32   Child Discourse

AMY KYRATZIS AND
JENNY COOK-GUMPERZ

0   Introduction: Placing Child Discourse in a Tradition

In the years since Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan published the first book on child discourse (Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan 1977), the field has moved through a series of changes. By turning to a discourse-centered approach, researchers have been able to shift focus, placing the child's learning process and productive pragmatic use at the center of their concern. The early discourse approach developed as a counter to traditional language acquisition studies, which centered on discovering how children could overcome the limitations of their incomplete grammatical system. Such studies made judgments of the child's ability to approximate to the adult norm based on direct elicitation in quasi-experimental settings. The impact of *Child Discourse* (Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan 1977), along with *Developmental Pragmatics* (Ochs and Schieffelin 1979), began a movement toward situationally embedded activities as the domain of child language studies.

   Researchers' interests began to turn away from exclusively psycholinguistic concerns with factors underlying the development of formal structures to concentrate on contextually situated learning. The discourse focus looked at children in naturally occurring settings and activities, and paid attention to their speech and communicative practice in everyday situations (Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz 1976). This research went beyond linguistic competence to what became known as the child's acquisition of communicative competence, which is seen as the knowledge that underlies socially appropriate speech. This approach was influenced by ethnography of communication (which saw communicative competence as a contrastive concept to the Chomskyan notion of linguistic competence), and involved theories of sociolinguistics, speech act usage, and conversational analysis. Although little conversational analytic work was done at that

time, by the late 1970s and 1980s there was a growing interest in children's conversational competence (McTear 1985; Ochs and Schieffelin 1979).

0.1   Language socialization and the acquisition of discourse

The ethnographic approach to acquisition served to refocus studies of children's acquisition to the problem of how language learners are able to be participating members of a social group by acquiring social and linguistic skills necessary for interaction. The term *language socialization* came to represent this new focus. As Schieffelin and Ochs (1986), who provided one of the first collections to address these concerns, commented: language socialization involves "both socialization through language and socialization to use language" (1986: 2). The focus on language-mediated interactions as the mechanism of production–reproduction is the unique contribution of language socialization to the core problem of how societies continue. In research taking this perspective (e.g., Heath 1983), both the sociocultural contexts of speaking, and the ways of speaking within specifically defined speech events of a social group or society, became primary research sites. In contrast to earlier studies of language acquisition, which focused on the acquisition of grammatical patterns, and later studies, which looked at children's speech acts, the new approach looked at speaking embedded in specific interactive situations and at the communicative, as distinct from linguistic, competence that these practices revealed (Hymes 1962).

By the mid-1980s the shift to language socialization was responsible for highlighting what it means for a young child to participate in meaningful language exchanges and to become an active agent in her or his own development, to which discourse competence was an essential key (Cook-Gumperz, Corsaro, and Streeck 1986). Children require both broad cultural knowledge about social relationships and an understanding of the social identities that define their position in a social world. Yet they also need to be active producers of the linguistic practices that construct these identities. While language socialization studies introduced the idea of studying child-centered communicative activities, interest in the later 1980s in peer speech redirected these concerns toward the child as a member of a culture that was different from that of the adult world (Corsaro 1985). As part of this rising interest in peers and peer cultures came a concern with the particular speech activities that children generate for themselves. Goodwin's (1990) *He-Said-She-Said* was an example. This ethnographic study looked at the role of children's disputes in organizing peer cultures. Within this peer context, the whole notion of conversational competence was shifted, such that children became the arbiters of their own conversational practices and rules of appropriateness.

0.2   Changes in the field of child discourse studies: from 10 years ago to present-day studies

Up to 10 years ago, when we reviewed the field of child discourse studies for the previous edition of the *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, the field had evolved to include the following. First, with the influence of ethnography and language socialization approaches, child discourse studies had begun to focus on how using language and

acquiring language are part of what it means to become a member of a wider society (Ochs and Schieffelin 1984). In the past 10 years or so, as noted in Garrett and Baquedano-López's (2002) review, the field of language socialization studies has itself broadened to examine "language socialization processes as they unfold in institutional contexts and in a wide variety of linguistically and culturally heterogeneous settings characterized by bilingualism, multilingualism, code-switching, language shift, syncretism, and other phenomena associated with contact between languages and cultures" (2002: 339; see also Duranti, Ochs, and Schieffelin 2012; Ochs and Schieffelin 2012). As it has done so, child discourse studies have also broadened to encompass institutional settings and culturally heterogeneous settings. Second, child discourse studies began to address the question, what does it mean socially and psychologically for the child to have an ever-increasing linguistic control over her or his social environment and self-awareness? With a rising interest in Conversation Analysis (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974) in the past 15 years or so, this question has become refocused somewhat. Rather than looking only for linguistic markers of children's developing reflexivity and self-awareness, child discourse studies now also look at speakers' multimodal *displays* of affect and attention in the moment, including those of the children themselves, and how these displays become integrated into (and themselves influence) unfolding sequences of adult-child interaction (e.g., Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin 2012). Thirdly, child discourse studies had come to focus on sociolinguistic practices and on events that were meaningful from children's own point of view, such as games, teasing rituals, and pretend play routines. They explored children's developing competence in their own peer world. In the past 10 years or so, there has been a proliferation of studies of children socializing children, many of these in culturally and linguistically heterogeneous settings resulting from transnational movements and postcolonial societal changes (e.g., see Goodwin and Kyratzis 2007, 2012, 2014; Kyratzis 2004 for prior reviews).

With these issues in mind, we will review some of the most relevant studies in two main situational domains: adult–child discourse and child–child discourse. Under adult–child discourse, we review studies in pragmatics of family life, personhood, and self-identity (where space is made for the child to begin to reflect on her or his own experience), and morality in the talk of everyday life (such as dinner-table narratives, politeness routines, and other adult–child exchanges). Under child–child discourse, we review studies of disputes, teasing, and gossip events among older children and of pretend play among younger children.

1   Adult–Child Discourse

1.1   *The pragmatics of family life*

The world of the family, with its often subtle distinctions of power and authority, provides children with their earliest learning experiences of how verbal communication can affect interpersonal relationships. By participating in family life, children gain practical experience of family dynamics and how talk is used to control, to persuade, or to conceal real intentions. Family discourse, particularly at mealtimes and on other ceremonial occasions, provides the essential testing-ground where children hone their

skills as communicators. It is in the family group that children listen to and learn to construct narratives, tales that reflect past and future events (Heath 1983). And it is through the pragmatic conventions of daily conversations that the relative positioning of family members is constructed as part of daily discursive practice. In family discussion, children are able to observe how talk reflects, and at times constructs, status relationships of gender, age, and power by the ways people talk to each other and about each other. It is also through family discussion that children first become aware of relationships in a world beyond the family.

1.1.1   Issues of power and control

Ervin-Tripp, focusing on the pragmatic conventions of family talk, provides important insights into the linguistic means by which interpersonal relationships are negotiated through the daily activity of family talk. Her analysis concentrates specifically on the speech acts or activities, such as requests, directives, greetings and politeness expressions, jokes, and complaints that demonstrate control of one person over another. In a paper on "Language and power in the family," Ervin-Tripp, O'Connor, and Rosenberg (1984: 119) point out the need to distinguish between effective power, "the ability in a face-to-face interaction to get compliance from an addressee," and esteem, "as the right to receive verbal deference." In other words, there is not a direct correspondence between descriptors of status and everyday verbal behavior. Rather, by looking at everyday discourse, we become aware of the variety of factors of context, interactants, social position, and/or emotional involvement, as well as activity scene, that all enter into choices of verbal strategies, and on a situation-specific basis determine pragmatic choice. Ervin-Tripp, O'Connor, and Rosenberg (1984), for example, examine how these factors influence choice of request forms. Among other things, as Ervin-Tripp, Guo, and Lampert (1990) argue, there is a relationship between the degree of indirectness of the request, the esteem of the person to whom the request is made, the power of the speaker making the request, and the cost of the request. It is now well known that children will issue direct commands to younger children in play, while recognizing the need to be indirect to those older and with higher status in the play situation. However, such indirect strategies are not necessarily employed with parents, with whom the child has a greater emotional involvement, for parents in their turn insist at least on politeness markers as a symbol of nominal deference to their adult status (Gleason 1988; Ervin-Tripp 1976, 1977; Wootton 1997). Thus, pragmatic choices, in something as apparently simple as request forms, reveal the real complexities of the discourse knowledge necessary for children to become competent communicators in everyday settings.

The range and complexity of children's social knowledge is further revealed by the way they act out family roles in pretend play. In role-playing games, children reveal a range of understandings of the complexities of directives and requests and the power associations of different family and institutional roles (see Section 2.2.2).

The study of family directives has undergone a re-direction in the past 10 years to include a greater emphasis on the interactional unfolding of directive–response sequences, including a focus on the use of multimodal resources as well as a more active, agentive view of the child's role. Goodwin and Cekaite (2013), for example, examine multimodal transactions used to choreograph and negotiate the ongoing

progress of parent–child communicative projects (e.g., getting a child ready for bed). Such projects are "temporally anchored" and involve "the movement of bodies through social space and transitions from one activity to another" (2013: 122). Study of the interactional accomplishment of the directive–response sequence is essential; as argued by Goodwin and Cekaite, "acceptances of activity contracts and compliance with directives constitute only one possible option in response to a parental directive; children have available an arsenal of possible ways of non-complying, such as responding through bargaining, refusing, ignoring, and delaying" (2013: 130). The entire trajectory of action must be taken into account. Transitioning from one activity to another in the larger communicative project requires continuous monitoring, as well as participants' display of "crucial information about the temporal and sequential organization of their joint participation in the current interaction" (2013: 122) through embodied as well as verbal means. These means can include gaze, touch, "reconfiguration of bodies into facing formations" (2013: 136), and "shepherding" (Cekaite 2010) the child through touch, all organized together to "align parent and child in an intercorporeal framework for mutual engagement" (Goodwin and Cekaite 2013: 136). Children's embodied displays of affect provide crucial information about the temporal organization of their joint participation as seen in parents' re-calibrations of directives in response to "children's confrontational refusals"; these were quite different when compared to parental responses to children's displays of "pleading mode" (Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin 2012: 39). Through analyzing these temporally unfolding trajectories, the substantial agency which children exert can be seen; as noted by the authors, "such multimodally organized directive trajectories thus show clearly that emotion and stance are not simply add-ons to an isolated individual action, but constitute an inherent feature of temporally unfolding sequences of social interaction" (2012: 39); children's emotion displays play a central role.

1.1.2   Dinner-table talk

A key site for looking at children's complementary roles within the family is dinner-table conversations. Children's discourse has been explored from the point of view of the participation frameworks of family routines and in particular looking at children's speech strategies during dinner-table talk and narratives. Richard Watts (1991), in a study of power in family discourse, states that the distribution of power in families can be directly related to members' success in verbal interaction, and in particular the ability to achieve and maintain the floor to complete any interactional goal. Blum-Kulka (1997), looking at family dinner-time narratives in Israeli and American middle-class families, shows that in families, children are less likely to master the more complex kinds of interruptions and only manage to gain the floor if it is conceded to them by adults. Moreover, there is cultural variation in how interruptions of another's turn are interpreted, whether as involvement or as inappropriately taking the floor.

Ochs and Taylor (1995) documented children's understanding of the linguistic marking of status and power relationships within families in a different way. They focused on the participation structure of dinner-time storytelling among family members. In white middle-class American families, mothers and children share reports of trouble and fathers take the role of problematizer, often negatively evaluating other members'

actions. This participation structure, in which children share, helps to construct power differentials within the family.

One way in which the child becomes aware of the social order is that it is modeled for them by the adult caretakers around them. Their place in the social ordering can differ cross-culturally or with other social-cultural factors, such as social class, family size, and birth order. As we explore in the next section, the child's identity is not a social given, not merely an expression of the social world into which she or he is born; rather it is realized through the interactive use of language.

1.2   Personhood and self-identity: how children understand their own position in a social world

How the child gains a realization of who she or he is as a person within a social and cultural world is a critical part of child discourse inquiry. Language is used by the child actively to construct a social identity and a self-awareness that comes with the self-reflexiveness made possible through the grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic resources of language.

Shatz (1994), in a diary study of her own grandson, Ricky's, language development through the first three years of his life, describes how, in acquiring a language, the child becomes a social person. She comments:

> I argue that the toddler acquires in language a powerful tool for learning. By coupling language with self-reflectiveness and attention to internal states that have begun to manifest themselves, the toddler can learn in new ways about new things. She can get from others information not based on immediate experience, and she can compare her own experience of feelings and thoughts with statements of others about theirs. Thus, the world becomes many-faceted, beyond immediate experience and limited perspectives. (1994: 191)

One example describes Ricky's growing awareness of familial group membership. At age three, during a family gathering, he looked around the dinner table at everyone and said, "I think you call this a group" (Shatz 1994: 191). Statements like this one provide the child with a reflexive awareness of himself or herself as a person who is able to recognize the group and his or her own place within it. The child's growing ability to refer to his own mental states and those of others, to consider whether events are possible, and to contemplate non-immediate phenomena is assisted by a growing control over complex grammatical features like verb aspect and modality as well as use of complement verbs (Köymen and Kyratzis 2014). Shatz gives an example of Ricky's situationally embedded counterfactuals. He is able to say to his grandmother when he surprises her for a second morning without his pajamas, "You thought they was wet," as they had been the previous morning. Although this is a fairly simple utterance, Ricky's joke depended on his ability to recognize his grandmother's perspective as different from his own, and only a detailed discourse study would be able to capture such events and so account for the child's growing competence.

In a similar vein, Budwig (1990), looking at the development of agentive causality and the use of self-reference forms, points out that it is only by focusing on discursive

practice that the real range of children's usage can be appreciated. In a detailed study of six different children's developmentally changing uses of self-reference forms between two and three years of age, Budwig discovers a major difference in orientation between children who habitually use only first-person reference pronouns ("I") and those who in similar situations use two different forms, "I" and "me–my." These choices did not vary with age or gender but rather reflect what could be considered a personal difference in orientation to the world, as either experiencers/reflectors-on-reality or as actors-on-reality. The child's sense of herself or himself as a reflective person able to distinguish her or his own feelings and thoughts from others is illustrated by many of the chapters in Nelson's (1989) edited volume *Narratives from the Crib*. In this volume, researchers analyze the bedtime monologues of a two- to three-year-old child, Emily. They demonstrate how, through her night-time retellings of the day's events to herself, the little girl learns to come to terms with her feelings and her reactions to the events surrounding the arrival of her new baby brother. At the same time, she gains awareness of herself as a separate person within the nexus of her family. By examining how narratives become linguistically and pragmatically more complex, these studies provide a basis for the understanding of the relations between a growing narrative and linguistic skill and the development of the sense of personhood.

In the past 10 years, child discourse studies have focused not only on linguistic markers of self- or other-awareness, but also on multimodal displays of such awareness (e.g., children's differentiated action responses to different "looks" from caregivers in response to their sanctionable actions in a US daycare setting, Kidwell 2005). They have also looked at non-Western societies where children are socialized to learn through participating and keenly observing, often as non-addressed participants, in ongoing multiparty community activities (Rogoff 2003). For example, although Zinacantec Mayan infants are positioned as overhearers, being faced outward toward a third party and spoken for by adults, they nonetheless show their developing participant roles through various embodied means (de León 2012). Current research looks at the moment-to-moment processes by which children in a diversity of cultural settings enact participant roles of different kinds and influence trajectories of interaction through their actions and multimodal displays of affect and attention.

1.3   Talk and the morality of everyday life

As the growing child engages others within a complex set of relationships, issues of right and wrong arise. What actions mean to others, whether hurtful or supportive, and what others mean by their words and deeds, become the subject of both adult–child and peer exchanges. It is through such everyday conversations that children gain knowledge of the fabric of everyday morality, that is, of how the social world works. Talk about emotions, caring for others' feelings, recognizing your own feelings, and how to manage your body and self in socially appropriate ways all have culturally different and conventionally expected ways of expression. Such cultural differences in ways of talking about these matters range from formulaic expressions of regret for such minor infringements as bodily noises (Clancy 1986), through sanctions against overtly expressing annoyance (Briggs 1992; Scollon and Scollon 1981), through expressions of care showing concern for others and responsibility for younger siblings and other

children (as Schieffelin 1990 shows with the Kaluli), to children's use of respectful forms of address which show the obligations not only of caring for others (Nakamura 2001), but of paying respect across generations (Ochs 1988; Schieffelin 1990; Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo 1986).

1.3.1   *Rules and routines: moral practices in everyday social situations*

Child discourse studies focusing on moral socialization illustrate how morality is not a matter of learning to match behavior to abstract rules or principles, but rather "is embedded in and is an outcome of everyday family practices" (Ochs and Kremer-Sadlik 2007: 5**)** and awareness of the local possibilities for actions that follow in response to sequences of talk. That is, it is through situated action that the child becomes aware of the social ordering of relationships and grows to realize the obligations these entail (Wootton 1997). It is through participation in mundane communicative encounters that children become everyday moralists, who, by paying attention to the details of inter-actions and talk, hold others to the expected outcomes of what has been said.

Two large studies in the United States, one situated in Los Angeles and the other in Georgetown (see edited collections of resulting studies in Ochs and Kremer-Sadlik 2007, 2013; Tannen and Goodwin 2006), the former of these with satellite counterparts in Italy and Sweden, have focused on socialization in middle-class families in which both parents work. As noted in a review by Amy Paugh (2008), these studies illuminate "the process of socialization and how children acquire ideologies, values, and ways of being through everyday social interaction with working parents," specifically, how they acquire a "middle-class habitus with particular conceptions of work, achievement, independence, and autonomy" (2008: 105). These studies examine family interaction and the negotiation of morality in mundane everyday routines within working fami-lies such as getting children ready for bed, asking them to clean their rooms, driving them to church or school, and taking them on mundane family walks and excursions (Ochs and Kremer-Sadlik 2007). For example, Aronsson and Cekaite (2011), working in Sweden, document how families repeatedly engage in negotiating "activity contracts," which are "spoken agreements about future compliance that make children morally accountable for their future actions" (2011: 139). What is key in these negotiations and what enables them to constitute "modern childhood, marked by negotiations and self-regulation" (2011: 150), is how they are extended over time, providing a space for chil-dren to have agency, at points ratifying the end-goal and having to give accounts when they delay its execution.

This is evident in Wingard's (2006) study, which finds that parents' first mentions of homework after school in dual-earner families are strategically positioned and set the stage for later parent–child negotiations of homework and other evening family routines (2006: 592). This is also evident in Sterponi's (2003) data of Italian middle-class family mealtime conversations, in which children are requested by other family members to provide an account for behaviors indexed as sanctionable, thereby being "positioned as moral agents, responsible for their actions and at the same time they are solicited to enact their moral agency" (2003: 95).

In mundane family interactions, children can also be socialized to different orien-tations toward acquiring knowledge. For example, in a sequence in which a father

attempted to assist his daughter in doing her homework described by C. Goodwin (2007), the daughter consistently refused to align her body in a way which would allow the father to assist her. He eventually evaluated her behavior as not being "nice." However, when he returned later, the two co-constructed a very different "epistemic alignment" toward one another through their bodily positions and other multimodal means. Goodwin concludes that this sequence illustrates a "range of different kinds of epistemic, moral and affective stances" that are made possible through different forms of embodied participation frameworks, as well as how these stances and participation frameworks function as crucial sites "for the constitution of human action, cognition, and moral alignment" (2007: 53, 66). M. H. Goodwin (2007b) illustrates how a particular moral stance to knowledge acquisition, the enjoyable pursuit of knowledge, can be socialized through arranging "forms of participant frameworks and positive affect" that "invite extensive and joyful elaboration of meanings" (2007b: 107). These studies illustrate how "participants constitute themselves as particular kinds of social and moral actors in the midst of mundane activities" (C. Goodwin 2007: 53), with children playing an active role in contesting how participation in these activities should be organized.

Studies of how children acquire a middle-class- and American or Western European-based ethos toward household responsibility and knowledge acquisition can be contrasted with studies which have been conducted in other societies. Regarding the development of family responsibility, Ochs and Izquierdo (2009) find differences between the socialization of middle-class Los Angeles children and the socialization of children of the Matsigenka of the Peruvian Amazon and of Samoans living on the island of Upolu. For many middle-class Los Angeles children, "parents' inconsistent assignment and follow-through of children's practical activities is not conducive to children's habituation of self-reliance and awareness of and responsiveness to needs of others" (2009: 408). In contrast, "Samoan and Matsigenka children from infancy are apprenticed … into being self-reliant and helpful, to doing things at once on their own and cooperatively" (2009: 407). Regarding knowledge acquisition, Duranti and Ochs (1997) document how Samoan-American caregivers in California "may produce a syncretic blend [of US and traditional Western Samoan] teaching strategies" (1997: 31) as they coordinate homework with other household task activities. The Western Samoan teaching strategies are based on "repeated demonstration of an activity, prompting, and action imperatives" (1997: 13), while the American strategies are more child-centered.

To summarize, the studies in this section illustrate how participants' forms of attention and participation during mundane daily activities of family life and knowledge acquisition can enact particular forms of "ethos" (Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin 2012: 26) and constitute particular types of moral actors (C. Goodwin 2007), with displays of stance and emotion "constitut[ing] an inherent feature of temporally unfolding sequences of social interaction" (Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin 2012: 39) and with children playing an active role. These forms can be culture specific or even family specific. Moreover, as Baquedano-López and Mangual Figueroa (2012) remind us, and as the work of Duranti and Ochs (1997) and other researchers documents, these "socializing interactions" help constitute and "occurred in a larger, complex societal context" (Baquedano-López and Mangual Figueroa 2012: 542, 543), for example, "modern childhood" (Aronsson and Cekaite 2011) in a particular national and regional context, or growing up in a community influenced by specific migration processes.

1.3.2   *Expressing feelings and politeness*

A critical aspect of moral learning is emotional socialization. Children develop the capacity to recognize the consequences of actions for their own and others' feelings, and learn to express these feelings in an accepted form. Mothers' and other caretakers' expressions of love, joy, annoyance, displeasure, concern, and admonishment provide their children with moral insight into human relations and how these are encoded in a discourse of feeling (e.g., Clancy 1986).

In enacting family relationships during peer play, children reveal and often over-communicate mothers' or fathers' caring talk by scolding, shouting, cajoling, and other expressions of concern for the correct behavior of others. In this way, what Cook-Gumperz (1995) has called "the discourse of mothering" not only reproduces a version of the activity but enables the child to practice the situational enactment of relationships through talk. The process of acquisition here is somewhat similar to that illustrated in earlier grammar acquisition studies, namely an overgeneralization followed by a progressive refinement of patterns governing both grammar and a discourse of feeling (Ochs 1988; Duranti 1992; Kulick and Schieffelin 2004). Schieffelin (1990) goes further in her ethnographic study of the Kaluli children by showing how children are socialized into the performance of the relationship of talk in action, by making appropriate voicing and prosody to communicate concern. That is, as Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) argue, it is not only through the correct formulaic expressions and the appropriate lexical and syntactic forms that emotion is conveyed, but through correct performance in which children may learn to display an appropriate understanding or stance vis-à-vis their own and others' actions. Clancy (1986) for example, documents how young Japanese children are socialized to enact a culturally appropriate stance of solicitousness toward a guest's needs through mothers' expressions of fear, alarm, and urgency at the child's failure to meet such needs. In a similar vein, Heath (1983) in the Trackton study and Miller (1982) in south Baltimore have shown how many working-class mothers encourage their children to engage in challenging verbal routines, even with adults, which reveal their ability to be resilient in a difficult public world. These community-based displays of toughness can be problematic for children in the multi-community-based context of school and preschool (Corsaro and Rosier 1992). In teasing routines, child and adult enter into a mutual verbal sparring exchange. These are part of a cultural nexus of challenge that enables children to rehearse the skills deemed necessary by adults to show resilience to life's adversities (Eisenberg 1986; Miller 1982). Politeness strategies constitute an alternative to verbal challenges, and may be seen as a way to avoid offense and anticipate or deflect possible difficulties (Brown and Levinson 1987). And as Brown (1993) has shown in a traditional Highland Chiapas village, women in particular engage in complex strategies such as hedging and the use of indirectness markers to manage their relations with others, and these strategies become part of young women's talk.

Although family interactions have historically been viewed as the main site of children's emotion socialization, as language socialization research has shifted its focus to include language socialization processes in institutional settings (Garrett and Baquedano-Lopez 2002), child discourse studies have also shifted to focus on how children are socialized to appropriate moral conduct and affect displays in classrooms. These studies have tended to focus more than in the past on analyses of the multimodal

resources (e.g., prosody; visible, embodied displays; eye gaze) used by participants. As observed by Moore (2008) in her analysis of "video recordings of Qur'anic school interaction" by which "Fulbe children are socialized into Qur'anic orality and literacy" (2008: 643), positioning of the body was very important to, for example, "learning to show and feel submission to God's Word" (2008: 660). Burdelski (2010) studying preschool classrooms in Japan reported observing "politeness routines as embodied social action" (2010: 1606), for example, teachers providing tactile guidance and aligning children's bodies so that they would make offers and bow to one another in grateful acceptance. These displays were "important means through which children were taught to display kindness, empathy, and other-oriented behaviors" (2010: 1606).

Cekaite (2012) followed the socializing interactions between teachers and a cultural "novice" (a Somali student) in a Swedish first-grade classroom as the student was engaged in literacy and math tasks. The student's embodied affective stances of non-compliance/resistance, as well as the teachers' (and peers') interpretations, were all "consequential for the emergence of her 'bad subject', that is, her socioculturally problematic identity" (2012: 641) and were framed against a "backdrop" of "wider sociocultural ideologies, linking feeling norms to the moral work ethic" (2012: 654). In a study of very young children (toddlers aged 26–34 months) enrolled in daycare centers in California (Kyratzis 2009), children were socialized to "use your words," being prompted with statements such as "are you saying you don't like that?" so that peers could be made aware/respectful of their feelings. Children appropriated these caregiver-modeled statements of feeling (e.g., "I say I don't want him do it"), but sometimes in ways that expressed negative stances toward their peers (Köymen and Kyratzis 2014), thereby subverting the school ideology. Johnson (2014), in her study of children's corrections in a peer collaborative reading activity in a kindergarten classroom, similarly showed how children mobilize peer-based forms of social control and affect display to organize their own "learning environments" in classrooms.

These studies illustrate how children are socialized to culturally appropriate embodied affect displays in families and classrooms, and also the agency with which children take up and sometimes subvert the adult-modeled stance displays.

1.3.3   Narrative accounts as everyday morality: narrative form and topic inclusion

One of the key discourse domains in which everyday morality is most apparent are personal narratives used to justify actions, to recall past events, or to express opinions about others. Blum-Kulka (1997), in comparing family dinner-table talk, found that Israeli and American middle-class families differed in the extent to which they allowed the child to be the focus of the storytelling attention, and the extent to which parents stressed that "tall tales" or exaggerations were inappropriate. In contrast, working-class families, such as the Trackton African American working-class community that Heath (1983) studied, and the white working-class families studied by Miller (1982), valued exaggerations as a display of linguistic competence (smart talk). It is just such mismatches in the expectations about discourse practices between the home and mainstream school community that can be a source of difficulty for young children (Michaels 1991).

As Gee (1985) and Michaels (1986), among others, have shown, adults take up topics that children offer in conversation and use these to guide children toward telling stories that display a literate standard, having a beginning, a middle of complicating actions, and a highlighted ending. Discourse analysis focuses on the ways in which children give narrative sequencing to events, provide coherence to the actions in the story, and are able to attribute motives to themselves and others, as well as provide an emotional evaluation. In this way, recent study of narratives, building on Heath's (1983) original point in "Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms," shows that narratives become not only a means of developing a literate sense of story, but also a means of knowing how to express feelings and thoughts in culturally acceptable ways. In this way, narrative experiences help to develop a moral sensibility about the consequences of actions for both the self and others.

In the past 10 years, narrative research using the language socialization paradigm has expanded to focus on children growing up in transnational and postcolonial settings and also to include institutional settings (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002). For example, Fader (2001) documents how literacy practices both at home and in segregated Hasidic girls' and boys' schools in a Hasidic community in Brooklyn reinforce "gender differences at the same time that they strengthen communal borders, which separate Hasidim from other Jews and gentiles" (2001: 278). Boys "entering the first grade spend the entire day acquiring literacy in liturgical Hebrew and Yiddish and studying religious texts, all in Yiddish" (2001: 267). Girls on the other hand, study both Yiddish and English literacy in first grade and beyond; loss of Yiddish competency is viewed as more acceptable for girls, as part of their being socialized to "women's domain of responsibility," that is, "creating a home environment to support their husbands' and sons' Torah study" (2001: 266) and dealing with the local Brooklyn community (266). Baquedano-López (1997) documents how identities were socialized through narrative practices during two *doctrina* (religion) and catechism classes at a Catholic parish in Los Angeles which was moving toward English-only instruction and toward eliminating its *doctrina* classes. Baquedano-López observed that the teacher of the Spanish-medium *doctrina* class engaged in various forms of tense-aspect marking and collaborative narration practices with her students that "interactionally reaffirm[ed] membership in a particular Latino community" (1997: 43). In the English-medium catechism class, the teacher engaged in practices "where the opportunities to create a collective identity as Mexican are limited and where homogenizing and generic discourses pervade" (1997: 42). These studies document how narrative and literacy practices involving children can be both "embedded in and constitutive of larger social conditions" (Ochs and Schieffelin 2012: 17**)**.

2   Child–Child Discourse

2.1   *The language of children as peers*

As noted, Child Discourse (Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan 1977) along with Developmental Pragmatics (Ochs and Schieffelin 1979) began a new movement in child

language research, one of looking at situationally embedded activities organized by children themselves as the domain of child language studies and studies of the acquisition of communicative competence. Several studies noted the ingenuity of children in making use of repetition, sound play, and other aspects of "attuned poetic performance" (Cekaite *et al*. 2014: 7; de León 2007; Garvey 1977) in their play and games. However, as described by Schieffelin and Ochs (1996), in addition to looking at "children's skill to use language," the research began to focus on "relating children's knowledge and performance to the social and cultural structures …, and ideologies that give meaning and identity to a community" (1996: 252), in this case, to children's "own peer- [or sibling-kin] group communities" (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012: 381). Several influential *ethnographic* studies of children's peer group interactions (e.g., Corsaro 1985; Eckert 1987; Eder 1995; Goodwin 1980, 1990, 2006; Rampton 1995; Thorne 1993) began to be conducted in this vein and illustrated how groups of children and teens in neighborhoods, school yards, and classrooms used social practices within such genres as arguments, songs, rhymes, pretend play, gossip stories, teasing, ritual abuse, jokes, and riddles, and also sanctioning of one another (Goodwin 2006: 22–3; Opie and Opie 1959), to negotiate belonging, inclusion, shared norms and meaning, and social hierarchy within the peer group. Many additional ethnographic studies followed, especially from the 1990s onward.

Many studies of older children, middle school-aged and beyond, have looked at disputes, teasing, and gossip events among peers, as these provide a means for children to negotiate alignments and hierarchy within the peer group. Younger children use pretend play and song games as venues to negotiate inclusion and peer group hierarchy. Studies of childrens' and teens' disputes, teasing, gossip stories, song games, and pretend play have been reviewed recently in two large literature reviews (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012, 2014), to which the reader is referred. However, we present a review of a small number of these studies here, and then draw some conclusions about what recent child discourse research tells us about how children participate in the negotiation of norms and moral order across both adult–child and child–child interactions.

2.2 Peer moral talk: how norms of the peer group are co-constructed through gossip, teasing, pretend play, and conflict talk

2.2.1 Disputes, teasing, and gossip events among older peers

As children negotiate how they stand in relationship to one another during peer disputes, teasing, and gossip events, they make assessments (Goodwin 2007a; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987) and "take up either common or divergent stances toward the target" (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012: 366). Through doing so, they "reference the peer group's notion of culturally appropriate moral behavior" (Goodwin 2007a; Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012: 367; Goodwin and Kyratzis 2014). As Marjorie Goodwin has shown in the *He-Said-She-Said* accounts of children's peer group talk (1990), members of friendship groups rely on the gossip chain to convey disapproval of others' actions. She shows how ritualized routines become a uniquely effective way for one girl's discontent with

the actions of another to involve the entire group in repeating or denying their partici-pation in the gossip chain.

Through conflict and gossip talk, peers consolidate the views of the group (Eckert 1993: 40). Eckert's (1993) study, "Cooperative Competition in Adolescent 'Girl Talk'," based on her two-and-a-half-year ethnography, documented how, in order to position themselves as having "done well" (1993: 37) in the competitive heterosexual market-place, high-school girls portrayed themselves as having boyfriends, a social network, and "information sources" (1993: 40), as well as skill in building group consensus. In her ethnographic study following cohorts of children from fifth through seventh grades in California elementary schools, Eckert (2011) found that girls who were members of "the [popular] crowd" differentiated themselves through engaging in "flamboyant perfor-mances" (91) and *negotiations* of pairings. "Through constant discussion, negotiation, evaluation, and display, the crowd members maintain control of the whole range of norms that others can only have indirect access to" (2011: 90).

Those peer group members who construct versions of events to which the peer group ascribes are positioned more highly in the local peer group hierarchy (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012, 2014). Evaldsson (2002) observed that, among a multi-ethnic peer group of boys in Sweden, those in the peer group who, during gossip events, displayed "pro-ficiency in repeatedly (a) depicting the deviant character of others and (b) soliciting audience support" (219), as through making ascriptions of other boys as having cried or acted cowardly (see also Goodwin 1990), legitimated their power over other boys. Boys' caricatures of other boys allow group members to differentiate themselves and "manage those aspects of 'heterosexual attraction' and 'desire' that, from their per-spectives, need to be negotiated in order to successfully appear mature" (Korobov and Bamberg 2004: 486).

Displaying claims to goods and knowledge and opposing others' claims to these plays a role in negotiating the peer group's social organization. In an adolescent friend-ship group of nerd girls, displays of intelligence were central to the negotiation of iden-tity, and therefore members' claims to knowledge were often disputed (Bucholtz 2011). Lunchtime discussions among a popular clique of girls at a progressive American ele-mentary school frequently provided opportunities for group members to "differentiate themselves in terms of their access to activities and privileges of the upper middle class" (Goodwin 2006: 172). Girls in inner-city Naples in an ethnographic study conducted by Loyd (2012) engaged in rhetorical practices of *appiccecarse* (argumentation) to dis-play "bravata," that is, "courage, boldness, and intimidation" (2012: 333) and also to "influence others' behaviors and attitudes and establish a social hierarchy" (2012: 333). One, among many, criteria that the girls used to evaluate one another was in terms of being desirable to boys and not acting like them. However, children in the "Quartieri Spagnoli" setting followed by Loyd, as well as in many other transnational and post-colonial settings in studies reviewed by Goodwin and Kyratzis (2007, 2012, 2014), could draw upon *multiple* identity categories, for example "of race, language, social class" (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2014: 522) for differentiating participants, and did not limit themselves to exploiting only gender categories.

Teasing is another genre of competitive interaction that can be used to negotiate peer group hierarchies and norms. Teasing can be differentiated from another prac-tice that occurs within peer group gossip activity, ridicule (Eder 1995; Evaldsson 2007; Goodwin 2006). In teasing and other forms of "playful jabbing" (Loyd 2012: 330) and

verbal competition, a criticism, threat, or insult is delivered to the addressee but in a relatively safe venue that blurs the boundary between realis and irrealis and allows tensions to be expressed and managed within the group (Eder 1993, 1995; Rampton 1995; Loyd 2012; Reynolds 2007; Tetreault 2009). In US girls' peer groups, teasing can be a way of managing jealousy and bringing out differences about sensitive topics in the peer group short of direct confrontation (Eder 1991, 1993, 1995**)**. Teasing can draw upon stereotypes (e.g., of race and gender) to differentiate participants. Reynolds (2007) following the practices of "chingarse," or teasing of a sibling-kin network of boys in a Kaqchikel–Spanish bilingual Mayan community in Guatemala observed the boys drawing upon such stereotypes as they format tied (Goodwin 1990) to one another's uses of a "cheeky greeting" that they had coined from a military salute and the greeting "Buenos días" for use as an improvised insult. Teasing and other playful genres of verbal competition demonstrate speakers' verbal skill and establish the group's social organization (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012, 2014; Kyratzis 2004). They provide a relatively safe space for children and teens to work out tensions between "circulating discourses" of citizenship and responsibilities to peers, family, and community (Reynolds 2013: 515).

2.2.2   *Pretend play in young children*

Those interested in how *younger* children negotiate norms and hierarchy of the peer group have focused on studies of pretend play, song games (Minks 2013), and other genres. There are several dimensions of pretend play that provide children with resources for negotiating social and moral order within the peer group (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2007, 2012, 2014). First, assignment to membership categories (Sacks 1995) oriented to in play (e.g., roles within a family or newsreporter team) can be used as a basis for determining who is in or out of the play (Butler and Weatherall 2006; Kyratzis 2007) or whose entry can be postponed (Evaldsson and Tellgren 2009; Sheldon 1996). Moreover, there is hierarchy in pretend play roles; hence "negotiating who is to be included in the most valued roles is an important feature of social organization" (Goodwin 1990: 133). Third, there are characteristic ways of speaking and voicing associated with different roles which can differentiate participants. Directives may be a primary feature that children attend to in negotiating hierarchy through pretend play (Goodwin 1990; see also Corsaro 1985; Ervin-Tripp 1982, 1996; Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan 1977). Mothers can be portrayed as speaking with bald directives, and older children and those projecting a leadership role can be observed taking on (or being allocated) this role and using those forms (Goodwin 1990, Griswold 2007; Kyratzis 2007; Kyratzis, Mark, and Wade 2001). In addition to directive forms, there are other features that mark relative positions among roles. In register and role-play, "the father and doctor display their authority with *well* as a marker of being in charge, as well as technical vocabulary" (Ervin-Tripp 1996: 34). Newsreporters, fathers, and doctors are portrayed as highly authoritative through discourse markers and claims to having the right to change a scene or topic or deliver bad news, as in a child drawing on newsreporter register and saying "Well, that's the end of our news for today" to curtail a peer's turn as newsreporter (Kyratzis 2007; see also Andersen 1990; Ervin-Tripp 1996; and Hoyle 1998; see also chapters in Cekaite *et al*. 2014).

In addition to providing resources for negotiating power asymmetries, pretend play provides children with resources for making commentary on the adult world (Kyratzis 2004, 2007), enabling children to not only reproduce adult culture but interpret (Corsaro and Rosier 1992) and even challenge and change it through language practices within the peer group (for a review of several studies, see Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012, 2014). For example, as they explore powerful adult roles, privileged to speak with particular markers of authority, children give their renditions of which characters or social categories (e.g., male or female, child or parent) can claim the right to use those forms (de León 2007; Kyratzis 2004, 2007, 2010; Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan 1977; Paugh 2012; Schieffelin 2003). This extends to children negotiating claims to displays of affect in the course of their exploration of adult roles (e.g., parent, mother, father, child) or gender roles in pretend play (Aronsson and Thorell 1999; Cook-Gumperz 1995, 2001; Cook-Gumperz and Szymanski 2001; Kyratzis 2001, 2007; Kyratzis and Guo 2001; Nakamura 2001). In multilingual communities, children can draw (or subvert existing) domain or role associations in their play for the languages or sets of language resources which are in contact in their communities (Paugh 2005, 2012; Schieffelin 2003). As they do so, they can either reproduce or transform dominant societal discourses (e.g., Kyratzis 2010; Kyratzis, Reynolds, and Evaldsson 2010; García-Sánchez 2010; Minks 2013; Paugh 2012; Schieffelin 2003; for reviews of studies on this topic, see Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012, 2014).

In the past 10 years, child peer discourse research has focused more than ever before on children's and teens' use of genres of verbal competition, humor, and pretend play in transnational and postcolonial settings (e.g., Evaldsson and Cekaite 2010; García-Sánchez 2010; Kyratzis 2010; Kyratzis, Reynolds, and Evaldsson 2010; Minks 2013; Paugh 2012; Schieffelin 2003; Rampton 1995; Tarım and Kyratzis 2012; Zentella 1997; see Kyratzis 2004; Goodwin and Kyratzis 2007, 2012, 2014 for prior reviews). Reviewing several studies in this area, Goodwin and Kyratzis (2014) conclude that through these practices, "children and teens in everyday peer and sibling-kin group interactions play with and lay claim to social spaces, discourses, and subjectivities in ways that alternatively resist and reproduce dominant discourses that marginalize their local communities (e.g., diaspora communities in transnational societies, indigenous communities in postcolonial societies)" (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2014: 521).

3   Conclusion

Ten years ago, we concluded our review of child discourse studies for the previous edition of the *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* by characterizing the state of the field as follows:

> As we have shown in the trajectory of themes of the chapter, increasingly, children get a sense of themselves in a wider social world … Developmentally, children move from having to fit into the family discourse space and participant roles and identities as adults construct them in pragmatics of family life, then begin to make a space for reflecting and thinking about social worlds in personhood, and then later begin to organize others as well as themselves, in terms of social organization and morality, in peer talk … In other words, our purpose has been to show how the field of child

discourse studies has shifted focus onto children as active constructors of their world within the domains of adult–child and peer discourse (606).

In the past 10 years, the following themes have been added to the research. First, while the influence of language socialization could be seen at that time in the researchers' focus on children's lives in a sociocultural context**,** in the past 10 years or so, the field of language socialization studies, and with it child discourse studies, have both broadened to examine "language socialization processes as they unfold in institutional contexts and in a wide variety of linguistically and culturally heterogeneous settings" (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002: 339). Second, with the rising interest in Conversation Analysis in the past 15 years or so, the examination of child discourse has become refocused somewhat to look at longer trajectories of action, for example, directive–response sequences (Goodwin and Cekaite 2013), and in so doing, to attribute greater agency to children. Child discourse studies now look at how a place is made for children to exert agency as through activity contracts (e.g., Aronsson and Cekaite 2011), at how multimodal and embodied *displays* of affect and attention in the moment, including those of the children themselves, become occasioned during (and themselves influence) unfolding sequences of adult–child interaction (e.g., C. Goodwin 2007; Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin 2012), as well as at how these displays become part of the changing, unfolding, emerging sociocultural contexts that embed the children's interactions in families as well as in classrooms. Thirdly, child discourse studies had come to focus on sociolinguistic practices and on speech events that were meaningful from children's own point of view, such as peer gossip, teasing, and pretend play routines, exploring children's developing competence in their own peer world. In the past 10 years or so, there has been a proliferation of studies of children socializing children, many of these in culturally and linguistically heterogeneous settings resulting from transnational movements and postcolonial societal changes (e.g., see Goodwin and Kyratzis 2007, 2012, 2014 for prior reviews). These studies illustrate how children negotiate a broad range of identity categories, "including but not limited to gender, ethnicity, language, social class, age, and friendship" (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2014: 522) as they act to "position one another in the local social group" (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012: 367). In these interactions, children's peer communicative practices have been found to have potential to reproduce adult culture but to also "reshape social and political formations" (Minks 2013: 180; see also Paugh 2012; Kyratzis 2010; Kyratzis, Reynolds, and Evaldsson 2010; Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012, 2014; Schieffelin 2003). In all these ways, modern-day studies of child discourse attribute still greater agency to children.

REFERENCES

Andersen, E. S. 1990. *Speaking with Style: The Sociolinguistic Skills of Children.* London: Routledge.

Aronsson, K. and A. Cekaite. 2011. Activity contracts and directives in everyday family politics. *Discourse & Society*, 22(2), 137–54.

Aronsson, K. and M. Thorell. 1999. Family politics in children's play directives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 25–47.

Baquedano-López, P. 1997. Creating social identities through doctrina narratives. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 27–45.

Baquedano-López, P. and Mangual Figueroa, A. 2012. Language socialization and immigration. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, and B. B. Schieffelin, eds., *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 536–63.

Blum-Kulka, S. 1997. *Dinner Talk: Cultural Patterns of Sociality and Socialization in Family Discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Briggs, J. 1992. Mazes of meaning: how a child and a culture create each other. In W. Corsaro and P. J. Miller, eds., *Interpretive Approaches to Children's Socializatio*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 25–50.

Brown, P. 1993. Gender, politeness and confrontation in Tenjapa. In D. Tannen, ed., *Gender and Interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 144–55.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bucholtz, M. 2011. *White Kids: Language, Race, and Styles of Youth Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Budwig, N. 1990. The linguistic marking of agentivity and control in child language. *Journal of Child Language*, 16, 263–84.

Burdelski, M. 2010. Socializing politeness routines: action, other-orientation, and embodiment in a Japanese preschool. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(6), 1606–21.

Butler, C. and A. Weatherall. 2006. "No, we're not playing families": membership categorization in children's play. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 39(4), 441–70.

Cekaite, A. 2010. Shepherding the child: embodied directive sequences in parent–child interactions. *Text & Talk*, 30(1), 1–25.

Cekaite, A. 2012. Affective stances in teacher–novice student interactions: language, embodiment, and willingness to learn in a Swedish primary classroom. *Language in Society*, 41, 641–70.

Cekaite, A., S. Blum-Kulka, V. Grøver, and E. Teubal, eds. 2014. *Children's Peer Talk: Learning from Each Other.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clancy, P. 1986. The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin and E. Ochs, eds., *Language Socialization across Cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 213–50.

Cook-Gumperz, J. 1995. Reproducing the discourse of mothering: how gendered talk makes gendered lives. In K. Hall and M. Bucholtz, eds., *Gender Articulated*. London and Boston: Routledge, pp. 401–20.

Cook-Gumperz, J. 2001. The interactional accomplishment of gender and girls' oppositional stances: young children between nursery school and family life. In B. Baron and H. Kothoff, eds., *Gender in Interaction*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cook-Gumperz, J., W. Corsaro, and J. Streeck. 1986. *Children's Worlds, Children's Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cook-Gumperz, J. and J. Gumperz. 1976. Context in children's talk. In N. Waterson and C. Snow, eds., *The Development of Children's Language*. London and New York: John Wiley, pp. 3–25.

Cook-Gumperz, J. and M. Szymanski. 2001. Classroom "families": cooperating or competing – girls' and boys' interactional styles in a bilingual classroom. In A. Kyratzis, ed., *Gender Construction in Children's Interactions: A Cultural Perspective* (special issue), *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 34(1), 107–29.

Corsaro, W. A. 1985. *Friendship and Peer Culture in the Early Years*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Corsaro, W. A. and K. B. Rosier. 1992. Documenting productive–reproductive processes in children's lives: transition narratives of a black family living in poverty. In W. A. Corsaro and P. J. Miller, eds., *Interpretive Approaches to Children's Socialization: New Directions for Child Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 67–91.

de León, L. 2007. Parallelism, metalinguistic play, and the interactive emergence of Zinacantec Mayan siblings' culture. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4): 405–36.

de León, L. 2012. Language socialization and multiparty participation frameworks. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, and B. Schieffelin, eds., *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 81–111.

Duranti, A. 1992. Language in context and language as context: the Samoan respect vocabulary. In C. Goodwin and A. Duranti, eds., *Rethinking Context*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 77–100.

Duranti, A. and E. Ochs. 1997. Syncretic literacy in a Samoan American family. In L. B. Resnick, R. Säljö, C. Pontecorvo, and B. Burge, eds., *Discourse, Tools, and Reasoning: Essays on Situated Cognition*. Berlin: Springer, pp. 169–202.

Duranti, A., E. Ochs, and B. B. Schieffelin, eds. 2012. *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Eckert, P. 1987. *Jocks and Burnouts: Social Categories and Identity in the High School.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Eckert, P. 1993. Cooperative competition in adolescent "girl talk." In D. Tannen, ed., *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 32–61.

Eckert, P. 2011. Language and power in the preadolescent heterosexual market. *American Speech*, 86(1), 85–97.

Eder, D. 1991. The role of teasing in adolescent peer group culture. In S. A. Cahill, ed., *Sociological Studies of Child Development, vol. 4.* London: JAI Press, pp. 181– 97.

Eder, D. 1993. "Go get ya a French!" Romantic and sexual teasing among adolescent girls. In D. Tannen, ed., *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 17–30.

Eder, D. 1995. *School Talk: Gender and Adolescent Culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Eisenberg, A. 1986. Teasing: verbal play in two Mexicano homes. In B. Schieffelin and E. Ochs, eds., *Language Socialization across Cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 182–98.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. 1976. Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society*, 5, 25–66.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. 1977. Wait for me roller skate! In S. Ervin-Tripp and C. Mitchell-Kernan, eds., *Child Discourse*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 165–88.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. 1982. Ask and it shall be given you: children's requests. In H. Byrnes, ed., *Georgetown Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University, pp. 232–45.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. 1996. Context in language. In D. I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, and J. Guo, eds., *Social Interaction, Social Context, and Language: Essays in Honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 21–36.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M., J. Guo, and M. Lampert. 1990. Politeness and persuasion in children's control acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 195–219, 307–32.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. and C. Mitchell-Kernan. 1977. *Child Discourse*. New York: Academic Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M., C. O'Connor, and J. Rosenberg. 1984. Language and power in the family. In C. Kramarae, M. Shulz, and W. M. O'Barr, eds., *Language and Power*. Belmont, CA: Sage, pp. 116–35.

Evaldsson, A.-C. 2002. Boys' gossip telling: staging identities and indexing (unacceptable) masculine behavior. *Text*, 22(2), 199–225.

Evaldsson, A.-C. 2007. Accounting for friendship: moral ordering and category membership in preadolescent girls' relational talk. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 377–404.

Evaldsson, A.-C. and A. Cekaite. 2010. Subverting and reproducing institutionalized norms for language use in multilingual peer groups. *Pragmatics*, 20(4), 587–605.

Evaldsson, A.-C. and B. Tellgren. 2009. "Don't enter – it's dangerous": negotiations for power and exclusion in preschool girls' play interactions. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 26(2), 9–19.

Fader, A. 2001. Literacy, bilingualism, and gender in a Hasidic community. *Linguistics and Education*, 12(3), 261–83.

García-Sánchez, I. 2010. Serious games: code-switching and gendered identities in Moroccan immigrant girls' pretend play. *Pragmatics*, 20(4), 523–55.

Garrett, P. B. and P. Baquedano-López. 2002. Language socialization: reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–61.

Garvey, C. 1977. Play with language and speech. In S. M. Ervin-Tripp and C. Mitchell-Kernan, eds., *Child Discourse*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 27–47.

Gee, J. P. 1985. The narrativization of experience in the oral style. *Journal of Education*, 167, 9–35.

Gleason, J. B. 1988. Language and socialization. In F. S. Kessel, ed., *The Development of Language and Language Researchers: Essays in Honor of Roger Brown*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 205–15.

Goodwin, C. 2007. Participation, stance, and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 53–73.

Goodwin, C. and M. H. Goodwin. 1987. Concurrent operations on talk: notes on the interactive organization of assessments. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics*, 1(1), 1–52.

Goodwin, M. H. 1980. Directive/response speech sequences in girls' and boys' talk activities. In S. McConnell-Ginet, R. Borker, and N. Furman, eds., *Women and Language in Literature and Society*. New York: Praeger, pp. 157–73.

Goodwin, M. H. 1990. *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organization among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Goodwin, M. H. 2006. *The Hidden Life of Girls: Games of Stance, Status, and Exclusion*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Goodwin, M. H. 2007a. Participation and embodied action in preadolescent girls' assessment activity. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 353–76.

Goodwin, M. H. 2007b. Occasioned knowledge exploration in family interaction. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 93–110.

Goodwin, M. H. and A. Cekaite. 2013. Calibration in directive/response sequences in family interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46, 122–38.

Goodwin, M. H., A. Cekaite, and C. Goodwin. 2012. Emotion as stance. In A. Peräkylä and M.-L. Sorjonen, eds., *Emotion in Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 16–63.

Goodwin, M. H. and A. Kyratzis. 2007. Introduction. In *Children Socializing Children: Practices for Negotiating the Social and Moral Order among Peers* (special issue), *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 279–89.

Goodwin, M. H. and A. Kyratzis. 2012. Peer language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, and B. Schieffelin, eds., *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 391–419.

Goodwin, M. H. and A. Kyratzis. 2014. Language and gender in peer interactions among children and youth. In S. Ehrlich, M. Meyerhoff, and J. Holmes, eds., *The Handbook of Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 509–28.

Griswold, O. 2007. Achieving authority: discursive practices in Russian girls' pretend play. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 291–319.

Heath, S. B. 1983. *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoyle, S. M. 1998. Register and footing in role play. In S. M. Hoyle and C. T. Adger, eds., *Kids Talk: Strategic Language Use in Later Childhood*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 47–66.

Hymes, D. 1962. The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin and W. Sturtevant, eds., *Anthropology and Human Behavior*. Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington, pp. 15–53.

Johnson, S. J. 2014. Multimodality and footing in peer correction in reading picture books. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Kidwell, M. 2005. Gaze as social control: how very young children differentiate "the look" from a "mere look" by their adult caregivers. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38(4), 417–49.

Korobov, N. and M. Bamberg. 2004. Positioning a "mature" self in interactive practices: how adolescent males negotiate "physical attraction" in group talk. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 22, 471–92.

Köymen, B. and A. Kyratzis. 2014. Dialogic syntax and complement constructions in toddlers' peer interactions. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 25(3), 497–521.

Kulick, D. and B. B. Schieffelin. 2004. Language socialization. In A. Duranti, ed., *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 349–68.

Kyratzis, A. 2001. Emotion talk in preschool same-sex friendship groups: fluidity over time and context. *Early Education and Development*, 12, 359–91.

Kyratzis, A. 2004. Talk and interaction among children and the co-construction of peer groups and peer culture. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 33, 625–49.

Kyratzis, A. 2007. Using the social organizational affordances of pretend play in American preschool girls' interactions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 321–52.

Kyratzis, A. 2009. "He take one of my tools!" vs. "I'm building": transitivity and the grammar of accusing, commanding, and perspective-sharing in toddlers' peer disputes. In J. Guo, E. Lieven, N. Budwig, S. M. Ervin-Tripp, K. Nakamura, and S. Ozcaliskan, eds., *Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Study of Language: Research in the Tradition of Dan Isaac Slobin*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 41–54.

Kyratzis, A. 2010. Latina girls' peer play interactions in a bilingual Spanish–English US preschool: heteroglossia, frame-shifting, and language ideology. *Pragmatics*, 20(4), 557–86.

Kyratzis, A. and J. Guo. 2001. Preschool girls' and boys' verbal conflict strategies in the US and China: cross-cultural and contextual considerations. *Gender Construction in Children's Interactions: A Cultural Perspective (special issue), Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 34, 45–74.

Kyratzis, A., T. Marx, and E. R. Wade. 2001. Preschoolers' communicative competence: register shift in the marking of power in different contexts of friendship group talk. *First Language*, 21, 387–433.

Kyratzis, A., J. Reynolds, and A.-C. Evaldsson. 2010. Introduction: heteroglossia and language ideologies in children's peer play interactions. *Pragmatics*, 20(4), 457–66.

Loyd, H. 2012. The logic of conflict: practices of social control among inner city Neapolitan girls. In S. Danby and M. Theobald, eds., *Disputes in Everyday Life: Social and Moral Orders of Children and Young People*. Bingley: Emerald Group, pp. 325–53.

McTear, M. 1985. The development of coherent dialogue. Conversational processes: turn-taking. In *Children's Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 164–83.

Michaels, S. 1986. Narrative presentations: an oral preparation for literacy. In J. Cook-Gumperz, ed., *The Social Construction of Literacy*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 303–52.

Michaels, S. 1991. Dismantling of narrative. In A. McCabe and C. Peterson, eds., *Developing Narrative Structure*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 303–52.

Miller, P. J. 1982. *Amy, Wendy, and Beth: Learning Language in South Baltimore*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Minks, A. 2013. *Voices of Play: Miskitu Children's Speech and Song on the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Mitchell-Kernan, C. and K. Kernan. 1977. Pragmatics of directive choice among children. In S. Ervin-Tripp and C. Mitchell-Kernan, eds., *Child Discourse*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 189–209.

Moore, L. C. 2008. Body, text, and talk in Maroua Fulbe Qur'anic schooling. *Text & Talk*, 28(5), 643–65.

Nakamura, K. 2001. Gender and language in Japanese preschool children. In A. Kyratzis, ed., *Gender Construction in Children's Interactions: A Cultural Perspective* (special issue), *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 34(1), 15–43.

Nelson, K., ed. 1989. *Narratives from the Crib*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ochs, E. 1988. *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. and C. Izquierido. 2009. Responsibility in childhood: three developmental trajectories. *Ethos*, 37(4), 391–413.

Ochs, E. and T. Kremer-Sadlik. 2007. Introduction: morality as family practice. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 5–10.

Ochs, E. and T. Kremer-Sadlik, eds. 2013. *Fast Forward Family: Home, Work, and Relationships in Middle-Class America*. University of California Press.

Ochs, E. and B. B. Schieffelin. 1979. *Developmental Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.

Ochs, E. and B. B. Schieffelin. 1984. Three developmental stories. In R. Shweder and R. Levine, eds., *Culture Theory: Essays in Mind, Self, and Emotion*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 276–320.

Ochs, E. and B. B. Schieffelin. 2012. The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, and B. B. Schieffelin, eds., *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 1–22.

Ochs, E. and C. Taylor. 1995. The "father knows best" dynamic in dinnertime narratives. In K. Hall and M. Bucholtz, eds., *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*. London: Routledge, pp. 97–120.

Opie, I. and P. Opie. 1959. *The Lore and Language of Schoolchildren*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Paugh, A. 2005. Multilingual play: children's code-switching, role play,

and agency in Dominica, West Indies. *Language in Society*, 34(1), 63–86.

Paugh, A. L. 2008. Language socialization in working families. In P. Duff and N. Hornberger, eds., *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, vol. 8: Language Socialization*. New York: Springer, pp. 101–13.

Paugh, A. L. 2012. *Playing with Languages: Children and Change in a Caribbean Village*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Rampton, B. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.

Reynolds, J. F. 2007 "Buenos días/ ((military salute))": the natural history of a coined insult. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 437–65.

Reynolds, J. F. 2013. Refracting articulations of citizenship, delincuencia and vigilantism in boys' sociodramatic play in postwar Guatemala. *Language & Communication*, 33(4), 515–31.

Rogoff, B. 2003. *The Cultural Nature of Human Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sacks, H. 1995. On some formal properties of children's games. In G. Jefferson, ed., *Lectures on Conversation, vol. 1*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 489–506.

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

Schieffelin, B. B. 1990. *The Give and Take of Everyday Life: Language Socialization of Kaluli Children*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, B. B. 2003. Language and place in children's worlds. *Texas Linguistics Forum (SALSA)*, 45, 152–66.

Schieffelin, B. B. and E. Ochs, eds. 1986. *Language Socialization across Cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, B. B. and E. Ochs. 1996. The microgenesis of competence: methodology in language socialization. In D. I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, and J. Guo, eds., *Social Interaction, Social Context and Language: Essays in Honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 251–64.

Scollon, R. and S. W. Scollon. 1981. *Narrative, Literacy and Face*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Shatz, M. 1994. *A Toddler's Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sheldon, A. 1996. You can be the baby brother but you aren't born yet: Preschool girls' negotiation for power and access in pretend play. *Research on Language and Social interaction*, 29(1), 57–80.

Sterponi, L. 2003. Account episodes in family discourse: the making of morality in everyday interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 5(1), 79–100.

Tannen, D. and M. H. Goodwin. 2006. Introduction. In *Discourse in Action: Family Values in Family Interaction* (special issue), *Text & Talk*, 26 (4–5).

Tarım, S. D. and A. Kyratzis. 2012. Challenging and orienting to monolingual school norms in Turkish American children's peer disputes and classroom negotiations at a US Turkish Saturday school. In S. Danby and M. Theobald, eds., *Disputes in Everyday Life: Social and Moral Orders of Children and Young People*. Bingley: Emerald Group, pp. 193–220.

Tetreault, C. 2009. Cité teens entextualizing French TV host register: crossing, voicing, and participation frameworks. *Language in Society*, 38(2), 201–31.

Thorne, B. 1993. *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. and D. Gegeo. 1986. The social world of Kwara'rae children: acquisition of language and values. In J. Cook-Gumperz, W. Corsaro, and J. Streeck, eds., *Children's*

Worlds and Children's Language. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 109–20.

Watts, R. J. 1991. *Power in Family Discourse*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wingard, L. 2006. Parents' inquiries about homework: the first mention. *Text & Talk*, 26, 573–96.

Wootton, A. 1997. *Interaction and the Development of Mind: A Study of Children's Conversation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zentella, A. C. 1997. *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Oxford: Blackwell.