British Journal of Social Psychology (2001), **40**, 417–435 *Printed in Great Britain*

© 2001 The British Psychological Society

Broadcasting the royal role: Constructing culturally situated identities in the Princess Diana *Panorama* interview

Jackie Abell

Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, UK

Elizabeth H. Stokoe

University College Worcester, UK

We examine critically the two traditions of work that have informed discursive approaches to identity: social constructionism and conversation analysis. Within both strands, identity is theorized as a flexible phenomenon that is situated in conversations. But although constructionists locate identity within the social, such work remains at a theoretical and rather abstract level and often fails to interrogate the discursive practices through which identity is constituted. Conversely, this attention to the occasioning of identity in everyday talk is precisely the focus of the second, conversation analytic strand of work. Whereas constructionists attend to the wider cultural positioning of identities, conversation analysts resist commenting upon the social significance of what is constructed in interaction. Conversation analysis is therefore limited by its restricted notion of culture in the study of the situated social self. Despite the apparent conflict between these approaches, we suggest that a synthesis of the two provides a comprehensive framework for analysing identity. Drawing upon the BBC *Panorama* interview between Martin Bashir and Princess Diana, we explore how culturally situated identities are located in this conversational context. We conclude that analysts must not only attend to the micro-level organization of identities but also engage in a wider understanding of the cultural framework within which they are located.

Discourse and identity

In the last decade, increasing criticism has been levelled at the main psychological frameworks for studying identity: Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978), Self-categorization Theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987) and the subsequent body of research within these traditions. Across social psychology, a shift in focus has occurred, moving away from an emphasis upon social identity as a private cognitive process to an understanding that is rooted in a discursive theory of language. Here, language is treated as the site of analytic interest rather than as

*Requests for reprints should be addressed to Dr Jackie Abell, Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, Bailrigg, Lancaster LA1 4YW, UK (e-mail: jackie.abell@lancaster.ac.uk).

a simple 'window on the mind'. As a result, the study of identity has been relocated from its treatment as a 'mentalist notion'—something that underpins human action—to its constitution in 'communication practice' (Carbaugh, 1996). From this perspective, a different 'take' on the issue of identity is provided. Rather than asking 'what' identities people have and how they may be distinguished from one another, the turn to discourse allows for an analysis of 'when' and 'how' identities are invoked and constructed in conversation. This shift within identity research has developed along two broad lines of inquiry. The first rests upon social constructionist approaches (e.g. Davies & Harré, 1990; Gergen, 1994), whereas the second is located within conversation analytic projects (e.g. Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Hester & Eglin, 1997). These strands of research have often been positioned in a conflicting relationship, particularly in their theorization of context and the extent to which background or cultural knowledge may be imported into analysis (e.g. Sanders, 1999; Schegloff, 1997; Wetherell, 1998). However, we suggest that a coupling of the two perspectives can produce a comprehensive framework for analysing identity (see also Buttny, 1993; Carbaugh, 1996).

Within constructionist frameworks, the social psychological notion that individuals possess a core cognitive self has been problematized. Gergen (1994) suggests that self-identities are an achievement of discourse rather than cognition. By replacing traditional psychological concepts of schemas and categories with 'self-as-narration', he argues that identities are constructed and performed within the communication of stories. Moreover, he argues that what counts as an appropriate self-narrative is shaped by cultural and historical factors. He writes:

> 'To understand how narratives must be structured within the culture is to press against the edges of identity's envelope—to discover the limits of identifying oneself as a human agent in good standing; it is also to determine what forms must be maintained in order to acquire credibility as a teller of truth' (p. 189).

The stories people tell about their identity are consequently shaped by shared rules of narrative construction. As Gergen states, 'one is not free to have simply any form of personal history' (p. 200). How an individual accounts for past actions is a crucial factor for how he or she constructs self-identity in the present together with trajectories for the future. Furthermore, Gergen claims that the identities people create will necessarily be varied as they are involved in a multiplicity of social relationships.

Also adopting a constructionist position, Davies and Harré (1990; see also Harré and van Langenhove, 1999) argue that in order to understand identity, one must look at the positions taken up, attributed, resisted, and so on, by speakers in conversation. They claim that people are constituted in various discursive practices, from telling stories to orienting to one's responsibility in accounts. Crucially, these authors locate subject positions within the wider conversations of social life; the conversational history that has previously been constructed among speakers. Conversations therefore reflect narrative forms already existing in culture which in turn become part of culturally competent members' resources (Harré, 1993). Furthermore, Malone (1997, p. 43) claims that 'conversations are populated with a cast of actors, present *and absent*, whose explicit characterisations and implicit

known identities given shape and meaning to the talk' (emphasis added). Some theorists have claimed that this 'shape and meaning' arises from a 'symbolically implicated system of social practies, relations and properties' (Carbaugh, 1996, p. 142). Carbaugh claims that such positioning in talk:

> 'demonstrates the various interactional ways in which cultural and social identities are interactionally (de)legitimated. Through such activities there is an intricate and ever-present social playing of identities, each with its moral messages of rights and duties, from unquestioned cultural beliefs about "person'' generally to the interactional accomplishment of the more specific social kinds' (p. 143).

Hence the taking up of a particular position carries particular implications about ways of being. Carbaugh suggests that to fully comprehend the meaning of an identity, one must treat it as a situated self, embedded within a particular community and 'wider system of identities' (p. 197). His approach to identity is eclectic: he draws upon symbolic interactionism, social constructionism, communication theory and cultural anthropology that together provide a rich framework in which identity is to be understood. In particular, Carbaugh emphasizes the integration of 'the pragmatics of everyday communication with the cultural meanings that are presupposed for and implicated by those very practices' (p. 12). In other words, analysts must attend to the cultural frame within which the conversational construction of identity takes place. In the same way that discursive psychologists have rejected conceptions of identity as something an individual 'has' (e.g. Edwards, 1998), he argues that it is something people 'do' in conversation. Identities are the product of 'communication practices', whereby such practices are cultural accomplishments.

Although the constructionist approach offers much to a theory of identity, it fails to provide a fine-grained empirical analysis of discourse. So although the above theorists locate identity within the social, their work remains at a theoretical and rather abstract level, thus failing to interrogate the actual discursive practices in which identity is constituted. Conversely, this attention to the occasioning of identity in concrete examples of everyday talk is precisely the focus of the second, conversation analytic strand of work. The subsequent development of conversation analysis (CA) since Sacks' (1992) pioneering work has seen a distinction between sequential conversation analysis (SCA, typified in the work of Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 1997) and membership categorization analysis (MCA; Hester, 1998; Hester & Eglin, 1997). The study of identity has emerged within both strands, each aiming to explicate how identities are constructed and invoked in talk. Thus Widdicombe and Wooffitt (1995) have studied the sequential accounts of members of youth subcultures, while Hester (1998) has investigated the categorization of 'problem children' as 'deviant' in conversations between teachers and educational psychologists.

A salient aspect of constructionist accounts of identity is the focus on the contextual frame of talk and the longer history of speakers' conversations that surround any fragment one chooses to examine. However, the extent to which analysts can and should make claims about broader cultural and contextual

sense-making resources is a gritty and controversial issue within CA. In the sequential strand of CA, researchers focus on the context that is built up by interactants as they display their understandings of emergent social actions. In other words, analysts do not go 'beyond the data' in the explication of what is being accomplished in interaction (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Widdicombe & Wooffitt, 1995). In this body of work, a theory of culture is surplus to an understanding of how people make themselves understood in mundane talk. The construction of identity and category ascription is traced in the turn-by-turn sequencing of talk. Identity is therefore treated as a locally managed participants' concern; a dynamic and flexible resource whereby people ascribe and resist identities during everyday conversation. An important aspect of this work is that in order to analyse the identities of speakers, one must look only to the categories that *speakers themselves* invoke—a focus on participants' rather than analysts' categories (Schegloff, 1997). This view, in its most extreme form, is expressed by Sanders (1999, p. 130), who concludes that cultural and common-sense knowledge is 'an unapparent and functionally unimportant element of routine everyday interactions'.

Although this position on cultural commentary unites sequential conversation analysts, the issue has been problematized within membership categorization analysis. Thus Sanders' stance, among others, is not completely representative of the CA line on importing background knowledge. The issue is debated in a collection of papers edited by Watson and Seiler (1992). In the introduction, Watson asks: 'how far is extra-textual material necessary to the carrying on of analysis at the level of concreteness common to ethnomethodology, conversation analysis, and contemporary language-oriented social constructionism?' (p. xiv). Here, it is argued that speakers display their common sense or *cultural knowledge* when they problematize some aspect of the interaction. In this way, language becomes a resource for '*uncovering* culture, knowledge [and] meanings' (Hester & Eglin, 1997, p. 12, emphasis added). From this perspective, shared cultural knowledge enables speakers to mobilize relevant identity categories in the accomplishment of particular theoretical business, and, as Sacks (1992) himself claimed, culture is an 'inference-making machine'. What is noticeable in these descriptions is the notion that culture is 'out there' waiting to be 'uncovered' by analysts or revealed in participants' interactional trouble.

So, on the one hand, membership categorization analysts claim to study *culture-in-action*, a position that embraces the display of speakers' cultural knowledge but remains ambivalent with regards to the status of the *analysts*' background and explanatory knowledge. On the other hand, 'sequential' conversation analysts such as Schegloff (1997) are explicit in their rejection of invoking the culture that carries on beyond the page of data. Overall, both strands of CA retain a fairly restricted notion of culture and pay scant attention to the wider cultural and social significance of what is constructed in interaction. Moreover, commentators from both strands of CA would question the extent to which *analysts* are justified in importing their own analytic framework or commenting upon speakers' wider interpretative resources (see Wetherell, 1998). In so doing, CA *privileges* aspects of context that can be pointed to in talk at the expense of the larger conversations that surround any isolated segment (Stokoe & Smithson, 2001; in press). So although

CA pays close attention to the interactional occasioning of identities, it fails to attend to the wider cultural positioning of such identities or explicate members' knowledge of the social structures that shape conversational interaction.

Let us briefly summarize the two contrasting perspectives on identity that we have introduced. Within the constructionist framework, identity is theorized as a socially constituted phenomenon but rarely investigated empirically. Alternatively, identity in interaction can be analysed at the micro-level of conversation but at the expense of acknowledging culture as a speaker and anlysts' resource in the production and explication of everyday interaction. We suggest that a useful analytic frame may be developed by integrating these two stances to produce 'conversation analytic constructionism' (Buttny, 1993). Interaction may be analysed at the micro level in order to examine the identities and category ascriptions that are made relevant by speakers. Additionally, a CA approach includes a focus on speakers' orientations to identity, including instances that are problematized or 'troubled' in some way (Wetherell, 1998). However, in order to produce an analytic commentary of such instances, one must look to the cultural positions of both speaker and listener in the explication of conversational data. In particular, when the data under investigation is derived from a publicly televised interview between a media journalist and the late Princess Diana, contextual and cultural knowledge is central in making sense of the interaction. Indeed, if the analyst were simply to investigate the turn-taking procedures in the interview, it is likely that something important would be missed from the analysis. As Malone (1997, p. 15) points out, 'it is because we are more than just turn-takers in a talking game that more is said than what is uttered'. Televised interviews require the delicate management of a performance, and the cultural category of 'Princess' carries certain expectations about how to 'act' in public. Hence, in the current study, a fine-grained conversation analysis is integrated with a study of the situated social self.

Identity, discourse and Princess Diana: The cultural context

As we have argued elsewhere (Abell & Stokoe, 1999), increasingly the media are a source of information about our lives and the lives of others in the Western world. Such others include members of the royal family, whose lives are reproduced, held to account and evaluated in the popular press and on television. In recent years, particularly since the death of Princess Diana, the position of the monarchy in contemporary society has been questioned. Reasons for such challenges include the highly publicized divorces and affairs, as well as the controversial behaviour, of members of the royal family (Billig, 1998). Before such events were attended to by the media, the 'personalities' of its members were hidden to the public (Edley, 1993). However, with the increased visibility of royal 'personalities', through biographies of, and televised interviews with, Charles and Diana (Dimbleby, 1995; Morton, 1992, 1997), the focus has shifted from 'members as public institution' to the private identities of the royal family.

The *Panorama* interview is arguably 'one of the most important social documents of its time' (Campbell, 1998, p. 202). Despite this claim, social scientists have been

slow to investigate the interview as a cultural text. This lack of attention has also been noted by Billig (1998), in his more general observation that there is an absence of interest in matters surrounding the monarchy. There is, however, a recent trend across a variety of academic disciplines in which the monarchy and, in particular, Princess Diana have been subject to investigation. Some of this research has been concerned with how the organizing institution of the media shapes the construction of different accounts of social lives. For example, Edley (1993, p. 419), in his analysis of newspaper constructions of Prince Charles' identity, argues that 'multiple contradictory representations' are invoked by journalists as a rhetorical vehicle for promoting political ideology and, ultimately, increasing newspaper sales. With particular respect to the *Panorama* interview, a limited body of academic work has been published. Potter (1997) used the interview to demonstrate discourse analytic methods. Kowal and O'Connell (1997) have studied the pragmatics of interview data, while Kurzon (1996) used the interview to explore the applicability of Grice's maxims. Of further interest is Bull's (1997) analysis in which the implications for equivocation theory are considered.

However, the aims of this study are slightly different. We explore the conversational construction of identity in the *Panorama* interview. We propose that a more comprehensive investigation of this theoretical issue can be achieved via an exploration that combines conflicting, yet complementary, disciplines. In contrast to much discursive/conversation analytic work, these data are not naturally occurring but broadcast, edited, scripted and produced by a team. Goffman (1959) notes that in broadcast television talk, great care is taken to manage the presentation of self. The institution of the media, particularly television, is treated as a cultural 'stage' or discursive framework in which identities are constructed and reconstructed (Carbaugh, 1996). It is important to consider the role of the conversational context and the parameters it sets for the speakers. In one of the few studies of identity in broadcast communication, Brand and Scannell (1991) explored the routinized construction of Tony Blackburn as a 'public institution'. In contrast to this, we focus on the tension between Diana's public and private selves in the interview. The current trend in public interviews is for interviewees to distance themselves from presenting a 'public' identity (which may be treated as superficial) and instead claim a 'private', authentic identity that is both worked up and managed within the context of the interview. We build on the discursive theory that the construction of identity involves more than a simple categorization process. During the course of the interview, Diana constructs herself in terms of two conflicting identities: her 'true self ' and her 'royal role'. The true self is constructed in terms of its ordinariness, whereas the royal role is defined in terms of the unique and extraordinary category entitlement it carries. Both the true self and royal role are defined and described by Diana during the local management of issues of accountability and speaker credibility. These identities are constructed within a narrative structure imposed by the edited design of the programme but also within a narrative containing descriptions of past events and the introduction of significant 'others'. We argue that the negotiation of 'self-identity' involves a construction of the identity of 'others' and focus upon the social action that is accomplished as particular identities are made relevant during the course of the interview.

The data

The interview between Princess Diana and Martin Bashir, which was aired on the BBC's *Panorama* programme (20 November 1995), was video-recorded. The tape was transcribed according to conventions adapted from Jefferson (1984).[1] The resulting transcript was analysed using an eclectic approach that draws upon social constructionist frameworks and conversation analysis, as well as 'discursive psychology' (Edwards & Potter, 1992). That is, the focus was upon how the talk is organized to accomplish particular rhetorical actions and how Diana constructed a plausible and authentic version of events. Thus, descriptions of events, objects and people were not regarded as neutral reflections of some reality, or as cognitive schemas, but as rhetorically oriented accounts engaged in performing social actions. Of further interest is how she oriented to particular categories, how these were mobilized, located and made relevant within the conversational context and how they were worked up to accomplish authentic, *culturally situated* 'identities'.

Analysis

In the subsequent sections of analysis, we follow the narration of Diana's life as negotiated between the Princess and Martin Bashir. The programme is structured as a progressive narrative, starting with her engagement to Prince Charles and ending with her construction of a 'new', post-divorce, single life. The storied nature of the account is emphasized by particular broadcast aspects and edited design of the programme. For example, sections split the interview into particular dated periods from 1981 to 1995. We analyse three extracts, representing a marked progression from engagement to divorce, and explicate the shifting identities that are invoked by Diana and Bashir at these points in the interview.

True self vs. royal role: tensions and conflicts

This first extract is taken from the opening few minutes of the interview. Throughout the interview, Diana constructs her identity in terms of a conflict between what we have termed her 'true self' and 'royal role'. While the true self is glossed as untutored in royal duties and reluctant to meet the public, the royal role carries certain cultural expectations concerning what is normative behaviour for principal members of the monarchy. What is of analytic interest is the narrative structure of her autobiographical account, and how a sense of time is worked up to further develop these conflicting identities and their subsequent resolution. Also of note is the introduction of significant others, including Charles and the public, of whom Diana offers an account in the context of comparing and warranting her identity as authentic. The shifts in footing (Goffman, 1979) are studied for the identity work they achieve as Diana culturally situates herself and Charles as members of the royal family, in contrast with the public:

[1]Transcription conventions: (.) denotes a pause < one second; (2) denotes a timed pause in seconds; <u>underlined</u> text represents emphasis; double parentheses ((nods)) represent contextual or non-verbal information; .hhh represents an audible intake of breath; equals signs between turns ' = ' indicate no discernible gap.

Extract 1: True self vs. royal role

1	Bashir:	and what did you do
2	Diana:	I swam (2) we went to erm (.) Alice Springs (.) to Australia (2) and we went and did a
3		walkabout and I said to my husband (.) what do I do now (.) and he said 'go over to the
4		other side (.) and speak to them' (.) I said I can't (.) I just can't (.) and-he said 'well (.)
5		you've got to do it' (1) and he went off and did his bit (1) and-I went off and did my bit (.)
6		and-it practically finished me off there and then (.) and I suddenly realized I went back to
7		our-my hotel room (.) and realized the impact that (.) you know (.) I had to sort myself
8		out (.) we had a six week tour (1) four weeks in Australia and two weeks in New
9		Zealand and by the end (.) when we flew back from New Zealand I was a different
10		person (.) I realized (.) the sense of duty (.) the level of intensity of interest (.) and (.) the
11		demanding role (.) I now found myself in

In Extract 1, Diana orders events and introduces the characters of the narrative. Diana responds to Bashir's question regarding whether she sunk or swam in her new royal status, claiming 'I swam' (l. 2). However, while this answer would be sufficient she moves on to describe a past event. The interactional demands of the interview situation are displayed in Diana's production of lengthy personal narratives in response to a brief question from Martin Bashir. The event is constructed as a 'key' moment for Diana in deciding to 'swim' and accept a royal identity. The pronoun 'we' suggests that the trip to Australia was a joint undertaking, and draws the listeners' attention to this public engagement being a shared duty. The term 'walkabout' infers some cultural knowledge, positioning both Charles and Diana as members of the royal family and also an emblematic example of a scripted routine activity for such people. However, while this appears to be a mutual venture, Diana then goes on to construct differences and distance between herself and Charles in a number of ways.

Firstly, it is interesting to note that throughout the interview, Diana refers to Charles as 'my husband' rather than calling him 'Charles' (l. 3). How speakers refer to others is a powerful rhetorical practice. Naming conventions are conversational and cultural resources as they mark the level of intimacy and nature of social relations between the speaker and subject. The identity of 'husband' invokes associated 'symbols, motives, meanings and norms' (Carbaugh, 1996). Here, Diana invokes the relationship of husband and wife but then constructs their actions as deviating from the normative behaviour of a married couple. Interestingly, both constructionists and conversation analysts would agree that the identity of 'husband' is associated with other categories and activities. Sacks (1992) argued that categories are 'inference-rich'. This means that they are linked to particular activities ('category-bound activities) such that there are 'common-sense' expectations about what constitutes a 'husband's' normative behaviour. However, when analysts draw their readers' attention to the links between categories and category-bound activities, they do so without considering their own position in making that link (Stokoe & Smithson, 2001). As Cicourel (1992, p. 294) writes, 'the investigator's ability to comprehend [conversational] exchanges is assumed to be self-evident and is seldom, if ever, an aspect of the analysis'. In contrast, constructionist and discursive theorists such as Wetherell (1998) might make the same sorts of claims but in so doing be explicit about their import of interpretative resources and background knowledge.

Secondly, the question 'what do I do now' (l. 3) positions Diana as untutored in the art of being royal. The pronoun 'I' signals a shift in footing: from reporting a past event to that of author. Consequently, a contrast is constructed between Charles, the 'expert' royal, and Diana, the 'inexpert' member. This is developed further in Diana's reporting of Charles' answer: 'he said "go over to the other side (.) and speak to them" ' (ll. 3–4). Reporting speech can 'effectively misframe responses by abstracting them out of their original dialogical context and putting them in another one, in the writer's own argumentative invention' (Leudar & Antaki, 1996, p. 6). So the reporting of Charles' answer performs rhetorical work in Diana's account, which involves producing certain contrasts between her and Charles. 'Them' signifies the public, and a further contrast is available between the royal family, who do 'walkabouts', and the public, who are the observers. Although Diana is a member of the royal family, she constructs differences between what she is expected to do and her true self. Again adopting the footing of author, Diana provides an authentic account of her 'self' claiming, 'I can't (.) I just can't' (l. 4) and contrasts this with another reported response from Charles, 'well (.) you've got to do it' (ll. 4–5). We are not informed why she has 'got' to speak to people. However, as was noted earlier, the cultural knowledge concerning what is expected of members of the royal family enables both Bashir and the listener to understand the implications of Charles' statement. So, by making Charles relevant to her account, Diana is able to build a contrast between her husband as someone who is familiar with fulfilling formal royal duties and herself who is unfamiliar.

Diana scripts her duties using the term 'bit' (l. 5) to suggest that the actions performed were routine and normative for members of the royal family. The scripting of events can serve to make inferentially available the dispositional states of the actors involved. This can be seen in Diana's claim that doing her bit 'practically finished me off there and then' (l. 6), which emphasizes not only the differences between Charles and Diana but also the profound effect the new role was having on her. This is emphasized further with words such as 'suddenly realized' (l. 6) and 'impact' (l. 7). These function as inoculations against a potential accusation of stake; that is, that Diana knew what the royal role would involve before she got married. Having established the differences between her and Charles in their ability to carry out routine royal activities, Diana extends this division between them in the repair, 'I went back to *our-my* hotel room' (ll. 6–7).

A sense of time pervades the account as Diana develops the tension between her true self and the royal role. Details of events are organized to provide narrative structure, which coincides with the edited design of the interview. As Gergen (1994) notes, narrative is a crucial factor in the development of identity. The overall interview is designed to provide a storied account of Diana's life from marriage to divorce (see also Abell, Stokoe, & Billig, 2000). Extract 1 contains scripted details of smaller progressive shifts from initial 'inexpert' royal to a gradual realization of the royal role. At the beginning of her response, Diana is unable to speak to the public in Australia. However, as the account progresses, the expectations surrounding the royal role are mobilized as Diana obeys Charles' orders. The listener is then told that this tour lasted for six weeks (l. 8), and at the end of it, the royal role has been realized and accepted, and furthermore, Diana's self has changed. The final

turn (ll. 10–11) is structured as a list (Jefferson, 1990) as Diana compares her true self with the royal role. She emphasizes the transformation of this self in constructing the contrast between someone who does not realize the implications of royal life to someone for whom realization 'suddenly' dawns.

In this first extract, we have demonstrated how conflicts between self and role are discursive resources used dynamically in accounting for past events. We also suggest that such descriptions can be used to warrant the authenticity of an account and make available the dispositional states of 'others' with whom the self can be compared. The situating of 'self' within a particular monarchical society therefore requires interviewer and audience, analyst and reader to import the relevant cultural knowledge such that these identities, and the rhetorical potential of all the associated meanings and inferences, can be understood fully.

Role as a resource for mitigation

The next extract comes later in the interview and concerns both Diana's post-natal depression after the birth of William and her self-harming behaviour. We focus on how she constructs her identity as depressed and how this is managed to warrant her entitlement to the royal role of Princess. Diana's cultural positioning of self both includes and excludes membership of the royal family. This account of self is again developed in the reporting of past events and in the construction of a context of relevant others with whom Diana is compared. Shifts in footing are noted for the identity work they achieve in managing a public account of post-natal depression and self-harming behaviour.

Extract 2: Role as a resource for mitigation

1	Bashir:	what effect did the depression have on your marriage?
2	Diana:	well it gave everybody (.) a wonderful new label (.) Diana's unstable (.) and Diana's erm
3		(.) mentally unbalanced (.) and unfortunately that seems to have stuck on and off over the
4		years
5	Bashir:	are you saying (.) that that label stuck within your marriage?
6	Diana:	I think people used it (1) and it stuck (1) yes
7	Bashir:	according to press reports (.) it was suggested that it was around this time (.) things
8		became so difficult that you (.) actually tried to injure yourself =
9	Diana:	= mmm =
10	Bashir:	= is that true
11	Diana:	mmm (.) when no one (.) listens to you or you feel no one's listening to you (.) all sorts
12		of things start to happen for instance you have so much pain inside yourself (.) that yo::u
13		try and hurt yourself on the outside cos you want help (.) but it's the wrong help you're
14		asking for (.) people see it as crying wolf (.) or attention-seeking (.) and they think
15		because you're in the media all the time (.) you've got enough attention, inverted
16		commas .hhh but I was actually crying out because I wanted to get better (.) in order to
17		go forward (.) and continue my duty and my role as (.) wife (.) mother (.) Princess of
18		Wales .hhh so I er (.) yes I did inflict s. upon myself (.) I didn't like myself (.) I was
19		ashamed because I couldn't cope with the pressures
20	Bashir:	what did you actually do?
21	Diana:	well (.) I jsut hurt my arms and my legs (.) and (.) I (.) work in environments now
22		where I see women (.) doing similar things (.) and I'm able to (.) understand
23		completely where they're coming from

Diana's response to Bashir's question about the depression (l. 1) is oriented to other people's reactions, rather than the effect it had upon her marriage. She claims

that it 'gave everybody (.) a wonderful new label' (l. 2). It is not clear to whom 'everybody' refers. However, the extreme-case formulation functions to construct consensus, almost conspiracy, between these 'others' in the label they ascribe to Diana (Pomerantz, 1986). The 'wonderful new label' is ironic and serves to undermine the credibility of the ascription. Reported speech functions to further ironize the 'wonderful label' (ll. 2–3). The use of distant footing maintains Diana's position as a relayer of events rather than their author. However, she adds, 'unfortunately that seems to have stuck on and off over the years' (ll. 3–4). The term 'unfortunately' signals Diana's resistance to the ascription. Furthermore, the use of 'stuck' is interesting as it is indexically linked to 'label', suggesting that the ascription is fixed. The insertion of 'on and off' functions to undermine the 'stuck' nature of the label. Thus, Diana discredits these others as inconsistent in their ascriptions.

In response to Bashir's question concerning whether this label 'stuck' within her marriage (l. 5), Diana contradicts herself. She claims, 'I think people used it (1) and it stuck (1) yes' (l. 6). This contrasts with the 'on and off' description of the label earlier (l. 3), but the contradictions serve a rhetorical function. While it enabled Diana to undermine the others who ascribe the label, on the grounds of being inconsistent, in this case, it allows her to implicate Charles and specific others who were involved with her marriage. Moreover, the description of this label as 'stuck within the marriage' suggests that Charles and these others were consistent in their ascriptions towards Diana. The following lines in this extract work to delegitimize such negative ascriptions by Charles and others.

Shifting the focus of the interview, Bashir refers to the controversial press reports of Diana's self-injuries (l. 7). However, he adopts the animator's position, deflecting his own identity away from what is said, and instead reports the suggestions of the press (Clayman, 1992). The statement refers to a controversial or sensitive topic and is signalled as such by both Bashir in his question and Diana in her response. Bashir states that the press reports have only 'suggested' the possibility of self-harming by the Princess, using imprecise words to leave open the possibility that these reports are incorrect in some way and can be denied by Diana. Bashir also mitigates the act of self-injury in his initial statement by offering an explanation for it. He claims that it was caused by things becoming 'so difficult' (l. 8), thus making it easier for her to confirm the statement. Her response to the question is delayed, displaying the typical features of a difficult response. Diana responds with 'mmm' (ll. 9 and 11), so indicating her recognition of a controversial area and a troubled subject position (Wetherell, 1998). But although conversation analysis enables us to identify this 'trouble', it cannot explain *why* responding to a direct question about self-injury is a difficult task for Diana. Some background knowledge about the controversial nature of self-injury, as well as the problems it poses for a key member of the monarchy, must be imported. Diana must counter allegations that she is unstable and not fit to be a member of the royal family. As a result, admitting to self-harming behaviour is a problematic issue. How Diana responds to this question will have consequences for how she is viewed by the public throughout the rest of the interview.

She continues her response with an exoneration for self-injury (ll. 11–19) but does not address Bashir's statement directly until after the 'reasons' for it have been presented to the listener. Here, Diana shifts between using the pronoun 'I' (ll. 16–18) to the more generic forms of 'one' and 'you' (ll. 11–15), indicating her recognition of a sensitive area and maintaining rhetorical distance from what is said. This also enables Diana to identify with her audience as she speaks for an absent group of people. She begins her response with an account of the reasons why people *in general* inflict physical injury upon themselves. The details remain vague, thus enabling Diana to increase the magnitude of what happens. It is not clear who the 'people' (l. 14) are who regard such behaviour as 'crying wolf (.) or attention-seeking'—it could apply potentially to both people within the royal sphere and the public. However, as she rejected the ascription of 'unstable' imposed upon her by others earlier in the extract, she also rejects the explanations for self-injury given by these 'people'. By adopting a distant footing, Diana is able to voice and then reject these ascriptions. The device 'inverted commas' (ll. 15–16) signals that Diana's position is that of animator, presenting the opinion of others. Hence, she manages her own publicly performed identity as a credible figure who has not encouraged attention, while voicing a plausible counter-argument that she is someone who receives a lot of attention from the media. The pronoun 'I' displays a personal explication of self-injury, 'I was actually crying out because I wanted to get better' (l. 16). The contrast becomes available between 'attention seeking' and 'wanting to get better', and, having rejected the former, Diana claims the latter as the explanation for her self-harming behaviour.

Diana provides reasons why people self-injure generally to warrant and mitigate her later admission of inflicting harm upon herself. She again negotiates the conflict between true self and royal role in accounting for her self-injuries (ll. 18–19). Note that the roles of 'wife (.) mother (.) Princess of Wales' (ll. 17–18) are made relevant to attribute this pressure to the conflicting roles she experiences. The full implications of someone trying to manage all these roles is understood when one calls up the cultural meanings and obligations associated with each role. Carbaugh (1993, p. 163) writes, 'if one performs "being a mother", or "a wife", one symbolises a distinctive social position, but, moreover, one has symbolically invoked a system of social practices, relations, and properties'. As discussed earlier, this way of analysing what is inferentially available when categories are invoked contrasts sharply with the conversation analytic position. Whereas Carbaugh talks of the cultural knowledge that is needed to understand identities, conversation analysts talk of the inference-rich categories and category-bound activities that can be located without resource to wider cultural information. But we suggest that although the analytic processes are described differently by their proponents, their outcomes are the same. Interestingly, 'Princess of Wales' appears as the third item on the list, which is often the most compelling (Billig, 1996; Jefferson, 1991). While listeners understand the pressures connected with wife and mother, that of 'princess' contrasts with the former and is magnified in terms of the obligations that surround it. Diana ends the response stating 'I was ashamed'. In the context of what has already been presented, such as the negative ascriptions and the

conflicting roles, this sense of shame appears unjustified as Diana concludes the exoneratory speech.

Bashir then asks Diana directly what she did (l. 20). Again, the 'well' and pause (l. 21) indicate trouble in answering the question. She deals with this question briefly: using the term 'just' serves to downgrade and minimize her actions. She shifts the account from one that focuses exclusively upon her own experience of self-injury to one that works up her entitlements to knowledge about other women in similar circumstances. This is achieved by reporting her 'work' within relevant 'environments' (l. 21), and also on the basis of Diana's own experiences with self-injury. The emphasis upon 'completely' (l. 23) highlights her empathy with other women. This builds upon the role occupied by Diana as someone situated at the top levels of society, but able to relate to people at the bottom.

In this extract, we see how conversation analysis can be useful in identifying interactional trouble, even in a broadcast interview situation. However, this level of analysis is limited because it cannot account for 'why' such trouble might occur. Background knowledge of the position Diana occupies in society, as well as the controversy surrounding the topic of self-injury, must be imported by listeners and analysts in order to explicate and fully comprehend this data.

Diana the ambassador

The final extract comes from the end of the interview. This section of the interview appears after a visual heading of '1995: The Princess of Wales now lives alone in Kensington Palace'. The audience is presented with the final step in the story of Diana's life, this being life after the divorce. This final section of the interview is dedicated to Diana's nomination of the role 'ambassador'. We consider how Diana positions this role in the context of British society and, in the light of Bashir's simultaneous challenges, works up her entitlement to perform it.

Extract 3: Diana the ambassador

1	Bashir:	what role do you see for yourself in the future?
2	Diana:	I'd like to be an ambassador for this country (.) I'd like to represent this country abroad.
3		(.) .hhh as I have all this media interest let's not just sit in this country (.) and be
4		battered by it let's take them (.) these people (.) out (.) and (.) to represent this country
5		and the good qualities of it abroad (1) when I go abroad (.) we've got sixty to ninety (.)
6		photographers (.) just from this country with me (.) so let's (.) use it in a-a productive
7		way, to help this country.
8	Bashir:	you say you feel that your future is as some form of ambassador
9	Diana:	mmm
10	Bashir:	at whose behest is that?
11		(2)
12	Bashir:	on what grounds do you feel that you have the right to think of yourself as an ambassador?
13	Diana:	I've been in a (.) privileged position for fifteen years (.) and I've got (.) tremendous
14		knowledge (.) about people and how to communicate (.) I've learnt that (.) I've got it (.)
15		and I want to use it (1) and when I look at people in (.) public life (1) .hhh I'm not a
16		political animal (.) but (.) I think the biggest disease this world (.) suffers from (.) in this
17		day and age (.) is the disease of people feeling unloved (.) and I know that (.) I can give
18		(.) love for a minute (.) for half an hour for a day for a month but I can give (.) I'm very
19		happy to do that (.) and I want to do that
20	Bashir:	do you think that the British people are happy with you (.) in your role?

21	Diana:	I think the British people (.) <u>need</u> someone (.) in public life to give affection (.) to make
22		them feel important (.) to support them (.) to given them light (.) in their dark tunnels (.)
23		I see it as a possibly unique role (1) and (1) yes I've had difficulties (.) erm a-as
24		everybody (.) has witnessed over the years (.) but let's now use the knowledge I've
25		gathered (.) to help other people in distress

In the first question–answer pair Diana treats Bashir's question as being about a future public, rather than private, role. It is interesting to see what interactants *make relevant* in their next turn-at-talk when being asked to identify or categorize themselves. The category of 'ambassador' carries certain cultural associations regarding its meaning and position in society. They are diplomats of the highest rank who 'represent this country abroad'. Diana therefore needs to work up her entitlements to such a role and argue for its purpose. She does this in a number of ways. First, she identifies with her audience and uses political rhetoric to describe the activities of an ambassador. Repeatedly using the deictic utterance 'this country' (ll. 2–7), Diana invokes a common national identity. Deictic utterances are forms of rhetorical pointing, and to understand their meaning, the listener must interpret it from the position of the speaker (Billig, 1995). Politicians frequently invoke the nation when claiming to speak on its behalf and, in praising its 'good qualities', Diana praises herself. The inclusive pronoun 'let's '(l. 3) functions to identify her with the nation. She states 'let's not just sit in <u>this</u> country (.) and be battered by it'. It is not just Diana who is being 'battered' by 'it', but the nation as well. Thus, she succeeds in constructing consensus and validation for her entitlements to 'ambassador' in terms of taking 'them', the media, to represent 'us', the nation, abroad. She strengthens her entitlements to such an 'ambassador' role by offering specific details of this 'media interest' and detailing the number of photographers who would normally follow her abroad (ll. 5–6).

Although Diana provides an account of her suitability for the role of ambassador, Bashir troubles this identity in the subsequent turns of the interview. In lines 8 and 10, he asks 'at whose behest' she has chosen this role. Because Diana's status is royal, not political (despite her earlier use of political rhetoric), she has no 'natural' entitlements to the role; no one has asked her to do it. Diana marks this troubled identity by a lengthy pause (l. 11). This leads Bashir to reformulate the direct question into a more general one (l. 12), enabling Diana to work up her unofficial entitlements to the role. In the first part of her response (ll. 13–15), she reports her qualifications for the role of ambassador in the form of two three-part lists. First, she states, 'I've been in a (.) privileged position for fifteen years (.) and I've got tremendous (.) knowledge about people and how to communicate' (ll. 13–14). This is spoken in the past tense, indicating Diana's current position outside the royal family. The idea of a 'privileged position' is a 'common-place' (Billig, 1996) which requires the import of cultural knowledge about the status of members of the monarchy. Diana is also specific about how long she has held this position, bolstering further her entitlement. Stating that this knowledge is about 'people' with whom she can 'communicate' functions to identify with the audience. Hence, Diana constructs herself as someone who is simultaneously unlike the 'people' in so far as she has access to particular knowledge and privileges that they do not, but is also similar to the 'people' as she can communicate with them. The second list

(ll. 14–15) shores up the entitlement work done in the first. She states, 'I've learnt that (.) I've got it (.) and I want to use it', indicating a progression from acquiring the knowledge through to applying it in her future role as an ambassador.

Who the 'people in (.) public life' (l. 15) are is ambiguous. However, it is used in conjunction with a rejection of a similarity between her and politicians, thus indicating a particular category of people. Line 15 signals yet more trouble for Diana, as she resists a political identity. Employing a metaphor, she claims, 'I'm not a political animal' (ll. 15–16). This statement does two things. Firstly, by rejecting the identity of 'politician' and instead claiming that of 'ambassador', Diana can appeal to a wider public. Politicians, despite often claiming to represent the nation, have motives, agendas and interests that are governed by party politics. However, ambassadors are apolitical, and their motives reflect the interests of 'this country' rather than a political party. Secondly, the statement 'I'm not a political animal' is followed by 'but', which is characteristic of disclaimers (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Diana rejects the identity of politician yet continues to voice rhetoric that is glossed as political. In addition, the disclaimer functions as a stake inoculation against the popular criticism within the media and government that Diana was 'too political' (Campbell, 1998).

The narrative structure of this and subsequent turns is important. Diana constructs the problems of people in the world and how the 'ambassador' role will resolve them. She claims: 'I think the biggest disease this world (.) suffers from (.) in this day and age (.) is the disease of people feeling unloved' (ll. 16–17). The preface 'I think' demonstrates her personal commitment to the statement and also mitigates what is said as being opinion rather than fact. The problem itself is constructed as a medical and psychological condition by using the metaphorical and emotional descriptions of 'disease', 'suffers' and 'feeling unloved'. This is followed by the formulaic phrase 'in this day and age'. Formulaic and metaphorical expressions carry implicit meanings that the listeners (and analysts) must interpret for themselves (Drew & Holt, 1989). However, this interpretation only becomes available by drawing upon the cultural framework in which Diana positions herself and the people. Having established what the problem is, Diana offers a solution, again in the form of a list. She states, 'I know that (.) I can give (.) love for a minute (.) for half an hour for a day for a month but I can give (.) I'm very happy to do that (.) and I want to do that' (ll. 17–19). The list is cumulative, running from 'a minute' to 'a month' and is concluded with a personal qualification, increasing the commitment to her offer.

Finally, Bashir clarifies 'this country' as Britain, asking Diana if the British people are 'happy' with this role (l. 20). Although Diana does not answer this question directly, she reiterates her earlier claims of the need for this role. Again using lists and metaphor, she offers a personal opinion ('I think') of her entitlements to such an identity. While she does not state explicitly that it is she who is needed by the public, Diana implies that this is a role she can fulfil. The British public are constructed as needing 'someone (.) in public life to give affection (.) to make them feel important (.) to support them (.) to give them light in their dark tunnels' (ll. 21–22). Metaphors such as 'light in their dark tunnels' can only be pointed to and understood by culturally competent analysts and listeners who must import

their knowledge of such devices. As noted earlier, Diana identifies herself as simultaneously like 'us', the general public and not like 'us', an ambassador. This ambassador role is something for which she is well qualified. Here, she suggests that it is 'a possibly unique role' (l. 23), thus illustrating what Nairn (1988) has termed the 'super-ordinariness' of royalty. Diana now distances herself rhetorically from ordinary people. Only she is entitled to belong to this category of ambassador. Diana has dismantled her royal role and reconstructed her chosen role of ambassador. The trouble in line 23 marks the stake confession of having 'difficulties' witnessed by 'everybody', which becomes the final category entitlement to the role of ambassador. Diana signals the end of the narrative with the temporal adverb 'now' (l. 24), which also points to the emergence of the ambassador self.

Discussion

In this study, we have explored the ways in which culturally situated identities are constructed in discourse. We have illustrated the flexible and dynamic nature of identity ascription and hence the fluidity of interactional identities. This is in sharp contrast to traditional social psychological notions of identity as a fixed, cognitive entity. Scan current journals of social psychology, and you will find that Tajfel's (1978) Social Identity Theory is almost exclusively conceptualized and theorized in terms of experimental manipulation by its proponents. However, this study adds to the body of discursive work that focuses upon the moment-to-moment construction of identity and its function as a rhetorical resource. In particular, we integrated social constructionist theory with conversation analytic practice to provide a rigorous framework for investigating identity.

At the start of the interview, Diana positions herself as an ordinary person who was unfamiliar, and ill at ease, with the position in which she 'found herself '. She reports that she became a different person as a result of the expectations and demands of others. The agentic 'true self' emerges as Diana develops her category entitlements to speak on behalf of specific and general groups of 'people'. Reported behaviours that are part of her true self, such as visiting people in hospital and finding an affinity with drug addicts and alcoholics, all function to construct Diana's shared social identity with ordinary people through her lived experiences. Finally, Diana resolves the conflict between true self and royal role by claiming the identity of ambassador. However, by the end of the interview, Diana constructs herself as 'super-ordinary'. While she has demonstrated that she can know the British people, their feelings and what they need because of her shared social identities, she uses this ordinariness to shore up her entitlement to the 'unique role' of ambassador. Hence, at the end of the interview, true self is unified with chosen public role. Diana, like others who wish to speak on behalf of a wider people, 'constructs her personal identity as *constituting* her entitlement to speak on behalf of a shared social category', in this case, the British public (Rapley, 1998, p. 341).

The multiple ('wife', 'mother', 'Princess') and inconsistent ('unstable', 'ambassador', 'self-harmer') identities that are occasioned in the interview result in problems for mainstream experimental approaches to identity. Different identities

and roles are mobilized in different parts of the narrative. As Antaki, Condor, and Levine (1996) point out, identities may be used by participants to defend argumentative positions and as grounds for warranting claims. From this discursive perspective, identities are always *situated* and must be interpreted from the context in which they are made relevant. Antaki *et al.* argue that it was Tajfel's initial project to explore identity in terms of its contextual and flexible nature, a goal that has vanished with the accent on experimental studies and the stable, enduring nature of identity.

We have argued that while an analysis of the minutiae of interaction is essential, it is equally important to consider talk as a culturally situated practice. Moreover, it is important to consider the rhetorical function of the cultural knowledge that is invoked by speakers in conversation. The analyst must 'go beyond the data' in order to explicate these rhetorical functions. It is not enough to argue that the categories and identities that are constructed in talk can simply 'speak for themselves', as conversation analysts would propose. Membership categorization analysts argue that common-sense knowledge or culture is displayed when speakers problematize or trouble some aspect of the interaction, and that categories make other categories and activities inferentially available to the speaker and listener. But to understand and develop analytic commentary on what is inferred by and what actions are bound to categories, one *must* draw upon cultural knowledge. Thus, to understand the rhetorical thrust of Diana's use of naming conventions, metaphors and the positioning of herself and others, the listener must engage in a wider understanding of the cultural and interpretative framework within which these become relevant.

In order to build such a theory of culture into our detailed analysis of the interview, we have drawn upon the work of social construction and conversation analytic theorists. Carbaugh (1996) argues that within any conversational context, a variety of identity positions are available. These identity positions, such as 'wife', 'husband', 'mother' or 'Princess of Wales', are grounded in certain cultural premises about 'what a person is (and should be), can (and should) do, feel (and should feel)' (p. 27). What Carbaugh does is to weave together the discursive critique of Social Identity Theory with a theory of culture. However, constructionist theorists fail to incorporate a rigorous explication of talk as the site of identity negotiation. What we have done in this study is explore the situational flexibility of identity construction in a fine-grained analysis of a cultural site: broadcast talk. We suggest that social psychologists need to embrace such an eclectic approach when examining the production of identity and meanings surrounding it, including an analysis of discourse and its cultural situation. We have analysed a text that is located socially and historically in contemporary society. Through such a text, people's common-sense understandings of the monarchy—its members and practices—are socially constructed.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank three anonymous reviewers for their very useful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

References

Abell, J., & Stokoe, E. H. (1999). I take full responsibility, I take some responsibility, I'll take half of it but no more than that: Princess Diana and the negotiation of blame in the 'Panorama' interview. *Discourse Studies, 1*(3), 297–319.

Abell, J., Stokoe, E. H., & Billig, M. (2000). Narrative and the discursive (re)construction of events. In M. Andrews, S. P. Sclater, C. Squire, & A. Treacher (Eds). *Lines of narrative: psychosocial perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Antaki, C., Condor, S. & Levine, M. (1996). Social identities in talk: Speakers' own orientations. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 35*(4), 473–492.

Antaki, C. & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.) (1998). *Identities in talk*. London: Sage.

Atkinson, J. M. & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1984). *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage.

Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and thinking* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Billig, M. (1998). *Talking of the royal family*. Reissued with new preface. London: Routledge.

Brand, G. & Scannell, P. (1991). Talk, identity and performance: The Tony Blackburn Show. In P. Scannell (Ed.), *Broadcast talk*. London: Sage.

Bull, P. E. (1997). Queen of Hearts or Queen of the Arts of Implication? Implicit criticisms and their implications for equivocation theory in the interview between Martin Bashir and Diana, Princess of Wales. *Social Psychological Review, 1*(1), 27–36.

Buttny, R. (1993). *Social accountability in communication*. London: Sage.

Campbell, B. (1998). *Diana: Princess of Wales: How sexual politics shook the monarchy*. London: The Women's Press.

Carbaugh, D. (1993). Personhood, positioning, and cultural pragmatics: American dignity in cross-cultural perspective. In S. A. Deetz (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 17* (pp. 159–186). London: Sage.

Carbaugh, D. (1996). *Situating selves: The communication of social identities in American scenes*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Cicourel, A. (1992). The interpenetration of communicative contexts: Examples from medical encounters. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp. 291–310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, S. E. (1992). Footing in the achievement of neutrality: The case of news–interview discourse. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 163–198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, B. & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: the discursive reproduction of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20*(1), 43–63.

Dimbleby, J. (1995). *The Prince of Wales*. London: Warner Books.

Drew, P. & Holt, E. (1989). Complainable matters: The use of idiomatic expressions in making complaints. *Social Problems, 35,* 398–417.

Edley, N. (1993). Prince Charles—our flexible friend: Accounting for variation in constructions of identity. *Text, 13,* 397–422.

Edwards, D. (1998). The relevant thing about her: Social identity categories in use. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 15–33). London: Sage.

Edwards, D. & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.

Gergen, K. (1994). *Realities and relationships*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goffman, E. (1979). Footing. *Semiotica, 25,* 1–29.

Greatbatch, D. (1998). Conversation analysis: Neutralism in British news interviews. In A. Bell & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 163–185). Oxford: Blackwell.

Harré, R. (1993). *Social being: A theory for social psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harré, R. & van Langenhove, L. (1999). The dynamics of social episodes. In R. Harré & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory* (pp. 1–13). Oxford: Blackwell.

Hester, S. (1998). Describing 'deviance' in school: Recognizably educational psychological problems. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 133–150). London: Sage.

Hester, S. & Eglin, P. (Eds.) *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorisation analysis*. Boston, MA: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and University Press of America.

Hutchby, I. (1996). Power in discourse: The case arguments on a British talk radio show. *Discourse & Society, 7*(4), 481–497.

Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (1984). Transcript notation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. ix–xvi). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jefferson, G. (1990). List-construction as a task and resource. In G. Psathas & R. Frankel (Eds.), *Interactional competence* (pp. 63–92). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kowal, S. & O'Connell, D. C. (1997). Theoretical ideals and their violation: Princess Diana and Martin Bashir in the BBC Interview. *Pragmatics, 7*(3), 309–323.

Kurzon, D. (1996). The maxim of quantity, hyponymy and Princess Diana. *Pragmatics, 6*(2), 217–227.

Leudar, I. & Antaki, C. (1996). Discourse participation, reported speech and research practices in social psychology. *Theory and Psychology, 6*, 5–29.

Malone, M. J. (1997). *Worlds of talk: The presentation of self in everyday conversation*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Morton, A. (1992). *Diana—her true story*. London: Michael O'Mara Books.

Morton, A. (1997). *Diana—her true story in her own words*. London: Michael O'Mara Books.

Nairn, T. (1988). *The enchanted glass: Britain and its monarchy*. London: Radius.

Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations. *Human Studies, 9*, 219-229.

Potter, J. (1997). Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.) *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 144–160). London: Sage.

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology*. London: Sage.

Rapley, M. (1998). 'Just an ordinary Australian': Self-categorisation and the discursive construction of facticity in 'new racist' political rhetoric. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 37*, 325–344.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Ed. G. Jefferson, two volumes. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696–735.

Sanders, R. (1999). The impossibility of a culturally contexted conversation analysis: On simultaneous, distinct types of pragmatic meaning. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 32*(1&2), 129–140.

Stokoe, E. H. & Smithson, J. (2001). Making gender relevant: Conversation analysis and gender categories in interaction. *Discourse and Society, 12*(2): 243–269.

Stokoe, E. H. & Smithson, J. (in press). Gender and sexuality in talk-in-interactions: Considering conversation analytic perspectives. In P. McIlvenny (Ed.). *Talking gender and sexuality: Conversation, performability and discourse in interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups*. London: Academic Press.

Turner, J., Hogg, M., Oakes, P., Reicher, S. & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorisation theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Watson, G. & Seiler, R. M. (Eds.) (1992). *Text in context: Contributions to ethnomethodology*. London: Sage.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpetative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse and Society, 9*(3), 387–412.

Widdicombe, S. & Wooffitt, R. (1995). *The language of youth subcultures*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Received 14 January 1999; revised version received 29 February 2000