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What will we talk about?

<$1$> What year were ye in Cyprus?
<$2$> In ninety five.
<$3$> Four.
<$2$> Five.
<$3$> Oh right.
<$2$> Four *we* were in France and [name] was there.
<$3$> Three *we* were in France.
<$1$> Three *we* were in France.
<$5$> Ninety+
<$2$> Oh it's four so.
<$5$> +ninety five *we* were <$G$?>.
<$3$> Yeah that's+
<$1$> Ninety-four *ye* were in Spain mum.

<$6$> Do you feel like *we* solved anything?
<$1$> Does that mean me or everyone?
<$6$> Generally. Have *we* achieved what we came to achieve?
<$7$> Got a date or something?
<$E$> Laughter <$\E$>
<$6$> No just confused here.
<$E$> All laugh <$\E$>
# Summary of the Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C-MELT</th>
<th>Family corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of recording</td>
<td>3.5 hours</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of speakers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of words</td>
<td>39,975</td>
<td>12,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A basic outline of the framework (Wenger 1998)
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### A corpus view of the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C-MELT</th>
<th>Family Corpus</th>
<th>LCIE</th>
<th>BNC (Spoken)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>we</strong></td>
<td>is</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>n’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>is</td>
<td><strong>we</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>it’s</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>do</strong></td>
<td><strong>we</strong></td>
<td>they</td>
<td>was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>think</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We normalised per million words
We

• “‘We’ is always simultaneously inclusive and exclusive, a pronoun of solidarity and rejection, of inclusion and exclusion’
  (Pennycook 1994: 175)

• Complexity of reference: encoding and decoding
It's nothing got to do with presents.

Shut up.

It's nothing to do with presents and happiness it's got to do with celebrating the birth of Jesus.

Okay so we won't give you any presents.

We're not allowed be happy because we are Catholic.

[name] shut up.

You're having no presents so are you?

I'll say a prayer for you.

We are Catholic. We are not allowed be happy. It's all about the birth of Jesus.
We in the family - exclusive

<Daughter> Mm. Because one night we were goin right and we got stopped. Another two got in in front of us and we said what oh they’re gold cards.

<Daughter> We have them outside too the eighty mini bulbs. Is that what they are? Eighty mini bulbs <$G3> yeah we’ve them too.

<Son> Are you doin corpus stuff?
<Daughter> Ah we hit at it last semester like.

<Son> +aren’t we already twinned with Quimper?
<Daughter> It’s in France.
<DoS> Right. So yeah that’s the spirit of the thing. The other thing is that I want to mention to you is eh it’s a huge big issue that’s we’re facing everyday about students getting lost or not coming in and eh eh a wider kind of an issue...
**We in the workplace: Mapping participant deictics**  
(Vaughan, 2009 after Wortham, 1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[PROF]</td>
<td>As professionals, e.g. in the classroom with our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[DEPT]</td>
<td>The teachers as a whole within this department/school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[MEET]</td>
<td>Procedural ‘we’: everyone in this room at this meeting, at this point in time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[OTHER]</td>
<td>‘We’ indexes some other entity e.g. a bit of both as we say in Ireland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explicitly articulating identity

Julia:  Because that’s what we’re trying to do we’re trying to make them study and learn English. But making them pay for not is not. Because there are some students that two hundred and fifty is not that much money and it won’t touch them and there are others. Who it really hurts and that’s total= that’s just an issue that is so far removed from learning English. I don’t know.

Olive:  We’re teachers here we’re not here to decide who pays what or.

Kate:  Yeah.

Anna:  Exactly.
Negotiating identity

Barry: It’s also university policy about attendance which we’re not following it’s also university policy about a lot of things which we don’t do.

Samantha: Yeah.

Katie: We’re separate.

Samantha: We’re part of the university too.

Barry: We always paint ourselves as separate from the university then.

Jack: Yeah autonomous.

Barry: Subversive.

Katie: An autonomous state.
Negotiating identity...
(Vaughan 2007)

Stuart: Yes but we don’t have the power to throw anybody out what I mean is we haven’t been given that kind of clout we don’t have that status in the university if they fail calculus they’re out if they fail English they just continue. So <$E$> laughs <$\$E$> so I think we should just accept that our horrible lowly status and.

<$E$> laughter <$\$E$>

Barry: We’re the poor cousins.

Stuart: Yes and we know that.

<$E$> Snort of laughter. General laughter <$\$E$>
Concluding remarks

• How to ‘flesh out’ (linguistically) the ideas of community and identity?

• Small, high frequency items: complex, rich and rewarding