YOU CAME HERE TO GET TACOS, BRO
PLACE REFERENCES AS ARGUMENTATIVE RESOURCES

JACOB HENRY

University of Colorado Boulder

References to place are made in interactions to serve a variety of needs, including supporting an argument. However, unlike other ontological categories, place is less fixed as a given geographic location can be conceptualized as being many different places at once. This gives rise to competing notions of place and what a place might index. Using case studies of language policing from the Corpus of Language Discrimination in Interaction (CLDI), this paper examines the ways in which place references are invoked in arguments regarding language, belonging, and proper public conduct. Place references in interaction seem strongly linked to ideas of institutionality and what behavior or practices are appropriate given the policies of the institution associated with a place. This paper shows evidence supporting a notion that place references can be broadly divided into categories of local and non-local place references, as both types of reference serve to introduce institutionality into an interaction, but they demonstrate different relationships between the speaker and the invoked institution. This paper also shows the ways in which place can serve to index ideas of racial membership and linguistic identity.

Keywords: language policing, place, reference, conversation, institutionality, conversation analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

Reference serves as a powerful tool in interaction, allowing participants to situate themselves in relation to a specific person, time, location, or other ontological category. Enfield 2013:433 calls the practice of reference "a matter of *selection*," stating that participants have the option of selecting from several varying options when making a reference. Thus, we can interpret the practice of making a reference as inherently agentive; if someone is making a reference in a specific way, there must be a reason as to why they have chosen that specific method of making said reference. In interactional studies, much attention has been paid to person references (Enfield 2013, Raymond 2016, but we can extend this conclusion of agency to other categories, including that of place. Work on place reference in conversation has mostly focused on their mechanics: how are they formulated, how they play into the turn design of an interaction, etc. (Schegloff 1972, Williams 2016, Dingemanse et al. 2017). However, there has been much less work done on how place references can covertly index other meanings or ideologies. References to other ontological

categories can serve to indicate a stance or status, and I argue that place references similarly can be used to not only signal some ideology, but to effectively argue in support of said ideology.

This paper seeks to better understand the use of place reference as an argumentative resource in the context of language policing incidents from the larger Corpus of Language Discrimination in Interaction (CLDI). In these interactions, both participants (the "policer" and the "policed") make place references to support their own stances and ideologies regarding appropriate language use. In presenting transcripts of these language policing events, I aim to elucidate how speakers orient to place in both making and undermining an argument. Furthermore, I will show how place references can serve to signal other stances on issues related to language policing, such as nationality and ethnicity.

2. PLACE REFERENCE IN CONVERSATION

The reasons why a speaker might choose a specific reference form over another are multitudinous (Enfield 2013), ranging from indicating specificity (e.g., "some time last week" vs. "last Tuesday at noon") to assigning affiliation (e.g., "Martha complained to me" vs. "your sister complained to me"). These examples also make it clear that a speaker can equally choose forms which obscure specific details or refuse to assign affiliation. Many of these reference forms draw their specific meanings from the Gricean idea of the cooperative principle; if it is assumed that a speaker is adhering to the cooperative principle, their utterances (and therefore their references) are taken as being relevant and well-formed, so we can draw meanings from their specific forms (Grice 1975). However, we can see in conversation that certain forms are selected in ways that are not predicted by Grice. For example, Grice's Maxim of Quantity predicts that speakers provide exactly the necessary amount of information in their speech, but speakers often purposefully avoid anaphoric references (thus providing more information than necessary) in conversation to demonstrate agency (Raymond et al. forthcoming).

What I call "place references" are possible answers to questions of "where" (Levinson 2003). These can include references to specific named locations (e.g. country or city names), references to general institutions (e.g., "in this store"), and deictic references like "here" or "there." Schegloff 1972 proposes three broad analytical categories for what he calls "location references": location analysis, membership analysis, and topic analysis (or activity analysis). Location analysis allows

speakers to identify or specify an object ("the rock to the left of the tree"), while topic analysis involves connecting a location to a specific activity ("where we ate lunch").

Membership analysis arises in contexts where a place reference can be used to indicate something about the social statuses of interactants. However, unlike other ontological categories, place is multi-faceted, and a given geographic location can be conceptualized as being "multiple places" (Schegloff 1972). This gives rise to sometimes competing ideas of a place and what that place might represent, meaning that place references serve as a kind of double-edged sword in argumentative interactions.

3. ARGUMENTS AS CONVERSATION

As a specific form of interaction, arguments involve speakers making, supporting, and disputing claims. In the literature, arguments have been understood as "conflict talk" (Grimshaw 1990). Often there are competing claims, and speakers must use interactional resources to manage disagreement. Arguments are thought to have a minimum of three turns, as the third position is where the original speaker can reject a conflicting stance from the second speaker (Dersley 1998, Muntigl & Turnbull 1998). This third position is also where we begin seeing the original speaker's face-saving work in response to a face attack from the speaker in second position. An original speaker's will respond proportionately to the level of opposition from the second speaker: more direct or overt opposition in second position is seen as more damaging, and so the original speaker will respond with a stronger turn three act to support their original position (Muntigl & Turnbull 1998).

We can see this sort of argument sequence in incidents of language policing. In addition to fitting the conventional definition of an argument or conflict, these interactions can easily be described using the claim-counterclaim framework. As we can see in the example below, there is a clear claim-counterclaim structure regarding what language is appropriate to use. At a restaurant, a customer (CHA) asserts that the owner (TAR) should speak English.

(1) CLDI 011 ('I've lived in California for 20 years)excerpt
```
01           ((overlapping voices))
02   CHA:    (I've) lived in California for 20 years and you need- e- English
03           is the- our first la:nguage. So you need to speak English.
04   TAR:    I'm sorry if I (didn't) (.) you know [I'm- I'm okay        ]
```

```
05   CHA:                                      [we:ll I'm sorry about]
06        you too.=
07   TAR:  =I'm- why? [I mean I'm- ]
08   CHA:             [get the fuck] out of my country.
09   ???:  HEY WHA-
```

In line 02, the Challenger clearly makes a claim regarding the use of English, and in the following turn, the Target acquiesces on line 04. In response to this relatively weak opposition, the act by the Challenger in line 08 is a weak, albeit somewhat rude, support of the original position. We can also see an overt place reference in the first turn, giving some credence to the idea that place references can serve as an argumentative resource in language policing incidents.

3.1. LANGUAGE POLICING

We can define language policing as one actor regulating (or attempting to regulate) the language of another actor (Blommaert et al. 2009). In the previous example, the language policing is overt and between individuals. However, the historical view of some scholars is that language policing occurs through the lens of regimented language policies. It was thought that while governments and governing bodies conduct language policing through specific policies and practices, "an individual's right to simply to use a particular language in public or private discourse seems uncontroversial" (King 1997: 495). As we can see in all the interactions from the CLDI, this is simply not the case. Language policing occurs in all spheres of life and is often performed by individuals who are not acting in an official capacity. In fact, more contemporary work on language policing draws a natural connection between the ideologies of large social institutions, like the media, and the language policing actions of individuals (Blommaert et al. 2009). The covert and overt policies of these organizations create and enforce normative language ideologies that individual actors can then internalize, leading to the language policing of individuals.

The research on how language policing is conducted is largely tied to broad social institutions, such as schools (Amir & Musk 2013, Cushing 2019) and workplaces (Hazel 2015). We can also see language policing in specific communities, such as a group of players in the online game *World of Warcraft* (Collister 2014). In all of these situations, language policing is centered around ideas of what is or is not appropriate for the space in which an interaction takes place. "Appropriateness" is often derived from normative language ideologies that valorize "standard" English (Hazel 2015, Cushing 2019). However, interactants can also orient to other goals when engaging in language

policing, such as trying to enforce a language of study in a foreign language classroom (Amir & Musk 2013) or creating an inclusive environment by prohibiting certain slurs or derogatory language (Collister 2014). In each case, participants are acknowledging and maintaining some sort of connection between their speech and the institution in which an interaction is taking place. Speakers are helping to construct the space through their interaction (Heritage & Clayman 2010).

While much language policing research has focused on institutions and specific communities, there does not seem to be much work on the mechanics of language policing in public spaces between strangers. Interactants in a classroom or an online community collaboratively construct institutions, but how do interactants adhere to the rules of an institution when they aren't building said institution? In many examples from the CLDI data, we can see a disagreement about what institutions are relevant and what policies those institutions impose. In the following excerpt, we see a passerby (CHA) harassing a group of younger people (TAR and UNK) as they wait at a crosswalk, ignoring their claim to invoke the institution of the "international city."

(2) CLDI XX ('This is an international city')excerpt
```
01  CHA     Then don't speak SO LOUD.=
02  TAR     NO, it's international ci[ty he:re.]
03  CHA                           [o:h shut ]up.
04          (0.5)
05  TAR     [YOU shut up (goat).]
06  UNK     [O:h shut up you   ]fucking racist.
07  CHA     Fuck off (.) I'm in the () and there's [just so: many  ] of you.
08  UNK                                         [you are ra:cist]
09  TAR     Oh, (I'm just) a: dinosaur: ok[ay.   ]
10  CHA                               [And you] <won't speak English.> (.)
```

In this example, there is no clear institution that the Challenger is orienting to, and thus she does not invoke an institution in supporting her stance regulating the speech of the Targets. However, in line 02, one of the Targets uses a place reference ("it's international ci[ty he:re.]"), and in doing so does appear to make a broad appeal to institutional appropriateness. One would imagine that in an international city, many different languages would be spoken, and moreover, this linguistic diversity is part of what makes the city "international." While we can't see the full structure of the

interaction, it's clear that the Challenger rebukes this notion and refuses to participate in constructing "an international city."

4. DATA

In my analysis of place reference, I am drawing on video-recorded interactions that are part of the Corpus of Language Discrimination in Interaction (Raymond et al. in-progress). The CLDI is comprised of incidents in which individuals (the "targets") are harassed in some way for speaking a language other than English in some public space. The harassers (or "challengers") engage in language policing against a variety of targets in a variety of contexts. These incidents show us real examples of how language policing can be conducted in a public space - and in some cases, seemingly devoid of an institutional influence.

Many of the interactions are videos taken by the Target or some bystander, while others come from security camera footage. Because of the nature of these interactions, much of the data is made of up by interactions already in-progress. Oftentimes, the act of recording serves to escalate the confrontation, and thus we do not see the true first turns of these interactions. However, the resources that the speakers use in making and undermining arguments become evident as the interaction is continued. As argumentative interactions can be shaped by other cultural practices (Ikeda 2008), it must be stated that at present, all of the videos in the CLDI are from North America. In some cases, the specific location of an interaction is recorded, and the corpus includes interactions from various regions of the United States and Canada.

5. ANALYSIS

Place references are made in many of the CLDI interactions, and these examples serve to highlight the relationship between place and authority in an argument. I divide the data into two large categories of place references: interactions where a "local" place is invoked (i.e. references about where the interaction is happening) and interactions where a non-local place is invoked. While both kinds of place reference invoke a sense of institutionality, the local vs. non-local dichotomy shows different relationships between the speakers and the institutions they are calling on.

5.1. LOCAL PLACE REFERENCES

Most of the interactions in the CLDI have some reference to a local place, and this is in part due to the relatively flexible nature of place as an ontological category. However, due to this malleability, participants can orient to place in ways that are contradictory. The first case presented below is an example of such a conflict between a Challenger and a Bystander in a Californian taco restaurant.

(3) CLDI 009 ('Palapas Taco Rant')excerpt

```
01   CAS:   do you know what you're gonna get, (says) Friday, [(only-) ]
02   CHA:                                                      [it sa]ys]
03          it in Mexican. we're not in Mexico, we're in AmeriCA.
04   CAS:    sir are you- [sir why are you yelling.]
05   CHA:                 [this is AmeriCA,        ] not- not Spanish.
06   BY1:   yeah, but you came here to [get ta   ]cos bro.
07   CHA:                              [not Span-]
08          huh?=
09   BY1:   =you came to get tacos.
10          (0.8)
11   CHA:   so WHAT, (1.0) in America,
12   BY1:   that's why::,
13   CHA:   it's above the border. (0.4) the red, the border.
14   BY1:   okay but it's- [(if it wasn't-] (.) if it wasn't [(for Mexico)]
15   CHA:                  [the water line],               [↑fuck you,  ]
16   BY1:   [if it wasn't for Mexico]
17   CAS:   [(>no no no no< listen).] okay,
18   BY1:   (we're pretty) [close to each other,]
```

Here we can see that the Challenger is the first to mention place in line 03 where he says "we're not in Mexico, we're in AmeriCA." The Challenger is contesting the use of Spanish in this restaurant by situating it in the broader place of America. However, Bystander 1 rebukes the importance of America as a place by instead orienting to the local context in line 06 when he says "yeah, but you came here to [get ta]cos bro." Bystander 1 is making the claim that in the context of the taco restaurant ("here"), Spanish is acceptable or even expected. We can see confirmation of this idea in lines 09 and 12: "=you came to get tacos. that's why::," Interestingly, this impasse between the Challenger and Bystander 1 is briefly debated in more references to place. The Challenger starts to make an argument based on geography and borders in line 13 ("it's above the

border. (0.4) the red, the border."), while Bystander 1 begins to make an argument presumably based on Mexico as the origin of tacos in line 14 ("okay but it's- [(if it wasn't-] (.) if it wasn't [(for Mexico)]"). Neither of these arguments get fully fleshed out before the Challenger pivots away from place to his personal identity as an American in line 19 and lack of Spanish ability in line 22. As we can see in this interaction, both participants realize place can be an effective tool in making an argument or claiming authority, but this point can be undermined by orienting to place on a different level. We can also see these references to place as inherent appeals to institutionality, with the Challenger positioning "America" as the institution embodying the language rules relevant to the interaction, and the Bystander doing so with "here" to invoke the institution of the taco shop. It is worth pointing out that the Challenger is the first to pivot away from the place argument, possibly showing that he recognized the Bystander as having a more salient institution, and therefore a stronger argument.

The concept of institutionality comes up in other instances of language policing and is sometimes invoked by representatives of said institution. In the following example, which appears to take place in a grocery store, the Manager of the store intervenes in the interaction between the Challenger and the Target, as a separate Recorder looks on.

(4) CLDI 007 ('Then call the police) excerpt
```
10  CHA:    I'm not harassing you.=
11  MAN:    =Well well well.
12  TAR:    Okay [I was being harassed-]
13  MAN:         [Stop. that language  ] is not allowed in this store.
14  MAN:    if-=
15  TAR:    =She is ha[rassing me,    ]
16  MAN:              [You need to go,]
17          (0.2)
18  CHA:    I'm [  not    harassing   you::.  ]
19  MAN:        [You're not welcome here if you] do that.
20  TAR:    There you go.=
21  TAR:    =You're telling me [what language to speak.]
22  MAN:                       [You are <not welcome  ] ma'am>,
23          (0.2)
24  TAR:    You're telling [me what language] to speak.
25  REC:                   [  Thank  you:,  ]
```

```
26  CHA:    Yeah.=speak Engl[ish. ]=
27  REC:                   [Bye:.]=
28  TAR:    =Don't [tell me what to do.]=
29  CHA:          [you're in America. ]=
30  REC:    =Bye:.
31          (.)
32  TAR:    Don't [tell me wha[t to] do.]
33  CHA:          [ B  y  e : [ .  ]
34  REC:                     [Bye.    ]
35  CHA:    ((looks toward & waves at camera: 2.0 sec))
36  REC:    Say hi to Eve[rybody.  ]=
```

The manager pointedly tells the Challenger that her behavior is not acceptable in the institution in line 13, where she says "[Stop. that language] is not allowed in this store." Here, we can again see the reference to place being used in a way to reinforce the institutionality of the interaction. The Challenger is in the place of "this store", where you can face punishment for not following the protocols in place for interactions with other customers. Indeed, we see that continuing to break the rules of the place results in the challenger being rejected from the place. In line 22, the Manager begins to make the Challenger leave the store and says "[You are <not welcome] ma'am>,". This interaction is similar to the previous example in that there are differing perspectives on how place is relevant in the interaction. In contrast to the Manager's focus on the store as the relevant institution, the Challenger tells the Target to speak English and uses the larger context of America as justification in line 29: "[you're in America.]" So, we can see that again these two participants bring up place to support their conflicting appeals to an institution, and thus, their broader arguments: the Challenger uses "America" to support her language policing against the Target, while the Manager uses "this store" to intervene in and stop the language policing.

5.2. NON-LOCAL PLACE REFERENCES

We can see in the previous examples that references to local places can be taken as appeals to some institution, and by extension, whatever language policy that institution would embody. In this way, place references are clear argumentative resources that interactants make use of in arguments. However, we can also see a few examples where participants bring up some remote place as a way of supporting their argument. In the following example, we can see a Challenger

make several local and non-local place references as part of her language policing in a restaurant, and the Target's son Jon responds to these references directly.

(5) CLDI 003 ('Yo no estoy ofendiendo a nadie')excerpt

```
31 CHA:    [yeah you go- you go back to your- sp- go back to SPAIN]
32 TAR:    quiet! BE QUIET! [CLOSE YOUR MOUTH!] I speak English too.
33 CHA:                    [go back to spain ]
34         (0.5)
35 CHA:    Well [I-  ]        [(see) in america-)]
36 TAR:         [huh?] okay? [I speak English   ]
37         (0.9)
38 TAR:    nat good, I speak english
39         (0.6)
40 TAR:    I job in this country. I: JOB in this country.
41         [pucking you] pucking you [IDI (.) YOU IDI   I JOB.  I:
42 CHA:    [AHHHHHHHHHH]             [see? This- this is what youve
43 TAR:    JOB]
44 CHA:    got]
45 JON:    =yeah its her fault for doin that,
46         (0.2)
47 CHA:    [we speak english in the united states        ]
…
68 JON:    and shes not from spain by the way
69 CHA:    thats [wi- ]     [thats where spain is] fr- spanish is
70 JON:          [so::] dont [be racist like that ]
71 CHA:    from spain
72         (1.2)
73 JON:    you cant be doin th[at, thats racism ]
74 CHA:                       [ive been to spain] so I know
…
127 CHA:             [I dont ]want Spanish [Ive been to spain ma-
128 JON:                                   [o↑ka:y           she
129 CHA:    ye- you havent] been to spain and I have,
130 JON:    speaks English]
131         (0.3)
132 JON:    I have been to spain befo:re
133 CHA:    an dyou speak spanish there,[dyou go over there ]and speak
```

```
134 JON:                                          [and I speak Spanish]
135 CHA:    russian?
```

We can see here that the Challenger is assigning an affiliation to the Target by telling the target to "go back to Spain" in line 33. She also makes references to United States to justify her actions, as we can see in line 47: "[we speak english in the united states   ]." These practices function similarly to the previous examples: the Challenger is orienting to "the United States" as the relevant institution from which language ideologies should be derived and is associating the Target's use of Spanish with the foreign institution of Spain. What is more interesting is that the Challenger talks about her own familiarity with this non-local place to strengthen her argument. In lines 69 and 71, the Challenger makes the claim "thats [wi-]   [thats where spain is] fr- spanish is from spain." She then goes to claim expertise over the relationship between Spain and Spanish in line 74 with "[ive been to spain] so I know." The Challenger is claiming to have knowledge over the language and practices of Spain due to her having been there, and she is making this claim in such a way as to present a sense of authority in the interaction. Of note, she makes this claim after being corrected by Jon in line 68: "and shes not from spain by the way." Later in the interaction, the Challenger returns to this claim and specifically positions herself in contrast with Jon as not having her level of experience. In line 129, she says "ye- you havent] been to spain and I have,". Recognizing this as a challenge to his expertise in the interaction, Jon responds in line 132 with "I have been to spain befo:re", allowing him to occupy the same ground as the challenger. The Challenger then seems to use Jon's claim about having been to Spain as a way to get him to acknowledge that places are tied to language norms, as she responds to his claim in line 133 and 135 by saying "an dyou speak spanish there,[dyou go over there]and speak Russian?" This could also be taken as a challenge to Jon's knowledge of supposed language norms. Thus, we can see both participants orient to familiarity with a place as relevant to their stances in the interaction, even if that place is removed from where the interaction is occurring. This would lend support to the idea that a place can index certain language ideologies and by claiming familiarity with a place, a participant can thus claim expertise over what language policies apply to an interaction.

This example is similar to the data presented in transcript (1), where the Challenger makes a statement about her expertise by saying "I've lived in California for 20 years." We can see that this statement is repeated several times through the interaction as she continues to try to support her argument.

(6) CLDI 011 ('I've lived in California for 20 years')excerpt

```
01          ((overlapping voices))
02   CHA:   (I've) lived in California for 20 years and you need- e- English
03          is the- our first la:nguage. So you need to speak English.
04   TAR:   I'm sorry if I (didn't) (.) you know [I'm- I'm okay        ]
05   CHA:                                        [we:ll I'm sorry about]
06          you too.=
07   TAR:   =I'm- why? [I mean I'm- ]
08   CHA:              [get the fuck] out of my country.
09   ???:   HEY WHA-
10   (variety of voices exclaiming, saying wow)
11   BY1:   wo::w
12   TAR:   (so do you think- so you are) US citizen?=
13          =[so you are getting- so what you]=
…
37   CHA:   [But you're] in Ame:rica? And you need to speak E:nglish.
38   TAR:   the- what- what I'm what I'm doing. What do you- what do you
39          thi:nk I'm doing,
40   BY2:   if you're gonna be racist here you're gonna leave.
41   ???:   (yeah what are you)
42   CHA:   I'M NOT RACIST
43   BY2:   now now that's racist. This this man takes care of me >you gon
44          get out of here< if you gon talk like that. don't do that here.
45   TAR:   [what do you think I'm doing]
46   CHA:   [I lived in California     ] for twenty years
47   ???:   (xxx calm down)
48   BY2:   >shut up.< Don't talk- don't talk to these people like- these are
49          good people. Don't do that. [you can- you can leave.]
50   CHA:                               [I lived in California  ] for twenty
51          years. [I have the kno:wledge ]
```

The challenger makes the same statement about living in California in line 02 and again in lines 46 and 50, where she goes on to make the statement "I have the knowledge," thus making a direct connection between expertise with a place and some other kind of knowledge. Notably, this interaction occurred in West Virginia, so this isn't a claim about being "from here," or we would

imagine her using specifically West Virginia, or a broader geographic descriptor (e.g. "I've lived in America/this country/here for 20 years."). The other instance where place is noted as being important in this interaction is in line 37, where the challenger asserts to the target that "[But you're] in Ame:rica? And you need to speak E:nglish." Thus, this seems to be another example of the Challenger positioning a place associated with Spanish (or Spanish-speakers) as a contradictory institution to "America," which would prescribe a language policy of mandatory English.

Of note, it seems that these references to place are also doing some facework as the Challenger's argument is undermined by the Target and Bystanders. We can see in line 40 that Bystander 2 is the first to label the Challenger as racist: "if you're gonna be racist here you're gonna leave." The Challenger immediately rejects this label in line 42 by saying "I'M NOT RACIST," which shows us that she does not want to be called a racist despite her actions. Bystander 2 doesn't accept this claim and still labels the Challenger racist in line 43 by saying "now now that's racist," so the next thing that the Challenger says in line 46 that she "lived in California for 20 years." She repeats this in line 50. It's interesting to note that lines 42, 46, and 50 are sequential for the Challenger; she doesn't say anything else between these lines, giving us something like "I'M NOT RACIST. I lived in California for twenty years. I lived in California for twenty years. I have the knowledge." If we apply the pattern identified by Montigl and Turnbull 1998 where a more face-damaging rebuttal (like accusing someone of being racist) is met with an act that strongly and overtly supports the original claim, this would indicate that a place reference (and the implied knowledge that it signals) is seen to be a strong argumentative resource, at least by the Challenger.

6. DISCUSSION

We can clearly see participants in these language policing incidents use place references to support their arguments. What's interesting is that there seems to be a distinction in how participants orient to local place references vs. non-local place references. In the interactions regarding local place references, Targets and their allies are forced to address the perceived tensions in "violating" the language policy of the place invoked by the Challenger. Often, this is done by reframing the place reference to focus on a more salient institution, like we see in (3) with the bystander's reference to the taco shop and (4) with the manager's reference to the grocery store.

Moreover, it appears these incidents are racially motivated, as speakers will often invoke racial categories or slurs during the interaction. Challengers are almost always white, and frequently mark themselves as "American," "Canadian," etc. In contrast, Challengers often say that Targets are "foreigners" who "don't belong." Taking this into consideration, local place references do some work to eliminate talking about more emotionally charged topics like race and nationality. These appeals to a local institution seem to draw on the idea that no matter who you are, if you inhabit a certain space, you agree to adhere to the policies of that place.

On the other hand, non-local place references seem to allow the Challenger to draw a sort of dichotomy between the institution local to the interaction and the institution that the Challenger perceives the Target to be participating in. Non-local place references seem to carry less argumentative weight than their local counterparts as they are not immediately rebuked by the Targets, and they are much less frequent in the corpus. However, these non-local references do seem to more overtly index the Challenger's ideologies about *who* speaks a certain language. If local place references work to remove race or ethnicity from the Challenger's argument, a non-local place reference necessarily centers it. In examples (5) and (6), we see the Challenger bring up their familiarity with some place that they associate with the language spoken by the target. This harkens to ideas of raciolinguistics, where perceptions regarding race and language use deeply entwined (Rosa 2016, Rosa & Flores 2017). We can see these non-local place references as attempts by the Challenger to assert knowledge about not only a place, but also the language spoken there and, by extension, the people who speak that language. This practice reflects what Ricklefs (2021) found in elementary school classrooms with bilingual children. Non-bilingual white children were habituated to being seen as the more knowledgeable and legitimate students, but when that was undermined by the presence of a language they did not understand, the children were inclined to claim expertise over that language, even if it was just through a simple word or two. In these language policing incidents, I argue that non-local place references act as similar but more complicated methods in preserving the legitimacy of the white participant as more knowledgeable.

7. CONCLUSION & FURTHER QUESTIONS

Ultimately, this analysis serves as a preliminary examination of how place references function in these language policing incidents. It is clear that they carry some weight as argumentative

resources, and that the type of place reference (local vs. non-local) will be taken up in different ways by other participants. Local place references are best understood as appeals to the intrinsic language policies of some relevant institution, while non-local place references seem to function as a way for the Challenger to express expertise about some oppositional institution. However, these cases do not truly answer questions about how institutionality is constructed in truly public spaces (that is, outside of a shop/restaurant/etc.). There is also work to be done regarding specifically where in the sequence of a language policing interactions place references are made, and if the "placing" of a place reference affects its effectiveness as a resource. Further examination can also analyze how non-local references function if they are brought into the interaction by the target instead of the challenger.

REFERENCES

Amir, Alia, & Nigel Musk. 2013. Language Policing: micro-level language policy-in-process in the foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse,* 4(2), 151–167.

Blommaert, Jan, Helen Kelly-Holmes, Pia Lane, Sirpa Leppanen, Mairead Moriarty, Sari Pietikainen, & Arja Piiranen-Marsh. 2009. Media, multilingualism and language policing: an introduction. *Language Policy*, 8, 203–207.

Collister, Lauren B. 2014. Surveillance and Community: Language Policing and Empowerment in a *World of Warcraft* Guild. *Surveillance & Society*, 12(2), 337–348.

Cushing, Ian. 2019. The policy and policing of language in schools. *Language in Society,* 49, 425–450.

Dersley, Ian 1998. Complaining and Arguing in Everyday Conversation. York, UK: Ph.D. dissertation.

Dingemanse, Mark, Giovanni Rossi, & Simeon Floyd. 2017. Place reference in story beginnings: A cross-linguistic study of narrative and interactional affordances. *Language in Society,* 46 (2), 129–158.

Enfield, N.J. 2013. Reference in Conversation. In *The handbook of Conversation Analysis,* ed. Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers, 433–454. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Grice, P. 1975. Logic and conversation. *Syntax and semantics. 3: Speech acts,* ed. Peter Cole & Jerry Morgan, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Grimshaw, Allen D., ed. 1990. *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of arguments in conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hazel, Spencer. 2015. Identities at odds: embedded and implicit language policing in the internationalized workplace. *Language and Intercultural Communication,* 15(1), 141–160.

Heritage, John, & Steven Clayman. 2010. *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities, and Institutions*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ikeda, Keiko. 2008. A Conversation Analytic Account of the Interactional Structure of "Arguments." *Studies in Language and Culture,* 34, 289–304.

King, Charles. 1997. Policing Language: Linguistic Security and the Sources of Ethnic Conflict: A rejoinder. *Security Dialogue,* 28(4), 493–496.

Levinson, Stephen C. 2003. *Space in language and cognition: Explorations in cognitive diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muntigl, Peter, & William Turnbull. 1998. Conversational structure and facework in arguing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 29, 225–256.

Raymond, Chase Wesley. 2016. Linguistic Reference in the Negotiation of Identity and Action: Revisiting the T/V Distinction. *Language*, 92(3), 636–670.

Raymond, Chase Wesley, Rebecca Clift, & John Heritage. Forthcoming. Reference without anaphora: On agency through grammar. *Linguistics: An interdisciplinary Journal of the Language Sciences.*

Raymond, Chase Wesley, Saul Albert, Cecillia E. Ford, Barbara A. Fox, Natalie Grothues, Jacob Henry, Olivia H. Marresse, Megan Pielke, & Regina Gayou Tom. In Progress. *The Corpus of Language Discrimination in Interaction.*

Ricklefs, Mariana Alvayero. 2021. Functions of language use and raciolinguistic ideologies in students' interactions. *Bilingual Research Journal.* DOI: 10.1080/15235882.2021.1897048

Rosa, Jonathan Daniel. 2016. Standardization, Racialization, Languagelessness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies across Communicative Contexts. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology,* 26(2), 162–183.

Rosa, Jonathan, & Nelson Flores. 2017. Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, 46, 621–647.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1972. Notes on a Conversational Practice: Formulating Place. *Studies in Social Interaction,* ed. David Sudnow, 75–118. Toronto, Ontario: The Free Press.

Williams, Nicholas Jay. 2016. Place Reference and Location Formulation in Kula Conversation. Boulder, CO: Ph.D. dissertation.