

4. Tracing Belonging in Spoken Data

In this chapter, I will elaborate on how we can analytically trace belonging in the form of narratives and other interactions. Instead of providing finite tables showing the specific linguistic forms which *could* be used by speakers to make belonging relevant (cf. de Cillia et al., 1999, 35), I will instead point to the different discursive levels on which belonging can be made a “communicative problem” (Hausendorf, 2000, 99f.); this occurs primarily through the use of categories, positioning and narrative practice. At the micro-level of interaction, categories and positions can be displayed or uncovered by looking at contextual cues the speaker provides through linguistic indexes (Silverstein, 1976). On a meso-level, the speakers display positions in interaction as members of a community of practice or by occupying specific interactive roles. These categories and positions can, then, relate to macro-level structures within the community, or to “big discourse” surrounding the notion of belonging in Guatemala and beyond.⁴⁵

In section 4.1 of this chapter, *Membership Categorization Analysis* and *Conversation Analysis* will be introduced as main tools to uncover the use of categories, their relations and organization in interaction. Positioning as a second major link to belonging is discussed and investigated in spoken language data in section 4.2. In section 4.3, I use an analytical approach to narrating as a community based practice, and underscore how it is a powerful locus for linguistic constructions of belonging 4.3.1. Finally, the specifics of positioning within the two temporal frames of narrative interaction are outlined in 4.3.2 before concluding in 4.4 how I will analyze my data.

45 These interactional levels point to the the concept of *context* as I use it in this book. Context is conceptualized here as a “dynamic construct” with the “dual status of process and product” (Fetzer, 2012, 107) that is jointly organized by all participants of an interaction. It draws on and simultaneously constructs different levels in these interactions. On the micro-level, context refers to previously (or anticipated) uttered *co-text* (c.f. Janney 2002). On the meso-level, context refers to the situatedness in the “here and now” of interaction, its “physical location” and “temporal situatedness” (Fetzer, 2012, 108), and the participants involved in a specific communicative practice (telling a joke, doing an interview, narrating a story). On the macro-level, context refers to the categories and positions available to the speakers that are grounded in their social and historical embeddedness. These three levels are related – even though not always explicitly – whenever speakers achieve a “common context” (Fetzer, 2012, 110).

4.1. Membership Categorization and Conversation Analysis

One of the three dimensions of belonging is the individual's membership in social groups, which I have already outlined in detail in the previous two chapters. Speakers use social categories and display their belonging or non-belonging – their depiction of how these groups behave or what they stand for, and their evaluations of these shared features. One of the major approaches developed to analyze how speakers convey their sense of how the world is organized socially is the Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA). Developed by Sacks (1972b,a, 1995) and based on the premises from ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967; Heritage, 1984), MCA aims at exposing “a set of resources and practices” or in other words, an “*apparatus*” (Schegloff, 2007b, 467, emphasis in the original) speakers use to orient themselves in the social world and position themselves within it. After establishing *what* categories people use and what ascriptions or activities they allocate to certain categories, MCA tries to reconstruct *how* these categories are used, how they are related to other social categories, and how they gain meaning in the specific context of an interaction or text:

“MCA unpacks peoples’ ‘reality-analysis’ (Hester and Francis, 1997); that is, how categories are stipulated, how membership in a category is accountable, and, particularly, how speakers proffer their category work *as* common, cultural knowledge” (Stokoe, 2012, 283, emphasis in the original).

Hence, a first step in the actual linguistic construction of belonging *to* social groups is the display of membership in certain groups by speakers during an interaction. Also, the delineation from other groups is an indicator of the social boundaries speakers draw around their own groups (Wimmer, 2008, 975). Especially when it comes to the second dimension of social belonging *with* a group, attitudes towards “us and others” and their respective norms and behaviors as expressed by the speaker are relevant to the analysis.

Delving into Sacks’ taxonomy in more detail, different terms point to the “workings” (Sacks 1995, 613, Schegloff 2007b, 467) behind the single category itself. Categories can be grouped in certain collections, including categories of the same kind. For example, mother, father and child may be allocated into the collection *family*. The category, its relation to (a) certain collection(s) and its rules of application form a membership categorization device (MCD) (Sacks 1995, 40f., Schegloff 2007b, 467, Stokoe 2012, 281). How these devices are activated, made relevant and contextualized within an interaction – and hence, how social action is *done* – is the main question of MCA inquiry (Schegloff, 2007b, 477). Categories are often presented with category-bound activities or category

predicates qualifying the assumed behavior or characteristics of representatives of a certain group. It is important to mention that MCDs and category use are context-bound, and can therefore change from interaction to interaction or even sequentially. Depending on the circumstances, relations between the speakers, topics etc., categories can be rendered relevant or irrelevant, and the allocated activities belonging to certain categories may change. However, some MCA research also looks systematically for decontextualized and recurring patterns of MCD use (e.g. Stokoe 2012). This work mostly draws on different corpora including different settings for interaction, and views MCA as falling under the umbrella of Conversation Analysis (CA) (Sacks et al., 1974; Sacks, 1995). Conversation Analysis scrutinizes the sequential organization and participants' resources in interaction. It is an ongoing debate whether CA in looking for overarching and "systemic dimensions of interaction" (Stokoe, 2012, 278, emphasis in the original) should "tame" and systematize MCA. This somehow limits MCA's definition as an "analytic mentality" (Sacks 1995, Schenkein 1978) to help us see ordinary and messy interaction as exceptional and "worthy" for the analytical eye. Putting MCA into rigid systems, then, runs the risk of sacrificing not only its flexibility, but also its capability of letting participants themselves guide the analyst when looking at the data. As Hester & Eglin (1997, 20, emphasis in the original) put it, it is the local construction of certain categories from the point of view of the interlocutors that the researcher should focus on:

"Our central point is that it is *in* the use of categories that culture is constituted *this time through*. It is in their *use* that the *collect-able* character of membership categories is constituted and membership categorization devices *assembled in situ*: membership categorization devices are *assembled objects*."

This means that membership categories cannot be detached from specific contexts of production. In this sense, it is also pivotal for the analysis of membership categories, to determine how they are introduced, developed and possibly altered *sequentially* and adapted to the recipient (Silverman 1998, 152, Schmitt & Knöbl 2013). The categories and how they are used may give us insights into "local practical reasoning" and "moral order" (Baker, 1997, 139) of speakers, in turn pointing to frameworks of normativity in which the categories are arranged and to a "shared 'stock of commonsense knowledge'" (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2002, 62).

In his analysis of calls at a suicide prevention hotline (Sacks, 1967), Sacks inferred the category "being gay" from descriptions of category-bound activities by one of the callers in the prevention center. This triggered a discussion about the possibility, as an analyst, to say "more" than the actual speaker is saying: "The fact that we cannot be definitive about relevant categories and inferences is what

gives language practices their *feasibility*" (Stokoe, 2012, 282, emphasis in the original). Even what the speakers actually say may be misinterpreted depending on the underlying "apparatus" the analyst assumes. This gives rise to the question what we can say at all. With the means of CA and MCA, complemented and supported by ethnographic knowledge (Deppermann, 2000), a sequential reconstruction of the participants' meaning making in interaction can validate the "inferences" on relevant categories. Furthermore, by analyzing categories and how they are used in *different* interactional contexts and across *different* speakers of the community, their relevancy in a specific community of practice can be substantiated.⁴⁶

Belonging, according to this methodological approach, can be "reconstructed" in its meaning for the interlocutors (Hausendorf, 2000, 90f.). Belonging (and the categories and positions related to it) will be treated as a communicative "problem", not necessarily for the speakers, but for the analyst who reconstructs its processing in discourse. Within this reconstruction, it is not only the categories that mark belonging, but also other indexes. These indexes help us to support the argument for a possible inference of a non-explicit category in speakers' utterances, which I do not reject as rigidly as Stokoe (2012) does. Categories should be analyzed as "indexical expressions and their sense is therefore locally and temporally contingent" (Hester & Eglin, 1997, 18). Between the two ends of a continuum of case-specific and rather universalistic MCA approaches, the approach taken in this book positions itself in the middle. The focus is on context-specific articulations of belonging in community interaction occurring in narrative accounts from interviews and historic sessions for tourists. Furthermore, I also will examine patterns on the level of community practices. This context-specific approach is broadened in terms of comparing the construction of belonging in different forms of data.

Membership categorization analysis works on all three of the dimensions defined as relevant for belonging in the community of interest: spatial, social and temporal. Spatial categorizations are contextually dependent and are bound to other categorization practices. They are "locally organized" (Schegloff, 1972, 93), for example by the "non-co-presence" and "co-presence" of speakers (Schegloff,

46 The demand of "definiteness" in knowing what a speaker means is a claim that actually cannot be fulfilled, neither by analysts nor by other participants in the same interaction or from the same community (Quine 2000). This problem is also considered by Coseriu (1955–56, 45, emphasis in the original): "en todo momento, lo que efectivamente se dice es menos de lo que se expresa y se entiende" ('in every instant what is said is less than what is expressed and what is understood', RV).

1972, 85), and by social categorizations of the interlocutors. Choices when formulating location are also bound to the allocated memberships of speakers. If the counterpart in interaction can be assumed to be from the same community, the speaker will use other devices to speak about place than she would when speaking to an outsider (Schegloff, 1972, 93). By analyzing how people speak about place, we can make sense of a “social actors’ interpretive and interactional reasoning in relation to the negotiation, navigation and comprehension of space and place” (Housley & Smith, 2011, 698). By relating the spatial terms used in interaction and attaching a normative or hierarchical order to them, speakers present a “common sense geography” (Schegloff 1972, 85; McHoul & Watson 1984, 283) or “common sense topography” (Smith, 2013). This conveys how speakers organize the world around them in spatial terms, and how they attach a “moral” and a “social order” to this kind of organization (McCabe & Stokoe 2004; Stokoe & Wallwork 2003). In conceptualizing space Schegloff (1972, 99f.) identifies five ways for formulating location: geographical labels (G), terms related to members (R_m), terms expressing spatial relations (R_l), terms referring to actions⁴⁷, and place names (R_n). Especially the R_m terms are crucial for categorizing belonging according to spatial dimensions:

“These special R_m terms, ‘the X’ type R_m terms, and especially the term ‘home’, have the special character not only of ‘belonging to’ the member in relation to whom they are formulated, but, as we noted earlier, such a place is for a member ‘where he belongs’” (Schegloff, 1972, 97).

The deictic expression *aquí*, ‘here’, which we will look at thoroughly in the analytical chapters, can be recognized as an R_m term, related not only to one member, but to the whole community of the Nueva Alianza. It is ‘loaded’ with social significance and is crucial for expressing belonging within formulations of place. Schegloff emphasizes that place formulation is also influenced by the content of interaction, as speakers assemble topics with specific place formulations. For example, when people from the Nueva Alianza speak about the *finca* as a place, the topic mostly focuses on stories centered on the experience of working under the *patrono*. An analysis of categorizations in spatial dimensions, thus, involves a consideration of “this conversation, at this place, with these members, at this point in its course” (Schegloff, 1972, 115): in other words, a situated sequential analysis of the interaction, membership categorizations, place formulations and topics, i.e. “location analysis”, “membership analysis” and “topic analysis”.

47 Schegloff (1972) does not provide a token for action-oriented space formulations.

For categorizations within social dimensions, speakers can display membership to certain groups and account for allocated behavior and practices within these groups, as well as evaluate them. Also, the delineation from other groups is an indicator of the social boundaries speakers draw around their 'own' group (Wimmer, 2008, 975). The categories are displayed within members' interactions and henceforth negotiated or adapted within discourse. They are, in that sense, always co-constructed, as membership categorization is a recipient-designed and sequentially contingent phenomenon. Social categories can be "creative understandings [...] that are already charged with social meanings" (De Fina, 2003, 185), or they can be invoked as new categories adapted to meet communicative ends (Kesselheim, 2009, 317).

With regards to MCA, the temporal dimension is the one that has been discussed the least so far. Schegloff assumes the same combination of a sequential analysis of the temporal category, membership analysis of the speakers, and topic orientation to be suitable for analyzing the use of temporal formulations (Schegloff, 1972, 116). Speakers make choices in temporal formulations (as in personal and spatial categorizations) from the available options⁴⁸ depending on "specific communicative ends, in a specific context" (Enfield, 2013, 437) and adapted to a "course of action" (Enfield, 2013, 436). In their narratives (see 4.3), community members align temporal categories with certain social categories (e.g. *antes* 'before' with *patrono*). We will see in that section how categorical pairs from different dimensions of belonging align.

To conclude, the advantage of MCA is its epistemic openness to further "understanding members' practices and local orientations to 'who-we-are-and-what-we-are-doing'" (Fitzgerald, 2012, 310), also in the specific case of belonging in social, spatial and temporal dimensions. Even though Sacks' description of categories and devices seems to appear fixed and somehow cognitively 'stocked' in the speakers, he also emphasizes how they are sequentially invoked, filled and negotiated in the course of interaction. Categories "do not remain static but are continually developed, clarified, made accountable and even retrospectively modified" (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2015, 14). MCA can tell us something about categorical knowledge the speakers convey and apply in interaction. As my analysis focuses on how speakers *do* belonging in interaction, a more meticulous analysis of the linguistic means (Hausendorf, 2000; Kesselheim, 2009)

48 Available options for person, spatial and time reference are summarized in Enfield (2013).

with which they do category work can complement and expand the sociological findings.⁴⁹

4.2. Positioning

Speakers not only display and negotiate categories and related characteristics and behaviors; they also *position* themselves and others within a certain social location (Yuval-Davis, 2010), or as a certain type of person when using them in interaction. In section 2.6.2.1, belonging was discussed in terms of social positionality and as a prerequisite for macro categories of groups and other social entities. As for tracing belonging in spoken data, the positioning of the speakers can uncover certain relations to, order of, and stance towards categories and category-bound activities. Roughly speaking, a position can be defined as “speaker’s orientation to ongoing talk” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 595) and *positioning* as the linguistic practice of doing so.

Positioning theory evolved from Mannheim (2015[1929]), one of the founding fathers of the *sociology of knowledge*, emphasizing that all knowledge depends on specific positions in society. Mannheim’s thoughts are elaborated later on by Berger & Luckmann (1966). Foucault (1980) introduces the concept of “subject positions”, in which subjects are “*produced* within *discourse*” (Hall, 2001, 79, emphasis in the original) and placed within a network of power and knowledge. The Foucauldian concept was applied to empirical data by Hollway (1984), using gender discourses to show how they “make available positions for subjects to take up” (Hollway, 1984, 236). Hollway suggests that access to certain discourses endowed with rules, obligations and powers (like the “sexually driven man” or the “monogamously committed woman”) provides subjects with positions from which they can relate to others. A less static and more interaction-oriented theory of positioning was introduced within the realm of psychology by Davies & Harré (1990). Positions are also seen as “taken up” or “adopted” (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999, 28); however, this approach focuses on speech acts and indexicality as a means of taking a position, and emphasizes its link to context (Davies & Harré, 1990, 43). The concept of position is intended to replace (Davies & Harré 1990, 43; Harré & van Langenhove 1999, 14) or supplement

49 As Hausendorf (2000, 13) points out, Sacks’ famous analysis of “the baby cried, the mommy picked it up” did not consider an analysis of “the” as an article before “mommy” (and “baby”) and “mommy” as a term of affection different to for example “mum” (Quasthoff, 1978). An analysis of the linguistic nuances underpins the insight that the “mommy” is most certainly the mother of the “baby” in the predication.

(Moghaddam et al., 2008, 9) the concept of *role*. Whereas roles are criticized for focusing on “static, formal and ritualistic aspects” (Davies & Harré, 1990, 43) of the self in interaction, positioning refers to the practices by which a speaker may locate herself. A position taken up in discourse by a speaker involves certain rights and obligations:

“Positions are clusters of beliefs about how rights and duties are distributed in the course of an episode of personal interaction and the taken-for-granted practices in which most of these beliefs are concretely realized. Positions are more often than not simply immanent in everyday practices of some group of people” (Harré et al., 2009, 9).

Hence, what a speaker may or may not do or say depends on the position she is adopting or attributing to someone else within interaction, and the affirmation of that position by the alter in conversation. Davies & Harré (1990, 46) even suggest that a speaker, when having taken up a position, acts and speaks only from that specific “vantage point”, connected to “images, metaphors, story lines and concepts which are made relevant within the particular discursive practice in which they are positioned”. This view appears rather deterministic given that a position is introduced as a filter for a speaker’s use of categories, speech acts, language practices and behavior. Norms, rights, duties and practices related to a position (e.g. the position of a *patrono* vs. a *campesino*) are presented as cognitively stored in the subjects as “conceptual repertoire(s)” (Davies & Harré, 1990, 46), and made accountable once the position is “engaged” in interaction.⁵⁰ The interactive aspect comes into play as a “second order positioning” (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999, 20), in which the other interlocutor affirms, challenges or rejects the position introduced by the speaker for herself or for an “other”. The thereby achieved positions can be multiple or intersectional (as a peasant *and* a woman), which makes the normative system underlying the position and the practices associated with it even more complex. Considering the merits of positioning as an interactive phenomenon grounded in discourse, the approach of Harré and his colleagues does not refer to later empirical accounts of the “linguistic, communicative and interactional practices of positioning” (Deppermann 2013b, 4; see also Hausendorf 2000, 18, footnote). Within their analyses of – in most cases – invented and scripted interaction, positions

50 In later publications (Harré et al. 2009, 10; Harré 2012, 195f.), they call the step of assigning practices and categories to a position *prepositioning*. It seems to be not very different from Sacks’ category-bound activities or the communicative task of *attribution* (Hausendorf, 2000).

are explained as activating certain storylines⁵¹ according to which the interlocutors ‘think’ and understand the speech acts of the other. However, they do not focus on the actual sequential and processual unfolding of positions in interaction, and the linguistic means by which they are achieved and negotiated. A practice approach to positioning assumes that every utterance of a speaker, even in long monological narratives, is naturally dialogical (inter alia Coseriu 1976; Bakhtin 1987[1965], 1986[1961], 1981 and his “dialogic approach to discourse”; Wortham 2001, 17; Jungbluth 2016). If at least two interlocutors encounter each other (and the speaker could also speak to herself in this respect), “participants and analysts must understand where the speaker is placing herself interactionally” (Wortham, 2001, 19). This placement of the speaker is relational: she can only position herself in relation to the counterpart and other groups in the conversation (Bucholtz & Hall 2005, 598; Hastings & Manning 2004, 304). The positioning of the speaker is then not only achieved vis-à-vis other interlocutors or groups that are made relevant within the story; rather, the speaker also positions herself (and the characters of her narratives) within time and space (Wortham, 2001, 21f.).

Positioning is related to categorization practices and the formulation of categorical attributes (as for example in Celia Kitzinger 2003 or Deppermann 2013a, 67). Positions are, however, not identical with categories. Interlocutors speak *from* certain positions which can be “macro-level demographic categories” (e.g. gender or status), “local, ethnographically specific cultural positions” (e.g. ‘being from here’), and “temporary and interactionally specific stances and participant roles” (e.g. as a narrator or an interviewee) (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 592). All of these different levels of interdependent positions can overlap, and are activated by speakers’ use of certain cues in interaction. In narrative analysis, the positioning levels are even more complex, as speakers position characters in narrated time and themselves and others in narrating time. How positioning plays out and can be analyzed within the specific genre of narrative will be further unfolded in section 4.3.2.

51 We can find both orthographic forms as “story lines” or “story-lines” in the publications of Harré and his associates. Even though the semantics of story-lines already point to the crucial importance of positioning in narrative (see 4.3.2), the concept remains somewhat opaque and ambiguous. In the texts, story-lines appear as discourse (in the sense of Foucault) – e.g. “paternalism” or “feminist protest” (Davies & Harré, 1990, 57), as some kind of communicative genre – e.g. “storyline is ‘instruction’” (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999, 18), as the social context of an interaction – e.g. a “tutorial” (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999, 17) or in the biographical concept of “life as interlinking story-lines” (Harré et al., 2009, 8).

By positioning themselves and others, speakers assign aspects of their own belonging and the belonging of others. As in the depiction of tracing categories of belonging in spoken data (4.1), linguistic means⁵² of positioning will be analyzed in their situated and processual unfolding (Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann, 2002, 200) with a conversation analytical approach (Hausendorf & Bora 2006; Day & Kjaerbeck 2013; Deppermann 2013b). In doing so, we recognize the interlocutors' "alignment" or "disalignment" (Day & Kjaerbeck, 2013, 36) with positions available in the particular interaction. Especially for the level of locally and ethnographically relevant positions in an interaction ethnographic knowledge will be additionally considered, as has been called for in Deppermann (2000).

4.3. Narrative as Practice

Narrative has been an influential concept in social and anthropological inquiries, and in theoretical thinking on culturally or contextually bound knowledge production for the past few decades. Under the auspices of the narrative turn (Andrews et al. 2008; Fahrwald 2011, 82–97), they are now considered a privileged data form to capture the subjective meaning-making of speakers, accounts of experience and establishing of identities and belonging as a "mode of knowing" that give a temporal and chronological coherence and order to lives and history (Mitchell, 1981; Bruner, 1991; Niles, 1999; Punday, 2002; Czarniawska, 2004; Scheffel, 2012).⁵³

Narratives take on a relevant position within the corpus of this book, and are a specific form of discourse in which belonging is construed on different, and sometimes intersecting, levels. The analyzed narratives told by the speakers are performances either within the interactional realm of an interview or an account of the community story for visiting tourists. How speakers refer to the past, what categories they apply and evaluate, and how they position themselves and others on the different levels of narration will be examined in detail in chapter 7. I will also assess whether there are certain shared practices common to individual performances which might indicate belonging to and with a community of narrative practice. Before describing the analytical merits of conceptualizing *narrative as practice*, both in terms of individual narrative performance and as a communally

52 For an overview of grammatical and sequentially embedded linguistic means of positioning in German and German varieties, see Günthner & Bückler (2009).

53 For an overview of narrative accounts in literary studies, see amongst others Herman (1999), for narrative theory in literary studies Phelan et al. (2012), for narrative worlds in literary and videographic accounts Michaelis (2013).

shared way of speaking, we will have a brief look at current structural and interactional conceptualizations of narrative so far.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, the interest in narratives was first defined according to text organization or genre; that is, how narratives are organized sequentially and what ‘ingredients’ (in terms of sequential features) might constitute a ‘good’ story. Second, sociolinguistic approaches have focused on narrative by using criteria of a certain mode or method of speaking, taking narrating as a reflexive practice in which the narrator conveys experiences of the world, and in which she positions herself and others (De Fina & Georgakopoulou 2012, Chapter 1; Bamberg 2012, 79f.). In his approach to the urban Black English Vernacular spoken in the US, Labov (1972)⁵⁴ defines “narrative as one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred” (Labov, 1972, 359f.). Narrative clauses are the minimal units of these stories. They connect chunks of experiences in a sequential manner and “represent” the speakers experiences as “relived” in narrative. Labov collected “narratives of personal experience”, having respondents tell stories about life-threatening events where they or another person were in “danger of death” (Labov, 1972, 354). In these stories, he identifies five major structural units: *abstract*, *orientation*, *complicating action*, *resolution*, and *coda*. In the abstract, the speaker gives a short overview of what is going to happen, usually using a single clause. The orientation provides the hearer(s) with sufficient information about the characters, as well as the spatial and temporal context of the story as it unfolds. The complicating action is represented by the events told until the story is resolved. Within the coda, the narrator connects the narrative discourse with the “here and now” of interaction and ends her narration. Labov sees these units as universal elements of narrative structure and as necessary to label a narrative as “complete” (Labov, 1972, 369) or “fully-formed” (Labov, 1972, 363). However, not every narrative includes all of the outlined parts.⁵⁵

In a secondary structure, speakers evaluate the story. Evaluations can transcend the mentioned structural units (e.g. speakers can use evaluative means in narrating the complicating action), or they can be formulated as an independent unit. They show what makes the story worth telling, the “point” of the story (Labov, 1972, 368). Speakers use different means of presenting an evaluation

54 The text is mostly based on the findings in Labov & Waletzky (1967) that laid the groundwork for the structural analysis of narratives.

55 For example, in his analysis of predominantly racist “complaint stories”, van Dijk (1987, 70) finds that the resolution is missing to present the point of the story as an unresolved issue.

within the narrative. “External evaluation” describes speakers “stepping outside” of the story to tell the hearer explicitly about its point. Secondly, speakers can “embed” evaluations by giving voices to the characters or assign specific “evaluative actions” to them.⁵⁶ Evaluations are produced by different linguistic means such as intensifiers, comparators, correlatives and explicatives within the narrative, weaving simple syntactical structures into more complex ones (Labov, 1972, 378–393).

In Labov (1972), we also find the first attempts at analysis for what is known today as a narrator’s positioning and voicing of self and others within the concept of evaluation. However, in this approach, narratives are functionally defined as stories of personal experience performed according to a predefined structure and elicited within interviews. Labov also proposes that ways of speaking or different practices of narrative evaluation are socially stratified. The definition of narrative in Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972) has influenced a large number of narrative studies, especially on auto-biographical stories and narratives as representations of events and speakers’ identities.⁵⁷ The data presented in these papers, however, appear to represent monolingual accounts using only a trigger question from the interviewer to show interactional features. The narratives are detached from co-text and context, and analyzed mainly in universalistic structural terms.

Within anthropological structural approaches to narrative, known as *ethnopoetics* (Hymes, 1981, 1989, 2004; Tedlock, 1972; Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Gee, 1986), the analytic focus lies within “different linguistic resources that languages and peoples employ in storytelling and on the links between narratives and socio-culturally mediated ways of apprehending reality” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012, 36f.). Ethnopoetics envision – like sociolinguistics – dependencies between forms of telling (poetics of narration) and culturally or ethnically specific meaning, focusing specifically on oral traditions and marginalized forms of narrative. Units of description are *lines*, *verses*, *stanzas* and *scences*.⁵⁸ Looking at the poetic

56 Labov connects external evaluation mostly to shared narrative practices of “middle-class narrators” (Labov, 1972, 371), whereas he finds embedded evaluations and altering of narrative syntax with skilled speakers of the black vernacular.

57 The ongoing impact of Labov and Waletzky’s model and new developments and discussions on it can be found in the numerous contributions to Bamberg (1997).

58 The conceptual definitions of these units within the ethnopoetic analysis can differ depending on the authors. A line in Gee (1986, 395) is an “idea unit”, whereas Scollon & Scollon (1981) define lines as a mere “utterance”. Verses are complete sentences (Scollon & Scollon, 1981) or “sentence-like contours that have proven to be the central

and culturally specific organization of narrative texts shifts the focus of analysis from mostly content-related structures, as in Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972), to content as an “effect of the formal organization of narrative: What there is to be told emerges out of how it is being told” (Blommaert, 2007, 216). Narrating is conceptualized as a *shared practice* in which structural features represent cultural features of the community where these narratives are being shared and told.⁵⁹ However, the analytical toolkit (in terms of verses, stanzas and scenes) has remained rather vague and varying in scope and definition. Where a verse, stanza and scene start and end is often a matter of the researcher’s interpretation, who, in turn, needs very specific linguistic and ethnographic knowledge about the community and narrative forms in question. Narratives analyzed as poetic performances are presented as monological ‘artifacts’, as pieces of oral culture. Even though the ethnographically-oriented analyses consider the context of narrative performance as well as the audience and occasions of narrating, interaction between interlocutors rarely plays a role in the research on these ‘artifacts’.

Within the conversation analytical approach to narrative (Sacks et al. 1974; Sacks 1995; Schegloff 1997b; Antaki & Widdicombe 1998, see also section 4.1 of this book), interaction and the structural organization of narrative as an action occurring between two or more interlocutors has been given greater emphasis. Most of conversation analytical approaches to narrative focus on structural aspects of narrative openings and closings, and less on the actual narrative content in the “middle” (e.g. Jefferson 1978).⁶⁰ It also covers how narratives are recipient-designed, and its organization oriented toward how much the hearer knows or requests about the story (Goodwin, 1986). Narrative is analyzed as co-constructed, emerging during interaction, embedded into local discourse, and observing the positions of the tellers (Quasthoff & Becker, 2004, 3f.). A strict conversation analytical approach, however, focuses on the “here and now” of telling – on the sequential and local production of narrative. Reference to discourses and contexts

building blocks of narrative form” (Hymes, 1996, 144). Stanzas are defined as lines with a parallel structure (Gee, 1986, 396) or “internal cohesion” (Hymes, 1981, 150) and display a similarity in the speakers orientation within the narrative. Scenes, finally, are one or more stanzas related within a specific content-context of the narrative (coherent spatial, temporal or personal relations within one scene) (Hymes, 1981, 171).

59 The influence of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Whorf, 2008) is evident here.

60 This is not to say that Sacks would not be interested in “topic talk” as part of the “overall structure of a conversation” (Sacks, 1995, 309).

beyond the situated narrative are usually not considered in a strong conversation analytical approach.

De Fina & Georgakopoulou (2008a,b, 2012) attempt to tie aspects of all three approaches together by analyzing *narrative as practice* using a “social interactional approach”. Focusing on narrative as practice considers the local contexts of narrative production as specific variables in the analysis of narrative: “time, place, relations between interlocutors, events in which the storytelling is inserted, salient topics discussed before and after the narrative” and “narrative interactional dynamics (such as telling roles and telling rights, audience reactions, etc.)” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008a, 381). The narratives “unfold” in these contexts, and are therefore not simple “artefacts”⁶¹ within a social vacuum. The role of the other interlocutors is crucial. They might alter the narrative with responses and reactions, and even play a role in monologically designed narratives, as they are still aimed at a specific audience with a specific assumed knowledge – or lack thereof – of the story (the interviewer, the tourists, the readers of a book etc.) (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008a, 381). The participants, even though assuming the role of mere (passive) hearers in the interaction, are hence understood as co-constructors of the narrative. The analytical approach to narratives as practice aims to “go beyond the local level of interaction and find articulations between the micro- and the macro-levels of social action and relationships” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008a, 382), and thus goes beyond inquiries of conversation-analytical approaches. The argument is that observable phenomena on the micro-level of narrative can only be made sense of if the analyst taps into larger discourses and categories on the macro-level. The notion of practice refers to the “habituality and regularity in discourse in the sense of recurrent evolving responses to given situations, while allowing for emergence and situational contingency” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008a, 383). For the communicative genre of narrative (Depermann et al., 2016, 12f.), this means that there might be frequently practiced patterns or structures of telling past events or of positioning oneself as a speaker. However, as narrating is a practice people engage in regularly and habitually, it can also be adapted to audiences, contexts, and of course be rendered through local interaction: in other words, they are objects of “recontextualization” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou 2008a, 384, or “relocalizations” in terms of Pennycook 2010).

Specific forms of narrative practices (in forms of habitualized and constantly innovated routines) are related to specific communities of practice (see section 3.4). Narratives form part of the community’s repertoire of language

61 De Fina & Georgakopoulou (2008a) use the British English spelling.

practices and are “[...] inflected, nuanced, reworked, strategically adapted to perform acts of group identity, to reaffirm roles and group-related goals, expertise, shared interests, etc.” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008a, 384). Speakers tell stories about themselves and their trajectories during times of community transformation. Looking at recurrent patterns of narrative structure, categorizations and positionings in these individual performances, we can find collectively shared “ways of telling” peculiar to this community, and expressed through “the articulation of linguistic and rhetorical resources [...] story schemata, rhetorical and performance devices, styles, that identify them as members of a specific community” (De Fina, 2003, 19).

Methodologically, an approach to narrative as practice implies a “nose to data”-view and interactional features explicitly marked in data transcription. It also emphasizes the need for ethnographic knowledge about the community of practice, the discursive context and the speakers’ relations when it comes to data analysis. Narrative is viewed as a practice interlinked or enmeshed with others, such as interview practices or practices of community touring; hence, the narrative is also historically situated between past and emergent forms of narrating within the community of practice. Therefore, a corpus such as the present one (c.f. section 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 for a detailed introduction) – with comparable narratives told by different speakers of the same community in comparable contexts (or same speakers in different contexts) – can tell us more about the constructions of belonging in this specific type of discourse.

Before we look at some specifics of membership categorization and positioning in narrative discourse, we will investigate the function of narrative as a privileged locus for belonging constructions.

4.3.1. Narrative and Belonging

Telling stories is a basic and everyday communicative practice in which speakers express how they make sense of the world and themselves (Bruner, 2002). The self in a narrative approach is seen as something which is construed through narrating past events and memories adapted for the purposes of the “here and now” – the local performance of narration. The self is a product of its “narrativization” (Hall, 1996, 4) and can be articulated as coherent, as a result of interwoven events or as characterized by biographic ruptures, depending on the interpretative frames (“Deutungsmuste[r] und Interpretationen”, Schütze 1983, 284) the speaker gives to her own biography or singular life events. A narrative formation of the self is based on the narrative organization of what we have experienced and what we remember:

“The inseparability of narrative and self is grounded in the phenomenological assumption that entities are given meaning through being experienced [...] and the notion that narrative is an essential resource in the struggle to bring experiences to conscious awareness. At any point in time, our sense of entities, including ourselves, is an outcome of our subjective involvement in the world. Narrative mediates this involvement. Personal narratives shape how we attend to and feel about events. They are partial representations and evocations of the world as we know it” (Ochs & Capps, 1996, 21).

The act of narrating is an act of constituting and making sense of the self by assembling events from a specific point of view in chronological order and connecting them in a sensible way. Narrative “construes significant wholes out of scattered events” (Ricoeur, 1981, 176). These narrative life accounts often take the form of autobiographies in which certain memories and events are chosen by the speaker as “fragmented experience” (Ochs & Capps, 1996, 22), with the goal of creating a picture of how she wants to be seen by others as well as by herself. In rather essentialist conceptualizations of identity, the “self” is seen as an entity portrayed through “represented subjectivity” in autobiographical narrative (White & Epston, 1990; Cohler, 1988). The temporality of events and their organization into a seemingly logical and chronological order gives the speaker the possibility to account for the person she wants to be seen as – the interpretation and organization she gives to her trajectory of life. Thus, especially in psychological research, but also in sociological inquiries, narrative was conceived as an accessible representation of the speaker’s subjectivity. It provides a “unitary frame” of “time, space and personhood” (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008, 378) for speakers to display a way to make sense of themselves (or not, for example in case of psychological illness or in case of a biography deviating from social norms).

Yuval-Davis (2010, 266) introduces articulations of social locations in terms of “narratives, stories that people tell themselves and others about who they are, and who they are not, as well as who and how they would like to/should be”. The process of narrating then is a process of identification which is bound to different practices of belonging – to social groups as well as to specific spaces (ibid. 203). Identification, in Yuval-Davis’ terms, is thus an agent-centered expression of belonging that can be grasped by looking at peoples’ narratives. In these narratives, they make sense of their social locations and of the ideologies underlying specific social and spatial locations within society. The narratives are performed and related to current discourses on belonging. They also have a dialogical character and stand in relation to an “other” (Yuval-Davis, 2010, 269ff.).

Current sociolinguistic approaches to narrative as a place for self-construction focus on the discursive means speakers use to position themselves in the locally and interactively organized formation of narrative. The self does not always have to

be narrated as a product of a series of past events, but can also be found in narrative accounts concerning the present or future projections (Ochs, 1997, 190). In analyzing speakers' identity work, the preference for "life stories or autobiographies, or at least stories of life determining (or threatening) episodes" (Bamberg, 2006, 2) – the "big stories" (Bamberg, 2006; Georgakopoulou, 2006) – has been complemented by a focus on "small-stories" (Georgakopoulou, 2007, 2006; De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008a; Bamberg, 2006, 2007; Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008). Small stories are different from what Bamberg and his colleagues call the "narrative canon" which usually comprises narratives being "researcher prompted, personal experience, past events" (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008, 381). To broaden the definition of narrative and to account for narratives as practice, small stories include "underrepresented narrative activities, such as tellings of ongoing events, future or hypothetical events and shared (known) events, but it also captures allusions to (previous) tellings, deferrals of tellings, and refusals to tell" (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008, 381). An approach to narrative as practice – as being emergent, co-constructed and tied to macro-levels of social action – applies to the analysis of both "big stories" and "small stories". The narratives in the corpus of this book correspond rather to the definition of "big stories" as the speakers tell the "life determining" episode of their community's transformation and their own experiences during that time. Narrating their story gives the speakers the opportunity to reconstruct the past, to position themselves and others within it, to make sense of who they were and who they have become, and also to reconcile past actions and deal with experiences of injustice (Czyżewsky et al., 1995, 78). By looking at narrative practice, we can analyze belonging as social identification and relation to temporal and spatial categories, as well as a communally shared practice (see 2.7) by means of categorization (4.1), positioning (4.2) and shared patterns in narrating. We can see how speakers express belonging and make it relevant in the stories they tell to others and members of their own community of practice.

The aspects of membership categorization and positioning outlined in section 4.1 and 4.2 apply for narrative as a form of spoken discourse, too. However, some specificity surrounding the positioning within narrative analysis must be considered due to the particularities of narratives in this corpus (personal accounts of past events). We need to trace different lines of action which are unfolded by the speaker: the narrated time and the narrative time. This is why I will consider positioning in narrative separately in the following section.

4.3.2. Positioning in Narrative

Speakers engaged in narration operate within different time depths, namely, narrated time and narrative time. While the first refers to the time within the story or the account the speaker tells, the latter refers to the actual time in the “here and now” of local interaction. Whereas the time in the “here and now” is sequential, narrated time does not necessarily have to follow that order, but can be a “narrative/experiential time model rather than a clock/chronological one” (Mishler, 2006, 37). Speakers can jump between different time depths in the story, and do not necessarily tell it in chronological order. They can also switch between the story level and the level of metacommunication, for example to explicitly evaluate or comment on the narration. Hence, in narrative analysis we have to consider a double perspective of time and a dual speaker in terms of a narrating self and a narrated self (Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann, 2002, 202). The narrator performs acts of self- and other-positioning of the narrated self and of the other characters introduced in the story. She is able to evaluate these positionings within the story itself, or step outside of it to view it from another perspective. Narrating aspects of the self as personal experiences or life-changing events might change the speaker with regards to who she wants to be or how she wants to be perceived (Wortham, 2000, 157).

Interactional self- and other-positioning of the narrator and the hearer as well as multiple forms of positioning on the content level of narratives are envisioned in the model of Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann (2002). It shows that the multi-dimensionality of positionings in narrative requires a thorough analysis on all levels of narration. Another model operating at the same levels as do Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann (2002), but adding connections to broader social categories or positions indexed in the narrative, is the complex positioning model of Bamberg & Georgakopoulou (2008). They form an analysis of positioning on the level of the story itself (positioning level 1), the local level of interactive narrative production (positioning level 2), and connections of the local interaction to broader discourses (positioning level 3). Bamberg and Georgakopoulou emphasize that this kind of analysis puts forward a conceptualization of different kinds of speaker positions – negotiated, acted out and performed on different levels of interaction. Furthermore, they show how small stories’ multi-leveled positioning in narrative go beyond structural or interactive access to narrative “as content”, pursued by many scholars interested in big stories. They argue that a multi-layered and multi-leveled analysis reveals manifold practices acted out locally, all playing into different (interactive, narrated, performed) identities jointly building a bigger picture “a *process* of constant change at the same time

as resulting in a sense of sameness” (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008, 393, emphasis in the original).

In his approach to autobiographical narratives and the constructions of selves and belonging, Wortham (2000, 2001) takes an interactional approach from a slightly different angle. Even though interaction between narrators and hearers is part of the analytical endeavor, Wortham bases his thoughts on interaction on Bakhtin’s (1986[1961]; 1981) philosophical theory of dialog.⁶² Criticizing narrative being viewed as a mere representation of the narrators’ identity, Wortham emphasises that discourse (and hence, narrative) is naturally dialogic in the sense that it is embedded in uncountable utterances before and after what the researcher can observe and record *in situ*: “Interpretation of an utterance also requires construal of a second, interactional level, because the words used in any utterance have been spoken by others” (Wortham, 2001, 21). By re-uttering those words associated with certain connotations or meanings exceeding the semantic level, the speaker positions herself in the “represented content” (Wortham, 2001, 22). Speakers are “using words that index some social position(s) because these words are characteristically used by members of certain groups” (Wortham, 2001, 38). Constructed dialogue (Tannen, 1986, 1989) is perhaps the most direct way of voicing other positions, but is also found in other instances of interaction. By taking on different voices, speakers index different positions they either align with or dissociate from. *Voicing* is a special form of contextualization cue or index, as it metaphorically transmits a “whole person” (Bakhtin 1984[1963] in Wortham 2001, 39) and their assumed stances, characteristics and social embeddedness with respect to the participants of the interaction. Voices can be manifested and solidified by other contextual cues which indicate a certain “reading” of the voice and its positioning to other voices present and presented in discourse. Sometimes, the line between voice and position is blurred in Wortham’s approach. Conceptualized as a contextualization cue, the voice of the speaker indexes a certain position, but it seems that positioning and voicing are sometimes interchangeable. Wortham seems to lose the selectivity in his analytical conceptualizations here, especially when the reader understands that “being voiced” (Wortham, 2001, 40) is actually meant as “being positioned” in the analysis.⁶³

62 The idea of the relational dialogue between an “I” and a “you” as existential for the becoming of the “I” goes back to Buber’s (2008[1923]) *dialogic principle*, which he developed in the 1920s as part of his religious philosophy.

63 Ribeiro (2006, 74) provides a different and more distinctive definition of the often interchanged terms “footing”, “position” and “voice”. Another perspective on “footing” can be found in Nogué Serrano (2013).

Finally, positioning described by Bamberg & Georgakopoulou (2008) as positioning on level 3 taps into larger social processes of the community of practice itself, or refers to macro-discourses or dominant discourses. By narrating, speakers can not only position themselves and others as specific types of people, but can also find social positions within macro-discourses for their community of practice. Looking at individual narrative performances and symbolic practices of a group of Italian migrants in a New York card games club, De Fina (2008, 439) finds that

“storytelling functions through specific interactional and structural mechanisms at an individual level to modify the position of members with respect to each other, at a collective level to implement a particular image of the club, and at a macro level as a symbolic practice through which members of the club negotiate and construct new perceptions about the social position and identity of the ethnic group to which they claim allegiance”.

By positioning the group within larger discourses, for example the discourse revolving around land appropriation and categories as *campesino*, *colono* and *patrono*, which are historically shaped and related to specific positions and behavioral attributions in Guatemalan society, a narrator can recontextualize, claim, or dismiss said positions and categories for herself or for the group she belongs to. The narratives could also point to metanarratives or *grand narratives* (Lyotard, 1979) like “good vs. evil” or “David vs. Goliath”, in which the framing of the local narration is organized. Pointing to larger social action and macro-discourses in which the group is positioned, “narrative activity can be seen as having a central role among the symbolic practices [...] in which social groups engage to carry out struggles for legitimation and recognition in order to accumulate symbolic capital and greater social power” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008b, 280).

Focusing on narrative as practice requires the analytical recognition of complex layers of positioning on micro-, meso- and macro-levels of interaction, while also considering dimensions of narrated time and narrating time. It provides a holistic window into the speaker’s reconstructions of experiences and points to her ongoing interactive positionings within specific contexts of narrating and adapted to specific audiences.

4.4. Interim Conclusion – What to Do with the Data?

Speakers *do* belonging by categorizing and positioning themselves and others in interaction. These categorizations and positionings emerge sequentially, are context-bound and recipient-designed. A methodological approach combining features of MCA, CA and positioning analysis is the three-step system of

Hausendorf (2000), which is largely based on Sacks' foundational work on MCA, but adds an evaluative layer to the analysis and focuses specifically on linguistic means in category work. First, Hausendorf looks at the categorizations speakers display; he then looks at attributions (predicates, category-bound activities), and finally evaluations of the categories and connected qualifying descriptions. Categorization, attribution and evaluation are primary, secondary and tertiary communicative tasks. Hausendorf (2000, 107ff.) also meticulously analyzes the linguistic means and forms with which these tasks are achieved. This kind of MCA includes various layers of conversational work which is considered as surpassing the 'mere' category and tells us more about the interactional embeddedness and constructedness of the category at hand. Hausendorf's model already encompasses an analytical moment for positioning analysis, as attributions to and evaluations of categories can point to the position the speaker assigns to herself and others. Additional linguistic means can index positionings as well. For example, the use of verbs (in their variations of transitive/intransitive, passive/active, tense etc.) as "metapragmatic descriptors" (Wortham, 2001, 71), quoted speech, "crossing" (Rampton, 2000) and deictics (Duszak, 2002; Jungbluth, 2005) can point to varying positions in interaction.

So, in the first phase of analysis we will look at the categories and positions at play in interaction, and at the linguistic means of their introduction, negotiation and possible co-construction. As is now clear beyond any doubt, we will focus the analysis not only on the content level of 'what is said', but especially on the interactional level of 'how, by whom and in which context' it is expressed. In the second phase of analysis we can compare the findings from data sources embedded in comparable context and from different speakers of the community, as well as from the same speakers in different contexts. The emergence of shared patterns in, for example, structural organization, characters' and speakers' positionings, applied and filled categories in interaction, and specifically narrative interactions, point to shared practices within the community that speakers may use to display their belonging beyond linguistic instantiations. Looking for iterative moments in the corpus involves "going beyond the here-and-now storytelling event to the trajectory and circulation of a story in different environments as well as to the recurrence of a specific kind of story in similar social settings" (Georgakopoulou, 2013, 92). Therefore, an ethnographic approach to data collection (see chapter 5) and data analysis with local and social involvement of the researcher is pivotal.

