (one the researcher and one the participant) while another participant occupies another position or none at all. As I showed in the previous chapter, the possibility exists for participants to be speaking from a position which is polyphonic. I shall highlight those moments in the data presented within this dissertation as I find them.

Therefore, the data from the interviewer, 'I' is also part and parcel to the analysis of this extract as 'I' (I) am also an expat. I have been, however, *two* different kinds of expat in the past. Initially 'I' moved abroad for a limited duration (one

year) whereby I received assistance in securing a work-permit but all other logistical matters were undertaken by me. The second 'type' of expat experience I had, was as the spouse of a foreign employee who had been sent by their company to the UK on a three-year contract. As I argued at length within the Methods section of this thesis, 'I''s (my) part in this interaction will be analysed along with that of 'I''s (my) own research participants because my presence and contribution to the interaction as a member of population I am interviewing by default impact the course of that interaction. This issue could be taken up on two points in this research: whether or not 'I' am an expat as well and whether or not 'I' share the ethnicity/national affiliation with the participants. Indeed, one or both these may be playing a key part in the interaction. However, for the following bit of analysis, the former point is clearly necessary to consider.

So, rather than turning the analytical attention away from the contribution 'I' makes, I am treating her data as constitutive toward the co-construction of meaning; a third participant in the interview. As such, I, am featured throughout as 'I', "...can be [an] active participant, arguing with members, and questioning their assumptions, just as participants can 'turn the tables' on researchers, prompting them to explain their questions and offer opinions" (Speer, 2002, p. 512) and I, as the researcher and the data I produced is not considered to be a "...'contaminant' –but [that I am] as much a 'member' as the other participants, and of equal status for the purposes of analysis" (ibid., p. 513) (see Chapter four, sections 4.4 Ethnography, 4.6 Subjectivity/reflexivity and 4.6a The unique adequacy requirement for my arguments regarding objectivity of my research). In general I assert that in order "to analyse these practices sensitively, the analyst

must possess sufficient knowledge of the context" (Arminen, 2000, p. 435). In fact, the very beginning of the very first interview I conducted and the very first extract I am presenting begins just that way; with an enquiry from my participant as to how I came to be sitting there asking them my question.

7.2 Analysis

The data for this section was selected by reading through the various points in the individual case study interviews where by the semantics, respective activities or category predicates of expats were being either explicitly discussed or implicitly referred to.

7.2a Case study 1 'E and G'

'E' and 'G', American and Swiss/British, moved to the UK as apart of their familial goal to move to Europe. 'E' had never lived abroad before while 'G' had been born and raised in Switzerland until the age of nine when his parents, a British father and Swiss mother, moved their family to Texas, USA. 'E' is a stay-at-home mom and 'G' is the working partner of the couple and is ten years younger than 'E'.

First Interview
Extract Twelve
E and G **(Case Study 1)**
February 2006

1.	I	...it started as a result of MY own experience of being an expat in
2.		Germany.
3.	E	right
4.	I	.hhh um: a
5.	E	and how long were you there?
6.	I	I was there over four years

The question which pre-empts 'I''s first utterance in Line 1 –an answering of the question which implicitly inquired how 'I' came to contact 'E' and her husband,

'G' for this interview – establishes that there are, at least at the onset of this interview, now three identity types present 1) people who the researcher deems to be expats (otherwise how would 'I' have come in contact with 'E' and 'G' to request their sharing of their *certain kind of story* 2) people who, in responding to the researcher's request for participants for a study about expats consider themselves to some extent to be a part of that group and 3) the Researcher –who herself is an expat; a point which I will address in a moment.

Perhaps this seems self-evident but it is not until they present themselves in the talk, can their place in the interaction be verified. Since this has been established at the beginning of the interview, it is likely that these identity types will be *omni-relevant* (Schegloff, 2006, p. 473) throughout the course of the interaction. Furthermore, these 'types' can arise in many alternative ways or be polyphonic. For example I am always a researcher but this falls at times to the background as my participants and I engage in other topical talk. Although they may not actually always be in the foreground, once they have existed, they are likely to appear again. Furthermore, the identity types, or categorization devices which occupy a primary position are omni-relevant and have priority in interaction when evoked in situ. As Sacks stated:

> An 'omni-relevant device' is one that is relevant to a setting via the fact that there are some activities that are known to get done in that setting, that have no special slot in it, i.e. do not allow any given last occurrence, but when they are appropriate, they have priority. Where, further, it is the business of, say, some single person located via the 'omni-relevant device' to do that, and they business of others located via that device, to let it get done.
>
> (1992, I, p. 313)

As Schegloff and Sacks present this, it seems to suggest that when an omni-relevant device is called for e.g. *has priority*, other devices are cast to the background and that one speaks from a single position at any one given time –

though they may dip in and out of that position frequently. If that is the case, that would mean in the context of this interaction I am dealing prima face with the encapsulated, single-faceted categorization device relational pairing of 'Expat(s)/Researcher'.

However, as I discussed at length and showed through analysis in previous sections of this thesis, Hermans' theorization of the Dialogical Self accounts for the possibility of speaking concurrently from several positions which are inextricably intertwined in a given moment but are fluid and susceptible to a re-alteration and creation of a new polyphony of selves as the course of the interaction requires. Therefore, I argue that omni-relevant devices can also possibly be polyphonic. I do not suggest that polyphony exists all the time but rather I am using the theoretical concept of dialogism in expanding upon aspects of a situated methodological framework. Even if an omni-relevant-device is referring to an interactional context, an interview, rather than a personal position or membership category, the possibility of polyphony still exists when the trajectory of what started out as an interview moves toward a conversation where participants' rights to the conversational floor are equal. That is to say, for example, when a something begins clearly as an interview but at the end of interaction is barely recognizable as such. Put another way, I ('I') may engage with my participants at times as another expat or as a researcher but the possibility exists that I am in fact both through a significant amount of time in the interaction.

This point of the possible polyphony in omni-relevant-devices is critical as it proposes that 'E' understands 'I' not only as a potential member of a category (expat) she assumes incumbency of but also that 'I', as both *a researcher of expats* and *an expat*, could possibly possess a more profound corpus of knowledge regarding the subject of being an expat –and could subsequently affirm or discredit the authenticity of another expat's claims.

Although this last point is not explicitly to be found in the data, several points yield me to think that this is theoretically possible. As Arminen and many other researchers on institutional talk have observed, "...an agent may orient to expert knowledge or organizational procedures taken..." (2000, p. 435). In the case of the extract I have provided here, the interaction with 'E' (and 'G') was set up to be an interview with foreigners in the UK and therefore, because this is the reason 'I' came in contact with 'E' and 'G', it can be assumed that 'E' and 'G' can expect at some point to be *asked questions* (an activity which is part of an interactional unit called *being interviewed*). Secondly, prior to the interview commencing –i.e. through general 'break the ice chit chat', it is established where everyone is originally from ('I' and 'E' are American and 'G' is Swiss/British but lived in the US the preceding nine years). As such, it is now clear that 'I' am also a foreigner. Therefore, in this interaction I am now not just a researcher but also a foreigner; a researcher who is studying foreigners and someone who could likely possess both practical experience as well as theoretical underpinnings about the subject as related to a doctoral course of

study would suggest. As the first extract in this data show, the first question was asked[39] by the research participant rather than the researcher.

In Line 1 'I' presents the possibility that the experience of being an expat – a categorization she employs explicitly- may be an idiosyncratic one and is soliciting the participants for their valuation on *their own* experience. This formulation sets the stage for what is being solicited from the co-participants; namely that expat experiences can vary and she is seeking to understand the ways in which it does. The first contingency which is made relevant is that of *time*. The way in which 'E' solicits information regarding the length of time (l. 5) 'I' spent as an expat in Germany orients to 'E''s interest in duration of time as a relevant contingency of being an expat and sets the stage at this point in the interaction for a swapping for 1st and 2nd stories. This implicit question is dealt with later in the interaction and for the two co-participants there is not a straight forward answer.

First Interview
Extract Thirteen
E and G **(Case Study 1)**
February 2006

1.	E	four yer
2.	I	AND I also went: to Germany under the the premise of only
3.		staying for a year .hhh that time I met my husband hhhh happens
4.		hehe
5.	E	hehe
6.	G	hehehehehehe

Between Lines 1-2 something curious happens.'I' takes up that length of time is a critical contingency of being an expat but presents another contingency of

[39] Due to technical difficulties with the audio recorder, the actual asking of the question does not appear here in the data, however, the account between lines 1-2 provided by 'I' is clearly oriented toward a call for information.

intended duration of stay. This begins the demarcation between staying 'only' for a year and staying beyond that time. In the case of 'I', being an expat was not something planned or intended but as a result of a change in status which then resulted in another change in contingency from simply living abroad to living abroad beyond a certain length of time. It is necessary at this point to explain that at the time of this interview 'E' had not yet been living abroad for more than seven months –but she came with the understanding/idea that the move was a permanent one.

First Interview
Extract Fourteen
E and G (**Case Study 1**)
February 2006

1.	I	AND I ended up staying and that's when things got difficult
2.	E	yeah. Cause your mentality has to be different
3.	I	YEAH

At this point it emerges that the category of person who lives for a long time away from their country of birth is emerging through the mentioning of category predicates and predicate activities and a category is being clarified by 'E' and 'I' as they begin the collaborative work of defining the correct interpretation (Smith, 1978) of the type of foreigner they are. This is being done through a process of self-disclosure begun by 'I' about the context through topicalized talk which focuses namely on; how I became an expat, what it is like to be an expat, i.e. the changes I went through and with an anticipation of reciprocation of self-disclosure from my participants.

In Line 1, 'I' states that once the decision to stay was made, a new set of circumstances arose and "that's when things got difficult". I cannot say for certain how I viewed the status of my residency abroad during that first year and

whether or not I considered myself an expat as such –I was certainly aware that I was a foreigner. As time carried on and my circumstances (status) changed, I began to feel, through my interactions with my partner and friends, that this mode of conduct was not always acceptable and that I was regularly made aware by my partner of my short-comings or mistakes from his native cultural point of view. It was clear that changes needed to be made and were indeed expected of me. As such my own definition of self began to change. As line 2 goes onto show, 'E' takes up the meaning I intended with what 'I' had said in line 1 by presenting the key requirement being a change in mentality.

These revelations may yield the possibility that people native to the country the expat is visiting may have or exhibit a certain level of tolerance and accommodation when the person is not viewed as being a permanent fixture to society; however, when that foreigner wishes to be or intends to become that other criteria are imposed –resulting in psychological changes within the foreign person. This idea is supported by Cooley's concept of the 'Looking-Glass Self' and seems to support McLemore's (1970) assertion that the main challenge for the stranger in a foreign environment is that their objectivity opposite the existing order can pose unexpected or unwelcomed challenges of it. Therefore those within it or near to the stranger may have an interest in minimizing that objectivity.

In Lines 1-2 'E' and 'I' are in agreement that one of the characteristics of being an expat includes a change in mentality –regardless of whether this occurs after a significant amount of time or at the onset of what is intended to be a permanent move. Furthermore, this change in mentality and suggestion that time duration is

not as important as *intended* duration indicated that there is an implicit distinction being made between those expats who go and decide to stay and those who do not. So, based upon the accounts presented, the interlocutors can discover in those descriptions whether or not the same profile is being presented or can debate about what that profile is. 'E' and 'I' have then set up that they are enduring a significant personal experience which requires a mental reorientation to which inevitably impacts their own feelings about who they are.

First Interview
Extract Fifteen
E and G **(Case Study 1)**
February 2006

1.	E	WHEN you're going for a year (.) it's different
2.	I	right yer yer just sort of the eternal tourist
3.	E	yeah
4.	I	and after that
5.	E	YEAH and when you know this is my new reality

Line 1 'E' returns to the factor of a specified length of time, 'one year'. Even though she'd had, at the time of this interview, been abroad for less than one year, her *intention* was that it had been a permanent move as she positions herself opposite those who do go for a year. 'E' is expanding the description of experience which 'I' began; perhaps pointing toward the extent to which someone is a part of the society they are in. The uptake from 'I' in Line 2 comes in the form of a classification which acts to name the type of people who go 'for a year' and simultaneously contrast it with others who stay more than a year. The differences between those who just spend a year travelling about and those who stay is that one is a mentally changed individual and one is a tourist –a person who is travelling for pleasure, site-seeing, learning the culture from the perimeter, choosing the points of society with which to engage and may or may not actually be able to interact socially with locals.

However, it seems there is more implicit meaning in the formulation of 'eternal tourist'. 'E' and 'I' are trying to narrow down a description which is appropriate for people who are similar to themselves. They have set up the category of 'eternal tourist' as one of the possibilities of living away from ones home country and contrasting that category and activities with other types of foreign-born residents. Even though 'eternal' tourist could indicate that one is perpetually on the go, never-ceasing in the exploration yet no matter how much time passes, this person is not like them. A certain length of time is a contingency but there is more to it. An 'eternal tourist' does not need/want to change their mentality. 'Eternal tourists' are not required necessarily to relate in a different way to the place and its people as a person actually living there would. It is possible that something is being done with this formulation to suggest that the difference is a surrendering of oneself as one is and becoming somebody else, i.e. the acceptance of *my new reality* (l. 5), to the culture you are in. Whereas the 'eternal tourist' always has the option to abandon and return to wherever *their reality* is.

However, there is a problem with this formulation as 'expats' –like the kinds 'I' and 'E' are slowly constructing themselves as in which they live, presumably, permanently abroad- still orient to home, as seen in the data from Chapter Six. However, perhaps what this change in mentality, new reality is suggesting, is that a person like 'I' and 'E' who orients in some way to home must simultaneously also orient toward a new culture they find themselves living in; as such they are in a culturally ambiguous situation living in one place with an orientation to another.

Line 4 returns to the contingency of time and I believe concurrently the change in mentality, as in *after the time you have been an eternal tourist-* one is at the cross roads –either to maintain their tourist status, to return home or to change. 'E' gives her affirmation to 'I''s utterance in Line 5 and her 'and when' can possibly indicated that this new reality is not always a result which is certain but *when* they come to the embrace this as *their* 'new reality' the logical completer is *then* which opens the possibility that the next thing that could be said is *–then everything changes.* With 'E's formulation of the last part of line 5 using 'my' she is taking on the position which she has been conceptually talking with 'I' about in the abstract. Furthermore, this utterance is momentarily polyphonically oriented as by this point, 'E' and 'I' have agreed upon an understanding that contingency of time and mental orientation to a life in a foreign country are implicative of the kind of expats they are. Considering this, 'E''s utterance in line 5 of a general 'you' embodies both herself and 'I' as *people who understand* the point being made.

The fact that this interaction took place at the beginning of the interview could be that the *research* participant, 'E', is seeking an answer to the implicit question she is making to 'I' *–where are you from?* This question, whether implicit or explicit is a very common way of initiating interaction with a stranger (Garot, 2007, p. 51). These types of questions enable members to handle a lot of information and assist them in collecting diverse inferences which help to form categorizations (ibid.). Once these categories are established, one "feel[s they] know a great deal about the person, and can readily formulate topics of conversation based on the knowledge stored in terms of that category" (ibid., p.

52 cf. Sacks, 1992). If 'E' can understand where 'I' is coming from –in the context of expat knowledge- then there is an understanding how the interaction can proceed further.

'G', 'E''s husband, is notably absent from this bit of interaction. He too is a foreigner in the UK and could certainly contribute here, so why isn't he doing so? It is worth mentioning here that for 'G' this move abroad is not his first and he had spent the preceding nine years in the United States. He is originally from Switzerland. Even though 'I' is now a *second-time*[40] foreigner, she is the interviewer and that requires her to engage her participants but both 'E' and 'G' are free to contribute or not and even though it could be said that 'E' could be holding some conversational dominance; the conversation analytical framework requires the inclusion of even those attempts by other speakers to gain access or control of the conversational floor as it were and including this point in the current analysis is critical to a complete analysis of this text (Schegloff, 1997). But 'G' does not attempt to do this.

Whether this interview takes the form of more institutional talk or an everyday conversation (Itakura, 2001) there exists the possibility of asymmetry in conversational dominance depending upon who is doing the talking or who is telling *this* part of the story (ibid.). Indeed it is obvious in most of these types of interviews and particularly those in which participants are being interviewed by fellow members, maintenance of a strict and consistent interview format is unlikely as they seek and discover differences and similarities. Considering this

[40] I have termed 'G''s status as a second time foreigner. What this means is that this is 'G's second move to a foreign country.

point, 'E' is at this point in time in need of formulating her identity as a foreigner; she is occupied with a reformulation of self in light of this, *her*, new reality. For 'G', perhaps the reality of having a changed mentality because he is living his life abroad is no longer a new realization but has long since been accepted. Interestingly, however, 'G''s account in the analysis presented in Chapter Eight display the identity of a person who was not able to change his mentality and therefore not accept his new reality *in Texas*. However, at the time of this interview, 'E' and 'G' were no longer in Texas but had moved to the UK and therefore, it is 'E' who is now the 'new' foreigner.

First Interview
Extract Sixteen
E and G **(Case Study 1)**
February 2006

1.	E	um::(.) it's gonna be it worries HE has a hard time at work .hh
2.		knowing that Beatrice and I: don't f:eel so solid or connected I
3.		mean he [articulates]
4.	I	[socially speaking]
5.	E	[that to me]
6.	G	[yeah]
7.	E	he articulates that to me
8.	I	uhhuh
9.	E	WELL YOU KNOW WHY AM I GONNA BOTHER eh A
10.		trying to find another mother baby group when I know I'm
11.		leaving in six months
12.	I	yeah
13.	E	and B (.) culturally we don't fit in in the area we live in here
14.	G	yeah
15.	E	we don't. [I mean]
16.	I	[um so]
17.	E	it's all pakistan:i indian: polish
18.	I	[okay]
19.	E	[huge polish] I mean I mean if I walk down the street with
20.		Beatrice the ODDS ARE nuh nuh ninety percent of the people I
21.		walk past do not sp:eak English as their language of [preference]
22.	I	[really?]
23.	E	yes
24.	G	Yeah .hh I mean you just when you just walk around here and you
25.		hear two people talk to each other [it's going to be either Polish
26.		or]
27.	E	[it's going to be Polish] or it's going to be like Pakistani Indian

28.	I	[okay]
29.	E	[you know] something like that
30.	G	[yeah um:]
31.	E	[SO there's just (.) they're not friendly I started out]
32.	G	[even even though they] can all probably speak English
33.	E	[YEAH but]
34.	G	[that's not how] they talk amongst
35.	E	[right]
36.	G	[each other] and so
37.	E	the language (???) over here
38.	I	mmhmm

In line 1, 'E' begins to construct her position as a foreigner in the UK. As she explains she and her daughter, Beatrice, don't feel "solid or connected" (l. 2) and that her husband sees this. Interestingly, at the time of this interview, Beatrice is only a little over one year old and is not able to recognize this for herself as the only people she is interacting with are her mother and father.

Between lines 9 and 13 'E' presents reasons for the social isolation which prevent her from pursuing any social relationships; the fact that she is leaving in six months and that "culturally we don't fit in in the area we live in here". Recognizing that she needs to expand upon this statement, 'E' makes a list of other ethnic groups who comprise the area around them, "it's all pakistani indian polish" (l. 17). In describing other foreigners in this way, 'E' is formulating her position in which she is not the type of foreigner *they* are; speaking English and being white are among the reasons why she is not like them. There may also be an economic contingency as well.

In line 21, 'E' describes the area they live as a place in which ninety percent of the people "do not speak English as their language of preference" (l. 21). The use of the word preference is interesting as it suggests that even though the people

around her may have a different native language to her, she assumes that English should be spoken in an English-speaking country. After 'G''s confirmation of this point, 'E' summarises this practice of not speaking English as not being friendly (l. 31).

In lines 32-34 'G' categorises this situation as something that people who are able to speak more than one language do and when they are amongst "each other" the natural tendency might be to speak their native language.

First Interview
Extract Seventeen
E and G **(Case Study 1)**
February 2006

1.	E	and I would started out smiling at other mothers down the street
2.	I	Mmm
3.	E	and stuff and OH GAWD if we walk her you know we'll walk
4.		through the park with Beatrice and she <u>loves</u> dogs
5.	I	mmhmm
6.	E	and she'll start smiling and you know cooing and saying her word
7.		for dog
8.	I	mmhmm
9.	E	andand I'll say that's right that's a doggie and we'll kind of catch
10.		the eye of the owner and try to smile like
11.	I	mmhmm
12.	E	.hh you know oh sweet dog whatever and they just give you these
13.		stony glare(.) um it's not a friendly country even when (.) you
14.		know something like you think a child cooing over their dog
15.		melt
16.	I	[mmhmm]
17.	E	[could] thaw a little bit of ice so it's not a friend and even MY I
18.		have a <u>British</u> friend that.I've.made .hh and which (?) and I go
19.		walking she's got a baby younger than Beatrice
20.	I	mmhmm
21.	E	~I I me SHE commented the last time we were in the park
22.	I	[mmhmm]
23.	E	[and Beatrice] was cooing at the pets .hh and we'd look up and
24.		try to smile and she's like (.) not very [friendly are they?]
25.	G	[it could be it's just]
26.	E	[OR IT'S JUST THIS] POCKET OF LONDON or
27.	I	[yeah]
28.	E	[whatever] because even Sharon who <u>is</u> British

29. I [yeah]
30. E [and is] born and raised here is kind of like

In this extract, 'E' goes about separating herself from other foreigners in order to reduce the distance between her and majority culture members. Having established in the extract immediately above that 'E' is unlikely to be able to initiate any social contact through discourse due to the presence of languages other than English, she draws upon the membership category of "mother" in presenting further arguments about the area being an unfriendly place. Between lines 1 and 15 'E' describes a scenario in which these other mothers are not responding in a way a mother *should.* "Mothers" are not a culturally-contingent category and therefore mothers should possess a shared sentiment which crosses cultural and linguistic barriers. Not only are the people around her foreigners to whom she cannot relate through interaction because they are unfriendly and do not speak English, but they are also mothers who do not respond as mothers should. A smile at other mothers walking down the street should elicit corresponding responses in return. E's demonstration of normal mother behaviour is met, however, with 'stony glares' from the other mothers. Mother's who 'ninety percent' of the time are speaking another language other than English and not only that, but to speak another mother tongue is a preference. There is moral implicative work being done here. In other words, 'E' has no basis from which to build any kind of social connection because the people around her differ from her socially and morally.

To garner support for her harsh assessment in which she deconstructed of the category 'mother' in an attempt to isolate mothers who are 'good' and mothers who don't behave like mothers should, 'E' uses an ethnic mention of a majority

culture member (l. 18), a British woman by the name of Sharon. 'E' describes having 'made' a friend in someone who is from the majority culture and that this friend also shares in this experience. The identity work here is that E is making it very clear that she, a foreigner, has sought out friendships with majority culture members and that, because of either her like-minded 'motherness' or other factors not presented here, she has been able to align with the majority culture. Mothers of 'other' ethnic origins are showing themselves as not even sharing these assumed motherly attributes and therefore, they are clearly opposite the majority culture of British people in the UK whereas 'E' is not.

In line 25 'G' begins to try and provide an alternative account as to the reason people in an English-speaking country may not be speaking English. He positions himself as someone who understands that the immediate community may not be a reflection of the larger collectivity. Further to this point, 'G' employs the word 'just', possibly an attempt to 'downgrade' the claim being made by 'E' previously in describing this places as "not a very friendly country" (l. 13). 'E' echoes this sentiment immediately as 'G' is uttering it. While 'G' does overlap with his evaluation, 'E' could return to the original question posed but she drops that and pursues an alignment with 'G' that the problem could be reflective of "this pocket of London". Perhaps in an attempt to show alignment, realising that 'G''s utterance could cast doubt upon the identity work she has done earlier in the interview as someone who has always held a broader worldview which will be presented in the next chapter.

Second Interview
Extract Eighteen
E and G (**Case Study 1**)
November 2006

At this time, 'E' and 'G' had moved to St. Neots, a smaller town in a rural area outside of London. 'G' was commuting each day by train to London while 'E' spent all of her time in the new house and town.

G It's just like, whether, you know, you, I, I, I tend to greet people at least with a smile and a nod, and sometimes even with a, you know, evening or something like that; and, and sometimes I'll get a response or something, you know.

E And I'll get like, if I'm coming over the footbridge with the pushchair and there's [unclear] I've got, you know, I've got young teenagers that are real polite, they stand there with their bikes and wave, you know, and they're nice and they all say, thank you, and they smile [unclear], and you've got other people that, you know, can't be bothered, so… it, it's definitely more polite.

I How do you feel culturally here, you men… you mentioned that culturally down in that area you didn't fit in.

E We don't fit in here either.

G Well, I, I don't know because I, I'm not really here that much, um, so my interactions tend to be limited to, to people with, in, in shops and

E Yeah, I mean, his work

G That's friendly enough I think that, that, you know, that the people in the shops here, because they tend to be, um, fairly young shops, tend to be friendly and take an interest in their business.

E Well, even at [unclear] I find that the check out points are quite nicer, [unclear] the check out the other day, and there's lady who talked more than once, but she didn't remember me, but we al… we had kind of the same conversation the second time, but this time I, I think she really remembered me. But she had, I didn't know it, she's like originally from Cypress and her husband was in something military, and so they were in Norway. And she was asking where I'm from, and I said, well, we moved here from Texas. And she was like, oh, we had neighbours from Texas when we lived in Norway. We were chatting a little bit about what it's like to be away from your home and all that kind of stuff, and she's going… and I said, well, actually we're getting ready to move again. And then she was like, well, like, you know, I hope that goes well, and she's like maybe I'll see you again, you know, before, yeah, before you move and just, you know, very, very nice and friendly. Um, and everybody is more relaxed at their tills and, um, the Sainsbury's in London is just, manic, hectic all the time, no matter what time of the day you went. And so

39. they didn't have time to be friendly, or, or courteous or whatever
40. it was, whereas the pace is definitely slower here. So you will see
41. people like the, the checkout clerk chatting with somebody that
42. they know as they go through the till or whatever. You know, I
43. mean, I've got people that just check me out and it's the basic
44. thing and I have other people that are a bit more friendly and it is
45. about [unclear], you know.

Between lines 1 and 10 both 'E' and 'G' describe their experiences in the area of their new home as being "polite"; greeting people here receives the expected response and even though it is not always the case that people are nice to them, "it's definitely more polite (l. 10). In this description, there is no mention of foreign languages or unreciprocated non-verbal communication. As they have been presented by 'E' previously, these things are culturally contingent.

'I''s question in line 11, however, does not assume these things to be culturally contingent and asks how the couple is fitting in *culturally*. In answering the question, 'E' changes her position on what constitutes culture. Having presented a position up until now that people's behaviour through verbal and non-verbal communication and 'pleasantries' were culturally implicit together with the work she did in aligning herself to a majority-culture member, Sharon, 'E' now states that they don't "fit in here either" (l. 13). This is shows a contradiction in 'E' in the way she is using culture in her positioning work. The same type of contingencies which were used in formulating that pocket of London as a place where they did not fit in culturally yet although they are now present, they are now not constitutive of a place where 'E' and 'G' fit in.

In describing some examples of interactions with local people, 'E' interestingly chooses to focus on an interaction with another foreigner rather than a majority

culture member (l. 26). The story includes a couple who share in some membership categories similar to 'E' and 'G' namely, people who are not native British and who have moved around. 'E' explains that she has told the woman that they had moved from Texas. As the data in the next chapter show, 'E' actually spends a great deal of time describing her up-bringing in Alaska as an account for how she was able to grow up in the US but with a multicultural mind set. Since the answer to this question must include 'G', the collective story about where 'E' and 'G' are from has to include Texas –the place where they met, married and lived together prior to moving to the UK. However, she could have told a story about how 'G' has Swiss and British parents and how she grew up in Alaska, but she does not. The evidence that 'E' actually told the story in this way comes from a polyphonic tool in which she uses ventriloquism in reporting the speech of the woman from Cypress (l. 29-30).

So while this place is very, very friendly and the pace is slower here than London, they still do not fit in.

Second Interview
Extract Nineteen
E and G (**Case Study 1**)
November 2006

1.	I	You said you didn't fit in culturally though; how so?
2.	E	Because I'm American, and it's just, um, like I went to a play
3.		group once in like the first week or two we were here, Haley's
4.		friend happened to be going and so she said, oh, bring Beatrice.
5.		And Beatrice really wasn't old enough for the play group, I said,
6.		was she old enough? She was only 18 months at the time and not
7.		walking. And she said, um, oh, yeah, yeah, yeah, when I took the
8.		literature she needed to be like 2½ to be there, so she was really
9.		not at the level of the other kids; so obviously it was [unclear].
10.		But, you know, it was, you know, the mom's kind of keeping to
11.		themselves and it just… my neighbour's a good example, like
12.		Haley's really friendly, but Haley grew up one street behind us,
13.		on Loop Street, her parents still live there, when she and Ian got

14. married they bought a house on Loop Street, two doors away from
15. her parents. When Haley moved here it was two minutes walk to
16. her parents' house; her parents stopped looking after her daughter
17. for her because it was so far away. Her parents drive here, and
18. Haley drives there and it's taken Haley three years to feel at home
19. here, in, in this house because Loop Street
20. G It's a stone throw away, you know.
21. E I could throw a rock, and if I was really good I could probably, if I
22. didn't hit her parents house I could hit her… the people across the
23. street from her parents. And she knows all these people, but that
24 is the… this is that world, and so you have friendships that are
25. very long-established. And they're used to Americans here,
26. because apparently there's two air bases or military bases nearby.
27. But that means that they're used to Americans coming and going
28. and there's always the, oh, so your husband's in the military? No,
29. my husband's British, and we've just moved here. Oh, and they
30. just kind of don't know what to do with that because they're used
31. to the Americans, a, having their own social and support from the
32. base, or even if they don't live on the base, having, yeah, they
33. shop, they socialise, the kids might actually go to school there and
34. they keep up their American ploy. Or, they're coming and going,
35. they're not here to stay. This man stopped me in the grocery store
36. the other day, I was letting Beatrice use one of those little trolleys;
37. and it was her first day with the little trolley and so when I was
38. trying to teach her that she needs to be, you know, start having to
39. talk a lot. And then always let people get passed and pull over
40. here, I'm going to take our, you know, fruit or whatever. And so
41. a man heard my American accent and started talking, and he's live
42. here 30 or 40 years, he's American. And it was funny to have
43. seen his face because I could tell on his face that he was… he still,
44. as long as he's been here, I could see he still, there's a part of him
45. that is still American. And I really think it made his day to just
46. have that little moment to talk to somebody else, you know, that
47. was from the same place he was; so and I thought like, gosh, you
48. know, [unclear] he was friendly [unclear].

It is clear through her question in line 1 that 'I' still does not understand in what way 'E' is not fitting in culturally –i.e. what culture *means*. As I explained in the analysis above, socially things seem different here, no mention of language barriers or problems with differences in non-verbal communication. 'E' even managed to have contact with someone who shared some similar experiences so where is the problem?

The reason is 'E' is American. The way she explicates what this means between lines 2 and 25 is by suggesting that people in St. Neots keep to themselves and that it is a tightly enclosed community where people grow-up and stay. Therefore the relationships people have, are built over long periods of time.

There is an interesting twist here in that this tightly knit community is "used to Americans" (l. 25). However, these Americans come and go. As this is information that 'E' has gotten through her interactions with local people, her narrative shows for a brief moment a reflexive extract from one or more past interactions she has had with others in their response to the question, *where are you from?* The way she presents this part of the narrative between lines 28 and 30 shows a dialogical orientation to 'I' in that she leaves out the exact questions which are often asked which provoke her response about the nationality of her husband. Rather, 'E' simply provides the answer to the type of question, "and there's always the, oh, so you're husband's in the military? No, my husband's British".

As she describes, "they just kind of don't know what to do with that because they're so used to the Americans…having their own social and support from the base" (l. 30 and 31) so through this 'E' is separating herself from other Americans and aligning herself to an extent with the majority culture; why else would she categorise her husband has British when nearly all-throughout the data from our interviews she refers to him as being Swiss?

Between lines 31 and 35 'E' splits the category of American into further sub-categories than what she did above between Americans who live here and those who do not. Now, there are subcategories of Americans who live on base and those who live off base but have all social contact with other Americans to "keep up their American ploy" (l. 33). Furthermore, there are the Americans who may stay awhile and then move on. In a sense, due to the fact that at the time of this interview 'E' and 'G' were already making their plans to move to Switzerland, 'E' would occupy this last category –whether or not she was married to a British man.

After having split Americans into various subcategories contingent upon certain activities, at line 42 'E' tells of an encounter with another American she had; an American who had been living in the UK for a long time. The way in which 'E' describes this piece of interaction is an example of the way in which social selves are situated and brought to the forefront in discourse depending upon who the participants are. She reports that she could see on his face, in his orienting to her *Americanness* revealed by her accent that "he still, there's a part of him that is still American" (l. 43-45). In her description of him and "that little moment to talk to somebody else, you know, that was from the same place…" (l. 46-47), 'E' describes sharing cultural membership of 'American' with this man.

The data to follow were collected after 'E' and 'G' moved to Switzerland –their third move in two years and second move to another country.

Third Interview
Extract Twenty
E and G (**Case Study 1**)
April 2007

1.	I	What kind of social contact do you have at the moment here?
2.	E	Um, I've done... I did a couple of coffee mornings with some
3.		expat women, but decided that they weren't... it's like one person
4.		said to me in New York. You get thrown together with people that
5.		you normally would not be friends with, and, and suddenly the
6.		only thing you have in common is that, oh, we're both in this
7.		foreign country and we speak the same language. This does not
8.		automatically make you qualified to be my friend. So I decided,
9.		um, when I came over here that I wasn't going to try to force
10.		relationships that are expat
11.	I	It's quite a common denominator of the...
12.	E	Yeah, exactly. And, um, so I dropped from that and, um...
13.		but true I have met a couple of other people through, um, like, you
14.		know, when they offered me some cream of tartar, we met up for
15.		a cup of tea and, um, we might get together another time, and
16.		when she goes back to the US later this year, she's going to give
17.		me all her American spices. And, um, um, you know, there's the
18.		lady in town that just had a baby that's American, that when they
19.		get done with all their church and christenings and whatever
20.	I	Do you find these people online?
21.	E	Yeah, so, you know, it's, it's... I haven't been like completely
22.		isolated but I am still socially, you know... it just doesn't affect
23.		me. I mean, I just... you don't... because I'm not looking for instant
24.		expat friends of the, the kind, I mean I could have every week
25.		since I've been here, gone and had coffee at Starbucks [unclear],
26.		but if I'm getting nothing out of it I think it's... I'm better serving
27.		myself and Beatrice and whatever, to do something that I actually
28.		find enjoyable and affirming to myself

To this point, 'E' has not provided any details about positive social connections she has in Switzerland. As the data from the interviews taken from different interviews in England showed, 'E' did not feel 'solid or connected' nor did she feel like she 'fit in'. There seems to be a pattern here and as the purpose of our interviews was to study acculturation, 'I' wanted to get to the bottom of it and attempt to do that through the question 'I' put forth in line 1.

Firstly 'E' mentions the "couple of coffee mornings" she has done with some expat women (l. 2-3) and begins to end the story but stops short in order to supply more information as to why coffee mornings with expat women do not necessarily lead to continued social contact namely; the common activities of being foreigners and speaking the same language do not necessary provide a basis for a friendship (summarization of l. 5-7). She engages this position as her own subjective position by reflexively drawing upon the words from the person in New York[41]. However, while she uses this story in conjunction with the details about her most *recent* social activities –the expat coffee mornings, it is also formulated between lines 8 and 9 to set a precedent for how she "wasn't going to try to force relationships that are expat" (l. 9-10). I believe this because the person in New York's voice is presented as the kind of position on expat relationships that 'E' uses for her own subjective position (l. 3-7) and follows it nearly immediately with "So, I decided when I came over here that I wasn't going to try to force relationships that are expat" (l. 8-10). This would indicate that she might look elsewhere for social contact yet this story about attending the 'expat coffee mornings' follows this decision. Furthermore, even after saying she'd "dropped from that", i.e. *forcing relationships which are expat*, 'E' provides several more examples between lines 13-19 of more expat contacts which started over someone lending her some "cream of tartar" (l. 14) or another woman who was American who has just had a baby (l. 18) and so on.

In 'I''s question about whether she has found these people online, 'I' is drawing upon her knowledge about 'E' and the fact that she knew 'E' was frequently

[41] It is not certain if this conversation took place virtually or in person. If the conversation took place in person, this would have occurred well before her move to the UK and Europe as 'E' had not been back to the US since she and her daughter moved abroad.

participating on expat message boards as a social outlet. In fact, it was over one such message board that 'I' found 'E' and recruited her for participation in this research.

Between lines 21 and 23 'E' affirms that she has found these expats online and then goes on to quantify her level of social contact along an implicit continuum upon which she formulates being closer to the end of 'isolated' –though not *completely* rather than significantly socially engaged but that this does not bother her. Between lines 23 and 26 exists, I believe, an example of what Bakhtin meant when proposing that the word has no semantic authority. Just as I explained above, 'E' initially presented the words of another person (in New York) and their subjective position about the characteristics of relationships between people who find themselves in a foreign country at the same time and with a common language but that these two contingencies may, in fact, be the only two things they have in common. Between those lines (23-26), a similar set of ideas appear but conveyed very clearly through a subjective position which 'E' puts forth as her own; no mention this time of someone else and what they had said. Here I believe she reformulates the ideas and character position which are similar but also now with her own intentions. The utterance sounds original now, as if coming from her. In Bakhtin's terms, 'E' has taken the words of someone else (or indeed subjective position and corresponding ideas and formulations) and has fused them with her own intentions. 'E' has now taken the position of an expat who acknowledges that there is a tendency for her and people like her to cultivate social contact with similar members based on those criterion but that she isn't necessarily getting anything out of it (l. 26).

Third Interview
Extract Twenty One
E and G (**Case Study 1**)
April 2007

1.	I	What about cultivating new friendships with Swiss friends, I
2.		mean, you had friends here from your childhood.
3.	G	Yes, so, um...
4.	E	Kristof. [?]\
5.	G	You've had different people over.
6.	E	Yeah, different people have come. One of his friends from school
7.		lives locally, and, um, so it's easier for him to come over and...
8.	G	I'd, I'd met him, uh, when I was over here by myself.
9.	E	Yeah, he's already seen him a couple of times.
10.	G	And then, uh, and then, yeah, we had him over here as a guest...
11.	E	And I think... I have a feeling that he's kind of evolved into a
12.		regular sort of once every month or few weeks or something, kind
13.		of, um, thing 'cos I think he had a, you know, a good time with...
14.		you know, we all just played games on the...
15.	G	And his life's uncomplicated enough, you know...
16.	E	Yeah, 'cos he didn't have a girlfriend, and, you know,
17.		he, he didn't have the time, and, um, (.)as far as his
18.	G	And there are a couple of the others, that, that have, um, that do
19.		have girlfriends that come over, um, for a
20.	E	Yeah, the one's from the Berne, [?] [unclear] area, um, (.) I mean,
21.		in, in, in Switzerland people tend to be friends with their... I don't
22.		know, they meet people at school and we haven't really met
23.		anybody yet, because first of all it's been winter and everybody's
24.		been inside. I mean, everybody, it's like funny, because it got
25.		warm two weekends ago, or was it last weekend? And, you know,
26.		spend the afternoon when we were here, um, and I went to the
27.		airport, I think we put Beatrice down for a nap or something and...
28.		no, we just were playing... she was playing outside and I went to
29.		the airport to go shopping and stuff. And, um, it was, um... I
30.		remember just walking to and from the train station everybody
31.		was out. It was just like, phew, the sun's shining and the weather's
32.		warm and it's just... you know, you could really see that
33.		everybody had been holed up for the winter. So, I mean, on the
34.		one hand everybody's kind of [sneeze] not been out to meet, but,
35.		um... I mean, I'm... there's a [unclear] or something that I've
36.		thought about joining because of the German-English thing,
37.		where the German speakers are trying to learn more English and
38.		the English speakers trying to learn the German and [cough] so
39.		they do hikes and they also do, and they're casual hikes, they're
40.		like if you want to scale Everest in a day we're not your group,
41.		you know. [chuckle] So it's, you know, my kind of fitness level,
42.		and then, um, twice a month they meet for dinner in Zurich and
43.		they put a clock on the table and for 30 minutes you speak one
44.		language and 30 minutes you speak another. So, you know, I'm
45.		looking at trying to do some things like that to, you know, a, on

46. the social front, and then, b, on the German practise front. And
47. then, um, basically, like you're getting ready... you're playing
48. something this month, aren't you, with Thomas and Rolf?

The question 'I' ask in line 1 shows a progressive trajectory toward a particular direction. I am interested to know how 'E' is feeling *culturally-speaking* in this new culture where she has a significantly limited resource to her advantage in connecting with others to help her feel solid (that point she made back in London which she said was a concern to her and 'G'); that of language. By mentioning 'Swiss friends' and whether 'E' is "cultivating new friendships with Swiss friends", 'I' is trying to determine what *actions* 'E' is taking to reduce the cultural distance between herself and majority culture members. This puts 'E' in the position to be specific about her position opposite majority culture members in general. She has already detailed some negative experiences and showed through narrative that she responded to that by eliminating contact.

In the question from line 1 'I' also includes a comment directed toward 'G' and the fact that he already has long-established friendships in Switzerland stemming from his childhood. Although he begins to answer this point he stops and 'E' briefly picks up the turn and suggests, 'Kristof' –an old friend of 'G''s. 'G' shifts the attention of 'meeting with friends' back over to 'E' in stating that "you've had different people over" (l. 5). Although 'E' concurs, she expands on this with details of 'G''s friends from school rather than any people that she has met on her own. Discussion about the different visitors, *'G''s friends*, continues for several lines. Interestingly, this is followed by sort of an account by 'E' between lines 21 and 23 in which she states that people tend to meet during school age and that "we haven't really met anybody yet". In actuality, 'G' *has* met people,

the people from school and about whom they have just spoken. The statement that *they* haven't met anyone is a polyphonic position uttered singly by 'E' of a couple as a single social unit in which both 'E' and 'G' would have to meet someone new *together*. Furthermore, for a moment she seems to separate 'G' from other Swiss who have met their friends in school (l. 22) which immediately precedes the statement that they've not yet met anyone new.

7.2b Summary of case study 1

In the set of extracts just presented we can see explicitly the ways in which membership categories, in this case the category of someone who is an '*expat*', are indeed a member's phenomenon and exhibit at times polyphonic arrangement[42]. Both 'E' and 'I' assumed membership incumbency of this category yet both did not necessarily assume that the other shared the same set of ideas about what constituted membership. This assertion is verified through the discussion and agreement regarding contingent points about real expats who are living abroad for a certain, intended length of time, who need to change their mentality and must accept a new reality; these people are considered by 'E' and 'I' as being different from another category of people who might be mistaken for (or mistake themselves) expats. They are referred to here as "eternal tourists". 'E' also separated herself from other foreigners on the basis that they were unfriendly and did not speak English.

[42] In classifying this as a 'polyphonic arrangement' I aim to describe the variability in the subjectivity of the term 'expat' as something which is metaphysical and fluid; due in part to several possibilities: 1) the meaning(s) each participant assumes of the term prior to engaging with one another here (subjectivity), 2) the various sources which have contributed to that the meaning(s) of the term and 3) the way in which the participants sort out the meaning between them in the interaction in purposeful coordination (and intersubjective orientation) to the other.

I make the claim that these categories are polyphonic through the mutual constitution of the category of expat which has just occurred between 'E' and 'I'. Both these members may indeed have gotten their ideas about expats from other sources yet what we can certainly see here is at the very least the establishment of the semantics of this category; all the activities, rights and obligations associated therewith which 'E' and 'I' will use later in interactions about expats. When they use that category later on, products of this activity will likely resurface and therefore the category is polyphonic.

Polyphony in 'E''s inter-subjectivity was visible throughout these extracts in 'E''s reflections from interactions she has had with people in which she cultivated certain elements to formulate her own subjective positions from time to time. By taking pieces which are explicitly characterised by 'E' as belonging to someone else, she reformulated them and used them again in her stories. There was also an instance where the subjective position and corresponding details of a named source were reconstituted by 'E' and used as her *own* subjective position without reference to anyone else even though the formulation was very similar which I assert is a display of inter-subjectivity.

This case made several points contingent to being an expat namely; a certain type of mentality, a certain length of time and but most importantly the intentions of the person with regard to what that experience should be. These contingencies distinguish between people who are expats and those who are tourists.

Through the course the three interview extracts, 'E' is shown to be doing a lot of work in constructing her identity as a certain type of expat and different from other Americans. Yet, membership in this category is not without its problems. In any of the three interviews, 'E' is seen contrasting her position with other foreigners, aligning with majority culture members but never really presenting herself as someone who is socially connected. Her husband 'G' is in large part absent from these interviews with a few minor exceptions. He is the partner of this couple who is at work most of the day and his minimal participation in the joint narrative about their experiences here suggests that either these issues are not relevant to him or not a concern to him.

7.2c Case study 2 'E and K'

'E' and 'K' moved to the UK in early in 2005 for 'E''s job. 'E' was not sent to the UK as a part of an expatriate contract with a company in the United States ('E' and 'K''s native country) but rather 'E' applied for a UK-based position in his search for a new job.

First Interview
Extract Twenty Two
E and K **(Case Study 2)**
November 2005

1.	I	so before you came (.) and actually <u>lived</u> here you had visi[ted]
2.	K	[mmhmm]
3.	E	[I actu:]
4.	I	and you thought maybe it could be a long term thing but now
5.		having lived here you've changed your mind?
6.	E	yeah: we've changed our mind. Um: (.) I mean (1.0) granted ah
7.		a lot still depends on what happens in November 06 but (.) it's (.)
8.		still (.)

Line 1 'I' makes the distinction between *someone who lives here* and *someone who visits here* with her deployment of 'actually' as an authentication device to distinguish between reality and illusion -visiting somewhere isn't living there. In

lines 4-5, 'I' summarizes the story which had been told to her by 'E' and 'K'. This story explained that 'E' and 'K' had considered a possible permanent move to England based upon experiences they had visiting England but now that they had the experience of *living* there, they had changed their minds. This formulation is very similar to the work which 'E' and 'I' had done in Case Study 1 which separated the category of people abroad between those who were tourists or eternal tourists and those who lived there and were considered to be expats.

Between lines 6 and 8 there are several instances of polyphony occurring. There is obviously an orientation by 'E' in line 6 toward conversations which he and 'K' have had in the past regarding the reasons why they had thought the move to England was the right decision and then later the reasons why they have changed their *mind*. The fact that 'E' formulates this as a collective activity ("we've") in changing a singular mind is explicitly polyphonic as it states that there are at least two voices which are contributing to a single social object; the social object of a decision about staying in the UK.

Furthermore, in this telling, 'E' is not only orienting to those conversations from the distant as well as recent past but is also orienting toward possible conversations in the future which will occur around "what happens in November 06" (l. 7).

First Interview
Extract Twenty Three
E and K **(Case Study 2)**
November 2005

1.	I	Did you have a limited contract here?
2.	E	no: not really. It's a five year con[tract]
3.	I	[is ↓it]

4.	E	and then if if I wanted to it could be either be extended or I could
5.		actually apply for citizenship but (.) I wouldn't (.) um
6.	I	okay
7.	E	um

In line 1, 'I' is ascertaining if the move for 'E' and 'K' was of a limited duration or whether it could have been permanent. Once again we see 'I' orienting to the contingencies of time and intended duration of stay abroad. In line 2 'E' understands limited contract as being one less than five years but for him a certain amount of time passes and it might as well be open-ended. He sees this as an open ended contract because after this time period of five years, one can "apply for citizenship" (l. 5) but this is more likely applying for permanent residency –two very different things and may just be a misunderstanding on 'E''s part as to what the two classifications actually mean. However, with line 5 'E' is saying there is a choice in adopting a new nationality but he wouldn't take it. 'K' is noticeably absent from this part of the couple's story.

First Interview
Extract Twenty Four
E and K **(Case Study 2)**
November 2005

1.	I	curious if you guys this this kind of expat did they <u>hel:p</u> you get
2.		over here? Did you do that under your own↓ <u>steam</u> so to speak?
3.	E	they: did ↓most of it. They did the ah:
4.	I	did they
5.	E	work permit. I had to take it and get the visa but they did all the
6.		paper work
7.	I	mmhmm

With lines 1-2 'I' begins to narrow her questioning to try and establish just what kind of expat 'E' and 'K' believe themselves to be and orients to *her* understanding of the two possible types namely; expats who get help (l. 1) and those who go abroad under their own steam (l. 2) respectively. 'I' formulates a two part question which requires affirmation or rejection (l. 1-2). However,

through the subsequent turns in this and the following extracts, it is evident to see that despite the implicit categorizing 'I' attempts to do through her listing of associated activities as she understands them, other expats do not necessarily share these same understandings.

It has been 'I' who sets up a distinction between different kinds of expats and her series of two questions (perhaps she could have produced more) indicate that her understanding at this moment is that there are two kinds; expats who get help with their moves and those who do not, placing a valuation toward the end with "under your own steam so to speak". 'I' is making a distinction between the expats who come via corporate-sponsorship and those who set out for the experience without the help and support. Now 'E' is placed in the position to account for what kind of expat he is. Rather than confirming outright whether or not 'E' is here under his own desire to move abroad or as a corporate-sponsored expat, he begins to build a unique profile which neither confirms nor denies his status as 'I''s formulated expat of *this kind* (l. 1). Here the contingent word is 'help' and what is meant by help in this context. To 'I', help means something very different than what the way[43] in which 'E' displays.

In line 5 'E' selects the first profile 'I' presented and provides an example of the *help* he received in getting 'over here' but downgrades the help from being with "most of it" to "work permit". Even though 'E' acknowledges having had to go and get the permit himself, he emphasizes that effort had been made on his behalf in the completing of the relevant paperwork for the visa.

[43] As the interviewer, I intended to ask if in fact 'E' and 'K' had gotten help with not only work permits, but also financial help in moving their personal effects to England, the locating of an apartment, etc.

In Line 7, 'I' follows 'E's utterance with a speech continuer (Gardner, 1998) 'mmhmm' which serves to encourage the continuation of the speech from the current speaker. As such, 'E' recognizes this and follows below beginning with Line 8 a further accounting of why he received the help he got.

First Interview
Extract Twenty Five
E and K **(Case Study 2)**
November 2005

1.	E	and (.) .hh and I guess I am the kind of expat that's got the special
2.		skill:s I'm on the (.) in the <u>fast</u> track so they had the paperwork
3.		within a few weeks

Line 1 'E' takes up part of 'I''s presentation of there being different kinds of expats but categorises explicitly that there is another type of expat –one which gets help but also the kind "that's got the special skills". This formulation of "the kind of expat that's got special skills" who is put "in the fast track" serves to raise the status of certain members of the broader, general category of expats (Leudar & Nekvapil, 2000).

With this formulation, 'E' is also splitting the category of expat and assigning himself membership to the sub-category of expats who receive help. However, the question remains as to whether 'E' would have done this category splitting if 'I' had not done so with the structure of her earlier questioning. Since this has occurred and 'E''s answering of the questions and formulations have taken on this structure, the polyphonic orientation of 'E' toward 'I''s propositions is evident.

First Interview
Extract Twenty Six
E and K **(Case Study 2)**
November 2005

1.	I	OK. Did they help you find a place to liv::e and everything?
2.	E	eh: alittle I mean it was informal I mean we actually found a
3.		place through: (.) the (.) friend of the taxi driver that that runs
4.		eh the bi you know (.) our company so. And it's probably just
5.		as well because I it doesn't look like I would have qualified
6.		for regular council housing I mean not not the income but .hh
7.	I	mmhmm
8.	E	again you need to have li::ved in some place for five years and US
9.		experience doesn't <u>count</u>

Line 1 'I' put a stop to further modification of the previous point by 'E' with the deployment of a code-switching particle 'OK' (Stubbe et al., 2003), as if to say '*OK –I get that. Now...*'. However, it is still unclear for 'I' which of the two profiles (she is still holding steadfastly to them) 'E' is presenting himself to be and tries to get clarification by asking a more specific question about another activity which she associates with the profile of expats who gets help; that is receiving help in finding housing.

With Line 2 'E' begins a series of progressive, troubled downgrading of *help with housing*. It first begins with "alittle", "informal" help –provided by *they* (those to whom 'I' referred to in the line 1) and progressively downgraded toward "the friend of the taxi driver" (l. 3).

Another profile is struggling to emerge here. Although 'I' is trying to compartmentalize him into one of these two categories he either is resisting this or simply does not share the same understanding regarding different kinds of expats. 'E' is presenting his own profile; that of the type of expat who gets help

with work permit paperwork from his employer and help finding housing through a friend of a taxi driver.

Lines 5-6 'E' mentions council housing[44] as having been one of his options for housing in the UK. He emphasizes that the reason he may not have qualified for it had nothing to do with income and that the problem of his lack of UK-based residency history was the factor which prevented him from qualifying. In presenting his complaint in lines 8-9 that "US doesn't count", 'E''s positioning of himself as a person who had certain assumptions that US rental history *would count* in the UK. In fact, in a section of the interview just prior the extracts I have just presented from 'E' and 'K', 'E' also presented a complaint about difficulties in securing a bank account in the UK and that US banking history and the money he had in there available to transfer would not help him establish an account in the UK (see Chapter Nine, Extract 54, l. 4; Extract 55, l. 1-5).

Second Interview
Extract Twenty Seven
E and K (**Case Study 2**)
February 2006

1.	I	I don't know. I kind of go back and forth. I mean it took me
2.		about two years to feel this way about Europe, you know, where
3.		I wasn't constantly wanting to go home
4.	E	It does take a while. The problem is we won't be there long
5.		enough to, to make that [adjustment]
6.	K	[hahaha] to make that adjustment
7.	E	yeah, you know, it's hard to say because, you know, there's
8.		things you can adjust to and there're things like, I don't want to
9.		adjust. I don't want to accept crappy service and just deal with
10.		it, you know?
11.	K	Yeah cancelling your train when you're trying to get to the airport
12.	E	Yes. The trains here, I think the trains are horrible. When you
13.		compare it to the rest of Europe(.)I mean(.)how they ever think
14.		they're going to meet their green targets is beyond me because
15.		they won't actually support the trains they're going to privatise it

[44] Housing available to people who meet certain (low) income criteria.

16. They're getting ready to privatise Royal Mail I can tell you(.)I can
17. guarantee you it's going to destroy Royal Mail. These(.)Tony
18. Blairis like the evil twin of Clinton, you know. Anything Clinton
19. did he's done it worse and this country's going to be so horrible in
20. ten years. It's already pretty sad. It's going to be even worse.

'I' establishes a benchmark of a certain amount of time which was required to for her adjust to living in Europe (l. 1-3). This adjustment is formulated through a description of a process which can be termed as a change in her state of mind. The change in her state of mind is a change in the way she views herself in Europe in contrast to her native country. Describing her state of mind in relation to Europe in this way, she is suggesting that a period of time passes in which one moves, mentally, from a position which is closer to 'home' and farther from the place one finds them physically in toward a mental position in which one moves in a direction away from 'home' toward where they are physically. This contingency of time was mentioned in other data from other participants as something which is necessary in the process of adjustment. However, it is not just a matter of a certain length of time spent in another place which promotes a psychological adjustment to a new place where one is living but also a certain type of intention toward a place either becoming or never becoming somehow *home*.

At the time of this interview 'E' and 'K' had not yet determined exactly when they would be leaving the UK only that they had, prior to living in the UK, thought the move could have been permanent but after living there some time changed their minds (see Extract 23, l. 6-8).

In lines 4 and 5 'E' states that he and 'K' will not be in the UK long enough to make the adjustment even though, as a said above, he and 'K' had not mentioned having specific plans of moving back to the US and had, at the time of the interview, only been in the UK for a few months. In fact during the first interview which took place in November 2005, 'E' had stated that yes, they had changed their mind about staying permanently but that "...a lot still depends on what happens in November 06 but still..." (Extract 23, l. 7-8). Therefore, even though it is not clear how much *time* they will remain in the UK, the *intention* to stay is not there and therefore there is an orientation toward the culture which will prevent them in adjusting –even though this is formulated by 'E' as contingent upon time rather than anything else.

With a decision not to stay having been made, we will see throughout the data for this case the ways in which they position themselves in respect to the British culture and see if there is consistency or if, in spite of the mental orientation to not accept certain things, whether there is still evidence of *adjustment*.

A brief moment of polyphony is in line 5 as 'K' echoes 'E''s statement that not enough time will pass for them to "make that adjustment". Although there is only a brief echoing of three words, the laughter and the statement itself, I believe, is dialogical as it seems to show 'K' orienting reflexively toward conversations she and 'E' have shared prior to this moment related to their feelings about life in the UK and their plans.

Between lines 7 and 10 'E' addresses the idea that with the passage of a certain amount of time that adjustment will inevitably take place –as if out of one's control. Instead, he presents culture as something which one has explicit control over; that there are things one can choose to make apart of oneself and things one can resist. Therefore he is resisting the idea that culture (or a new one) is (or can be) constitutive of a person. Yet, the example he puts forth, "service" is in many ways attached to aspects of a cultural infrastructure which is created and managed by the people within it. Through service, one is exposed to volumes of people on a daily basis who do things *the way they are to be done here*. These ways were constituted by people within a cultural context and are part and parcel to the people themselves. Therefore crappy service is culturally implicit of the UK and it's people and of 'E' who makes a clear distinction between the type of culture which allows crappy service and the culture to which he is comparing and aligns with where he has experienced good service.

Following 'K''s mention of an example where they experienced crappy service, 'E' extends upon 'K''s example with the crappy service of the train system and then contrasts the UK with Europe (l. 13). Furthermore, he presents a second example of the Royal Mail, again, an aspect of the cultural infrastructure, which is managed by the government. In highlighting the 'bad decisions' being made with aspects of the country's infrastructure, the UK is presented as a place which is intolerable at present and which will only be getting worse with time.
Lastly in lines 17 and 18 'E' brings two heads of government together to formulate his argument; something which I categorise as an example of *political*

polyphony[45]. Yet, former Prime Minister of the UK Tony Blair and Bill Clinton, former President of the United States held office at different times; Tony Blair having been in office at the time of this interview while Bill Clinton had left office in January 2001. Mentioning Tony Blair at the time of this interview in conjunction with his complaints about the UK infrastructure makes sense however the connection drawn between Tony Blair and Bill Clinton is more interesting. During the course of the first interview and in data which will be presented in the next chapter, 'E' cited "the political situation" (Chapter Eight, Extract 45, l. 5) as one of the reasons he and 'K' left the US, a political situation which was currently under the leadership of George W. Bush. I am not certain about the similarities being drawn here about the two men and do not want to speculate but the point is a curious one.

7.2d Summary of case study 2

In this section of the chapter, two presupposed expat profiles were presented to the participants. This splitting of the expat category, being initiated by the *interviewer* inevitably impacted the course of the interaction. One member of the participant couple, 'E', took up this splitting and attempted to align to one of the types presented. However, it became clear that 'I''s understanding of the constitutive activities and assumptions of this category were not shared by 'E'; resulting in a unique profile of an expat *who receives help*. Based upon what we learned about 'I''s understanding of a true member of the expat category versus that of the eternal tourist from her participation in the Case Study 1 interaction, we can conclude that 'I' and 'E''s category of expat do not share saliency.

[45] An example of the bringing together of two or more political ideologies, in this case belonging to two separate cultures and time periods, for the purpose creating a new subjective position.

Furthermore, I can conclude that in the Case of 'E' and 'K', the problem of not being able to apply native scheme's of interpretation was the contingent reason between being able to stay and live in the UK –a point which is supported by data from 'K' in the next chapter. This further supports the claim that the expat profiles of 'E' and 'I' are not the same as 'I' believes that a change in mentality and acceptance of a new reality are prerequisite to being termed an expat rather than an eternal tourist.

This case provides further support toward the contingency made relevant from case study one that acculturation impacted by ones mental orientation toward their intentions. Through this case study, it was shown that when the intention to stay is not there, acculturation is viewed something one may have some control over; aspects about a culture one can choose between accepting and not accepting. In the case of 'E' and 'K' they have chosen not to accept certain things, positioning them outside of the majority culture while living within its borders.

'E' and 'K' have constructed their shared narrative in polyphonic unison. Through their account they are playing the same song –one of disenchantment with the elements of the UK culture and their shared perspective on what their intentions are for this experience. Through the use of continuers like "mmhmm", the outright repeating of words or phrases used by the other or adding parts to the account which are unique but in tune with the type of account being provided this

case shows inter-subjective polyphony in use in the telling of a story about a couple's feelings living in the UK.

7.2e Case study 3 'J and L'

'J' and 'L' moved to the UK during 2005 for 'J''s job as a part of an expatriate contract with a company in the United States ('J' and 'L''s native country). Due to some circumstances which will be looked at through data in the next chapter, 'J' had been travelling back and forth between the US and the UK for several months before it was certain that he would be moved to London. After the offer was official, 'L' made arrangements to live with him there.

First Interview
Extract Twenty Eight
J and L **(Case Study 3)**
February 2006

1.	J	we we hired a a person from an a rival bank in the US who came
2.		over and is now our managing director (.) and sth it was funny cau
3.		he you know he was cutting his teeth for the first week too saying
4.		(.) .hh things like oh: in the US you do this and youyou RIGHT
5.		immediately you kind of see: that people kinda sh:ut down and
6.		they they don't want to hear it that way [like]
7.	I	[right]
8.	J	how we do it better [or you kn]
9.	I	[r:ight]
10.	J	[ow] it's just trying to say well we do things differently:
11.	J	.hh andand some people good at (.) ~.hhn s: <youknow> I think
12.		he: and I are actually fairly good at understanding what the other
13.		point of view is
14.	I	[°hm°]
15.	J	[and] not forcing where some people'll .hh say "well this is the
16.		only way to do it"
17.	I	yeah
18.	J	and people don't like that at all: but .hh it was funny for the first
19.		two weeks h(h)he got in the habit of saying "well in THAILAND
20.		we do our" SAYING SOMETHING ELSE INSTEAD OF THE
21.		US HE WAS TRYING IT YOU KNOW JUST TO BREAK HIM
22.		OF HABIT OF SAYING [IN THE US]
23.	I	[YEAH:]
24.	J	so:: itit became like this joke youknow well in Thai[land we ah::
25.		(.) do it this way↓]

26. I [he(h)ha(h)ha(h)ha (.) that's a good strategy thou]gh innit?
27. J [ha(h)hhhh]
28. I yerll YEAH YEAH cause ah ~ah~~ah diy hm↓ that's sort of going
29. into a different area but might as well ask it .hh um:: do you think
30. that's particularly sensitve right now? ah with the political climate
31. tete to come over I mean it's always sort of: .hh a bad isn't it ta
32. "well in the US" but do you think right now it's even m:ore so?
33. J ↑uM:: I'm not sur::e jus: frfrom my experience you know from
34. what I i:i: it's more (.) people just tease and I think they th:ink that
35. just in general like Americans are kinda closed minded and things
36. and they don't understand other cultures:: or
37. I mm

Between lines 1 and 6 'J' tells a story about the experiences of a new managing director from America and his experiences with needing to adjust his communicative tactics when dealing with new employees who also happen to be of a different culture (though it is not yet clear to which culture or cultures they belong). 'J' summarizes temporally several recollections from the new managing director's first week on the job in which he "was cutting his teeth…saying…things like…oh in the US you do this…" (l. 3-4). Through mutual interaction which is both verbal and non-verbal, e.g. gesticulation, facial expressions, eye gaze and body language (l. 5 –the seeing of people "shutting down"), the managing director is encouraged to seek alternative ways of communicating with *some* members of this new group. Obviously, as 'J' presents later in the data a position analogous to the managing director, the alternative tactics were necessary for only certain members of the new group.

The problem the managing director is having as seen by 'J' is when the implication is made that the way things are done in the US is somehow "better" (l. 8). With this formulation, 'J' is speaking from a collective cultural position which is shared at least by the managing director and 'J' through the use of *we* (l. 8). This is the first way in which 'J' chooses to characterise the communicative

tactics of the managing director and himself but then immediately following in line 10 reformulates the intention of that tactic with what I believe to be a downgrading manoeuvre. This downgrading manoeuvre is being done to formulate something in a more positive light. Through changing the formulation from "do it better" (l. 8) to "do things differently" (l. 10), 'J' has neutralized the possibility that he is claiming one cultural method is superior to another. This lends itself nicely to the next line in which 'J' begins to establish identities of people who are able to consider alternative points of view (l. 12-13). This is certainly more believable when coming from someone who does not assume his culture does things *better* than another, but simply *differently*. This simultaneously positions the managing director, an American, and 'J' (also American) together and opposite the *"other"* point of view; a point of view which exists around them in a place where they are foreigners. Yet they are both Americans who are able to consider other points of view. However, the interesting point to make here which will appear later in the data is that the others opposite 'J' and the managing director are themselves primarily comprised of other foreigners. Therefore, the acculturation which is taking place is not necessarily that in light of a new *British* cultural reality but a new *corporate* cultural reality which is, in its self, a heterogeneous cultural mix.

In lines 15-16 'J' provides a comparison of his and the managing director's kind of communicative tactic of explicating things as merely being done *differently* with the tactics of "some people" who say "well this is the only way to do it". This positions 'J' (and the managing director) as a person who is sensitive to their position as a minority in a majority cultural situation. The lines immediately

following describe a strategy used by the managing director in to avoid drawing comparisons to the US and his current cultural location when commenting on something in the presence of others who are not assumed as affiliating in some way with the US.

Yet the problem is not whether 'J' and the managing director are foreigners but the kind of foreigners they are namely; American expats in this new cultural corporate environment who are in the position to tell their counterparts how things are done *elsewhere.* In this case, 'elsewhere' happens to be the US and the US-based business is classified by 'J' as being "...so successful" (Extract 31 l. 6). The problem seems to be rooted in the use of a place name, "the US" in which 'J' assumes that others possess assumptions about the intended use of the place name "US" when used in any kind of communication as a basis of comparison. I will go into greater detail in the next chapter about the use of place names and how they can often be used in discourse to do many "non-place name" things in discourse but suffice it to say with 'J''s description of a discursive strategy which only exchanges the use of "in the US" with "in Thailand" (l. 18-22), it is clear that the problem is not drawing some kind of comparison between the present cultural context and *another one* but that the use of the "US" is what is problematic. In fact, the goal in making a verbal behavioural change is to say "something else instead of the US" (l. 20). It does not matter what, just "...break him of [the] habit of saying 'in the US'" (l. 21-22).

The tactic of saying 'anything but the US' becomes described in line 24 as a collective joke (l. 24-25), something which is polyphonic having been generated through a succession of interactions conducted as well as observed by numerous individuals which 1) saw the use of a commentary comparing current practices in the UK office and the US office and 2) resulted in an evolved response to received reactions and *anticipated future reactions* of others who possess an alternative point of view.

Between lines 28-32 'I' asks if perhaps the present political climate, "particularly sensitive right now" is the seed of this problem with saying "the US". However 'J' reformulates a synopsis of collective presuppositions about Americans (l. 35-36) which 'J' has gotten from an opposite point of view from *them*; "they think that just in general like Americans are kinda closed minded and things and they don't understand other cultures…". This opinion about Americans was generated by others who 'J' refers to as "they" and is therefore polyphonic. Something interesting happens next in the way 'J' positions himself distantly from Americans through the use of the third person pronoun "they" (l. 36) rather than using a self-inclusive "we" as in "*…and that we don't understand other cultures*". Within the span of just a few moments 'J' has both aligned with and distanced himself from an American position.

First Interview
Extract Twenty Nine
J and L **(Case Study 3)**
February 2006

1.	J	um:: (.) andand you'll still they'll tease me and ifif the first week
2.		you know was trying to understan:d you know we have one
3.		assistant who you know east end of London who: I couldn't
4.		under[stand] a word she sa[(h)i(h)d]
5.	L	[°hehe°]

6.	I	[°hmhm°]
7.	J	for the first three days I talked to her
8.	I	uhha:h
9.	J	[you know]
10.	I	[Eastenders] ha(h)hahaha
11.	J	[yeah]
12.	L	but you know ALOT of: I mn his office veryvery diversified I
13.		mean you have Australians and New Zealand people from New
14.		Zealand than just <even though they're> from l::[ondon]
15.	J	[*in audible*]
16.	L	and there's (.) you know different nationalitites and ~it seems
17.		[????????????]
18.	J	[WE STARTED COUNTING THE] number of nationalities we
19.		have and it's you know at least a dozen and a half you know I was
20.		joking saying I'm gonna try and learn all the national anthems
21.		from all the countries and I started thinking about them I'm like oh
22.		that's like sixteen different (.)
23.	I	hm(hhh)[HEHA]
24.	J	[count]ries when you think about it so:
25.	L	to me it:'s from just being an outsider it seems more diverse than
26.		like your office in the states (.) with a bunch of: w:hite people and
27.		[you know what I mean?]
28.	I	[hhha(h)HAHAHAHA:yeah:]
29.	L	don't you th[nk?]
30.	J	[yeah]

In this extract 'J' and 'L' discuss the diversity among the people working within 'J''s office beginning primarily with line 12. This turn in the conversation comes on the heels of 'J''s story about his difficulty in understanding a fellow British colleague during his first few days; a story which was preceded immediately by an extract containing several activities on the part of 'J' in his identity work of someone who is sensitive to his position among people with other points of view and at times removed from the Americans who are thought to be "closed minded" and "don't understand other cultures". This story about difficulty in understanding the accent of a fellow native English speaker moves 'L' in line 12 to contribute and she categorises 'J''s work environment as "very diversified" and lists natives from other English-speaking countries. Yet this does not entirely accomplish what she hopes and she adds in "…and other nationalities" (l. 16) to

which 'J' chimes in and expands upon 'L''s *other nationalities* by providing a numerical count. With there being "at least a dozen and a half" an implicit assumption can be made that some of these countries from which 'J''s colleagues originate are not native English-speaking; therefore confirming the diversity of 'J''s working environment.

Diversity has been categorized up to this point as being constituted by "different cultures", "nationalities" and the listing of country names. However, in line 26, diversity is categorised by 'L' as an environment which includes other skin colours rather than "...a bunch of white people..." to which 'J' agrees in line 30.

First Interview
Extract Thirty
J and L **(Case Study 3)**
February 2006

1.	I	yeah
2.	J	but I think sometimes (.) [there's this perception that you know
3.		like]
4.	L	[I mean it's New York and it's a melting pot] supposable
5.	I	°hm↓°
6.	J	I think there's some of (????) because our business is so successful
7.		in the US that it's just gonna they just wanta ta:ke over:: or they
8.		wanna (.) change the way they do business [or]
9.	I	[hm↓]
10.	J	how they how we do things <and I think> .hh our team does fairly
11.		well at tryin tah (.) (??) but (.) naw I get teased when I said like
12.		toda I said cell phon:e but I guess it dep I TAILOR MY SPEAK
13.		sometimes now tah who I'm speaking too
14.	I	do you↓
15.	J	instead of saying like mobi::le or
16.	I	yeah
17.	J	um: (.) youknow the other day we were I WAS TALKIN we just
18.		had two new people come in and I jus .hh and we were TALKING
19.		BOUT SOMETHING <and I said> "well let's table that for later"
20.		and .hh ~i IN THE CONTEXT THEY KNEW WHAT I WAS
21.		SAYING but you know then they said well normally when you
22.		say you table something here means you're putting it on the table
23.		let's talk about it as opposed to I was saying let's take it off the
24.		table effectively and talk about it
25.	I	right

26.	J	so I think it's little phra:ses make easier you know how you
27.		pronounce things or
28.	I	yeah or that you don't really speak English
29.	L	yeah we got made fun of (.) when: we came from Michigan to: the
30.		east coast↑ yeah
31.	I	didja
32.	L	I had to stop saying pop
33.	I	oh right cause they say soda t[here]
34.	L	[°yeah:°]
35.	I	don't they?
36.	L	and then I'd go back to Michigan an:d I'd say soda: and they'd
37.		tease me cause I was[n't]
38.	I	[so]
39.	L	(*in audible*) AHAHSO:: (*in audible*)
40.	I	[ah no: (.) yeah that's] true
41.	L	or in (.) the East(.)coast it's sneakers and we call them tennis
42.		shoes and [here]
43.	I	[yeah they're]
44.	L	[trainers]
45.	J	[trainers]
46.	I	yeah: tr[ainers I kn:ow]
47.	L	[°so just little ???°]
48.	I	[I KN::OW] eh I had that problem with cell phone too .hh because
49.		in Germany: they call it handy↑ an::d here they call it mobile:
50.		~US c:ell and (.) I'm like always jus you know ~it <depends on
51.		who I'm talkin to↓ if I'm talkin to my husband it's the ↓handy>
52.		.hh if I'm talking to my parents it's the ↓cell [.hh and if]
53.	L	[he(h)he(h)he]
54.	I	I'm talkin to anybody at school sometimes I flip between handy
55.		and mobile or I'll go CELL I mean mobile

With line 1 'J' attempts to move the talk away from the topic of diversity and back to cultural perceptions although 'L' continues on the topic of diversity for another line by adding to her remarks about the ethnic constitution of 'J''s New York office. 'J' does not pick this topic up in line 6 but continues on to finish what he started in line 1. He wants to explain where he thinks the trouble with saying "the US" comes from; a problem rooted in "…this perception…"(l. 1) which has been generated from the successful business in the US (l. 6-7).

Lines 6 thru 10 see 'J' flipping between the positions of aligning himself with those around which the perceptions are being constituted e.g. "…because our

business is so successful in the US…" (l. 6-7) and that of a person who is a distant observer watching the tension of an attempt at assimilation of one corporate culture (UK-based) into of the system of another (US-based) e.g. "…it's just gonna they wanta take over or they wanna change the way they do business" (l. 7-8). However, while 'J' and all the people about whom he is speaking are employed by the same company, just members of different subsidiaries, he clearly struggles with where he belongs and furthermore often splits the members into different categories of 'us' and 'them' although it is not always clear to which he belongs.

In dealing with this confusion in his environment, 'J' discusses a strategy of tailoring his speech depending upon who is speaking to (l. 12-13) although he admits not always being able to maintain separate positions depending upon his audience. He provides a couple of examples such as the use of the colloquial term for a mobile telephone which is different to his US native term of cell phone and how this term was accidentally used even though he is aware and while his counterparts would understand the term 'cell phone', "teasing" still occurs as a result of his 'mistake'.

The ability to be able to do this, to already possess an linguistic resource to use but then to reflexively consider the more *appropriate* term in a communication with another person or group with alternative terms is evidence of dialogicity. In 'J''s communication with people of his native culture, a term for this appliance already exists and it is called a cell phone. However, in 'J''s new surroundings, he has become aware of a new term and although his native term would be

understood his anticipation of teasing or the fact that "...little phrases make [it] easier you know how you pronounce things" (l. 26-27) prompt him to do something which is somewhat unnatural to him (initially at least and obviously in the context of this story being told) which is to deliberately choose alternative words for who he is speaking to. It is also evidence of acculturation having taken place in that 'J' is describing his native preference and his active effort to accommodate a new cultural norm.

Additionally, through 'J''s second example told through a story between lines 17-24, there is evidence of the dialogism among 'J''s conversational counterparts. 'J' describes a scenario in which his use of the phrase "table that for later" was done so by him with the *American* meaning but that he was informed later by his colleagues (it is unclear if they are British or another nationality) that "here [it] means you're putting it on the table let's talk about it as opposed to I was saying let's take it off the table effectively and talk about it [later]". 'J' states that "in the context they knew what I was saying..." (l. 20-21). The fact that his colleagues understood what he meant in the context within which the phrase was being used is evidence that the people listening to him did so with an awareness of what the phrase means in their native usage as well as the American usage.

In line 29 'L' begins to tell a similar second story about the problem of being different speakers of the English language. In the story of 'L' and 'J''s move from one region (Michigan) to another region (East Coast) of the US, an identical strategy was required to the one which 'J' has just described, the learning of new

local colloquialisms and the concentrated effort to use them instead of their native, preferred term –another example of acculturation but within their own native country. However, there is a difference in this story from the one 'J' told. In lines 36-37 'L' describes that she would get teased when back in her native state of Michigan for using the 'new' term of "soda". This story aims to illustrate acculturation on the part of 'L' to the East Coast way of speaking. Whether or not it had become a part of her own discursive repertoire that she, perhaps, unconsciously used the term or that she used the term consciously as a way of *showing* folks 'back home' that she'd adjusted to a new way of speaking is unclear. The telling of the story however indicates that 'L' either acculturated or wants to present herself as having been someone wanting to be seen as having done so.

After some collective exchange between 'L' and 'I' (both originally from Michigan and both with experience on the East Coast) of other terms which differ between the Midwestern and East Coast regions of the US, 'I' tells her own second story. This second story is similar in polyphonic structure as stories were in the analysis of the previous chapter on message boards. In the construction of her story, 'I' uses the same character positions as 'L' and 'J' in having "...had that problem with cell phone too" (l. 48). In her story, 'I' provides examples of places she has been and how the terminology for the same object differs although her story has more variety in that it includes a place, Germany, where English is not the native language. She blends these different experiences together to build her story analogous to those of 'L' and 'J' and echoes 'J''s use

of the conditional phrase, "it depends on who I am talking to" (l. 50-51; 'J''s use can be found in Extract 31 lines 79-80).

The next extract is from the second interview with 'J' and 'L' after they had been in UK for nearly a year together. In this extract 'L' and 'J' explicitly discuss their position as corporate-sponsored foreign expats in comparison to other foreigners in the UK.

Second Interview
Extract Thirty One
J and L **(Case Study 3)**
August 2006

1.	L	even I, other people on the forum are finding jobs and finding a
2.		cheap place to live
3.	I	yeah
4.	L	and I almost feel guilty that, you know, we're having everything
5.		handed to us
6.	I	mmm
7.	L	I don't know if that makes sense but, like, we've, WE'VE
8.		REALLY had everything handed to us and they paid for us to
9.		move here they're paying our rent
10.	I	mmm
11.	J	there's some of that stuff, doing it. That stuff left to deal with, but
12.	L	Yeah, but they did have reasons for our (.)people that do our
13.		taxes for it, you know what I mean, but(.)they were, whereas you
14.		know, I
15.	J	Well, we have a (.) quite honest, I mean, you still have to go
16.		through the whole process yourself, and take care of it, you know
17.		I still had to wait how long to get my um, national insurance
18.		number
19.	I	mmm
20.	L	Right. But(.??) and stuff, and the stories I hear is just, sounds so
21.		rougher than[.]
22.	I	[Is] there, are there more of them that have come over here not
23.		same conditions?
24.	L	A lot of them have married British people

In this extract 'L' is describing a difference in the conditions between those under which she and 'J' moved and currently live in the UK and people who do

not have the advantages she lists between lines 1 and 9 such as having help with finding house, paying for housing, a job, people to do the taxes and so on.

In having these advantages, 'L' categorises the feelings she has as "guilt". Through describing their experiences in the UK in this way 'L' is making a statement about the type of experience this is. It is not the experience of all foreigners in the UK; it is something different, something *easier*. This claim of mine is supported by 'L''s position again in response to 'J' in lines 12 and 20 whereby she refutes his attempts to add some gloss of difficulty onto their experiences through the use of examples of things he has had to do.

'J' takes up 'L''s statements as suggesting that their experiences in the UK have been somehow insulated from *true* experience, that they are somehow easier than the experiences of others. There is, according to him, still "...stuff left to deal with" (l. 11). 'L''s comments thus far have been dispreferred and he deploys "well" at the onset of his response in line 15. As Schiffrin states the word well "can precede an answer in which a speaker cancels a presupposition of a prior question...thus well signals moves that are in some way dispreferred" (Pomerantz 1975 cf. Schiffrin, 1985). I argue that 'well' can also follow a statement by a conversational partner who is co-constructing a story in which the user of well wishes to signal a change in the way the content of the story being told. 'J' describes that there is in fact "the whole process" (l. 16) which one has to go through and "take care of...". The example he provides, however, is an innocuous delay in having to wait for his national insurance number (l. 17).

This is not accepted by 'L' as being on the same level and she follows his example with a cutting "Right. But..." and then explicitly classifies the experiences of others as "rougher" (l. 21). In this statement, 'L' has reflexively collected the various details of other expat stories which have contributed to her formulation of 'her' position in this extract.

This statement prompts 'I' to ask about the *others* to whom 'L' is referring (l. 22-23). The response of 'L' is interesting as rather than answering with a simple 'yes' or 'no', 'L' explains through a statement that the foreigners to whom she is referring –many of them- "...have married British people" (l. 24).

Therefore, 'L' is making the assessment that her and 'J''s experiences are insulated as those with tighter association to host country natives have it rougher. Being that 'L' and 'J' are married and therefore will not have, during their time together in the UK, have the opportunity to marry British people, their experiences, according to how 'L' has been presented them here, will always remain somewhat insulated.

7.2f Summary of case study 3

'J' presented a profile of an expat similar to that of 'J' in Case Study Four in which he is in the UK branch of a globally-present company and is there to inject input as someone coming from the successful US-based office. Throughout this extract he describes the practical problems of doing this. While everyone knows why he is there, he has learned, through acculturation in this corporate culture that he has to be covert about doing this. In doing so, he presents his identity as someone who is culturally sensitive. This is accomplished through careful inter-

subjective positioning on the part of 'J' as to which positions in his narrative he aligns himself with through the usage of the collective pronoun, 'we' as well as the points where he establishes discursive boundaries between 'us' and 'them'; aided by an inter-subjective orientation to others' perceptions about Americans.

The acculturation which is taking place in 'J''s office environment however is not in a *British* cultural environment but in an environment which is culturally mixed as most members are themselves foreigners. The problem implicit in 'J''s narrative is that he is American.

The extracts for this case provided numerous instances showing the dialogicity of acculturation not only on the part of the person *doing the acculturating* at points of contact between themselves and majority members but also on the part of the majority members themselves. This was evidenced by the example in which the majority member's[46] were described by 'J' as having understood him in the context where he 'incorrectly' used a phrase which would normally be used in a different way. In 'J''s stories about his and the managing director's anticipation of the perceptions about Americans, the theory on dialogism is explicit as the resulting strategy 'J' described of 'saying anything but the US' was the result of simultaneous reflexivity about past interactions as well as the anticipation of future ones. Furthermore, dialogism was present in the stories of 'J' and 'L''s conscious activity to adjust some communication tactics depending upon to whom they were speaking. As a result of this account, acculturation is shown as a phenomenon which is discursive and can manifest not just in ways of thinking or

[46] In this case this is not necessarily a British categorisation as I presented, 'J''s work environment is largely constituted by members of diverse nationalities. The majority culture in this context is that of a corporate culture rather than an ethnic one.

behaviour but also through speech within the same language. Furthermore, acculturation is not unique to cross-cultural contexts but can occur within a single culture; illuminating regional cultural differences and supporting the claim that culture is as variable and dynamic as the people who constitute it.

Through these pieces of text, it was evident that the two expats split the category to which they in some ways belong –yet in always in the same way to one another. This means that 'J' and 'L' constructed identities of a certain kind of expat whose experience in a foreign country is insulated through special benefits and unique, multi-cultural work environments. This latter example proves acculturation to be a phenomenon which is independent of the culture within which it occurs.

7.2g Case study 4 'J and S'

'J' and 'S' moved to the UK during 2004 for 'J''s job as a part of an expatriate contract with a company in Germany ('J' and 'S''s native country). Several months prior to their move to the UK they found out that they were expecting twins. The timing of the births would have come at a time when they would be in the UK and although they discuss in the data below that they had considered their time in the UK perhaps a good time to start a family, the pregnancy caused some concern due to possible complications and put the final decision into question.

Although this data in comparison to other in the previous sections of this thesis might have fit in a different section of the thesis better, I have chosen to put it here as I believe the positioning work and use of culture in the discussion of differences in the health systems between the UK and Germany show adequately

the ways in which these participants understood themselves to be opposite

Britons.

First Interview
Extract Thirty Two
J and S (**Case Study 4**)
June 2005

1.	I	Huh HA .hhh UM: OK UM: (.) did you ~both have any major:
2.		issues or did you have any na u na na unn <disaggreements> or or
3.		not .hhh um about the mo:ve like (.) you kno:w the mo:ve like (.)
4.		you kno:w
5.	J	we both [together]
6.	I	[yeah] any difficulties you were: thinking oh
7.	J	the only difficulty was when we when we get got to know ah that
8.		Simones pregnant
9.	I	ohhh↓
10.	J	this was the only thing where we needed to thought about
11.	I	um hmm
12.	J	are we getting the medical um: the right medical (.)
13.	S	help?
14.	J	yeah
15.	I	um hmm
16.	J	or is is er is possible to get ah to to become the baby a:nd
17.	I	mmm hmm
18.	J	to hhhh (.) [so on]
19.	S	[YEAH I mean wewe] we first (.) decided to go over to England
20.	I	mm hmm
21.	S	um then we (.) decided that would be good time to get children
22.	I	um (.) hmm
23.	S	then (.) I (.) was (.) no I get I got [°pr°]
24.	I	got↑ pregnant?
25.	S	°preg° [nant]
26.	I	[mmm hmmm]
27.	S	immediatley and .hhh um: then we realized that(.)~it(.)would be
28.		true↑
29.	S	.hhhh um: and then we: thought about the: healths system and
30		°everything° .hh I mean the day when when I (clears throat) knew
31.		about the um: twins (.) we talked alot at the evening an and um:
32.		had to decide if we um: go to England um: although we are going
33.		to get um: um twins
34.	I	mmmhmm
35.	S	and um: (clears throat) and I ~just said ok just (.) sssleep one night
36.		and then you can talk again and
37.	I	mmmhmm

The story of 'J' and 'S''s decision-making process is very much a co-scripted

story told together in which each participant fills in certain aspects and details

but together in such a way that a coherent story is progressively told as is seen throughout the data from this case. At times they also help each other at times with finding the right word to use (see lines 12-13). The collaborative and undisputed turns of the story display the synthesis of two voices working in reflexive sync; pulling together brief anecdotes about relevant points in time.

In response to the interviewer's question about whether or not any issues or concerns surrounded 'J' and 'S''s move to the UK, 'J' jumps to a point in time which came after the initial decision to make the move (l. 7-12) when he and his wife learned that they would be having twins and explains that there were concerns about whether the couple would be "...getting the...right medical [help]". As 'S' explains in lines 19-21, the decision to move to England came first and that it had been thought that their time in England would be a good time to start a family (l. 21). However when they "...realized that it would be true" and that they were expecting children, they describe that they were urgently moved to consider the health system in the UK (l. 29).

These presuppositions the couple had about a health care system in the UK were that it was a system which might not be able to guarantee the "right medical help" (l. 12) and caused 'J' and 'S' to even question whether it "...is possible to get...the baby" (l. 16). These types of presuppositions existed in the part of the couple's past which immediately preceded their move to the UK. The fact that 'J' and 'S' held the idea that the UK somehow offered a lower standard of health care positions 'J' and 'S' as people who would be moving to a lower standard of living from where they are from, Germany. As Germany and the UK are both

members of the European Union, it also shows a differential in the standards of living among countries of the European Union and the splitting of standards of living in this way, are identity implicative about the differences among 'Europeans'[47] .

First Interview
Extract Thirty Three
J and S **(Case Study 4)**
June 2005

1.	S	so on and .hhh [the next]
2.	J	[and then I tried to] get some get some informa
3.	S	[yeah the next day]
4.	J	[tion that ????]
5.	S	Jens didn't go to work [he had]
6.	I	[hmm]
7.	S	um: free day. It was a Friday
8.	I	mmm hMM
9.	J	haha
10.	S	lucky (.) lucky Volkswagen employee
11.	I	h(h)h()hahaha .hhhhhh
12.	J	no I think I tried to get as much information as possible [did I]?
13.	S	[yeah]
14.	I	yeah
15.	J	[didn't I]
16.	S	[yeah]
17.	I	about what exactly?
18.	J	abou about the medical system
19.	I	oh okay
20.	J	called the uh E
21.	S	.hh he called [the embassy ha(h)ha .hhhh]
22.	J	[British Em:ba:ssy and the a somesome]
23.	I	[.hahaha]
24.	J	doctors and (.) ~a what I wanted to get is I wanted to ag ag gum: a
25.		German:: (.) doctor in in UK or
26.	I	[um hmm um hmm]
27.	J	[something like this] so I wanted to get an impression
28.	I	um hmm
29.	J	cause [you]
30.	I	[so]
31.	J	don't (.)

[47] There is ample discourse around whether Britons 'feel' themselves to be European although they are part of the European Union. While people from specific European countries are likely to associate themselves firstly with their country and then the European continent, the continent of Europe has some continuity for the people living upon it in comparison to the island nation which tends to be associated more so with the countries which make up the United Kingdom and the commonwealth respectively.

32.	I	[hmm]
33.	J	always understand thee is this s the right or wrong or whatever
34.	I	hyeahh
35.	S	that you wanted to talk to someone wh who knows (.) the
36.		Engli:sh: um
37.	J	health system
38.	S	[health sytem]
39.	J	[*in audible*]
40.	S	and the German
41.	I	right
42.	S	the German health system
43.	J	yeah to compare
44.	S	[yeah] (clears throat)
45.	I	[right]
46.	S	so you (.) because wh when you live here in England just knowing
47.		your system you don't know how it's like wh when you are in
48.		Germany <or something>
49.	I	[yeah]
50.	J	[yeah it's right ????]
51.	S	[so you can't compare to] you you think you think it it it's
52.		goodgood a good system here .hhh and when you go to Germany
53.		you see ~ (1.0) better.
54.	I	is it hh[HAHA]
55.	S	[HAHA]
56.	J	hahaha

'J' and 'S' continue their collective story-telling and provide greater details about their one issue with moving to the UK, the health system. 'J' explains that he wanted to seek the advice of a German doctor in the UK (l. 24-25) in order to make a comparison of the two health systems (l. 43). 'S' explicates between lines 46 and 53 the reason why a German doctor in the UK is a valid source of this information. She presents people only familiar with the UK health system (and that can be doctors as well as everyone else) as being non-the wiser to the true quality of the system as they have no base of comparison (l. 46-48) to them and she says they think it's a good system here (l. 51-52). However, if one has the opportunity to make a comparison, the conclusion will be that the German system is better (l. 52-53). Due to the fact that a German doctor living in the UK

would know both systems and ipso facto know that the German system is better, the opinion that doctor would provide would be credible.

The question which remained for 'J' and 'S' then was not whether a difference in the quality of health care existed; it is presented by them as being a statement of fact that there is a difference and that the UK is substandard in comparison to the German system. The critical piece of information is whether or not there is a *significant* difference; whether or not it is possible to have a baby in the UK (Extract 34 l. 16)!

As this data consists of a story which is telling of the past immediately preceding the decision to move to the UK and as such precedes any extensive experience they would have had with the health system in the UK, the formulation that the German health system is superior to the UK health system is identity implicative both for the period of time preceding their life in the UK as well as their current position as foreigners. Even if they had previous experience in the UK and with the health system, it was still not enough to provide them with a basis upon which to make an informed decision as to whether or not a move to the UK was 'safe'. So the question remains, where did the opinion of a superior German health system come from? It came through discourse around them, the source and venue of which is, however, unclear.

First Interview
Extract Thirty Four
J and S **(Case Study 4)**
June 2005

1.	I	so is that your impression I mean what were yr~ yu yu yu you got
2.		ahold of somebody to answer your question?
3.	J	no just I I remember that I I wa was um: um [I called up the ah]

4.	S	[talked to someone ????]
5.	J	think I called somebody from the Auswertigungamt [which]
6.	S	[yeah]
7.	J	is what is thee:
8.	I	Auswertigungamt?
9.	S	[*in audible*] yeah von wuhhhh office?
10.	J	for foreign office
11.	S	office
12.	I	oh the foreign office (.) oh sus uh uh huh
13.	J	that's why I gave somebody a ring foreign office because I
14.		thought they might (.)
15.	I	[ah]
16.	J	because they sending people like their:[]
17.	I	[mmm]
18.	J	people in in each (.) everywhere in the world [so the]y
19.	I	[mmm]
20.	J	should have g~ shouldshould .hhh at least (.) should have a
21.		German German um: doctor contact or whatever
22.	I	um hmm
23.	J	.hhh um: so I and I spoke to somebody and she told me it's not (.)
24.		you're not going to Africa you're going to the UK so it shouldn't
25.		be th(h)at b(h)ad
26.	I	hhhh[HAHAHAHA hehehehehehe] hehehehhehehehe
27.	S	ha[haHAHAHA]
28.	J	you [know th(h)a(h)t's wh(h)at she said righ(h)t(h)]
29.	I	.hhhhh
30.	J	I got my (.) I got my baby in namibia or something [like that
31.		she saida why where's your problem?]
32.	I	[erhhhhhHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA]hahahahahaha
33.	S	[hehhh hehhhh]
34.	I	.hhh were you ~satis(.)fied with (h) that [answ(h)er?]
35.	S	[haha HAHA]
36.	J	at least gives you some ah (.) er some idea of ah: of[(.) how to
37.		judge] thee (.)
38.	S	[yeah too too] [°yeah°]
39.	I	yeah
40.	J	yeah (.) [to balance your (.) balance your yeah]
41.	S	[in audible] Auf die auf den ah: Tat auf den Grund der Tatsachen
42.		zurück gebraucht]
43.	I	yeah ok ok
44.	J	~yeah. But that's difficult so th yeah you're right I think that wa
45.		was one of du difficul↓ties ↑ t~to understand how is the system
46.		and ah are we getting the same because you don't want to .hhh
47.		actually ri get the risk [(.)]
48.	I	[hm]
49.	J	just for travelling [over]
50.	I	[yeah]
51.	J	wouldn't be so important for us
52.	I	yeah
53.	J	so w~w~w~

54. I ah so THAT REALLY WAS depen tha tha ~that decision↓ for
55. you was

'I' formulates 'J' and 'S''s statements and conclusions from the immediately preceding data about the difference in the quality of the two countries health care systems as [their] "impression" (l. 1). The formulation by 'I' of 'J' and 'S''s statements in this way shows 'I' orienting to James' (1890) distinction between two kinds of knowledge which had not been empirically validated yet by 'J' and 'S' and was based upon mere ideas cultivated through word-of-mouth.

'J' decided that the best source of information would be to call the German foreign office where there are compatriots with experience in sending their members abroad; they would be able to tell him what he needed to know and provide him with the information of a German doctor (l. 5-21). In making this call, 'J' assumed a shared membership with the Germans to whom he would be speaking, i.e. *people who would understand him and his concerns*. However, 'J' encountered some variation within his assumed category namely, a German who did not feel that the UK should not be such a concern (l. 23-25). With this, the story is about how naive to life in the UK 'J' and 'S' were.

This results in 'J' and 'S' gaining some perspective regarding the acute risk they were facing in having their children in the UK and in the end they decided to go ahead with the move.

Second Interview
Extract Thirty Five
J and S (**Case Study 4**)
February 2006

Now that some time has passed and they have been living in the UK for awhile, the couple discusses some things they have noticed and show the positions they hold in relation to home and host culture.

J It's actually, you know, actually you're, um, I'm getting this period when you like, er, 18 months in the job that you would like to have some change and I'm looking for some, you know, some interesting...because, you know, you're getting used to the language, you're getting used to the job and, er, you know, you're looking at what else can I do to make it more interesting again.
I Really? Um, how do you feel about being a German working in Bentley because you know there's sort of, well, Matthias talks about a tension sometimes when he's there, you know, between the Bentley workers and him, um, do you have this problem or experience?
J What did you say, attention?
I No, I said that kind of...
J Oh, tension?
I ...tension, yeah.
J No, I don't think it's a tension, I think I would say because I'm, you know, because I was aware that there may be some things, not really tension, it's, er, I found that sometimes being uninterested or...
I Them or you?
J ...them.
I Okay. In a different culture, or what?
J So, for example, if you, like, um, we have a project, new equipment project, and, er, starting at Bentley and we...I know there's something similar, um, ongoing at Volkswagen, there may be some synergies [unclear], er, so that's quite hard to explain to the people, to, you know, that this makes sense to, um, get in contact with Volkswagen to bring people over maybe or whatever, to go over ourselves to, you know, to at least...
I To get some advice.
J ...no, maybe not advice, to at least get an understanding, would make sense to work together. I think that's not the perspective people have. I think they would like, you know, they would like to, um, they would like to keep, you know, stay in their own kingdom a little bit and...and just do it...do it themselves.
I You used that word kingdom [laughter].
J I think it's the, I mean, there are different...maybe different reasons, I mean one reason is because they are used to, for example, IT, they're used to...to print, um, [unclear] which they

40. normally use so they probably want, you know, don't want to get
41. in contact with somebody overseas or, you know, if they already
42. have good contacts and if they always work together with the
43. company so, and, um, they also know that they are not getting
44. politically…they wouldn't get involved in the same…in the same
45. way because, you know, they know that they have to involve
46. you…myself, for example, because not everybody speaks English
47. and I don't know if it's really tenderness, a bit like they're quite
48. aware, no, is it reluctance, or I don't know if you could call it.
49. I Yeah. Yeah.
50. J it's a bit like being careful [?] you know.
51. I We call that passive aggressive.
52. J No, not aggressive.
53. I No, passive aggressive.
54. J Yeah, being…being, er…
55. I Like I hear you but I'm not going to do what you say but I'm not
56. going to…
57. J Tell you…
58. I …tell you outright…
59. J [Laughs.]
60. I …it's going to be like, sorry, yeah. I think…
61. J Probably a little bit the English way, I just to need to hear [?]
62. things [?], yeah, acknowledging it but, um, maybe not pulling it
63. out.
64. I That could be because…
65. J Smiling and yeah, yeah. [Unclear]
66. I Yeah, have you found that experience here?
67. J No, not really.

Between lines 1 and 6 'J' explains that over the past 18 months he has grown accustomed to his job and speaking the language (he is German) and is now at the point where is looking to make things more interesting *again*. This position situates 'J' as someone who was originally stimulated by the newness of speaking another language at work as well as the demographics of the job; not necessarily the contingency of working in an environment in which he was a minority. While speaking a new language could indicate implicitly that he is a minority, his formulation does not include any overt mention of the new culture, cultural differences, etc. To an extent 'J' aligns himself with members in his work environment by describing it as a place where things have reached a status

normality and need to be made 'interesting again' –a position which he had when he was new to the job 18 months ago.

In line lines 7 to 11, 'I' makes *being a German working at Bentley* relevant to 'J' as she reflexively draws upon the subjective position of her husband, "Matthias" in his comments about his experiencing tension working at Bentley *as a German* while presently orienting to 'J' as a German. The question asked by 'I' puts two nouns together, 'German' and 'Bentley' respectively, which is to suggest some kind of unique relationship. As Volkswagen is a German company which owns Bentley, a *British* cultural icon, cultural differences are possible as well as issues embedded within cultural history of the two nations stemming from the wars.

'J' rejects the formulation of 'tension' from *Matthias*, who is German, but states that "I was aware that there may be some things" (l. 17) and characterises the social climate through a downgrading as more of "sometimes being uninterested" (l. 18).

In clarifying with whom the disinterest lays 'I' separates 'J' from his colleagues through an implicit orientation toward what I believe is a *cultural* distinction, "them or you" (l. 20) which 'J' affirms that it is "them" (l. 20). I believe this to be true as the "things" which 'J' was aware of before he came to his job in the UK were *things* which are attributable to dialogue he had in Germany with German colleagues; suggesting that the contingency of the social objects is cultural.

Between lines 23 and 28, 'J' now occupies a subjective position which presents him opposite to his colleagues in that he possesses a knowledge corpus from the parent company, Volkswagen, which could be useful to the local business at Bentley –a collection of people who do not possess this corpus but for whom it would be beneficial. However, in line 29 the position changes again when 'J' suggests that "to go over [to Germany] ourselves" would be beneficial as a work group.

In describing his perspective on his work group at Bentley, 'J' flips back to a subjective position as a member of the parent company Volkswagen. In speaking from this position, 'J' positions members of the Bentley work group as people who do not see the benefits of working together and establishing boundaries between themselves and members of Volkswagen by 'wanting to stay in their own kingdom a little bit' and to 'do it themselves' (l. 31-35).

Between lines 37 and 48 'J' tries to build an account for why this might be which includes reasons like not wanting to do things differently when there is already a process established, having to deal with people overseas who may or may not speak English and so on but he is not entirely sure how to categorize it. In line 51 'J' formulates it as being careful although based upon his description, 'I' understands this differently and suggests that it is "passive aggressive" (l. 51) which after 'I' explains what is meant by this formulation, 'J' states that this is "probably a little bit the English way" (l. 61) and although he categorizes this way as *being a little bit English*, he denies having experienced this a lot (l. 67).

7.2h Summary case study 4

This case involved a married expat couple who sought an experience; a chance to experience living aboard but not at all costs. As their narrative began, they presented themselves foreigners who viewed their potential move to the UK as a downgrading their quality of life; believing that they were moving to a culture where the health care was sub-standard. Being that they are Germans ipso facto Europeans, their work initially separates the UK from the rest of Europe. Although their presuppositions about the UK health system was formulated as a *German* perception (a mechanism for interpretation acquired at home), it was only when another German in an authoritative position provides a credible opinion to 'J' and 'S' gain some perspective, i.e. it was not like they were going to Africa.

Although 'J' is seen at times reducing the cultural distance between himself and his colleagues, through 'I''s participation in the interaction and contributions laden with unique member knowledge ('I' knew 'J' and 'S' prior to their move to the UK when she lived in Germany and 'I''s husband works for Volkswagen as well but is in the UK at Bentley with the same type of contract), 'J' does not resist the distinctions being made between himself and the cultural other. This part of the narrative shows 'J' in a position where is remains very much an expat who views himself still a member of his native culture and parent company and opposite majority culture members.

The polyphony seen in this case is similar to that which was seen in case study two where the co-participants are inter-subjectively oriented toward their couple's narrative and fill in parts of the story separately almost as if on que.

7.3 Chapter summary

In this chapter I began to look at acculturation as a member's phenomenon by first looking at the ways in which the participants viewed themselves as such. This is often done through alignment and contrasting activities which draw upon majority culture members as well as through the use of other foreigners. By positioning other foreigners at a greater cultural distance to majority members, the person is automatically positioned closer to the majority culture. Through examples where majority culture members are described as sharing views with the person, cultural distance is also reduced if not removed as being the contingency through which people of different cultures are in communication. In my aim to look at polyphony of self in acculturative contexts, I thought examining the ways in which people constructed their identities as certain types of foreigners was prudent through a framework which showed how certain categories operate 'behind the scenes'. Other categories besides the explicit use of certain named cultures were brought forth sometimes in polyphonic unison to do other moral work in helping participants establish their identity as an expat.

Chapter Eight

Contrasting Reasons for Leaving between *Kinds* of 'Expats'

8.0 Chapter Introduction

This chapter uses the tools and techniques discussed and utilized in Chapters Five and Six in order to look closer at the individual case studies of my participants. There will now be a more focused interest in highlighting the unique aspects of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity in a conversational setting and the structure of stories as they arise through the interview setting. However, the goal of this chapter is to learn more about the acculturation of the participants and to extract the variability from these accounts; a process which is inextricably intertwined with the identity work of the participants.

I am focusing this chapter upon the participants' accounts for leaving their home country, how that gets done through their jointly-produced narratives and the ways in which the accounts of differ between different 'kinds' of expats. Often research in psychology tends to place a heavy emphasis upon the generalizability of findings. The strength of a method such as that which I have undertaken here seeks to highlight the variety in accounts about acculturation –the variability of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity. This is an "approach to mental action that emphasizes diversity rather than uniformity in the processes involved, and a concern with the cultural, institutional, and historical situatedness of mediated action" (Wertsch, 1991, p. 8).

In the data extracts below, there are many things happening. The data which follows is primarily treated as highly indexical. As such, the analysis is for the most part embedded in a DA paradigm. As I explained in the Methodology Chapter Five, this type of DA does not have the operational aspects of the interaction as its primary focus such as in the way CA looks at how a piece of interaction is structured turn-by-turn but rather the way in which the talk is being used to accomplish something –i.e. what is done in and through talk. Although I cannot ignore the structural phenomena when they present themselves, and in fact they may be relevant to the analysis, the majority of analytical focus upon the operational mechanisms of the interview –such as if it indeed remains an interview or not- or the structure of the stories contained within (as was the focus in Chapter Six) fades to a greater extent to the background in this chapter. Instead, I am focusing on *how* conversational devices such as formulations, accounts, self-disclosures and categories/ categorizations are shaped as a result of people's own use of local resources, i.e. the implicit information they assume which is shared amongst them. This is a good platform upon which to take a closer look at the great amount of diversity in the ways in which people describe something which they assume is a shared understanding between conversational partners. This focus allows me to really present evidence as to the polyphonic quality of these utterances.

Rather than looking at sentences and what they are doing as is generally the focus of DA, I am focusing more upon "...*communication* and not language...[which consists of]...a unit more comprehensive than a sentence" (Holquist, 1983, p. 311). As Holquist explains, "[An] 'utterance' is Bakhtin's

overall term for a *duality* of roles that previously has been obscured by the assumption that speaking and listening were mutually opposed, unitary activities" (p. 311). This perspective considers the "addressivity" (ibid.) to others as well as the polyphonic nature of otherness (ibid.).

Particularly in the case of my research where I sought to use the idea of the Dialogical Self and polyphony to orient my analysis, it would be paradoxical to then try and package the variety tightly back together in some way. The negotiation of kinds of expat identities –as I showed through the analysis in chapter seven, is a situated process respective to interviewer and interviewees and indeed the participants formulate themselves in relation to the place. Over time, this formulation of self in relation to place (as one becomes increasingly socialized in that new context) can be expected to change. The idea of a polyphonic self helps me in understanding the expats because it is a way to explain how people manage and include, at times, such diverse and paradoxical aspects of experience and self into a continuous narrative. When considering the explanation I provided in chapter four about the constitution and evolution of self through interaction, some theoretical underpinning is needed to account for the extreme complexities in self when people are confronted with an even greater (broader) 'generalized other'. In the analysis of the following data, these complexities are to be uncovered by explicating how expats deal with the dissociated and fragmented environment they are in. In the case of the expats, the 'generalized other'[48] not only includes that of a home culture but additionally,

[48] I am employing this term in a slightly different way to Mead. As Leudar et al. (2008) summarised, "Mead postulated that people react to their own actions from the perspective of others and that these reactions become internalized parts of oneself as the 'other' and the 'generalized other'" (p. 190).

and sometimes in conflicting ways, that of an additional culture (or perhaps even more than one). This opens the possibility for radical variability in ones sense of self when the potential otherness is so vast and diverse.

To extract this variety, I asked my participants to talk about their past. Such 'cognitive' activities such as remembering or recalling generally are considered to be treading onto thin ice as the initial reaction to them is the question: *to what extent is the content of such 'believed in imaginings' (Sarbin, 1997b) reliable?* However, as Lynch suggests, recollecting (as well as remembering and recalling) "does not require facts from neurology and psychology…instead it requires knowledge about the salience of events for persons in specific membership categories…" (2006, p. 100). People, such as the expats in this study, are members of certain categories as is the interviewer. The unique combination of these categories in any particular moment inevitably affects the formation of such recollections, i.e. the relevant parts of any given recollection which would make sense and be traceable to the present parties. The reconstruction of the past is not interesting here for the extent to which the authenticity of the account can be proven or accepted but rather what the phenomenon in the "treatment of practices *as practices*" (Lynch, 2006, p. 102) can say about those who are doing them –in this case- the constructing of a past which is being used as a person's account for their current situation or state of affairs as an expat. The action of expats constructing their past is the unit of analysis (Wertsch, 1991).

This type of action is often referred to as 'mediated action' (Wertsch, 1991) and the mediated action of the expats is my interest. As Wertsch asserts, this focus

"recognizes the essential relationship between these processes and their cultural, historical and institutional settings" (1991, p. 6) –he coins this as a 'sociocultural' approach to mind. As I advocated earlier, one cannot understand what is produced through talk with ontologically separate concepts of self and environment. However, talk is not a random collection of occurrences which are unorganized. Such as the focus of CA on the local management of talk, there are tools which help "shape the action in essential ways" (ibid., p. 12).

These accounts about leaving (as well as the data in the next chapter regarding the expats' reasons for *not staying* in the UK) all have to do with the self. The construction of their past as told by a person and then subsequent accounts through up to the present reveal an evolving sense of identity in relation to the place they find themselves. This, looked at over a period of time as I have done with my participants, reveals a self which is changing. This changing self as displayed through various performances of recollection becomes increasingly polyphonic as the recollections include stories involving others whose actions are sometimes merely reported or are possibly reported through ventriloquial speech –"in which one voice speaks through another voice or voice type as found in social language" (Hermans & Kempen, 1995, p. 108). As a general anchor for my analysis, I read through the data sharing "Bakhtin's concern with *who is doing the speaking?*" (Wertsch, 1991, p. 53 original emphasis). This phenomenon in itself is not unique to acculturation, however the variety of polyphony in which cultural contrasts are embedded in some way shows acculturation in action and supports a conception of self which is embodied.

I have split the data in this chapter into two sections with the distinction *I as the researcher* have made between the participant categories namely those who are not corporate-sponsored (section I) and those who are (section II). In these sections, there is a single case analysed followed by similar case extracts to provide a comparison. This "splitting" did not just occur from my interpretations about *who my participants* were. It also arose out something I noticed in the data.

In my reading of the data prior to its inclusion here, I noticed something odd- participants who were non corporate-sponsored oriented to the relevance of needing to account for why they chose (or had at the time of initial decision) a life abroad. These accounts were extended in comparison to those of the corporate-sponsored participants but more importantly the need to account this way seems to have been summoned by the interviewer. The accounts provided by non corporate-sponsored informants share some saliency in that they present themselves as being somewhat marginalised through descriptions of activities and "mind sets". These are presented as being in distinct contrast to normative activities and "mind sets" attributable, according to the participants, to the majority culture from whence they come.

As I will show in this chapter, polyphony is something accomplished in specific circumstances and I shall highlight occurrences when they are evident but expect to be able to do this to a greater extent in the next chapter of analysis in which I analyse participants' complaints through accounts of living in a new majority culture.

The data for this thesis were collected through semi-structured interviews which were primarily conversational and followed no real strict set of questioning. This means that if the interviewer wanted to elicit more information on a topic the participants had or had not discussed, the interviewer would ask. Originally my focus was very loosely on 'differential factors in acculturation between working and non-working life partners' and while there is data here which could allow me a more in depth look at these factors, I found it more interesting and original to focus upon *the way* in which people managed change as a part of a hermeneutic account of experience.

The first extracts from the cases contained in the following section were retrieved from first interviews which were collected in 2006. As a result of the relative 'unstructuredness' of these interviews, the stark phenomena are even more noteworthy. The extracts below, evident in four of the five case studies, all show participants (both interviewer and interviewees) orientation to the relevance of providing an account for making the choice to live abroad.

Analysis

Section I

8.1a Case study 1 'E and G'

At the time of this interview, 'E' and 'G' had been living in the UK (London) together for less than one year. 'E' is American and had never before been to Europe prior to her move to England. 'G' is Swiss and had spent the nine years prior to this interview in the United States. 'G''s parents had moved 'G' and his brother to Texas from Switzerland and that is where he met 'E'. 'E' is ten years older than 'G' and has been married before. 'E' has also lived in different parts

of the United States including different states in the South such as Tennessee and finally Texas where she had been for over ten years before meeting 'G'. 'E' was born and raised, however, in Alaska. The move to England was very much a joint decision and the following extracts from Case Study 1 present a very co-constructed story.

First Interview
Extract Thirty Six
E and G (Case Study 1)
February 2006

1.	I	.hh SO WHAT w:how'd you get here?
2.	G	(1.0) hhhhhh um:
3.	E	well
4.	G	well we had we had talked about ah moving to Europe ah and
5.		and moving to England .hhh [ah: for]
6.	E	[for a l:]
7.	G	[a long time]
8.	E	[on and off you] know we had [discussions]
9.	G	[just yeah] (.) they be sort of
10.	I	[°mmhmm°]
11.	G	you know sometime in the future [kind of situation]
12.	E	[and we would say] if we have a child
13.	G	[yeah]
14.	E	[specifically] if we had a child we <u>really</u> would like them to grow
15.		up in Europe to get ah broader world view
16.	I	had you had you been to Europe before?
17.	E	no
18.	I	ok
19.	E	actually had not
20.	I	you just <u>had</u> this idea that Europe was .hh(.) ~a place where one
21.		could grow up and and h(h)a be more worldly
22.	E	yeah

This extract follows a very long account –provided mostly by 'E', about her past including a prior marriage, education, how 'E' and 'G' came to know one another and so on. In line 1 'I' attempts twice to formulate a *Wh*-question in order to target the information which is needed to complete an unfinished proposition namely; how is it through the course of the extensive autobiographical narrative which has just been provided, did 'E' and 'G' come to

live in England. In this case the trajectory of the interview, i.e. that certain type of story 'I' was looking for has not yet been told. 'E' and 'G' begin in lines 2 and 3 respectively with their response to the question as not just something which has happened but rather something which has happened as a result of deliberation (l. 3-7).

As Schiffrin states, "'well' can precede an answer in which a speaker cancels a presupposition of a prior question...thus well signals moves that are in some way dispreferred" (Pomerantz 1975 cf. ibid.). Furthermore, the account being started, firstly by 'G' and followed immediately by 'E' is formulated as an account of 'we'. 'We' is a term of plurality and encompasses the voice and associated perceptions of intentionality of the speaking voice as well as the voices included in the 'we' unit.

In their deliberation, 'E' and 'G' present one of the reasons for their decision namely, to find a better place to raise a child; with this the US is presented as a place which has a type of mentality which they are trying to distance themselves from. While these points are quite obvious, what is interesting is the beginning of a polyphonic cultural position which oscillates between non-US (or European) and US cultural positions respectively throughout the following extracts from 'E' and 'G'. These polyphonic cultural positions are constituted of many possible voices such as the conception of a self-position which was acquired through interaction with members of the 'E' and 'G''s native culture, the new self-position as experienced by 'G' following his move to the US, the products of interaction between 'E' and 'G' as well as their friends and family.

Beginning in lines 13-14, 'E' presents her position herself away from the US as it is a place that does not satisfy her requirement for providing her daughter with a broader world view. As I will discuss shortly the plural position of a 'we' account undertaken by both 'E' and 'G' does not satisfy 'I''s request for an account about their decision to move abroad. This is an important point as the presentation of 'we' (which is done a considerable amount in this first extract) could normally have done a lot of work in explaining how two people with possibly different perspectives (being that they were each born and raised in two separate countries) arrived at a decision. By constructing an account together which is shared and even taken up by the other member as a 'we'-type account, the implicit assumption can be made that discussions took place (as is indeed presented) and decisions were made; thus removing the necessity at the present moment to go into great detail about those discussions.

However, even though that first reason as presented in line 13 by 'E' provides an answer to 'I''s question from line 1 in which it is explained that if they had a child, they would want that child to grow up in Europe to gain a broader world view, the answer proves to be an insufficient account and more information is solicited by 'I'. In line 15, 'I' asks 'E' through her questions whether she has *experienced* Europe in order to have attained this way of thinking. Here 'I' is implicitly orientating to the two different types of knowledge in the manner of James (1890) and with that is implicitly suggesting that merely a knowledge of acquaintance does not suffice but rather a knowledge corpus of *how* can account for one, in this case, justifying moving countries.

'E''s answer to 'I''s question of "had you had you been to Europe before" again could have closed the line of questioning yet clearly by 'I's reformulation of 'E's statement from lines 13-14 as an account for moving based upon ideas rather than practical experience (l. 19-20), 'I' reformulating 'E''s own account in a polyphonic way–with many of 'E''s own words- as a question which derives a preferred answer (Pomerantz, 1984 cf. Tileagă, 2005, p. 608) of "yes". Rather than using this line of questioning as a means of clarification, 'I' uses it as a platform from which to request further accounting from 'E'.

As we shall see in the extract to follow, the life story of the couple is very much managed by 'E'. She needs to account for why she made the decision to permanently move from her native country. 'G' is Swiss-born and was moved to the US by his parents when he was a young child. 'G' is noticeably absent here in the account for leaving but comes in later providing reasons for *not staying* in the US which are in harmony with 'E's. However, 'G' does not provide the extensive historical account in the manner of 'E'. Although they co-construct the preliminary part of the account for leaving the US between lines 1 and 12, the conversational trajectory for the account changes for 'E' through 'I''s question of whether she had ever been to Europe before.

The question 'I' deploys now places 'E' in the position to have to account for where she has attained this view of Europe and why a move there was imminent and the right decision. As we will see, this inevitably directs 'E' toward aligning with 'G''s *European* way of thinking –an account which is polyphonic in nature as it must include 1) artefacts or implicitly references to interactions about which

aspects belong to a US-mindset[49] 2) show through how 'E' positions herself with a mindset which is opposite to a US-mindset 3) include an account from where she has obtained a non-US mindset having never left the US 4) what a European-mindset *is* and 5) the ways in which 'E' has come to the conclusion in the past that she possesses a European-mindset rather than a US-mindset.

Below 'E' and 'G' embark upon a long account as to how 'E' came to align with a European mentality[50] and what a European mentality consists of. Interestingly, in order to account for this non-US mindset (awareness of what is and is not a 'world view'), 'E' deploys firstly a story from her past about growing up in Alaska –a state in the US! Referring briefly back to the lines above in which the US was deemed by 'E' and 'G''s deliberation to be a less desirable place to raise children, this turn by 'E' back to a US cultural position demonstrates a hybrid cultural alignment.

First Interview
Extract Thirty Seven
E and G (Case Study 1)
February 2006

1	I	and where did you get that?
2	E	WELL I grew up in Alaska so I grew up (.) aroun:d <u>lots</u> of
3		different cultures
4	I	mmhmm
5	E	(.) and with a much more open mind set um::
6	G	cause Alaska's kind of a melting pot too [with everyone coming]
7	E	[yeah I mean it's the first] stop out of Asia so there's huge Asian
8		[population]
9	I	[↑is it↓] really

[49] The term "mind-set" is used in and in relation to this data set and it refers to a set of ideologies or a formulation of one's relationship a place which has been formulated previously. Defined by the Oxford dictionary as "a habitual way of thinking". In light of this definition, change in mind-sets are possible.
[50] Although "mentality" and "mind-set" seem to be used interchangeably in the data, there can be some categorical differences between them. In contrast to "mind-set", "mentality" is defined by the Oxford dictionary as "a characteristic way of thinking" –a definition which yields itself more to an association with a particular place or membership group within that place.

10	E	yeah:: well depending if you depending on which direction they
11		fly: I mean.hhh you know there's [a lot]
12	I	[hmm↑]
13	E	there's a hu:ge Korean p(.)opu[lation]
14	I	[I would've] I would've thought obviously native Americans and
15		eskimo but I didn't know that
16	E	YEAH: but percentage wise they're not that lar:ge [~of a]
17	I	[↑oh]
18	E	YEAH and most of them live in the rural (.) in the bush
19	I	↑umhmm:
20	E	um:: (.) you know in in their vill[ages and]
21	I	[hmm]
22	E	whatever and I grew up in Anchorage which is a quarter of a
23		million people .hhh um: you know (.) they high rise buildings
24		and you know ~d the mountains are right there [and]
25	I	[right]
26	E	whatever but I was a city kid .hhh um: sth so (.) I mean I've had
27		this fascination with Europe since I was: .hh I can remember
28		being in social studies class in the seventh grade and being
29		assign:ed .hh a country and we had to research and that country
30		and put a report together .hhh and I remember being really
31		disappointed because I got Japa:n because I <u>des</u>:parately wanted
32		something in Europe or Scandanavia[.hhh]
33	I	[mmhmm]
34	E	I just and then we: had to um get penpals in (.) one of our classes
35		in (.) in junior high so before I ever took a <u>lan</u>guage class I think
36		(1.0) no it must have been when in ninth grade when I took
37		French because we had to have a pen pal in a French speaking
38		country so that we could practice our (.) writing skil(h)ls.hhh BUT
39		we could sign our you know before the days of the INTternet
40	I	h(h)m
41	E	you know
42	I	yeahmm
43	E	so we could sign up for other countries as well and I picked all
44		the countries ~you know sth New Zealand, Australia, .hhh
45		holland, Fran:ce, Sw~ I I I actually my French speaking one
46		was in Switzerland
47	G	h(h)m
48	E	and then um:: ah: (.) England. You know those were all the
49		countries that you know that I had this just interest and [and]
50	I	[°mmhmm°]

In line 1 'I', having been previously provided brief accounts from 'E' and 'G' as to *how they got here,* confronts 'E' specifically regarding her moving to Europe based only upon ideas. The question from 'I' in line 1 demands another answer from 'E' specifically and this answer will be polyphonic as I will show in a

moment. The fact that the previous account did not satisfy the question from 'I', 'E' is now placed under some pressure to account for a way of thinking acquired remotely –through *mere* interactions.

In line 2, 'E' structures her answer to the question which begins with "WELL" and involves the telling of a story (ibid., p. 648). I propose further, that the manner in which 'well' is uttered here with strong inflexion could indicate that the delay in answering the question outright is protracted; as if to inform the listener that this might take awhile.

In her study of story-telling in normal conversation, Schiffrin states that in formulating an answer in this way with the suspension of normal conversation convention and inclusion of a story, participants would normally leave the interpretation work regarding the story's significance up to the listener. However, as this is an interview, the structure seems to refute this. This seems to be the case with the significance of the place term 'Alaska'. As Gergen and Gergen state, "...users of the same descriptive term[s] could fully agree on the way in which the term[s] should be used but hold entirely different conceptions of the object itself" (1986, p.23). Such is the case with the indexicality of 'Alaska' in this piece of interaction. In fact, in using Alaska, 'E' is doing a significant amount of non-place formulation (Schegloff, 1972). Specifically this means that in her use of Alaska, 'E' is constructing herself as someone who, having grown up there, comes from a different kind of place. Since both 'E' and 'I' are American and are familiar, at least by name, with Alaska and it has been established that 'E' had no previous *experience* in Europe prior to her moving

there, some work needs to be done explaining why Alaska is a place which is different from any of the other states in the US. Since the call for how 'E' came to acquire her ideas about Europe has yet to be answered, Alaska is deployed here as a tool to satisfy that. However, in contrast to what Schriffin states about the inclusion of a story in amongst the interaction, 'E' does not leave the work of interpreting what Alaska means in this story up to 'I' but rather guides 'I''s analysis (Schegloff, 1972) of it. While both 'E' and 'I' are both Americans, the object could be the same but the conceptions of it different, just as Gergen and Gergen state. That is something 'E' seems to understand and she wants to be sure that Alaska is understood in the way in which she is using it to help her account.

By listing the relevant attributes of Alaska, such as 'lots of different cultures, a melting pot, big cities and rural villages as well as a school system which required the study of foreign languages and communication with foreign pen-pals' (distributed throughout lines 1-50), 'E' is formulating a multicultural upbringing with the use of a place term (Schegloff, 1972). This multicultural up-bringing could make it hard to live in any of the other US states and thus provide the impetus to move abroad.

In the telling of her story 'E' deploys common and generally-expected terms and statements from a social genre of language which belong in a story about why one changes cultures including: culture, ethnic mentions, contrasts of old and new cultures and a gradual progression which moves the teller farther away from the old culture and closer to the new. As Gergen and Gergen state, "perhaps the most essential ingredient of narrative accounting (or storytelling) is its capability

to structure events in such a way that they demonstrate, first, a connectedness or coherence, and second, as sense of movement or direction through time…" (1986, p. 25). The job of the listener is to take these objects, in the order they have been presented, and come up with a conclusion as to what their placement and orderliness mean.

In her narrative, 'E' grounds the account in the place, Alaska. Her life, her biography as well as that of her family are all embedded in an account of what Alaska *is* and *means*. As I discuss below, a conception of what Alaska is, i.e. what it means to have chosen a life there and have grown up there, has been previously constituted by other people and 'E' borrows these formulations, infuses them with her own intentions and deploys them in her positioning work.

With these tools, 'E' is constructing a type of narrative and that is the narrative of *marginalization* in her own country and an interest in other countries.

A marginalization narrative (in Gergen and Gergen's discussion of narrative forms this would be considered a *progressive narrative* in which one is steadily progressing toward a goal) suggests that the move to a new culture is not so unusual as the teller was already in a position of not really fitting in, in the native culture. This latter point has not yet presented itself in the data but will do shortly.

Note that the account about how 'E' and 'G' made an informed decision to move abroad could at all times be jointly-produced by both 'E' and 'G' but that in this

extract 'G' is predominantly absent. This supports my earlier claim that up to this point, the data seem to suggest that 'E' is a person –based upon her historical lack of international experience- who does not, from the position of the interviewer, have a congruent story about why she felt she would be able to move abroad to Europe having never been there. As such, the accounting work is basically being required from 'E' and she is orienting to this fact with her singly-constructed account as is 'G' with his notable absence.

Therefore up to this point, the way in which 'E' formulates a coherent story about her move abroad as an action which was long in the making is done firstly through comparing Alaska and Europe. Later, a contrast between Alaska and the rest of the US will be made which aims to align Alaska and Europe while simultaneously separating the state of Alaska from the other United States. This contrast is important as 'E' uses Alaska as a tool for explaining where she acquired her fundamental ways of thinking which are in stark contrast to the thinking of others she encounters later in her life in various areas of the US.

'E''s account for her having "just had this idea" requires her to temporally go back in time to growing up in Alaska. Alaska acts in this context as an *apparatus* (Schegloff, 2006) consisting of *multicultural places* which are made up of people doing certain things, having certain ways of thinking, etc. In line 2 for 'E' Alaska *means* "lots of different cultures" thus lots of different people with lots of different ways of doing and thinking as associated with their respective culture. Here 'E' begins to speak from a polyphonic position which includes utterances generated by what is referred to as a 'social language'. A social language, unlike

a national language, is "a discourse peculiar to a specific stratum of society (professional, age group, etc) within a given social system at a given time" (Holquist & Emerson, 1981 cf. Wertsch, 1991, p. 57).

Social languages are polyphonic because they are not simply "unique speech events (individual utterances produced by unique voices) [but are] categories or *types* of speech events (types of utterances produced by types of voices)" (Wertsch, 1991, p. 56). These types of voices are socially mediated. As I discuss in further detail below, the social language genre being used in discussing Alaska and the attributes listed are an implicit reference to the things that constitute a *pioneering spirit* (found in extract twenty four). In so doing, 'E' is borrowing the narrative for Alaskans which has been constituted previously by, among others, people from Alaska. This narrative aids her in positioning herself in this interaction as someone who *knows* 'being multicultural' and has "a much more open mindset" (line 5).

As 'E' as already stated, Europe is such a place as she has come to understand it, likely through her talks with 'G' as well as through her learning about it in school (hence her desire to raise her child there) and so is Alaska. Through these activities, it is very possible that 'E' is trying to present the way in which she was able to align with a European way of thinking; she does this through explaining how the two places are similar meanwhile juxtaposing Alaska with the rest of the United States. This latter point is an example of the economy rule (Schegloff, 2006) in MCA. In separating Alaska from the rest of the US and making the US a place which is not homogenous but rather variable, 'E' is simultaneously

occupying two cultural positions. In her presenting of the US as a heterogeneous place within the conversational context between herself and 'I', 'E' implicitly orients to aspects of their shared nationality which aim to unite the US and its citizens and is disputing an idea that the US is one homogenous land through her *listing activities* of these unique attributes of Alaska; if it were clear that Alaska was analogous to a multicultural place like Europe, there would be no need to list these. Yet, if the US is a heterogeneous rather than homogenous place, that it is possibly *multicultural* and may contain *world views*. As we shall see later, 'E' and 'G' show through their use of place names and a named person as a place name how a mentality associated with George Bush which was once localized in Texas could possibly have spread, making the US an even harder place to live. Now I wish to focus a moment on how 'I' is being addressed by 'E' in this interaction –a perspective which, according to Shotter, is actually where the focal point should be in describing the nature of interactions (1989).

Throughout these extracts, 'E' has been doing a fair amount of identity work as someone who previously was not an expat, considers herself now to be one and is doing so with a glance toward a possible future expat self. In order to accomplish this, 'E' needs to take into consideration in front of who she is doing this work; i.e. for whom she is performing. In the case of the previous and up-coming extracts, the performance is being done for herself, for 'G' and well as for the interviewer -a fellow expat and American, 'I'. As I mentioned previously, with the manner in which she pursued her questioning, 'I' placed 'E' implicitly into a certain category; that being a person whose mere ideas were not sufficient to account for a decision to live abroad. In effect, 'I' placed 'E' in a category of

inexperienced expat; it is 'I' who has "assume[d] the leading role" (Shotter, 1989, p. 137) in shaping the text of 'E'.

While one cultural position is that of a person who is *European-like-minded* in that it is a place which has "a much more open mind set" (line 5) the other cultural position follows immediately thereafter with 'E's agreement with 'G''s (only) contribution in this extract in line 6 of the 'melting pot' analogy. I consider 'E's overlapping agreement to this assertion as her occupation of a cultural position of *American* as it is common for Americans to draw upon the cultural idiom of "melting pot" when describing American cultural constitution. Indeed I should point out 'G''s own noticeable alignment to an American cultural position in his use of the term albeit that he himself is not an American citizen. Furthermore, even more noteworthy is that 'G' is using this idiom to say something about Alaska –although he is has never lived or even been there. This is clear evidence of the fact that 'G' has incorporated 'E''s own story in order to say something about his own identity.

First Interview
Extract Thirty Eight
E and G (Case Study 1)
February 2006

1	E	I THINK (1.0) <u>my</u> mom went to Alaska before it was even a
2		state. It was a territory. She didn't know anybody when she
3		moved there.hhh um: so I just kind of grew up with this: (.)
5		really independent and and she worked for an attorney who
6		was a sen a state senator↑ .hhh so twice we lived in Juno while
7		he was serving the state legislature I mean I was like playing in
8		the state capital building and .hh and sneaking a ride on the
9		elevator up to ~the governmental level on the fourth floor: you
10		you know.hhh and and I <u>knew</u> (.) like a representative in the house
11		of representatives I used to walk his da:wg [you know]
12	I	[°mmhmm°]
13	E	I mean like government and all that seemed the world just seemed
14		very (.) ~I ah ~it just felt like I was ~d around a lot of dialogue:

15 and a lot of um: .hhh ~rh wher (.) people could be part of a
16 process and change things and whatever.hhh and I just when I
17 moved down to the lower 48: especially once I ended up in Texas
18 where I was for 17 years .hh I mean just felt so disenfranchised by
19 (.) the (.) I hate the electoral college system it's outdated .hh it
20 disenfranchises people I never felt like my vote counted [.hhh and
21 I]
22 I [°mmhmm°]
23 E you know just a lot of reasons that (.) you know I just: (.) felt like
24 ~I ~I I'm ok with with <leaving them> .hhh I'M just you know
25 it's to leave I had friends that were exchange students .hh I just
26 think it's good outside of your ↑culture↓ [because we're]
27 I [°mmhmm°]
28 E myopic you know?
29 I [mmhmm↑]
30 E [we just] .hhh the I went I deliberately chose a college in the
31 South because my family was all in the West so I was very
32 familiar with the mentality of Alaska and of the West and of the
33 f frontier and <whatever> .hhh sthe the SOUTH might as well
34 have been Europe for me in in terms of culture because all I knew
35 it from was books and movies and [things]
36 I [hmm↓]
37 E .hhh so I went to school in Tennessee and I got culture
38 [sh(hh)o(h)°ck°]
39 I [mmh(h)ha(h)ah]

The extract begins with 'E' telling the story about how she initial came from Alaska. It is a story which begins with her mother moving there –a story which was likely told to her by her mother. As such this part of the narrative begins with an inter-subjective polyphonic story told by the voices of 'E' and her mother but whose *meaning* contained in that story extend beyond them and was also created by others. The meaning of moving to a place before it was a state was created long before it was used here. It is the story of the frontier in the US, the last wild places and the hardy sorts of people who embarked on new lives in uncharted or scarcely-occupied places. Her mother did this. 'I''s use of continuers in the interaction spur 'E''s telling of her story and the fact no attempt to clarify what is meant by the first sentences indicates that 'I' understands what this utterance is communicating which, seeing as 'I' has never been to Alaska but

is familiar with the place through name and what is being said, supports the idea of 'E''s use of Alaska in the way it has been used here as a part of a 'national language'[51].

This narrative includes not only 'E''s own voice constructing her narrative as well as that of her mother but also the narratives and sentiments made by countless unknown others as to what kind of person moves to Alaska, "...before it was even a state" and where "she didn't know anybody when she moved there..."; as Wertsch presents, "in Bakhtin's view, users of language 'rent' meaning" (1991, p. 68). 'E''s "borrowing" of her mother's narrative of a *pioneering spirit* in the constructing of her own is to aid her in the establishment of her own identity as someone who forges new paths later in this extract when she discusses her deliberate choice of college in a place which "...might as well have been Europe..." (l. 29-34) and is the foundation for an account of someone who's move abroad was inevitable. Collectively, this polyphony in what 'E' is telling in her story about Alaska consists of the voices of a country, a state, a mother and a daughter.

In lines 12-15 'E' mentions explicitly the polyphonic quality of being in Alaska as she was "...around a lot of dialogue..." (l. 13). This is then contrasted with the lower forty-eight states and particularly Texas where she lived for seventeen years in which 'E' felt "disenfranchised" rather than being a part of the dialogue. In Alaska 'E''s voice constituted in part the place, in Texas, it did not; although

[51] According to Wertsch, Bakhtin "...envisioned...the dialogical orientation among 'social languages' within a single *national* language and the dialogic orientation among 'different national languages within the same culture'" (1991, pg.56 internal quotes cf. Bakhtin, 1981, pg. 275 all emphases in original).

she tried to contribute her voice (l. 19). This positions 'E' as a stranger in the US before she ever even left and so prepares her for being an expat. In this way, 'E' can be viewed as someone who is already culturally polyphonic constituted by an Alaskan multi-cultural position and a person who's proverbially gag-ordered in Texas. This complex inter-subjectivity is likely to become even more complex as she sets out further afield.

In lines 22-25 it appears that 'E' is trying to summarize the point of her story up to now. She hops between various points in her history which are not temporally adjacent but highlight main points for why she made the decision to move. These include: many reasons (some which she has listed in her story) with things in the US which were enough to make her "ok with leaving them" (l. 23) and the insight she had gained from friends who had been exchange students about how good it is to go outside your culture (l. 24-25).

With lines 25 and 27, 'E' is making an evaluative statement about those points which she has just listed in saying that "...we're myopic you know?" This last statement obviously shows 'E' as understanding that she and 'I' share membership in the category of *American* but also in the category of *Americans who understand the problems with the culture itself.* This work positions both 'E' and 'I' in hybrid cultural positions of Americans who are somewhere between the myopic Americans and people who are not. Furthermore, a self-categorisation of being 'myopic' shows polyphonic inter-subjectivity in that she is simultaneously able to make the classification of herself and other Americans

that there are things they do not see while at the same time recognizing this fact which would indicate that in some fashion, she *does* see.

Having worked to present a narrative of herself as someone who grew up with the sort of mind set attributable to people who grew up in a different kind of place and stem from people ('E''s mother and people like her who went to Alaska before it was even a state), 'E' has then laid the foundation for why she is able to make decisions to move based upon ideas rather than experience. With line 29, 'E' has two false starts in order to try and properly set the tone for this formulation. Lines 29-34 are a polyphonic recapitulation of the narrative of 'E''s mother as well as addressing the implicit position 'I' had done earlier in the extract when she placed 'E' in the category of *inexperienced* Expat[52]. The story of 'E''s "deliberate" selection of a college in the South whereby she left all her family in the West and the frontier resembles that of her mother's own story of having left her home (whether or not there had been family) to move to the *territory*[53] of Alaska. As such, with lines 32-34 her decision to move to the South is made implicitly analogous to her decision to move to Europe because similar to any preparation she could have made prior to moving to Europe, all 'E' knew about the South came through "books and movies". With these lines, 'E''s utterance is inter-subjectively polyphonically-oriented at the very least toward her mother's narrative, and reflexively toward her own narrative as well as subjectively toward 'I''s presumptions about 'E' as they were presented at the beginning of the extracts for this section (Extracts 23 and 24).

---

[52] As I presented earlier, Bakhtin's understanding of an utterance assumes the duality of speaking and listening; considering the "addressivity" to others as well as the polyphonic nature of otherness (Holquist, 1983).
[53] Prior to statehood, the region of Alaska was known as a territory.

Immediately following 'E''s listing of sources for her knowledge about the South (those books and movies), she describes moving to Tennessee and labels her experience as getting "culture shock". In this instance, 'E' concurs (perhaps not explicitly aware as such) with 'I''s sentiment that knowledge based on ideas rather than experiences is not sufficient when preparing for an actual life in a new culture.

First Interview
Extract Thirty Nine
E and G **(Case Study 1)**
February 2006

1	E	you know and so (.) you know I I can I just had always this
2		fascination with Europe and I mn we had talked about that and
3		just (.) knowing his experience in (.) school and whatever and
4		talking with my in-laws and .h and stuff about (.) ~th the way they
5		saw the American mentality
6		mmhmm
7		um: ~a coming into it as outsiders and you know that kind of
8		thing .hh and so TALKED about that and wanting that for our
9		child and BUT my mother: I'm and ona only child (.) and my
10		mother was a single parent my dad h-had died (.) back when I was
11		in college .hh um and her health was not that good and I just that
12		was the big thing that would ~I ~it's THAT'S WHY IT
13		ALWAYS felt way down the road

This extract shows 'E' summing up the point of her narrative in which she is painstakingly situated leaving the US in her past life by making it meaningful with respect to her childhood and then young adulthood. She further draws upon other voices from interactions with people who *are experienced*; namely her husband 'G' and his family –all of whom were at that time expats living in the US and has included these subjective positions in her narrative about herself as a person who made the decision to leave home.

In lines 1-5 'E' combines a historical interest in Europe together with the names of a few of the others with whom she has interacted and who seemed to share in a 'mentality' which was not *American* in order to summarize her position on her decision to move. The polyphony here is seen in the way a decision was made to move to Europe and includes inter-subjective and subjective polyphony which is reflexive on the part of 'E'. In this decision-making process, 'E''s own history as well as many other points of view were gathered and form the make-up of her inter-subjective position while the reflexive subjective positions include 'G' and her in-laws as well as the products of *their* interactions which also have inter-subjective components; for example those 'G' had in school and those which her in-laws had had in order to formulate their understanding of 'the American mentality'.

'E' eludes to the fact that the understanding of an American mentality for an 'outsider' is not the same to what an insider, i.e. an American, would consider an American mentality in lines 4-5; and she distances herself from them with the use of 'they' (rather than formulating a collective 'we' position opposite the American mentality) and categorizing 'G' and her in-laws as "outsiders". An American mentality as presented by 'E' is clearly not something which is automatically possessed by those who are born there as the American-born 'E' distances herself from it. Yet just seconds before in talking with 'I', a compatriot, she said "we're myopic, you know?"

Finally, in this extract, 'E' then states that it was just her feeling of responsibility to her mother which kept her in the US and once that tie was no longer there, there were no other reasons to remain.

First Interview
Extract Fourty
E and G (Case Study 1)
February 2006

1	E	[um] so once my mother die:d all of the sudden one morning I
2		just woke up and just said (.) there's nothing keeping us here <and
3		he wasn't that> happy
4	G	[no:: I]
5	E	[in the US] AND THAT WAS A STRUG[GLE]
6	G	[I mean it's]
7	E	for our relationship
8	I	°hmm°
9	E	.hh it was:
10	G	hhh ~it was it was strange for me cause I had n I had a: relatively
11		well paying job: I was ~r well regarded at work um:
12	E	[<very well regarded>]
13	G	[~I ~I] and um:
14	E	<great house>
15	G	~I ~I you know I liked doing what I was doing um: yeah we had a
16		good house ah: ~a comfortable lifestyle really and I~w and um:
17		had all the <u>things</u> could ask for
18	E	and he was [miserable]
19	G	[ah:] andand yet yeah I was just ah it was it didn't feel: (.) like the
20		right place for me to be
21	I	°mmhmm°
22	G	um: it was ah: (.) [.hh the mine the mind set] of my environment
23		both both at work a:nd just in general .hh I just really just felt like
24		it didn't belong in Texas (.) especially
25	E	AND HE FELT THTH:
26	G	.hhh
27	E	[and the hard thing]
28	G	[*in audible*]
29	E	was him feeling like a failure for feeling that way
30	G	~a because ah yeah yeah I had this expectation of myself that that
31		I would eventually (.) .hh you know make new friends: um: and
32		and just try to sort of um: (.) integrate int into society a bit better
33	I	you mean the society.hh being society in Texas?
34	G	~y: YEAH [and I did]
35	E	[SOMEWHERE]
36	G	and I didn't realize how different it actually is in Texas from
37		maybe the rest of: [the US but yeah]
38	E	[.hh WELL I MEAN EVERY] place is different you know
39	I	okk that's that was my question you're talking about .hh Texas as

40		sort of different from other place in the [US]
41	G	[yeah]
42	E	yeah it's cause Texas is [different]
43	G	[yeah]
44	E	from Iowa [and different from]
45	G	[it's very]
46	E	California or [New York]
47	I	[hmm↓]
48	E	or Tennessee
49	G	sth yeah and even even Fort Worth the side where we lived versus
50		Dallas which sort of the other side of this huge city complex [~a
51		~a]
52	E	[metropolitan]
53	G	I'm just (.) [trying]
54	E	[°right°]
55	G	to use a wo(h)r(h)d you know the Dallas side of it is more
56		international(.)perhaps in mind set a little bit.hhum:: (.) but
57		y~ you know you get in that area just th this this very closed
58		.hh ah: mind set of:
59	E	well I mean it's George Bush country
60	G	yeah
61	E	they elected him governor you know .hh it just
62	I	[that they did ha(h)ha(h)ha]
63	G	[and th and th then then that] this that is a you know there's the
64		political viewpoint that is <u>completely</u> opposite to mine an an I
65		~I ~ah ~oh all of the issues that that really moved people to voice
66		their opinions <u>strong</u>ly (.)~they moved me to to want v voice my
67		opin my opposite opinions strongly as well but I knew that if I did
68		.hh that I'd be um stoned basically

'E''s mother dies and for her it is clear, she and 'G' can do what they have been talking about; now the story begins to be co-constructed from 'E' and 'G'. 'E''s reasons for staying are now gone and she and 'G' agree in line 4 that he is not happy there. 'E' embeds this unhappiness in the reason; *the US* (l. 5). 'G' tries to expand upon this point (l. 6) but his talk is overlapped by 'E' who briefly begins to formulate another negative point against life in the US –the struggle of being unhappy upon their relationship (l. 7).

In line 10 'G' highlights for himself and perhaps for 'E' the incongruence he feels in having this position of being unhappy because he had all the things

which he "could ask for" (l. 17) such as well-paying job, respect at work, good house, comfortable life-style yet these things did not bring happiness or contentment. While this is part of the story he wants to tell 'I', the point he makes with "it was strange for me…" (l. 10) is a clear instance of his personal momentary reflexivity. In lines 18 and 19, 'E' and 'G' agree, respectively, that all those things which 'E' and 'G' listed in a co-constructed manner were not enough to help him feel like it was the right place. Therefore, his account likely needs to be one which presents personal or ideological reasons; these present themselves momentarily.

With lines 30-32 'G' sets up the context for a mindset which does not belong in Texas. In relation to this data, a mindset is a set of ideologies or a formulation of one's relationship to a place which was formulated previously. Therefore, 'G''s ideological fabric is what does not belong in Texas. In line 37 'G' starts to separate Texas from the US much in the same way 'E' did with Alaska, however in the overlapping talk which occurs between 'E' and 'G' in which 'E' asserts that "*every* place is different" (l. 38), 'G''s initial assertion with specific focus upon Texas seems to soften a bit when he says "…but yeah" (l. 37) in brief agreement with what 'E' is concurrently saying. However, when 'I' seeks clarification through a question designed for a preferred response if in fact 'G' means that society in Texas is the society in which his mindset does not belong and whether or not Texas is in fact different from the rest of the US (l. 39-40), 'G' affirms with "yeah" (l. 41).

However, even though 'E' had briefly stated with line 38 that every place was different, she now begins to list many other states which are in distinct contrast to Texas (l. 42, 44, 46 and 48). The states she lists are not presented as being in contrast opposite to *each other* but are all in contrast to Texas. This is verified through line 48 because Texas is even different than Tennessee –the place she had gone to from Alaska and where she first felt culture shock. Interestingly, after having agreed with 'E''s statements that these states are different from Texas, 'G' begins to explain that even in a place like Texas there is some variability (l. 49-50, 55) such as one part of Dallas, he explains, is "a little" bit international (l. 56) but in general the mindset is very closed (l. 57-58). The acknowledgement that variety and 'a little bit of internationality' exists in Texas aids in their narrative as it presents them as people who can recognize what internationality looks like and distinguish it rather than lump it together as part of the cultural make of Texas. In order to be able to do this, to see internationality, one needs to possess a world-view to be able to recognize it.

With line 59 'E' categorizes this climate there in Texas as "George Bush country". "George Bush country" is another example of a place term doing non-place formulation. Yet it is even more than this. Using a named person as a place term is a more specific categorization as there is implicit moral work being done such as here in the case of George W. Bush who, at the time of this interview, was President of the United States. He was and remains a highly controversial figure and when an example such as this in which a name of a political figure is used as a rhetorical device in positioning work, it is morally and ideologically implicative of the user. I presented briefly several chapters ago that the rhetoric

of a nation's leader is inextricably linked to the nation's people (Lynn & Lea, 2003; Stuckey, 2004). Through this categorization, 'E' and 'G' are positioning themselves as non-members of the collectivity in George Bush country; a place made up of people who voted him into the governor's office (l. 61). Therefore, any such collectivity of people who would do that, share a very different set of ideologies and values from 'E' and 'G'. However as the data from 'E' and 'G' have shown thus far, the US is constituted by contradictions and in a sense they instantiate the polyphony of the US which they introduced.

Finally, 'G' asserts that this political orientation is completely opposite to his and under normal circumstances he would be moved to contribute *his voice* through the voicing of his opinions (l. 66) but knew that in this particular environment, i.e. the generalized other, he might (tongue in cheek) "be...stoned basically" (l. 68). 'G''s utterance here is displaying an orientation toward 'I' as a person who belongs to the category of people who understand George W. Bush (as well as the type of people who voted someone like him into office) in a similar way to he and 'E' as well as an orientation toward the generalized other which would have stoned him in the case had he voiced his opposing opinions.

With the work which had been done above through the use of the place term, "George Bush country", it is possible that the environment of that place had spread (at the time of this interview) across a nation. I suggest this because with two successful election campaigns behind him, there was a contingency of George Bush supporters strong enough to win him those two elections. As such, George Bush country was no longer limited to Texas but had spread nationwide.

Therefore, the utterances of 'E' and 'G' are a classic example of what Bakhtin meant in the dualism of addressivity; where the "...utterance reflects not only the voice producing it but also to the voices to which it is addressed. In the formulation of an utterance a voice responds in some way to previous utterances and anticipates the response of the other..." (Wertsch, 1991, p. 53). In CA terms this means that the voice in a single turn is oriented both toward the self and other as recipient of the utterance.

With this understanding, it would be clear that 'E' and 'G' would now find the mindset of such a nation as inhospitable and perhaps inhabitable.

First Interview
Extract Forty One
E and G (Case Study 1)
February 2006

1	I	did you feel that that your opposite opinion was due to the fact
2		you were European?
3	G	ye:s I I felt very much that my my ~um European background was
4		wha wha what .hh imprinted in me mymymy value system you
5		know mymy .hh um: sth ~feelings for the environment um: being
6		aware that what we were doing to our environment .hh ~directly
7		impacts us because Europes(.) kind of: smallish and whatever you
8		do here really has a big impact you know you just can't go ~ah
9		200 miles away ~you know ~you're still (.)
10	E	°im[pacting°]
11	G	[i i impacting] somebody because there's always a city or a town
12		or [something] close [by]
13	I	[°mmhmm°] [°mmhmm°]
14	E	you can't just go find in the middle of the desert somewhere
15	I	right
16	G	yeah [and there's no there's]
17	E	[*in audible*]
18	G	large uninhabited really in in Europe the way(.)there are .hh ~stils
19		areas like that [inr in the US]
20	E	[well and socially]issues too like ah abortion and a woman's right
21		to choo:se
22	G	(.) ~yeah a lot [of those those things]
23	E	[rights tolerance]
24	G	~aah: a th [that are dealt with completely differently]
25	E	[OH BUT EVEN SEX EDUCATION in the] schoo:ls

26	I	°mmhmm°
27	E	[you know]
28	G	[yeah]
29	E	.hhh and whetherit is acceptable to discuss the use of condoms
30	G	[whether it should be an abstinence only]
31	E	[they were given a banana]
32	G	message you know
33	E	they were given a banana ina and a condom and said here you
34		need to know how to put his on properly
35	G	both the girls and the boys you know [had it was part of the]
36	E	[so the girls would know what a proper]
37	G	it was part of the stop AIDS education program in [Switzerland
38		[yeah]
39	I	[in in Switzerland]
30	E	and it was in school:l
31	I	mmhmm
32	E	and you know and so for hi:m it felt like stepping into the dark
33		ages
34	I	mmmhmm
35	E	which I could understa:nd because although Alaska is a
36		republican s:tate there is a lot of independent thought up there
37		um: the Average teacher in the amer in the Alaskan school system
38		has a master's degree↓
39	I	mmhmm
40	E	in in the: you know the primary education level overall is higher
41		um: .hh there's just (.) people then to be attracted to it
42	I	[mmhmm]
43	E	[that](.)want something different in their life or independence [or]
44	I	[mmhmm]
45	E	or whatever .hh and: SO I think that's what made me:: (.) .hh I
46		MEAN I JUST I was dra:wn to him
47	I	[mmhmm]
48	E	[and then I] jus I felt like I could a I could really talk to somebody
49		for the first time in I don't know how many years when I met him
50		for the first time.h I just felt like(.)I can really say what I thi::nk
51		and and I do think it had to do with his European [background]
52	I	[mmhmm]
53	E	and the fact that .hh um I didn't have to worry about somebody
54		wanting to string me up by my thumbs for what I was thinking or
55		saying.

With line 1 'I' tries to clarify the type of mindset by categorizing it as "European" and 'G' affirms this. This European mindset is attributable to another type of 'generalized other' and it was making it difficult to live in Texas. Between lines 2 and 9 'G' begins to list some of the attributes which constitute this mindset; namely awareness for the environment and how that relates to the

European community. Line 10 begins a melodic co-construction of these attributes by both 'E' and 'G'. Therefore it is a subjective polyphony comprised of two voices from the explicit presence of two separate people who have coordinated their account to some degree but also inter-subjective polyphony (intra-personal polyphony) on the part of 'E' as the most of what she contributes here regarding attributes about Europe, and later Switzerland, are most certainly artefacts from her previous conversations with at least 'G' and perhaps her in-laws. In any case, the attributes about life in Switzerland which 'E' contributes between lines 10 and 40 are pieces of information which she has definitely gotten *second hand*; meaning from other sources but she is telling 'G''s story in some case together with him and sometimes for him.

In line 42 'E' formulates 'G''s experience in Texas (and it is Texas she means because that was where he had been living in the US) as feeling *like having stepped back into the dark ages*. This is an interesting formulation as back in line 68 (Extract Twenty Seven), 'G' deployed a similar discursive tool in describing a *dark ages type* environment in Texas in which it was a place where one could get "stoned" for voicing opinions which were seen as unfavourable. In effect, 'E''s formulation of 'G''s experience in this way could possibly be an example of 'E' *chiming in* with 'G' on his formulation of Texas in this way; as such a place where one could "be stoned".

Beginning with line 45, 'E' makes her experience in Texas analogous to 'G''s by grounding this comparison in her upbringing and uses it implicitly to suggest the type of mindset she was educated amongst. This work from 'E' juxtaposes the

school system in Alaska in which there was "a lot of independent thought up there…[and] the average teacher in the…Alaskan school system has a Master's degree" and where "…the primary education level overall is higher" (l. 50) with the details of the Swiss school system (l. 25, 27-40).

Between lines 55 and 56 'E' begins the work of concluding her account for why she shares category incumbency with 'G' and his European mindset. By having presented the ways in which both she and 'G' were raised, the values and ideologies they share in and their mutual exclusion from membership in "George Bush country", 'E' closes her account by explaining that 'G' was someone with whom she could finally talk freely (l. 58-59) and attributes this to his European background (l. 61). As such, in 'G''s company, 'E' does not risk the same dark ages type punishment –being strung up by her thumbs- as 'G' mentioned for the things she thinks or says (l. 64).

First Interview
Extract Forty Two
E and G (Case Study 1)
February 2006

1	G	[ah one of] one of the other big th~ [sorry d'you]
2	I	[NO that's fine]
3	G	~um one of the other big ah things for me was the whole of
4		religion andand the church[.hhh]
5	I	[hmm]
6	G	in society and how andin in sort of the Dallas Fort Worth area I
7		think in Texas in general .hh um there's a very strong feeling of
8		what the church should be for for people .hh and and(h)and the
9		bible brings and all this: other stuff um: which um:: anditandit(.)
10		~i:ts peoples fopinion and feeling that it should ah inform law
11		making andand things like that and .hh I just really see no role for
12		(.) ah ~I mean I jusljus you [know S]
13	E	[he's a]
14	G	EPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IS [VERY BIG FOR
15		ME AND]
16	I	[IT'S SUPPOSED TO BE]
17	G	[AND THAT IT'S SUPPOSED TO BE AND]

18	E	[WELL YOU DON'T JUST] well hhhh
19	I	[he(h)ha(h)ha]
20	E	[no but there's move]ment to legislate morality
21	G	and [and you can't]
22	E	[right now]
23	G	do that
24	I	[hh(h)haha.hhhhehehe]
25	G	[andand you can't do that] just ahtato in my: ~I toto my mind you
26		just that [hhhh]
27	I	[°mmm°]
28	E	[CAUSE WE TALKED ABOUT WE TALK ABOUT W].hh
29		AFTER 911 I got very frightened because a greencard holders and
30		I don't think about most of them think about this
		skip two lines in audible
31	E	have no rights
32	I	°no°
33	E	<u>they can be</u> for <u>no</u> reason whatsoever locked up without access to
34		an attorney or their family indeffinately .hh <u>scared</u> cr:AP out of
35		me

In line 1 'G' begins to present another aspect of the contrasting mindsets between himself and his environment; namely place of religion and the church (l. 4) in Texas society. Later in line 14 'G' specifies that he is referring to the separation of church and state. 'G' localizes what he is about to say on this issue in the Dallas Fort Worth area and then immediately broadens it to Texas in general. Texas, what was categorized earlier as "George Bush country", is described by 'G' as a place where the church, the bible and "all this other stuff" (l. 9) is considered by people there as what should "inform law making" (l. 10).

'G' declares strongly in line 14 that separation of church and state is very important to him. 'I' not only agrees strongly with this (l. 16) but formulates as the way things *should* be. Both these utterances from 'G' and 'I' orient to a greater debate within and very possibly extending beyond the US regarding the transformation of a United States government into one where the lines between the executive branches of government and religion had become progressively

blurred. This change in the climate of the politics was attributed to George W. Bush. Many of George Bush's policies and indeed his greatest supporting constituency were Christian Conservatives. As Leudar, Marsland and Nekvapil present in their analysis of the speeches of US President George W. UK Prime Minister Bush, Tony Blair and Leader of Al Qaeda Osama Bin Laden immediately following the September 11th attacks in the US, Bush and Blair's responses were not without religious undertones (2004). Considering this, 'G' and 'I' are orienting to a larger Dialogical Network (see Leudar and Nekvapil, 2004) taking place in the media regarding the increasing religionization of the American political system. Furthermore, both 'I' and 'G''s assertion that church and state *are supposed to be separate* (l. 17) is an example of national languages[54] in which, say, the history of a democratic nation would be told. Although the national language on the separation of church and state is presented as having changed, 'I' is orienting to what she *had been told* in the past about one of the founding principles of the US government.

This change in the political climate in the US is formulated by 'E' as a "movement to legislate morality" (l. 20). 'G' begins to utter something which seems to expand on this idea in agreement (l. 21). However, much if not all the description work which 'G' has done up to now in creating an inhospitable place which prompted a move abroad has been localized within Texas. 'E', on the other hand, has accomplished the task of spreading this in hospitability from Texas to a national level and therefore, it is not just Texas which makes it impossible to stay but rather the US which has now become George Bush

[54] I suggest that 'G' and 'I', based upon their upbringing in different countries, have obtained this value within separate surrounding discourses, i.e. separate 'generalized others'.

country. In lines 28-34 'E' attributes this to a post- 9/11 era which saw policy changes brought on by an event which had been initiated[55] by a religious contingency.

8.1b Summary Case Study 1

Reasons for leaving as presented by 'E' are embedded deep in her past before she ever actually met her husband and made the decision to move aboard. The format of the interview and the trajectory of the initial questing from the interview placed 'E' in the position to provide a certain type of account; of a certain type of person. Having had no prior experience being in Europe, 'E' had to search for an account which could be considered plausible. A multi-cultural up-bringing in a state which was determined later by 'E' in her life to be somewhat alternative to the rest of the US left 'E' feeling as though she were a stranger in her own land. When she met her Swiss-born husband, 'G', she had an epiphany. She felt understood and this connection she attributed to his European background. Without experiential accounts to draw upon, 'E' undertook an extraordinary effort aided strategically at times by 'G' to separate herself from her native country but where her mentality did not fit and align herself with a European mentality. To do this, 'E' needed to draw upon her own feelings but also rely greatly upon information she'd collected from other people. The subjective account of 'E' about how her mentality was more closely aligned with that of Europeans saw her draw upon various inter-subjective positions. At times theses positions were in polyphonic contrast to one another while at other times aligning through a subjective position with the inter-subjectivity of 'G' and his parents –

[55] This is not to say that policies of the United States did not in some way perpetrate the events of September 11th, 2001, however the attacks were a catalyst to change in US immigration policy and diplomacy.

people whose inter-subjectivity constituted a European mindset. Furthermore, the cultural polyphony –an inter-subjectivity constituted by various cultural positions- was embedded in the part of the narrative belonging to 'E' which was being told in the present (the UK) but which was situated in the past before she ever left the US.

8.1c Case Study 2 'E' and 'K'

'E' and 'K' moved to the UK in early in 2005 for 'E''s job. 'E' was not sent to the UK as a part of an expatriate contract with a company in the United States ('E' and 'K''s native country) but rather 'E' applied for a UK-based position in his search for a new job.

First Interview
Extract Forty Three
E and K (Case Study 2)
November 2005

1	K	.hhh K:: wanna explain how we <u>got</u> here?
2	E	alright
3	K	he(h)he(h)he
4	E	um (1.1) well I was:: very tired of at my job in Chicago as well as
5		completely depressed about the po (.) overall political situation
6	I	mmhmm
7	E	and: so I started applying and found basically I found basically
8		five job opportunities and two in Chic: we were living in Chicago
9	I	mmhmm
10	E	which is Kelly's home town. And um (.) I found two job
11		opportunties in Chicago but neither worked out. And (.) one (.) in
12		(.) Atlanta, Georgia which was (1.0) would have been a stretch but
13		we would've: (.) probably (.) well you would've (.) liked it more
14	I	atlanta?
15	E	yeah. Ah that didn't quite pan out. I I forgot what the next one
16		was: and then um: (.) and then this one ~I think Kelly said .hh her
17		mom had this premonition that when she found out I was applying
18		ta job in England I would get it. Um (.) I thought it was ludicrous
19		that I would get a <u>job</u> in England but nonetheless it was (.) a really
20		interesting opportunity so
21	I	mmhmm
22	E	um: (.) within a (.) few weeks they called me up to do a phone
23		interview and um: that went really well. And then (.) we had (.)
24		kind of a long conversation about whether I should even (.) do the

25		(.) next step
26	I	mmhmm
27	E	in fact (.) it ah (.) it was a fight
28	I	mmHMM
29	E	and I end up ah
30	I	happens he(h)he(h)he(h)he
31	E	going to um: (.) Cambridge for ah basically two days: and did a
32		face to face interview
33	I	mmhmm
34	E	and at that point they offered me the job and I (.) c came back and
35		we talked about it and we had another fight
36	I	hhhhe(h)he
37	E	finally decided that
38	K	thought it was disagreement didn't think it was a fight
39	E	well there was ah
40	I	hm(h)hm(h)ha(h)ha
41	K	I was
42	E	you were
43	K	very hesitant
44	I	uh huh
45	K	because I knew that um (.) there was no support system for us over
46		here my mom has been great (.) as far as s:upporting us when I
47		when both of us would go to work she would take care of Kendall
48		[because she's retired (.)]
49	I	[mmmhmm mmmhmmm]
50	K	so: I really (.) was (.) very hesitant about m:oving over here
51		because you know I I liked London we'd been to London once (.)
52		to visit (.) but ah: living over here I thought would be difficult
53		because we wouldn't really hav:e any type of social life and I
54		wouldn't have any type of (.) outlet
55	I	mmhmm
56	E	yeah
57	K	so

'K' answers the solicitation for a story about how they came to England by delegating the work for doing so to her husband, 'E' (l. 1). Although the telling of their collective story is entrusted to 'E', the inflexion upon the word 'got' from 'K' suggests that while their story is shared, there is something odd about the way 'K' enunciates the word 'got'; almost as if she cannot quite fathom the story. Her laughter in line 3 puts a further evaluative gloss onto the utterance.

'E' grounds *how they got here* (reasons for leaving the US) in career and political dissatisfaction (l. 4-5) yet a move abroad stemming from these reasons was not imminent but merely one of the possibilities as 'E' mostly applied for jobs in the US with the exception of one, which was in England. Amusingly, considering that a move to Atlanta to Chicago would not have meant moving countries, 'E' suggests in line 12 that the job in Atlanta "would have been a stretch". It is not certain if the distance between Atlanta and Chicago was the contingent point or if he is making reference to a possible *cultural distance* between the northern city of Chicago and the southern city of Atlanta. Interesting still, a move within the US would not have helped his 'depression about the overall political situation' (l. 5).

'E' uses his reflexivity in which he summarizes previous bits of conversations he and 'K' have had in the past about *aspects of the kinds of places 'K' might and might not like* into the utterance of "well you would've liked it more" (l. 13). In 'E''s story (l. 10-13) it seems what 'E' is implicitly referring to is a greater *presupposed* possible cultural difference between Chicago and Atlanta than between Chicago and England but in the end 'K' "probably" (l. 13) would have liked it more.

Having been unsuccessful in obtaining any of the jobs in the US which he had applied to, 'E' steps briefly out of telling his story in the conversational historical present (CHP) and formulates having gotten "this one" (l. 16), his current job, by

default[56]. Lines 16-20 'E' presents what I believe to a socially-constructed 'reaction to the possible move to England' which is constituted by the voices of 'E', 'K' and 'K''s mother. The way in which this polyphony is structured is that initially 'E' had uttered to his wife 'K' that there "was a really interesting opportunity" (l. 19) in England. 'E''s mother in law "found out" that he was applying to a job in England (l. 17-18), i.e. likely told to her by 'K' and after having heard the news, shared with 'K' her premonition that 'E' would get the job in England (l. 17-18). The mother in law's premonition was then told back to 'E' by 'K'.

Lines 22-35 show 'E' presenting the next chronological steps in the story. 'E' condenses a period of time of "a few weeks" (l. 22) and embedded in this story are artefacts from the conversations which ensued over this period of time about "whether I should even do the next step" (l. 24). After having had a face-to-face interview in Cambridge, 'E' was offered the job, returned to the US and "...talked about it" and "had another fight" (l. 35) with 'K'.

Up to this point in this extract, 'K' has been physically silent, but her *voice* has been very present in the story which 'E' has been telling. It was 'K' who had delegated the telling of a story in which she is included to 'E' and therefore the story 'E' is telling needs to be one in which 'K' can hear her voice in what is being told.

[56] Sometimes in American English the phrase "win by default" is used to say someone has automatically won as there is only one in a competition. "There was only one man in the course so he has won by default".

Up to this point the story seems accurate to 'K'. However, in line 38 she downgrades 'E''s categorization of the "fight" they had about the move to England (l. 35) to a "disagreement" (l. 38). At this point, 'K' lends her physical voice to detail the turning point of this story where she and 'E' began to split regarding how they saw the shape of their story and what the relevant points were to each regarding such a move. In line 41 she begins and it appears that 'E' knows what the point or points are of the story yet to unfold as told by 'K'. 'E' follows 'K''s two word utterance of "I was" (l. 41) with "you were" (l. 42). Although it is clear that their personal positions about this move are at this point in the narrative in opposition to one another, 'E' and 'K' harmonize the narrative here briefly through their mutual reflexivity to the point in time when they realized that they shared differing opinions; almost as though one is playing the melody while the other is playing the harmony.

Although 'E' has up to this point constructed a shared story of 'E' and 'K' which included reasons for leaving the US, 'K' begins in line 45 to present a contrasting account to 'E'. The structure of this part of the story as told by 'K' shares parallels to the structure of 'E''s account, though the parallels are in *mirrored contrast*. Where 'E' presented reasons for leaving the US in the earlier section of this extract, 'K' presents reasons for *not wanting to leave* the US namely; "no support system" (l. 45) which includes child care for 'K' and 'E''s son as well as the absence of "any type of social life" (l. 53). I refer briefly for the moment back to the analysis of the stories in message boards presented in chapter six. Following my explanation about the structure of stories, I showed the polyphonic quality in the narratives about customer service. Because the respondents of

those message boards had all chosen to write their stories under the thread entitled "customer service"; it was likely that most stories or posts which would be found there would be salient in some way; i.e. that they would be stories about experiences of customer-service provider interactions, include predictable "characters" for a customer service scenario and so on. The same kind of analytical mentality can be applied to this section of the extract if we see 'E' and 'K''s respective *reason presenting* activities as 1st story/2nd story unit. As such, 'K' has oriented to the structure of 'E''s first story in which he *lists reasons* about wanting to leave the US over job dissatisfaction and depression over the political situation. 'K' then structures her story *listing reasons* not to leave the US such as familial support and a social network. Unlike the example of the message boards where respondents were "guided" as to what kinds of stories or structure of stories were likely, the context of this interview does not limit the interaction in this way. Therefore I suggest that this reflexivity is not only oriented to the accounting work being done in the here and now but contains aspects of past discussions and is therefore polyphonic in both its structure as well as it's temporal content.

In line 50 'K' presents a contingency which was also visible in the data from Chapter Six regarding the difference between people who visit a place and people who actually live there, i.e. the difference between tourists and expats. 'K' explains that she believes just because one has been to a particular place and liked it, does not mean that they will be happy living there (l. 51-52) and grounds this in the questionable availability of a "social life" or "any type of outlet" (l. 54-55). There is of course nothing which *prevents* 'E' and 'K' from building a

social life in England; no language barrier. Therefore it seems that 'K' is saying that the lack of a *ready-made* or *established* social life would be problematic to her; much in the concern of Schutz's (1944) 'Stranger' which I discussed in Chapter Four. This same problem would have occurred, however, if they had moved to a new city in the US. So it seems likely that there are other reasons that England caused particular concern.

First Interview
Extract Forty Four
E and K **(Case Study 2)**
November 2005

1	E	well ~I I guess (.) and part of it was the question (.) whether it was
2		going to be: <temporary or permanent> and I think (.) um: (.) <and
3		I think> we both (.) thought it <u>could</u> be permanent and that's (.)
4		ch:anged [but um]
5	I	[mmhmm]
6	E	so it seemed like a really big step.
7	I	[mmhmm]
8	E	[I mean] bigger than the time we moved to New York which was:
9		kind of exciting but not nearly as: frightening I think
10	I	mmhmm
11	E	um:: (1.2)
12	I	[you moved??]
13	E	[but we weighed the various] options <and I mean> some of things
14		kind of happened in the meantime were (.) ah Kelly's job was
15		starting a little more tenuous and I think (.) the irony is had we
16		HAD we stayed we probably both would have been unemployed at
17		least for a little while [so:]
18	I	[mmhmm]
19	K	[yeah and] and they were layin people off like crazy and I was the
20		<u>last</u> one to come <u>on</u>
21	I	[mmmm::]
22	K	[so you know] last one on
23	I	[mmahh:]
24	K	[first one off]
25	E	so for a little while it seemed it almost <u>was</u> a smart because you
26		know well (.) ° ~um° (.) °~i ~i ~a° (.) um. In mine my my job
27		situations certainly better um. It's still a <u>very</u> <u>stress</u>ful job because
28		it's a challenging job but it's it's much better than what I was doing
29		the last you know (.) seven (.) to nine months like w:here I was
30		before

Line 1 shows 'E' presenting another contingency which also surfaced in the data presented in Chapter Six regarding length of time/intended duration abroad. 'E''s utterance here is directed toward what 'K' has just said about the difference between visiting a place and living there. The contingency of *time* in a stay abroad differentiates between tourists or someone who actually lives there and therefore has other implications to consider and experiences the culture in a totally different way (refer to Chapter Six). Furthermore, what 'E' says between lines 1-3 are reflexive to a discussion (or discussions) 'K' and 'E' had regarding *issues around the move* preceding their time in England. Seeing as 'E' and 'K' both "thought it could be permanent" (l. 3) the issues of people who are not tourists were the ones which occupied the attention of 'E' and 'K' (l. 6).

In line 8, 'E' does something which was present in data from Case Study 1 and will be seen in the data from Case Study 3 in which moves between US cities and moves between the US and places abroad are contrasted. Here 'E' is stating that switching cities is not like switching countries and with that presenting the US as a place which is to some extent homogenous. This is an opposite approach in describing self in relation to place as to what 'E' from Case Study 1 initially presented in her attempt to produce an account of someone who grew up in a different kind of place (despite the fact that she had never left the US) yet changes within her narrative by creating the US as a George Bush country type place which is ipso facto homogenous.

However, this is a change in position from 'E' as back in line 12 (Extract 30) he mentioned that the possibility of a move to Atlanta, Georgia "would have been a

stretch" and as I showed in the analysis of that part of the extract, this utterance suggested a greater *presupposed* cultural distance between Chicago and Atlanta than that between Chicago and England.

Up to this point, the co-constructed story of 'E' and 'K' on how they came to making a decision to live in England has been a true symphony of shared short story structures, harmonized together with contrasting positions. At times, the voice of 'K' has played a more leading part; at times that of 'E'. Furthermore, it seems that while 'K''s contributions to this interview setting have been to a great extent monologous –meaning they have been spoken from her position and contain only her voice, 'E', and his charge of *explaining how they got there*, has displayed a significant amount of polyphony in the things his physical voice has uttered.

This continues in what 'E' presents between lines 13 and 17 in which he summarizes the job situation of both he and 'K' during the time when they were considering the move to England. One of the points 'E' mentions is that 'K''s job was looking more tenuous and that the risk was that they could have both been unemployed at some point in the near future. 'K' steps in briefly between lines 19 and 16 to provide additional relevant details about how the status of her job looked at that time. With this 'K' is in brief harmony with 'E' and sharing a position of someone who's job was also dissatisfactory or at risk and then steps back once again from the story to allow 'E' to sum up the story. Having gotten from 'K' this one moment of *togetherness* in their story, 'E' sums up the decision to move (having presented earlier that the job in England was by default) as

"almost…smart" (l. 25). Therefore, the collective reason of 'E' and 'K' for moving to England is embedded solely in a job. As the trouble 'E' has in following his utterance from line 25 shows, he is not sure where to go with the story from here.

8.1d Summary of case study 2

The move abroad was presented by 'E' and 'K' through a collective story which for the most part included the voices of both participants but the majority of which was told by 'E'. However, as I argued, the telling of a collective story by one person while the other is present obliges that the teller to orient toward the other member in telling a story which the other member would consider consistent. At such times as the other member intervenes, that part of the story is no longer representing what the other member considers the real story to be.

The contingent reasons for the move were presented as largely economical and political. The move was not, in contrast to Case Study One, embedded in a story about an inevitable destiny but rather more of a chance endeavour to try something which may or may not have resulted in something permanent. Therefore, the initial orientation to the move was tenuous, making it easier in long run to explain that it didn't work out.

The polyphony seen in this case was largely a narrative polyphony; observed in the account about a couple's collective decision-making process and experiences. Sometimes this account was told by one person –orienting as I mentioned inter-subjectively to the other. At other times the account was co-constructed with

brief and intermittent branching-off by one member, usually 'K', to tell separate or contrasting parts of the same story. This was seen explicitly through the example of the *reason presenting* 1st/2nd story unit in which 'E' had presented reasons for leaving the US while 'K' later presented reasons *not to leave* the US.

Section II

8.2a Case Study 3 'L' and 'J'

'J' and 'L' moved to the UK during 2005 for 'J''s job as a part of an expatriate contract with a company in the United States ('J' and 'L''s native country). Due to circumstances which will be looked at through data in the next chapter, 'J' had been travelling back and forth between the US and the UK for several months before it was certain that he would be moved to London. After the offer was official, 'L' made arrangements to live with him there.

First Interview
Extract Forty Five
L and J **(Case Study 3)**
February 2006

1	J	it started becoming more like three weeks London: one week
2		New Yor::k a month London:: [um]
3	I	[mmhmm]
4	J	and as things started getting more and more busy .hh ah:: just
5		was turning to be a little bit more time in London versus New
6		York .hh and then by:: the December of: 2004 that year (.) they:
7		had asked me if I would consider moving over for a two year
8		assign↑ment↓ (.) so:: <u>we</u> decided: (??) January of 2005 that we
9		would (.) we would ↑take that assign↑ment↑
10	I	mmhmm
11	J	(clears throat) so:: (.) sth (??) business trips .hh my first official
12		da:y in the UK as a UK °emp° you know as a UK employee in the
13		office was: the first of March: 2005
14	I	mkay
15	J	and then: we kinda went through the transition of tryin to PACK
16		every up and move <so> .hhh we eh we actually gotta (.) up until
17		that point I was kinda living out of a living out of a hotel in
18		Canary Wha(h)r(h)f:
19	I	oh wow
20	J	um: (.) and when they: would put me up ina like in a like and
21		executive suite so I had a li you know living room and a kitchen

22		and (.) a bedroom. Sosoit was like having a small apartment
23	I	ok
24	J	but we moved into this place in March of:
25	L	well you did
26	J	well I DID

The interview has just begun and 'J' responds to the call for his story by embedding the story about the move to England in the context of a job (l. 1-13). In contrast to the cases presented in section 7.1, 'J' (I shall address 'L' in a moment) does not connect his current story to his earlier history; he is being interviewed about his being an expat in England and his relevant start point is here, with his job. It is presented as just a natural progression in his career development. This remains the case throughout the extracts from this section of the interview with 'J' and 'L'. Between lines 1 and 7, 'J' speaks from a first person position and therefore, this part of the narrative is solely his.

Some trouble begins for 'J', however when he needs to include his wife, 'L', in the collective story about their move. As I discussed explicitly with the case of 'E' and 'K' (Case Study 2), because of the fact that 'I' is interviewing *the couple* together as a unit, the story being told –regardless of who is speaking- needs to be seen by both partners as a story about *them*. This trouble can be seen in line 9 where, up to this point, the story had been rather free flowing from 'J' as to what was going on, the time frame in which things were happening and so on. In line 9, 'J' begins constructing the 'we' part of the account of he and 'L'. 'J' orients to the fact that presenting a story about the couple moving abroad and the decision making process which inevitably occurs prior to a move needs to be presented as what I call a 'we-type account'. The 'we' is an utterance which includes more than the voice of the speaker is concurrently oriented toward that/those others

who may be present. However, as the change in speech rhythm with extended enunciations, brief pauses and upward inflexions which had been absent up this point indicate, 'J' is uttering these things perhaps tenuously. This is followed by 'J' clearing his throat (l. 11) and pausing before continuing with the story. As we will come to see shortly, the story as it has been started by 'J' is not what 'L' sees as the appropriate starting point of this story. 'J' begins to wrap up the story of coming to England with explaining how things were with respect to his living arrangements at the time just prior to the beginning of his full time contract in March of 2005.

In line 24, 'J' continues in chronologically with a 'we' type account and is now up to March 2005 when he began as a full-time employee in London, living in "this place". It is at this point that 'L' begins to contribute her voice to the story (l. 25). In contrast to Case Study 2 in which 'E' had been charged by 'K' with telling their collective story and then that story subsequently was a collective story, the story 'J' has told to this point has to a great extent just his. 'L' reformulates 'J's telling of this point in time in line 25 by clarifying that it was he who had "moved into this place" in March of 2005 and not both he and 'L'. 'L' was not yet at this time even in London, but back in the US and as she will tell shortly, only *now* taking seriously that the move was happening and that her life was moving to London.

First Interview
Extract Forty Six
L and J **(Case Study 3)**
February 2006

1	L	and basically I couldn't mov:e until the animals: (.) did their
2		quarantine
3	I	[okay]

4	L	[there] so there's a whole thing that you have to go through
5	I	so: you oh right the six month [??]
6	L	[SO THIS WHOLE] TIME IN LIVING IN still living in New
7		Jersey
8	I	oh okay
9	L	um:: so: when it became an official: I should have sta(h)r(h)ted
10		the process but <u>honestly</u> I was procastinating hoping it wasn't
11		gonna happen↑ °I'll be truthful°
12	I	hm[(h)hm(h)hm]
13	L	[and] um:: s:o I didn't <u>start</u> the process of gettin them ready to:
14		travel until (.) the <u>off</u>er was put on the table officially
15	I	[°okay°]
16	L	[so:] um: fix it (.) the process to get the cats ready is: they have to
17		be (.) um: mircochipped vaccinated for rabies
18	I	mmhmm
19	L	then they do some crazy blood test that get's sent off to some lab
20		and then six months from the day of the blood test [°they can
21		travel°]
22	I	[yeah]
23	L	so THAT WAS September was so I I couldn't come here until
24		September
25	I	okay
26	L	so I arrived on September third
27	I	actually thethe I had the same problem with my dog
28	L	SO WE DID THAT LALONG DISTANCE THING for like a
29		year a half [before]
30	I	[okay]
31	L	I got here

Having just explicated the point where she does not see herself as apart of the collective story 'J' had been telling up to this point, 'L' grounds the reason for this firstly in needing to prepare their animals for the trip to England, "and basically I couldn't move until the animals did their quarantine" (l. 1-5).

Although 'L' and 'I' have exchanged information around preparing animals to come into the UK privately, 'L' finds this a relevant point to this story in the interview context[57]. However, the knowledge[58] 'I' had about this preparation

[57] The fact that 'L' details this process to the extent she does even though she and 'I' have spoken significantly in private about their shared experiences seems to indicate that 'L' seems to be *going on record*; i.e. that this is very much an interview and not a simple conversation at this point.

process allows me to draw the conclusion I stated above that 'L' only took seriously the move after 'J' began his job as a full-time employee in the UK in March of 2005 and not any time prior although there would certainly have been an official offer "put on the table" prior to March 2005. It was clear that things had been moving in this direction for several months prior; at least as early as December of 2004 (l. 7 Extract Thirty Two).

Even though 'I' displays membership knowledge about preparing pets for the scheme in line 6 as well as line 27, 'L' does not allow this to derail the chronological ordering of her story. In line 10 'L' tells that inspite of "when it became official", she still did not start the process of preparing the animals because she was still hoping it would not happen (l. 11-12) and glosses this with a quietly uttered "I'll be truthful". Again, it is uncertain as to whether or not according to 'L' *it becoming official* was prior to March 2005 as she says that she did not start the process until "the offer was put on the table officially" (l. 15). This gloss and the contents (issues) are what 'L' presents as the relevant points to her part of this story and they begin to create a character position for 'L' as the spouse who does not have any reasons to leave the US; it has yet to unfold if she has specific reasons to stay. This is unlike 'K' in Case Study 2 where it is clear that there were reasons to stay in the US but also one reason to leave; the prospect of both 'E' and 'K' becoming unemployed.

[58] Under the PETS Scheme, people from certain originating countries may bring their animals into the UK and forgoe the previous mandatory six month qarauntine if they follow a very specific preparatory protocol. This process requires that the animal be micro-chipped, vaccinated against Rabbies followed a month later by a blood test confirming the negative test result. Once this result has been documented, the animal may travel to the UK six months to the date of that result. Therefore, this process requires a total of seven months preparatory time.

'L' brings her part of the narrative up to the point where 'J' had stopped his back in line 24 (Extract Thirty Two); however the points in time which are represented by their separate parts of their narrative are in September 2005 and March 2005 respectively. What this means is that 'L' sees September 2005 as the time when she officially arrived in the UK together with the cats whereas 'J' said that they had moved into their current apartment in March (l. 24 Extract Thirty Two). Now that the time line of a collective story about 'L' and 'J''s move into their London apartment has been clarified, the story can continue. This separate orientation as to when their lives together in the UK began plays a fundamental role in the course their narratives will take. It appears that while 'L' and 'J' are a couple with a couple's story about being in the UK together, they in fact also have their own separate narratives which are interwoven within the tapestry of this explicit narrative which is being told; that of a couple's move to another country. At times there is coordination visible in the activities done to produce a collective story but there seems to be an implicit narrative too which seems to be for the purpose of presenting to *each other* their personal positions on this move, the ramifications of it and so on. The presence of several types of narrative simultaneously within a single explicit, collaborative narrative structure shows polyphony in narratives as well as inter-subjective and subjective positions.

First Interview
Extract Forty Seven
L and J **(Case Study 3)**
February 2006

1	J	what we did what we had ah::when I was in business trips she'd
2		com:e for weekend vis↓its↓: .hh or then once we finally made the
3		move over she'd come for an extended weekend we would .hh you
4		know we had the whole weekend of trying to find a place to live
5	I	mmh[mm]
6	L	[yeah]
7	J	um:: then once we found a plac:e then we:: (.) had a few days wer

8		we just (.) .hh we were going to move most our furniture or buy
9		new furniture in the US so: um we just <you know> went
10		SHOPPING for like the essentials
11	I	mmhmm
12	J	so I was basically living here with you know a jus: couple towels
13		an: couple pillo[ws]
14	L	[he wa]s living downstairs in [the: ONE ROOM ????]
15	I	[he(h)ha: SOUNDS FAMILIAR YEAH YEAH] all for the sake of
16		the animals my husband [would sp chime right in with you]
17	L	[he(h)he(h)he(h)he(h)he(h)he]
18	I	.hh [ha(h)]ha(h)ha
19	J	[so] and thwe were lucky to give our landlord when we when we
20		actually looked at this place there wasr a new build so they had (.)
21		f:furniture in one of the show units↑
22	I	uhhuh
23	J	and: he: I think two or three of the the places so: there was uhuh:
24		murphy beds pulled down from the wall↑
25	I	[uh huh]
26	J	[so] we asked him if he could put it into our unit: so we could
27		have it as a guestroom but also: so we could sleep youknow I had
28		a place to sleep until: all our furniture arri[ved]
		three lines omitted as 'L' speaks to the cats
29	J	(.) so it's kind of been abou:t ~i it's really been a <youknow
30		almost> ohohmo more than a year and half but it's kind like ah for
31		me but it's been kind of on and off: .hh ana: I would so KIND of
32		almost consider like March kinda like my first when I really move
33		here but then .hh we really have the furniture an: you know Lynn
34		wasn't here: and the here and the cats weren't here until: July [eh]
35	L	[°September°]
36	J	and it was AUGust September time I mean so:
37	I	yeah

With lines 1-2 'J' describes how things were during the time when he and 'L' were spending more time apart. In the reformulation of who had actually moved into the apartment in London which took place in line 25 (Extract Thirty Two), 'L' made clear (and 'J' concurred) that she had not yet moved into the apartment; she was still back in New Jersey. Yet a curious thing happens in lines 2-3 with 'J' uttering "or then once we finally made the move over she'd come for an extended weekend…" 'J' is continuing to tell a 'we' story although still at the point the in time to which he is referring 'J' had been living and working on a full-time basis in the UK but 'L' had not yet joined him on a permanent basis.

'J' continues throughout this extract to describe the activities they engaged in as a couple in setting up a new household during their weekend visits (l. 7-9). There comes a point, however, between lines 12-14 where 'J' and 'L', with their separate voices, are in melody about the fact that 'J' is living on his own in the apartment in London. This part of the story shows polyphony a within the same story 'L' and 'J' are reflexively considering the details of the shared story and are adding to the story in a coordinated way but not repeating what the other has already said. This sees explicitly different parts being played by two individuals but with this case, it is more of a rarity that this kind of coordination takes place.

Lines 14 and 15-16 uttered by 'L' and 'I' respectively show a unique polyphony in the form of an explicit 1st story and an implicit 2nd story. Let me explain. For the majority of this interview, 'L' has told a story about preparing their animals for the move to the UK. This preparation time, a minimum of seven months, required that 'L' stay behind in the US while 'J' begin his new job in the UK. As 'J' had just explained in line 12, he had "basically been living here with…jus: couple of towels an: couple of pillows" in the one room down stairs (l. 14 as uttered by 'L'). In lines 15-16 'I' adopts the same position as 'L' as someone who stays back in the country of origin preparing an animal for travel to the UK while her husband is living alone in a house in the UK with very little but a bed to sleep on and a few essentials; "all for the sake of the animals" (l. 15-16). With this latter point, 'I' is addressing both 'L' as person who shares her position as well as 'J' as a person who's position is opposite to hers and analogous to someone is absent from the interaction but present within the second story of 'I'.

Furthermore, 'I' orients explicitly to the polyphony of shared positions between 'J' and the absent person, 'I''s husband, through the use of a musical metaphor, "chime right in" (l. 16).

The activity between lines 15 and 18 are, however, remain between 'L' and 'I', and even though 'I' addresses 'J' implicitly in line 16, he does not respond to this and once the laughter among 'L' and 'I' ceases, 'J' continues on with his part of the story about the apartment search and finally deciding upon the apartment they are living now (l. 19-28).

Between lines 29 and 34, 'J' summarizes the stages of a gradual move of himself, the furniture, 'L' and the animals. He reiterates that he considers March as "when I really move here" and states that 'L' and the cats weren't there with him until July although 'L' had in lines 24 and 25 (Extract Thirty Tree) stated that she had not come here until September and lists the specific date of September 3rd in line 27 (Extract Thirty Three). Upon hearing 'J''s error in the time line, 'L' corrects him (l. 35). Interestingly, 'J' does not accept this reformulation/correction entirely and reformulates the description of the time as "and it was AUGust or September time…" (l. 36).

Despite 'L''s very specific naming of a date in which she arrived in the UK, 'J' does not seem to be oriented to the specificity of time or events in same manner as 'L'. Up to this point, this story, although contributed to by both partners, is not a really a shared story. Both partner's have parts in the stories that each one tells

in this interview together but events, relevant activities and issues and points of orientation seem more separate than together.

As I presented above, the account of the couple's current presence in England which was begun by 'J' and embedded in his being offered to take an extended assignment by his employer, has been contributed to by both partner's but the continuity of the story is lacking in any real sense of *togetherness*. While there are moments which the couple seem to be on the same page, it is not yet possible to draw any firm conclusions about 'L''s position on this move now, i.e. as it is being discussed here after some time has gone by. At the point of this interview, 'L' had been living in London on a full-time basis for about five months whereas 'J' had been doing so for about eleven and had been spending a great time of time in London in the year preceding March 2005.

At the beginning of my analysis of Case Study 3, I highlighted the contrast between the way in which this interview began and two interviews from the previous section (7.1). The interviews of section 7.1 were collected with people who had made a decision to move abroad but *were not corporate sponsored.* The data from the previous section showed participants accounting for their moves through either extended histories in which they determined that the US was not the place for them or a combination of these issues together with seeking employment. Either way, there was a need (hence the way in which the participants structured their stories) to provide reasons.

Although 'E' and 'K' of Case Study 2 mentioned employment as a contingency of the decision to move, their move was not sponsored by an employer who 'E' had been working for in the US as I showed in the data from Chapter Six in which 'I', 'E' and 'K' negotiated what kind of expats they were. The reason I am discussing this now is that 'L', while married to a corporate-sponsored expat, does not yet show herself in any way as being a part of a decision to move. She has detailed the activities (logistics, etc.) but has not presented anything about how this move relates to her personally. 'K''s part of the story from Case Study 2 is somewhat similar to 'L' in that they both do not provide any kind of historical account as to why the move to England had become inevitable. However, as I showed at the end of the analysis of Case Study 2, 'K' did align to 'E''s account in that the risk of both becoming unemployed was evident.

For 'L', there is no evidence yet that this move was something which her history would have determined. In the data below, what is presented is a history which suggests that a move like this would have been extremely unlikely.

First Interview
Extract Forty Eight
L and J **(Case Study 3)**
February 2006

1	I	did you actually <u>talk</u> about going to Tokyo like to<u>gether</u>?
2	L	he knew that [wasn't]
3	J	[um:]
4	L	happening ha(h)ha(h)[ha(h)ha]
5	J	[we gah:] ↑I <u>kind</u>↓ of::↓ said↓ it:: youknow I kinda had a feeling
6		at some point maybe the offer was going to come
7	I	[mmhmm]
8	J	[and wewe] sort of talked about it:: and .hh you know I was ther::e
9		~an Lynn she's just you know wasn't really: she didn't think <u>Asia</u>
10		(.) was a place that she'd wanta go::
11	I	yeah even for a shor [ah: short period of time]
12	L	[well let's ba:ck] we can back up further than that when <u>we</u> met
13		each other: was <u>right</u> when he graduated from college and he was:

14		like li:terally the weekend like he was moving .hh
15		°°soahhhh:::cks°°°
16	I	°it's really okay°
17	L	MOVING to um:: [New York]
18	I	[he(h)he(h)he .hh]
19	L	and I was still in Ann ↑Arbor
20	I	ah:(h):
21	L	and:: um we had had mutual friends and stuff and ~we talked and
22		said
23		"oh let's kept in tou:ch" and I think neither of us thought we
24		would
25	I	yeah
26	L	but we DID and then we did the long distance thing for a year and
27		then when we got engaged I moved to: (.) well (.) we choo chose
28		Hobocken New Jersey um: [andand]
29	I	[YEAH: I had a frie]nd who lived there too [yeah]
30	L	[um::] because my work was in New Jersey but THAT was (.) the
31		hardest thing I've ever done in my life was to make that transition
32		because .hh we're also ten years age difference
33	I	[mmhmm]
34	L	[so when] we got married I was (.) what? [thirty]
35	J	[thirty four]
36	L	thirty three thirty four
37	I	mkay
38	L	.hh so: I ha(h)d lived my whole life in Ann Arbor I had all my
39		friends [I had my]
40	I	[yeah::]
41	L	job I was like totally SET
42	I	yeah::
43	L	whereas he was just starting
44	I	mm::
45	L	you know his new life after college [kin]
46	I	[hm(hh)]
47	L	da thing so that was a really really hard transition for me so: .hh
48		MOVing in general is not (.) my thing and that was:: I was very
49		homesick and there were lots of times when °°think°° °I was
50		gonna° get in the car and go ho(h)m(h)e
51	I	mmhmm
52	L	ca(h)l(h)l off the wedding and the whole shab[ang]
53	I	[yeah::]
54	L	[and um::] .hh so the thought of moving to Tokyo when that came
55		up I was like there's just no way
56	I	hmm↓
57	L	so this was almost: (.) a relief in a way::
58	I	ah(h)h(h)a
59	L	they spea(h)k English and they drink beer [that's what I keep tellin
60		everybody]

This extract begins at a point in the interview where there had been a short break and 'J' had mentioned that the possibility of being offered to go to Asia had also been looming. 'J' had made frequent business trips there as he had similarly done to London. 'I' releases the question, based upon her analysis of the two situations as being similar, i.e. frequent business trips to London and Asia, as to whether or not the possibility to live in Asia had been offered to 'J' and whether the two had discussed going there together (l. 1).

Here is the point where 'L' adds an additional gloss as to her position to the issue of moving abroad (similar to what she had done when she explained that she had not started the animals on the PETS Scheme because she was hoping it wasn't going to happen) with "he knew that wasn't happening" (l. 2 and 4). With this, the position of 'L' is clear and does not really need any further clarification. However, 'J' wants to provide his own answer to this question. In answering the question, 'J' positions himself as a person who "had a feeling at some point maybe the offer was going to come" (l. 5-6) but that "Lynn she's just you know wasn't really: she didn't think Asia was a place that she'd wanna go" (l. 9-10). As such, not going to Asia rests with 'L' as both she and 'J' formulate. Here, the couple are briefly synchronized. What I mean by synchronized here is that 'J''s action in telling the story in this way shows his uptake of 'L''s *other* position and although he names that position as belonging to 'L' it is still being included in the narrative which *he* is telling.

'I' offers up the contingency of time, a popular contingency in expat talk, (as I have shown through the data several times) to 'L' in line 11. In offering "...even

for a short period of time", 'I' is suggesting that one can go abroad even to a place where one doesn't really want to go but that it is survivable if the time frame is not too long. This utterance from 'I' influences the trajectory of the interview onward. For 'L', it isn't about Asia, or London or length of time specifically but *moving in general.*

'L' finds the telling of her past now as necessary to explain the here and now; "well let's back, we can back up further than that when we met each other" (l. 12-13). For the rest of this extract, 'L' is telling the story with the exception of two points in which 'J' utters supporting remarks to the story being told by 'L'. His remarks, however, are not related to his current position as an expat in London. In fact, he does not orient any of the shared past 'L' is telling to his current state. For him, the contingencies about his presence in London have been told. His account was brief and it was simply that he had been offered the opportunity by his employer.

'L' presents a story between lines 13 and 19 of the beginning of her relationship with 'J'. 'J''s character position in this story as produced by 'L' is that of a young man[59] just finishing university and moving to New York (l. 13). The relationship continues despite 'J''s move to New York (l. 17) with 'L' "still in Ann Arbor" (l. 19). This part of the story shares parallels to the story of 'L' and 'J''s move from the US to the UK in that 'J' went on to the next destination

[59] 'J' is ten years younger than 'L' and although the membership category of *recent college graduate* is described in more of an action description ("right when he graduated from college) as opposed to an overt categorization as such, the work being done can be understood the same as had 'L' categorized 'J' as a recent college graduate. This point is explicitly mentioned later in the data and becomes a relevant contingency as it fixes 'J' to a category in the MCD of *stages of life*; one which 'L' presents as having passed some time ago.

whereas 'L' remained at the point of 'J''s origin. However, the relationship at this point was still quite new.

The long distance relationship continued for a year until their engagement at which point 'L' moved to New Jersey (l. 28). The narrative has now arrived to the point which allows 'L' to link her present state in London with her past; the fact that moving was something which she discovered, following her move to New Jersey, as something which is very hard for her to do. 'L' says explicitly in lines 30-31 "THAT was the hardest thing I've ever done in my life was to make that transition". 'L' pins the reason for this upon the contingency of *age* (the ten years age difference between she and 'J') suggesting that considering both she and 'J' spent most if not all their lives in Ann Arbor, in 'L' having spent *ten more years there* meant a whole different set of circumstances for her than for 'J' in moving to New Jersey. She lists these circumstances as being friends (l. 40), job (l. 42) and the feeling of belonging somewhere; being "totally SET" (l. 42) in contrast to 'J' who "was just starting" (l. 4) his new life after "college" (l. 46).

Therefore, out of this experience, 'L' concluded that "moving in general is not my thing..." (l. 48). However, 'L' has still not presented any connection *–for herself*, having told this story, to how it is that she came to being in the UK[60].

What I am saying with the above is, 'L''s life in London –for however long it is to be- is a new chapter in her autobiography. As I discussed in Chapter Four,

[60] Although one could say that 'L' is in the UK because that is where her husband's job took them and at that time 'J' was the only one of the couple with a job, the possibility still exists that 'L' could have remained in the US or that 'J' could have refused the job on account of 'L''s resistance to leave the US. Therefore, there is still room for 'L' to provide *her* reasons for being there; i.e. the personal meaning of the experience.

narrative is a metaphor for psychology. It seems that 'L' has not yet, after five months of living in London and with a foreseeable additional two and a half years to go, worked out how to weave this new aspect of life into her story.

In line 55 'L' has concluded her story by reorienting what she is telling back to the question from 'I' (l. 1) about whether moving to Asia (Tokyo) even for a short period of time had been discussed. In closing her story in this way, 'L' is implicitly saying that a story like the one she has just told is grounds for why she would not have considered moving there. I will address in a moment how 'L' makes cultural distance an important contingency.

'L' begins to contrast what could have been (a move to Tokyo) with what is (a move to London) and categorizes the latter as being "almost a relief in a way" (l. 58); the lesser of two evils. The reason that London is the lesser of two evils is presented in line 60 as 'L' lists two category bound activities of culture which she can relate to. In her splitting of different cultures between those who "speak English and drink beer" and those who do not; 'L' is implying that the cultural distance in a place where English is spoken and beer is drank is not as great as a place where those two things do not occur.

This explanation of the cultural sharedness has been a prevalent topic in her talks with "everybody" (l. 60) with whom she has discussed the move. Furthermore, 'they' are a category of people occupied by Americans as 'L' is describing to "everybody" some of the things which make living in *their* (they from l. 59) culture tolerable.

8.2b Summary of case study 3

The reasons for leaving are barely part of the account in this case. They are not embedded in a story about a major decision-making process nor are they in a historical account of one's past. For 'J' the move was presented as just a part of his career progression. However, for 'L', the experience of moving and her response to the move itself are very much embedded in her past. To a large extent even though the story was at times jointly constructed, there are several narratives occurring within this interactional unit of the interview. The narratives include a decision-making process, the plans and timeframe of the move and the implications of that decision upon 'L'. At times the narrative is itself following a format of a single story being told to a third party. At other times, within that narrative structure, it is as if 'J' and 'L' are presenting narratives to each other; using the biographical narrative interview platform to do this. This, I believe, is evidence of an interesting type of polyphony in which two subjective voices work in unison to construct the story being evoked but in which the two members orient to the inter-subjectivity of the other in ways which do not coordinate. 'L' and 'J' construct the story and their respective parts under two different time frames, for example. Whereas the collective move began for 'J' at a point in time before 'L' had actually arrived, 'L' did not consider the move until she was in the UK, long after 'J' had already been there. Once the story time frame was agreed upon, normally a collective story could ensue. However, for 'L' the significance of the move was then retrospectively from the distant past. Once again, 'J' and 'L' were not temporally coordinated.

8.2c Case Study 4 'J' and 'S'

'J' and 'S' moved to the UK during 2004 for 'J''s job as a part of an expatriate contract with a company in Germany ('J' and 'S''s native country). Several months prior to their move to the UK they found out that they were expecting twins. The timing of the births would have come at a time when they would be in the UK and although they discuss in the data below that they had considered their time in the UK perhaps a good time to start a family, the pregnancy caused some concern due to possible complications and put the final decision into question.

First Interview
Extract Forty nine
J and S **(Case Study 4)**
June 2005

1.	I	No, that's very interesting. [Unclear] we didn't get that, the
2.		tongue got stuck out. [Laughs.] Okay. Well, that's good, um,
3.		you know, unless you have something else you want to say about
4.		that, we'll just kind of move to sort of the next subject which is
5.		what happened just before you moved to England. What I mean
6.		by that is, um, what were your feelings about moving to a foreign
7.		culture to live with, as you say, live and work and be part of it as
8.		opposed to just travelling there, why don't we start with that?
9.		[Laughs.] We'll get one question at a time.
10.	S	[inaudible]
11.	J	Well, ask you. Actually, also, [clears throat] always to wanted to,
12.		um, wanted to work in a foreign, in another country for maybe a
13.		subsidiary for, for Volkswagen, wasn't really, wasn't really
14.		thinking about [unclear] and England but, um, when, when I got
15.		the, the offer, because we both thought might be a good
16.		opportunity to do it, um, so we really didn't think about it that
17.		much, right? So it was just about the conditions and, er,
18.		the…there was a quite positive feeling. I mean it's different if
19.		you talk about you want to work in a foreign country and you
20.		actually do it.
21.	S	Yeah, true.
22.	J	You actually get the offer and, er, are confronted with the, with
23.		the decision you need to make.
24.	I	You said that, um, in the last [unclear] you said that you were
25.		both, thought it was a good idea to come, what, what was a good
26.		idea about it for you? What was…?
27.	J	Just to work in another country, to, er, just to get to know
28.		other…another culture and get the experience.
29.	I	[Inaudible.]

30. J Yeah, it was really about the culture and living in a different
31. culture.
32. S And it was that, um, we also thought it would be England, um, it
33. was good for us because I could speak the language a little bit,
34. um, if it would have been Spain or something, I had to, to...I
35. would have had to learn the language for them so you can go
36. shopping here and you can say what you want and, um, just doing
37. some small talk and so on, it's more easy for me as, um, as the
38. wife...
39. I [Laughs.]
40. S ...um, to live in a country where I can speak the language.
41. J So it was probably more positive in the end. It was more about,
42. um, where are we going because we didn't know the region, we
43. didn't, it was not about...I think at first, at first what we did was
44. finding out what's Crewe like and what's the area like? Was it
45. interesting or was it just a normal industrialised, not very nice part
46. of, er, of the UK, this was the question, [laughs] wasn't it, in the
47. beginning.
48. I What do you think of it now?
49. J It's nice. I think it's very nice. That's what we thought when we,
50. when we, well, actually you get some, some, um, some
51. ambiguous information I think, er, you get some positive
52. information about the area, some negative, there's still some...I
53. remember this when we looked through the books. You
54. sometimes don't get any information because it's not the touristic
55. area of the place.
56. S Touristic area and...and...
57. J Not, but we think it's nice.
58. I Yeah, we also got a couple of negative impressions from people
59. that either lived here or worked in Crewe or something, you
60. know, saying that it was like [unclear], you know. [Laughs.]

In answering 'I''s call for an account about how he and 'S' came to live in the UK, 'J' begins in line 11 to describe this move as a long term goal which had been realised; specifically during his tenure with Volkswagen. The idea of working perhaps for a subsidiary of Volkswagen suggests that while the goal of moving aboard to work was there, the means by which that would be made possible would have likely been attached to the home-based parent company in Germany and would therefore have likely been a limited-duration arrangement[61].

[61] German tax law prevents its citizens from living and working aboard for a subsidiary of a while under contract with the parent company for period longer than five years.

Between lines 18 and 20 'J' begins to establish his identity as well as 'S''s by association through a narrative which is about *them* as he proposes two types of people; those who *talk* about moving abroad and those who actually *do*. 'S' concurs with this formulation in line 21. As 'J' and 'S' are now living abroad, it is clear to which categorisation they belong.

'J' provides a general classification of the goal as being to living and experience another culture (l. 27-31). However, as 'S' suggests between lines 32 and 37, it was not merely about going to a foreign country where they would be starting from a null position but a place where they had some basis to work from, that basis being language skills. Although 'J' could have gone to another subsidiary of Volkswagen in a country where he did not speak the language, he could have used his English skills[62]. 'S' states that "as the wife" (l. 37-38), it was important for her to be able to speak and communicate. Therefore, it can be assumed that 'experiences abroad' are stratified based upon cultural distance. As English is a standard school subject in Germany, all students are exposed to and learn a certain level of the language. As such, even though 'J' and 'S' sought out an experience of living in a foreign country, it needed to be a place with less cultural distance from Germany.

Since the cultural distance was low, 'J' describes their preparations as not so much about *cultural* aspects but rather the about the area, "...was it interesting or was it just a normal industrialized, not very nice part..." (l. 44-45).

[62] German expats working at Volkswagen in Japan, for example, speak the common language of English primarily.

First Interview
Extract Fifty
J and S **(Case Study 4)**
June 2005

1	I	that's good let's um: you know unless you have something else
2		you wanna say about that we'll just kinda move to sort of the next:
3		subject which is what HAPPENED just before you moved to
4		England .hhh what I mean by that is um: what were your feelings
5		about moving to a foreign culture to live like you say live and
6		work and be a part of it as opposed to just traveling there .hhhh
7		<WHY don't we start with that> .hhh he he we'll get one question
8		at a time
9	S	mmmhmm
10	I	(1.2) ???
11	S	(clears throat)
12	J	°what are my feelings° (1.0) .hhh actually I oas ah all (clears
13		throat) wanted um to wanted to work in for in ina another country
14		for a maybe subsiderary for for Volkswagen wasn't really
15		[thinking of]
16	S	[people]
17	J	wasn't really thinking about Bentley
18	I	mmhmm
19	J	and England but um when when I got the the offer we both
20		thought it might be a good opportunity to do it (.) um: so w we
21		really didn't think about ah that much right↑
22	S	yeah
23	J	so it was just about [the]
24	S	[???]
25	J	conditions and ah the (.) it was a quite positive feeling .hhh [I
26		MEAN]
27	S	[???]
28	J	it's different if you talk about you want to work in a foreign
29		country and [you]
30	I	[°mmm°]
31	J	acutally do it
32	I	mmmhmm
33	J	hhhhhe
34	I	yeah
35	J	or(h) you [actually]
36	I	[you said you thought]
37	J	[or you actually get the] offer an(h)d are confronted ah with [thee]
38	S	[°yeah°]
39	J	with the der da deciscion you need to make
40	I	you said that um: °I'm going to ask you what you said° you said
41		that you were both you thought it was a good idea to come wha
42		what was a good idea about it for you wha what w~s
43	J	just to work in another country to wor ah to get to know oth cul n
44		n nother culture and
45	S	yeah (clears throat)

46 J get the experience
47 S mmmhmm

'I' begins a new turn in the interview with a set of several questions packaged into one turn. Any of these questions are viewed by 'I' as areas of interest for her inquiry and an appropriate platform from which to start her participants, 'J' and 'S', talking about the next part of the interview, their move to England. Within the multi-question unit, 'I' orients to a contingency which 'J' has mentioned at some point prior to this moment about the difference between people move to a foreign culture to "like you say live and work and be apart of it as opposed to just travelling there" (l. 5-6); the difference between expats and tourists –a theme which has presented itself in all the data within this thesis.

Although 'I' says, "...we'll get to one question at a time" (l. 7-8), she ends her turn and allows for either 'J' or 'S' to respond, i.e. not specifying as to which question should come first. After a short pause, 'J' repeats in paraphrase one of 'I''s questions "what are my feelings" (l. 13). 'J' struggles with what to say here as the pause, false starts and clearing of his throat indicate. 'J' then finally embeds the account he is about to give regarding his feelings about moving cultures in his desire to work in another country (l. 14). However, 'J' is somewhat specific as to possibly where he would have considered working; "maybe a subsidiary of Volkswagen" (l. 15) but not necessarily Bentley (l. 18), where he was at the time of this interview.

'J' summarizes quite concisely that when he received the offer (l. 20), he and his wife, 'S' simply "thought it might be a good opportunity to do it...[and] really didn't think about that much..." (l. 21-22). 'S' concurs with 'J''s account with an

affirmative, "yeah" (l. 23) and although 'S''s next contributions are inaudible, they can be understood as being *in tune* with the details 'J' is telling as he does not break or change direction in the story he is telling to address any aspect of dis-alignment between what he has been saying and what 'S' has said.

Between lines 29 and 40, 'J' reorients what he is saying back around to the idea that *working* in a foreign country is different. However, while this is similar to what, according to 'I' as she paraphrased during her first turn in this extract, 'J' had said before; there is a slight difference in what is being presented here.

The difference is no longer between tourists and expats, but rather between people who talk about being more than tourists; i.e. people who talk about the possibility of working in a different country, "it's different if you talk about you want to work in a foreign country" (l. 29-30) and then there are those who "actually do it" (l. 32). Yet beginning in line 38, 'J' almost downgrades the categorization he has just done with "or you actually get the offer and are confronted with the decision you decision you need to make" (l. 38-40).

'I' seeks some clarification regarding what 'J' had said previously by reformulating "what you said, you said that you were both you thought it was a good idea to come what was a good idea about for you?" (l. 41-43) 'J', with agreement from 'S' formulates the good idea as being "just to work in another country, to get to know another culture and get the experience" (l. 44-45, 47). This combined with what 'J' said above about going and actually working in another country is orienting to the two types of knowledge in the manner of

James (1890) in which knowing about a culture occurs through experiences *living* there and one of the contingencies to living there is to have work.

8.2d Summary of case study 4

As the focus of this chapter was presenting reasons for leaving, there was a fairly limited set of data from this case which I could present here. This case, in talk about the cultural 'here', is more comprehensively represented. This is contingent, I believe, upon the point that for 'J' and 'S', the move for a determined period of time is not something which needs to be rooted in any kind of long autobiography. The couple, who are very much a couple in sync orienting to one another through their narrative, have a real shared couple's story. Therefore, there is not the strife or contrast in time frame or personal relevance as what we saw in the previous case study of 'J' and 'L'; a couple who also came to the UK as a part of a corporate move.

As 'J' set up the story for how he and his wife 'S' came to the UK, it was clear that any goal to experience life for awhile outside their own country needed to be constrained within certain criteria. The destination was likely to be a subsidiary of the company 'J' was working for which would then assume a certain level of continuity i.e. corporate culture or values to some extent. Furthermore, it needed to be a place which would allow 'S' the opportunity to have social outlets therefore the destination country needed to be English-speaking as it was the only other language she could speak. As the options narrowed further, places abroad were seen being stratified by the contingency of cultural distance.

'J' and 'S' established themselves as members of a category of people who follow through on the talk about living and working abroad. A decision to move to a place within the certain parameters they've listed separates this category even more between people willing to work and live abroad in places with limited cultural distance versus those who do not limit themselves in this way.

8.3 Chapter summary

This chapter looked at the accounts for people's reasons for leaving their home countries. This was useful in order to learn about the ways in which moving abroad was constitutive of their identities as expats. As the participants showed, there is tremendous variability between the accounts of different people who assume -and are assumed- as being members of a certain group predicated by certain activities; namely leaving home by choice.

For the expats whose move abroad was the result of part of their career progression, the accounting regarding their reasons to leave their home country are relatively brief. There is no need to lay a foundation as to the significance or relevance of this decision upon the greater narrative of their life up until now. Their work for that comes afterward; in weaving this experience into their life narrative when they've returned home. However, for the people who have made the move as more of a personal endeavour, something for which there is no convenient account such as 'just to have the experience' or 'it's good for career development' the stakes are higher, the work to account is more involved. This was evident by the way in which each the interviews conducted by the same person proceeded.

The discourses in these narratives highlighted the duality of listening and speaking in communication. This perspective aided me in the analysis of my data as it made overt the inter-subjectivity of people in interaction toward the talk immediately occurring, the implicit and explicit subjective positions as well as discourses occurring in the larger public sphere. This latter point is particularly useful in the analysis of the data in the final chapter of this thesis in which participants talk about the cultural 'here'; at times orienting to these public discourses about foreigners.

Chapter Nine

Polyphony in 'Expats'' talk about the cultural '*here*'

9.0 Chapter Introduction

This fourth and final analytical chapter provides further extracts from the four case studies in which participants are seen discussing aspects of their experiences as minorities in new majority cultures. Data from three of the four participant couples are from their interviews in the UK whereas a fourth case, Case Study One, includes data from a new culture, Switzerland.

The purpose of this chapter is to look more specifically at the way people discuss issues or things they have noticed about a new majority culture and what positions –cultural or otherwise- they take in doing that explaining. This information is particularly useful for a conclusive understanding of the ways in which people present themselves culturally as expats, the ways they may have changed their position(s) the help of data from the previous chapters and to further expand upon the construct of polyphony as a tool for examining these situated activities.

9.1a Case Study One 'E' and 'G'

Second Interview
Extract Fifty One
E and G **(Case Study 1)**
November 2006

This interview took place shortly after 'E' and 'G' had made a move out of London to the smaller town of St. Neots. However, at the time of the interview,

with much of the house still packed in boxes, 'E' and 'G' had already made the decision to move again –this time to Switzerland.

E And, and so that, that also [unclear]. So anyway we started looking and we're just kind of looking at everything real good, you know. Cambridge because that would reduce the commute costs and so that would mean, because it was 400 a month to commute from here to London, so $75, or Pounds, a month to go to Cambridge on the bus is far cheaper. That would [unclear]. And so just started looking for some things and then, you know, I mean, this is obviously a tense time and, you know, our feelings were up and down, and whatever. And then one day, because he was getting a bit frustrated and I was getting a bit frustrated because we were trying to, where do we go from here, you know? Because I tend to see all change, change as an opportunity, you know, because we, we can redefine, you know, where we are, what we want to do, whatever. And I have long been on a, my little hobby horse that I just think, we can go to Switzerland, that we could be happier there, I love Switzerland, you know, we'll try that. We, you know, the UK just didn't, you know, you know, God love it, it's just been a not so successful concern. [laughs] You know, it's worth a try, but, so, and, you know, he was feeling pressured by me to do that. So one day in the midst of this job thing, I don't think we'd been at it very long, only a week or two, and we were sort of at logger heads a bit, and he kept saying, you know, he's feeling the pressure, whatever. And I went, let's just, I'm throwing out all, because I had started researching for like Switzerland and schooling for Beatrice because that's something that we're concerned about, you know. What's schooling like and whatever, so I had to try to get some information on that. He wanted to make sure that she would have, um, lots of academic opportunity because Switzerland is similar to the UK, to some extent, where they trap children at a fairly young age, was is it like 11 of 12? [overtalking] where they put the kids in the, decide which one's going to which kind of secondary school or which one ultimately goes up to university; [and]

G [???]

E kind of early on…

G Yeah, [unclear].

E Yeah, early on…

I Kind of like generally the schools do.

E Yeah, so very early on they decide, you've got college potential, when you don't, [unclear] you can't say who's really got college potential, you know. My ex-husband is proof of that because he didn't decide to buckle down and work until he got his first job at age 16. He decided [unclear], and maybe getting a degree wasn't such a bad thing because if it meant he could have a better life and buckled down and got his [unclear] and did very well, and he's a

very well paid one. He's an engineer now, so that's proved that if [unclear] somebody would have made the wrong call, so absolutely a fair concern. But we've been able to, I think, educate ourselves more about the… it's all we knew about the school system is, system was for strictly speaking his experience in it. And that, to some extent, is coloured by what his parents knew of the system and his dad was British, so, he didn't know anything really about it. And his mom understood it to an extent, but she wasn't put in that university track that Gavin was; so that was a big thing to be proud, but at the same time there, um, there was, I think, sort of, my impression anyway is now, you know, years later, but, it's just sort of, um, well, the school's always right kind of, of thing, you now. You wouldn't question the school or a decision the school made or that a teacher made, or whatever, and, you know…

G But, but it wasn't, it wasn't so much that as it was just that it is important to be in school and do well in it and pursue it to its fullest. They disagreed readily with, um, teachers, that, and, and any time I went home and told them about stuff that, that…

E Because you used to say that you felt that, that, okay…

G It, it was, um[??]

E [Well, anyway], he had [???]

G [???]

E reserves about the school system, and I had been trying to resist that. In the course of trying to get some answers for what his concerns were like for how will Beatrice be treated, [unclear], would she feel different, how common is that, you know? [unclear] so I was trying to, you know, [unclear] anyway that was making him pressured. So we just sat down one day and were just throwing around all the geography, and saying, what do we want from your job and our life? And so, you know, like I'll go first; and I'd go, I don't want you to have a commute that's an hour or more a day. I don't want you to work in a place where the business hours start at 9 am and go till 5:30 and then you have that commute because our family life has suffered terribly since we went from the US, because you dare happen to be working from seven to 4:30 at the time. But even seven to four or something… [overtalking] yeah, and even when he was working eight to five it wasn't as bad as, as here. Like, you know, there's nights when she goes to bed and, you know, she might go through the, she doesn't even know when he takes an overnight business trip because it happens so frequently that he has to miss a bedtime. And in a way that's good, but in a way, you know, where from her stand point, she doesn't see him in the morning because she's not awake when he gets up, so she literally gets maybe an hour a day with him. I said, you know, a huge part for me is living somewhere where there is affordable quality housing and good schooling and good quality of life things. And, and reasonable commuting distance, which to me is 30 minutes or less from your job, so that if you have to work late he could come home and have

105. dinner with us and then go back to work. Or it's easy from a
106. public transportation stand point for us to get to you to meet you
107. for lunch, because we did do that when we were in London, and
108. here [unclear] is not very push chair accessible. And then it's not
109. cheap either to get into London; so to do that it's a huge expensive
110. undertaking to just go and see him for lunch. And, um, you know,
111. so I just, you know, started thinking, these would be priorities,
112. forgetting where [unclear] fits this priority list. But this is my
113. wish list for, you know, out of your job what I would like from the
114. standpoint of, you know, the family and the [unclear] beyond
115. what for me were the fundamentals and givens, which is, yeah,
116. that he's happy with what he's doing. And that he feels valued
117. and appreciated, and he feels challenged, that he's working with
118. the skill sets that he enjoys because he never gets to do that. So
119. then, you know, we kind of did the same thing, and we just,
120. through the course of that we ended up talking for like three
121. hours. One of the things that he expressed was a real concern
122. about getting led down the garden path again, because so many
123. things fold in the beginning, and he thought he was coming to
124. have this great, you know, this job was like sold to him as what it
125. really turned out to be. It was sold to him as what Tim wants to
126. hire or wishes he was responsible for.
127. G Yeah.

Between lines 1 and 11 'E' sums up the series of decisions which finally led to the realisation that she and 'G' could "redefine where we are" (l. 13) i.e. take stock of their current situation and what had occurred up to this point with their experiences in the UK. From the positions both had created from our first interview, a redefinition of where they were and what they wanted to do was definitely taking place through the course of this interview. Originally, 'E' and 'G' positioned themselves as people who wanted to move abroad for several reasons but one of the most explicit reasons what so that their daughter, Beatrice, could grow up with a more worldview. One of the discursive tools used in that long account was the type of schooling available in Switzerland (see Extract 41, l. 25, 27-40) which could provide such a worldview. Interestingly, in lines 25 to 28, 'E' describes there being some "concerns" about the school system and she was therefore researching it because 'G' "wanted to make sure that she would

have lots of academic opportunity" (l. 28-29) because the Swiss school system and the UK school system were the same –although Beatrice was not yet of school age in the UK.

Now the very school system which had been used to support their identity work in a positive way as the means by which 'G', a person with a certain type of mentality, had been indoctrinated and one which 'E' could relate to through her schooling in Alaska, is being scrutinized (l. 25-60). The information 'E' and 'G' have about the Swiss school system has 'only' come from his personal experience as a child in the system until the age of nine and the opinion of 'G''s parents and these two positions have a negative connotation toward the school system in Switzerland. Through these lines, 'E' describes the systems' early determination of children's aptitudes and explains that the potential exists, such as the case of her ex-husband, for people to develop later in life thus putting this entire practice in question. However, she seems, through a significant amount of discursive trouble throughout these lines, to not be entirely sure where she stands on the subject.

Line 69 begins polyphonic joint inter-subjective narrative account told only by 'E' of the 'redefinition' of 'where they are' and 'what they want to do'. The account includes 'E''s own subjective positioning as she puts forth her concerns and wishes but which includes at times the opposing positions held by 'G'. Through the section of narrative between lines 69 and 127, 'E' is pushing for a move to Switzerland and this account is broken up into sections in which she presents the opposing viewpoint of 'G", if there is one, and her point of view.

The contingencies which I will address now in greater detail comprise of 'G''s concerns about Beatrice's eventual treatment at school in Switzerland, the possible places which would be viable for 'E' and 'G' to go –which do not include the UK (see l. 17-18), 'E''s wishes, although she formulates them as *their wishes* for 'G''s job and her wishes for their life and finally a listing of the priorities attached to the next step.

'E' presents 'G''s concerns about how Beatrice will be treated in school in Switzerland –whether or not she will be treated any different (l. 70-74). It is unclear wherein the concern lies as at the time of this interview, Beatrice was not of school age and was not yet really speaking. However, as the primary home language was still at this time English, it would be likely that by the time Beatrice did reach school that she would not have an age-appropriate level of Swiss-German.

At line 75, 'E' mentions that she and 'G' were "throwing around all the geography" which seems to mean that they were discussing places which were feasible to go to considering that only English and German-speaking regions were possible options. Remember, the UK was no longer an option, according to 'E'.

Between lines 75 and 76 'E' begins to describe a discussion which she and 'G' had regarding "what do we want from your job and our life? And so, you know, like I'll go first" the contents of which, although presented as a discussion the two had, are only told from 'E''s point of view, her voice. Although accounting

work in the first interview with 'E' saw her use the US as a negative contrast to Europe, the US in line 81 is now being used as a positive point of comparison to their life in the UK.

Line 100 begins a new list of priorities –a list which is now somewhat different than what were presented as priorities in the accounts told in the couple's reasons for leaving the US. Priorities such as affordable quality housing, good schooling, good quality of life of things as well as a decent commuting distance which would allow 'G' to have more time with his daughter. These things, according to the way the narrative was told in interview one, were all things which they had in the US. The thing that was missing in the US was a certain type of mentality or mind set. Now, the list of priorities does not include the desired *place with a world view.*

Third Interview
Extract Fifty Two
E and G **(Case Study 1)**
April 2007

This interview took place after 'E' and 'G' had moved to Switzerland and had been living there for about four months.

1.	E	Um, so I didn't know that you're supposed to total the... you pay
2.		more than one, to total them, um, for the lady at the window. The
3.		reasons never occurred to me, 'cos I used to be like a bank teller.
4.		If people... somebody gave me something I was responsible for
5.		totalling that and ensuring the total, because I have to make my
6.		drawer balance [sneeze] at the end of the day. So, and they're in a
7.		cash sampling situation, so I didn't know it was a company
8.		[?] upon me. [And]
9.	G	[The], the point is, they want to force you to double-check them.
10.		Or, or, you know, that it's supposed to be a, a, a checking thing.
11.	E	I'll double-check... [overtalking, unclear]
12.	G	Yeah, so don't do... because they wouldn't just take it...
13.	E	Anyway, the bottom line is she was not that helpful a couple of
14.		different times, and then the last time that I went in she, um... and

15.		I always go in, and I always try to start out with German, and I do
16.		the best I can and then, um, if not, you know, you know, you
17.		know, can you repeat that and whatever, and... 'cos
18.		in the beginning I have a [unclear] understanding numbers, you
19.		know, when you're trying to tell me what the total was. Anyway,
20.		she just got real pissy with me one day and, and it just... it
21.		annoyed me, because it happened to be at a time where in the
22.		news here, everybody was on about the push that foreigners must
23.		integrate, and they ought to take classes at their own expense, to
24.		learn about Swiss culture and they need to take language classes
25.		and all this. And I was doing that, I was going to a language class
26.		that night, and I said, you know, it just makes me angry, because
27.		I'm one of the foreigners trying to do what the Swiss, including
28.		her, presumably, want. And [pause] her attitude doesn't
29.		incentivise me. It discourages me from continuing in my
30.		efforts to integrate.
31.	G	I think what was the most annoying bit about your interaction
32.		with her, if I remember right, was that she, um, she just acted all
33.		put out and stuff the first time, and then the second time she, she
34.		managed enough English to tell you off for not... [overtalking,
35.		unclear]
36.	E	Yeah, but the first two times she never once, when I was
37.		struggling and I was really trying with my German, she never
38.		once spoke any English with me to... or very little to try to help
39.		me.
40.	I	Mmm

In their third interview which followed their third move and second move in less than two years to a new country, 'E' and 'G' were asked to describe how things had been going. While 'G' had been born and raised in Switzerland until the age of nine, 'E' had been there maybe once before she and 'G' moved there together. In response to being interviewed about her experiences 'E' embarks upon a story about interacting with a bank teller. In her story, 'E' shows how she used her cultural knowledge of being a bank teller in the US (l. 3) to guide her action and interpretation of her experiences. This story within the narrative contains an example of the polyphonic inter-subjectivity of 'E' as she tells the story in one character position, a bank teller in the US, while she is simultaneously telling the story of being a foreign customer of a bank teller in Switzerland. This account is

met by 'G''s knowledge of the Swiss system (l. 9-10). This story and the manner in which 'E' and 'G' are in discussion with one another at this point show a reflexive orientation on the part of both to an on-going conversation which was begun prior to this interview.

Between lines 13 and 25 'E' elaborates on the story about the bank teller with whom she has several interactions and to whom she ascribes a subjective position of a Swiss person who wants foreigners to integrate, take language classes and learn about Swiss culture (l. 23-24 and 27-28) which she has collected from discourse in the media (l. 21-22). To do this, 'E' presents herself as the type of foreigner who is attempting to integrate to the majority culture through, for example, learning the local language of Swiss German (l. 25-26). She puts forth that when she needs to conduct her daily business, she "always [tries] to start out with German, and I do the best I can..." (l. 15-16) but explains that this is not being reflected back to her necessarily in a positive way such as in the case of the bank teller who "...got real pissy with me one day..." (l. 20).

'E' connects the attitude of the position taken by the bank teller with the current discourse in the media about foreigners integrating into society in Switzerland (l. 21-25). As Leudar, Hayes, Nekvapil and Baker found in their analysis of media, community and refugee narratives:

> ...hostility towards refugees took different forms which were in part contingent on contemporary social and political activities...[and that] refugee and asylum-seeker informants constructed their identities around hostilities expressed towards them in the media and by local inhabitants.
>
> (2008, Abstract)

With this summation, 'E' has created a link between herself, the negative experience she has had with a majority culture member and the larger discourse around a category of which she is a member; *foreigner*.

To understand what could be potentially going on in this data, I want to draw upon Leudar and Nekvapil's (1998) concept of the 'dialogical network'. The concept looks at the ways in which discourses are shared activities "...distributed across different activities and settings in a way that is a notable accomplishment of participants" and analysis of such discourses must focus on the "...links – implicit and explicit- that participants themselves create between expressions, describing the practices in and through which they make these links notable" (Leudar et al., 2008, p. 190).

Through her narrative 'E' is contesting the ascription she is assuming is being given to her which is that of a foreigner who is not learning the language or integrating. While these social discourses have made their way into 'E''s narrative, they are different to what Leudar et al. (2008) found, which saw how these hostile or negative discourses constituted the identities constructed in the narratives of refugees and asylum-seekers. 'E' argues that she is the type of foreigner who "...was going to a language class that night...it just makes me angry because I'm one of the foreigners trying to do what the Swiss, including her, presumably, want" (l. 25-28) and in doing so resists, at least for now, an identity which she believes the bank teller is trying to ascribe to her –an identity which, in part, from the discourses in the media about foreigners and integration created by majority culture members. Through her argument, 'E' rejects the

negative ascription she *assumes* is being made of her and aligns with the attributes which constitute the type of foreigner viewed favourably in Swiss culture. Yet there is still the problem of the negative reflection from the part of the Bank Teller which seems to threaten 'E''s sense of identity as an acceptable foreigner.

There is something to be said here as well regarding polyphony. Within this narrative constructed by 'E''s sole voice there are many others' voices present. There are the subjective positions of 'E', the bank teller and the numerous others who constitute the greater Swiss voice –i.e. "...everybody [who] was on about the push that foreigners must integrate..." (l. 22-23). There are also the inter-subjective positions of 'E' which comprise of a foreigner in Switzerland, a foreigner who was once a bank teller in the US and a foreigner in Switzerland who is attempting to integrate- a voice in part constituted by the general other around her in the new majority culture. These voices and positions mix and mingle throughout this part of the story to aid 'E' in carefully constructing her identity as a foreigner in Switzerland which allows her to include experiences that may threaten that work. Therefore it is imperative to consider the "intertextual nature" (Leudar et al., 2008) of the social discourse she mentioned explicitly.

As I will argue with support of the data in the next section, 'E' will contribute to a part of the dialogical through this interview by responding to the integration issue.

Third Interview
Extract Fifty Three
E and G (**Case Study 1**)
April 2007

E: But, when, when she recognised me and, and was annoyed with me the third time, you would have been amazed at the amount of English she was able to pull out. And that's what made me angry, because I thought, you know what, I'm, I'm going as far as I can go in this equation right now, and I hadn't had any German classes at that point, so, you know, I couldn't go very far in that equation. Now I've had nine weeks of German class, I can go further in that equation. But, you know, I think that what makes, um, integration work is if... is if you have the ability to go 70% to the person's 30, or 60 to their 40, that makes for smoother integration, and that makes people motivated and incentivised to, to integrate and... but, you know, so I had, you know, and she really got... really annoyed me. But, you know, I went to class and I continue to go to class. And I just choose to go to the, the Post Office at the airport now, where I don't get treated like shit, you know, and I do... and there they appreciate the fact that I do try to speak some German, because they get all the foreign tourists who can't speak any. So, um, you know, it's, it's to me a... on a certain level it's a consumer-based thing, and I'll just, you know...

I: So in spite of that, experience like that, you feel good here?

E: Yeah, because, you know, as Walt said, she probably treats the Swiss people exactly, exactly the same way. She's just a pissy person, and there's pissy people everywhere. And, um, she happened to pick on me, because of my, um, my language gave her a second point to be pissy about, but, you know, as Walt pointed out he's been fussed at, for not telling his... [laughter, unclear] And he sweats, you know, and, and she probably is pissy to everybody. She's just one of those people that... she just, you know, she doesn't seem to enjoy her job, she never has really a smile on her face and, you know, it's like fine. But, you know, it's also my truth not to repeatedly subject myself to that person if I don't have to and so I don't. But, you know, I would say like more than nine times out of ten the interactions I have with people are positive, you know, I... it, you know.

G: Look at the butcher.

E: Yeah, I mean I try to... I make an effort, and I absolutely know that there are cultural and subtext things that I am not getting. And I'm totally okay with that. I mean, if somebody is laughing at my expense when I walk away, I don't really care.

I: mmhmm

E: You know, because it's more about them than it is about me, and life's too short and all that.

In between lines 7 and 11 is 'E''s contribution to the dialogical network around the integration of foreigners in Switzerland. Here she provides her assessment about what makes integration work and what the majority culture needs to make people "motivated and incentivised to integrate" (l. 11). In contributing to the dialogical network she is also overtly responding to the bank teller almost as if she is speaking to her in the present by speaking her thoughts in response to the bank teller's behaviour in the CHP (Conversational Historical Present); "...because I thought, you know what, I'm, I'm going as far as I can in this equation right now..." (l. 4-5). The switch to CHP, according to Thornborrow (2000) is significant because it is signalling a change from narrative to performance (p. 358). This is polyphonic in several ways. Firstly, as CHP was found by Wolfson to "...occur when speakers are sure that their stories will be understood and appreciated by their audience –i.e. when levels of similarity and empathy between participants are high...[and thus] can therefore be seen as a discursive resource for constituting intimacy between speakers..." (1981 cf. Thornborrow, 2000, p. 358). As 'I' has been a foreigner in a country which did not use her native tongue, Germany, 'E' is orienting to 'I' as a similar person who has experienced moving to a foreign country where there was a language barrier.

Furthermore to the point of polyphony -as the character position 'E' once had in the previous exact where she told of the encounters with the bank teller from the dual-subjective positions of a former bank teller as well as a foreigner in Switzerland have now been momentarily reduced to that of just a certain type of foreigner in Switzerland.

'E' in the subjective position of the type of foreigner in Switzerland who is doing what she should, suggests a majority cultural environment in which majority members participate in a graduated manner to meet the learning needs of each foreigner and to know the difference between the ones who are like 'E' – participating in language classes, etc and those who are not (l. 8-12).

'E' explains that as the result of this negative experience she has decided "not to repeatedly subject herself to that person if I don't have to" (l. 31-32). However, rather than seek out another local bank, she sought out a solution whereby she would likely not have similar problems and decided from now on just to go to the Post Office in the airport where the language is English for the "tourists" who cannot speak any German (l. 17). This strategy presents some interesting problems for the identity work 'E' is attempting to do in separating herself form the types of foreigners who are not integrating. If the source of the negative experience lay truly with the bank teller, then surely not all bank tellers would react in the same way and one would just choose to seek out a different bank. This positions her as a foreigner who is not integrating. Yet she uses the discursive device of "tourist" which serves to reduce the distance between 'E' and the majority culture as she is a foreigner who is able to speak some German and simultaneously aids in denying any membership she would have to the type of foreigners who are "tourists"[63].

[63] I remind the reader of the data from Chapter Seven, Case Study One in which 'E' used this same discursive strategy as a way to establish her identity in the UK as a certain type of foreigner.

In line 20 'I' reorients back to original question about how things are going and whether or not they are feeling good here. 'E' answers positively and continues on with an assessment which she has taken up from 'Walt' (it is unclear who Walt is) about the woman and that she "probably treats Swiss people exactly the same way" (l. 21-22) and therefore she is not representative of people in Switzerland but "she's just a pissy person and there's pissy people everywhere" (l. 22-23). Draws upon Walt's voice again to support her arguments and although it is not clear whether he is Swiss, he is someone who 'E' is bringing in as an authority on Swiss culture; "Walt pointed out he's been fused at…" (l. 25-26). This serves the purpose of distancing herself from the membership category she felt she was being ascribed to by the bank teller and furthermore reducing the cultural distance between herself and other Swiss if the 'all get treated the same way'; Swiss or people like Walt who may or may not be Swiss but has experienced something similar.

Following 'E''s declaration that "nine times out of ten the interactions I have with people are positive" (l. 33), 'G' mentions "the butcher" in trying to coordinate with 'E''s story but it is not explicit, to the third person in the interaction, the interviewer, what this utterance is being used to do. Yet, the very fact that it is used shows and orientation of 'G' and perhaps 'E' as well to parts of a narrative which are not being told her but to which both 'E' and 'G' can and do orient reflexively toward.

9.1b Summary of case study 1

The data contained in this chapter followed 'E' and 'G' through two moves after we had first met in London and finally saw them in Switzerland about four months after they had settled there. At the time of our second interview, things had not gone well for them in the UK and they had decided that it was possible to redefine where they were and what they wanted to do. This was an interesting formulation as all the work which had been done to explain how they got to the UK in the first place provided, at least for 'E', a bit of a challenge.

One of the main reasons, embedded deep in 'E''s own history was that of seeking out a place where there was a more worldly view; a place where their daughter could grow up with a different kind of mindset than that which 'G' and 'E' thought would be available to her in the US. The reasons which had motivated their move abroad and away from the US had changed a bit now in light of their experiences in the UK; perhaps not drastically but the explicit priority of a worldview for Beatrice did not make the list the second time. Discursive tools and positions which had been carefully formulated about certain things such as the Swiss school system in comparison to the US school system in order to account for a difference in mindsets and mentality and thus a reason to leave the US now presented a problem. The decision to move somewhere else, one possible place being Switzerland, was now being contrasted with UK (in a negative way) by 'G' through the use of the tool *the Swiss school system*. Furthermore, the priorities which were now important for their life echoed, except for the lack of a world view, the life they already had in the US and in fact that say this in an explicit way.

The story as per usual was largely managed by 'E' and is therefore intermittently woven together with 'G''s own positions as told by 'E'. Sometimes 'E' could also be seen orienting to 'G' inter-subjectively.

The story continued and left off in Switzerland. Here we saw a few things happening. Firstly, we saw 'G' more active in the actual telling of their story but in such a way which clarified the points which 'E' was trying to make. This meant that 'G' was not so much oriented to the listener (interviewer) but rather also inter-subjectively toward 'E' in her stories about problems in the Swiss culture.

Within the scope of the extracts from our interviews in Switzerland we were able to see lots of different examples of polyphony and inter-subjectivity in subjective positioning; mostly by 'E'. Instances of story-telling which 'E' needed to speak as both a foreigner and a former bank teller in the US explicated the way in which a person can speak as a multitude of positions in a single turn. This was necessary to establish herself as a foreigner with certain challenges but not without certain resources; resources which, however, were culturally contingent upon US experience. Furthermore, 'E' established context for the kind of trouble she was having in order for her to shift the focus away from her limited abilities and onto larger public discourses. The public discourses were creating a context within which things were made more difficult; marginalising 'E' in categorising her with *other* foreigners who were not learning Swiss-German and trying to

integrate. As such, she decided the best thing to do was to just avoid those kind of situations all together.

Although a fair amount of work had been done throughout the course of all our interviews to distinguish between 'tourists' and other types of foreigners versus expats (a category to which she assumed she belonged), in the end, 'E''s activities and challenges often resembled some of those which were attributed to tourists and other foreigners, such as not changing her mentality to accept a new reality or avoidance of further contact in a foreign language when things got difficult.

9.1c Case study 2 'E and K'

First Interview
Extract Fifty Four
E and K **(Case Study 2)**
November 2005

1.	E	um::: but I started finding <u>some</u> issues that that the <u>biggest</u> issue
2.		that I found is:::(.) I mean (.) things are different↓ and it's actually
3.		I think harder to come over as an American than as a Euro<u>pean</u>
4.		because .hh the banking is in<u>credibly</u> difficult and I'm still (.)
5.		waiting to get a real credit card instead of just a debit car::d
6.	I	mmhmm
7.	E	um: (.) you know just ah a number of things I think are really
8.		inefficient and I (.) find this annoy:ing [and I feel]
9.	K	[mmhmm]

When 'E' arrived, he began uncovering the truth of living in the UK through his finding of '<u>some</u> issues'. The emphasis here seems to suggest that it was not completely fraught with issues, but *some* were enough to cast a shadow of a doubt leading to Line 1. Spoken from a subjective position as an American, 'E' is perhaps tempted to present a list of the differences starting with "the biggest" but reformulates to a broad-sweeping statement that things are just different and that

this is collectively the same of all Americans coming to the UK. Furthermore, 'E' separates Europeans from the people in Britain although this may not have to do with a social/cultural disparity but rather the fact that members of the European Union are subject to certain advantages.

'E''s story about the trouble with getting a credit card illustrates his initial assumptions about the similarities between the US and the UK and how his previous history in the US was not able transferable to the UK.

First Interview
Extract Fifty Five
E and K **(Case Study 2)**
November 2005

1.	E	(clears throat) um: the ba the banking's been a big deal itit <u>really</u>
2.		upset me
3.	I	yeah it bothers a lot of people
4.	E	And I think actually that (.) more than anything was one of the
5.		first things I was like you know I just can't see living here
6.		because w: (.) .hh you know I've got a fair bit that –I that
7.		someone's gotta keep an ey:e on [at hom]e
8.	I	[mmhmm]
9.	E	[I coul]dn't just: (.) so um (1.0) <u>very</u> frustrating

Through detailing the problem of banking as being "a big deal" categorising those problems as being "more than anything…one of the first things" which directed 'E' to the conclusion that he could not imagine living in the UK, 'E' is clearly and explicitly positioning himself as a cultural outsider in the UK. Getting a bank account for the first time is a practical, ordinary problem of *people who live here* and although the process may have been different, he *did succeed* in getting one. The problem was that he did not get an account in the manner or timing which he considered ok. Furthermore, through his formulation between lines 6 and 7, he is making an evaluation about the banking system in

comparison to the US; through mentioning the "fair bit" that he or someone has to keep "an eye on at home" there is an implicit statement being made that somehow life in the UK and it's banking system which make doing that difficult.

Second Interview
Extract Fifty Six
E and K **(Case Study 2)**
February 2006

1.	E	... the divide [?]
2.	I	[yes] thank you, I can't think of a good word
3.	E	Um, I think a couple of things. I mean I think, I think in actuality
4.		when you look at statistics there's just as much class mobility here
5.		as in the US. The US has actually a lot less than most people
6.		believe, however, [child talking in background] perceptions are a
7.		big part of it because people here believe that they're going to be
8.		stuck forever and that has led to some of the negative
9.		consequences, like people just completely don't care about other
10.		people so you end up with this, really this yob culture that is
11.		pretty toxic. I think in reality people in the US are stuck the same
12.		way but they don't believe it and they're more optimistic, and
13.		so...
14.	I	The, the American dream, kind of thing?
15.	K	Mmhm.
16.	E	Yeah, I mean I think it's actually partly [?] a shame because I
17.		think that makes them do very silly things politically, voting-wise,
18.		but, but it also means that you're just interacting with people that
19.		are slightly more pleasant. Things are really unpleasant when
20.		interacting with lower [?] class people here, I find. [Child].
21.		Especially, because I can't even take the bus and... You know,
22.		I'm on the bus and these kids have already dropped out and
23.		they're like, you know, messing with people and poking people
24.		with pens [?], and of course, you know, passive aggressive Brits
25.		don't do shit, and so I have to go down and talk to the driver to
26.		get him to kick these kids off the bus. Like, unbelievable...

In this extract, 'E' contrasts the social/economic cultures of the US and the UK. In doing so, his inter-subjectivity is constituted through several subjective positions which he flips between to make his points. This polyphony in positions consists namely of 1) an alignment with America 2) the detached observer of the American social/economic situation 3) the detached observer of the UK

social/economic situation and 4) a person participating in cultural activities living in the UK.

'E' and 'I' are aligned in their positions between lines 1 and 2 in that they understand what the issue at hand is. Prior to line 1, 'I' has uttered a position in which she suggests a social difference exists in the UK but can not think of how to appropriately classify what she means; 'E' supplies the word 'divide' and 'I' concurs which shows a unique occurrence of what I believe to be a shared cultural polyphony where by 'E' and 'I', both foreigners in the UK but who have only met each other on other occasion, share an *understanding*. Perhaps this shared understanding is an aspect of their shared American nationality. No matter what the source(s) of this shared understanding may be, there is orientation displayed by both that each of them possess a common, detached observer perspective although neither is explicit about this, e.g. pre-empting the statements with any kind of cultural marker.

Between lines 3 and 13, 'E' embeds his explication about 'the divide' in the UK within the contingency of social mobility and expresses that the US and the UK are aligned; "...when you look at the statistics there's just as much class mobility here as in the US" (l. 4-5). In the lines immediately following, 'E' explains that the social ramifications of this are different in the two countries due to the perceptions of people (l. 6). This is significant because perceptions in the social sense are hermeneutic in constitution; they are socially-constructed. As such, to say that the US and the UK are the same in social mobility but that this results in different social outcomes is identity implicative. Whereas the US has a "more

optimistic" social structure (l. 12) which is attached to the ideology of 'the American Dream' (uttered by 'I' in line 14 and affirmed by both 'K' in line 15 and 'E' in line 16), this results in "negative consequences" (l. 8-9) and a "yob culture that is pretty toxic" (l. 10-11). There is, however, also polyphonic inter-subjectivity on the part of 'E' here as he explains the differences between the two cultures from a detached observer position –always using the third person pronoun 'they' to refer to members of *either* culture while simultaneously describing his point-of-view from a position which as been socially constituted by some aspect of an American *other*. Furthermore, within this part of the interaction, the three Americans are aligned and harmonizing with something which resonates with them –the social object which is the American Dream. In fact, I argue that the American Dream has been an omni-present aspect of this extract from immediately before line 1.

Between lines 16 and 19 'E' explains that while this 'more optimistic' social climate exists in the US, it also has some negative consequences in that it "makes them doing do very silly things politically, voting-wise" (l. 17-18). This set of social circumstances is once again contrasted with the UK but without any mention of a political system but merely a cultural social system in which youths who have already dropped out of school ride the buses and poke people with pens with a "passive aggressive" British people merely sitting idly by letting it happen as if nothing can or should be done (l. 22-26). The manner in which 'E' describes the Brits in lines 24-25 is more extreme in contrast to any descriptions he used in categorising Americans. This may also indicate a leaning toward an American subjective position.

The conclusion is that an optimistic environment may not be politically sound, but an environment which is negative results in social unrest. In some regard, there is almost a gloss here between a society which is civilized and one which is less so; a moral ascription.

Second Interview
Extract Fifty Seven
E and K **(Case Study 2)**
February 2006

1.	E	You know, in part it was, oh, this is supposed to be a more just
2.		country than, than the US, but to me I come here and everything
3.		costs double, I don't know where the tax is going to, it actually
4.		still is not a chiefly [?] just country compared to the rest of
5.		Europe…
6.	I	When you say just you mean…?
7.	E	Well, in terms of distribution of income, in terms of how they
8.		treat the, you know, the poor and the elderly and, you know, they
9.		do have National Health, certain [?] insurances, which is nice but
10.		things fall apart…
11.	I	It's actually what, [unclear], that's what I was actually asking
12.		about [unclear] with regards to the class system here. I seem to
13.		have an impression that there's a very - how can I say? - very
14.		small middle class here. At least, I don't know, I mean I have no
15.		idea how this area is down here. Where we are living there are
16.		people with a lot of money, but there are lots of people that don't
17.		have a whole heck of a lot, and, um, in Germany I tended to, it felt
18.		like most people were sort of on the same plane, you know, where
19.		it was the middle classes are, [unclear] - do you have this sort of
20.		impression?
21.	E	Well, it's hard to say because I would say I mostly work with
22.		middle class people so I would probably encounter more. I guess
23.		Cambridge is a little bit better but Cambridge is funny because a
24.		lot of people that stay here, they trade, they're willing to trade off
25.		the really high [unclear]. Most people that have lived here, if
26.		they're not middle class, are very bright, hence they went to
27.		Cambridge, but they're trading off the incomes they could've had
28.		if they moved to London to live here. So they actually don't make
29.		as much money but they've got like…
30.	I	Quality of life.
31.	E	Quality of life and a different kind of outlook and so it's much
32.		more like the people that hang around Ann Arbour [?], you know.

'E' describes having had a presupposition about the UK being a "more just country than the US" but that in light of what he has observed in his time living here, this has changed. As categorisation 'just' is a moral ascription, he is categorising the UK as a place which less morally right and fair than the US. When asked to expound upon what contingencies he means with this moral ascription, he lists "distribution of income...how they treat the poor and the elderly" (l. 7-8) and although the National health system does exist, he says it is not serving the needs of the people it was designed to serve; the people of the nation of the UK. In essence, the UK is failing its' citizens on all levels – economically, socially and in general overall well-being (l. 7-10). The contrasting work and observations are being made by 'E' from a polyphonic subjective position through the inter-subjective positions of a detached observer with a certain mindset[64][65] as well as a participating member *within* a culture (not necessarily someone who feels himself a cultural member) –he is paying taxes here and "everything costs double [and] I don't know where the tax is going to" (l. 2-3).

'I' summarizes between lines 11 and 20 the way which she sees the economic distribution and includes a disclaimer between lines 14 and 15 that suggests her position might be a regional phenomenon and that her opinion of there being a 'very small middle class here' (l. 13-14) could be inaccurate. Interestingly, although a significant amount of the interview extracts have shown the work around the 'cultural here' being down through the contrasting of UK and US

[64] I am using 'mindset' in the same way as it was discussed previously in chapter eight which is a habitual way of thinking.
[65] A mindset is not necessarily culturally implicative here as residents of the UK may also have this mindset. Furthermore, the inter-subjectivity includes a point-of-view which is able to distinguish between the rest of Europe and the UK.

culture, 'I' uses Germany[66] as a contrasting unit to the UK as a culture where "it felt like most people were sort of on the same plane..." (l. 17-18). What this says about 'I''s position on the distribution of economic wealth in the US I cannot say for sure but it is an indication of 'I''s own acculturation.

In lines 19 to 20, 'I' requests in affirmation in a question which calls for a preferred response. Throughout this extract as well as the previous extract, Fifty Six, 'I' has collected the essence of 'E''s subjective position on this point –that there is a socio-economic 'divide' and I believe it is what has driven her to formulate the question in this manner. This shows an reflexive orientation on the part of 'I' toward 'E''s subjective positioning in the previous pieces of interaction, her own subjective position from the previous interaction and these things inform the way in which she has proceeded with her questioning in the present.

Although 'E' began the extract by making some strong, morally-implicative statements about the UK from a socio-economic position, he is now uncertain of the certainty of that position in line 21 and this uncertainty is due to his immediate surroundings of "middle class people" at work. 'E' now expresses having a similar problem to that which 'I' mentioned in the extent to which she could conclusively make a statement about the socio-economic distribution (l. 14-15) but does make an affirmative statement that his local area of Cambridge is something of a unique situation. It is, in a sense the same character position which 'I' took in those previous lines. According to 'E', a place like Cambridge

[66] 'I' is American but lived in Germany four years preceding this interview.

is an intersection of certain type of people, most of whom "if they're not middle class, are very bright...[and] trading off the incomes they could've had if they moved to London to live here" (l. 25-29). Here there is an interesting classification being done by 'E' in which intelligence and economic status may not always be correlative and that people in this area may or may not have at least a middle economic standing but do have "quality of life and a different kind of outlook" (l. 31). As an "outlook" means a person's point of view or attitude to life and the prospect for the future[67], this is in direct contrast to the generalizing he did in extract fifty six in which he categorised the UK culture as negative and pessimistic due to members' perceptions that class mobility is limited. When 'E' then likens Cambridge (a University town with an internationally esteemed institution of higher education) together with Ann Arbor in line 32 (a University town in the US with an internationally esteemed institution of higher education) he is making a place in the UK analogous to one in the US. In the work he has down up to this point toward 'the cultural here', he has at one time made the two cultures distinct based upon socio-economic moral implicatives while at other times drawn upon cultural aspects which are similar.

What his work on 'the cultural here' have done in the case of his own position has shown him to be a person who does not have any single cultural affiliation but one who's subjective positioning is a mixing and moving of cultural inter-subjectivity. What 'E' seems to align with are places which have a certain socio-economic ratio to intelligence (being "bright") and these places are not necessarily culturally bound.

[67] Per definition from the Oxford English Dictionary

Second Interview
Extract Fifty Eight
E and K (**Case Study 2**)
February 2006

1.	E	And we, we don't get to spend as much time in, in London as we,
2.		we thought we would, mostly because it is just such a headache
3.		getting down there with Kendall then dealing with the
4.		Underground. It's so un-child friendly.
5.	I	I, I have to ask myself if you have a wheelchair, if you have a
6.		disability, you are out…
7.	K	It's the same thing in New York too.
8.	I	Is it? Is it?
9.	E	Yeah.
10.	K	Yeah, I mean, Chicago, [unclear] have elevators for people with
11.		disabilities…
12.	E	Not everywhere.
13.	K	Not everywhere but more than New York.
14.	E	Yeah, New York is not good. D.C. is actually the best I think.
15.	I	Is it?
16.	E	Yeah, because they built it later. I mean, you know, these things
17.		are a hundred years old but the thing that, the thing that kills me is
18.		there's almost no pressure in the UK or Ireland to make any
19.		improvements. I mean there is pressure in the US because of, you
20.		know, ADA to, as, you know, the brown [?] line, it's going to,
21.		almost, most stations are going to have elevators…
22.	I	Right.
23.	K	Yeah,
24.	E	… so when you make major renovations you have to make
25.		improvements, for instance, but they don't care. Here, here is just
26.		about the worst in terms of the trade-off between like historic
27.		preservation and the road network, you know, it's like so much of
28.		this is completely unsatisfactory and unsafe but they don't care.
29.		They're not going to, they, they won't tear down that fence over
30.		there to expand the roadway to, to a safe distance.
31,	I	Why do you think that is? Why do you think…?
32.	E	Because I think[??]…
33.	I	[seem] to, to care more about people with disabilities having a
34.		quality of life, being able to get out. I don't know; that's how I
35.		look at it. I look at it as having a, a better quality of life if you can
36.		sort of live amongst everybody else and take the subway and…
37.	E	Well, anyone with a much more legalistic culture, you know, so
38.		one [unclear], you know, if you don't do it you're going to get
39.		sued. It seems to be a lot harder [?] here. It seems to be very
40.		unclear what the law actually is in England. I think it's very, and
41.		it changes so quickly. There's no, you know, it's pretty much
42.		whatever the Prime Minister really wants will become the law, so
43.		it's very unstable [cups clinking] and, um, I don't know. But I
44.		think fundamentally in the sense, you know, it's an elite [?] driven
45.		culture just the same way that is Germany or France. Some

46. [unclear] dominate and they clearly care far more about historic
47. preservation and they don't really care about disabled people
48. when it comes right down to it.
49. I Yeah.
50. E Discrimination; I mean it's almost impossible to win
51. discrimination suits here. In fact, you're allowed to discriminate
52. on almost any basis in employment.

'E' tells of the presuppositions he and 'K' had prior to living in the UK which included frequent trips to London but found that having a child with a pushchair put them at a significant disadvantage, restricting their mobility in the city (l.1-4). In line 5, 'I' take up the issue of the accessibility to public transport in London and expands this problem to all people with disabilities as well as people with children. Although this began as a discussion about 'the cultural here' –the UK and London specifically, 'K' removes culture from the equation by stating that an American city, New York faces the same problem (l. 7). Some further discussion about the access to public transport for people needing assistance ensues between lines 10 and 16 when 'E' once again makes culture relevant to the issue of accessible public transport. While he acknowledges that some of these public transport systems are significantly aged, he attributes the lack of modernisation of these systems in the UK and Ireland to the absence of any constituency with enough political clout to pressure the government into making changes (l. 16-21) while in contrast, the US government enacted the ADA[68] (Americans with Disabilities Act) to force the possible modernisation or new building of such public transport systems in regulation with this mandate.

[68] Title II of the ADA prohibits disability discrimination by all public entities at the local (*i.e.* school district, municipal, city, county) and state level. Public entities must comply with Title II regulations by the U.S. Department of Justice. These regulations cover access to all programs and services offered by the entity. Access includes physical access described in the ADA Standards for Accessible Design and programmatic access that might be obstructed by discriminatory policies or procedures of the entity.

Since this is lacking in the UK, 'E' categorises those in the position to do anything about these problems a moral ascription; "they don't care" (l. 25) and he attributes 'not caring' explicitly to a greater interest in "historic preservation" (l. 26). I suggest that 'E''s complaint between lines 24 and 30 is identity implicative as American; a country which is fairly young, with limited sites and structures of historical significance and that of a culture which is very much in tune with taking out the old to replace with the new[69]. In line 31 asks for 'E''s viewpoint on why it seems so that historical preservation supersedes safety. This question is not asking about a view which only 'E' has "why do you think that is" but *that* is something which 'I' aligns with as well. As 'E' begins to answer in line 32, 'I' overlaps 'E''s talk between lines 33 and 36 and formulates the necessity to implement such changes as a moral obligation and a civil right. Through this explication, she has expanded upon 'E''s complaint which consisted of a subjective position in favour of the needs of people on a general level which stands opposite a *cultural other* which is in favour of historic/structural preservation. I believe the latter is a *cultural other* opposite to 'I' and 'E' because they have already aligned together as sharing a perspective on legislation in support of people with disabilities (l. 20-22).

Although 'I' and 'E's share their subjective position in support of legislation and measures in support of improvements for, among others, people with disabilities, 'I''s formulation was a moral implicative. Beginning in line 37, 'E' diverges from this position slightly, while maintaining a subjective position which is in opposition to the *cultural other* mentioned above, he glosses the environment of

[69] This is a purely subjective claim. Having been born and raised in the US I am drawing upon the unique corpus of cultural knowledge which would be too lengthy to explain in appropriate detail here.

the US as "legalistic"[70] (l. 37) in which people do the right thing out of fear of being sued (l. 38-39) rather than moral obligation to other people. With this formulation, the US is not *necessarily* a more just place but certainly more punitive.

However, 'E' admits he is not really sure about the laws in England but categorizations the political system as being heavily dependent upon the whims of whoever is Prime Minister at the time, "very unstable" (l. 42-43) and splits the culture between contingencies who are "elite" (l. 44) and "care far more about historic preservation" (l. 46-47) and who "don't really care about disabled people when it comes right down to it" (l. 47-48). Interestingly, although 'I' had presented Germany in the previous extract as a place where socio-economic distribution seemed more even than the UK and 'E' had contrasted the rest of Europe in a positive light in comparison to the UK, he changes that position and categorizes Germany and France in the same way as he had the UK; as an "elite driven culture" (l. 44-45).

9.1d Summary of case study 2

Talk of the cultural 'here' was undertaken primarily by 'E'. As we saw in the previous chapter's, 'K' while present in the collective story about their move to the UK, was not a part of the narrative about really *being* here. She had 'got' here somehow, was here now and knew that she was not staying. Although she contributed to these extracts, it was not imperative for her to be a part of topics in any significant way. I believe this is because 'K' really was not totally on board

[70] I believe meant to use the word "litigious" rather than "legalistic".

with the move and was not convinced it was the right thing to do in the first place but when the opportunity arose and no other job for 'E' was on the horizon, they figured they would give it a try. As she said I in another part of our interviews, she liked Duran Duran and had liked London when they had visited and British TV shows too but quickly realized this was not the basis for establishing a long-term existence in the UK.

Much of what 'E' presented here saw him oscillating between various inter-subjective cultural positions; speaking about the US and the UK sometimes as a distant observer in one moment, only to switch to the position of a participating member in the UK cultural while orienting to his participation as a cultural member in the US. In doing so he at times occupied a culturally ambiguous position; simultaneously aligning with and distancing himself from both the US and the UK. Further inter-subjective polyphony was evident in the joint participant orientation to social objects such as culturally-bound ideologies like 'the American Dream'. However, there was a trend in his account and that is providing systematic critique of the UK which eventually leads to a presentation of the cultural as a place which is failing at all societal levels; such as through unequal distribution of wealth, insufficient healthcare particularly for those most vulnerable and even the infrastructure.

9.2a Case study 3 'J and L'

Data from the first interview did not produce anything viable for this section as it consisted primarily of the couple's history of how they came to the UK and a significant amount regarding 'J''s job and his position as a foreigner in the UK.

While that data could have fit well here, it was more appropriate for chapter

Seven's focus.

Second Interview
Extract Fifty Nine
J and L **(Case Study 3)**
August 2006

1.	L	Well, I'd like, we said to you the other day, I find(.)this is horrible
2.		to say but(.) in New Jersey where we're from um, it's very
3.		Hispanic, and very much a big(.)economical(.)difference between
4.		like, you're either here or you're here, there's not too much in
5.		between, and I find myself feeling far less, I don't consider myself
6.		a racist by any means, but far, look, it, those kind of thoughts just
7.		don't even enter my head, like they did back in, ohh…
8.	I	Are you saying this is of the, the, oh, when you say there was a
9.		disparity between economics, are you saying the Hispanic
10.		population tended to have less financially?
11.	L	Yes.
12.	I	And now you're saying, okay, you noticed that <u>there</u>, but you
13.		don't notice it here?
14.	L	You know what I'm trying to say, help me explain it.
15.	J	I'm not sure I [overtalking]. But I do [overtalking] one thing I will
16.		say…
17.	L	I find myself being(.)well racist in a way, like, you know, the
18.		igignorant cashier, or I'm sure they do it here, like, you're from
19.		the East and you're less. Even though I didn't mean it to be that
20.		way.
21.	J	It's weird because we do sort of have these kind of sometimes
22.		conversations at work here where I sort of th:ink.I feel like
23.		ethnicities more [merged]
24.	L	[acceptable]
25.	J	[yeah] I think you can see an interracial couple you know here and
26.		I think people [don't]
27.	L	[right]
28.	J	flinch at it as much
29.	I	Oh I see what your're sayin.Right so when you have, like in the
30.		States, when you have.frustration with someone(.)you <u>may</u>
31.		attribute that to.HE'S WEARIN A TURBAN SEE
32.	L	whereas here it just seems less of an issue.
33.	J	You brought it up in the context that you had to call the hospital
34.		for your records
35.	L	Yes
36.	J	And, you know(.)sometimes the service that you get is, you know
37.	L	But people complain about customer service here that it's shit too,
38.		but I, I haven't notice that as much as back there.
39.	I	yeah
40.	L	where you have this minimum wage in play you know who just
41.		doesn't care if they help you or not. And that could be any race

Between lines 1 and 7, 'L' sets up a difference between the US (New Jersey) and the UK (here, London) regarding socio-economic status and ethnicity. In the US, there is a divide between groups –though she does not explicitly say who the *other* opposite group is between being "here or here" (l. 4), in explicitly stating that "it's very Hispanic" 'L' establishes a categorical boundary between *them* and herself but it is not clear if there are more than two choices of "here or here"; why not, here or *there*? By formulating the place she is speaking about, it could be analysed in such a way as to say that there are two places –*here* or *here* to which 'L' does not belong to either. If she did, she would have located herself *here* and not *there* with, for example, the Hispanics. In contrasting her current *here* London to that place where she was in New Jersey, she is now in a place where something is different. Firstly, 'L' begins to formulate this difference as a feeling (l. 5) but stops short to provide a disclaimer that she does not consider herself to be racist by any means (l. 5-6). She reformulates her state of being as now not having the same thoughts here in London.

'I' needs to confirm that she has understood 'L' breaks this process into two sections; clarifying that the Hispanics were economically disadvantaged stating that in New Jersey in the US ethnicity and economic status were related (l.8-10) and that now in London this was not something she noticed (l. 12-14). Yet there are many people in London who are economically disadvantaged but without the typical indicator of certain ethnicity, it is not something that even enters 'L''s head (l. 6-7). While this later point is a question posed by 'I' to seek more clarification, 'L' does not offer an explicit answer but solicits the help from her husband 'J'. This move by 'L' in line 14 shows her orienting inter-subjectively to

'J' as she assumes he can help her explain 'it' because *he knows what she is trying to say*. I say this is because up to this moment, 'J' has not been present on this topic through the course of our talk. Therefore, 'L' is inter-subjectively orienting to any number of conversations from the past which the two have had in which they discussed how things were around them in New Jersey. Furthermore, considering that both 'L' and 'J' were born and raised in the same town in the US and moved together to New Jersey; they have acquired firstly their own inter-subjectivity within a local cultural realm and then moved together and expanded their inter-subjectivity as a couple in a new area together.

However, 'J' does not seem to be able to expand upon 'L''s position and begins to try to state is own position when he is overlapped by 'L' offering an explanation of the kinds of things that used to go through her head namely; "racist in way" (l. 17) responses to interactions with certain people but normalizes this kind of response by stating that she is sure they do it here (l. 18). What she cannot say is to *whom* do *they* do it to, i.e. who belongs to the group of the 'ignorant cashiers' and who can say "ignorant cashier". Where in the US, this was easier through ethnic-identification, it is not the case here in London.

In lines 23 and 24 'J' and 'L' show a harmonizing in the same melody which is describing the ethnic blending in London; only playing slightly different parts where 'J' categorises ethnic lines as "merged" while 'L' adds to the melody stating that this blending is "acceptable". This shows the dialogicity between 'L' and 'J' in their shared scheme cultural position of interpretation as well as their shared assessment of their new cultural surroundings.

In line 29, 'I' reorients the talk back to the point which 'L' was making before regarding the conclusions which she would make about people based upon the socio-economic categories she assumed they belonged to. In seeking clarity on this point, 'I' embeds a second story of sorts in her reformulation of how in the US people might attribute 'problems with others' as ethnically-contingent. The second story comes in the form of 'I' occupying a similar character position to 'L''s from the above but includes her own unique details to her story of someone getting frustrated because the other is doing something and that is contingent upon the fact that the other is a member of a category of people who wear turbans (l. 31).

'L' and 'J' construct jointly between lines 32 and 41 a position that service is sometimes bad and that service in the US is implicative of ethnicity. However, in the UK, even though there is sometimes "shit service", it is not contingent upon any particular ethnicity. The shit service is made contingent upon people who occupy jobs which pay minimum wage and as 'L' presented earlier, in the US, those people who are financially disadvantaged are generally people of other ethnicities such as the Hispanics. While in London, ethnicity is not necessarily a relevant contingency.

Second Interview
Extract Sixty
J and L **(Case Study 3)**
August 2006

1.	J	I find that in the States there's more of a racial undertone on
2.		things sometimes…
3.	I	Yeah.
4.	J	But there's, you know like, it's kind of funny because you know

5.		we were talking the other day, and I said, you know, I know,
6.		what's the, you know, in the US if you say, you said someone was
7.		black, well that's not politically correct, it's African American,
8.		and that's it,
9.	I	yeah
10.		you can't say Afro American, it's African American. Now but, so
11.		what do you say, you know, we were kind of just joking a little
12.		bit…
11.	I	Right.
12.	J	…well, you know, ah I'd say you…
13.	I	And we claim by saying that, that we're not being, ah, then we're
14.		being politically correct and not racist, which in fact…
15.	L	We're all Americans and it shouldn't matter.
16.	J	it's like I'm sayin here you know, are they African Britons? And
18.		we were just kind of joking about it, I'd probably say he is a black
19.		guy, and I'm like, if I said that…
19.	I	In the States.
20.	J	…I said, well, but it's also us, well, we actually, it was kind of a
21.		multi-mix you know,
22.	I	yeah
23.	J	it's [unclear] Indian, you know, blacks, caucasian, you know…
23.	I	Mm.
24.	J	…it was sort of, it was a kind of mixture of people, but it was kind
26.		of funny because we're…
27.	I	Yeah.
28.	J	…well, I couldn't really say someone's black…
29.	I	Yeah.
30.	J	…you know, that would be like a no-no...
31.	I	Yeah.
32.	J	…I think.
33.	I	No I agree.
34.	J	And I sort of feel like, it, [overtalking] the lines are a little
35.		more blended here.
36.	L	Yeah.
37.	I	Do you think that might be because it's because of London,
38.		because it's, it's London?
39.	L	Don't you think New York and [unclear] Manhattan will be the
40.		same way?
41.	J	I don't think so, because New York is just as bad sometimes I
42.		think.
43.	I	Is it?
44.	J	I think you've got to definitely you know, like a shh, walls are
45.		between like whites, blacks, even Hispanic, in New York.
46.	I	Mm, I definitely feel that in Detroit, definitely feel that.

In a position of the 'cultural here' which is in London 'J' begins by stating that the US has more of a racial undertone than the UK or, at least, London. The undertone is manifested through the guise of 'political correctness' when dealing

with how to properly categorising groups of people; groups which are not white (l. 4-11). Political correctness is termed as not using terms or behaviour which might be offensive to some groups of people. There are varying degrees of what constitutes as an offensive term and in the case of how to properly categorise a person of African descent, 'J' orients to the American politically correct term of "African American" (l. 10). While this was an accepted term, it would not work in the UK as the UK is not America.

Between lines 13-14 'I' displays her American identity through the use of the collective pronoun 'we' and begins to weigh in on the issue of political correctness by stating that by virtue of the fact that these classifications between different people are being made *is* in a way racism. 'L' supplements what 'I' has said in that Americans are just one group and that demarcation among them should not be the case. However, as the data from the previous extract showed, 'L' did this activity and furthermore she made ethnicity and socio-economic status mutually inclusive.

In line 11 'J' had begun to lead into his problem here in the UK as an American. He assumes that there must be a construct of political correctness in the UK but he is not sure exactly how it works (l. 16-18). Here is makes a further distinction between the US and the UK in that while there *must* be a system of political correctness in the UK, it is probably more relaxed here than in the US because here he probably would "..say he is a black guy" (l. 18) but that if he said that somewhere else (assuming the US as the contrasting is being done between both

countries but he does not get to finish this sentence) there would be consequences enough to deter him from doing so.

Between lines 20 and 33 'J' describes a scenario in which he was talking with a "mixture of people"; constituted by people whose ethnic backgrounds are different. 'J' describes himself being in an ambiguous situation where he is simultaneously compelled to orient to his American way of thinking which means categorising different ethnic backgrounds with politically-designed terms and separating between them but in a cultural setting where the lines between people are a bit more blended (l. 34-35). This shows 'J' acculturating as what he is describing is a new awareness that a native way of thinking about things is not necessarily helpful in a new cultural context. This new awareness, a perception which is constituted by dialogue about context, is dialogical because this new environment for 'J' is being socially created by the people around him, just as his understanding of the lines between ethnicities in the US is socially created.

In lines 37 and 38 'I' proposes through her question that London is a place which is constituted is such a way; London is a multicultural place where no one ethnicity has the majority in order to be able dictate the classifying of *other*.

Interestingly, although both 'J' and 'L' have presented in this and the previous extract a part of the US, New Jersey (in a neighbouring town to Manhattan) as a place where people are separated by various contingencies such as ethnicity and economics, the placement of 'L''s question about whether or not Manhattan isn't 'the same way' (l. 39-40) situates her at a position where she is in the topic of

multi-cultural places where the lines between people are blended. Strangely within the same sentences, 'J' at one moment denies that the two are which would suggest that Manhattan is not a multi-cultural place where the lines between ethnicities are blended yet states that New York is *just as bad sometimes*. If London (a place where there is blending) and New York (not a place where there is blending) are not the same, the question remains, in comparison to *where* is New York *just as bad*? I venture to say that 'J' is making a claim that New York, although it has a reputation for being a melting-pot, the very port where generations of immigrants have made their start in America, is not multi-cultural despite its multi-ethnic constitution. The lines are not 'blended'; ethnicity is still very much a topic and a source of social tension which is *just as bad* as the rest of the US.

9.2b Summary of case study 3

'L' and 'J' presented the cultural 'here' as a place which contrasted to home based upon socio-economic contingencies. Where they were once in a place where ethnic lines were distinct and socio-economic status was contingent upon ethnicity, London was presented as a different kind of place, while multi-cultural, a place where the lines between categories of people are less well-defined. A social construct referred to as 'political correctness' was shown by 'L' and 'J' to be a cognitive problem in a new cultural environment as it was culturally-bound to the US. While they assumed that political correctness existed in the US as well, they reported having problems deciding how to go about it.

Polyphony was seen at times through 'L''s inter-subjectivity toward she and 'I' as a couple and conversations they have had in the past about the places they

were. She tried to draw upon those things in the present, subjectively, to help her explain where she and 'J' are in the present. Further dialogicity was seen in the way the two constructed their view about their impressions about their new cultural surroundings; telling separate parts of the account but in an achieved coordination with one another.

9.2c Case study 4 'J and S'

First Interview
Extract Sixty One
J and S (**Case Study 4**)
June 2005

1.	J	It's quite interesting because I was the first in my department
2.		to…as a German, so it's quite normal for the…for them to,
3.		[unclear] German to become Volkswagen. I was the first so, um,
4.		apart from the person in the department obviously is responsible
5.		for, in charge for foreign service and [unclear] they are in contact
6.		but they've never been, um, never had a German in their team so
7.		it was quite an experience.
8.	S	[Unclear].
9.	J	I think it was quite interesting for them too, to get somebody from
10.		Germany and the first feedback I got is he's…he's normal.
11.		[Laughs.] I believe it was, yeah.
12.	S	And they were surprised that you…you're funny or you're
13.		smiling a lot.
14.	J	Yeah, smiling.
15.	S	They were.
16.	J	Yeah, because they were…I think they were expecting somebody
17.		who was, er, like they're normally expecting very serious people,
18.		very, um…
19.	S	Straight.
20.	I	And did they actually tell you they were surprised that you smile?
21.	J	I asked for feedback and so…and, um, I think the first feedback
22.		as I think they actually think you are normal, which is, you know,
23.		not normal, we…that's interesting.
24.	I	[Laughs.] Yeah.
25.	J	So I would say the same in Germany, wouldn't I? If somebody
26.		comes over that's just, er, if you go well into the team and you
27.		don't…and he's just normal, he is not like strange and you feel,
28.		oh…
29.	S	They said he's strange just because he's British or…
30.	J	Oh, no. You're right.

'J' tells a story that while it is quite normal for employees of Bentley to come to Germany, to Volkswagen, he was the first German to ever work in his department at Bentley in the UK. In lines 9 and 10 he explains that the first feedback he received from British colleagues about himself *as a German* in their department was that he was "normal". In lines 12 and 13, 'S' explains the way in which normal is constituted namely; being funny and smiling a lot. As such, the fact that 'J' was normal meant that he was a 'deviant case' of the British-held German stereotype. A stereotype such as this one and with the way it is presented here by 'J' shows the dialogicity of such social objects. As what is normal in a cultural context is something relatively shared collectively by its members, what is not normal is equally so. Normality is a construct which is something that is agreed upon by members and for 'J' to be classified as normal requires the input of various voices in consensus. This formulation is also identity implicative of British colleagues in that Germans, apart from ones like 'J', are 'not normal'. Normal in this case is culturally-contingent meaning; British are funny and smile a lot and Germans are "very serious" (l. 17). As 'J' is normal, the cultural distance between himself and British colleagues is greatly reduced.

'J' presents this activity of categorisation by his British colleagues as normal and reduces the cultural distance again by saying that he would do the same in Germany (l. 25). In line 29 'S' enriches 'J''s statement above that 'normal' and 'strange' would be used by cultural members about other cultural members without explicitly needing to <u>say</u> that this comment is about ones culture but that these assessments can be made upon other contingencies with may have nothing

to do with culture such as being funny, smiling a lot, fitting well into a team and so on.

First Interview
Extract Sixty Two
J and S (**Case Study 4**)
June 2005

1.	I	So, are you saying that, um, that you've integrated well?
2.	J	Yeah, I think so.
3.	I	Yes.
4.	J	Apart from, I mean, there are still language barriers, I think,
5.		which will never…some language barriers or some culture
6.		barriers with regard to, um, having a different heritage and not
7.		being able to watch the same TV shows and [unclear] at the
8.		moment, um, which help you to integrate because you look better.
9.	I	Oh, I see. Okay. So you're not watching, er, Footballers' Wives
10.		and Desperate Housewives? I can tell you all about that?
11.		[Laughter.] I can fill you right in. [Laughs.]
12	J	Bu that's a difference, isn't it?
13.	I	Are you working with mostly women or men and women?
14.	J	Mostly women.
15.	I	Okay, hm, that's interesting.
16.	S	We have to…to read a little bit.
17.	J	Yeah, which…which is different, which I think you're right
18.		because that's…this makes a difference too because there are
19.		different interests mainly.
20.	I	Oh, I would say definitely.
21.	J	Definitely, so, um, so, yeah, but I think it works fine at the
22.		moment.

'J' presents himself as having well integrated and takes the position that one can still do this despite having language and cultural barriers (l. 2, 4-6) and that these things will never change on account of the fact that people inherit a different heritage (l. 6) though those constructs of culture and language; each of which are constituted by people who share those things and which are constituted also through a history. 'J''s mentioning of TV shows is important point as TV programming reflects in many ways cultural values, situations, language (which is embedded in history and culture) (Marková, 2003a) which constitutes current as well as on-going discourses which have spanned over time. They are filled

with loads of implicit cultural data. 'J' recognizes the value of this medium for integration because they can provide a basis from which one can begin to contribute to the on-going dialogue which has preceded his being in the UK. If both a Brit and a German can talk about a show, cultural affiliations are put in the background and something is shared; reducing the cultural distance. This is something that 'J' is not able to do for some reason at the moment but despite this still feels he has integrated well. The means by which he has integrated rely therefore upon other contingencies.

'I' takes this point up and mentions some things on TV which she is watching at the moment (one show is a British show while one is American). 'J' orients with his question in line 12 to the fact that these shows are geared toward women although he does not explicitly say so. 'I' shows through the question in line 14 that 'J''s uptake of her story could implicitly mean that the TV shows that people who he is interacting with may not be of his interest which prompts her to ask whether or not 'J' works primarily with women, i.e. *the difference* 'J' mentions after 'I''s story about how she can fill him in on all the details of two people women's dramas on TV.

'J' confirms that 'I''s analysis was correct. In doing so, there are now two types of culture 'J' is facing in his interactions with people at work; the British culture and the culture of *women* in Britain.

First Interview
Extract Sixty Three
J and S **(Case Study 4)**
June 2005

S Watch these…we like to watch this…
I Oh, no, it's okay.
S …these, um, TV shows with, um, with Climbing the House, find out all the…
J [Unclear] property…
S …and, er, Home Abroad.
I Oh, a Place in the Sun.
S Yeah.
I Uh huh. Don't you wonder where they get all that money from? Oh, we decided to buy two homes.
[Laughter.]
J It's different because they…they…there was one…there was one, er, where they just sold their house, um…
I Without having a new one.
J …yeah, just resigned from their job, without having a job, just going over so that's different, isn't it?
I Definitely. I saw one where they had bought, they had had a house in London, and they sold it and they made like, how much was it, they made like £300,000 profit so they decided to go and buy a house in Fiji, I would do the same. [Laughter] because I mean they're like…they're like, with their profit they could, like, er, no, sorry, with the profit they could buy a normal home or an apartment, right, and then take 300 grand and go to Fiji because right now apparently you can buy property over there for cheap. It's just amazing, and I think…I think how can they do that because they have the most oppressive taxes in this country, I thought Germany's taxes were bad but England is even more expensive. 17%, um, [unclear] here, luxury tax, or VAT, and it's 16% in Germany, okay, so it's even more. Do you find it expensive here or?
J It's 50%, it's more expensive but we knew about this.
I Okay, but I mean we have the cost of building adjustment.
J Cost of living adjustment so that's not a problem. I think you just need to go to [unclear], it depends on…
S You wonder how, um, all the people, um, can afford their homes.
J Yeah, that's more interesting because for us, I mean basically we have a nice security package.
I Yes, we do. [Laughs.]
J I just wonder how normal people can, like normal or even get a good…
I They don't get the cost of living adjustment.
J …can…can afford this also. So that's where…
I And Ferraris have been driving around here, I think, oh, my God. So, I mean, my…my conclusion is if you have…if you have a Porsche or a Ferrari or something like that here, you've really got

46. money, like, okay, in America, not that I could afford a Porsche or
47. a Ferrari, I mean, oh, no, [laughs], did I give you that idea? No.
48. Not that I could there but I think it's easier to get that kind of stuff
49. there. We say in the States, um, we have more disposable income,
50. that means you pay less taxes, we get to keep more of our money.

This extract shows the participants discussing more details about the various television shows that they like to watch. The first few lines show a dialogical orientation between 'S', 'J' and 'I' as they try to determine which TV programme they are talking about and once they have agreed upon the show it is clear they have all watched it and have a common basis upon which to further the conversation. The talk done between lines 1 and 16 of this extract shows the dialogical orientation of all three toward one another because all participants do not need to spell out each and every detail of the show or shows which they are referring to. Sometimes they are seen finishing each other's sentences about what has gone on in the show.

In describing the events of this TV show about people buying and selling homes, there is a lot of cultural work being done. As I mentioned above, TV shows are laden with cultural representations. In discussing the people and activities of these TV shows, the participants are doing their own cultural identity work. For example between lines 12 and 16, 'J' represents the activities of the people in the show as though they are regular, normal events and nothing exceptional but do reflect the culture and it's people in some way. In doing so, he is presenting the UK homeowner/seller as someone who is different (l. 12, 16) because they "just [sell] their house", without having a new one (a point made by 'I' in completing 'J''s point from the previous line but with which he agrees) and "[resigns] from

their job, without having a job, just going over" (to the place abroad where the new house is that the person *wants* to buy).

'I' chimes in with a second story drawing upon the details of another show but in which she shares the character position of 'J' who is watching the activities of the people with the same opinion which is wondering how *these people* are able to do this (l. 17-26).

Up to this point in the conversation, the different cultural affiliations of 'J', 'S' and 'I' had not been overtly present. In fact, a fair amount of alignment was seen as they positioned themselves together through their stories about the homeowners/sellers on British TV. Now in line 29, 'I' makes 'J''s German nationality relevant. She has distinguished herself as someone with different nationality having "thought Germany's taxes were bad but England is even more expensive" (l. 27-28). While many Germans think Germany's taxes are high, 'I' orients to having had a moment where the *thought* occurred to her as she had another tax system to contrast the German tax system with.

Line 31 sees the beginning of 'J''s work on furthering his identity as an expat which is co-constructed by he and 'I' through their mutual orientation toward the knowledge about the difference in the cost of living (l. 31) and the cost of living adjustment they receive (l. 32). The manner in the way this is presented show that while 'I' and 'J' are able to live and experience the UK culture, it is an insulated experience. They are now not just foreigners working in the UK but ones which receive special benefits. Seeing as that is the case, 'J', 'S' and 'I' are

now aligned in harmony between lines 35 and 50 once again as expats who are in a financially-advantageous position compared to average Brits. Yet, there must be some other group other than average Brits because if the three of *them* cannot afford homes, how can others? There must be a contingent of people who appear normal –the discussion of average folks buying and selling homes, but in fact, are not. There must be a contingent of people in the UK that despite the high cost of living and absence of cost of living adjustment, have a lot of money.

'I' introduces the context of the US to provide clarity. She presents the fact that in the US, it is more likely that average people with a certain level of income are able to afford such items of luxury because their disposal income is higher due to lower tax brackets and while she does not consider herself one of these people, she believes that it is easier *there* than *here* to be one. While this may or may not be true or just simply relative, what is this example does is position 'I' simultaneously with 'S' and 'J' in polyphonic unison of expats, with certain advantages, who despite those advantages, are culturally and financially separate from majority culture members –members who can afford homes and nice cars.

First Interview
Extract Sixty Four
J and S **(Case Study 4)**
June 2005

1.	S	Um, [unclear] a lot, um, they did buy the car [overtalking], when
2.		you walk around our estate you always see these, um, mostly
3.		expensive cars like Audis and, um, new cars, all new cars, yeah,
4.		and you just wonder how all these people can afford two new cars
5.		in front of their four or five bed roomed house in a new estate.
6.	J	There's a lot of [unclear] you need to start early, like your
7.		example, if you started about 20 years ago, or like 15 years ago
8.		when it was probably a good time to…
9.	I	How old…how old are these people, do you have an idea, like
10.		you're talking about the ones that have all the nice cars, are

11.		they…are they our age? Are they older than us?
12.	J	A little bit older than we are, between 30 and 40.
13.	I	They must be people with children.
14.	J	30, 40.
15	I	Are they? So maybe we'll get there.
16.	S	Two or three or four children [unclear].
17.	I	[Laughs.] Okay. Um, okay, just a couple more questions and
18.		then we can stop. Um, what's positive about living here and
19.		what's negative?
20.	J	Probably the area is positive, positive…
21.	S	To know the language. To have…to look at your own country for
22.		the memory [?], it's interesting and…
23.	J	It's a good question…
24.	S	…just the experience, just to…to live abroad, and it's, um,
25.		[unclear] [speaks German].
26.	J	You have to get to know all the system and how it works.
27.	S	Yeah, it's [unclear] it's really better than Germany because, um,
28.		now we…we have one day a week, um…
29.	J	[Unclear] to baby-sit.
30.	S	…sent the children to a nursery and it's nearly impossible to do in
31.		Germany because we don't get any place or a place…
32.	I	Yeah.
33.	S	…in a kindergarten and when I talk to my sister in normal
34.		kindergarten, start at three, at the age of three, and you're lucky
35.		when you get a place.
36.	J	If you get a place, you can send them from eight to 12.
37.	S	Yeah, and you can send them from eight to 12 and how can you
38.		go to work when…when you have to pick up your child after
39.		three hours?
40.	J	Yeah, it is quite interesting. I think that's positive, you get to
41.		know the different systems and you understand and to be able to
42.		compare the German and see the positive differences.
43.	S	Yes, positive, you can use it. You can use this nursery system as
44.		well. Negative is, um…
45.	J	Positive is also we live a good life here.
46.	S	Yeah. You have someone looking for a house.
47.	J	[Laughs.]

The conversation of the cultural here with people all around them being able to afford large homes and expensive cars continues and 'J' suggests that time has played a role in the ability of these people to do that (l. 7-8) and begins to suggest that the economic situation fifteen to twenty years ago set people on a path to reach this economic level they see around them today. However, through answering 'I''s question about the age of the average person with this lifestyle,

the contingency of time does little to account for why the people around them are able to afford these things.

Having presented their position about where they see themselves in relation to and opposite majority culture members, 'I' asks the couple to make explicit the positive and negative aspects of living in the UK. 'J' and 'S' to construct their collective story (between lines 20 and 31) and begin with positive aspects which include the area they are living in, the experience of needing to use another language and gaining a different perspective of their country, the learning of new norms in a system which is different to the one they are used to as well as some things their life as expats afford them which is not the case in Germany. This last point is expanded upon in which 'S' states that things are better here in the UK than in Germany as she has the ability to take their two young children to a nursery one day a week. Between lines 33 and 39 there is a clear example of how 'J' and 'S' have acculturated in some way to the UK system. While this can be generally said when someone makes an explicit evaluation that a new place is better than the old as is done in line 27, here they have taken on the position of constructing a complaint about the German system. The structure of the complaint is done in light of a new experience which has added value to 'S' and 'J''s life. This added value was made possible in a different cultural context to their own native Germany.

First Interview
Extract Sixty Five
J and S **(Case Study 4)**
June 2005

1.	I	You were going to say a negative.
2.	S	Um, yeah, negative is the house [?]. I mean it's not that bad
3.		[unclear], and...but it's not...

J A negative is also…it's not really negative but I think it's, I mean we didn't have the chance really because of the babies to get to know a lot of people but I think in general I think the…the English people are interested, generally interested but not really more in…in, er, I can't say foreigners in us Germans, think quite difficult to find…I think normally if you're in contact with English people they normally already have foreign like foreign friends from foreign countries so they at least have something, that's my, you know, that's my impression. They are not very open, that's what I want to say.

S They are more open when they know people who live abroad. When they don't know people abroad they are not very open minded and they are also not very interested in you, in your country, they don't ask, they don't…

J Basically, yeah, it's not…I think they ask but you get the impression that they are not really interested in what you have to tell them. That's my…that's my feeling.

I Okay, then.

J So they ask you and they will say, oh, that's very nice but they will ask you in two weeks the same question. That's what I mean, so it's…

I You don't think they pay attention.

J …it's quite all right, um, it's nice…it's nice to ask but I don't think that's really…I wouldn't have expected it differently.

S I mean it's hard for me to explain in English but, um, you just get the impression when you, um, read the newspaper on the front page, when you see on TV, the news, or what you know about the, um, the feeling the British people have about the Germans, you just have to, something which is…you can't really grip it all, you just feel that something's, um, when you talk to people, you're not very sure if they like you or they don't like you so sometimes you just have the impression, when I say I'm German they won't like me or something just because of all the experiences with, um, [unclear]. They talk about the Second World War [unclear].

J Oh, that's another negative one, another negative one is that we don't get any international news here, you're buying a big well known newspaper, The Times, and you, I think, the first international news start on page 50 of, er, of the whole newspaper and you're just getting British news. I think that's a big difference. I think that's negative.

I Is it different in Germany?

J Definitely.

S Yeah. Front page international news.

I Yeah? Okay.

J So for us it's important, isn't it, at least in general important. So, um, that's the reason why we basically got German TV because we normally, we didn't get German TV to watch in German…like German language but to get the information basically.

S And sometimes…

J We didn't want to change this. We still wanted to get the

54. information.
55. I [Laughs.]

Having provided the positive points about living in the UK, 'I' requests again from 'S' and 'J' to provide any negative points. 'S' mentions the house but does not provide a lot of detail. 'J' however, provides an extended account between lines 4 and 13 of a social aspect which he finds negative. Although he suggests their limited ability to socialize due to having young children could have an impact upon their ability to come in contact with many other people (majority culture members), he still feels confident enough to make an assessment about the openness of British people opposite foreigners (l. 6-9). In his assessment, 'J' feels that while there is a sort of superficial interest from English people; that is about it. It does not go deeper though he is not sure if that is only opposite Germans or foreigners in general (l. 8). He is not stating here that there is not an interest in other *cultures* but that they seem to already have their "foreign friends from foreign countries" (l. 10-11). Whatever the underlying reason, 'J''s impression is that they are not very open. Therefore, as 'J' presented through the extracts thus far, he feels he has integrated pretty well to his life in the UK but that is a life which is insulated economically through a cost of living adjustment, socially through not watching all UK TV, living in an area which is affluent where people engage with him to a certain extent.

Between lines 14 and 17 'S' specifies more about the type of English person who is open to foreigners namely; those who know people who live abroad which suggests that 'S' means that open English people in the UK are so because they have attained a different perspective vicariously. 'J' contributes to their shared perspective asserting that any interest is superficial and that they do not listen as

is evidence by being asked the same question by the same person two weeks later (l. 23). Interestingly, although he shares these points, points which clearly show he has made thoughts about them and conclusions he states in line 27 that he would not have expected differently. However, the formulation of a negative point or complaint show that in some way, there were expectations.

While it was not certain if 'J''s impressions about the openness of English people had anything to do with he and 'S' being German, 'S' now orients toward public discourses about Germans and the British people's feelings about them which she has read in newspapers –"on the front page" and seen on TV.(l. 29-31). Just as 'E' from Case Study One, 'S' has created a link between herself, the negative impression she has about the openness of English people opposite her and the larger discourse around a category of which she is a member; *German.*

Is 'J''s statement about not having expected a different reception in England an orientation toward discourses back in Germany which warned him that this is the social climate in Britain toward Germans? Although he expected it, was he still hoping it would be different and thus the story about the negative, almost disappointment? Perhaps.

Another negative point about the UK is its apparent lack of interest in international news (in contrast to Germany) (l. 38-43). There might be a connection between this point and what 'S' said above about what is in the newspaper about Germans and the second world war. If, in fact, these topics appear "on the front page" (l. 29-30), it is certainly a significant statement about

the kind of public discourse –even in a "big well known newspaper, The Times" (l. 40) which is occurring if the 'internationally-disinterested' UK Newspaper industry finds such topics prudent.

'S' and 'J' present the UK media as providing them with insufficient international news; something which they like about Germany and which they decided they did not want to accept even for a period of time while living in the UK (l. 53). Just as 'E' from Case Study Two did, 'J' is presenting acculturation as something which one can exhibit control of and choose.

Second Interview
Extract Sixty Six
J and S (**Case Study 4**)
February 2006

At the time of this interview, 'J' and 'S' had been living in the UK for about a year and a half.

1.	J	Um. It's difficult to explain to you all this. I think it's the same as
2.		in Germany sometimes.
3.	I	Do you?
4.	J	Well, I think it's the same because people play their own little
5.		games, don't they, and everybody wants to know. There are a lot
6.		of people, especially in the project, there are a lot of people who
7.		want to, you know, want to…
8.	S	They want to have different, um, targets or something.
9.	J	Yes, they took the targets and they have to personal…also
10.		personally, you know, they want to get, you know, benefit
11.		from…from the project with regard to their own development and
12.		that's why they're playing their own…their own games. And they
13.		are not very…
14.	S	There's competition between different departments at work.
15.		Everyone tries to get them together, it's difficult.
16.	J	It's probably the same at the end.
17.	I	Okay.
18.	J	And also, of course, maybe, you know, you need to, you know,
19.		need to, um, to think, you know, as…like somebody else would
20.		think. If you…if you were coming from…from…if you were in
21.		Germany and somebody would come over from the UK with all
22.		this and tell you it's like this and we did this like this, and you do
23.		not want to get in contact with Bentley and you said why we can

24. do it ourselves, we don't need, you know, [laughs] you know
25. your help so.

This extract sees a melodic co-construction by 'S' and 'J' in which they remove culture from the work context and make the things that occur between people contingent upon people being just people; whatever the cultural context. They go about doing this with 'J''s first turn in line 1 by equating what is happening here in the UK with what happens in Germany sometimes. Rather than culture being the contingent point, it is people's "own little games" which they play (l. 4-5) with their own targets in mind (l. 8) to get what they want "from the project with regard to their own development" (l. 11).

Although this account from 'J' and 'S' is a nice example of a subjective polyphonic account of the context, it is also an example of polyphonic inter-subjectivity because this account is about 'J''s work situation; 'S' is a stay at home mother. Therefore, the construction about the context of 'J''s workplace is being doing with the subjective position which originated from 'J' through stories he has told to 'S' about what is going on at work. 'S' has then taken up some of those points of 'J''s stories and puts them forth as her subjective position in the here an now in inter-subjective coordination with 'J'.

In his final comments beginning with line 18, 'J' presents the expat-type account about *trouble working in a new cultural 'here'*. This account resembles the one told by 'J' from Case Study Three who also works as an expat in the UK branch of a business which has a global presence but whose successful subsidiary is located in the US. As 'J' is not a member of the majority culture but a member of

the parent company he faces certain challenges namely; people within a majority culture do not want to be managed or influenced by someone outside the culture. He explicates this point through a story between lines 18 and 25 in which he employs a 'if things were reversed' scenario. This last point again removes any culturally-implicative contingency to what he has said about his experiences in working in the UK and has categorised those things as just things which people do; here or there.

Second Interview
Extract Sixty Seven
J and S (**Case Study 4**)
February 2006

1.	J	...that somebody told me, I heard an interesting story, a German
2.		told me that he was, um, somebody who was [???] kind of
3.		working, you know, at Bentleys like a specialist, when he
4.		was...a few people coming over from, when he was back at
5.		Volkswagen, there were a few people coming over to...to visit
6.		Volkswagen for a certain period, I don't know, for a month...
7.	S	People were coming...
8.	J	...check on Bentley, working for two months in, er, Woflsburg [?]
9.		and they have, um, the German people actually said, all right, we
10.		probably need to invite them to, you know, to have like...to go for
11.		a meal and to go to the pub and maybe have something to do in
12.		the weekend, and, er, they also tried to share the, you know, the
13.		department say is anybody, you know, able to do something with
14.		them because they, you know, probably not, you know, everybody
15.		speaks English in Wolfsburg and whatever, what was interesting
16.		was that's maybe not...it was an example from this department,
17.		that's always the case, but, um, the interesting part was now that
18.		so, you know, I think they stayed over there for like one month,
19.		two months, and every evening they asked them and they all
20.		wanted to do something and they did, every evening, did
21.		something with them, er, and they were all fine with that, so when
22.		he came to Bentley, these guys were still at Bentley but they
23.		didn't even ask him once did he want to go out or if he wanted to
24.		stay with the family, or if he wanted to go in the pub with them. I
25.		was quite surprised by this and I just found this quite an
26.		interesting cultural experience. I just thought it maybe the
27.		personalities...
28.	I	Yeah, but especially...
29.	J	...you know, asking myself the question is the...is this England or
30		is this, um, just these two people which may also be true.
31.	S	I just read in my book, Watching the English, it's...the English

32. are very fond of their privacy, they, um, [clears throat] they like to
33. stick to themselves, their family, and, um, really want to be just at
34. home, er, just be private and…
35. J [Inaudible].
36. S It's interesting, um, the author just described that even the houses
37. don't have a name on it, they don't have…sometimes they don't
38. have a number outside. They do these big fences around their,
39. um, their little green bit they have, um, I mean we do get, in
40. Germany, it's quite to put fences on our ground, garden, around
41. our garden, but not always and not as high as…as here so like
42. [unclear] live in a box.
43. J Be themselves.
44. S Be at home and don't want to see anyone else or sometimes…
45. I I think my…my observation in Germany was that the walls were
46. rarely that high as I've seen them here.
47. S Right.
48. I But, um, I found them wanting even more privacy with these
49. blinds they come down, you can't see any light in the
50. window [laughs] I mean maybe it was just a very strange feeling
51. for me the first few nights in Fallersleben I went for a walk
52. and it was like the town was shut down and everybody left. It was
53. like a business.
54. J That's what happened here, isn't it?
55. I Yeah.
56. J You can look through the windows…
57. I It's a contrast.
58. J Yeah. As far as hospitality…

The extract begins with a polyphonic first story told by 'J'; the story, however, belonging to someone else, "a German" (l. 1). This use of an ethnic mention does important work in explaining the point of the story. The story, a German's story being told by another German is being used to say provide an example of what the German scheme of interpretation of the context of the story is. It is also identity implicative of 'J'.

'J' begins the story of a German from the parent company of Volkswagen and how he was at the subsidiary company, Bentley, working for a few months on some kind of project exchange. He began firstly with the perspective of the German worker at Bentley but then retrospectively switches within the story to

the point in time when the situation then was reversed and the same people from Bentley went over to Volkswagen for project work as it was this latter scenario which came first and that timing is vital to the point he is trying to make with his story.

Immediately this story separates between 'us' and 'them' it is a cultural separation between the English and the Germans although the German categorisation is explicit whereas the English is not. In place of 'English' 'J' uses "Bentley" –the UK-based subsidiary of the German parent company Volkswagen –the name of which is used interchangeably, I believe, to *mean* 'German'.

Between lines 8 and 20, 'J' uses explicitly the "German people" in describing the activities of what it means to be good hosts; a collective undertaking which involved every member of the department. These activities included things such as going out for meals, the pub, plans for the weekend, ensuring the English visitor had support in the local town in case there was a language barrier problem and all this over a period of one to two months. The Germans acquiesced all the visitor's request and "they were all fine with that" (l. 21) because, as 'J' is presenting through the story of another German –*that* is what being a good host means in Germany.

In line 21 the story reaches an axis point. Stories like this are like mirrors. The context, characters and details of the first part are set up in such a way to then provide a mirrored image or antithesis of that first part in the telling of the second part. As the first part of the story detailed good hospitality on the part of

the Germans, the second part of the story therefore shows the lack of hospitality on the part of the English. 'J' verbalizes having been "surprised" by this meaning that he did not expect this and must have had some assumptions about the extent to which the English and Germans shared understanding about what it means to be a good host. Rather than just chalking it up to "maybe the personalities" (l. 26-27), this story made him put his entire cultural understanding of the English into question.

This moves 'S' to share information she considers relevant to this point of 'J''s story; information she has acquired from a book she is reading about the English (while already having lived in the UK for about 18 months). She reports that one of the things the English value is privacy (l. 31). The point in time that 'S' has chosen to include this information is important as she is attributing what 'J' considered negative behaviour simply which is representative of a cultural value and this cultural value is expressed not just opposite outsiders but also between themselves through the lack of house numbers and names and the large, high fences which line their properties.

Between lines 45 and 48 'I' makes this value of privacy analogous to what she experienced in Germany as there are also walls, but not as high. Furthermore, there measures undertaken in Germany to ensure privacy but they are just different (l. 48-53).

The conclusion for 'I' is that it's just a contrast but for 'J' the contrast is in hospitality between the two places. This formulation by 'J' shows an alignment

to his German perspective on what it means to be hospitable and through the story he told, the conclusion is from his point of view, the Germans are hospitable, the English not. 'S' however, through her story seems to have been able to attribute this behaviour to a cultural value which is practiced between majority culture members as well.

9.2d Summary of case study 4

'J' and 'S' presented the cultural 'here' as a place which contrasted to home based upon economic contingencies; in occupying a position which is economically-advantageous through foreign-assignment contractual income supplements, house, auto and utilities subsidies, they are living among others who do not have these. However, these advantages serve the purpose of elevating their economic status in order to be able to live *among* majority cultural members who can afford these things without the supplements.

Despite the language and cultural barriers 'J' refers to, he says that they have integrated well. Seeing as those barriers are ones which can never be fully removed, it is important to at least *appear* as though one belongs. The economic assistance serves the purpose that by appearances, 'J' and 'S' seem correctly positioned within the culture where they are living. As I argued back in chapter four, even physical appearances are social objects. By *looking* the part through appropriate house, car and residential area, this should reduce some of the cultural distance between 'J' and 'S' and other majority culture members living around them. If they had been forced to live on a non-adjusted income, they might have had a very difference experience socially-speaking.

The description of 'J' and 'S''s surroundings and their opinions about a culture in which they see members being able to buy and sell houses and leave jobs without any real consideration or consequences presents a very interesting contrast to the naïveté –at least regarding the economic status of some of it's members- with which 'S' and 'J' viewed the UK culture through their concern with the health system. Although data from other parts of our interviews which did not make it into my analysis in this thesis continued to show 'S''s concern with certain practices of the health care system, by presenting data which showed the aspects of the UK which surprised 'S' and 'J', I am able to show the ways in which presuppositions about a culture and its people are dealt with discursively and the implications for how they view their positions as foreigners.

There were various instances of polyphony which included not just the inter-subjectivity displayed by 'S' and 'J' in their construction of a couple's narrative about living in the UK but also in the ways in which they oriented to points of larger public discourses around them as foreigners or Germans. For example, 'J' oriented to the polyphonic social object of a British stereotype about Germans, by being characterized as 'normal', 'J' was a deviant case; he was not like other Germans. Interestingly, however, this deviant case is not enough to disprove the stereotype. Rather than taking this latter position himself and pointing a moral finger toward people who do such things, 'J' normalizes this social behaviour by putting himself in the same position of British counterparts in saying that he would do the same (assumingly meaning 'if the situation were reversed').

Furthermore, we also saw the same phenomenon which was present in case study one and three in which participants' oriented parts of their narratives toward larger public discourses around categorizes they aligned with such as Americans, Germans or foreigners in general.

'J' and 'S''s narrative was told in light of the larger public discourses around Germans as they had been 'warned' about prior to coming to the UK as well as what they had seen through the media while they had been living there. The media as a source of cultural information is explicitly mentioned but according to 'J' and 'S', language and cultural barriers limit their access to this information and therefore limit their ability to be a part of the majority culture –even if they are participating in the same activities as majority culture members.

'J' and 'S' do appear to have acculturated in some way to the UK as evidenced by the way in which 'S' constructed a complaint about the German day-care system.

9.3 Chapter summary

This chapter saw the participants taking cultural positions in doing talk about living in a new cultural *'here'*. Much of this talk showed the ways in which culturally-bound information was evoked to account for difficulties or means of interpreting experiences they were having and the problems associated with doing that. As a result of new cultural experiences elsewhere, participants were often seen relying retrospectively on their native cultures.

The role of the majority culture as an ambiguous collection of voices (creating attitudes, ideologies, values and so on) was now brought more explicitly into the narratives of the participants as it was these *things* –the social elements which constitute culture- which forced the ordering and re-ordering of the experiences and events of their lives in the UK in coordination with their past, part of which had been told through the course of our interviews.

People discussed issues or things they have noticed about a new majority culture and the analysis provided an opportunity to see what positions –cultural or otherwise- they took in doing that explaining. This information was particularly useful for understanding the ways in which people present themselves culturally as expats in relation to the majority culture, other foreigners and their native culture as well as the ways they may have changed their position(s). Through the analysis I was able to show the possible variation in inter-subjectivity; orientation to a partner, public discourse, other people who are participating in the interaction at hand are all possible sources from which speakers can draw upon in their work to construct a coherent story about these experiences, explicating the indexicality of such stories. These situated activities saw people at the intercultural interface. Through points of their life being told at certain times in their interview, they were deep into living in another cultural here and now.

Chapter Ten

Discussion

"And all the answers that I started with, turned out questions in the end"

Allison Krauss & Union Station from the song "Gravity"

10.0 Chapter Introduction

In this chapter I will provide a summary of the findings of this study in the light of the aims for this thesis. I was interested in how acculturation added to the complexity of a sense of self and show changes in the self through this experience. To summarize on the numerous scholars whose work I turned to in helping me write this thesis, it is indeed an accomplishment to be one person. For years, my predecessors and contemporaries have studied phenomena of the human psyche which they could see, measure, predict and generalize. While all these efforts are indeed helpful in yielding greater understanding to the human condition, I was troubled studying an experience so personal to me and which I intrinsically felt would be limited by what has been done before. However, it took a while for me to arrive at the point where I had a firm theoretical basis from which to produce this thesis.

I sought to investigate what happens at the interface of interculturalism; what happens when Psychology and culture meet? Seeing that Psychology is the study of the human mind and its functions, mental characteristics, attitudes of a person and the mental factors governing a situation or activity[71] and culture is 'man made', I had to find a way to study the ways in which these psychological 'non-

[71] Per Compact Oxford English Dictionary

tangibles' could be made *real* in order to study this process. This resulted in a methodology aimed at studying the symbolic representations of reality (Chaudhary, 2003) through language.

Under the guidance of my supervisor, I began the PhD in psychology with a focus on the self through language and communication. Under his recommendation, I spent a fair amount of time familiarizing myself the methods outlined in this thesis. I collected my data and attempted some analysis strictly focused on what was going on within the talk and the normative features which people would orient to therein. The question still remained to me, however, how can I see change? What does acculturation look like when it is done through language? In what way can I show evidence that acculturation is Psychological?

The 'a-ha' moment occurred well into the second year of my PhD when I read a paper by Hubert Hermans on the 'Dialogical Self'. For me, this theory was the key to explaining why living with permanent intention abroad seemed change me in ways which I could not quantify or even explain. It was about more than just seeing things in a different way or using different words. It seemed that the experiences changed some of the ways in which I viewed myself; where I belonged, what my values and beliefs were particularly now from a position outside of my native culture. It also changed the way I viewed my own history; changes that I began to weave in my own narratives I told to people which felt necessary in light of my new present reality.

As I was focused on this process as manifested through language, I needed a method which could help me avoid the pitfalls of subjectivity in research through researcher bias/contamination but yet could explain phenomena which, for better or worse, are cognitive or 'inside the head'. In other words, how could I avoid being trapped in drawing conclusions about my data which were the result of ascribing intentions to what people were saying. For me, no method thus far could help me explain these things.

With the 'Dialogical Self', new world of understanding psychology opened to me and led the way to even more scholarly work which I could draw upon to build a solid analytical framework and greatly enriched my analysis. The concept of 'I-positions' resonated with me. After this point, I was then able to explore acculturation through a method of study looking at positions one might hold as a person in a cross-cultural context by attributing various positions to normative features in conversation. In paying special attention to these different positions, I had a construct with which I could focus on the multiplicity of the "...occasionally incompatible cultural selves or personal cultural positions" (König, 2009, p. 98) which constitute a person's sense of self as a result of living in a foreign country.

As I mentioned above, a significant amount of research seeks to explain human phenomena which can inevitably be encapsulated and generalized. Rather than seeking to present any kind of generalization about my participants and their experiences, I sought to highlight the variety among them. More specifically, although the context I chose to focus on –acculturation- has certainly provided a

fair amount of evidence through my data as to its great variability, in the end, my greater interest turned toward the variability of the self. Acculturation became at the end of this project just another interesting context through which to study what now interests me the most; the variability of self as evident through inner speech and dialogue.

10.1 Overview of the Findings

As Marková states, "although internal dialogue and inner speech form essential part of communication, it has not been given much attention in studies of interaction and language" (2006, Abstract). The methods and theoretical framework of the thesis allowed me to answer the calls of Hermans (2001) to study culture differently and of Marková to use a 'dialogical epistemology' to study the "dialogical phenomena in their complexity and multiplicity language, communication [and] subjectivity..." (2006, Abstract). The former provided a named means by which to categorize and compartmentalize these different positions of self in talk about culture and the latter provided the sound theoretical framework for explaining the irreducible dyad of self and other (Marková, 2000; 2003b; 2006; 2009); others who constitute that culture in which the self is found.

Through a methodological framework which focused on the normative features of conversation (Sacks, 1992) such as storytelling and using membership categorisations and place names in situated instances to do 'performative work' in the construction and maintenance of one's identity, I was able to show the variability in the empirical problems of the stranger (Schutz, 1944). This variability was abundantly evident through the instances of talk which were

clearly to product of inter-subjectivity or 'collective voices in the self' (Hermans, 2001).

In order to help me better explain this complexity and multiplicity, I often relied upon musical terminology. As I am only at the mere beginning of my understanding of these complicated and intertwined ideas, it was the best way to keep myself clear. I often likened the narrative to a song which was being played. A song which was at times played by different instruments (or voices) sharing in the melody, at times only one instrument. At other points, the song continued to be the same one, but the parts played by different instruments were more in harmony with one another. Perhaps in the future I can find more fitting analogies but for now, I will stick with that one.

10.2 Findings

Below I have grouped my findings under certain headings and in each of those sections provide specific examples from the chapters which I find particularly noteworthy and significant.

10.2a Findings: Chapter six

This chapter began the study of the ways in which language is a catalyst of managing interpretative schemes; it is a regulating activity (Leudar & Costall, 1996). One of the regulating activities of language is narrative. As narrative is used as a metaphor for psychology, people are seen using it as a mechanism through which they constantly order and re-order the events of their lives (Hermans & Kempen, 1993). As I mentioned in this chapter, the 'Quixote

Principal' suggests that one way in which people shape their identity is through the reading of stories. Through the studying of situated story-telling among multiple story-tellers as was the case of this chapter, I was able to show this phenomenon in situ.

In order to show embed this phenomenon in culture, I looked at the 'standardized relational pairing' of membership categories 'us' and 'them'. I was able to show the ways in which talk about a shared cultural activity of shopping was debated and configured through the use of culturally-bound objects of knowledge. This not only resulted in explicating the variability of culture as made by people but also the variability of personhood as made by culture.

By looking at the 'standardized relational pairing' of membership categories embedded in culture, 'us' and 'them,' I was able to show the ways in which talk about a shared cultural activity such as shopping was debated and configured through the use of culturally-bound social objects. This not only resulted in explicating radical variability of culture but also radical variability of self in and through that culture and vice versa.

Data in this chapter showed the way in which certain character positions are called forth in situated instances to accomplish something in and through talk. While a person may occupy any number of character positions, in the situated instance of a message board-based discussion about customer service, the character positions based upon retrospective experiences as 'customer service provider' and 'customer' were evoked in order to contrast cultures. Furthermore,

the orientation of these character positions to those of other participants in order to formulate arguments around the context of customer service showed evidence of dialogical orientation of people in situ.

The unique platform of the message board by virtue of its categorisation as 'American' provided a proverbial axis upon which the unit of a singular American culture could be seen being weighed; showing just how variable culture is among those members who presume to share it. As such, 'culture' was shown as a tool which modulated those activities of people as well as created challenges for them at the same time.

As Marková (2009) states, speakers create links to others' communications, anticipating their responses, reactions and feelings (p. 219). Through message boards, the structure of people's posts showed an orientation toward this 'dual addressivity'. As the posts were possibly the only opportunity a person had to establish their identity in a strong enough way, the structure of their argument had to be as efficient and well-formulated as possible. Through various discursive tools such as disclaimers (Hewitt & Stokes, 1973), ethnic mentions (De Fina, 2003), formulations and accounts, people are deploying personal experiences to show their positions in relation to majority culture and its members. Often, such as through the use of ethnic mentions and accounts detailing considerable knowledge through experience, interlocutors are trying to establish positive positions within the majority culture or establish that their cultural interpretive scheme is better and generally use these tools to ascribe global relevance (De Fina, 2000) to their arguments and claims about culture.

Through the various posts which followed, people were seen orienting to aspects of other people's formulations in order to structure their own argument. Moreover, having read previous arguments and subsequent reactions and second stories, the next author could carefully consider their position, examine what seemed to work and what not and were aided in creating their contribution; all with an orientation not just toward those who had already posted and but also toward responses yet to come.

10.2b My findings: Chapter seven

This chapter looked at the way the assumptions and presuppositions about membership categories operate in narrative. As the context of these narratives were interviews about people who live abroad, or 'expats', the focus was to see the way these categories were constructed and managed in narrative.

Variability in the 'shared-sameness' was highlighted in chapter six. Here I took a closer look at something I noticed in the data namely, the specific ways in which this variability extended to what 'kind' of foreigner one considers themselves to be. This point of orientation serves as a benchmark for subsequent work in contrasting cultures, the ability of a person to integrate into a new majority culture; the interface of culture and psychology. In order to be able to go on and 're-order' the events of their lives in a foreign culture, one needs to sort out their place among those majority members. This serves to answer some fundamental rhetorical questions such as *how foreign am I?* and *to what extent can I belong here?*

'Expats' and other migrants who are not ascribed their membership categories such as is the case with Refugees and Asylum Seekers have an additional task of somehow defining what constitutes their membership. These participants came to our interviews with certain ideas about who belongs to a certain category and the things those kind of people do to belong in that category (Smith, 1978). They quickly realized that they had to sort these details out between them in order to proceed with further talk about life as *that type of person living abroad.*

The data revealed something interesting in that there was clearly a big difference in the way people felt they needed to establish what kind of foreigner they were. For the people who had moved as a part of their job, there was very little need to establish the type of foreigner they were as it was attached to a greater specific purpose. However, the people who just decided to move to a foreign country, there was a missing platform for their foreignness for which they needed to establish and they did that in and through their talk.

The data and analysis in this chapter challenged some assumptions made by Sacks (1992) and Schegloff (2006) about the primacy of membership categories in interaction. While there are numerous devices which people can use to conduct their participation in interaction; when a context is pre-established such as the case with an interview. Some of these devices have priority (Schegloff, 2006). This would mean that as an interviewer, my role of interviewer has prime face relevance. However, the data showed that although this was an interview and the interviewer should be asking the first question –this did not always

happen. What held priority was the fact all participants in the interview (interviewer and interviewees alike) were expats, thus making all members equally-contributing members capable of interviewing each other. While it is true that at times, I as the 'interviewer' asked questions of my participants, the unusual start of the first interview with case study one showed that what appears explicitly as a particular type of interaction such as an interview, may not necessarily be governed by the corresponding (and presumably omni-relevant) category devices. This opens the door to the possibility that such devices are polyphonic –not that one necessarily supersedes the other but are occasioned and indexical depending upon who participants are regardless of what they *should* be doing.

The participants in these cases presented several contingencies relevant to the category which they considered themselves members. Changes in mentality, orientation to what the move abroad meant on the whole for a person's future and the length of time one stays and intends to stay were all contingent points which separated those expats from other people who spend time abroad. Furthermore the data revealed that for second-time foreigners, such as 'G' from case study one, the contrasts are not so stark and there may be less of a need to 're-order' the events of one's life from before.

The work in establishing one's position as a foreigner saw one strategy explicitly used here; the strategy of distinguishing between self as a foreigner and *other* foreigners. In combination with a listing of activities and attributes which other foreigners engaged not and which were not associated as belonging to a majority

culture as well explicitly alignment to majority culture members, participants were able to reduce the extent of their foreignness. The data also showed the extent to which people will split membership categories –including those to which they belong- in order to define exactly the type of member of that category which they consider themselves to be such as 'E' from case study one did in the case of Americans abroad. This point illustrates the fact that membership categories, such as American, are seen as variable from within the category as outside of it. In fact, I would argue that the way in which membership categories are viewed from within are exponentially more variable than the ways in which they are seen by non-members. Based upon these points, membership categories are constituted socially, are polyphonic and therefore fluid social objects.

In accordance with a certain-type of mentality needed to live abroad, case study two added support to a claim that acculturation is something which is in part under one's control and that one can choose whether or not to accept things about a new culture. Although 'E' from case study two did not attribute this choice to any greater social environment, it is a variation of the point made by other case study participants, 'J' from case study three and 'S' from case study four, in which their acculturative strategies or activities were as a direct result of larger public discourses about foreigners (Breugelmans & van de Vijver, 2009).

One last point which appeared in the data was at times a stark contrast in the way participants discursively constructed their identity as a particular type of expat and what the analysis of their narrative accounts actually described them doing. In the case of 'E' from case study one, a lot of effort went into building an

identity of someone seeking out a place with a more worldly point of view yet the descriptions of her activities saw her more and more isolated and selective in regards with the kind of people she was willing to interact with. Although the move abroad and her impending position as a foreigner was something she connected to a long history and alternative, multi-cultural upbringing, 'E' faced serious problems when encountering the actual experience of living abroad. This case presented a very explicit example of the problems faced by a person, despite their preparations, when ideas are empirically tested and furthermore they are tested at the interface of person and a new majority culture. This is the point where the person is at their most vulnerable and now truly experiences what it means to be the stranger.

10.2c My findings: Chapter eight

Through the course of this chapter, many reasons were presented by the expats for leaving their home countries. As I discussed above, for participants whose moves were not tied to a larger purpose such as a job, the accounts for leaving were significantly more embedded in personal reasons. In an effort to look at the ways in which subjectivity and inter-subjectivity were constructed and used to build a narrative about the personal significance of moving abroad, I took and approach to mental action which emphasized diversity; diversity of self through situated accounts (Wertsch, 1991). Whereas contingencies within a narrative might constitute the unit of analysis (ibid.), here it was the constructing of the past *itself* that was interesting.

This focused upon how conversational devices such as formulations, accounts, self-disclosures and categories shaped these narratives. In other words, paying very strict attention to the ways in which people put those things together. When people do this, there is an assumption that speaking and listening are mutually-opposed (Holquist, 1983, p. 311). The ways in which these things were organized was very much with the purpose of constructing a consistent narrative for themselves and those listening. The dynamic added by the fact that family members were part and parcel to this made the accuracy of this task all the more important as they are witnesses who could verify or refute what was being told (Ochs & Capps, 1997). In this way, the irreducible dyad of self and other is evident as the participants orient to their partners in the telling of a collective story about the couple. I was able at times to dissect singular aspects of an intertwined story by focusing on Bakhtin's concern with who was doing the speaking (Wertsch, 1991).

The data in this chapter saw the use of several discursive devices which as I explain in greater detail below in the 'theoretical implications' are polyphonic. For example, 'place-names' and named person's as place names were relied heavily upon in establishing things like 'mindsets', 'mentalities' and types of people and the ways in which these things were related to the person using them. In one case, these things were methodically used to reduce the diversity within the US –something which was first established through a multicultural up-bringing, in order to present the US as possibly 'in-hospitable'.

Another interesting point seen in the data was the way in which participants talked about what it is like switching cities (in the US) and switching countries. Although 'culture shock' is often something described as happening to people when they switch countries, in the data it was described as something which can happen within one's native country simply by moving to another area. This is significant to the stories being told about moves abroad are in some way analogous or related to the move within their home country. For 'E' from case study one, the 'culture shock' resulted when she moved from Alaska to the South as the only things she had known about that area had come through reading books or seeing films. Similarly, 'E''s move to Europe had also been preceded only through information and not experience. For 'L' from case study three, a story about a move to London spawned a story about her first move away from home in the US when she moved from Michigan to New York.

As I mentioned above, the participants who chose to move abroad independent of a job which sent them there needed to embed their move in their personal history. In case study three something peculiar happened –even though 'L''s reason for being in the UK was attached to her husband, 'J''s job, she still sought to assign this undertaking personal relevance. While other participants embedded their impetus to move abroad as something connected to their history, 'L' used her history to account for the reactions she was having as a result of moving to London.

10.2d My findings: Chapter nine

This chapter looked more closely at people describing their experiences at the cultural interface. In the case of one participant couple, 'E' and 'G' from case study one, new cultural experiences had them arrive at a point where they needed to take stock of their current situation and allowed them to 're-define' where they were and what they wanted to do. In Hacking's (1995) terms this would have meant that the past of individual actions is indeterminate. However, as Sharrock and Leudar (2002) assert, the re-definition is coordinated with the initial description. Even if the current position of participants brought them to a point of realization that their past had lead to a point which was not consistent, the past would still have relevance as it provides a context against which one can contrast and make adjustments.

In an interview of experiences of being an expat, this often resulted in stories involving interaction with majority culture members. These stories aligned characters in certain ways and often described problems, limitations or things which seemed to cause the teller to reconsider their way of thinking or doing something. In the case of 'E' from case study one, a story about an interaction with a bank teller was one such example. Here 'E' told the story as a foreigner with bank teller experience which was culturally-bound to the US. Rather than accepting that the difficulties she was having might be because of her limited cultural and linguistic resources, she attributes the problems to larger public discourses as Leudar et al. (2008) found in their study about hostility themes making their way into the narratives and identity work of Refugees in the UK. This was then used by 'E' as a potential disclaimer as to why she would not

integrate into Swiss culture and supports what Breugelmans, van de Vijver and Schalk-Soekar (2009) found regarding the impact of majority culture attitudes on multiculturalism on the acculturation strategies of foreigners. This orientation to larger dialogical networks in order to 'formulate a place' was seen in cases one and four when participants explicitly mentioned the larger public discourses about foreigners as a part of their narratives in discussing doing their own identity work as a certain type of foreigner in the cultural 'here'.

In fact, all forms of the media –the dispersion of information within a culture about that culture and about other cultures- was quite prominent in the narratives included in this chapter. These elements made relevant the ways in which what is said through these channels are important and content (and context) rich sources of cultural information which serves to define what constitutes the majority culture socially-speaking as well as what –and who- does not.

Data in this chapter also showed that despite participating as cultural members in the new country and doing every-day things, this did not change the way they felt. Many of the activities described in talking about the cultural 'here' were the same as those which they would engage in at home yet implicit culturally-bound interpretative schemes created new problems. Some of those schemes were such things as culturally-bound ideologies such as 'the American Dream' from case study two or 'political correctness' from case study three. Often these social objects were used to do various description activities; doing moral ascription in the process.

Finally, talk about the cultural 'here' saw participants often looking retrospectively at their home countries and doing contrasting work about their home countries in light of new cultural experiences in the UK. Rather than the native cultural necessarily being the point of orientation, participants could be seen flipping between positions –using the new cultural context as the benchmark as was seen in case study four in talk about the day-care system in the UK.

10.2e Narrative as metaphor for psychology and the 'polyphonic novel'

Sacks' work on 1st and 2nd stories was among one of the most useful tools in helping me to solidify an analytical mentality toward the complex and multiplicity of dialogism in language and communication and personal positions or subjectivity. While Sacks determined that the similarity of stories in interaction was not accidental but rather the result of people 'achieving similarity', he stopped there; his primary interest here being to show that storytelling was a normative feature of interaction and that the component parts of stories (things like characters, plots and context details) revealed participants' orientation toward one another making conversation something highly organized rather than chaotic.

In looking at stories in this way, it was very clear that much more could be derived from this 'achieved similarity' –it had to come from somewhere. As Sacks was a Sociologist, he did not tread in the direction of psychology although his work is certainly useful for those studies also.

The orientation of one person to another's ordering of events, characters and the building of context in the construction of their own 2nd story were evidence to me of inter-subjectivity. In the construction of a 2nd story a person -oriented to the other and the inter-subjectivity which constituted the subjectivity of the 1st story, is drawing upon their own inter-subjectivity in constructing their subjective position. Therefore one person's subjectivity is constituted by "concrete manifestations...with the self *versus* another self, the self *versus* group and group *versus* other group..." (Marková, 2006, p. 125).

In the interview data I also observed the different trajectories stories took depending upon who the recipient was (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 1997). As I, the interviewer, was always at least one of the recipients of these stories, my participation in the interview ultimately influenced the story depending upon the ways in which I participated at points in the interview; sometimes as an interviewer who was asking certain questions and requesting certain stories or pieces of information at other times as a conversational partner who was a fellow member of the category of 'expats'. I believe the variety in the types of 'expat stories' shows how my inter-subjectivity constituted by different things such as what I know about being an expat, the stories of other expats and so on affected these different conversational encounters. Afterall, the goal of each of these talks was to request a certain kind of story.

10.3 Polyphony

One of the points I struggle with the most during the course of my analysis was how to go about explaining what constituted polyphony at any given time. Admittedly, this was a recurrent question from my supervisor. Furthermore, not

just the elements which constituted polyphony but what the differences were between polyphony and variation. To date, I still do not have a concrete answer to this question.

During my viva Professor Ivana Marková asked me whether or not I believed I had actually used Bakhtin's meaning of the word. I sat quietly for a moment and could not say with certainty that I had. In fact, says Professor Marková, the concept is very hard to understand and no one is really certain of Bakhtin's intensions with this term. As she noted, the term was really only used by Bakhtin in his critique of Dostoevsky's novels. Professor Marková also noted that according to other scholarly reviews of Bakhtin, he is understood as having been very frustrated at the fact that most people did not understand his intensions with this term.

The concept of polyphony as a construct for explaining dialogical phenomenon in psychology has been exploited by various scholars. The uses of the term are as varied as the scholars who try to use it. I had a grasp of what I had wanted to do with this term but the critique was that I had been too bold and extended my use too far. Moreover, I needed to make clear that in using this term, one should be very careful as not to make any claim that dialogical phenomena, polyphony and the like are in any way tangible.

What I hoped to do with terming 'something' i.e. *utterances,* as a polyphony or as polyphonic was to find a way to explain the possibility of many voices in constituting social objects; *objects* which are somehow *units* of meaning. These

utterances are, in Bakhtinian terms, "unit[s] of 'speech communication'" (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p. 125) and these are different than other speech acts because there is an assumption that it is being said to someone (ibid.)

> ...each utterance is by its very nature unrepeatable. Its context and reason for being differ from those of every other utterance, including those that are verbally identical to it. Two verbally identical utterances never *mean* the same thing, if only because the reader or listener confronts them twice and reacts differently the second time...the reasons we speak, the very reasons texts are made, lie in what is *un*repeatable about them.
> (ibid., p. 126 emphasis in original)

The implicit, *un*repeatable aspects of talk and text are what I hoped to explain as polyphony; in an attempt to answer the question of 'why that now?' whereby particular categories were used in building various utterances at certain instances. Yet this explanation provides only one account of my use of polyphony. In effect, this understanding of polyphony would be considering the *intersubjectivity* of the "metaperspective" (Gillespie, 2007, p. 276) which is the "Self's perspective on Other's perspective on Self and Other" (ibid., p. 276) as well as the *intra-intersubjectivity* or "meta-metaperspective" which is how the "Self conceptualize[s] Other's understanding of Self's perspective on either Self or Other" (ibid., p. 276). Yet these are only two examples of how I used 'polyphony'.

The third way was not *entirely* in consideration of any type of any exhaustive coordinated activity between interlocutors. At times I saw certain categories or place-names being used to do something which made me believe that these categories have been socially-constituted and acted as resources picked up by the user i.e. *pre-existing and available to be used.* If so, from where?

While there were at times some indication that the use of a socially-constituted place name such as Alaska was done in coordination with me as the interviewer – an American who knew Alaska in a less remote way than someone else might- 'E' did not entirely assume that the meaning in the utterance of Alaska was implicitly exhaustive; hence her description of it. Therefore, her use of Alaska was *in part* coordinated with me and the fact that I was American who shared some understanding of what Alaska meant and in part not as her active description of the place showed.

I attempted, to exhaustion, to pull apart utterances by orienting to the question: *who is doing the talking*? As I discussed above, this assumed a 'dual addressivity' consisting of speaker and listener and this helped me immensely. What was noticeable was that polyphony was not present in all instances when someone was speaking –at least not to such an extent where I could identify it as such. This raises an interesting question –especially in light of Bakhtin's position on how the words we use have come from other people rather than the dictionary but it seems that polyphonies are a particular type of multivoicedness. They are more than words but rather collections of words which formulate ideas, attitudes, values, beliefs, objects of knowledge and numerous other social objects. While I have yet more work to do on this area and certainly much more reading, those are my thoughts on polyphony at the moment.

10.4 Acculturation

Through this research, I addressed the persistent problem of much of the scholarship on acculturation using a reified concept of culture (Meintel, 1973) which assumes a passive individual is affected by the culture around him/her. As

this research has shown, acculturation is not merely an adding and subtracting of cultural objects but a much more complicated and rich process which is on-going, done through talk and radically variable.

Using culture as a tool in doing contrasting work between cultural places shows the way in which people manage ambiguity. It is not that they do not have resources from which to draw upon, but as we saw through the data, those resources were generally culturally-bound to their native culture. Even if the specific discursive object was not explicitly a named cultural member such as *an American* or *a Brit* but rather a character position, such as bank teller or customer, which is trans-cultural, those character positions were constituted by social means about the activities and interpretations about what it means to be a bank-teller or a customer in a specific cultural context.

In managing the ambiguity created by the existence of new cultural alternatives, acculturation was shown as a problem where the identities of people living in foreign contexts involved constant negotiation (Bhatia & Ram, 2002; Bhatia, 2001). This constant negotiation was evident through people's orientation to the 'standardized relational pair' of membership categories; distinguishing between 'us' and 'them' (Leudar, Marsland & Nekvapil, 2004). As the activities discussed in both cultural contexts were shared (shopping, renting homes, transport, banking, working, going to the post office, etc.), the means by which these things were made explicitly or implicitly culturally-contingent by participants showed the cultural orientation in situ. It is therefore very much a member's phenomenon in that member's detail what the relevant axis points are and through close

analysis and orientation toward the polyphony in subjective positions show just how variable and personal this process is.

10.5 Methodological Implications

I sought to design a method which would allow me to look at culture and self differently; looking at inner speech and dialogue with attention given toward how culture is used doing identity work and to track the changes people exhibit through intercultural contact. A method with a pragmatic approach to situated action was extremely useful in being able to highlight the things which were being done in and through talk. The methods of CA and DA have focused on normative features of conversation sequentiality and the important of context but have failed to explain the presuppositions of dialogicality (Marková, 2006).

Studies with a focus on 'cultural differences' using pragmatic methods suggest that these should be treated as "dynamic construct[s] that may or may not be present among interactants, rather than *a priori* condition for interpreting social actions..." (Higgins, 2007, p. 1) and that scholars "...who share this view treat culture and intercultural differences as salient only if the participants make them relevant in the course of their interactions" (ibid., p. 1).

While it is true that a focus on the way in which talk is being used to do something is useful and things are being learned about the ways in which contexts are being created through situated accounts (Leudar, Sharrock, Hayes & Truckle, 2008), there is so much more which can be extracted from these studies when a focus on the ontology of those individual selves and socially-constituted symbolic representations are considered. People were seen throughout this data

doing all kinds of cultural work; at times this was oriented or *made relevant* but when considering the phenomenology that is the triad of psychology, language and culture, the question comes to mind: *wasn't the talk being done in creating the context of an interview about being an expat always in some way making cultural differences relevant?*

10.6 Theoretical Implications

Narrative as a metaphor for psychology explains the way in which people are able to order and re-order the events in their lives (Hermans & Kempen, 1993). Language is the catalyst of managing interpretive schemes; it is a regulating activity (Leudar & Costall, 1996). As I mentioned above, I sought to develop a framework to look at the ways in which acculturation resulted in these 'ordering and re-ordering' activities of narrative in order to deal with the "multiplicity of occasionally incompatible selves or personal cultural positions" (König, 2009, p. 98). In short, the theory has helped in challenging the constructs of an essential self and an essential culture (ibid.).

While Hermans' 'Dialogical Self' theory was certainly an illuminating discovery for me in helping to me bring the research to the point where it stands now, I did not carry on throughout the remainder of my analysis by sticking whole-heartedly to the mechanism detailed in the theory known as the 'I-position'. There were several reasons for this. Firstly, as Barresi so aptly notices, the current formulation about these positions is that "an individual can adopt a narrative or authorial stance, somehow above the characters that make up the polyphonic and dialogical self, and can freely move the narrative 'I-position' from one character to another to give each his or her own voice" (Barresi, 2002,

p. 247). Considering this, I am forced to consider the platform of my interviews, for example. As the analysis showed, the different participants' contributions shaped that interaction in many different ways. True those respective 'I-positions' were called forth to accomplish certain things in talk and might have been explicit at times. The problem here is that even through the construct is that of a self in which "narrative voices are connecting the individual to the culture around them" (Raggatt, 2000), we are right back to the persistent problem of culture and self as separate ontological units. No matter how great the diversity of a multivoiced self is presented and includes cultural elements and aspects of other –when assuming that an 'I-position' is under one's authorial control and not in any way a position which is situated, the 'I-position' is then again separate from the immediate context and those sharing it.

Secondly, there is an assumption somehow with this formulation that despite the possibility of numerous social selves, that only one is called forth at a given time. Although there may be explicit instances where one brings forth a position preceded by something like *as an American ... a woman... a foreigner,* this is seldom the case. Now although Hermans does not make this claim directly, the contradiction in terms between a Self which is constituted of certain authoritative voices able to freely move and a Self which is sometimes dominated by sub-selves (ibid.) shows inconsistency in the theoretical construct of the 'I-position' and its (or rather better, *their*) activities in narrative. It is this last point particularly, informed by the reading I did on dialogical ontology of self, which did not resonate with me. I decided to focus more specifically on the potential voices I could see in the narrative –sometimes showing up in the form of

socially-constructed symbolic representations of cultural points; at other times it was simpler than that with a focus just upon the way in which another named person was brought in to construct a subjective position. The former of these points suggests the possibility that maybe a Self does not pre-exist the representation but rather a pre-existing representation of something collective may be what a Self later ascribes their membership too. Regardless of the level of priority a person assigns to such representations to their self concept, these representations are out there and cannot be ignored. In order to remain consistent –i.e. to show an awareness of where one *is* the grander scheme of things- these sub-selves may in fact dominate more authoritative voices.

Josephs asserts that the concept of voice in the 'Dialogical Self' –"emotionally grounded and personally constructed…in the here-and-now" (2002, p. 162) results in voices which populate the self in unlimited ways and are "…unpredictable *by anybody but the person her- or himself*" (ibid., my emphasis). If this is what constitutes voice in the theory of Dialogical Self then we are faced with a greater problem as I for one cannot begin to consistently nor explicitly identify all the voices which constitute me and furthermore I have often been be faced with having to retrospectively consider something I have said, meaning that there are indeed points in time where the unlimited possibilities of myself are unpredictable –even and especially to *me*.

10.7 Limitations

The thesis could have benefited from more case studies to further explicate the amount of diversity between participants. Additionally, looking at the topical talk which I separated into the respective analytical chapters would have benefited

from greater diversity of participant narratives from members of different migrant groups. Although the lack of relevant empirical studies with which to compare my findings is indeed a limitation, I find it is also to be a strength. The purpose of my research design was to develop a new, interdisciplinary framework to look at acculturation as well as to look at the role of inner speech and dialogue in the communication *about* acculturation. Finally, as I saw through the data from case study one, following the participants either onto their next move or eventually 'back home' would have given more insight in the way in which new cultural experiences were used in narratives about the cultural 'here' in their home country and the ways in which they might refine where they were as a result of those experiences.

10.8 Future research

I found at times I was limited in the ways which I could explain what I saw happening. Although I tried to draw upon musical terminology when pointing out instances of inter-subjective polyphony between conversational co-participants and used the obvious 'cultural polyphony'; I believe one direction this research could go would be to find ways to identify perhaps normative features of certain polyphonies. The goal with this would be to categorise them to support other research in identifying the multiplicity of self in given instances. Research looking to understand the fragmented self in certain circumstances could benefit by understanding what constitutes polyphony or polyphonies related to specific contexts.

As I mentioned above, I am curious to broaden the scope of my understanding about cultural polyphony of migrants in general and therefore I believe it would

be extraordinarily beneficial to the current scholarship on acculturation to use this methodological framework to study random migrant participants' narratives about living in a new culture.

This research served as a starting point to begin to show empirically the ways in which inner speech and dialogue contribute to people's communication. Although this research focused on a specific context, I believe the methodology and ethos contained herein can benefit research on many topics treating language as its unit of analysis.

References

Akkerman, S., Admiraal, W., Simons, R.J., & Niessen, T. (2006). Considering Diversity: Multivoicedness in International Academic Collaboration. *Culture & Psychology, 12,* 4, 461-485.

Antaki, C., Condor, S., & Levine, M. (1996). Social Identities in Talk: Speaker's Own Orientations, *British Journal of Social Psychology, 35,* 473-492.

Arminen, I. (2000). On the context sensitivity of institutional interaction. *Discourse & Society, 11,* 4, 435-458.

Bagley, C. (1968). Migration, Race and Mental Health: A Review of Some Recent Reseach. *Race & Class, 9,* 3, 343-356.

Bagnoli, A. (2007). Between Outcast and Outsider: Constructing The Identity of the Foreinger, *European Socities, 9,* 1, 23-44.

Bakhtin, M. (1973). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics.* (2nd ed,; R.W. Rotsel, Trans.) Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis. (Original work published 1929).

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barresi, J. (2002). From 'the Thought is the Thinker' to 'the Voice is the Speaker': William James and the Dialogical Self. *Theory & Psychology, 12,* 2, 237-250.

Benhabib, S. (2005). The "Claims" of Culture Properly Interpreted: Response to Nikolas Kompridis, *Political Theory, 34,* 3, 383-388.

Bennet, J.M. (1993). Cultural marginality: Identity issues in intercultural training. In R.M. Page (Ed.), *Education for intercultural experience* (2nd ed.; 109-135). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Berry, J.W. (1970). Marginality, Stress and Ethnic Identification in an Acculturated Aboriginal Community. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1,* 3, 239-252.

Berry, J.W. (1984). Multicultural policy in Canada: A social psychological analysis, *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 16,* pp. 353-370.

Berry, J.W. (1997). Immigration, Acculturation and Adaptation. *Applied Psychology, 46,* 5-68.

Berry, J.W. (2001). A Psychology of Immigration. *Journal of Social Issues, 57,* 615-631.

Bhatia, S. (2002). Acculturation, Dialogical Voices and the Construction of the Diasporic Self. *Theory & Psychology, 12,* 1, 55-77.

Bhatia, S. & Ram, A. (2001). Locating the Dialogical Self in the Age of Transnational Migrations, Border Crossings and Diasporas. *Culture & Psychology, 7,* 3, 297-309.

Bhatia, S. & Stam, H. (2005). Critical Engagements with Culture and Self. *Theory & Psychology, 15,* 419-430.

Bhugra, D. & Jones, P. (2001). Migration and Mental Illness. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment, 7,* 216-222.

Bhugra, D. (2004). Review article: Migration and mental health. *Acta Psychiatr Scand, 109,* 243-258.

Billig, M. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis: an exchange between Michael Billig and Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Discourse & Society, 10,*4, 543-582.

Black, S.J. & Stephens, G.K. (1989). The Influence of the Spouse on American Expatriate Adjustment and Intent to Stay in Pacific Rim Overseas Assignments. *Journal of Management, 15,* 4, 529-544.

Bloch, A. (2001). The Importance of Convention Status: A Case Study of the UK. S*ociological Research Online*, vol. 6, no 1, http://www.sorcesonline.org.uk/6/1/bloch.html

Bourhis, R.Y., Moïse, L.C., Perreault, S., & Senécal, S. (1997). Toward and Interactive Acculturation Model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology, 32,* 369-386.

Breugelmans, S.M., van de Vijver, F.J.R. & Schalk-Soekar, S.G.S. (2009). Stability of Majority Attitudes toward Multiculturalism in the Netherlands between 1999 and 2007. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 58,* 4, 653-671.

Brown, L. & Holloway, I. (2007). The initial stage of the international sojourn: excitement or culture shock? *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 36,* 1, 33-49.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Bruner, J. (1991). The Narrative Construction of Reality. *Critical Inquiry, 18,* 1-21.

Carlin, A. (2003). Observation and Membership Categorisation: Recognizing 'normal appearances' in Public Space. *Journal of Mundane Behaviour, 4,* 1 [Retrieved on May 27, 2008] from http://www.mundanebehaviour.org/issues/v4n1/carlin.htm

Chandler, M. (2000). Surviving Time: The Persistence of Identity in This Culture and That. *Culture & Psychology, 6,* 2, 209-231.

Chaudhary, N. (2003). Speaking the Self into Becoming? *Culture & Psychology, 9,* 4, 471-486.

Chaudhary, N. & Sriram, S. (2001). Dialogues of the Self. *Culture & Society, 7,* 3, 379-392.

Charalabaki E., Bauwens F., Stefos G., Madianos M., & Mendlewicz J. (1995). Immigration and psychopathology: a clinical study. *European Psychiatry, 10,* 5, 237-244.

Cheung-Blunden, V.L. & Juang, L.P. (2008). Expanding acculutration theory: Are acculturation models and the adaptiveness of acculturation strategies generalizable in a colonial context? *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32,* 1, 21-33.

Coelho, N.E. & Figueiredo, L.C. (2003). Patterns of Intersubjectivity in the Constitution of Subjectivity: Dimensions of Otherness. *Culture & Psychology, 9,* 3, 193-208.

Cohen, E. (1973). Nomads from Affluence: Notes on the Phenomenon of Drifter-Tourism. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 14,* 89-103.

Collins, S. & Marková, I. (1999). Interaction between impaired and unimpaired speakers: Inter-subjectivity and the interplay of culturally shared and situation specific knowledge. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 38,* 339-368.

Cornejo, C. (2004). Who Says What the Words Say? The Problem of Linguistic Meaning in Psychology. *Theory & Psychology, 14,* 1, 5-28.

Costigan, L. & Dokis, D. (2006). Similarities and Differences in Acculturation Among Mothers, Fathers, and Children in Immigrant Chinese Families. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37,* 6, 723-741.

Crawford, V.M. & Valsiner, J. (1999). Varieties of discursive experience in psychology: culture understood through the language used. *Culture & Psychology, 5,* 3, 259-269.

Davies, B. & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves, *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20,* 43-63.

Denzin, N. (1997). *Interpretive Ethnography. Ethnographic Practices for the 21st Century.* London: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. (2001). The reflexive interview and a performative social science. *Qualitative Research, 1,* 1, 23-46.

De Fina, A. & Georgakopoulou, A. (2008). Analysing narratives as practices. *Qualitative Research, 8,* 3, 379-387.

De Fina, A. (2003). *Identity in Narrative: A Study of Immigrant Discourse.* John Benjamins Publication Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Diken, B. (1998). *Strangers, Ambivalence and Social Theory.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Dillard, A. (1982). *Living By Fiction.* New York: Harper & Row.

Dodds, A.E., Lawerence, J.A. & Valsiner, J. (1997). The Personal and the Social: Mead's Theory of the 'Generalized Other'. *Theory & Psychology, 7,* 4, 483-503.

Dovidio, J.F. & Esses, V. (2001). Immigrants and Immigration: Advancing the Psychological Perspective. *Journal of Social Issues, 57,* 3, 375-387.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (1992). Talk at Work: an introduction in P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work: Interaction in Insitutional Settings*, 3-65. Cambridge University Press.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk.* Chicago.

Dumont, J.G. & Lemaître, G. (2005). *Counting Immigrants and Expatriates in OECD Countries: A* New Perspective. Retrieved October 10, 2005 from, http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/34/59/35043046.pdf.

Edley, N. (2001). Analysing Masculinity: Interpretative Repertoires, Ideological Dilemmas and Subject Positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. Yates (Eds.) *Discource as Data: A Guide for Analysis,* 189-228. Sage: London.

Edwards, D. (1991). Categories Are for Talking: On the Cognitive and Discursive Bases of Categorization. *Theory & Psychology, 1,* 515-542.

Edwards, D. (2004). Shared Knowledge as a Performative Category in Conversation. *Rivista di Psicololinguistica Applicata, 4,* 2-3, 41-53.

Eglin, P. (2002). Members' Gendering Work: 'Women', 'Feminists' and Membership Categorization Analysis, *Discourse & Society, 13,* 6, 819-825.

Eglin, P. & Hester, S. (2003). *The Montréal Massacre: A Story of Membership Categorization Analysis.* Wilfrid Laurier University Press: Ontario.

Eisner, E.W. (2001). Concerns and aspirations for qualitative research in the new Millennium. *Qualitative Research, 1,* 135-145.

Fischer, R. (2006). Congruence and Functions of Personal and Cultural Values:

Do My Values Reflect My Culture's Values? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32,* 11, 1419-1431.

Flannery, W.P., Reise, S.P., & Yu, J. (2001). An Empirical Comparison of Acculturation Models. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 1035-1045.

Gardner, R. (1998). Between Speaking and Listening: The Vocalisation of Understandings. *Applied Linguistics, 19,* 2, 204-224.

Gardner, R. (2005). Acknowledging Strong Ties between Utterances in Talk: Connections through 'Right' as a Response Token. *Retrieved on March 6, 2008 from* http://hdl.handle.net/2123/115

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology.* Englewoods Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Garot, R. (2007). 'Where You From!' Gang Identity as Performance. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 36,* 1, 50-84.

Gergen, K.J. & Gergen, M.M. (1986). Narrative Form and the Construction of Psychological Science. In Th. R. Sarbin (Ed.), *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct,* 22-44. New York: Praeger.

Geertz, C. (1975). *Interpretation of Cultures.* Hutchinson & Co LTD: London.

Giddens, A. (1988). Globalization, Change & Conflict, *Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, 9,* 26, 15-28.

Gieser, T. (2006). How to Transform into Goddesses and Elephants: Exploring the Potentiality of the Dialogical Self, *Culture & Society, 12,* 4, 443-459.

Gillespie, A. (2008). The Intersubjective Dynamics of Trust, Distrust, and Manipulation. In. I. Marková & A. Gillespie (Eds.), *Trust and Distrust: Sociocultural Perspectives,* 273-289. Information Age Publishing.

Gillin, J. & Raimy, V. (1940). Acculturation and Personality. *American Sociological Review, 5,* 371-380.

Goodman, S. (2006). *The Discursive Construction of Asylum Seekers.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Manchester, United Kingdom.

Goodman, S. & Speer, S. (2007). Category Use in the Construction of Aslyum Seekers, *Critical Discourse Studies, 4,* 2, 165-185.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life.* New York: Doubleday Anchor.

Gong, Y. & Chang, S. (2007). The Relationships of Cross-Cultural Adjustment

with Dispositional Learning Orientation and Goal Setting: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 38,* 1, 19-25.

Gordon, M.M. (1964). *Assimilation in American Life: The role of race, religion and national origins.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hacking, I. (1991). A Tradition of Natural Kinds. *Philosophical Studies, 61, ½,* 109-126.

Hacking, I. (1995). *Rewriting the Soul: Multiple Personality and the Sciences of Memory.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hammersley, M. (2003). Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: Methods or Paradigms. *Discourse & Society, 14,* 6, 751-781.

Harré, R. (1991). The Discursive Production of Selves. *Theory & Psychology, 1,* 1, 51-63.

Harré, R. & Slocum, N. (2003). Disputes as complex social events: On the uses of positioning theory. In R. Harré & F. Moghaddam (Eds.), *The self and others: Positioning individuals and groups in personal, political and cultural contexts.* (123-136). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Harré, R. (2004). Discursive Psychology and the Boundaries of Sense. *Organization Studies, 25*, 8, 1435-1453.

Harvey, M.G. (1985). The Executive Family: An Overlooked Variable in International Assignments. *Columbia Journal of World Business, Spring,* 84-92.

Hermans, H.J.M. (2001). The Dialogical Self: Toward a Theory of Personal and Cultural Positioning. *Culture & Psychology, 7,* 3, 243-281.

Hermans, H.J.M. (2001a). The Construction of a Personal Position Repertoire: Method and Practice. *Culture & Psychology, 7,* 3, 323-365.

Hermans, H.J.M. (2002). The Dialogical Self as a Society of Mind. *Theory & Psychology, 12,* 2, 147-160.

Hermans, H.J.M. (2004). Introduction: The Dialogical Self in a Global and Digital Age. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 4*, 4, 297-320.

Hermans, H.J.M & Kempen, H.J.G. (1993). *The Dialogical Self: Meaning as Movement.* San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.

Hermans, H.J.M. & Kempen, H.J.G. (1995). Body, Mind and Culture: The Dialogical Nature of Mediated Action. Culture & Psychology, 1, 103-114.

Hermans, H.J.M. & Kempen, H.J.G. (1998). Moving Cultures: The Perilous Problems of Cultural Dichotomies in a Globalizing Society. *American Psychologist, 53,* 10, 1111-1120.

Hermans, H.J.M., Kempen, H.J.G. & van Loon, R.J.P. (1992). The Dialogical Self: Beyond Individualism and Rationalism. *American Psychologist, 47,* 1, 23-33.

Hermans, H.J.M., Rijks, T.I. & Kempen, H.J.G. (1993). Imaginal Dialogues in the Self: Theory and Method. *Journal of Personality, 61,* 2, 207-236.

Hester, S. & Eglin, P. (1997). Membership Categorization Analysis: An Introduction. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Vol. Eds.), *Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis: Vol. 4. Culture in Action* 1st Ed. 1-24). Washington D.C.: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.

Hevern, V. (2004). Threaded Identity in Cyberspace: Weblogs and Positioning in the Dialogical Self. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 4,* 4, 321-335.

Hewitt, J.P. & Stokes, R. (1975). Disclaimers as aligning actions preserving situational definitions in face of disruptive lines of conduct. *American Sociological Review, 40,* 1, 1-11.

Hicks, D. (2000). Self and Other in Bakhtin's Early Philosophical Essays: Prelude to a Theory of Prose Consciousness. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 7,* 3, 227-242.

Higgins, C. (2007). Introduction: A Closer Look at Cultural Difference: 'Interculturality' in Talk-In-Interaction. *Pragmatics, 17*, 1, 1-7.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Holquist, M. (1983). Answering as Authoring: Mikhail Bakhtin's Trans-Linguistics. *Critical Inquiry, 10*, 2, 307-319.

Holquist, M. & Emerson, C. (1981). Glossary for *The dialogic imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin,* (Ed.) Michael Holquist. Trans. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Housley, W. & Fitzgerald, R. (2002). The reconsidered model of membership categorization analysis. Qualitative Research, 2, 1, 59-83.

Horton-Salway, M. (2001). The Construction of M.E.: The Discursive Action Model. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. Yates (Eds.) Discourse as Data: a Guide for Analysis, 147-188. Sage: London.

Ingold, T. (1986). Evolution and Social Life. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

International Labour Office (ILO), International Office for Migration (IOM), Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). (2001, August). *International Migration, Racism, Discrimination and Xenophobia.* Retrieved October 31, 2005 from, http://www.iom.int/iomwebsite/Publication/ServletSearch Publication?event=detail&id=833.

International Office for Migration (2003). *World Migration: Managing Migration –Challenges and Responses for People on the Move.* Retrieved October 31, 2005, from, http://www.iom.int/iomwebsite/ Publication/ServletSearchPublication?event=detail&id=2111.

Itakura, H. (2001). Describing conversational dominance. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33,*1859-1880.

James, W. (1890). *Principles of Psychology, Vol. I.* Dover Publications, New York.

Jamieson, J.W. (1999). Migration as an economic and political weapon. *The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies, 24,* 3, 339-348.

Josephs, I. (2002). 'The Hopi in Me': The Construction of a Voice in the Dialogical Self from a Cultural Psychological Perspective. *Theory & Psychology, 12,* 2, 161-173.

Kaderka, P. (2008). Book Review: HEIKO HAUSENDORF and ALFONS BORA (eds). *Analysing Citizenship Talk: Social Positioning in Political and Legal Decsion-Making Processes.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 2006. Vii + 368 pp. *Discourse Studies, 10,* 5, 695-711.

Kang, S. (2006). Measurement of Acculturation, Scale Formats, and Language Competence: Their Implications for Adjustment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37,* 6, 669-693.

Knowles, E. & Sibicky, M. (1990). Continuity and Diversity in the Stream of Selves: Metaphorical Resolutions of William James' One-Many-Selves Paradox, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 16,* 4, 676-687.

Kofman, E (2004). Gendered Global Migrations. *International Feminist Journal of Politics, 6,* 4, pp. 643 -665.

König, J. (2009). Moving Experience: Dialogues between Personal Cultural Positions, *Culture & Psychology, 15,* 1, 97-119.

Kompridis, N. (2005). Normativizing Hybridity/Neutralizing Culture. *Political Theory, 33,* 3, 318-343.

Kompridis, N. (2006). The Unsettled and Unsettling Claims of Culture: A Reply to Seyla Benhabib, *Political Theory, 34,* 3, 389-396.

Ledman, R.E. (2001). The Family Impact of Expatriate Assignments: An Experiential Exercise. *Journal of Management Education, 25,* 3, pp.341-351.

Leudar, I. (1991). Sociogenesis, coordination and mutualism. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 21,* 2, 197-220

Leudar, I. & Costall, A. (1996). Situating Action 1: Truth in the Situation, *Ecological Psychology, 8,* 2, 1532-6969.

Leudar, I., Marsland, V. & Nekvapil, J. (2004). On membership categorization: us', 'them' and 'doing violence' in political discourse. *Discourse & Society, 15,* 2-3, 243-266.

Leudar, I. & Nekvapil, J. (1998). 'On the Emergence of Political Identity in Czech Mass Media: The Case of the Democratic Party of Sudentenland', *Czech Sociological Review, 6,* 43-58.

Leudar, I. & Nekvapil, J. (2000). Presentations of Romanies in the Czech media: on category work in television debates. *Discourse & Society, 11,* 4, 487-513.

Leudar, I. & Nekvapil, J. (2004). Media Dialogical Networks and Poltical Argumentation. *Journal of Language and Politics, 3,* 2, 247-266.

Leudar, I., Hayes, J., Nekvapil, J. & Baker, J. (2008). Hostility themes in media, community and refugee narratives. *Discourse & Society, 19,* 2, 187-221.

Leudar, I., Sharrock, W., Hayes, J. & Truckle, S. (2008). Psychotherapy as a "structured immediacy". *Journal of Pragmatics, 40,* 863-885.

Leudar, I. & Thomas, P. (2000). *Voices of Reason: Studies of Verbal Hallucinations.* London: Routledge.

Ligorio, M.B. & Pugliese, A.C. (2004). Self-Positioning in a Text-Based Virtual Environment. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 4,* 4, 337-353.

Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The past is a foreign country.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, M. (2006). Cognitive activities without cognition? Ethnomethodological investigations of 'selected' cognitive topics. Discourse Studies, 8, 1, 95-104.

Lynn, N. & Lea, S. (2003). A phantom menace and the new Apartheid: the

social construction of asylum-seekers in the United Kingdom. *Discourse & Society, 14,* 4, 425-452.

Lysaker, P. & Lysaker, T. (2002). Narrative Structure in Psychosis: *Schizophrenia* and Disruptions in the *Dialogical Self, 12*, 2, 207-222.

Mancuso, J.C. & Sarbin, T.R. (1983). *The Self-narrative in the Enactment of Roles (233-253).* In T.R. Sarbin & K.E. Scheibe (Eds) Studies in Social Identity. Praeger: New York.

Marotta, V. (2000). The Stranger and Social Theory. *Thesis Eleven, 62,* 121-134.

Marková, I. (2000a). *Amédée or How to Get Rid of It:* Social Representations from a Dialogical Perspective. *Culture & Psychology, 6,*4, 419-460.

Marková, I. (2000b). The Individual and Society in Psychological Theory. *Theory & Psychology, 10,* 1, 107-116.

Marková, I. (2003a). Dialogicality and Social Representations. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Marková, I. (2003b). Constitution of the Self: Intersubjectivity and Dialogicality. *Culture & Psychology, 9,* 3, 249-259.

Marková, I. (2006). On 'The Inner Alter' In Dialogue. *International Journal for Dialogical Science, 1,* 1, 125-147.

Marková, I. (2009). A Dialogical Approach in Psychology: An Alternative to the Dualism of ToM. In I. Leudar & A. Costall (Eds), *Against Theory of Mind*, 209-220. Palgrave Macmillan.

Mason, L. (1955). The Characterization of American Culture in Studies of Acculturation. *American Anthropologist, 57,* 6, 1264-1279.

McKinlay, A. & McVittie, C. (2006). Using topic control to avoid the gainsaying of troublesome evaluations. *Discourse Studies, 8,* 6, 797-815.

McLemore, S.D. (1970). Simmel's 'Stranger': A Critique of the Concept. *Pacific Sociological Review, 13,* 2, 86-94.

Mehan, H. (1997). The discourse of the illegal immigration debate: a case study in the politics of representation. *Discourse & Society, 8,* 2, pp. 249-270.

Mendenhall, M.E. & Wiley, C. (1994). Strangers in a strange land: the relationship between expatriate adjustment and impression management. *American Behavioral Scientist, 37,* 5, 605-631.

Meintel, D.A. (1973). Strangers, Homecomers and Ordinary Men. *Anthropological Quarterly, 46,* 1, 47-58.

Mishler, E.G. (1986). The Analysis of Interview-Narratives. In Th. R. Sarbin (Ed.), *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct,* 3-21. New York: Praeger.

Mitra, A. (2001). Marginal Voices in Cyberspace. *New Media & Society, 3,* 1, 29-48.

Morson, G.S. & Emerson, C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics.* Stanford University Press: Stanford, California.

Murakami, K. (2001, September). Talk About Rice: A Discursive Approach to Studying Culture [32 Paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitiative Sozialforschung/ Forum: Qualitative Social Research* [On-line Journal], 2(3). Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-eng.htm [Date of access: September 10, 2008].

Murakami, K. (2003). Orientation to the Setting: Discursively Accomplished Intersubjectivity. *Culture & Psychology, 9,* 3, 233-248.

Nash, D.J. & Wolfe, A.W. (1957). The stranger in laboratory culture. *American Sociological Review, 22,* 400-405.

Nekvapil, J. (2003). Language biographies and the analysis of language situations: on the life of the German community in the Czech Republic. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 162,* 63-83.

Norrick, N. (2004). Hyperbole, extreme case formulation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36,* 1727-1739.

Oberg, K. (1960). Culture Shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology, 7,* 177-182.

Ochs, E. (1997). Narrative. In Teun A. Van Dijk (Ed) *Discourse as Structure and Process,* 185-207. Sage Publications: London.

Ochs, E. & Capps, L. (1996). Narrating the Self. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 25,* 19-43.

Ochs, E. & Capps, L. (1997). Narrative Authenticity. *Journal of Narrative and Life History, 7,* 1-4, 83-89.

Ødegaard, O. (1932). Immigration and insanity: a study of mental disease among the Norwegian-born population in Minnesota. Acta Psychiatr Scand [Suppl 4]: 1–206.

Padilla, A. (2006). Bicultural Social Development. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioural Sciences, 28,* 4, 467-497.

Park, R.E. (1928). Human Migration and the Marginal Man. *The American Journal of Sociology, 33,* 6, 881-893.

Pels, T. & De Haan, M. (2007). Socializing practices of Moroccan families after migration. *Young Nordic Journal of Youth Research, 15,* 1, 71-89.

Pepper, S.C. (1948). *World Hypotheses: A Study in Evidence.* University of California Press: Berkley and Los Angeles.

Perinbanayagam, R.S. (1975). The Significance of Others in the Thought of Alfred Schutz, G.H. Mead and C.H. Cooley. *The Sociological Quarterly, 16,* 500-521.

Pomerantz, A. (1975). Second Assessments: A study of some features of agreements/disagreements. Irvine: University of California dissertation.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). 'Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis,* pp. 57-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Potter, J. (2006). Cognition and Conversation. *Discourse Studies, 8,* 1, 131-140.

Potter, J. (2003). Discursive Psychology: between method and paradigm. *Discourse & Society, 14,* 6, 783-794.

Potter, J. & Hepburn, A. (2005). Qualitative interviews in psychology: problems and possibilities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 2,* 281-307.

Prebensen, N.K., Larsen, S., & Abelsen, B. (2003). I'm Not a Typical Tourist: German Tourists' Self-Perception, Activities, and Motivations. *Journal of Travel Research ,41,* May, 416-420.

Pudlinski, C. (2008). Encouraging responses to good news in a peer support line. *Discourse Studies, 10,* 6, 795-812.

Radnitz, S. (2006). Weighing the political and economic motivations for migration in post-soviet Space: The Case of Uzbekistan. *Europe-Asia Studies, 58,* 5, 653-677.

Raggat, P.T.F. (2000). Mapping the Dialogical Self: Towards a Rationale and Method of Assessement. *European Journal of Personality, 14,* 65-90.

Raggat, P.T.F. (2007). Forms of Positioning in the Dialogical Self. *Theory & Psychology, 17,* 3, 355-382.

Raghuram, P. (2004). The Difference that Skills Make: Gender, Family Migration Strategies and Regulated Labour Markets. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 30, 2, 303-321.

Rapley, T.J. (2001). The art(fulness) of open-ended interviewing: some

considerations on analysing interviews. *Qualitative Research, 1,* 303-323.

Ratner, C. (2000). Agency and Culture. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 30,* 4, 413-434.

Reynolds, A. (1992). Charting the Changes in Junior Faculty: Relationships among Socialization, Acculturation, and Gender. *Journal of Higher education, 63,* 6, 637-652.

Roepstorff, A. & Bubandt, N. (2003). *General introduction: The critique of culture and the plurality of nature* (9-26). In Roepstorff, A., Bubandt, N. & Kull, K., (Eds.) Practices of Cosmology and Identity. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Rudmin, F. (2003). Critical History of the Acculturation Psychology of Assimilation, Separation, Integration and Marginalization. *Review of General Psychology, 7,* 1, 3-37.

Rudmin, F. (2009). Constructs, models and measures of acculturation and acculturative stress. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33,* 106-123.

Ryder, A.G., Alden, L.E., & Paulhus, D.L. (2000). Is Acculturation Unidimensional or Bidimensional? A Head-to-Head Comparison in the Prediction of Personality, Self-Identity, and Adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79,* 49-65.

Sadi, M.A. & Henderson, J.C. (2005). Local versus Foreign Workers in the Hospitality and Tourism Industry: A Saudi Arabian Perspective. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly,* 46, 2, 247-257.

Sandikci, O., Ekici, A., & Tari, B. (2006). Consumer Acculturation as a Dialogical Process: Case Studies from Rural-to-Urban Migrants in Turkey. *Advances in Consumer Research, 33*, 429-434.Turkey.

Sarbin, T.R. (1986). The Narrative as a Root Metaphor for Psychology. In Th. R. Sarbin (Ed.), *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct,* 3-21. New York: Praeger.

Sarbin, T.R. (1997a). The Poetics of Identity. *Theory & Psychology, 7,* 1, 67-82.

Sarbin, T.R. (1997b, May). *Believed-In Imaginings: A Narrative Approach.* Paper presented at the Conference on Believed-In Imaginings Clark University, Worcester.

Sarbin, T.R. (2000). Working, Self and Identity. *Culture & Psychology, 6,* 2, 253-258.

Schegloff, E. (1972). Notes on a Conversational Practice: Formulating Place. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction,* 75-119. New York: Free Press.

Schegloff, E. (1998). Reply to Wetherell. *Discourse & Society, 9*, 3, 413-416.

Schegloff, E. (1997a). "Narrative Analysis" Thirty Years Later. *Journal of Narrative and Life History, 7,* 1-4, 97-106.

Schegloff, E. (1997b). Whose text? Whose Context? *Discourse & Society, 8,* 2, 165-187.

Schegloff, E. (1988/9). From Interview to Confrontation: Observations of the Bush/Rather Encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 22,* 215-240.

Schegloff, E. (2006). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39,* 462-482.

Schegloff, E. (2007). Categories in action: person-reference and membership cateogorisation. *Discourse Studies, 9*, 4, 433-461.

Scheibe, K. (1986). Self-Narratives and Adventure. In Th.R.Sarbin (Ed.), *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct,* 129-151. New York: Praeger.

Scheibe, K. (1995). *Self Studies:The Psychology of Self and Identity.* Praeger: Westport, Connecticut.

Schiffrin, D. (1985). Conversational Coherence: The Role of *Well. Language, 61,* 3, 640-667.

Schiffrin, D. (1996). Narrative as self-portrait: Sociolinguistic constructions of identity. *Language in Society, 25,* 167-203.

Schubert, H.J. (2006). The Foundation of Pragmatic Sociology: Charles Horton Cooley and George Herbert Mead. *Journal of Classical Sociology, 6,* 1, 51-74.

Schutz, A. (1944). The Stranger: An Essay in Social Psychology. *The American Journal of Sociology, 49*, 6, 499-507.

Shaffer, M.A. & Harrison, D.A. (1998). Expatriates' psychological withdrawal from international assignments: work, nonwork, and family influences. *Personnel Psychology, 51,* 1, 87-109.

Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gregersen, H., Black, J. S., & Ferzandi, L. A. (2006). You can take it with you: Individual differences and expatriate effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 1, 109-125.

Sharrock, W. & Anderson, B. (1987). Work Flow in a Paediatric Clinic". In G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (Eds) *Talk and Social Organisation.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sharrock, W. & Coulter, J. (2009). 'Theory of Mind': A Critical Commentary Continued. In I.Leudar & A. Costall (Eds), *Against Theory of Mind*, 56-88. Palgrave Macmillan.

Sharrock, W. & Leudar, I. (2002). Indeterminacy in the Past? *History of the Human Sciences, 15*, 3, 95-115.

Sharrock, W. (1974). *On Owning Knowledge* (pp.45-53). In Roy Turner (Ed.) Ethnomethodology. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Shotter, J. (1989). Social Accountabililty and the Social Construction of 'You' 133-151) . In J. Shotter & K. Gergen (Eds.), *Texts of Identity.* Sage Publications: London

Simmel, G. (1908). *Exkurs über den fremden.* Sociologie. Leipzig: Duncker and Humboldt.

Simmel, G. (1950). The Stranger. In K.H. Wolff (trans.) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Smith, D. (1978). 'K is mentally ill': The Anatomy of a Factual Account. *Sociology, 12,* 1, 23-53.

Smits, J., Mulder, C.H., & Hooimeijer, P. (2004). Migration of couples with non-employed and employed wives in the Netherlands: the changing effects of the partners'characteristics. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 30,* 2, 283-302.

Speer, S. A. (2002). 'Natural' and 'contrived' data: a sustainable distinction? *Discourse Studies, 4,* 4, 511-525.

Stonequist, E. V. (1935). The Problem of the Marginal Man. *The American Journal of Sociology, 41,* 1, 1-12.

Stonequist, E.V. (1937). *The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture Conflict.* New York: Charles Scribner.

Stubbe, M., Lane, C., Hilder, J., Vine, E., Vine, B., Marra, M., Holmes, J.& Weatherall, A. (2003). Multiple discourse analyses of a workplace interaction. *Discourse Studies, 5*, 3, 351-388.

Stuckey, M.E. (2004). *Defining Americans: The Presidency and National Identity*. University Press of Kansas.

Sui, P.C.P. (1952). The Sojourner. *The American Journal of Sociology, 58,* 1, 34-44.

Tadmor, C. & Tetlock, P. (2006). Biculturalism: A Model of the Effects of Second-Culture Exposure on Acculturation and Integrative Complexity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37*, 2, 173-190.

Taylor, C. (1991). The dialogical self. In D.R. Hiley, J.F.Bohman, & R. Shusterman (Eds), *The interpretative turn* (304-314). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

ten Have, P. (2002a). The Notion of Member is the Heart of the Matter: On the Role of Membership Knowledge in Ethnomethodological Inquiry [53 Paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* [On-line Journal] *3* (3). Available at http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/3-02/3-02tenhave-e.htm Retrieved on May 20, 2008

ten Have, P. (2002b). Ontology or methodology? Comments on Speer's 'natural' and 'contrived' data: a sustainable distinction? *Discourse Studies, 4*, 4, 527-530.

ten Have, P. (2005). Conversation Analysis Versus Other Approaches to Discourse. Review Essay: Robin Wooffitt (2005). Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction [32 Paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* [On-line Journal]. *7*(2), Art. 3. Available at http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-06/06-2-3-e.thm Retrieved on May 20, 2008

Thompson, P.C., Anderson, L.P., & Bakeman, R.A. (2000). Effects of Racial Socialization and Racial Identity on Acculturative Stress in African American College Students. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 6,* 2, 196-210.

Thornborrow, J. (2000). The construction of conflicting accounts in public participation TV. *Language in Society, 29,* 357-377.

Tileaga, C. (2005). Accounting for extreme prejudice and legitimating blame in talk about the Romanies. *Discourse & Society, 16,* 5, 603-624.

Unger, J., Gallaher, P., Shakib, S., Ritt-olson, A., Palmer, P., & Johnson, A. (2002). The AHIMSA *Acculturation* Scale:: A New Measure of *Acculturation* for Adolescents in a Multicultural Society. *Journal of Early Adolesence, 22,* 3, 225-251.

Valsiner, J. (1998). *The guided mind: A sociogenetic approach to personality.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Valsiner, J. (2003). Editorial Introduction: Beyond Intersubjectivity. *Culture & Psychology, 9,* 3, 187-192.

van de Vijver, F.J.R. & Phalet, K. (2004). Assessment in Multicultural Groups: The Role of Acculturation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53, 2,* 215-236.

van der Valk, I. (2003). Right-wing parliamentary discourse on immigration in France. *Discourse & Society, 14,* 3, 308-348.

van Dijk, T.A. (1992). Racism and Argumentation: Race Riot Rhetoric in Tabloid Editorals (243-257). In F.H. van Eemeren, et al. (Eds.) Argumentation Illuminated. Dordrecht, Foris.

van Dijk, T.A. (2000a). On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration. In M. Reisigl & R. Wodak (Eds.), *The semiotics of racism: Approaches to critic discourse analysis.* (85-103). Vienna: Passagen Verlag.

van Dijk, T.A. (2000b). Ideologies, racism, discourse: Debates on immigration and ethnic issues. In ter Wal, J & Verkuyten, M. (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on racism.* (91-116). Aldershot etc.: Ashgate.

Wang, X. (2002). Expatriate Adjustment from a Social Network Perspective: Theoretical Examination and a Conceptual Model. *Cross Cultural Management, 2,* 3, 321-337.

Watson, R. (1978). Categorization, Authorization and Blame-negotiation in Conversation. *Sociology, 12,* 1, 105-113.

Watson, R. (1997). Some General Reflections on 'Categorization' and 'Sequence' in the Analysis of Conversation. In S. Hester and P. Eglin (Eds) *Culture in Action.* Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Weiss, A. (2005). The Transnationalization of Social Inequality: Conceptualizing Social Positions on a World Scale. *Current Sociology, 53,* 4, pp. 707-728.

Wertsch, J.V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social social formation of mind.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J.V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J.V. (1997). Narrative Tools of History and Identity. *Culture & Psychology, 3,*1 5-20.

Wetherell, M. (1997). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society, 9,* 3, 387-412.

Williams, C.L. & Berry, J.W. (1991). Primary Prevention of Acculturative Stress Among Refugees: Application of Psychological Theory and Practice. *American Psychologist, 46,* 6, 632-641.

Wise, M. (2004). *Mad Science: Discourses of 'Schizophrenia' and 'Therapy' for Hearing Voices*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Murdoch University, Australia.

Wolfson, N. (1981). Tense switching in narrative. *Language & Style, 14,* 226-231.

Wooffitt, R. (2001). Researching Psychic Practitioners: Conversation Analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. Yates (Eds) *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis* 49-92. Sage: London.

Wowk, M. T. & Carlin, A. P. (2004). Depicting a Liminal Position in Ethnomethodology, Conversation Analysis and Membership Categorization Analysis: The Work of Rod Watson. *Human Studies, 27,* 69-89.

Zahavi, D. (2006). *Subjectivity and Selfhood: Investigating the First-Person Perspective.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Zick, A., Wagner, U., van Dick, R., & Petzel, T. (2001). Acculturation and Prejudice in Germany: Majority and Minority Perspectives. *Journal of Social Issues, 57,* 3, 541-557.

Zimmerman, A., Holman, D. & Sparrow, P. (2003). Unravelling Adjustment Mechanisms: Adjustment of German Expatriates to Intercultural Interactions, Work, and Living Conditions in the People's Republic of China. *Cross Cultural Management, 3,* 1, 45-66.