



Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Interviews as sites of ideological work

Journal Item

How to cite:

Marquez Reiter, Rosina (2017). Interviews as sites of ideological work. *Spanish in Context*, 15(1) pp. 54–76.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2018 John Benjamin's Publishing Company

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1075/sic.00003.mar>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Interviews as sites of ideological workⁱ

Abstract

This paper maintains that the interview, understood as an interactionally achieved social practice, can be a locus for ideological work. It shows how a differentiated understanding of stance, alignment and the discourse identities that the participants assume and leave in interaction, can bring into focus aspects of ideology that would be difficult to capture otherwise. Specifically, the paper shows how mis- and realigning actions with respect to the stances conveyed by the interview participants relative to a given subject or from a given discourse identity can lead to the construction of ideology, encouraging (or not) movement along a given interview trajectory. The ideological work observed is contingent on how the participants locate themselves and others in the interview where tensions between legitimised linguistic views and discourse identity adoption, as well as contradictions with regard to other circulating discourses emerge. The paper thus suggests that (language ideological) analyses of interview data can and should be focused on the social dynamics of the participants and how their ideological presuppositions play out in the situated interaction of the interview.

Key words: stance, alignment, discourse identity, ideology, Latin American migrants

1. Introduction

Interviews in their various formats whether structured, semi-structured or unstructured, represent one of the most popular methods for collecting data qualitatively. However, the nature of interviews and the type of data they provide has been the topic of debate in sociolinguistics and associated language and social interaction disciplines such as conversation analysis. While it is now acknowledged that they are not mechanical instruments in which the interviewer poses ideologically free questions, the interviewee automatically responds to them and an objective truth on a given topic emerges,¹ their potential for the construction of ideology they provide us has been overlooked. To this end, a stance-taking perspective that differentiates between stance and alignment, and takes into account the (oscillating) discourse identities that the participants assume in interaction is adopted.

Interviews constitute situated social encounters (see, for example, De Fina and Perrino 2011) and a social practice in and of itself (see, for example, Talmy 2010 for a *précis*). They are understood here as dynamic sites where ideologies, conscious or unconscious normative beliefs about an individual, a group or a society can be formed, reconfigured, reinforced and circulating discourses contested or endorsed. This paper pays attention to the construction of language ideologies, that is, conceptualisations about languages, speakers and forms of talk that are ‘pervaded with political and moral interests’ (Irvine 2012).² It shows how these are constructed in the situated communicative arena of two interviews conducted with Latin American migrants in London and Madrid.

The paper endorses the understanding of interviews as social practice and argues that they are, first and foremost, interactionally accomplished situated social encounters. It shows how the discourse identities assumed by the participants throughout the encounter, their aligning actions with respect to these and the views conveyed, can bring into focus aspects of ideology

¹ See for example, Martín Criado 2014 for critique of the way in which interviewers’ behaviour is often treated as indicative of their internalization of a uniform culture, and Moreno Fernández & Moreno Martín de Nicolás 2011 for a cognitive sociolinguistic perspective of discourse production in semi-structured interviews.

² For a review of different definitions and approaches to ‘language ideology’, readers are referred to Woolard & Schieffelin’s (1994) seminal paper on the subject

that would be difficult to capture otherwise. The ideological work discussed in this paper is contingent on how the participants locate themselves and others in the interview where tensions between legitimised linguistic views and discourse identity adoption, as well as contradictions with regard to other circulating discourses often emerge.

The paper thus shows how, through the calibration of stance, alignment and discourse identities, rapport is built between the interview participants. This rapport is not necessarily in line with the maintenance of the professional-personal boundary typically expected of interviewers. It is the result of the interviewer's involvement with the interviewees' accounts. The rapport established between the interviewee and the interviewer can lead to the latter's continued access to the group examined or to his or her rejection, for instance, by having someone from the community who vouches for the interviewer's presence, often voluntarily finding other suitable members to participate in the research or, by encountering difficulties in the recruitment of more interview participants.

2. Stance-taking and aligning actions in sociolinguistic interviews

It is now fairly well established that qualitative interview data should be placed in context and that they represent situated interactions. Seminal examples can be found in the work of Briggs (1986) who convincingly showed that each interview constitutes an event (see also Cicourel 1964) informed by the participants' ideological constructions of discourse production, an event in which the gap between action and expectation, as far as appropriate interview behaviour, can be observed.³ In addition, conversation analysts argue that interview data should be treated as a topic rather than as a resource (Seale 1998) and that the data produced constitute jointly constructed accounts by the interviewer and the interviewee rather than reports (e.g. Roulston 2006, Rapley 2001). It then follows that analyses should focus on the construction of accounts and how meaning is negotiated. In short, as Holstein and Gubrium (1995) argue, interviews are reality-constructing and meaning-making occasions. The status of interview data has also been the subject of sociolinguistic debate. De Fina and Perrino's (2011) special issue on narratives in interviews and interviews in narrative studies represents an important recent contribution to the sociolinguistic debate on the suitability of interviews as a data collection instrument (cf. Labov & Waletzky 1967/1997). Overall, the papers in this issue argue that research which utilizes interviews as a vehicle for data collection should not ignore the fact that it constitutes an interactional encounter and should take this into account in the analysis of the data. One of the ways in which interview encounters have thus been examined is, to a greater or lesser extent, by recurring to a stance informed perspective with a view to explaining how the accounts produced therein are constructed.

Stance has received considerable attention in the language and social interaction literature. Notable examples can be found in Jaffe's (2009) seminal volume on stance, Walton and Jaffe (2011) on how ideologies of race and class are articulated through stance (though not always explicitly asserted) and, Kiesling (2011) on the relationship between stance and the indexical meaning, to mention a few.⁴ Much of the language in society work on stance points to the fact that stance styles and the (non)linguistic features through which it can be identified are accomplished intersubjectively as a result of the interactional requirements of the environments in which participants are located. Intersubjectivity and, more recently, the distinction between epistemic stance and status, has been one of the key areas of talk-in-

³ Briggs (1986) illustrated this by examining the communicative 'errors' which can arise from the interviewer's and the interviewee's conflicting metacommunicative norms.

⁴ The connection between stance and indexicality can be traced back to the work of Ochs (1986) on socialization. According to Ochs (1986) stance is a 'mood, attitude feeling and disposition as well as degrees of emotional intensity *vis à vis* some focus of concern' (p.410). She distinguishes between affective and epistemic stance and shows the indexical nature of each of them.

interaction analysts (see Heritage 2013). Rather than focus on style and indexicality, among others, conversation analysts concentrate on the way territories of knowledge are used to form actions and speakers orient to them as part of sequence organization (see Heritage 2013), including the role of stance-taking (Du Bois 2007) in this process (see, for example, Stivers 2008). Stance has thus been defined and operationalized in a variety of different ways in sociolinguistic and conversation analytic work.⁵ Indeed, the range of scholarly stances on stance is too broad to do it justice here. In light of this, I will draw on one of the perspectives that have played a leading role in research on language and social interaction with a view to explaining the way in which stance, positioning and alignment are used in this paper.

Du Bois' (2007) definition of stance is perhaps one of the most elaborate ones. It has exerted much influence in language and social interaction research, despite, as I argue for the purpose of this paper, collapsing stance, alignment and positioning. He defines stance as 'a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means (language, gestures and other symbolic forms), through which social actors evaluate objects, position subjects (themselves and others), and align with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimensions of the sociocultural field' (p.163). The author conceptualises stance 'as a single unified act' (2007:162) and suggests that evaluation, positioning and alignment represent different aspects of 'a single, overarching unified stance act' (2007:163). He explains that positioning is 'the act of situating a social actor with respect to responsibility for stance and for invoking sociocultural value' (p.143). In other words, positioning 'represents a type of stance in the same way as alignment and evaluation' (p.163). According to Du Bois (2007), therefore, stance is an act of evaluation and, in the process of evaluation, the speaker positions himself or herself as a subject with respect to a given object or subject. Du Bois explains that the intersubjective relationship implicit in the stances of engaged co-participants is calibrated through alignment (p.162). He acknowledges that stance 'derives from and has consequences for social actors, whose lives are impacted by the stances they and others take' (p.141), and points out that 'the stance individuals have taken is remembered over time' (p.173). However, the primary focus of his approach is on stance relations with respect to an object but not necessarily with respect to the discourse identities the participants have assumed throughout the encounter, how this helps or not to develop rapport between them, or the extent to which the stances taken by the participants have a bearing on the trajectory of the talk.

According to Zimmerman (1998), discourse identities are interactional, situational and transportable. Interactional discourse identities are the turn-generated roles that interlocutors continuously assume and leave in talk-in-interaction. They are rooted in the local context and the activity the participants are engaged in (e.g. questioner-answerer, story teller-story recipient). Situational discourse identities are shaped by the local context, in our case by the particular type of situation the interview represents, and project assumptions about the role expectations of the participants, that is, an understanding of the participants' entitlements and obligations as well as their ability to shape and anticipate behaviour in the arena of the interview. Transportable identities are latent identities (e.g. gender and ethnicity) that travel with individuals across situations and might be explicitly oriented to, or tacitly apprehended in, the local interaction. Discourse identities are contingent on the interaction. They constitute, often oscillating, social positions that the participants occupy in the situated arena of the interview. These are tied to expectations that guide the participants' behaviour, such as what it means to be an interviewer and an interviewee and, as we will see in the data, what it means to be a good mother, a daughter and a nanny.

Interview participants assume and leave discourse identities by means of their misaligning and realigning actions primarily with reference to the stances that are communicated. While assuming or leaving a discourse identity can be representative of a type of stance with respect

⁵ Kockleman (2012) provides a useful review of the notions, primarily those from a language in society perspective.

to an object or a subject (Du Bois 2007: 163), this is not always the case, consider the discourse identities of questioner and answerer in interviews. Stance is conceived of here as the attitude, evaluation, or judgement of the participant's point of view through overt or covert communicative means. Alignment is generally understood in the language and social interaction literature, and in this paper, to be achieved when interactional participants cooperate in creating and maintaining the interaction. In this sense alignment is 'omnirelevant' for talk (Lindström and Sorjonen 2013:353) It is essential for the sustaining and progression of the main interactional activity underway (i.e. the interview) where participants orient to their respective roles within it. In other words, alignment is structural.

The paper partly draws on Stokes & Hewitt's (1976) notion of aligning actions, that is, 'largely verbal efforts to restore or assure meaningful interaction in the face of problematic situations of one kind or another' (p. 838). The authors claim that the role played by aligning actions, or what for the purpose of this paper may be called 'realigning actions', is an integral part of sustaining a relationship between culture and conduct. Thus, realigning actions are understood as communicative actions oriented to restore or assure meaningful interaction in the face of problematic situations of one kind or another such as stance calibration and the oscillation of identities. By contrast, misaligning actions are conceived of as those where a conflicting stance is conveyed with respect to a given topic, subject or identity. This, however, does not necessarily affect structural alignment.

In light of this, this paper recalibrates elements of stance theory to account for the observed construction of ideology in two interviews. It contends that the ideological work that emerges is situationally contingent and jointly constructed by showing how the participants locate themselves interactionally by way of the identities they assume throughout the encounter. These include normative expectations as to what may be situationally appropriate in the situated arena of an interview as well as what it means to assume a given identity in interaction (e.g. being a good mother, daughter, nanny). Through the adoption of identities, participants engage in realigning and misaligning actions where they project and convey their stance. The stances that emerge in the interaction are not only representative of the participants' point of view with respect to a given object or subject. They also respond to the way they relate to one another interactionally in the situated communicative arena of the interview.

3. Background and methodology

The interviews analysed were conducted as part of a project into the linguistic practices and ideologies of Latin American migrants in London and Madrid.⁶ To this end, 17 in-depth interviews were conducted in London (November - December 2012) and 7 in Madrid (January - February 2013) with (ir)regular migrants, men and women in their 30s, 40s, and 50s. The interview questions were informed by prior ethnographic observations and informal conversations with other Latin American migrants in both cities. They aimed to map out the linguistic and migrant trajectories of people who usually speak a language or language variety different from what they learned and used in their primary socialization (O'Rourke, Pujolar and Ramallo 2015). These speakers are often seen as inherently illegitimate and inauthentic by the locals by virtue of their non-native English status –Spanish-speaking Latin Americans in London – or because they speak a variety of Spanish with limited currency in the receiving

⁶ Fieldwork was possible thanks to the funding provided by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación within the Plan Nacional I+D+I 2008-2011 to the project 'New speakers, new identities: Linguistic practices and ideologies in the post-national era' (NEOPHON; ref. FFI2011-24781) led by Joan Pujolar. The London and Madrid data were collected with Luisa Martín Rojo. The two interviews analysed here were conducted by the author.

society –Spanish-speaking Latin Americans in Madrid (Márquez Reiter and Martín Rojo 2015).

The interviews were carried out in vibrant Latin American enclaves in both cities following ethnographic observations in these areas. In *Seven Sisters* (London) the author, a Latin American migrant, albeit what might be considered to be an elite migrant rather than an economic migrant, conducted an intergenerational interview with a grandmother, her daughter and granddaughter, all of whom live in London. In *Cuatro Caminos* (Madrid) the researcher interviewed a group of three Hondurans in the queue of a Latin American coffee shop and bakery shortly before their return to Honduras. They had been in Madrid for over one year but had only been able to obtain unskilled work. I was accompanied by my son who was then 3 and 5 months old, respectively, and publicly breastfed at the sites where the data were collected. He thus acted as a point of entry and trust and his presence became relevant in one of the interviews (see example 2).

Although Latin Americans are statistically invisible in the UK, with a population of circa 250,000, London is now home to one of the largest Latin American populations in Europe, second only to Spain (McIlwaine, Cock and Linnecker 2016). Latin Americans arrived in the UK from the 1970s onwards with Colombians and Ecuadorians constituting the main bulk of arrivals in the 1980s and 1990s. Since 2000 Latin American migration to the UK has been principally motivated by economic factors. 85% of Latin Americans are reported to be in work though more than half of them occupy elementary positions (McIlwaine et al. 2011) for which knowledge of English is not always necessary given that most of them work with co-ethnics servicing the needs of the Latin American community (e.g. looking after children from Spanish-speaking families, cleaning private homes, being front line service providers in ethnic shops, etc.)

On the other hand, Latin Americans are highly visible in Spain, particularly in Madrid where as a whole they constitute the most populous migrant group after Moroccans (more than 87,000 registered migrants January 2013). Ecuadorians and Colombians are second and third with almost 80,000 and over 54,000 nationals, respectively while the population of Hondurans is estimated to be over 8,000. As indicated in the Spanish regularisation of 1991, most Latin Americans are employed in elementary unqualified positions such as domestic housework, elderly care and hospitality with low salary and suffering exploitative conditions. Recent changes in the Spanish labour market conditions have meant that many of them have had to find temporary unskilled work or have returned to their countries of origin (García Ballesteros, Jiménez Basco and Redondo González 2009; see Márquez Reiter and Martín Rojo 2015 for more details), as is the case of the participants in the second interview analysed in this paper.

4. The interactional construction of ideology in interviews

Ideologies are by their very nature evaluative as they entail an assessment of worth with respect to an object or a subject. It then follows that stance taking, understood as the expression of a point of view, goes hand in hand with ideologies; and, that the participants' reactions to each other's stances from the dynamic identities they adopt throughout the encounter will have a bearing on the participants' rapport building and on the trajectory of the interview, thus providing the conditions for the construction of ideology.

In the first interview, I concentrate on the way in which misaligning actions regarding the interviewee's stance on the language practices of her children and concomitant ideologies enabled the emergence of further ideological work. I show how my reactions to stances regarded as counterproductive for parents of bilingual children to think, indicate a shift: from interviewer to 'accuser'. This leads the interviewee to position herself as good mother and a good citizen, providing an argumentatively tinged discussion where the ideological work emerges and linguistic ideologies crystallize in the accounts provided to justify given stances.

In the second interview, I focus on how negotiations over stance primarily through actions that are heard as realigning lead the interviewees to position the interviewer as a Latin American colonial subject, too. And, how this encourages further movement along the trajectory that the interview had taken, offering us a glimpse of language ideologies that are often difficult to capture.

4.1 The construction of ideology through misaligning actions

Example 1, below, begins with some fragments from an interview the researcher conducted in Seven Sisters with a first-generation economic migrant: a Colombian grandmother who migrated to London 25 years ago. She was having breakfast with her daughter, a second-generation migrant, who came to London when she was 8 years old, and her granddaughter who was born in London and was 3 years old at that time. In this interview segment, the grandmother who had kindly agreed to the interview, talks about her two youngest children who, like her granddaughter, were born in London.

Example 1

A=grandmother, H=daughter, R=Researcher

- 0 R: Dos mayores,
Two older ones,
- 1 A: mayores y 2 pequeños
older and 2 little ones
- 2 R: Nacidos aquí,
Born here,
- 3 A: Los pequeños aquí.
The little ones here.
- 4 R: Y los pequeños en qué idioma hablan,
And the little ones in what language do they speak,
- 5 A: En español.
In Spanish.
- 6 R: Entre ellos,
Between them,
- 7 A: No
- 8 R: No?
- 9 H: a veces,
sometimes,
- 10 A: No
- 11 H: Yo (les he escuchado)
I (have heard them)
- 12 A: Hablan alguna que otra palabra entre ellos mismos pero a mí
13 me hablan en español y me responden en español
They speak one or two words between them but they speak in Spanish to me and respond to me in Spanish
- 14 R: mm. pero entre ellos en inglés
um. But English between them
- 15 A: mm.
- 16 R: Ok. Y tú con ellos en español,
OK. And you speak Spanish with them,
- 17 H: En las dos lenguas.
In both languages.
- 18 R: En las dos lenguas.
In both languages.
- 19 A: Sí
Yes
- 20 H: =ellos me contestan a mí en español y en inglés,
=they respond to me in Spanish and in English,
- 21 R: Ajá.(.) pero entre ellos (.) en inglés,

- Aha. (.) *but between them (.) in English,*
- 22 A: mmm.
- 23 R: Y eso por qué le parece que es,
And why do you think that is,
- 24 A: Pues porque los niños(.) según eso los niños están
25 confundidos no saben ni qué hablar si español o inglés
*Because the children(.) according to that the children are
confused they don't know which language to speak in Spanish
or English*
- 26 H: Ha ha.
- 27 A: =Sí?
=Yes?
- 28 (.1)
- 29 R: ¿le parece que es por eso .
.you think it's because of that.
- 30 A: porque en la escuela me dijeron no?(.) que yo tengo los
31 niños confundidos(.3 *mientras come*) confundidos en el
idioma.
*Because they told me in the school right?(.)that I have the
children confused (.3 while she eats) confused with the
language.*
- 32 R: que usted los tiene confundidos le dijeron la escuela,
that you have them confused they told you in the school,
- 33 A: sí porque tengo-si yo vivo en Londres tengo que hablar
inglés, no?
*Yes because I have-if I live in London I have to speak
English, right?*
- 34 R: En qué escuela le dijeron eso,
In which school did they tell you that,
- 35 A: en la escuela donde ellos están.
In the school they go to.
- 36 R: en la escuela del estado la la,
in the local school the the,
- 37 A: mm.
- 38 R: ¿sí sí en la escuela(.) en la escuela pública .
yes yes in the school(.) the local school.
- 39 A: mmm.

At L. 4 I enquire as to which languages the grandmother's own children speak (L. 4) and upon learning that they speak Spanish I ask her whether her children speak Spanish between them and receive a negative answer (L. 7). The answer, however, does not fit entirely with my knowledge of sociolinguistic facts or indeed with my own ideology. As per her earlier comments, the interviewee lives alone with the children. Her English is not 'good enough', the children communicate with her in Spanish, and most of their friends are Latin American or of Latin American descent. Hence, the children are likely to navigate the affordances that these two languages can provide them with and at least code-switch at some point. This, from my own ideological standpoint, would represent Spanish-speaking but clearly not in the view of the interviewee (see lines 12-3) (see, for example, Zentella 2007). In view of this, I challenge her answer by repeating her exact response: the negative particle, albeit with rising intonation (L. 8). With this misaligning action I indicate that this is not an expected response and that I do not take her answer as final (Mazeland 2004, Márquez Reiter 2011) and begin the projection of a conflicting stance by foregrounding the ideological distance between us: Spanglish as a legitimate v. illegitimate practice. In view of this, the daughter produces a misaligning action with respect to the stance articulated by her mother by self-selecting (L. 9) to deal with what she perceives as inaccurate information (Robson, Drew and Reuber 2016). This is something that the grandmother emphatically repairs at L.10 by assuming the situated identity of mother. She positions herself from the authoritative role as a mother who lives with the children and witnesses their interactions with one another on a daily basis (L.12-3).

Her daughter, however, resists it on the basis of the situated identity she had adopted so far: being a sister who also interacts with them (L. 11). The daughter's assumption of the situated identity as sister and thus as a legitimate interview participant is also evident in L.20 where she attempts to lock out the main interviewee.

My misaligning actions (i.e. indicating scepticism by challenging the grandmother's response) and her daughter's, led the grandmother to justify her preceding contributions (L.12-3) by underlying that she is a present mother. The justification provided inferentially reveals a linguistic ideology of monolingualism where code-switching is not considered to be a legitimate practice. This is something that her daughter continues to implicitly argue for in her responses to my questions (see e.g. L.17, 20), from her situated identity as sister. This segment captures how misaligning actions with respect to a given stance entail the participants' assuming and leaving discourse identities: from interviewee to mother, from daughter to sister.

At lines 29 and 32 I recast my original question (cf. line 23) in the form of a metapragmatic comment and produce an identical repeat, respectively. The inclusion of *le parece* ('you think') (L. 29) constitutes a particularised implicature in breach of quantity (Grice 1976). It brings to the fore that this is the grandmother's own view, a stance that I from a situated identity as an academic and linguist construct as sceptical, and hence threaten her face (Goffman 1959). This leads her to invoke a different source of institutional authority in the form of reported speech (Holt and Clift 2007) to legitimise her actions and repair the damage caused to her face. On hearing this, I react by recasting her prior contribution, albeit this time I emphasise the source of the ideological contention i.e. 'confudidos' (confused) (line 32). In providing a virtually identical repeat (Robinson and Keove-Feldman 2010) of the grandmother's prior contribution with continuing intonation (cf. the final intonation with which the grandmother had uttered her response) I suggest that I have trouble accepting it (Svennevig 2008). My repeat includes the presence of *usted* (formal second person singular) when this is grammatically unnecessary. In so doing, I (inadvertently) engage in another misaligning action with respect to the interviewee. The inclusion of *usted* is heard as emphasizing the mother's role in this rather than as a misaligning action with respect to the school's stance on bilingualism from my situated identity as a linguist. The grandmother hears this as challenging as observed in the way in which she rationalises and justifies her assimilationist ideology (L. 33). Her answer is typically heard in the responses to accusatory questions ('yes because'), finished with a tag with rising intonation ('no?') oriented to seeking stance agreement (i.e. migrants should speak the language of the receiving country). It shows how alignment works at the structural level (i.e. the participants cooperate in creating and maintaining the interaction) and with respect to the issues at hand.

Upon learning that she was told this at the children's school, I produce a specifying question (Thomson, Fox and Couper-Kuhlen 2015): I enquire about the school where she gathered the information. I thus indicate a misaligning action with respect to the school's advice. I convey scepticism with respect to schools offering such advice but not necessarily with respect to her. From my situated identity as a linguist I am surprised to hear that schools ill-advise parents of bilingual children. I thus provide another virtually identical repeat (Robinson and Keove-Feldman 2010) with continuing intonation (L.36). This time I disambiguate the source of the trouble (cf. L.34 any school v. L. 36 in the local school), displaying further disbelief by indicating trouble in accepting it (Svennevig 2008). The grandmother reacts with a minimal token ('mm', L.37) with which she confirms that this was institutional advice. I, however, recast her answer in a softer voice (L. 38) indicating that I understood her answer but still have trouble accepting it. The grandmother proceeds to offer a repetition of the minimal token ('mmm' L. 39) with final intonation.

Relationally speaking, my contributions have the effect of underlining the asymmetries rather than the commonalities between us (i.e. Spanish-speaking Latin American born mothers living in London). For instance, differences in status insofar as my actions are heard as

undermining the very practices that are being accounted for in the interview. My authoritative positioning on the topic discussed, based on what I am entitled to know or should know as an academic, bears on the interaction as I show that I am misaligned with the beliefs and practices of the interviewee. Specifically, in producing virtually identical repeats as well as specific and telling questions of her account when the information provided was sufficiently clear as far as her ideologies are concerned, I go beyond what was said earlier, generating further ideological work and affecting the trajectory of the interview in as much as the interviewee feels it necessary to initiate a new vector. She does this by invoking a different source of institutional authority to justify her ideological stance. She thus assumes the situated identity of being a 'good' mother and an exemplary migrant. This affects the progression of the interview: from eliciting the interviewee's views to engaging in an argumentatively tinged discussion which, in turn, offers a window into the nexus between her ideological stance, her migratory trajectory (cf. the daughter's trajectory) and what she feels is culturally expected in diaspora. In short, it serves to inform the research project in an unexpected manner.

The construction of ideology through realigning actions

Example 2, below, illustrates an interview that the researcher conducted in Madrid with three Honduran friends shortly before their return to Honduras as they had been unable to find 'good' jobs in Madrid. The interviewees are 2 Honduran females in their late 20's and early 40's, respectively and one Honduran male in his late 20's. The interview was conducted in the queue of a Latin American bakery. I was accompanied by my son in his pram. In this fragment I ask them if the reason they have been experiencing difficulties in finding work responds to the economic crisis in Spain (see L. 1).

Example 2

M1= female in her 40's, M2= female in her 20s, H= male in his 20s, R=Researcher

- 1 R: [Pero] les parece que eso es por la crisis,
[but] do you think it's because of the crisis,
- 2 (1.0)
- 3 H: Ehm=
- 4 M2: =[La verdad es que sí. (.) es por la crisis.]
=[in truth it is (.) it's because of the crisis.]
- 5 M1: [e::h sí, en parte es por la crisis, pero::]
[u::m yes, on one hand it's because of the crisis, but::]
- 6 R: =y por otra parte,
=and on the other hand,
- 7 M2: =Sí porque yo [vine anteriormente y sí había más trabajo].
=yes because I [had been here before and yes there was
more work.]
- 8 H: [Y por otra parte el gobierno que no-]
[and on the other hand the government
doesn't-]
- 9 M1: [El gobierno] no nos está apoyando.
[the government] is not supporting us.
- 10 H: Claro, que no hay apoyo en ese sentido de de alguien:
I mean, in this sense there's no support from from anyone:
- 11 M2: Todo ha [cambiado].
Everything's [changed.]
- 12 H: [calificado no?]
[qualified right?]
- 13 M1: [No pero] pero yo pienso que también es es
14 como:: también aquí como se le trata a uno también porque:
15 se si- aquí uno se siente como si viniera a retroceder
16 (0.1) que: como: veinte años (.) qué veinte años, más, en
la época de:

*[no but] but I think that it's also is like::
also here like they treat you too because: if- here
you feel as if you regressed (0.1) that: like: twenty
years (.) not twenty years, more, to the time of:*

17 H: De la [conquista ha ha]
Of the [conquest ha ha]

18 R: [ha ha]

19 M1: cuando ellos no[s cuando ellos nos conquistaron a América]
when they conquered u[us when they conquered our America]

20 R: [ha ha]

21 H: [ha ha ha ha]

22 M1: [que piensan] que todavía están en la época
23 de la esclavitud
*[that they think] that they are still in
the time
of slavery*

24 R: =ha ha ha

25 M1: [porque le quieren ver a uno]
[because they want to see you]

26 R: [Por cómo te tratan.]
[because of how they treat you.]

27 M1: Sí.
Yes.

28 M2: =Sí.
=yes.

29 R: Cómo te tratan,
How do they treat you,
30 (0.1)

31 M1: e::h quieren que uno les resuelva totalmente la vida.
32 (0.1) bueno donde yo trabajaba de hecho si la señora
33 pensaba que yo tenía podía da- de:: producir leche hasta
34 del pecho le daba al bebé también,
*U::m they want you to resolve everything in their life.
(0.1) well
Where I worked in fact if the woman thought that I had to
Could gi-do:: produce milk I would have to even breastfeed
the baby
Too,*

35 M2: ha ha ha=

36 R: HA HA ha

37 M1: =[Y es demasiado.]
=[and it's too much.]

38 R: [HA HA HA HA HA HA]

39 H: [No pero (.) pero es que]=
[no but (.) but is that]=

40 R: =Ponte a trabajar [()]
=get to work [()]

41 M1: [ha ha ha ha]

42 M2: [ha ha ha ha]

43 H: [No pero sabes]
[not but you know]

44 R: (póngase) a trabajar [(conmigo ha ha ha ha)]
(get to) work [(with me ha ha ha ha)]

45 M1: [No pero] pero no me no me yo probé
46 pero no salió nada. [ha ha ha ha]
*[no but] but I don't I don't I tried
but nothing came out. [ha ha ha ha]*

Example 2, above, starts while discussing the problems the interviewees had been experiencing to obtain employment commensurate with their qualifications. I thus ask them if

this is because of the economic crisis in Spain at the time when the interview was conducted. The interviewees, in particular two of them (M1 and H), react by engaging in a misaligning action with respect to my stance, my judgement of their transient situation in Spain at the time. This is illustrated by the significant silence at L. 2, the hesitation device at L.3, and the modulated response offered at L.5 in which M1 signals, by inference, that there are other, more important factors at play here. In short, their stance, evaluative point of view with respect to their situation, is different from mine.

I thus proceed to enquire about these other reasons (L. 6). The interviewees start expressing their opinions when at lines 13-16, M1 begins to articulate the stance, the judgement of her own point of view, she had projected earlier (L.5). She brings to the fore her lived experience as a transnational and, in particular as a Latin American migrant in Madrid. This is something they know I have in common with them, at least as far as being a Latin American though not necessarily one who has lived in Spain, something that can be easily inferred from my variety of Spanish. M1's contribution invokes postcolonial attitudes and is oriented to seeking agreement, that is, while maintaining structural alignment it is aimed at obtaining alignment with respect to stance conveyed (i.e. the participant's evaluation of a postcolonial Spain). This is illustrated by the pause of 0.1 after she introduces the topic of *retroceder* and what this evokes at an interactional juncture where any of the other participants could have taken the floor.⁷ In view of the fact that none of them do she follows this with an explanation. The explanation offered is exaggerated. The lack of precision of the time frame mentioned (*como veinte años*) and its repetition with an increment (*que veinte años, más, en la época de:*) helps to strengthen her stance (Drew 2003: 917). In a non-competitive overlap H performs a re-aligning action by finishing M1's turn and bringing up the topic of colonialism *la conquista*; another hyperbole for dramatic effect that serves to construct this jocular telling. Before *la conquista* is uttered by H (at L. 17), I react by laughing (at L. 18). This suggests that I am predicting what is about to be said. It indicates a realigning action (cf. my stance-taking at line 1) in so far as it insinuates my assuming the situated identity of a Latin American subject (cf. my discourse identity as an interviewer at line 1). It thus encourages further movement along this trajectory. H's completion of M1's turn represents an adequate version of what M1 had projected, as illustrated by the fact that is ratified (L.19) (Lerner 2004: 230).

My laughing thus gives the green light for M1 and her compatriots to expand on their stance. At L. 23-24, M1's brings to the fore *la época de la esclavitud*, yet another exaggeration (Drew 2003) (cf. the topicalisation of the conquest at L.17). With this she voices what she sees as the slave-like conditions that she has had to endure in her capacity as a subordinate subject. Despite this being no laughing matter, on hearing *esclavitud*, in latched I laugh again (L. 24). I thus accept their interpretation of my positioning as non-Spanish. This is heard as realigning and endorsing the externalisation of the interviewee's stance, namely the existence of postcolonial structures in modern Spain, from the situated identity of colonial subject he has assumed. This is evidenced by the fact that M1 wishes to expand on it but I interrupt her by offering my interpretation of the reasons why she might feel this way (L. 26), thus tuning in on their experience. Both M1 and M2 quickly and collaboratively indicate that my rendition is correct (L. 27 and 28 respectively). I thus ask M1 to tell me about it on the relational connection that has so far been constructed: the interviewees' locating themselves as subordinate subjects by virtue of their Latin American status, the joint construction of my situated identity as one of them, and the collaborative way in which this sequence has been constructed (Lerner 2004).

M1 thus engages in a description of a postcolonial structure based on the dependent domestic servile work she was employed to do where a clear separation between Spanish women and the migrants that perform various household tasks is made. Once again she recurs to

⁷ Following Du Bois (2007) she offers an evaluation of the situation by positioning herself as a subject with respect to the topic at hand.

dramatization with two extreme case formulations (Pomerantz 1986), invoking the maximal properties of what she describes. The first one *les resuelva totalmente la vida* helps to depict the exploitative nature of the labour market conditions and their positioning as subjects, and the second one provides an example of it *hasta producir leche para darle al bebé*. It brings to the fore that nothing has changed since colonial times: now instead of minerals they would even extract milk from you if they could (L. 31-34). This indicates the preposterous view of the Spaniards' ideas in the eyes of the interviewees. Spaniards are depicted as being able to dispose of their Latin American 'slaves' at will by asserting a wish which would require the ability to manipulate physical affairs arbitrarily. This absurdity has a humorous effect as observed in the laughter it invites about the target, i.e. Spaniards are revealed as ignorant.

The female participants, the other Honduran interviewees and myself, display realigning actions by laughing. My laughing, however, is somehow different this time. It is markedly louder than before and that of the other female participants (L. 36). It indicates an emotional connection between us primarily based on the work they were required to do (i.e. looking after children- L. 33-34) and what they correctly assume I do from my transportable identity (L. 40,44). It helps in the co-construction of this jocular telling through which we position ourselves as non-Spanish. The affiliative strength of my laughter is seen in its capacity to convey that I am tuning in on the experience. Indeed, I bring to the fore my transportable identity as nursing mother, yet another identity that I have in common with them besides my situated identity of being a transient Latin American in Madrid and non-Spanish. This, however, is heard as my endorsing their stance and enables the interview to go back to track (see example 3 below). The interviewees thus begin to construct rich accounts of the linguistic discrimination they suffer at the hands of the locals and, in so doing, offer us a glimpse of their own normative ideologies about Spanish. This was an important aspect of the data we set out to collect as part of the research project (see Background and Methodology) but had found challenging to capture in other interviews. It is observed less than a minute later in the interview (Excerpt 3 below) where the female interviewee who had worked as a nanny describes the linguistic surveillance she was under.

Example 3

- 60 M1: No sé que ell- ellos pie- ellos me quieren hacer hasta
 61 que uno hable como hablan ellos porque los niños van a
 62 aprender (.) palabras que uno dice. [que pa-]
I don't know the-they thin- they want me even to
Speak like they speak because the children are going to
learn (.)
- 63 R: [cómo cómo cómo así?]
 [what what what do you mean?]
- 64 M1: Por ejemplo yo digo:: voy a agarr- e:h voy a agarrar tal
 65 cosa, ellos dicen no no se dice agarrar se dice coger o no
 66 sé (.) [para mí coger y agarrar es lo mismo,]
For example I say:: I'm going to take- u:m I'm going to
take such thing, they say no no it's not take it's coger
and so on (.) [for
Me coger and take are the same,]
- 67 H:
 68 [En lugar de conversar,] eh que hay que pla- nosotros
 69 decimos platicar, no, es que tienes que conversar. (.) y
 70 cosas- o sea (.) no sé,
[instead of talk,] um that we pla- we say
platicar, no, you have to say talk.(.) and things -I
mean(.)
I don't know,
- 71 M2: Marisol me decían a mí cuando estaba trabajando (.) tienes
 72 que pronunciar la ce la zeta porque si no mi hijo va a
 73 hablar como tú me decía y yo, (1.0) pero >si usted me

74 contrató sabiendo que yo era hondureña y que yo hablaba
75 distinto<, (.) o sea yo cuando leo con el niño, yo le
76 pronuncio (.) bien porque lo sé. (.) o sea sé que así se
77 pronuncia (.) pero en mi dialecto y en mi forma de ser >yo
78 jamás voy a decir eso<. (.) o sea, ella me decía Marisol
 esta cosa< OK (.) no. se dice vale. (.) vale.
 Marisol they'd would say to me while I was working (.) you
 have pronounce the /θ/zet because if not my son will speak
 like you
 She would say to me and I, (1.0) but >if you knew when you
 hired me that I was Honduran and that I speak
 differently<, (.) I mean when I read to the child, I
 pronounce (.) correctly because I know it. (.) I mean I
 know that this is how it's pronounced (.) but in my
 dialect and in my way of being
 >I will never say that<. (.) I mean, she would say to me
 Marisol this thing< OK (.) no. it's vale. (.) vale.

M2 thus brings the interview back on track as far as the linguistic practices and ideologies we set out to explore as part of this project. She provides an account of the linguistic practices and ideologies of the locals with respect to Latin Americans and of her own stance in respect to these. She does this by detailing the constant corrections, albeit unwarranted in her eyes as far as spoken interaction is concerned, that her employer subjected her to. This shows an acute awareness of the way in which given indexicals (Silverstein 2003) such as *platicar* ('to talk'), *agarrar* ('to grab or take'), *okay* and the Northern Peninsular Spanish phonological opposition between /s/ (voiceless, alveolar, fricative) and /θ/ (voiceless, interdental, fricative) are used to treat them as outsiders and, what is more, as potentially uneducated. This emerges more clearly at L.74-76 where the interviewee voices her own normative linguistic ideology: correct pronunciation entails distinguishing between /s/ and /θ/ by positioning herself as educated.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have discussed how interviews can provide specific foci for the unfolding of ideological work by offering a detailed analysis of the social dynamics between interviewers and interviewees in two interviews. The analysis concentrated on the way in which mis- and realigning actions with respect to the stances conveyed by the interview participants relative to a given subject or from a given discourse identity can lead to the construction of ideology, encouraging (or not) movement along a given interview trajectory.

The two interviews examined were selected for analysis as they illustrate the way participants can initiate an itinerary different from the trajectory of the interview set by the interviewer as a result of mis- and re-aligning actions with respect to the stances and discourse identities they assume, resulting in the construction of ideology. In the first interview, I show how misaligning actions were salient with reference to the verbalisation of a given stance and how this, in turn, provided fertile ground for the interactional manifestation of linguistic ideologies. The construction of ideology in this interview delayed its trajectory from that expected by the interviewer as the main interviewee initiated a new vector: that of presenting herself as a dutiful mother. My self-initiating stances according to my own ideology and what I know to be sociolinguistically false led the interview into a different direction: to an argumentatively tinged discussion in which some of the ideologies that inform the interviewee's account of linguistic practices came to light: a monoglot ideology where code-switching is an illegitimate practice. I argued that these accounts offer us a lens from which to explore the participant's beliefs about language ideologies and practices in so far as they were deployed to justify their stances with respect to the issues discussed. Self-initiated stances were observed in my recasting and repeating the interviewee's exact response, albeit with an

intonational contour that indicated that I did not take the interviewee's answer as final, and in my follow up questions aimed at eliciting further articulation of the interviewee's accounts. This was achieved, among others, by producing virtually identical repeats of the interviewee's answers, and by asking specifying as well as telling questions when the response offered was sufficiently clear as far the interviewee's linguistic ideologies and/or practices were concerned. These actions were heard as challenging insofar as I displayed trouble in accepting them, when, in theory, the interviewer is meant to adopt a supportive attitude rather than convey that the answers received are not expected. As a result, the interviewee provided justifications of her stance to present herself on moralistic grounds, and, in this process articulated some of her language rationalisations: English competence is the mark of good citizenship (Blommaert 2010).

In the second interview, I focus on how realigning actions with respect to the sharing of a stance generated rapport among the interview participants as they were interpreted as primarily affiliative. Laughter was invited by the production of exaggerations and extreme case formulations in which the locals were depicted as senselessly ignorant colonial masters who expect their subjects to manipulate biological affordances arbitrarily. This resulted in the interview taking on a different itinerary central to which the interviewees presented themselves as experienced and knowledgeable transnational workers subjected to the unethical working practices of uninformed locals. This led to moments of interpersonal connectedness between the participants where ideologies that did not form part of the interview schedule emerged: the re-production of a colonial episteme where Central-Northern Peninsular Spanish is invoked as a dominant variety and yet resisted (del Valle 2007). This was observed in their accounts of the linguistic discrimination and surveillance they report to be subjected to. It was accomplished by my collaboratively finishing off turns, predicting what the interviewees were about to say and volunteering interpretations of their feelings that turned out to be correct. I showed that moments of connectedness enabled the unfolding of linguistic ideologies and practices that we had found difficult to capture in other interviews.

A sharpened understanding of stance, alignment and the discourse identities that participants assume and leave in interaction, including the way in which the interviewer designs his/her questions, the way in which he or she reacts to the responses allowed us to see aspects of ideology that we would have otherwise missed. I have demonstrated how negotiations over stance primarily through aligning actions can become the locus of ideological work in interviews. They are informed by the interviewer's and the interviewee's own ideologies of discourse production. I have argued that the interview is an interactionally achieved social practice.

Much of the social science literature on interviews (implicitly) holds to the tenet that interviewers have to maintain a supportive attitude and remain 'neutral' despite the implicit ideological assumptions in interview questions. However, neutral reactions to the accounts that interviewees provide run the risk of the interviewer being heard as withholding, potentially leading to minimal responses. A closer look at the work that stance, discourse identity adoption and alignment play in interviews, have allowed us to capture ideologies that may have otherwise escape our attention, thus serendipitously feeding into the research agenda.

The analysis presented only focuses on two examples. In order to establish the extent to which the ideologies that emerged in these two interactions are also prevalent in the experiences of other Latin American migrants in these two cities, and the way in which they are constructed in interaction more data would be needed. Notwithstanding this, the paper contends that interviews can represent an apposite vehicle to examine the construction of ideology given that they are, above all, an interactionally achieved social practice. It maintains that analyses of interview data can and should be focused on the social dynamics of the participants, and that an understanding of the meaning of the accounts constructed in these

social encounters requires a reconsideration of stance and alignment that takes into account the interactionally contingent adoption of discourse identities.

References

- Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Briggs, Charles. 1986. *Learning How to Ask A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cicourel, Aaron Victor. 1964. *Method and Measurement in Sociology*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe
- Consejería de Asuntos Sociales, Comunidad de Madrid, enero 2013, Informe de la población extranjera empadronada en la Comunidad de Madrid
- De Fina, Anna. 2011. "Researcher and informant roles in narrative interactions: Constructions of belonging and foreign-ness". *Language in Society*, 40: 27-38.
- De Fina, Anna and Sabina Perrino (2011) "Introduction: Interviews vs. 'natural' contexts: A false dilemma". *Language in Society*, 40 1-11.
- Del Valle, José. 2007. *La Lengua Patria Común. Ideas e Ideologías del Español*. Berlin: Verveurt/Iberoamericana.
- Du Bois, Jack. 2007. The stance triangle. In *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*, ed by R. Englebreston, 139-182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Drew, Paul. 2003. "Precision and Exaggeration in Interaction". *American Sociological Review* 68: 917-938.
- García Ballesteros, Aurora; Beatriz Jiménez Basco and Angela Redondo González. 2009. "La inmigración latinoamericana en la España del siglo XXI". *Investigaciones Geográficas, Boletín del Instituto de Geografía, UNAM*, 70: 55-70.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. USA: Anchor Books.
- Grice, Paul. 1976. Logic in conversation. In *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts 3*, ed by P. Cole and J. Morgan, 41-49. New York: Academic Press.
- Heritage, John. 2013. "Epistemics in Interaction". In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, ed by J. Sidnell and T. Stivers, 370-394. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Holstein, James and Jaber Gubrium. 1995. *The Active Interview*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Holt, Elizabeth and Rebecca Clift. 2007. *Reporting Talk: reported speech in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Irvine, Judith. 2012. Language Ideology. *Oxford Bibliographies Online*.
- Jaffe, Alexandra. 2009. *Stance. Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kockleman, Paul. 2012. Review of 'Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives' by Alexandra Jaffe (ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 2: E105-E118.
- Labov, William and Joshua Waletzky. 1967/1997. Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*, ed. by Helm, June, 12-44. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Lerner, Gene. 2004. "Collaborative turn sequences". 350-369. In *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, ed. by G.H. Lerner, 227-257. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lindström, Ann and Marja-Leena Sorjonen. 2013. "Affiliation in Conversation". In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, ed. by J. Sidnell and T. Stivers, 350-369. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Márquez Reiter, Rosina. 2011. *Mediated Business Interactions. Intercultural Communication Between Speakers of Spanish*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Márquez Reiter, Rosina and Luisa Martín Rojo. 2015. "The Dynamics of (Im)Mobility. (In)Transient capitals and linguistic ideologies among Latin American migrants in

- London and Madrid." In *A Sociolinguistics of Diaspora: Latino Practices, Identities and Ideologies*, ed by Márquez Reiter, R. and L. Martín Rojo, 83-101. New York: Routledge.
- Martín Criado, Enrique. 2014. "Mentiras, inconsistencias y ambivalencias. Teoría de la acción y análisis de discurso." *Revista Internacional de Sociología* 72: 115-138.
- Mazeland, Harrie. 2004. "Responding to the double implication of telemarketers' opinion queries." *Discourse Studies*, 6: 95-115.
- McIlwaine, Cathy, Juan Camilo Cock, and Brian Linneker. 2011. *No Longer Invisible: The Latin American Community in London*. London: Trust for London.
- Moreno Fernández, Francisco and Irene Moreno Martín de Nicolás. 2001. "Dinámica perceptiva de la entrevista sociolingüística." In *Realismo en el análisis de corpus orales*, ed. by P. Martín Butragueño, 457-490. México, El Colegio de México.
- Office for National Statistics, UK Census 2011 <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/census/2011/index.html>
- Ochs, Elinor. 1986. *From Feelings to Grammar: A Samoan Case study*. In *Language Socialization Across Cultures*, B. Schieffelin and E. Ochs (eds.), 251-272. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Rourke, Bernadette, Joan Pujolar and Fernando Ramallo. 2015. "New speakers of minority languages: the challenging opportunity—Foreword." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231: 1-20.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1986. "Extreme case formulations: a way of legitimizing claims". *Human Studies* 9: 219-229.
- Rapley, Timothy. 2011. "The art(fullness) of open-ended interviewing: some considerations on analysing interviews". *Qualitative Research*, 1: 303-323.
- Robinson, Jeffrey, D. and Heidi-Kevoe-Feldman. 2010. "Using full repeats to initiate repair on other's questions". *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43: 232-259.
- Robson, Catherine; Paul Drew and Markus Reuber. 2016. "The role of companions in outpatient seizure clinic interactions: A pilot study". *Epilepsy & Behaviour*, 60:86-93.
- Roulston, Kathryn. 2006. "Close encounters of the 'CA' kind: a review of literature analysing talk in research interviews". *Qualitative Research*, 6: 515-314.
- Seale, Clive (ed). 1998. *Researching Society and Culture*. Sage: London.
- Schegloff, Emanuel. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 2003. "Indexicals orders and the dialect of sociolinguistic life". *Language & Communication*, 23: 193-229.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2008. "Stance, alignment and affiliation during story-telling: When nodding is a token of affiliation". *Research on Language and Social Interaction*. 41:31-57.
- Stockburger, Inge. 2015. "Stancetaking and the joint construction of zine producer identities in a research interview". *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 19: 222-240.
- Stokes, Randall and John Hewitt. 1976. "Aligning actions". *American Sociological Review*, 41: 838-849.
- Svennevig, Jan. 2008. Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40: 333-348.
- Talmy, Steven. 2010. "Qualitative Interviews in Applied Linguistics: From Research Instrument to Social Practice". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30:128-148.
- Thomson, Sandra A.; Barbara A. Fox and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2015. *Grammar in Everyday Talk. Building Responsive Actions*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Walton, Shana and Alexandra Jaffe. 2011. "Stuff White People Like": Stance, Class, Race, and Internet Commentary. In C. Thurlow and K. Mroczek (eds) *Digital Discourse*. 287-301 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woolard, Kathryn and Bambi, Schieffelin. 1994. "Language ideology". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55-82.

- Zentella, Ana Celia. 2007. "Dime con quién hablas y te diré quién eres: Linguistic (In)security and Latino Unity". In *The Blackwell Companion to Latino Studies*, ed by Juan Flores and Renato Rosaldo, 25-39. MA: Blackwell: Malden.
- Zimmerman, Don. 1998. "Identity, Context and Interaction". In *Identities in Talk*, ed by C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe, 87-106. London: Sage.

Transcription conventions (adapted from Schegloff 2007)

[]	overlapping speech
(1.5)	numbers in brackets indicate pause length in seconds
(.)	micropause
:	lengthening of the sound of preceding letter
-	word cut-off
.	falling or final intonation
,	continuing intonation
?	rising or question intonation
=	latching utterances
<u>Underlining</u>	contrastive stress or emphasis
CAPS	indicates volume of speech
°°	markedly softer speech
> <	talk is compressed or rushed
< >	talk is markedly slowed or drawn out
()	blank space in brackets indicates uncertainty about the speech

ⁱ I'd like to thank Anna De Fina, Arnulf Depperman, Kristine Fitch, Luisa Martín Rojo and Ben Rampton for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this paper. I would also like to thank the recommendations from the two anonymous referees and express my gratitude to the editors for bearing with me throughout this process. All remaining errors or misinterpretations are my own.