Nor Jnl Ling 32.2, 245–269 © Nordic Association of Linguists 2009 doi:10.1017/S0332586509990060

Schøning, Signe & Møller, Janus Spindler. 2009. Self-recordings as a social activity. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 32(2), 245–269.

Self-recordings as a social activity

Signe Schøning & Janus Spindler Møller

In this paper, self-recorded interactions from two studies of verbal interaction in Denmark are analysed using key concepts from Erving Goffman's frame analysis and Don Zimmerman's theory of identities in talk. It is documented how the recorder is integrated into everyday interaction as soon as the informant in his or her capacity as temporary fieldworker has explained the reason for its being there and has obtained the permission from his or her partners to record them. In several excerpts ascribed identities and using the recorder as an addressee are used to create amusement and to exploit the possibilities for supplying the innocent overhearing researcher with new and shocking information. The question of language norms during recorded sessions was raised in conversations in both studies and the limits of privacy were brought up.

Keywords ascribed identities, casting, interaction analyses, keying, self-recordings

Signe Schøning & Janus Spindler Møller, The LANCHART Centre, University of Copenhagen, Njalsgade 136, 2300 København S, Denmark. signewedel@hotmail.com, janus@hum.ku.dk

1. INTRODUCTION

An important question in sociolinguistics is how speakers use linguistic variants when they carry out their everyday life. In order to answer this question, scholars need to document what happens (linguistically or otherwise) in everyday situations. This has traditionally been framed as part of a paradox, the observer's paradox (Labov 1972). However, one rather obvious way of overcoming the observer's paradox is to ask speakers to conduct self-recordings (Wilson 1987). Informants are equipped with a recorder, and are asked to record themselves when interacting with peers, family members, workmates, etc. This way of collecting data temporarily assigns to the informant the status of 'fieldworker'. In this paper we address the question of how informants as temporary fieldworkers incorporate the recorder into their social activities. This may elucidate other ways of collecting data as well.

2. DATA

2.1 The Vinderup data set

Vinderup is one of the locations where the Danish National Research Foundation LANCHART Centre repeated a previous sociolinguistic study (Kristensen 1980).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

During our data collection we came across a girl who turned out to be a daughter of one of Kjeld Kristensen's original informants. Here she is called Nanna (generally in the paper all original names of informants are changed to pseudonyms). Nanna referred to her brother as speaking the local dialect and we decided to interview him as well. Thus, the Vinderup data set reported here includes the two teenage siblings, Erik and Nanna. Having recorded sociolinguistic interviews with them, we asked them to record themselves in all possible everyday life situations over the course of two months in 2008. The data consist of almost nine hours with Erik in 17 different situations and almost five hours of Nanna in 12 different situations. Both informants, incidentally, volunteered to conduct more recordings than asked for. Situations recorded include encounters with friends and family members. Other recordings are from the workplace, school, a visit to the doctor and a party. When we handed the recorders to Erik and Nanna, we explained that we would like the participants in the self-recordings to speak as they normally do. To obtain a fuller understanding of Erik's and Nanna's everyday lives, we carried out two personal interviews in depth. Finally, a dinner conversation including the siblings, their parents, their grandfather and a friend of Erik's was recorded. The Vinderup data thus comprise two sociolinguistic interviews, two personal interviews, a dinner conversation and 14 hours of self-recordings. In this paper we only deal with the self-recordings.

2.2 The Køge data set

The Køge project is a longitudinal study of a group of Turkish-Danish elementary school students who were followed through their entire school career from 1989 to 1998 (Jørgensen forthcoming). Eleven of the original twelve informants participated in a new round of data collection in 2006–2008 (Møller & Jørgensen 2008) including interviews and group conversations. In addition, the informants contributed self-recordings of their peer group activities and, in some cases, their family life. Actually, there are two kinds: SELF-RECORDINGS in which an informant is exclusively responsible for the recording activity, and SELF-RECRUITED RECORDINGS. Self-recruited recordings are those where an informant lets a fieldworker know when a specific activity worth recording will take place. The fieldworker then puts up the recording equipment, turns it on and leaves the scene for approximately an hour. Example 1 below is taken from such a self-recruited recording. In our analyses, however, we shall deal only with the self-recordings proper. The self-recordings in the Køge project consist of five recordings from restaurants and cafés and four recordings from private homes, resulting in a total of approximately eight hours. We have recordings of both inter-generational and intra-generational participant groups. In this paper we deal with the intra-generational groups as these groups discussed the recording situation far more often than the other group. Some of the recordings contain more than one core informant because they still see each other regularly.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

When we equipped an informant with a recorder, we said that we would like all participants to speak without any restrictions. We generally asked the informants to make at least one recording lasting at least one hour.

In both the Køge and the Vinderup studies the informants were given a Roland R-09 digital recorder to conduct the self-recordings. This type of recorder is a little too large to carry in a pocket, and in both projects, as a matter of ethics, the informants responsible for the recorder were instructed to place the recorder somewhere visible and to tell the other participants when they turned it on.

Our point of departure is thus two sociolinguistic studies situated in the Danish towns of Vinderup and Køge, respectively, with the former being the more rural, whereas the latter is highly urbanised. All Vinderup informants are mother-tongue speakers of Danish while the Køge informants have Turkish as their first language and Danish as their second. We compare excerpts from these two studies in order to establish similarities and differences.

3. METHOD

We handed out a recorder to a participant and asked him or her to record interaction with friends or family who may or may not have been in direct contact with the researcher. One consequence was that the participant with the recorder was RESPONSIBLE for e.g. explaining the purpose of the recording to the other participants and for obtaining their permission to be recorded. Making the informant responsible results in an asymmetrical relationship between otherwise – in this respect – equal partners. In both our data sets the presence of the recorder is often discussed in the beginning of the recording. These discussions may involve a clarification of linguistic norms or a negotiation of the participant roles. Generally, we find that the participants in the conversations use the presence of the recorder for several types of identity work. We also find that the informant responsible for the recordings is often asked to clarify the situational frame. In our analyses of the interactions we deal with how and why informants include the recorder in the conversations. Before we proceed to the analyses we have to clarify what this paper is about and what it does not treat at all.

Ganuza (2008) describes her experience with self-recordings as a method of data collection:

> The recording equipment occasionally appears to have distracted speakers during the self-recordings. At times, they discussed the equipment or the recording situation, or even addressed the listener (i.e. the researchers) directly to support information about something going on in the background, but on the whole, participants appear to have been able to relax and speak naturally during their self-recordings. (Ganuza 2008:41)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ganuza makes a clear distinction between so-called 'tape-affected speech' (Wilson 1987:169) on the one hand and 'natural' and 'relaxed' speech on the other, thus reproducing the well-known distinction between formal and casual speech styles. We do not agree with this distinction. Instead, we view the recorder as part of the context which needs to be taken into consideration in the analyses when made relevant by the participants (see Blommaert 2005:43). In our interaction analyses we do not find that talking about the recorder and the recording situation is in conflict with 'relaxed' interaction; often it is quite the contrary. It should, however, be noted that Ganuza's research focuses on syntactic variation and not on interaction. In this paper we carry out sequentially-based micro-analyses of social interaction inspired by e.g. Gumperz (1982) and Rampton (1995, 2006).

4. THEORETICAL PREREQUISITES

4.1 Framing and keying the activity of self-recordings

Among the characteristics of everyday face-to-face interaction Clark (1996) describes one as 'Recordlessness: the participants' actions leave no record or artefact' (Clark 1996:9). The self-recording activity differs from this. The intention of the activity IS precisely to provide a 'record' and an 'artefact' for future listeners to analyse. Consequently a question arises of how participants frame this atypical activity. Goffman (1974) explains how people structure their social experience in frameworks and distinguishes between NATURAL and SOCIAL frameworks. He defines social frameworks as follows:

> Social frameworks . . . provide background understanding for events that incorporate the will, aim, and controlling effort of an intelligence, a live agency . . . Such an agency is anything but implacable; it can be coaxed, flattered, affronted, and threatened. What it does can be described as 'guided doings'. These doings subject the doer to 'standards', to social appraisal of his action based on its honesty, efficiency, economy, safety, elegance, tactfulness, good taste and so forth. (Goffman 1974:22)

We view the recording situation as a social framework, and Goffman's key concepts of BACKGROUND UNDERSTANDING, LIVE AGENCY and, particularly, GUIDED DOINGS are therefore useful in our analyses. Participants are in general not familiar with a situation in which they are asked to record themselves for research purposes. Thus, they often discuss the recording situation. Such discussions of background understanding are often included in the recording. This gives us an opportunity to analyse them. For example, participants discuss who initiated the activity. Is it the participant who turned on the recorder, or is it the researcher who gave the recorder to the participant? Participants also discuss the guided doings related to the fact that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

they are being recorded. In several recordings the participants address the question of linguistic norms in a recording situation. They discuss whether they are allowed to swear, whether they should speak 'nicely', whether they should desist from speaking Turkish, etc. In other words, they discuss what is appropriate. We have several examples in which the participants discuss restrictive norms and, subsequently, show how they abandon them by using swear words or several languages. More generally, we find that when the participants have dealt with the social framework concerning the self-recording situation they start exploiting the self-recording activity in their identity negotiations. Goffman (1974:45) defines KEYING:

> a. A systematic transformation is involved across materials already meaningful in accordance with a schema of interpretation, and without which the keying would be meaningless.
> b. Participants in the activity are meant to know and to openly acknowledge that a systematic alteration is involved, one that will radically reconstitute what it is for them that is going on.

According to Goffman, all types of events can be keyed and small alterations in an activity may 'utterly [change] what it is a participant would say was going on' (Goffman 1974:45). The participants cue each other to signal how an event is to be interpreted, and a change in keying may, for example, be a transformation from a serious to a more playful interpretation of a frame. The following example from the Køge data illustrates how we use the concept of keying in our analyses (for transcription conventions used, please refer to the appendix):

Example 1: Stolen toothpics, 58:48–58:50, Køge Corpus (KC)
Participants: Murat (responsible for the recording), Ceyhun, Ferhat

1. Ceyhun:	*iki üç tane şundan alalım da*
	(*let's take two or three of these*)
	(1.4)
2. Murat:	*onu da mı çalıyorsun*
	(*are you stealing them as well now*)
	(0.5) **((several participants giggle))**
3. Ceyhun:	xx[x
4. Ferhat:	[og Ceyhun har nu stjålet tandstikker
	([and Ceyhun has now stolen toothpics)
	(5.0) **((the pause is filled out with laughter from several participants))**
5. Murat:	Ceyhun nej du må ikke tage bordet
	(Ceyhun no you are not allowed to take the table)
	((laughter))

Example 1 involves three Turkish-Danish speakers at a restaurant. In line 4, Ferhat describes Ceyhun's (fictive) action to the recorder and thereby indirectly to the researcher. This activity could be taken as a straightforward case of reporting and thus as belonging to the guided doings of this type of recording. In a very real sense, Ferhat is helping the researcher understand what is going on. A theft of toothpicks

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cannot be heard. However, when we take the local context into consideration it is not likely that Ferhat primarily wants to inform the researcher that Ceyhun stole some toothpicks. Indeed, toothpicks are for free and anyway not worth stealing. It is much more likely that Ferhat exploits the presence of the recorder to insult Ceyhun in a playful way. The laughter in the example supports this interpretation, and so does Murat's exaggerated accusation in line 5 about Ceyhun's alleged theft of a table. Furthermore, the activity of (fictitious) reporting that Ceyhun steals something occurs several times during the recording, and it is probably this repeated activity that Murat refers to in line 2 ('as well'). Example 1 illustrates how participants may transform their interpretation of an activity, and how this transformation may involve local identity ascriptions as well as speaker and hearer roles.

4.2 Identity work

Zimmerman (1998) describes how participants display and negotiate identity in interaction. He distinguishes between three levels of identities: Discourse identities, situated identities and transportable identities. The first two are of interest to our study. Zimmerman characterises these two identity types as follows:

> Discourse identities bring into play relevant components of conversational machinery, while situated identities deliver pertinent agendas, skills and knowledge, allowing participants to accomplish various projects in an orderly and reproducible way. Activities in a given setting achieve their distinctive shape through an ARTICULATION of discourse and situated identities for each participant and an ALIGNMENT of these identities across participants. (Zimmerman 1998:88; emphasis in the original)

DISCOURSE IDENTITIES provide guidelines for the participants of how to recognise a specific activity and how to execute their roles in the activity, e.g. as a speaker or a hearer. Discourse identities function as one resource to maintain the sequential order and progression. For the SITUATED IDENTITIES to be brought into being, participants need to align their discourse identities. Situated identities 'circumscribe and make available those extra-situational resources [which] participants need to accomplish a particular activity' (Zimmerman 1998:95). Situated identities, then, include features such as social knowledge of an activity to shape the interactional frame. In Example 1, Ceyhun, Murat and Ferhat in turn take on the discourse identities of speakers and hearers, respectively. They agree about who has the floor when, and they act accordingly. Moreover, in line 2 Murat identifies Ceyhun as a thief, which is confirmed by Ferhat in line 4 and exaggerated by Murat in line 5. The example illustrates how Murat and Ferhat establish a situated identity for Ceyhun, that of a thief. Example 1 shows how identities can be subject to constant negotiation among participants in interaction. Participants may assign particular identities to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

themselves or others, and it is up to the co-participants to decide whether they want to align with these identities or not. Our data also contain examples in which the participants refrain from aligning. The resulting mis-alignment may function as an attempt by the participants to control the situation.

4.3 Casting

In lines 4 and 5 in Example 1, Murat and Ferhat assign to Ceyhun the role of an overhearer of the conversation. They do so by means of casting. Ng & Bradac (1993:64) describe casting as a dynamic element in identity construction because 'speakers may cast . . . their hearers into particular conversational roles', and, following Clark & Carlson (1982), Ng & Bradac identify three hearer roles: the addressee, the participant and the overhearer. The addressee is the one to whom the speaker directs an utterance, whereas the '[p]articipant is a role assigned to a hearer whom the speaker intends to take part on a supportive basis in the conversational act that is directed at the addressee' (Ng & Bradac 1993:65). Finally, '[t]he overhearer may be an eavesdropper from whom the speaker wants to conceal the message . . . or an audience that the speaker wants to address indirectly' (Ng & Bradac 1993:65–66). In line 2, Murat casts Ceyhun as the addressee. In line 4, however, he is no longer the addressee, but the overhearer for whom Ferhat provides an indirect playful insult. Instead, Ferhat addresses the researcher by describing Ceyhun's fictive act. In line 5, Murat once again assigns to Ceyhun the role of an addressee. By the exaggerated accusation against Ceyhun of stealing the table, Murat instead casts the researcher as overhearer. Example 1 shows how hearer roles may change in subsequent speaker turns. It also illustrates how the recorder and the researcher may become part of the local context. Our data contain many similar examples of how the participants cast the researcher as an addressee, and how this keying of the interactional frame makes room for playful acts of identity.

According to Goffman (1981:144–145), speakers may occupy three speaker roles, viz. (i) THE ANIMATOR, that is, the person animating, i.e. giving voice to, the words; (ii) THE AUTHOR, that is, the person composing the words; and (iii) THE PRINCIPAL, that is, the person or institution whose views are being expressed. Our data reveal how our informants may separate the speaker roles to acquire specific identities because 'participants are rarely equal in their ability and motivation to play by the rules' (Ng & Bradac 1993:75). In handing a recorder to an informant, we make the informant responsible for obtaining useful data. It is left to the informant to explain the reason for the recording to the other participants. As a result, the informant no longer (inter)acts solely as a friend or a workmate, but may, as a temporary fieldworker, have an additional purpose, which is not available to his or her partners. This purpose needs clarification. In our data, the informants ask for permission to record the interaction, and they explain the purpose of the recording to their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

co-participants, but they very often minimise their role as the responsible fieldworker precisely by exploiting the three separate speaker roles. Example 2, from the Vinderup data, illustrates how Erik presents the recorder to his friend and colleague Jacob:

Example 2: Over in Copenhagen, 00:00–00:20, Vinderup Corpus (VC)
Participants: Erik (responsible for the recorder), Jacob

1.	Jacob:	hvad er det for en ting du har med der (.) xxx
		(what's that thing you have got there (.) xxx)
2.	Erik:	jeg sætter lige den her til at optage
		(I just turn this one on)
3.		det er sådan noget **((bildør smækkes))** jeg er med i
		(it's something **((slamming of car door))** I'm part of)
4.		det er et eller andet øh (.) det er sådan noget jeg er med i (.)
		(it's something eh (.) it's something I'm part of (.))
5.		de optager vores stemmer
		(they record our voices)
		(.)
6.	Jacob:	hvad fanden er det for noget (.) [mp3
		(what the hell's that (.) [mp3)
7.	Erik:	[det
		([it)
		(.)
8.	Erik:	det er sådan noget taler noget
		(it's some kind of speaker something)
9.	Jacob:	optager vores stemmer
		(record our voices)
10.	Erik:	ja det er noget de bruger ovre i København
		(yes it's something they use over in Copenhagen)
11.		på sådan en institut jeg har været med i
		(at this institute I've been part of)

By the use of the disfluency devices, the pauses and hesitations, and the inclusion of the word 'something', Erik presents the recording situation as potentially problematic (lines 2–5). He states that '*they* record our voices' and implies that he is not responsible for the recording. In line 5, he further distances himself from the task by explaining that 'it is something they use in Copenhagen'. Erik drops a hint that the recorder has been imposed on him by someone in Copenhagen. By doing so, he presents the situation as one in which he and Jacob have equal motivations for the conversation, and for which they are equally (ir)responsible. In his explanation he accepts the roles of animator and author of the words, but not the role of principal. Our data suggest that the strategy of distancing oneself from the fieldworker responsibility is often employed by our informants. This may serve to sustain the participants' familiar relations as friends, family or colleagues in an unfamiliar recording context. It may also persuade the co-participants to participate in the recording situation since the informant is acting on orders from someone else, so to speak. The fulfilment of the identity as a temporary fieldworker in mundane, everyday situations is not a straightforward task.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5. ANALYTICAL APPROACH

Our focus in this paper is on how speakers react to a context in which they are recorded. We specifically address two questions:

1. How do speakers frame and transform the activity of a self-recording and the guided doings it involves?
2. How do speakers exploit the fact that they are being recorded in their local identity work?

We analyse excerpts from our data sequentially in order to show how the framing activities progress and how routines involving the recorder are established. A key interest of ours is how the informants signal to each other how they interpret what is going on, by the use of contextualisation cues. These are defined by Gumperz (1982:131) as 'any feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signalling of contextual presuppositions'. Gumperz gives as examples '[t]he code, dialect and style switching processes, . . . prosodic phenomena[,] . . . choice among lexical and syntactic options, formulaic expressions, conversational openings, closings and sequencing strategies' (Gumperz 1982:131). To this list can be added laughter which may indicate how participants interpret the contextual frame (Glenn 2003).

6. RESULTS

6.1 Negotiating the frames of the self-recording activity

The following excerpt from the Vinderup data is from the beginning of a self-recording with Erik and four male schoolmates at school. Line 1 of the excerpt suggests that an explanation of the research project and of the presence of the recorder precedes the recording:

Excerpt 1: That was Eskil, 00:00–00:16, VC
Participants: Erik (responsible for the recorder), Person 1, Eskil, Person 2

1.	Person 1:	du må da godt nok få nogle sjove **((ler))** øh xxx	
		(surely you must get some pretty funny eh **((laughs))** xxx)	
2.	Erik:	ja	
		(yes)	
3.	Eskil:	må man gerne må man øh prøve at bande lidt så det ligesom	[altså xxx
		(can one try to eh try to swear at little so that it's like	[you know xxx)
4.	Erik:		[det er bare normalt (.)
			([it's just normal)
5.		hvad ø[h	
		what e[h)	
6.	Eskil:	[for helvede i satan det er da **((ler))**	
		([bloody fucking hell it's **((laughs))**)	
		((said with a coarse voice))	
		(.)	
7.	Person 2:	**((ler))** det var [Eskil	
		(((**laughs**)) that was [Eskil)	

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In line 3, Eskil asks for a clarification of the linguistic norms valid in this particular context. In line 4, Erik duly repeats (as animator) the original words of the fieldworker (principal) that they should just talk as they normally do, but he is interrupted by Eskil's swearing in line 6. Eskil's swear words may be interpreted as an attempt to play with the linguistic norm outlined in lines 3 and 4. Eskil's laughter and his use of the coarse voice function as contextualisation cues to a change of key from serious to playful. In line 7, Person 2 reports to the fieldworker that Eskil is the one responsible for the breach of norms, i.e. the swearing. It seems unlikely that this information should be aimed at the other participants who already know this. Two comments are in order. First, it is interesting that the question of swearing is seen as relevant. Secondly, the breach follows so close after the question that it must be seen as intentional right from the start, i.e. the norm of not swearing was introduced only to be breached subsequently.

Excerpt 2 is taken from a self-recording from the Køge data where four girls meet in a café to celebrate the birthday of one of them. The participants are Esen and Canan, who are core participants in the Køge project, Esen's younger sister Zeliha, and their friend Fatma, whose birthday they are celebrating. (In the part of the recording transcribed here, Canan and Zeliha remain silent.) Right before excerpt 2, Fatma asks Esen if the recorder has something to do with her work, and Esen explains that she got it from Janus. In excerpt 2 Esen elaborates on this explanation:

Excerpt 2: Bunu unut/You can forget about it, 1:07–1:28, KC
Participants: Esen (responsible for the recorder), Fatma, (Canan, Zeliha)

1.	Esen:	ja han vil godt have sådan et uddrag af vores hverdag hvilket *hani* (.)
		(well he would like to have an extract from our everyday which *you know* (.)
2.		sprog vi bruger og
		(language we use and)
		(.)
3.	Fatma:	skal vi så snakke dansk [xxx
		(must we speak Danish then [xxx)
4.	Esen:	[nej] vi snakker bare [som vi vil
		([no] we just speak [as we want to)
5.	Fatma:	[nå okay
		([well okay)
6.	Esen:	så får han det oversat *hani Türkçe olursa* [*Mediha var*
		(then he gets it translated *you know if it is in Turkish* [*Mediha it is*)
7.	Fatma:	[er det rigtig
		([is that right)
8.	Esen:	ja
		(yes)
9.	Fatma:	*o- yani küfür falan etmeyeceğiz o zaman*
		(*does that mean that we shouldn't swear and so*)
10.	Esen:	jo fordi så kan jeg bare sige til ham Janus *bunu unut*
		(yes because then I can just tell him Janus *you forget it*)
		(0.6) **((loud laughter))**
11.		*şaka* Janus
		(*it is a joke* Janus)
		((laughter))

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In line 3, Fatma asks if the recording situation involves a restrictive norm concerning language choice. In line 4, Esen states that this it not the case and explains that 'he' ('he' referring to Janus) gets the recording translated by a Turkish-speaking project worker. Fatma then asks if it means that they should not swear. Esen answers that this is not the case and explains that, if they swear she can just ask Janus not to pay any attention to it. Then, in line 11, Esen addresses Janus by name and stresses that it was a joke. Esen's two contributions directed to or involving Janus (*bunu unut* and *şaka*) in lines 10 and 11 are both produced in Turkish. This is an illustration of Esens's awareness of the translation routines adopted by the Køge study: she can address the Danish-speaking researcher Janus in Turkish because what she says will subsequently be translated into Danish. Furthermore, Esen may indicate that the recorder should not generally impose formality on the situation. When Esen addresses Janus, the other participants laugh loudly. Esen thereby successfully changes the key from serious to playful and in addition demonstrates that she (and not the presence of the recorder) determines the characteristics of the situation. The participants then start discussing a perfume gift Fatma has just unwrapped.

Excerpts 1 and 2 show how the contextual framing of the recording situation is established in the beginning of the recording by the participants: the participants' discussion of linguistic norms can be seen as a way of clarifying the contextual frame. They incorporate the recorder by keying it as a playful element in their interaction and by noting the virtual presence of the real fieldworker through it. This done, they leave the subject, and the recorder has now become part of the context. The excerpts illustrate how the recorder is incorporated into the local context.

In the self-recordings from both studies we find that the participants sometimes discuss and negotiate linguistic norms. These negotiations often concern swearing ('bad language'), but in the Køge data the negotiations furthermore often involve the language choice between Turkish and Danish, and in some instances the degree of formality in the spoken language. In every case the person responsible for the recording informs the co-participants that no special formality is needed in the recording situation. As previously mentioned, this was made clear whenever the researchers gave instructions concerning the self-recordings.

Excerpt 3 is the final sequence of a recording in which Erik has read aloud to the recorder, with his two friends, Thomas and Jesper, listening. In the sequence preceding the excerpt, the three participants have started watching a film, and they discuss whether to incorporate the recorder into the new activity of film watching or simply to stop recording.

Excerpt 3: Godnat Signe/Goodnight Signe, 29:58–30:03, VC
Participants: Erik (responsible for the recorder), Thomas, Jesper
1. Thomas: hvad øh skal hende der gutten blive ved med at høre øh
(hey eh is she that guy going to continue listening eh)
2. Jesper: prøv lige at se her
(take a look at this)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3. Erik: godnat Signe (.) hej hej
(goodnight Signe **((chews))** (.) bye bye
((said directly into the microphone))

In line 1, Thomas poses a question. First of all, this may signal that Erik is in charge of the recording situation, and that Thomas cannot just turn off the recorder. Thomas' way of referring to the researcher in line 1 indicates that he has not been enrolled by the researcher (Signe), but by Erik who, in contrast, addresses her by name in line 3. Thomas and Erik, then, seem to have different access to controlling the recording situation. Secondly, Thomas casts the researcher as an overhearer who had a legitimate part to play in the previous contextual frame, but whose role may be doubtful in the new frame of film watching. In line 3, Erik aligns to this perspective, when he, as a response to Thomas' request, directly addresses the researcher. He accepts Thomas' serious request by turning off the recorder with a friendly gesture to the overhearer. In so doing, he accepts the authority as master of the recorder.

While excerpts 1 and 2 above illustrated the integration of the recorder, excerpt 3 illustrates how the participants negotiate the detachment of the recorder from the contextual frame.

Excerpt 4 is from the same recording as excerpt 2, the girls celebrating Fatma's birthday. The participants' meals are arriving. Zeliha has just encouraged Canan to tell more about a wedding discussed earlier on. In this discussion, Canan has mentioned that one of their acquaintances misbehaved at the wedding. Excerpt 4 starts with Canan's reply to the encouragement to elaborate on the incident.

Excerpt 4: Şu açık ya/That one is on you know, 37:50–38:00, KC
Participants: Esen (responsible for the recorder), Canan, Fatma, Zeliha
1. Canan: *işte o* (1.7) men det andet det har jeg ikke lyst til at fortælle *şu açık ya*
(*well* (.) but the other thing I don't feel like telling *that one is on you know*)
(1.5)
2. Zeliha: *Canan kapatalım mı artık yani yemek yerkende*
(*Canan can't we turn it off you know now when we are eating the food*)
(1.2) **((Fatma laughs loudly))**
3. Zeliha: *hani*
(*you know*)
4. Fatma: smask *yapıyor muşuz*
(*we will* chew noisily)

Again, we have here a request for turning off the recorder. The participants may feel freer to discuss an unhappy incident without the researcher listening in. Apparently, there are limits to what it is appropriate to record. Shortly afterwards, the recorder is actually turned off, and Zeliha has thus been successful in playfully providing unrecorded space for Canan's story.

Excerpt 4 illustrates Canan's awareness that they are being recorded, and she hints that there are topics she omits. The fact that Zeliha addresses Canan directly shows that she views the recording activity as controlled as much by Canan as by

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Zeliha's older sister Esen, but that Zeliha does not consider herself entitled to simply turn off the recorder.

In excerpts 3 and 4 the argument for stopping the recorder was the change of activity type, but in excerpt 4 the most probable reason for this termination (the exchange of gossip) is never explicitly stated. It is, however, characteristic of the self-recordings as a whole that their terminations are often accompanied by arguments such as a change of activity type or, in the Køge data, the participants having fulfilled the one-hour recording request. It is also characteristic that the switching-off activity can be accompanied by a greeting and a few words addressed to the researcher. Finally, the two excerpts illustrate how only some of the participants are entitled to switch off the recorder, and how the other participants may bring this about by polite requests.

Common of all four previous excerpts is that the participants align in their framing of the situation, whether these situations involve the contextual clarifications of the social frameworks involved or reasons for terminating the recording. As we shall see in excerpts 5 and 6, such alignment does not always occur. This may have negative consequences for the self-recordings.

Excerpt 5 is taken from a recording of Nanna and her two friends, Lise and Mette, planning a party.

Excerpt 5: Having a great time, 00:00–00:19, VC
Participants: Nanna (responsible for the recorder), Lise, Mette

1.	Nanna:	råhygge med Lise og Mette (.)
		(having a great time with Lise and Mette)
		((speaks directly into the microphone)) **((noise))** (.)
2.		jeg optager lige hvad vi snakker om okay (.)
		(I just record what we talk about ok (.))
3.		[jeg skal låne sådan
		([I need one of)
4.	Lise:	[nej **((ler))**
		([no **((laughs))**)
5.	Nanna:	JO JEG SKAL BRUGE DET [TIL noget
		(YES I NEED IT [FOR something)
6.	Lise:	[nej
		([no)
7.	Lise:	nej det gør du bare ikke
		(no you don't just do that)
8.	Nanna:	jo for jeg skal optage alle mulige samtaler
		(I am because I have to record **((noise))** all kinds of conversations **((noise))**)
9.	Lise:	det må man ikke
		(you have no permission to do that)
10.	Nanna:	jo I har givet mig lov til det =
		(yes you gave your permission =)
11.	Lise:	= mm hvis man ikke får lov så må man ikke
		(= mm if you have no permission then you are not allowed)
12.	Nanna:	ja [**((ler))**
		(yes [**((laughs))**))

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

13. Lise: [jeg] siger ingenting
([I] say nothing)
((Nanna continues talking, but when she receives no replies from Lise or Mette over the course of four speaker turns, she turns off the recorder))

Nanna begins by framing the activity as one in which she and her two friends are having a great time. Her utterance is most likely directed to a double audience. It is a means to help the researcher identify the situation type. But it also signals to the two friends present that this is what they are supposed to take part in, i.e. to have a great time. In line 2, Nanna explains the presence of the recorder and then, in line 3, moves on to talk about something else, as if the recorder has now become a legitimate part of the contextual frame. Lise, however, in line 4 does not agree. In line 5, Nanna interprets Lise's minimal response as a negative reaction to being recorded. Nanna tries to justify the recording with her needing it to fulfil her obligations. The controversy between Nanna and Lise continues from line 6 to line 11. Lise keeps refusing to align to the recording situation and elaborates her discontent by referring to the norm that recording without the speakers' permission is unacceptable. Nanna, however, continues to argue for the self-recording and eventually claims that Lise and Mette have already agreed to participate. Neither party, then, succeeds in persuading the other party. As a result, in line 13, Lise chooses to stop talking. This strategy turns out to be effective: Nanna turns off the recorder shortly afterwards.

The excerpt pinpoints the importance of the participants' agreement to participate in a recording for it to be successful. The excerpt also demonstrates that the informants cannot unproblematically record everyday interaction or uncritically rely on the goodwill of friends and family members to participate. However, several indicators suggest that Lise's refusal to participate in the recording is not to be taken all too seriously. Firstly, Lise laughs when she provides her first minimal response in line 4. Secondly, Nanna implies in line 10 that Lise has already agreed to participate. Thirdly, later on the recorder is turned back on, and then Lise willingly participates.

In excerpt 6, Canan is sitting in a café with her two sisters. Prior to the excerpt Canan and Selda have a disagreement (Ag, forthcoming, analyses this disagreement in detail from a conversation analytic perspective). This disagreement may help explain Selda's request to get the recording erased and later to turn off the recorder. In the following, we analyse a part of this discussion. In an important passage Canan starts to answer a question, but is interrupted by Selda, who demands the following:

Excerpt 6: Journalist, 15:02–15:29, KC
Participants: Canan (responsible for the recorder), Selda, Aylin

1. Selda: kan du ikke slukke det der er nogle ting man vil fortælle som man ikke skal
(can't you switch it off there are some things one want to tell that one shouldn't)
2. øh [*şey*
(eh [*something*)
3. Canan: [det er jo anonymt for helvede
([as you know it is anonymous bloody hell)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4. Aylin: *yeter kız bu* [*kadar* optage *yaptın*
(*enough girl what* [*you did* record *until now*)
5. Selda: [det er sgu da lige meget [*kapat ya*
([that does not bloody matter [*turn it off*)
6. Canan: [nej
([no)
(0.8)
7. Aylin: *sonra bir daha baş*[*lat*
(*then you can start it again la*[*ter*)
8. Canan: [*bunu bile* optage *yapıyoruz konuşup durmayın*
([*we are recording this so stop talking*)
9. Selda: *neyi*
(*about what*)
10. Canan: *bu konuştuklar* [*ımızı*
(*what we are talking* [*about now*)
11. Selda: [*söndür sen de* [xxx
([*then turn it off* [xxx)
12. Canan: [nej
([no)
13. Aylin: [og hvad så det er da lige meget
([and so what it doesn't matter)
(0.6)
14. Selda: *ben buraya* aflyt *olmaya geldim*
(*I came here to be* listened in on)
(0.8)
15. *başıma* journalist *çıktın*
(*you behave like* a journalist)
16. Aylin: ahah ha **((produces a fake laugh))**
17. Canan: *neyse kapatıyorum*
(*okay then I just switch it off*)
(1.3) **((said close to the microphone))**
18. jeg slukker for i dag tak
(I turn off for today thanks)
((said directly to the microphone))

In line 1, Selda requests that Canan switches off the recorder because there are things she does not wish to have on record. Canan argues that the data will be anonymous (line 2), but Selda writes this argument off and repeats her request in line 5. Aylin starts arguing that what Canan has already recorded suffices (line 4), and that Canan can turn it on later again (line 7). Canan is now under pressure from both her sisters, and, in line 8, she requests that they do not discuss the recording situation while they record. She uses the first person plural form of the verb *yapıyoruz* 'we do' and thereby includes all of them in the recording activity. Canan's contribution in line 8 reflects a framing of the recording situation where the guided doings do not include talk about the recorder. In line 11, Selda once again requests that the recorder gets turned off, and in line 12 Canan once again refuses. Selda then starts to ascribe situated identities to Canan. In line 14, Selda uses the verb *aflytte* 'spy on', which connotes police or secret service activities. Then Selda accuses Canan of behaving

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

like a journalist, which finally makes her turn off the recorder. As in excerpts 3 and 4, Canan accompanies this action with a comment produced directly into the microphone.

As a whole, the argument – from which we have analysed only one excerpt, viz. excerpt 6 – may be seen as a power struggle between Canan and Selda. Selda makes four requests to have the recording erased or stopped, but Canan refuses to do so every time. In their discussion, they negotiate the frames of the situation, and, as such, the activity is, in general, similar to what we find in excerpts 1 and 2. The difference is that Selda constantly expresses her unwillingness to participate. It is likely that Selda wants to confront Canan because of their earlier argument in the conversation and uses the recording context as a platform for this activity, and that Canan refuses to follow her sister's demands because she considers them part of their more general power struggle.

Excerpts 5 and 6 demonstrate the importance of the participants' collective agreement to the framing of the recording situation. In both excerpts some participants overtly refuse to being recorded. In excerpt 5 a general issue of the acceptability of recording is brought up, and in excerpt 6 Selda's final arguments imply that Canan (on behalf of the researchers) is intimidating them by recording the conversation. Another similarity is that both interactions seem to involve more general power struggles between the participants as well as discussions concerning the recording situation. No matter what lies behind the discussions, both pieces of interaction result in the termination of the recording activity. The two excerpts differ in that the negotiation of the recording situation in excerpt 5 is keyed as partly jocular by the participants, as indicated by e.g. the laughter, whereas the only laughter in excerpt 6 is Aylin's fake laugh following Selda accusing Canan of behaving like a journalist.

Excerpt 7 follows shortly after the encounter between Erik and his friend Jacob in example 2 above. Between these two sequences, Erik explains that he has difficulties with carrying out the self-recordings. In the sequence just preceding excerpt 7a, Jacob has asked him to elaborate on the research project.

Excerpt 7a: Spy, 00:45–00:58, VC
Participants: Erik (responsible for the recorder), Jacob

1. Erik:	= vil de gerne høre når jeg selv tager optagelser
	(= they would like to hear when I myself make the recordings)
2.	og snakker med sådan nogen som dig
	(and talk to someone like you)
3. Jacob:	hvorfor
	(why)
	((laughs while talking))
4. Erik:	fordi det synes de da er sjovt
	(because surely they think it's funny)
	(.)
5. Jacob:	hvad fanden er du blevet spion eller hvad
	(what the fuck have you become a spy or what)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6. Erik:	ja
	(yeah)
7. Jacob:	det er fanme utroligt (.) for helvede
	(it's bloody unbelievable (.) hell)

Lines 1–4 contain continuing clarification of and questioning about the research project, but in contrast to example 2, where Erik presented the recorder as potentially problematic, recording no longer seems to be an issue. In line 4, Erik presents the reason for conducting the research project as self-evident ('because surely') and fun. The framing of the activity has obviously changed from one in which Erik was to ask Jacob for permission to record the situation into one in which permission has been granted, and in which the participants may joke about the consequences (Erik's virtually becoming a spy on himself and his co-participants, secretly obtaining information). In excerpt 6 the situated journalist identity was used and reacted upon as degrading, whereas the spy identity in excerpt 7a is treated as a joke. This is not readily apparent from the transcription. It could be the case that Jacob was enraged by it – if we just followed the wording. However, having heard the tape we are not in doubt: Jacob transforms the contextual frame from one of clarification of the research project to one in which the recorder becomes a playful element in their local identity work.

In the sequence between excerpts 7a and 7b, Jacob elaborates on the spy identity, with both him and Erik laughing, and then moves on to ask how Erik got hold of the recorder.

Excerpt 7b: Spy, 01:15–01:21, VC

Participants:	*Erik (responsible for the recorder), Jacob*
1. Jacob:	xxx sig mig hvad fanden er det for noget (.)
	(xxx tell me what the hell is that (.))
2.	hvorfor er jeg ikke med i det
	(why am I not part of it)
3. Erik:	det det er nok fordi du ikke er så sej
	(probably because you aren't cool enough)

Jacob asks why he is not enrolled in the research project. Erik jokingly explains that Jacob is not cool enough. The participants seem to suggest that being an informant who makes self-recordings is prestigious. Erik then goes on to explain in more detail why he became part of the project (and reframes the activity back to one of clarification).

Like excerpt 6, excerpt 7a illustrates how co-participants may assign negative situated identities normally associated with intimidation and secrecy to the participant in charge of the recorder. In contrast to excerpt 6, Jacob's suggestion that Erik has become a spy is only a joke and a way of incorporating the recorder into the contextual frame. Excerpt 7b further illustrates that being an informant may be something special and prestigious. This notion is implied on several occasions in the Vinderup data.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Excerpt 8 comes from a recording conducted by Bekir and takes place in a restaurant. The excerpt follows an activity where Cevdet, encouraged by Erkan while Bekir tries to stop him, describes in detail a pornographic movie clip placed on Bekir's home computer (the passage is analysed in Møller 2008:224–228).

Excerpt 8: Manuscript, 5:37–5:56, KC
Participants: Bekir (responsible for the recorder), Cevdet, Erkan

1. Cevdet:	*yalan mı Bekir ağbi*	
	(*isn't it the truth Bekir brother*)	
	(1.0)	
2.	*bu var diye böyle şey yapmayın*	[*konuşun*
	(*you should not lie because of the recorder*	[*just talk*)
3. Erkan:		[*he konuşun normal olarak*
		([*yes you should just speak normally*)
4. Bekir:	*serbest dediyse bu kadar değil*	
	(*when I said speak unrestrictedly I didn't mean that much*)	
5. Cevdet:	*serbest* [xxx	
	(unrestricted xxx)	
6. Bekir:	[man må gerne være lidt tilbageholdende jo	
	([it is okay to hold back a bit you know)	
7. Cevdet:	*a bizim* samtale'*de her şey olacak*	
	(*in our* conversation *there should be everything*)	
8. Bekir:	jo jo	
	(yes yes)	
9. Erkan:	*kitaba yazsınlar Bekir Öztürk* TGV	
	(*let them write in the book about Bekir Öztürk* TGV)	
	((Erkan laughs when saying TGV))	
10. Bekir:	*bir dahakinde şey gitireceğim* manuskript	
	(*next time I will bring with me* a manuscript)	
11. Erkan:	xxx	
	((says something while laughing))	
12. Bekir:	så skal I læse så skal I læse op	
	(then you will have to read then you will have to read aloud)	
	((Bekir laughs when he produces this utterance))	

In the utterance produced in lines 1 and 2, Cevdet describes the framing of the interaction as 'telling the truth'. Erkan aligns with Cevdet in line 3. Erkan's word choice is similar to the word choice in Bekir's explanation in the beginning of the recording. Therefore, Erkan possibly indicates that Bekir is the principal of Erkan's utterance in line 3. The activity Cevdet and Erkan are engaged in can be described as not only accepting, but also taking over Bekir's earlier framing of the situation. Bekir, then, reacts in lines 4 and 6 by suggesting a more restrictive norm for the content of the conversation. Cevdet reacts by formulating a new norm guiding the conversation in line 7, namely that everything can and should be included in their conversation. Erkan, then, in line 9, suggests that they let 'them' write in 'the book' about Bekir and includes Bekir's last name and the acronym TGV. In the beginning of the recording Bekir has mentioned that he is supposed to return the recorder to Janus who is writing a Ph.D. thesis, and this might be the book (and Janus might be

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'them') that Erkan refers to. TGV is discussed by the participants at another time in the conversation, and it is ambiguous, as it refers both to a place in the Copenhagen area to which Bekir is connected and to the French high-speed train. A mentioning of what goes on in the situation to be included 'in the book' occurs a couple of times during the conversation and reflects the fact that the participants are fully aware that the recordings will be analysed, and that the analyses will be published. Bekir then states in lines 10 and 12 that next time they are to do a self-recording, he will bring a manuscript. By this he may be indicating that he wants to enhance his control over the issues discussed in the conversation.

In excerpt 8 the participants negotiate the frames and the guided doings related to the recording situation, but they do so in an ironic and playful way. Erkan and Cevdet describe the frames of the recording situation, and Bekir, ironically, tries to drag them into a more restrictive framework. If Bekir really meant to change the frames it would be easy just to switch off the recorder, but he never does so. The excerpt shows how the participants exploit the recording situation to play with situated identities and to entertain not only each other but also the researcher who is writing the book.

The following excerpt of Nanna and her friend Katja is taken from a self-recording in which Nanna and Katja are hanging out in Nanna's room. For the greater part of the recording they jokingly tease each other, call each other names and play with the recorder. Just before the excerpt presented here, Nanna damages a strap that is attached to the recorder.

Excerpt 9: Signe's strap, 09:57–10:37, VC
Participants: Nanna (responsible for the recorder), Katja

1. Nanna:	nej **((ler))** nu ødelagde jeg Signes rem (.) ups **((ler))**	
	(no **((laughs))** I damaged Signe's strap (.) oops **((laughs))**)	
2.	det skulle jeg nok ikke lige sige i til den der maskine (.)	
	(I probably shouldn't say that into to that machine (.))	
	((laughs while talking))	
3.	jeg kom til at (.) ødelægge den (.)	
	(I accidentally damaged it (.))	
	((laughs while talking))	
4.	hovsa	
	(whoops)	
	((laughs while talking))	
5. Katja:	påmindelse (.) Nanna hun ødelægger	[ting (.) og hun er ikke særlig høflig
	(reminder (.) Nanna she damages	[things (.) and she is not very polite)
6. Nanna:		[**((ler))**
		[**((laughs))**
7.	det [var sgu da bare det var bare	
	(it [was just it was just	
	((laughs while talking))	
8. Katja:	[så ved I det	
	([now you know it)	
9.	fordi jeg skulle have den om benene jo	
	(because I wanted it around my legs see)	
	((laughs while and after talking))	

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

10. Katja: så ved I det
(now you know it)
11. Nanna: ja ja (.) du snakker og maven den går
(Right right (.) you talk and the stomach it goes)
((Nanna's 'you talk and the stomach it goes' is a paraphrase of the Danish expression 'you talk and the arse it goes'. We are not aware of an English equivalent, but it means something like 'blablabla'))
12. Katja: jeg snakker da bare til dem
(I'm only talking to the ones)
13. derovre i Køben[havn (.) der skal have den der
(over there in Copen[hagen who are to have that one)
14. Nanna: [ja ja [**((ler))**
([yes yes) [**((laughs))**)
((laughs while talking))
15. Katja: [var det
([wasn't))
16. ikke det opgaven [den gik ud på
(it what the task [was about)
17. Nanna: [jo **((ler))**
([yes **((laughs))**)

In line 1, Nanna cries out that she damaged Signe's (the researcher's) strap, and in line 2 she says that she should refrain from saying so while the recorder is on because Signe would then find out. Nanna thereby casts the recorder as overhearing the situation. She repeats that she has damaged the strap in line 3, despite having just stated that she does not want Signe to find out about it. This is elaborated on by Katja in lines 5, 8 and 10 in which she addresses the researcher directly via the recorder and tells on Nanna's incautious behaviour. Katja adds (line 5) that Nanna does not apologise when she has damaged other people's property. Katja casts the recorder as the addressee and Nanna as the overhearer, but her repetition of line 8 in line 10 suggests that she wants Nanna to react to what she says. This highlights the teasing nature of her utterances. Nanna reacts in line 11 and claims that Katja is just blabbering, and should not be taken seriously. By paraphrasing the expression 'you talk and the arse it goes' into 'you talk and the stomach it goes', Nanna probably refers to previous sequences in the recording in which she teased Katja about being fat. Nanna therefore continues the playful and teasing nature of the activity, but tries to get back at Katja by once again pointing out her (fictitious) oversized body shape. Nanna tries to project Katja as fat, but Katja reacts in lines 12 and 13 by redirecting the attention to the recorder and the damaged strap, as she says that she is just talking to the researchers in Copenhagen. She follows up the teasing element in lines 15 and 16 by asking if talking to the people in Copenhagen is not what the recording is all about. She thereby implies that she did nothing wrong when telling on Nanna in line 5. With this question she refers to Nanna's explanation of the purpose of the recording, whereby she only animates what Nanna had said previously. In that way Katja justifies her telling on Nanna. The whole episode goes to show that a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

co-participant who in principle is recorded only because she spends this time with Nanna may take advantage of the recorder to present her friend as impolite and clumsy while her friend is overhearing it.

Note that according to Katja, the task is to talk to the recorder, whereas the original aim of the recording situation was to record the participants in everyday situations. As in excerpt 8, then, Katja and Nanna change situated identities, as Katja now describes the frame of the recording situation. Her redefinition is agreed on by Nanna in line 17, and together they transform the reason for recording the situation to fit their play frame. Excerpt 9, then, illustrates how participants, when the recorder has been contextualised, incorporate the recorder for their own amusement and address it in order to ascribe (fictive) situated identities to each other.

Excerpt 10 comes from the same recording as excerpt 8, and it contains the last part of the recording. The conversation preceding excerpt 10 is playful and involves sex-related subjects.

Excerpt 10: Abdullah's pyjamas, 1.02:42–1.03:20, KC
Participants: Bekir (responsible for the recorder), Erkan, Cevdet

1.	Erkan:	*ağbi onuda şey xxx kapatta yani o da şey olmasın*
		(*brother you know xxx close for the recording so it does not become eh*)
2.		*Abdullahı kitapa yazarsalar*
		(*if they write about Abdullah in the book*)
		((Erkan laughs while speaking))
		(.)
3.		deres ven *Abdullah pijama giyiyor diye*
		(that their friend *Abdullah is wearing a pyjamas*)
		(.)
4.	Cevdet:	*giymiyordu* =
		(*doesn't he* =)
5.	Erkan:	= jeg siger til dig manden han fatter ikke en meter af det her på grund af støjen
		(= I'm telling you the man won't understand one bit of this because of the noise)
6.	Bekir:	det tror du ikke
		(you don't think so)
7.	Erkan:	nej det tror jeg ikke en skid på det skal være et (.) stille sted
		(no I don't fucking believe it it has to be (.) somewhere quiet)
8.	Cevdet:	så må vi bare gøre det en gang til
		(then we just have to do it one more time)
		(1.8)
9.	Cevdet:	*yok lan bir şey olmaz dinleriz* [xxx
		(*no man there is nothing lets listen* [xxx)
10.	Bekir:	[*adam* det gode er
		([*man* the good thing is)
11.	Erkan:	du kan ikke høre den [Cevdet
		(you can't hear it [Cevdet)
12.	Bekir:	[hvis de kan bruge det til noget
		([if they can use it for anything)
13.	Cevdet:	selvfølgelig kan du høre den [mand
		(of course you can hear it [man)
14.	Bekir:	[så kan de bruge det til noget
		([then they can use it)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

15. hvis de ikke kan bruge det til noget
(if they can't use it for anything)
(1.2)
16. Cevdet: x[xx
17. Bekir: [whatever
((exaggerated pronunciation))
(.)
18. Bekir: jeg har jeg har prøvet
(I have I have tried)
19. Cevdet: *anasını satayım*
(*fuck that*)
(.)
20. Cevdet: selvfølgelig kan man høre det mand
(of course you can hear it man)
((Cevdet speaks nearer (or directly into) the microphone))

In lines 1 and 2, Erkan, like Katja above in excerpt 9, employs the recorder and 'the book' in his performance. He asks one of the other participants to switch off the recorder so their friend Abdullah will not be mentioned in 'the book'. Immediately afterwards (line 3) he mentions what it is about Abdullah that he wants to conceal. In this ironic way the participants explore the possibilities of ascribing personality traits to their friends and explicitly mention the possibility of getting these identities included in 'the book'. Cevdet's reply in line 4 ('doesn't he') can be interpreted in several ways. But whatever the interpretation, the contribution should probably not be taken at face value. It is more likely to be a contribution to a fictitious story about Abdullah and thus to the general exploration of possibilities for using the recording situation for amusement, playing with the supposed realism of recording everyday interaction.

Cevdet, in line 9, questions the quality of the recording. Bekir interrupts him and states in the lines 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 that he will return the recorder because he has done his best and cannot be bothered with the task anymore. Bekir's statement indicates that he, similarly to Canan in excerpt 6a, may experience the task of conducting the self-recording as something he is pleased to finish. Following Bekir's statement in which he appears to make an effort to describe exactly how he feels about the recording situation, Cevdet changes his stance from critical to supportive. In line 19, we interpret Cevdet's swearing as a way of saying that Bekir should not worry, and in line 20 Cevdet states that the recording quality is fine. At the same time Cevdet demonstrates this by speaking directly into or close to the recorder. Immediately after this exchange Bekir switches the recorder off.

The interaction in excerpt 10 is an example of how the participants' keying of subjects related to the recording situation can also switch direction from playful to serious. In lines 1–4 the participants use the recorder as a resource to ascribe (a fictive) identity to an acquaintance of theirs. We also observe in lines 5–20 how the recording and its quality have become a shared project among the three participants.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Excerpts 7–10 demonstrate how the participants transform the purpose and the guided doings related to the recording activity. Excerpt 7 (spy) and 8 (manuscript) are both negotiations of the frames and norms related to the recording. In excerpt 7 Jacob exploits the situation to ascribe a spy identity to Erik and then explicitly assigns prestige to the carrier of the recorder, thereby exploiting a potential difference in the power balance brought about by the fact that one participant is responsible for the recording and the other is not. In excerpt 8 a similar potential change in the power balance is exploited, though not explicitly mentioned. Cevdet and Erkan appoint Bekir to be the key informant of the recording by telling embarrassing things about him and by quoting his earlier explanation that they should speak 'normal' and 'unrestricted'. In excerpts 9 and 10 the participants exploit the possibilities of ascribing fictive identities to other participants and to friends by addressing the recorder, the researcher ('Signe' in excerpt 9) or the outcome of the research ('the book' in excerpt 10). Moreover, in excerpt 9 the participants use the option of addressing the recorder and thereby of casting another participant as an overhearer in order to ascribe each other (fictive) situated identities. Generally, excerpts 7–10 illustrate how the participants can treat the recorder as a resource in play. Sometimes the participants address it directly thereby exploiting speaker and hearer roles (not to mention mass-media roles such as 'reporter'), and sometimes they creatively examine and exploit the situated identities connected to the recording situation. The recorder is being transformed from a serious tool to a platform for more or less sophisticated amusement.

7. CONCLUSION

The analyses reveal how the informant responsible for the recording and the co-participants incorporate the recorder into the social activities. We have shown how the participants frame and negotiate the guided doings relevant for the recording situation, and how the responsible informants could apply different strategies in order to introduce the recorder. Our excerpts display the importance of negotiation and agreement between the participants in their framings of the recording situation. If the participants do not come to an agreement about what goes on in the actual context, the self-recording activity terminates. To a certain extent, the responsible informant reproduces the explanations given to him or her by the researcher.

The analyses illustrate how the activity of conducting a self-recording can be seen as a course of events in which the participants first clarify the relevant social frameworks and guided doings related to the situation and then change the keying of the situation. We have seen how the participants joke with the linguistic norms, ascribe situated identities to each other, address the recorder directly, or exploit the recording situation in other creative ways. Of course this general sequence of events

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cannot account for all conversations. For example, our data contain recordings in which a transformation of the situation to a more playful key never takes place, and where the participants just leave the issue of the recording after the clarification.

One major difference between the Køge and the Vinderup data sets is that the Køge informants often indicate that they just wanted to get enough data to return the recorder to the researcher, as exemplified in excerpt 10. Furthermore, it was not always easy to make the informants carry out the self-recordings. However, as exemplified in excerpt 7b, being enrolled in the research project was projected as something prestigious in Vinderup. The two informants, Erik and Nanna, enjoyed doing the self-recordings, and in fact it was difficult to make them stop.

We do, however, find far more similarities than differences when we compare the content of the self-recordings in the Vinderup and the Køge data. In our analyses we have paired excerpts from these two studies in order to suggest that some of our findings could be valid for self-recordings in general. We have demonstrated how the participants integrate the recorder in the activities they carry out. This knowledge can be useful in sociolinguistic studies occupied with documenting and explaining how speakers employ their linguistic resources in order to socially navigate through their everyday interactions and activities.

APPENDIX

Transcription key

[ ]	Overlapping speech
=	Latching between two speaker turns
(English)	English translation
(0.0)	The numbers indicate silence between or within turns of more than five tenths of a second
(.)	The dot indicates silence of less than five tenths of a second
xxx	Unrecognisable speech
((laughter))	Bold double parentheses contain laughter, non-verbal action audible on the recording or comments on the transcription
//	Self-interruption within a word
LOUD	Capitals indicate that a word is pronounced with higher volume than the surrounding words
italics	*Turkish*
underline	Languages other than Danish and Turkish

REFERENCES

Ag, Astrid. Forthcoming. At gøre være storesøster. To appear in *Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism* (2010).

Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Clark, Herbert H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Clark, Herbert H. & Thomas B. Carlson. 1982. Hearers and speech acts. *Language*, 58(2), 332–373.
Ganuza, Natalia. 2008. *Syntactic Variation in the Swedish of Adolescents in Multilingual Urban Settings: Subject–Verb Order in Declaratives, Questions and Subordinate Clauses*. Ph.D. dissertation, Stockholm University.
Glenn, Phillip J. 2003. *Laughter in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Goffmann, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jørgensen, J. Normann. Forthcoming. *Poly-lingual Languaging: Nine Years of Poly-lingual Development of Young Turkish–Danish Grade School Students*. Copenhagen: Danish University of Education (2010).
Kristensen, Kjeld. 1980. Situationsafhængig sprogbrug hos vestjyske skoleelever. *Danske folkemål* 22(2), 29–124. København: Akademisk forlag.
Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Møller, Janus Spindler. 2008. Polylingual performance among Turkish-Danes in late-modern Copenhagen. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5(3), 217–236.
Møller, Janus Spindler & J. N. Jørgensen. 2008. Poly-lingual languaging in group interaction. *NordAnd* 3(2), 39–56.
Ng, Sik Hung & James J. Bradac. 1993. *Power in Language*. Newbury Park, CA; London & New Dehli: Sage.
Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing, Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.
Rampton, Ben. 2006. *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wilson, John. 1987. The sociolinguistic paradox: Data as a methodological product. *Language and Communcation* 7(2), 161–177.
Zimmerman, Don H. 1998. Identity, context and interaction. In Charles Antaki & Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk*, 87–106. London: Sage.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586509990060 Published online by Cambridge University Press