



Swansea University
Prifysgol Abertawe



Swansea University E-Theses

Children's co-construction of context: Prosocial and antisocial behaviour revisited.

Bateman, Amanda

How to cite:

Bateman, Amanda (2010) *Children's co-construction of context: Prosocial and antisocial behaviour revisited..* thesis, Swansea University.

<http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa43032>

Use policy:

This item is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence: copies of full text items may be used or reproduced in any format or medium, without prior permission for personal research or study, educational or non-commercial purposes only. The copyright for any work remains with the original author unless otherwise specified. The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder. Permission for multiple reproductions should be obtained from the original author.

Authors are personally responsible for adhering to copyright and publisher restrictions when uploading content to the repository.

Please link to the metadata record in the Swansea University repository, Cronfa (link given in the citation reference above.)

<http://www.swansea.ac.uk/library/researchsupport/ris-support/>

**Children's co-construction of context: prosocial and antisocial
behaviour revisited.**

Amanda Bateman

**Submitted to the
University of Wales
in fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

Swansea University

2010

ProQuest Number: 10821422

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10821422

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346



Summary

Prior research addressing children's antisocial and prosocial behaviours have predominantly used a predetermined set of criteria which have been devised by adults. This psychological approach has led to the perception of children as an individual phenomenon, using a dichotomy of behaviours consistently regardless of their immediate social environment. Therefore an argument is made for the use of an inductive, sociological approach in order to gain understanding of the everyday social interactions which children engage in. Conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis (Sacks, 1992a, 1992b) were employed to transcribe audio and video footage taken of thirteen, four-year-old children in their primary school playground in mid-Wales. The detailed and iterative analysis found that children employ specific resources to organise the social order of their playground. These resources include the use of name calling; access tools; possessive pronouns and collective proterms; reference to gender; physical gestures and the use of playground huts. The resources were used in the interaction of excluding or affiliating with peers, and also in the disaffiliation of peers where no further interaction was produced. These actions worked to produce different outcomes but were often used simultaneously in the co-construction of context. The wider findings which emanated from the detailed analysis identified the issues of sequences in children's establishment of social order; the context free and context sensitive nature of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion; issues of power; verbal actions supported by physical gestures; children's use of their environment; exclusive dyads; and children's social competence. The thesis holds implications for practice where practitioners can acknowledge the complex, multidimensional aspects of children's social organisation processes in order to avoid stereotyping. This study extends research which uses conversation and membership categorization analysis in the area of childhood studies which is important as this methodology affords unique access into children's worlds.

Declarations and Statements

DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed (candidate)

Date 21.1.2011

STATEMENT 1

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Where correction services have been used, the extent and nature of the correction is clearly marked in a footnote(s).

Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed (candidate)

Date 21.1.2011

STATEMENT 2

I give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed (candidate)

Date 21.1.2011

Table of contents

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION.....	11
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW.....	15
2.1 Definitions of prosocial and antisocial behaviour.....	16
2.2 The school playground as a context for social interaction.....	21
2.3 Group and dyad access initiation.....	23
2.4 Peer preference and peer rejection.....	26
2.5 Social intelligence.....	30
2.6 Group maintenance.....	32
2.7 Power inequality and bullying.....	35
2.8 Autonomy and socialisation.....	37
2.9 Social reinforcement.....	39
2.10 Friendships.....	41
2.11 Gender.....	44
2.12 Age and social competence.....	48
2.13 Review of methods used in research on children’s behaviour.....	49
2.14 Research using an emic perspective.....	52
2.15 Conclusion.....	59
CHAPTER 3 – METHODOLOGY.....	61
3.1 Ethnomethodology.....	62
3.2 Conversation analysis.....	64
3.3 CA and MCA combined.....	73
3.4 Membership categorization analysis.....	74
3.5 The use of CA and MCA for this study.....	84
3.6 Conclusion.....	86
CHAPTER 4 – DESIGN OF THE STUDY.....	88
4.1 Pilot study.....	89

Observation 5.2.3.....	138
Observation 5.2.4.....	140
Observation 5.2.5.....	142
5.2.6 Conclusion and discussion.....	144
5.3 Possessive pronouns and collective proterms.....	147
Observation 5.3.1.....	147
Observation 5.3.2.....	150
Observation 5.3.3.....	154
Observation 5.3.4.....	156
Observation 5.3.5.....	159
Observation 5.3.6.....	160
Observation 5.3.7.....	161
5.3.8 Conclusion and discussion.....	162
5.4 Referencing gender.....	166
Observation 5.4.1.....	167
Observation 5.4.2.....	170
Observation 5.4.3.....	171
Observation 5.4.4.....	173
5.4.5 Conclusion and discussion.....	176
5.5 Physical contact.....	180
Observation 5.5.1.....	181
Observation 5.5.2.....	183
Observation 5.5.3.....	185
Observation 5.5.4.....	187
Observation 5.5.5.....	190
Observation 5.5.6.....	195
Observation 5.5.7.....	197
Observation 5.5.8.....	199
5.5.9 Conclusion and discussion.....	202
5.6 The children's use of huts.....	205
Observation 5.6.1.....	206

Observation 5.6.2.....	209
Observation 5.6.3.....	213
Observation 5.6.4.....	216
Observation 5.6.5.....	219
5.6.6 Conclusion and discussion.....	222
5.7 Chapter conclusion.....	224
CHAPTER 6 – DISCUSSION.....	226
6.1 The sequential order of children’s interactions.....	227
6.2 The children’s use of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion.....	228
6.2.1 Affiliation.....	229
6.2.2 Disaffiliation.....	230
6.2.3 Exclusion.....	231
6.3 The context free and context sensitive nature of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion.....	233
6.4 Occurrences through the assertion of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion.....	235
6.4.1 Power inequality in children’s openings.....	236
6.4.2 Power inequality in children’s closings.....	236
6.4.3 Assertions of power.....	237
6.4.4 Verbal actions supported by physical gestures.....	238
6.4.5 Children’s use of their environment.....	240
6.4.6 Exclusive dyads.....	242
6.5 Children’s social competence.....	246
6.6 Conclusion.....	249
CHAPTER 7 – IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	251
7.1 Overall findings.....	252
7.2 Implications.....	253
7.3 Implications for future research.....	257
REFERENCE LIST.....	260

APPENDIX 1 – CONSENT FORMS.....	293
1a Explanatory statement (Head teacher).....	293
1b Consent form (Head teacher).....	294
1c Explanatory statement (Teacher).....	295
1d Consent form (Teacher).....	296
1e Explanatory statement (Parent/Guardian).....	297
1f Consent form (Parent/Guardian).....	298
1g Explanatory statement for the parents of non-participating children.....	299
APPENDIX 2 – TRANSCRIPTION DOCUMENTS.....	300
2a Emma.....	300
2b Katie1.....	302
2c Ricky.....	304
2d Tina, Katie and Mel.....	306
2e Harry, Dean and Mark.....	308
2f Katie, Sally and Lee.....	311
2g Sue.....	314
2h Zac and Ricky.....	316
2i Harry.....	320
2j Lee.....	322
2k Tina and Jess.....	323
2l Jon.....	325
2m Mark.....	326
2n Tina, Jon and Lee.....	328

Acknowledgements

My deepest gratitude goes to Dr Amelia Church who has given me overwhelming support from the very beginning of my PhD up until the very last week, even when the phone bills have been excessive. Amelia has offered encouragement throughout my PhD journey and has given me the motivation to continue through the difficult times with her vibrant sense of humor and insightful academic awareness. I have been incredibly fortunate to have had Amelia as my first supervisor and can't thank her enough for all the support over the years. I would also like to thank Professor Trisha Maynard, Jane Waters and Dr Alex Morgan from the Centre of Child Research at Swansea for the wonderful academic support and friendship they have given me over the years.

Thanks go to my Mum, Jennifer Williams and Dad, Tudor Williams for the moral support as well as my brother Gethyn Williams, and sister Dawn Roberts and her family for offering a good sense of humor and welcome distraction away from the hard work when a break was much needed.

Finally, my biggest 'thanks' goes to my husband Justin, and my wonderful children Keira and Tate. You have been my inspiration for starting, reason for continuing and motivation for finishing my PhD. Thank you for putting up with me when I have been grumpy when the work has been difficult and continuing to give me your devotion and humor which has made me resilient during PhD despair! Without your continued love, none of this hard work would have been worth it. Thank you most of all.

List of Tables

The conversation analysis symbols used to transcribe the data are adapted from Jefferson's conventions described in Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974).

[the beginning of an overlap
]	the end of an overlap
=	the equals sign at the end of one utterance and the beginning of the next utterance marks the latching of speech between the speakers. When used in-between words it marks the latching of the words spoken in an utterance with no break.
(0.4)	the time of a pause in seconds
::	lengthening of the prior sound. More or less colons are used to represent the longer or shorter lengthening.
?	a rising intonation in speech
.	a falling intonation in speech
<u>Underscore</u>	marks an emphasis placed on the underscored sound
Bold	words which are underscored and bold indicate heavy emphasis or shouting
°degree sign°	either side of a word indicates that it is spoken in a quiet, soft tone
(brackets)	utterance could not be deciphered
((<i>brackets</i>))	double brackets with words in italics indicate unspoken actions
.hhh	audible in-breath
hhh	audible out-breath
>arrows<	utterance spoken quickly

Chapter 1

Introduction

This research presents an early childhood approach due to the author having many years experience as an early years practitioner in the field and an avid interest in the social theories surrounding early childhood. The area of research initially became of interest when it was found that the recognition of anti-social behaviour including children as young as ten years old has been identified (Antisocial Behaviour Act, 2003) indicating that problem behaviour is no longer restricted to adults and adolescents, but is also prevalent in children. Therefore a study into how and why this behaviour develops has been called for by the National Children's Bureau (2006). To address this problem, this study aims to investigate children's antisocial and prosocial behaviour as a core focal issue. In order to address this focal issue, this research set out to investigate children's social interactions further in order to see what children are 'doing' when they engage with peers. The findings which emanated from the data presented another focal issue, that being the children's co-construction of social order.

Consequently, this study has both theoretical and practical implications. On a theoretical level the findings which emanate from this study provide an informed account of how children create social order through their everyday interactions. Through acknowledging children's competencies research increasingly recognises children as capable and knowledgeable members of society. This encourages the image of childhood to be one where the members are proficient in co-constructing social relationships and moves away from the view of children being deficit and in need of structuring. On a practical level this study also has a direct impact on early childhood practice as it informs early childhood teachers of the turn by turn sequence of events which work to co-construct each social interaction in the playground rather than viewing the actions of one particular child as problematic. This encourages practitioners to provide a consistency of care for all children through avoiding negative labels and stereotypes. The recognition of children's social competencies is important and in line with early childhood curriculums such as the Foundation Phase in Wales (Welsh Assembly Government, 2008) and *Te Whaariki*

(Ministry of Education, 1996) in New Zealand where social development is strongly linked to children's well-being.

In order to initiate this study, chapter two will review literature which addresses children's prosocial and antisocial behaviour. The majority of existing literature adopts a psychological perspective, and deductive methodologies are used in these positivist paradigms. This approach encouraged qualitative data and predefinitions of behavioral characteristics created by the researchers. Consequently, the data from these studies identify cognitive (eg. Nelson and Crick, 1999; Pellegrini and Bohn, 2005) and emotional processes (eg. Blair et al. 2004; Fabes et al. 1999b) involved in children's interactions. Although informative, this approach encourages a deficit model of the child and subsequently stimulates research which investigates identifying, assessing and eliminating antisocial behaviour (for example Eisenberg, 2007; OFSTED, 2005; Parrott and Giancola, 2007) and promoting prosocial behaviour (Hay et al. 1999; Mooij, 1999a 1999b;). These psychological studies, although important in their field of research, are perceived as limiting from an early childhood perspective where the child is viewed as 'not a naturally given phenomenon, but the result of social processes of discourse, definition and interaction' (Maynard and Thomas, 2004; p2). A review of literature using a sociological, emic perspective is presented towards the latter half of the literature review, identifying an alternative approach to an investigation into the wide range of children's social behaviours.

Methodological issues are discussed in chapter three where an ethnomethodological approach is subsequently advantageous for an investigation of children's social interactions in order to find out what is happening from within the children's cultural world. An emic perspective allows the researcher the freedom to observe the varied interactions which the children engage in without being restricted through the limitation of pre-defined categories of behaviour (Seedhouse, 2005a). Membership categorization analysis and conversation analysis (Sacks, 1992a; 1992b) are used as this satisfactorily addresses the research investigation into how each four-year-old child 'does' interactions and with whom.

The design of the study is presented in chapter four. In this chapter it is explained that the study is achieved through observing a group of four-year-old children shortly after their entry to school. In order to explore the range of behaviors displayed by young children the school playground was used as this provides an area where many children of varying ages are together for a period of time with minimal adult supervision (Pelligrinni and Blatchford, 2000). This age group of children was chosen as it offers an insight into the establishment of social relationships in a new environment. The children were observed in October, one month after they had begun their first year of school, as the research is not concerned with investigating children's ability to adjust or adapt to primary school but rather the social relationships initiated within that new environment. Audio and video recordings were used to provide a set of data for the analysis of the occurrences in the children's everyday social interactions. The data which was collected was then transcribed using Jefferson's conversation analysis conventions (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974) in order for the children's resources to become visible to the researcher.

Chapter five discusses the findings which became evident through the transcription of data. Throughout the transcription of data, recurring themes emerged which drew attention to the resources which the children were using in their everyday social interactions. These are identified as: name calling; the use of access tools; the use of possessive pronouns and collective proterms; the reference to gender; the use of huts; and physical actions. This study shows that the children use these resources as tools for social construction. This is evident as the children use the resources to become affiliated to, disaffiliated from and to exclude other members of the playground.

These findings emanate from the fine and detailed analysis of the data transcription and then move to the wider more general analysis of the children's social interactions for the subsequent discussion chapter (chapter six). A discussion of children's affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion is detailed in chapter six. In the discussion of results, the analysis of the children's competently co-constructed context is revealed through their context free and context sensitive (see Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974) use of the

identified resources. This is established through investigating how the resources are applied to the different social situations by all children in order for them to create local social order. The various interactions which the children engage in indicate that all children are involved in co-constructing social relationships to create the immediate context. Therefore, the labeling of an interaction or child as antisocial or prosocial is insufficient. Rather than some children being deficit in the ability to interact and others being consistently positive, this study acknowledges each child's competence to engage in a range of verbal and non-verbal actions to actively create social contexts.

This study extends the current knowledge of children's worlds and contributes to the expanding body of research of children's social interactions using an emic perspective (Butler and Weatherall, 2006; Butler 2008; Church, 2009; Cobb-Moore, Danby and Farrell, 2008; Cromdal, 2001; 2009; Danby, 2008; 2009; Goodwin, 2002; 2003b; 2006; Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987; Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2007; Theobald and Danby, 2009). The present study investigates children's social behaviours by applying an inductive research methodology from a sociological perspective. Throughout the thesis, a step away from the predefined categories of 'prosocial' and 'antisocial' children is made so that a more detailed investigation into the actual interactions in children's social networks can be studied. Through this acknowledgment the stigma related to a dichotomy of behaviours, and indeed children, is reduced. By acknowledging the children's use of various identified resources to affiliate, disaffiliate and exclude, it is evident that their social organisation processes are complex and managed by rules and resources negotiated by the children themselves. Existing research that views these interactions from a deficit perspective therefore underestimates the competence of children. The finding that each social context is uniquely co-produced tells us that the actions of each member of an immediate situation contribute to the sequence of events which create the immediate context. The significance of this is that practitioner's can be advised that their reactions to children's interactions actively contribute to the development of the immediate context. Rather than perceiving children's interactions from a subjective, correctional approach this study encourages an understanding of the co-construction of specific situations (Hargreaves, Hester and Mellor, 1975).

Chapter 2

Literature Review

To begin a study into children's prosocial and antisocial behaviours it is important to review research in the field in order to become familiar with current findings and approaches. Although prior research addressing early antisocial behavior has contributed greatly to the understanding of a wide range of issues such as cognitive and emotional processes, the persistent challenges of antisocial behaviour in educational settings argues that more research remains to be done (Berger, 2007). This study proposes to address the need for further knowledge concerning antisocial and prosocial behavior (BERA SIG, 2003; Berger, 2007; Farrington, Leober and Kalb, 2001; NCB, 2006; Pellegrini and Blatchford, 2000; Scott et al. 2001; Tapper and Boulton, 2005).

This chapter discusses current and past research which has addressed children's antisocial and prosocial behaviour as doing so provides an important standpoint from which the present research can develop. The review of literature indicates that the majority of past studies have investigated children's antisocial and prosocial behaviour from a psychological perspective which uses predefined categories of behavioral characteristics. An alternative approach is recommended through a review of research using a sociological, emic perspective to further understand children's social interactions from within their unique cultures. In this chapter, through the review of relevant literature, a sociological approach is considered as more suited to the present investigation into children's social worlds.

This chapter begins by discussing the definitions currently used in research in order to establish a common understanding of the behaviours investigated. The need for the current research is then presented. This is followed by a discussion of the various findings which have been established through prior research addressing the diverse concepts of children's social behaviours. This begins by investigating how and why interactions are initiated and then extends throughout the chapter to review how relationships are maintained once they have been established. The chapter will conclude

with an overview of research which provides a robust argument for data driven investigations into children's social behaviours.

2.1 Definitions of prosocial and antisocial behavior

In order to begin an investigation into children's prosocial and antisocial behaviour it is important to establish the definitions which are used in existing literature so that a clear understanding of the behaviours which are to be studied is gained. Research into antisocial behaviour by Farrington, Loeber and Kalb (2001) suggests that early identification is needed in order to prevent the increasing and extreme financial cost to society. This opinion is mirrored by Scott et al. (2001) who suggest that a proactive approach is needed: 'Antisocial behaviour in childhood is a major predictor of how much an individual will cost society. The cost is large and falls on many agencies, yet few agencies contribute to prevention, which could be cost effective.' (p1). Although future financial benefits are an important incentive for investigating early antisocial behaviour development, research also recognises the importance of investigating antisocial behaviour in order to support children's current social wellbeing. Prout (2000) notes that the image of childhood is conflicting as the government seeks to secure society's needs for the future through the shaping of children into prospective adults. The tension is that perceiving children merely as a subsequent work force provides little recognition of the immediate needs of children and the social competences which they have (Corsaro, 1997). The disregard for children's current needs is viewed as problematic from a psychological perspective as it contributes to the increase in young children currently suffering from mental health issues in Britain (OFSTED, 2005). Whether to benefit future society or to promote children's current psychological wellbeing, the need to further investigate antisocial behaviour remains evident through the call for research in this area (BERA SIG, 2003; Berger, 2007; Farrington, Loeber and Kalb, 2001; NCB, 2006; Pellegrini and Blatchford, 2000; Scott et al. 2001; Tapper and Boulton, 2005).

However, a specific focus on research concerning antisocial behaviour can be restricting in that it only enables researchers to analyse the problems associated with negative

behaviour (Nelson and Crick, 1999). Research on children's perceptions of prosocial behavior have been limited and there is more focus on research addressing children's negative behaviors (Warden et al. 2003). Fabes et al. (1999a) address this by advocating the combined study of prosocial and antisocial interactions as it is believed that this collective approach minimises stereotyping as, 'to examine one set of behaviors without examining the other presents a skewed and limited description' (p.13). Hay et al. (1999) offer an alternative view on the study of antisocial behavior through the hypothesis that it can be further understood through an investigation into prosocial behavior as it is the lack of these positive interactions which causes antisocial behavior. Mooij (1999a) believes that research into prosocial interactions can educate practitioners on how to proactively enforce positive behavior. This can consequently help prevent children from settling into antisocial activities and using negative reactive strategies in their interactions.

In order to address the issues of antisocial and prosocial behaviour, predefined characteristics are frequently used in literature as positivist approaches using deductive research methodologies are used. The participants involved in these studies vary in age ranges from birth through to adolescence, indicating a gap in research concerning social behaviours in early childhood. The Home Office 'Report 26' (2004) supports this deductive approach through calling for the definition and measurement of antisocial behaviour as it is believed that specific characteristics are helpful for establishing a common set of criteria which aids the identification of children using this type of behaviour.

Research concerned with specifically prosocial behaviour addresses the processes of social interaction among children which involve an investigation into the motivation of children's prosocial behaviour. Early research into prosocial behaviour by Brief and Motowidlo (1986) criticized existing definitions as they believed them to provide a restricted account of behaviour. Brief and Motowidlo (1986) used a broader set of criteria in their research in order to 'encompass a wide range of behavior with important implications for organisational functioning' (p711). Although this research argued for a wider approach to the investigation into prosocial behaviour subsequent research

continued with a specific set of characteristics which used precise definitions. This is evident in research by Jackson and Tisak (2001) who define prosocial behavior through the terminology used by Hay (1994) which is, 'any action that, as it happens, benefits others, or promotes harmonious relations with others, even if there is no sacrifice on the actor's part and even if there is some benefit to the actor' (p345). Barry and Wentzel (2006) found that children displayed prosocial behaviour as a goal for their own social advantage. This conclusion was reached through the use of predefined descriptions of behaviour nominated by the researchers which the sample group then had to choose from when describing their peers' prosocial interactions. As these characteristics were chosen by a third party other than the sample group, the definitions may have limited the results of the study due to the participants being unable to give their own perceptions of their peers' behaviour.

The method of predefining behavioural characteristics was also found in research investigating children's responses to aggressive peers by Tapper and Boulton (2005). In the study childhood aggression was categorised into direct physical, direct verbal, direct relational, indirect verbal and indirect relational by the researchers through observing the children's interactions. Similarly, Nelson and Crick's (1999) study also involved the researchers determining three categories of extreme social behaviour which were defined as relational aggression, overt aggression or prosocial. Relational aggression was defined as the act of ignoring people when they are upset; overt aggression included children who physically harmed other children when upset and prosocial characteristics involved children doing nice things for each other (Nelson and Crick, 1999). Although definitions enabled the researchers to analyse the children's responses to aggression from an outsider's perspective in these studies, the issue of these definitions being identified by adults from a third party perspective are also evident.

Warden et al. (2003) recognize the lack of children's perceptions of antisocial and prosocial behaviour and asked the sample group of children to define their own characteristics of what constituted these behaviours. The children's definitions of prosocial behaviour included being helpful, inclusive, sharing and caring. The antisocial

behavior characteristics were defined by the children as being physically abusive, verbally abusive, rejecting peers and being delinquent (Warden et al, 2003). Although this research investigated the important issue of children's perceptions it was unable to determine why the children chose those specific characteristics.

It is evident in this review of literature addressing definitions of childhood antisocial and prosocial behaviour that the definitions identify characteristics which vary throughout the different studies. These varying perspectives of acceptable social behaviours support the view that antisocial and prosocial behaviours are influenced by personal interpretation and context. A definition compiling a list of behaviors could unintentionally exclude some characteristics which are perceived as important aspects of social behavior to some children (Warden et al, 2003). Although pre-definitions can be used in the identification of specific behaviours as recommended by the Home Office (2004) the concept of what constitutes antisocial and prosocial behaviour, or how these definitions or categories are arrived at, should be informed by closer understanding of how they might be constructed by the children themselves.

Blanket definitions of behaviour which are applied to categorize the interactions between all children from all environmental contexts is problematic as this disregards cultural traditions and beliefs. Evidence of the differences of how children's behaviour is perceived and managed is offered in a comparative study which involved three preschools (Tobin, Wu and Davidson, 1989). The study involved observations of children aged between three and six years in preschools in China, Japan and the United States of America. In this study, it was concluded that each preschool implemented their cultural beliefs and that consequently, there was no correct way of providing provision for children. In the subsequent study (Tobin, Hsueh and Karasawa, 2009) a group of children from the Japanese school were observed engaged in what was perceived as a physical conflict situation by the American researchers, but was viewed by the Japanese teacher as the children socialising each-other through expressing their feelings. In the context of the Japanese preschool the teacher did not deem it necessary to intervene whereas when children displayed behaviour which was perceived of as negative in the American school

specific 'individualized services' (p206) were employed to support the individual child in need of help. This study demonstrates that children's social actions are interpreted and responded to differently throughout various cultures; behavior which is perceived as socially offensive in one culture is acceptable in another.

Differences in the numbers of peers involved in interactions were also observed by Rogoff (2003) where these changed from groups to dyads in varying cultures. A shift from children being seen as individuals who are independent of their culture to a more holistic socio-cultural understanding is offered by Rogoff (2003) who supports the work of Bronfenbrenner and Vygotsky. A socio-cultural view of children's interactions has implications for the study of children's 'antisocial' and 'prosocial' behaviour as these labels imply that a child is behaving this way individually and independent of their immediate surroundings. Rogoff (2003) suggests that children's interactions should be studied in context rather than investigating a child's actions independent of his environment as, 'together, the interpersonal, personal, and cultural-institutional aspects of the event constitute the activity. No aspect exists or can be studied in isolation from the others' (p58). The acknowledgment of the social construction of interactions supports the suggestion that defining a child as either 'antisocial' or 'prosocial' is problematic as it disregards the social and cultural context of the interaction.

Through constructing a set of criteria which define behaviour as either 'prosocial' or 'antisocial' labels are applied to children which encourages stigma (Bateman and Church, 2008). The World Health Organisation (WHO) (2002) suggests that children who are perceived of as having problematic behavioural issues developed further social problems such as low levels of wellbeing. It was also recognized in this research that the pro-active promotion of children's mental health and well-being was important due to the strong connections they have with children's holistic development (WHO, 2002). This link between children's social development and wellbeing is supported by the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG, 2008) where 'Personal and Social Development, Well-Being and Cultural Diversity' are one of the seven areas of learning to be promoted by early years practitioners. These findings offer support for an argument to proactively

investigate the children's social behaviours without the limitations of categories in order to promote children's psychological wellbeing for their current and future quality of life.

This thesis will argue that it is important to investigate these behaviours through the direct observation of children as this can demonstrate which interactions are meaningful to the children rather than labelling children as being either antisocial or prosocial, as found in the dichotomy presented in the psychology literature. Through conducting research into children's socialisation from a sociological perspective an inductive approach can be applied which investigates these behaviours from within.

2.2 The school playground as a context for social interaction:

In order to investigate social behaviour in young children it is important not only to explore children's family backgrounds but also at their school environment as this can often be overlooked (Pellegrini and Blatchford, 2000). This is recognised by research which acknowledges that more needs to be done regarding the development and spread of delinquent behaviour with particular focus on peer and school factors as the majority of prior work has been limited to the teenage age group and family (Farrington, Loeber and Kalb, 2001). The primary school playground offers a unique environment for childhood research as it has a low amount of adult supervision (Pellegrini and Blatchford, 2000)

Moss and Petrie (2002) suggest that limited access to children's play spaces have become an issue in British society due to adults genuine anxiety about the children they care for. Children's places have become very controlled through what has become an extreme reaction to social problems. The concept of the institutionalisation of children's space was referred to by Rasmussen (2004) who observed that children often reside in either their home, school or other recreational institutions due to an increased reduction of children's space. This becomes further aggravated by the restrictions which adults place on children's opportunities to follow their own interests in school (Prout, 2000) and the wider society (John, 2003). However, Pellegrini and Blatchford (2000) argue that in relation to children's playgrounds, there is often a minimal amount of adult supervision

and children are given space and time to interact relatively freely as they are comparatively less supervised than other environments in which children reside. Research into children's utilization of their school environment is therefore imperative due to these current circumstances as children's school grounds have become a very significant part of their lives (Malone and Tranter, 2003).

This therefore becomes problematic when it is recognised that children's playtime may be perceived negatively by some adults who work in a supervisory capacity in the school environment (Blatchford and Sumpner, 1998). This is due to the increased levels of aggressive behaviour and racial discrimination which occurs during the unsupervised time in the school playground. It has subsequently been observed that there is a suggestion that the time afforded to play in the school grounds should be minimised with the idea that it would be more productively used for extra academic work (Blatchford and Sumpner, 1998; Pellegrini and Bohn, 2005).

Sluckin (1981) suggests that the culture of the school will influence how the children interact at playtime in their sub-groups. Tapper and Boulton (2005) suggest that aggressive behaviour is *less* likely to occur in the school playground because it is a wide open space which affords room to avoid conflict. The playground's affordance of space is also linked to issues of gender where it is acknowledged that a majority of boys are more likely to utilize the large open playground spaces to play and socialise whereas girls often play on the periphery (Gordon, Holland and Lahelma, 2000).

However, Fantuzzo et al. (2005) suggest that children who are socially disruptive in the school environment carry this to other contexts such as the home, indicating that some children have consistent difficulty in establishing and maintaining social interactions. Research from Stevenson-Hinde, Hinde and Simpson (1986) also found that children consistently used a single type of behaviour as they transferred the same behaviour in their preschool context as they did at home. This is supported by Olweus (1977) who found that 'the behavior of highly aggressive boys is often maintained irrespective of a good deal of environmental variation and in opposition to social forces acting to change

this same behavior' (p1311). Although no immediate environmental influence which was enforced by adults impacted on the boys' aggressive behaviour, Olweus suggests that the boys themselves initiated and maintained their own ways of engaging in this behaviour. In this longitudinal study Olweus (1977) concludes that each individual boy has a part to play in the development of an aggressive situation.

Within this literature, context is referred to as physical environmental spaces in which children reside. The difficult issue of a diminishing amount of space which children are free to use is then recognized as a problematic issue within early childhood. However, there are many debates as to what constitutes the concept of 'context' within literature and this is discussed in more depth in chapter three, section 3.1 and 3.4, and chapter six, section 6.3.

Whether the interactions between children are identified as being 'antisocial' or 'prosocial' the children in this literature have been observed as being involved in social exchanges with each-other. This indicates that many different children competently initiate interactions with their peers throughout many individual school playgrounds. In order to investigate children's social interactions further, initiations of interactions are important to address so that an understanding of how social relationships are instigated can be gained.

2.3 Group and dyad access initiation:

People are born with a predisposition for social interaction (Lindenberg et al. 2006). Behaviourists have investigated the cognitive processes involved in social construction and suggest that children learn socially through observational learning processes (Barry and Wentzel, 2006). Children's social information processing is influenced by their observations of peers; when children recognise peers displaying similar play behaviours as themselves they become play partners as they have *experienced homophily* (Martin et al. 2005). Alternatively, children may become play partners due to *expected similarity* where a child cognitively believes that a peer has the same beliefs and behavioural

characteristics as themselves, such as the same gender or social class, as they display similar attributes. It is suggested that, in order for children to become a part of the in-group, they need to learn the appropriate interpretative skills which can allow them to gain access to their desired socio-cultural community (Davies, 2003). Children's ability to access a group or dyad becomes more successful with advanced cognitive functioning as the hopeful onlooker learns to interpret the ethos of the play and make correct judgements on how to gain entry (Wilson, 1999). When children approach their desired group the prospective new member displays 'prosocial' behaviour to the existing members in the new social context in order to speed their acceptance into that group (Gruman, Saks and Zweig, 2006).

Children learn to understand socialisation through the use of cognitive processes which enable the categorization of positive and negative social interactions (Nelson and Crick, 1999). This is identified in the use of humour where it is believed that, in order to initiate social construction, there are certain processes which occur involving encoding and decoding humour (Giles et al. 1976). People who initiate humour or 'encoders' do so in order to achieve a social goal such as whether to include or exclude peers; receivers of a humorous comment or 'decoders' then decide whether the encoder is including or excluding them through their interpretation of how the humour was used. This is linked to the work of Holmes and Marra (2002) who suggest that humour can be used to either support or contest peers. Contestive humour may have been previously identified under the label 'verbal aggression' which has been associated with children behaving antisocially (for example: Tapper and Boulton, 2005). Through humour children initiate and maintain relationships as well as protect themselves by degrading other individuals or groups which are perceived as threatening (Giles et al. 1976). Humour is thought to be an essential tool in group solidarity as the participants display how close they are to each other (Coates, 2007) and reinforce psychological boundaries where values and beliefs are reaffirmed in subgroup cultures (Holmes and Marra, 2002). Everyday conversational humour which emanates from in-group knowledge provides examples of this behaviour where members display, 'a manifestation of intimacy, with the voice of the group taking precedence over the voice of the individual speaker.' (Coates, 2007: p31). Groups use

humour to form solidarity as they maintain a topic of conversation in a humorous way to sustain their friendships through recognition of similar thought patterns (Coats, 2007).

Emotional regulation has also been regarded as important in the initiation and maintenance of positive peer relationships as children who have emotional regulation are better equipped to deal with negative social encounters as they learn to deal with their own feelings and the negative feelings of others (Blair et al. 2004). In order to successfully gain entry into peers' play children must interpret and understand the social information observed so that emotions can be regulated and personal social goals can be achieved (Wilson, 1999). Therefore, once an interaction has been initiated, children can learn to regulate their emotions through increased time spent with peers (Hay et al. 1999).

Fabes et al. (1999a) believe that social cognitive theory and information processing paradigms are related to the development of social relationships in that a child's perceived confidence in social skills affects their ability to initiate positive relations. Therefore, a social experience which is cognitively processed as a negative interaction will negatively affect a child's confidence in their ability to initiate future social interactions. Wilson (1999) supports this theory throughout the study of group access where it was found that many entry attempts fail and children tend to react to this by either becoming withdrawn and fearful of replicating their mistake therefore not attempting future entry, or by changing their strategy through inhibiting inappropriate negative emotions and persisting with future interactions. The former may result in more aggressive tactics which encourage peers to use overt rejection whereas the latter results in the establishment of emotional regulation through social information processes. Through observation, children categorize their peers into groups with members who are, or are not, similar to themselves. Once commonalities are observed, a child will initiate access into the desired group. If access is denied the child will remember this and the experience will affect future initiation of an interaction as their social knowledge is greatly affected by their peers' reactions to their behaviour.

When attempting group and dyad access the use of objects is often employed. Birkbeck and LaFree (1993) refer to literature which suggests that material objects can often initiate aggressive incidents between people. Charlesworth and Hartup (1967) also refer to children's use of objects in their social interactions and suggest that 'affection, personal acceptance, and tokens appear to function as instrumental actions used to initiate an interaction sequence' (p1001). This suggests that objects can be used to initiate any interaction. These interactional objects which children use have been observed to be important tools in the co-construction of social relations in the primary school playground where the children's use of them is compared to that of prison inmates' and hospital patients' use of contraband; although to a lesser extent, they are all members of an institution who are answerable to more powerful 'others' (Thorne, 2004). Children who are labelled as 'antisocial' may use the same access strategies towards group members when wanting to be accepted and become a member of the group themselves, but as they have been negatively categorised these actions are not acknowledged.

Although this literature has provided an insight into *how* social interactions are initiated it does not account for *why* children choose to instigate exchanges with some children and not others. The current research is able to provide more information on aspects of children's group and dyad access initiation, therefore providing a more detailed analysis of everyday social interactions. This is discussed in more detail in chapter five, sections 5.1 and 5.2 and also in chapter 6, section 6.4.1. Through investigating children's peer preference and peer rejection it offers an alternative view to children being consistently prosocial and antisocial to all children.

2.4 Peer preference and rejection:

Once children have initiated an interaction with a peer they can either become rejected or accepted by the peer they approached. Observations of popular children show that they engage in friendly approaches, acceptance of peers initiation of discussion, social conversation and social play (Gifford-Smith and Brownell, 2003). Research investigating peer popularity suggests that *popular* children, defined as 'well liked by many peers and

seldom disliked' (Gifford-Smith and Brownell, 2003; p237) are described as cooperative, helpful, considerate and socially outgoing by peers. Popular children have been observed to read social cues accurately, perceive benign intent and use positive prosocial problem solving strategies. Cillessen and Rose (2005) propose that there are two distinct types of popularity amongst children who are considered to have high popularity status which include *sociometrically popular* and *perceived popular* children. *Sociometrically popular* children involve themselves in prosocial cooperation and peaceful conflict resolutions whilst avoiding aggressive behaviour. *Perceived popular* children are those who peers aspire to be like even though they display aggressive behaviour when provoked and can also be socially manipulative. When the sample group in Cillessen and Roses' (2005) study were asked which characteristics they perceived popular children to have, they included both positive and negative characteristics of behaviour as being equally evident. Although 'sociometrically popular' children were perceived as having high levels of positive behaviour, 'perceived popular' children were equally as popular with peers even though they displayed high levels of physical and relational aggression (Cillessen and Rose, 2005). It is therefore suggested that 'perceived popular' children used a range of social strategies in order to manipulate peers into giving them high social status and that aggression is deliberately displayed by some children to promote their popularity.

Vaillancourt and Hymel (2006) used peer nominations to investigate the relationship between aggression, peer preference and popularity and found that children who used relational aggression were nominated as popular by their peers. However, relationally aggressive children were also reported as being the most disliked even when their personalities attributed high levels of peer-valued characteristics. This is thought to be because relational aggression occurred in intimate groups where valued friendships could be lost as a result of negative manipulation. 'Sociometrically popular' children may be defined as 'prosocial' by their peers as their positive behavior encouraged others to rate them as popular (Cillessen and Roses, 2005). 'Perceived popular' children were also rated as having high social status, indicating that other forms of interaction must have been evident even though they displayed high levels of social aggression and

manipulation. This indicates that children who are generally defined as 'antisocial' are also capable of interacting in a range of ways, although this may be displayed exclusively to a selection of specific peers.

When investigating the initiation of childhood relationships through peer preference it has been found that children who were perceived of as 'prosocial' believed that achieving a relational goal, such as maintaining a relationship with a friend, was more important than fulfilling an instrumental goal, such as being competitive (Nelson and Crick, 1999). Warden et al (2003) also found that children who regularly displayed 'prosocial' behaviour were perceived as the most popular children with their peers. However, on further analysis of the data Warden et al (2003) hypothesised that these children actually enhanced their social standing by actively using their 'prosocial' behaviour. The synthesis of research by Warden et al (2003) and Nelson and Crick (1999) therefore indicates that children who are defined as 'prosocial' due to their initiation of friendships may only be opening these interactions as they aid their achievement of an instrumental goal to be popular. Therefore, children who are perceived of as 'prosocial' may be influential in peer rejection as they exclude peers who are not useful in their pursuit of popularity. Consequently the children who are often defined as having 'prosocial' behaviour characteristics may also be involved in negative interactions. This is evident in research by Garandau and Cillessen (2006) where it was found that peer rejection is strongly linked to the development of aggressive behavior. Gottfredson (2001) supports this hypothesis and suggests that peer rejection experienced by young children can initiate a consistent pattern of delinquent behaviour throughout childhood and into adolescence as rejected children do not have the opportunity to develop competent social norms due to their exclusion. Gifford-Smith and Brownell (2003) also offer an alternative view of the effect of rejection on social development where they found that only half of aggressive children are recognised to have been rejected.

As behavioural homophily is achieved through children observing similarities with their peers through experience, the initial interactions between children in a new context shows general peer contact which settles into more substantial friendship networks later in the

year as children identify peers who display similar behaviour as themselves (Martin et al, 2005). This indication that children settled into friendships over a period of time was tested by analysing children's gender segregation patterns at the beginning and end of one school year where 'prosocial' behaviour was more evident in children who were new to a setting such as at the beginning of primary school. These socially broad interactions can be linked to Warden et al. (2003) who indicate that children will use 'prosocial' behaviour to find friendships as these close relationships offer emotional support. Later, more dyadic or specific friendships are observed once the children have been in the school for a longer period of time. Further research investigating the complexities of peer preference in friendships has been carried out by Avgitidou (2001). Avgitidou (2001) suggests that 'prosocial' behavior is a prerequisite for establishing friendships as it involves the concepts of altruism and empathy. Empathy is thought to be universally used in early childhood and altruism is seen as an essential requirement for advanced social understanding (Avgitidou, 2001). Although informative, the blanket definition of 'prosocial' behaviour used in these studies limits the interrogation of the behaviour itself which could be gained through observing the children's interactions.

In this literature, it is evident that regardless of which group or dyad children categorize themselves as belonging to, they inevitably exclude other members. Children who are described as being a member of the 'prosocial' category may reject other children from acquiring membership to their group and prefer peers who are also labelled as prosocial. Therefore, children who are defined as prosocial are just as likely to display exclusive behaviour characteristics and reject peers as children who are defined as antisocial. The issues of peer preference and rejection which were discussed in this section are also found within the data collected in the current research. These findings are presented and discussed in chapter five and six, sections 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3.

Within the reviewed literature, aspects of social intelligence are linked to these social preferences and are thought to be instrumental in children's establishment of social relationships where children who are categorised as 'prosocial' are deemed to be more

socially intelligent than those labelled 'antisocial'. The issues of social intelligence are therefore investigated further here.

2.5 Social intelligence:

Research acknowledges that the link between social intelligence and children's inability to positively interact socially is due to some children being deficient in key social information processing skills (Ladd, 1999). Research by Blair et al. (2004) also supported this theory where it was found that social intelligence and indirect aggression showed the highest link; this was followed by verbal aggression and the lowest relationship was between social intelligence and physical aggression. These results indicate that children who are socially intelligent are less likely to be involved in physical aggression and more likely to use peaceful means to conflict resolution.

Bjorkqvist and Osterman (2000) suggest that social intelligence correlates with 'prosocial' behaviour where socially intelligent children choose to act in a way which exposes them to the least danger. Sheridan, Buhs, and Warnes (2003) also believe that children act 'prosocially' as it is important to be perceived as socially appropriate and adaptable to important others in different context; children who lack the ability to understand this are often less successful at forming relationships. Bjorkqvist and Osterman (2000) link the ability to achieve personal goals with social intelligence by suggesting that social intelligence enables a person to display the required behaviour to achieve their own social goals and recognise these motives and goals in others.

Personal goals have been defined as, 'a cognitive representation of the extent to which an individual would like to display prosocial behaviour in a given situation.' (Barry and Wentzel, 2006; p154). This definition indicates that positive interactions are initiated through a deliberate and conscious cognitive decision. Barry and Wentzel (2006) found in their research that all children displayed 'prosocial' rather than 'antisocial' behaviour when pursuing a goal for their own social advantage. Research indicates that children are able to repress undesirable emotions through their motivation to interact as this helps

achieve personal goals (Hecke et al. 2007). This emotional regulation is also referred to by Eisenberg et al. (1995) where it was hypothesised that cognitive reasoning could override emotions in school children in order to gain approval from teachers and peers. This indicates that emotions affect the way in which children behave and that they will use specific behaviours in a social context as a tool for achieving their personal goals. This is supported in research which suggests that 'prosocial' behaviour is used by children for their own personal motives in order to achieve close dyadic friendships, but that this manipulation may cause the relationship to become more equivalent to that of bully/victim (Boxer, Tisak and Goldstein, 2004).

Research by Pellegrini and Bohn (2005) found that children who played with peers in the school playground had better academic outcomes than children who interacted mostly with adults in the same context. This was thought to be because when children disagreed with each-other they had to find a way of mediating peaceful conflict resolution in order to repair any damage the disagreement may have caused; the children who interacted mostly with adults did not tend to disagree as readily as other children. This indicates that interaction with peers is more socially complex than interaction with adults and requires sophisticated social cognitive skills. However, Willoughby, Kupersmidt and Bryant (2001) make an important observation that when the children disagreed with the adults they were interacting with in the playground they were regarded as having some form of conduct disorder rather than being perceived of as developing their social skills.

When looking at related literature on antisocial behaviour Fox and Boulton (2006) found that children who lacked social intelligence and competence were at greater risk of becoming the victim of aggression. Past research addressing aggressive behaviour indicates that it is often initiated through frustration when a person blocks another's achievement of gaining a personal goal (Shantz, 1987). Prior research in the area of cognition and bullying behaviour offers two components which influence 'antisocial' behaviour (Andreou and Metallidou, 2004). These include the children's beliefs in their ability to successfully gain from engaging in certain behaviours and the environmental influence of aggression encouragement by their peers.

However, it is argued by Bjorkqvist and Osterman (2000) that socially intelligent children can easily engage in a range of social actions. Nelson and Crick (1999) also suggest that 'prosocial children' (p 17) can often misunderstand the intention of their peers' social interactions to be more positive than intended through a *benign attribution bias*. It is also important to note that children who are perceived as antisocial are also capable of forming sub-cultures and social networks with peers; therefore indicating that close social relationships remain achievable (Dasgupta, 2004). It has also been found that the children who have been defined as using 'antisocial' behaviour do better on social cognitive tests than children from the other categories (Andreou and Metallidou, 2004). Further support for the argument that perceived 'antisocial' children are as socially intelligent as perceived 'prosocial' children is presented in research by Garandeau and Cillessen (2006) who suggest that the social manipulation present in indirect and relational aggression requires high levels of social intelligence skills. As all children are observed to successfully form social networks, this indicates that their social cognition is comparable. These findings therefore contradict the common perception that some children are 'antisocial' and, as such, they have low social intelligence.

The findings within the current research aligns with the discussed literature which supports children's social competencies, although the social competence of all children is acknowledged in the present study. This recognition of children being capable social citizens in their cultural worlds is discussed in more detail in chapter 6, section 6.5. As it is suggested here that all children are able to competently initiate social relationships, further investigation into the management of these relationships is addressed. Through examining the surrounding issues of group maintenance an insight into how children socially construct peer networks is achieved. This informs the research of the existing perceptions of children with regard to their behaviour in the maintenance of relationships.

2.6 Group maintenance:

Once children become established members of a group they believe that their group is superior to others and this enhances their self-esteem and social identity (Gini, 2006;

Baumeister et al. 2003). In groups children expect their peers to interact in the same way as themselves, therefore reaffirming in-group solidarity (Rutland et al. 2006; Warden et al. 2003). This in-group solidarity was observed in a study by Warden et al. (2003) where the children were found to have perceived their peers as being more prosocial than antisocial, and where the most valued prosocial characteristic was reported as being inclusive. In the study the most reported antisocial characteristic was found to be verbal abuse such as name calling. It was suggested that the children who perceived themselves as prosocial may have been rigid when identifying the same behaviour in their peers as prosocial children may have a high standard when categorizing positive behaviour (Warden et al, 2003). Although these studies are informative, the methodology does not allow for a notion of context relevance and fluidity of social behaviours which account for each child demonstrating different characteristics with different people in different situations.

Children's inclusive and exclusive peer interactions can be found in research by Cairns et al. (1995) where it is observed that social networks are an inclusive concept whereas social groups are referred to as 'clusters' in peer networks. It is further stated that, 'Not all persons in the network necessarily belong to a social group, and some persons may belong to two or more groups.' (p1332). An explanation of this behaviour can be gained through research by Martin et al. (2005) who proposed that as friendships emanate from expected and experienced homophily the initial year when children meet involves frequent general interactions which then settle into closer friendships over time. Although peer groups were perceived as dynamic evolving systems it has been recognised as important to acknowledge that there is stability over certain time periods of a few weeks (Gifford-Smith and Bownell, 2003).

The maintenance of friendships identifies a difference between general peer acceptance and close dyadic friendships (Rose and Asher, 1999) in that friendships are multidimensional and complex and children use different responses to conflict situations in their friendships in order to maintain their close relationships. This is supported by Christensen et al. (2004) who believe that in groups there is a commonality of principles

which members are bound to and that they are at risk of rejection if they deviate from these. Mooij (1999b) also found that continuity of behaviour was found to have a larger overall influence over social behaviour than any other variables such as environment and social influence. This study indicated that having a close friend who participated in a specific category of behaviour was the biggest instigator for a peer to also use the same behaviour. Children, who display negative behaviour in strong peer groups where cohesion and homogeneity involve sympathy and empathy for one another, are likely to be excluded as they fail to replicate these strong friendship connections (Garandean and Cillesen, 2006).

It is evident that friendships can involve negative aspects as well as providing close social support for the members. This is upheld by research which found that the intricate groups and dyads of girls friendships also encourage negative indirect aggression as relationships and emotions are discussed more openly, therefore influencing social manipulation (Bjorkqvist and Osterman 2000; see also Goodwin, 1990; 2006 in latter part of literature review). Other problems initiated in small exclusive friendships include children intervening in established friendships and telling lies as a form of indirect aggression where the perpetrator appears innocent to adults, therefore getting away with minimal risk of punishment but also causing a lot of trouble for the victim (Garandean and Cillesen, 2006).

However, having a wider circle of friends and being in the presence of many peers may also make each person feel less responsible for their actions due to deindividuation (Harris, 2006). It is suggested that victims will naturally occur amongst large groups due to the social organisation involved as instigators are often able to hide behind the crowd; they manipulate peers into physical or verbal fights and retreat in order to be seen as blameless for the aggressive situation (Garandean and Cillesen, 2006). However, this suggests that one child is solely responsible for orchestrating an event independent of peers and disregards the social construction of situations.

It is therefore acknowledged here that although behaviour is used by individuals, it is the collective actions of all of the members involved which work to maintain the social situation. This co-construction of group and dyadic maintenance is investigated in more detail in chapter six, section 6.1, where the sequential order of children's interactions is discussed in relation to the findings of the study. It has also been found in prior literature that there are issues of power inequalities between the members in the maintenance of group organisation. This is investigated further in order to establish how children are represented within the literature and to find out how these inequalities establish social organisation.

2.7 Power inequality and bullying:

As with the maintenance of groups, bullying is not just a dyadic event which involves the bully and victim, but an event which is affected by wider social influences whereby reactive behaviour is used as a way to raise social status and power (Gini, 2006). In subcultures it is observed that there are categories which include *assistants* who actively help the bully; *reinforces* who give encouraging feedback; *defenders* who stick up for the victim and *outsiders* who silently encourage bullying by remaining observers of the event (Dasgupta, 2004). Links between power and aggression found that relational aggression was more effective in manipulating social power than overt aggression which was context specific (Vaillancourt and Hymel, 2006). Although overtly aggressive children were not generally well liked, they perceived that they were popular due to their feelings of high social status and power. Further power inequality is found in aggressive situations where children have been found to perceive bullying as wrong but practically still engage in it because they feel too frightened of the bully to defend the victim (Garandeau and Cillessen, 2006).

With regard to adult intervention, research has found that incidents of physical violence amongst children are the most common form of aggression in which members of school authority are likely to intervene (Xie et al. 2002). However, it is also proposed that children's aggressive behaviour is aggravated by adult's power over children in their play

spaces (Prout, 2000). Adult assertion of a role of power over the actions of children therefore reaffirms that such hierarchy is not only acceptable, but essential for the everyday structure of social organisation.

Nelson and Crick (1999) suggest that 'prosocial children' (p17) are less likely to feel upset about conflicts with peers due to their positive perception of peers' intentions towards them. It is suggested that because of this, positive interpretation of peers' intentions some children may be less likely to experience negative emotions which stimulate aggressive responses, resulting in a vicious circle (Nelson and Crick, 1999). Consequently, some children may not acknowledge their peers assertion of power or feel that they are being 'bullied' by peers.

Abdennur (2000) informs that by demonstrating their anger physically, children enforce their identity to be strong, competent and capable of defending themselves. Therefore children who are defined as 'antisocial' may cope better psychologically as they do not repress negative emotions and so become more competent in expressing themselves in their interactions. Blair et al. (2004) agrees with this and recommends that constructive coping strategies were more beneficial in emotional development. It is further recognized that children who are perceived of as 'prosocial' may use non-confrontational aggression as a way of coping with negative emotional situations as it is more difficult to detect (Abdennur, 2000). This suggests that although some children may display characteristics associated with the label 'prosocial', other behaviours may be engaged in which are not observed by adults.

This suggests that all children are equally capable of initiating and maintaining a range of behaviours in order to organize their social relationships from within. Issues of power inequalities are also found within the data of the current research and discussed further in chapter six, sections 6.4.1, 6.4.2 and 6.4.3. These findings link to the discussed literature where children are found to assert power in their interactions with peers and these assertions are shown to be acknowledged within the situation through the group members next turn in the interaction.

The power issues which are evident between the children are instrumental in this process where issues of autonomy are apparent as the children organize which members hold the most power in specific situations. As issues of self-governance are noticeable throughout the maintenance of children's social groups it is further investigated.

2.8 Autonomy and socialisation

Andreou and Metallidou (2004) believe that, 'children who feel competent and in control are less likely to behave in ways that support bullying' (P38). They go on to suggest that because of this, children should be given more control over their academic work. This proposes to encourage self-regulatory strategies in children in order to promote prosocial behaviour as aggressive children are often found to be less independent (Andreou and Metallidou, 2004). However, this stereotyping of children as being either 'prosocial' or 'antisocial' disregards the multifaceted nature of social interaction and so limits their full potential as competent social participants by their teachers

Research by Gruman et al. (2006) found that institutionalised socialisation tactics, such as formally structured social gatherings engineered by leaders of an institution, encouraged 'prosocial' behaviours. However, when applying these findings to independent peer organisation in the playground, the top-down formal socialisation tactics initiated by adults could disrupt the natural process involved in the initiation and maintenance of children's socialisation and autonomy (Corsaro and Eder, 1990). Through suppressing children's ability to actively achieve their own social goals it places limits on their autonomy. By dictating institutionalized tactics children's full range of social competencies will remain but the aspects of behaviour which are disapproved by the adults will be *camouflaged* by the children (Abdennur, 2000).

In relation to children having more autonomy, it is claimed by Young (1980) that institutions are also more likely to impede the development of autonomy due to children having less independence in those contexts. This becomes problematic when it is evident

that, in Britain, the vast majority of children are members of a school or preschool institution from a very early age. Young (1980) also refers to the impact of socialisation on autonomy and suggests that, 'some barriers to autonomy are just 'outgrown': a neurotic fear of not being liked might disappear upon involvement in a serious loving relationship' (p568) arguing that the emotional support offered through close relationships affords greater autonomy and confidence to secure further social networks.

Research by Blair et al. (2004) and Fantuzzo et al. (2005) suggests that 'prosocial' behavior increases as a natural process over time due to the internal development of emotional regulation. This is supported by Stevenson and Goodman (2001) who found that early behaviour problems such as deficits in early emotional regulation predicted later adult criminality more than the impact of negative family or social circumstances. Fantuzzo et al. (2005) found that children who had lower levels of self-control displayed early socially negative behaviour; lower levels of social-emotional interaction and awareness were also present. Grotberg (2001) suggests that emotional resilience, 'the capacity to deal with, overcome, be strengthened by, and even transformed by experiences of adversity' (p2) is more likely to be promoted when a child feels that they have some control over a stressful social situation. This is because a prior experience in a particular situation helps develop resilience if the same or similar situation reoccurs (Grotberg, 2001). These social experiences can influence children's displays of behaviour as emotionally resilient children will persist in the face of adversity whereas non-resilient children withdraw, submit and experience depression as they have not been empowered to overcome negative experiences.

It is argued here that providing support for children's autonomy should not just be restricted to those children who are categorised as 'prosocial' as providing a supportive empowering environment for all children reaffirms the child's sense of importance and value (David, 2004). By realising children's competence in social organisation their autonomy is nurtured through social reinforcement. In order to understand the impact of social reinforcement on children's maintenance of relationships this is examined further.

2.9 Social reinforcement:

Social reinforcement is considered to be at the centre of 'antisocial' and 'prosocial' interactions in children's peer cultures as each action is reacted to either positively or negatively by their peers (Prinstein and Dodge, 2008). Research on the social reinforcements which children give to other children in nursery schools found that 'Attention, approval, and submission seem to require a prior social response from another child' (Charlesworth and Hartup, 1967; p1001) which indicates a sequential aspect in their interactions. This is evident when children are interacting with younger peers where they are motivated into displaying protective and caring behavior and the younger child reciprocates this behavior in turn (Avgitidou, 2001). These behaviors are defined as 'prosocial' and are engaged in when children are faced with age differences in a context which supports such values.

Sluckin (1997) writes about the way in which children's fight situations are steadily produced in the playground context and how children can resolve these potentially threatening social situations. By using their behaviour in a non-confrontational way in their next turn with such strategies as faking sleep or reacting with humour, it encourages a more positive sequential reaction from their peers. The motivation for aggressive interactions at a young age is linked to the victim's response where pre-primary children's aggressive behaviour was reinforced through the victim's positive reaction with crying, giving up an object or withdrawing from the situation (Tapper and Boulton, 2005). Children's reactions to their peers' prior interaction are also related to issues concerning age influence on sequential aggressive behaviour where the older the child is, the more likely they are to perceive relational provocation with a positive attitude rather than with a form of aggressive behaviour (Nelson and Crick, 1999).

This is evident in research on delinquent friendships where it was found that although these friendships provided essential bonds of trust and self-value, delinquent behaviour was reinforced in the friendships (Giordano, Cernkovich and Pugh, 1986). Further research investigating 'conflict turns' and 'postconflict proximity' was carried out by

Hartup et al. (1988) where it was found that children who are friends are more likely to disengage themselves from each-other post-conflict by physically turning away from each-other, although they remained physically quite close. This was thought to encourage equality in the conflict; as the dispute was broken off there was not a clear winner or loser of the argument. It was concluded that friends who argued were more likely to continue interacting post-conflict than were non-friends who had engaged in a dispute (Hartup et al. 1988).

Hartup, Glazer and Charlesworth (1967) found that when a child displayed negative reinforcement to peers who were not members of the same group this correlated with the rejection of the child. This exclusion is subsequently damaging as the child then becomes stigmatized by other peers. Children who are negatively perceived as 'antisocial' may be excluded from social networks prior to them engaging in any action which has the characteristics of 'antisocial' behaviour due to stigma. This social exclusion could be reinforced by any child in any social context (Abdennur, 2000). The social implications of negatively labeling a person have been investigated by Hebl and Dovidio (2005) who suggest that this involves exclusion of the stigmatized individual from the wider social network; this is partly achieved through the avoidance of the stigmatized person. In addition to this exclusion through social reinforcement, further stigmatization is enforced as children self-evaluate their social identity through how they perceive others to value them; if they believe that they are negatively stigmatized they will engage in behavior which will reinforce their perceived identity (Sinclair, Huntsinger, Skorinko and Hardin, 2005). Mooij (1999b) supports this assertion through research which found that if children are perceived as 'perpetrators of aggression' (p492) at the beginning of high school they are 33% more likely to increase the intensity of this behaviour in year three. Having antisocial friends increases this statistic by 5% whereas school affects contribute to an increase of 7% (Mooij, 1999b). Negative stigma also encourages misleading attitudes towards children as Garandeau and Cillessen (2006) highlight, 'Contrary to the stereotype of bullies as socially marginal and maladapted males lacking social intelligence, a significant number of them are likely to be females, at the center of peer clusters, having high levels of peer-perceived popularity and good social-cognitive

skills.’ (p615). This indicates that negative peer reinforcement can be achieved by any children.

Labelling children as socially disruptive or emotionally disengaged at an early age negatively affects their emotional resilience as it is damaging to the child’s perception of external social support (Grotberg, 2001). Negative stigma damages children’s psychological wellbeing as it devalues a person through excluding them on one aspect of their whole identity and in doing so also excludes all positive attributes of children’s personalities (Major and O’Brien, 2005). Through recognising that all children engage in a range of social actions their competence can be acknowledged and reinforced and the emotional stigma placed on children restricted.

With regard to positive reinforcement, the current research also recognizes that a sequential series of actions are evident in social reinforcement. These sequences of actions are discussed further throughout chapter six, and specifically in section 6.1, where it is found that sequences of actions are co-constructed by the members of a group or dyad to provide affirmation of friendship and maintain positive relations as well as establish conflict situations. Aspects of friendships in children’s peer relationships are an important element of positive social reinforcement, and as such are investigated further below.

2.10 Friendships:

Children who are victimised by a group of peers find it easier to cope with the situation if they have a close friend to confide in and help to reduce the incidents of victimisation because having a friend increases ‘prosocial’ behaviour and good-humour (Gifford-Smith and Bownell, 2003). Further protection from psychological damage due to negative social experiences can be found in children’s emotional resilience which prevents the development of future anxiety, depression and behavioral problems (Conway and McDonough, 2006). The development of emotional resilience is initiated by early close maternal bonds which then transfer to subsequent childhood relationships through close

personal contact (Conway and McDonough, 2006; Greener and Crick, 1999). These aspects of external social supports in interactions can be linked to emotional resilience through research by Grotberg (2001) who refers to how children perceive these supports as 'I have' (p76). The ability to recognise personal inner strengths 'I am' and abilities 'I can' are also perceived as essential in the development of emotional resilience.

Fox and Boulton (2006) found that the quality of friendships was rated as more important in combating being bullied than having a large number of friends. Children who report having good quality friendships have higher self-esteem, less feelings of loneliness, better general peer interactions and do better at school (Gifford-Smith and Bownell, 2003). Further research into the relationship between friendships as a protector from bullying found that there were many social support behaviors evident in the playground (Fox and Boulton, 2006). It was also found that children with friends were alone less, therefore making them less open for acts of bullying; children who were peer rejected were often on their own and classed as unpopular, therefore this legitimized the bullying behaviour. However, although these negative social experiences are emotionally traumatic for the victimized children, Grotbergs' (2001) explanation that children build resilience through repeated experiences could be linked to coping strategies which children use to help them through emotionally difficult situations where repeated experiences may help children learn more about how best to deal with the situation.

'Prosocial' peer supports play an essential part in the development of emotional resilience (Grotberg, 2001) and this is important from an early age as children who are emotionally resilient in preschool are less likely to experience depression and anxiety in later childhood (Conway and McDonough, 2006). Fox and Boulton (2006) suggest that having a group of friends, or having a best friend or two help protect against becoming a victim of bullying, even when the child has individual risk factors such as social skills problems to begin with.

It is also suggested that friendships are 'antisocial' when two children who are perceived of as engaging in persistently deviant activities form a close alliance within a dyad

(Hartup, 1996). Children typically affiliate themselves with peers who demonstrate the same or similar behavioural traits as themselves (Kiesner, Poulin, and Nicotra, 2003; Martin et al. 2005). Therefore, children who engage in 'antisocial' behaviour will affiliate themselves with other children who engage in the same behaviour and that the levels of 'antisocial' actions in these friendships will increase (Kiesner, Poulin, and Nicotra, 2003). Research into delinquent friendships (Giordano, Cernkovich and Pugh, 1986) has found that the members were more likely than less delinquent peers to disclose private and personal information to each-other and believed that their friends cared and trusted them. Furthermore, these aspects along with the loyalty between the members provided 'significant benefits from their friendship relations' (p1192) and it was consequently suggested that, 'these results simply reflect a different friendship style that should not be viewed as either positive (attached) or negative (cold and brittle)' (Giordano, Cernkovich and Pugh, 1986; p 1192). This suggests that characteristics of 'prosocial' behaviour are evident in groups labeled as 'antisocial' and that friendships are valued by the members. Therefore, it is a contradiction to suggest that there are such phenomena as antisocial friendships.

It is suggested here that rather than labeling friendships as either 'prosocial' or 'antisocial' it would be more advantageous to acknowledge that all children have some degree of competency in engaging in friendships. As with the discussed literature, the importance of friendships is evident in the present study where the data reveals that exclusive dyads are the preferred organizational structure within the playground. These findings are discussed further in chapter six, section 6.2.1 where affiliations are investigated, and section 6.4.6 where exclusive dyads are considered further.

These different types of friendships which are evident in various social groups are prominent in literature investigating gender and social organisation. The issue of gender in children's peer culture is of significance as there is often a tendency to associate girls and boys with particular types of behaviour due to stereotyping. Gender and children's social behaviour is therefore investigated in order to gain an understanding of the issues surrounding the area.

2.11 Gender:

Gender issues in childhood have been investigated through a broad range of research studies. As the current study is interested in children's social interactions, the literature reviewed here addresses one interpretation of gender in early childhood. An alternative approach to the study of gender in early childhood social organisation is offered when revisiting issues of gender in the discussion below.

Boys may have a different perception as to what is acceptable social behaviour and bullying behaviour than girls do, as it has been claimed that girls condemned physical bullying more than boys (Gini, 2006). It is further suggested that these gender differences indicate dissimilarity in each gender's perspective of boundaries in normal social interaction and conflict resolution. Simpson and Cohen (2004) found that bullying behaviour was gender specific in adults where what constituted bullying behaviour was perceived differently by males and females. With regard to research investigating children's use of behaviour in the school playground differences in gender perceptions are also relevant as boys' broader interpretation of bullying behaviour may provoke a perceived exaggerated reaction not only from their female peers, but also from the playground staff as the majority of these are female.

Martin et al. (2005) found that same-sex homophily was strongly apparent at the beginning of the school year and didn't change significantly over the year; same-sex peer interactions were high for both sexes. The observational study found that boys showed a wide range of emotions during interactions with same-sex peers. More positive emotions were displayed by the participating children when they interacted with same-sex peers, whereas they showed no significant emotions and remained neutral during other-sex interactions (Martin et al. 2005). This was particularly evident with the girls who demonstrated differential emotional displays depending on which sex they interacted with; same sex interactions correlated with positive emotional displays and other sex interactions encouraged displays of negative emotions. The findings showed that same-

sex homophily was strongly apparent where engagement with same-sex peers was high for both genders at the beginning of the year and didn't change significantly with time (Martin et al. 2005). It was concluded in this study that this may be because girls respond negatively to 'rougher, agonistic, and dysregulated nature of boys' play styles' (Martin et al. 2005: p322).

Gender differences in children's interactions were also referred to by Bjorkqvist and Osterman (2000) where 'small tight groups' and dyads of girls' friendships were thought to encourage indirect aggression. This was evident as relationships and emotions were discussed more openly therefore allowing social manipulation when a conflict situation arises. This is supported by Blair et al. (2004) where gender differences were also found, the most prominent being that girls were found to display more internalizing, relational behaviors and boys were found to be more externalizing through displays of physical aggression. Girls were found to refrain from asserting physical actions through using passive coping strategies when confronted with a problematic situation. These passive coping strategies were interpreted as internalizing emotional behaviors as physical, or overt, aggression was not used. Although a refrain from using physical aggression in response to a conflict situation may be perceived positively by the adults who are caring for children, passive coping strategies were thought to reflect high behavioral inhibition and the repression of emotions (Blair et al. 2004). Consequently these children are susceptible to internalizing behavioral problems such as anxiety and depression. Therefore, the use of passive coping strategies in a conflict situation was perceived as even more detrimental to highly frustrated or irritable girls as they did not learn to deal with social problems; this was thought to lead to further behavior problems.

Boys were observed to be using more externalizing behaviors as constructive coping strategies where they dealt with social problems directly; consequently emotional development was enabled (Blair et al. 2004). However, passive coping strategies were observed to be used by some boys and these boys were consequently overlooked as being emotionally deficit. Therefore externalizing constructive coping strategies were recommended as being more beneficial in the development of emotional regulation (Blair

et al. 2004). It has also been found that males have significantly higher self-efficacy in aggression than girls and have significantly greater expectation of reward. Girls reported more self-efficacy in academic achievement than boys did whereas the boys scored significantly higher engaging in bullying than the girls (Andreou and Metallidou, 2004). It is apparent that the majority of research on aggression has been centred on the negative social interactions of boys. However, there is a growing recognition that girls are also involved in aggression, although this tends to be indirect and covert where gossiping and social manipulation is used rather than physical aggression. The reasons why girls use this form of aggression has been associated with the effectiveness it has on their victim (Gifford-Smith and Brownell, 2003). Other research suggests that relational aggression is used amongst girls because they are aware that they can not support their verbal comments with physical violence due to their lack of physical ability to do so (Bjorkqvist and Osterman 2000).

Links between gender and age have also been found in the literature concerning emotional regulation through social support by Weinberg et al. (1999). It was suggested that girls would be better at gaining affective emotional regulation in their social interactions than boys and the boys would require more social support from their mothers to regulate their affective states. Therefore, there would be more mother-son dyadic interaction and the mothers would use different strategies in supporting the boys than they would the girls. The findings showed that the boys did have more difficulty in regulating their emotions and were generally uncooperative throughout the study relying on their mothers for comfort. Boys also showed more social, emotional and vocal expressions whereas the girls showed more general interest and enjoyment in playing with objects. Boys seemed to have limited self-regulation and displayed a need for social comfort and interaction with their mothers whereas the girls were more independent. These early processes of emotional regulation are thought to be precursors of future behaviour and offer an explanation of the gender differences apparent throughout development (Weinberg et al. 1999). This finding is supported by Charlesworth and Hartup (1967) who found that, in their study, young boys were the most likely children to actively give physical affection as a positive reinforcement in their peer group. They also

found that this was particularly evident when the young boys were engaged in dramatic play whereas the girls showed fewer positive reinforcement occurrences with their peers and were more inclined to interact through the use of objects in the table top play area (Charlesworth and Hartup, 1967). These findings suggest that although boys are perceived as using more overt forms of aggressive interactions, they are also observed displaying overt forms of affiliation and affection.

Although there has been a reoccurring perception throughout existing literature that boys are more aggressive than girls it is also acknowledged that girls are more likely to engage in relational, camouflaged aggression than boys. Alternatively, the literature also indicates that both girls and boys were observed to be displaying affection. It is therefore suggested here that boys and girls are both equally effective in asserting and maintaining a range of interactions with peers. This is evident in the data collected and analysed in this research where both girls and boys were found to be equally capable in the co-construction of social organisation in the playground. These findings are analysed in chapter five, section 5.4 where children's reference to gender is presented and discussed further in chapter six, sections 6.2, 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3.

The recognition of children's social competence is also an issue in relation to children's age. Children's social competence in relation to their age is a relevant topic to the current study and so is examined in more depth here.

2.12 Age and social competence:

Gottfredson (2001) argues that there is a decrease in physical aggression and externalising behaviour between early childhood and adolescence. It is also suggested that children aged eleven to twelve years are able to take a 'third person' perspective on dyadic social interactions and are able to read symbolic and immediate implications of behaviour displayed in conflict situations in their small intensive peer groups (Bjorkqvist and Osterman 2000). This reduction in the use of aggressive behaviour in pre-adolescence and adolescence coincides with a significant decrease in adult supervision

during the development of these years. This then makes an argument that children are socially competent through interactions with peers and less adult supervision. Interaction in the relatively unsupervised use of the school playground is therefore encouraged as it provides a unique environment for low levels of adult intervention and high levels of peer interaction (Pellegrini and Blatchford, 2000).

Alternatively, the decrease in physical aggression in children over the age of eight could also be explained through research by Bjorkqvist and Osterman (2000) who suggest that there are three progressive stages towards aggressive behaviour. This is initiated by 'physical aggression' which is the first stage of aggressive behaviour as children have not yet developed sufficient social and verbal skills to express anger in other ways (Bjorkqvist and Osterman, 2000). This is followed by 'direct verbal aggression' where children have developed sufficient skills to be able to express anger verbally, and finally 'indirect aggression' occurs when children cause harm to another child through social manipulation without the instigator being actively involved (Bjorkqvist and Osterman 2000).

Children's peer relations change as they grow, peers meet different needs in children at different stages of development as there are many changes in children's social organisation during primary school age (Gifford-Smith and Brownell, 2003). Although sharing, cooperating and comforting are all recognized as aspects of 'prosocial' behavior by some adults it is suggested that they may not all develop at the same time or be equally valued by all children (Jackson and Tisak, 2001). However, preschool children have also been viewed as being able to make sense of their social status and interactions in their immediate peer groups (Donaldson, 1987). They are capable of engaging in many types of behavior (Abdennur, 2000; Veenstra, 2006) and use this behaviour in the co-construction of their unique cultural worlds (Corsaro, 1997). The current research aligns with this perception of young children being socially competent where the findings from the data reveal children's capability in the co-construction of social order in their playground. These findings are presented and discussed in more depth throughout

chapters five and six, with a specific focus on children's social competencies available in section 6.5.

The research considered in the review to this point has been limited to perspectives on children's social interactions as situated in developmental psychology. While it provides a wide range of information with regard to children's perceived antisocial and prosocial behavior, from how and why interactions are initiated to the intellectual capabilities of maintaining relationships it tends to approach the investigation of the child as an individual phenomena, rather than a social being. This represents a shortfall in information regarding how the complexity of peer interactions are locally managed by the children themselves and that they draw on a range of social competencies. In doing so it underestimates children's social abilities and competency in organizing their social networks in everyday life. Therefore an alternative approach to investigating children's social behaviour through research which has used an emic perspective is now presented.

2.13 Review of methods used in research on children's behaviour

The majority of past research has addressed the development of behaviour deemed 'antisocial' as a single entity where a variety of both qualitative, but mostly quantitative, methods have been applied (Olweus, Block and Radke-Yarrow, 1986). Research began to include behaviour categorized as 'prosocial' as a contrasting concept to the study of 'antisocial' behaviour in the 1970s (Veenstra, 2006). This reached a peak in the 1980s where observational methods were applied using predefined categories in order to analyze when people used prosocial behaviour, while hypothetical questionnaires sought to explain why people used these behaviours (Penner et al. 2005). Due to the psychological underpinning of these studies, research addressing both prosocial and antisocial behaviours together often used predefined definitions and categories of behaviours which were bound to the activity of either prosocial or antisocial interactions and are created by the researchers (eg. Willoughby, Kupersmidt, and Bryant, 2001). Behavioral categories nominated by the researchers have also been used to differentiate between children's activities, such as rough and tumble play and aggression, where

detailed descriptions of behavior are recorded for analysis (Pellegrini, Symons and Hoch, 2004). Although the use of the predefined categories 'antisocial' and 'prosocial' may be helpful for the organisation of data for analysis, there is a concern that the classifications employed are designed by adults who are not members of the children's socio-cultural world and may therefore be incorrectly applied (Sacks, 1972).

The growing trend in children's involvement in research is evident in studies which elicit children's perception of their peer's aggressive behaviour alongside adult perceptions. Studies of antisocial behaviours directly involving children as research participants have tended to use a variety of child interviews and questionnaires where the children report their reactions to hypothetical situations (eg. McMahon, Wernsman and Parnes, 2006). This method has also been employed to elicit peer provocation (Goldstein et al. 2006) and motives for behaviour (Kalish, and Shiverick, 2004). More formal interview techniques and questionnaires have also been used in a small number of research projects but these have become less popular as it has been established that young children find interviews difficult due to the formality of the situation (Mauthner, 1997) and this consequently affects the validity of the data.

Further research into children's perceptions of peers aggressive behaviour has been initiated by specific activities being categorized into different types of aggression such as overt or relationally aggressive behaviour by the researchers; the children are subsequently asked to associate the particular characteristics with members of their class (for example: Gifford-Smith and Brownell, 2003; Rose, Swenson and Carlson, 2004). This method is often used in research which investigates the measurement of peer social status in relation to their exhibited behaviour and has subsequently led to the children being categorized as belonging to specific profiles such as 'invisible' children, children with low peer acceptance, and rejected children (Coie, Dodge and Coppotelli, 1982). Although useful in eliciting children's perspectives of their peers, this method encourages labeling of the observed children through the researcher's perspective of behaviour classification. Subsequently, this places limitations on each child being valued as an

individual and encourages practitioners to evaluate children on one aspect of their personality.

Whilst prior research addressing the issue of perceived positive and negative social behavior is informative, it has often been restricted by methodologies which elicit reflective accounts of children and adults' perspectives through the use of self-reports and peer nominations (see Parrott and Giancola, 2007 for an overview). This is problematic as the use of these methods in the area of children's prosocial and antisocial behaviour research has led to the presentation of a dichotomy of either prosocial or antisocial children. Reflective and hypothetical methodologies are problematic when children's immediate interactions and their contextual interpretations are being investigated. Perspectives of incidents change in their intensity and meaning through time, altering the immediate interpretation of an interaction. An etic approach to research, one that informs research through categories which are meaningful to the observer rather than the observed, can be restrictive as it influences the data by shaping it to fit the designed model rather than the data freely informing the researcher (Lepper, 2000; Psathas, 1995).

It is therefore argued here that a more authentic picture of the social relationships which children initiate, negotiate and maintain can be obtained through a method which privileges the collection and analysis of naturalistic data. An emic perspective can examine the internal cultural organisation which emerges from the interactions between children in their natural environment as they network together in dyads or groups. Detailed observations and subsequent data driven analysis are presented without the limitation of 'preconceived and pre-formulated identities, personality characteristics, or social "variables", "forces" or "factors."' (Psathas, 1999; p 141). Through applying an emic perspective to children's interactions, the research can provide an informed account of what the children are actually doing when they socially interact.

2.14 Research using an emic perspective

An etic perspective has often been used to analyze social interactions through the use of an outsider's perspective of events whereas an emic perspective investigates social worlds from an insider's perspective through analyzing aspects of interactions which the members themselves orient to (Sacks, 1992a; 1992b). Approaching the study of children's interactions from an emic rather than an etic perspective offers an insight into the everyday activities children are engaged in from within. This is particularly useful for research which investigates the activities practiced in early childhood conduct as an emic perspective affords, 'the perspective from within the sequential environment in which the social action was performed' (Seedhouse, 2005a; p252). By employing an emic perspective to the investigation of children's social worlds an important insight into the aspects of interactions which the children themselves find important is afforded. This is demonstrated by the children as they orient to some verbal and non-verbal actions and choose not to orient to others (for example: Butler, 2008; Butler and Weatherall, 2006; Church, 2009; Goodwin, 2006; Hutchby, 2005; Maynard, 1985; Sacks, 1992a; Shantz, 1987). Research using an emic perspective to investigate children's social worlds demonstrates how productive this perspective is in establishing a true representation of the interactions which form children's everyday lives.

Children are active participants in their own cultural worlds where they 'both affect and are affected by society' (Corsaro, 1997; p5). Corsaro (1985a; 1997) suggests that children co-construct their own peer cultures in childhood and also contribute to the organisation of adults worlds. The concept of co-construction is defined by Jacoby and Ochs (1995) as '*the joint creation of a form, interpretation, stance, action, activity, identity, institution, skill, ideology, emotion or other culturally meaningful reality*' (p 171 original italics). 'Co-construction' acknowledges each person as contributing to the production of the social environment. Language plays an integral part in the co-construction of children's social worlds as it is these exchanges which demonstrate each child's intentions and are systematically built on to develop individual social situations. Through the verbal turn by turn actions in everyday social occurrences, children and adults co-construct the social organisation which creates reality (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974; Sacks, 1992a, 1992b). Not only do children participate in the co-construction of adult life, but they are

also competent in co-constructing their own peer groups and cultures (Butler, 2008; Butler and Weatherall, 2006; Church, 2009; Corsaro, 1979, 1985a, 1997; Danby, 2008; Goodwin, 1990, 2006; Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2007; Kyratzis, 2004). Through perceiving children as actively involved in the co-construction of their own lives and the lives of others offers an alternative, positive view of children which differs to the prior image of children as potential threats to society until they are socialised by more powerful adults (Corsaro, 1997). The deficit model of the child underestimates their abilities and strengthens the power imbalance between children and their care givers whereas acknowledging children's contribution to the co-construction of social organisation recognises children as competent participants.

Social situations are co-constructed through the participants' immediate interpretation of events (Garfinkel, 1967) where a mutual understanding of an event is demonstrated by the participants; this is referred to as intersubjectivity (Schegloff, 1992a). In the context of social interaction, research has studied the aspect of intersubjectivity which can be defined as 'how separate individuals are able to know or act within a common world' (Goodwin and Duranti, 1992; p27). Intersubjectivity is relevant in the study of children's social interactions as these are also actively co-constructed by the members through their demonstration of their understanding of the social context (Sacks, 1992b). As this study is concerned with investigating children's social interactions through their use of verbal and non-verbal behaviour *pragmatic intersubjectivity* is explored as it 'concerns how participants deal with and understand each other in social situations; how agreement is achieved in collaboration with others...that such agreement is not a static state of knowledge, but an interactive process that stretches across different parties' (Aarsand and Aronsson, 2009; p1559). This indicates that a shared understanding is context relevant to the participants and environment in which the utterance is spoken. Social organisation develops systematically through the mutual understanding of verbal and non-verbal actions. Intersubjectivity is such an instrumental aspect of everyday social order that if a participant of an interaction fails to understand the intentions of the speaker, they make this known in their next turn of talk more often than not (Schegloff, 1992a). Misunderstandings are then addressed as soon as possible in order to sustain the smooth

flow of interaction. Through examining children's verbal orientation to specific verbal and non-verbal interactions, the importance which they place on certain items is made observably relevant to their immediate group and onlooking researchers. The following review of literature demonstrates how the analysis of such verbal and non-verbal interactions can be productive.

Although there has been a substantial amount of literature regarding gender differences in children it is important to refer to research which offers an emic perspective here as this informs of children's verbal reference and orientation to gender in their daily activities. This perspective can therefore offer a direct insight into children's construction of gender categories in their unique cultural worlds rather than relying on adult's perception of how gender is socially constructed amongst children. Goodwin (2002) refers to these socially constructed ideals of gender identity in literature which suggests that girls value aspects of affiliation and collaboration in their social interactions whereas boys are more abrupt and use competitive talk. Through a study which involved direct observation of children Goodwin (2002) found extended arguments, bullying and excluding behaviour in the girls' observed interactions which offered a very important contrast to prior research in this area. The issue of gender being a socially constructed achievement is explored by Garfinkel (1967), amongst others, where conduct is used to demonstrate socially relevant norms of gender roles in routine activities. Stokoe's work (eg. 2006) shows that members refer to gender categories to co-construct social organisation but emphasises that this orientation must be shown to be relevant in the interaction (see also Kitzinger, 2007).

Similar practices have been found in the social organisation of girls groups in the school playground (Goodwin, 2006). In this ethnographic study of playground interactions it was found that the girls used specific language to include and exclude members. Interactions were often related to relational aggression where gossip and name calling were used to alienate unwanted peers and, 'constant negotiation occurs with respect to who will be friends with whom, and who is excluded from such friendships' (Goodwin, 2006; p211). Boys were often observed as being involved in sporting activities which afforded regular opportunities for the realignment of social hierarchies amongst

members. Observations of children's talk-in-interaction in their social organisation show that children will make reference to membership and affiliation with certain peers and in doing so make their relationships with one another relevant (Butler, 2008). In their interactions children both boys and girls co-construct affiliations to some peers and actively exclude other members (Butler, 2008; Goodwin, 2006).

Further indication of children's use of physical action being used to support verbal action was found in research which observed an interaction between two girls where they made a verbal agreement together in the form of an assessment, and supported this with physical nods of the head (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992). The physical actions which were observed to be used by girls in another study involved their exclusion and inclusion of peers through the use of bodily alignment and stance (Goodwin, 2006). Other research by Charles Goodwin (1981) investigating verbal and non-verbal interactions concludes that the findings in the study support the prior theoretical perspectives of Birdwhistell (1971) in that, 'speech and body movement are integrated aspects of a single communications process' (p 169).

Goodwin's (1990) investigation of the behaviours and organisation of groups of children whose cultural world had received very little academic research attention, found that the children aged between nine and fourteen years formed groups with peers where membership was constructed with preference to age, gender and social housing proximity (Goodwin, 1990). Pre-adolescents' use of language to assert everyday social organisation through membership categories was initiated by Evaldsson (2005) where words which were initially used by one person were subsequently used by a second person to form an insult. Schegloff (2007a) explains that when sequences which initiate rejections and preferences occur, the subsequent interactions can proceed to either close or extend the interaction. Goodwin and Goodwin (2000) explain that the rejection of peers occurs when inappropriate behaviour has been used by an individual and the child is subsequently ostracized from the group. In this turn-taking a rejection can sequentially produce an argument (Maynard, 1985) whereas preference for an interaction can lead to affiliation (Seedhouse, 2005b). Corsaro (1979) observed the turn by turn processes in children's

attempted access to their desired dyad or group where it was noticed that an action by the child attempting access was reacted to depended on how the child reacted prior to that turn.

The concept of turn taking in the construction of social interaction is foundational in the field of conversation analysis (see Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). It is evident that in the activity of conversational turn taking membership categories are produced, and contextual social identities are constructed (Psathas, 1999). Through these turns at talk aggressive or affiliative behaviour is used as children align themselves verbally and through embodied action (Goodwin, 2006). It is this mutual understanding of the unspoken rules and social structure which sequential interactions are built on and from which social organisation emanates (Schegloff, 2007a). Literature regarding the social reinforcement of negative stigma through membership categorization analysis indicates that society's application of membership categorization devises organizes people depending on their category bound activities; if a person belonging to a category deviates the norm in some way they become noticeably different and are 'marked out' (Hester, 1998; p139). The exclusion of specific children is therefore noticeable as a co-construction of social order and is achieved through reciprocal interactions between members of a group (Goodwin, 2006).

Children will orient to specific aspects of conversation, therefore providing evidence for the meaningfulness of the activity (Goodwin, 1990). Further research into children's disputes also found that objects were oriented to and that ownership over the selected objects caused conflict between the children involved (Church, 2009). Through this empirical data children's orientation to goals can be investigated as it is observed that children display a variety of actions in order to manipulate their social situation to fulfil their own goals. Not only does this perspective provide an insight into the context relevant interactions children engage in with each-other to fulfil their personal and social goals, but it also enables researchers to further understand the verbal and non-verbal strategies the children use in gaining their goals through their physical alignment and talk-in-interaction (Gardner and Forrester, 2010; Goodwin, 1998). Further insight into the

processes of fulfilling a goal is acknowledged where the use of verbal orientation to hypothetical *conversational objects* or *tickets* is recognized as having import for members who are concerned with gaining access to, and the maintenance of, an interaction with a group or dyad (Sacks, 1992a; 1992b). These objects of conversation are items which any person can begin talking about to another person and are used to initiate an interaction. Conversational tickets are also useful for the members as the items can sequentially be referred back to throughout the conversation to maintain an interaction. The aspect of sequential turn taking in the reference to conversational objects is important in the discussion of group access, as access is either accepted or rejected by the other members in the sequence of opening an interaction (Schegloff, 1968).

Group access is also referred to by Corsaro (1979) where attention is given to children's observational strategies which are used prior to group or dyad entry. Corsaro suggests that children will physically move into their desired area of play and move around the members in a circling motion prior to their entry attempt; this is referred to as 'encirclement' (p 322). In interactional openings, if the members are strangers to one another, pronouns are used to secure attention prior to a subsequent interaction (Sacks, 1992a). These pronouns work in the mapping of individual roles in new social situations and are a part of the co-construction of social organisation (Butler and Weatherall, 2006). Pronouns and conversational objects or tickets are observable in the initiation of an interaction for accessing a group or constructing a dyad (Sacks, 1992a).

Goodwin and Goodwin (1987) suggest that in children's everyday lives, 'the children frequently seek opportunities to display character and realign the social organisation of the moment through opposition' (p206) therefore suggesting that when children practically demonstrate conflict behaviour it enables a repositioning in the social order. This highlights the issue of children's co-construction of social order where membership hierarchies are built through the use of conflict talk and disagreement with peers. This is supported by Van Dijk (1993) who claims that the unequal power relations present in social interactions are jointly produced in their initiation and maintenance. These power relations are an aspect of all social interactions, and that it is the members' orientation to

these issues of dominant power which make it relevant for social interactions in each specific context (Pomerantz and Fehr, 1997). These issues of power imbalance can violate children's rights and are evident in episodes of bullying (Goodwin, 2006).

This emic perspective to children's interactions offers a different view on the context of antisocial and prosocial behaviour as it encourages the concept of children's competence in the co-construction of a social environment which is built and maintained *within* the children's interactions. This perspective supports the concept of children being socially competent in their interactions with peers. Children's social competence can be observed in their natural settings where they use talk and physical alignment to demonstrate interactions which are meaningful to them within that context (Goodwin, 2006; Hutchby, 2005). In observations of children's interactional competences it is observed that children use their language to co-construct social organisation and cultures (Butler, 2008; Butler and Weatherall, 2006; Goodwin, 1990; Kitzinger, 2007). Children's display of social competence is also apparent in observations of sample groups of children co-constructing social organisational hierarchies through pretend play (Butler, 2008; Butler and Weatherall, 2006; Kyratzis, 2007) and social moral order through their orientation to the importance of specific social values (Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2007). With regard to age, recognizing children's competent use of their language as a tool for social construction, rather than viewing them as having underdeveloped intellectual skills in the making, subsequently presents children as existing competent citizens within their cultures (Thornborrow, 1998). Social competence was also found to be evident in children's arguments where, rather than viewing children's arguments as negative interactions which should be fixed, the Goodwins found that, 'argumentation gives children an opportunity to explore through productive use the structural resources of their language (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987).

Through using an emic perspective to investigate children's social worlds it becomes evident that all children are socially competent and this is practically demonstrated through their interactions. Research has observed children's social competence through their co-construction of social organisation where they demonstrate their ability to join

groups and dyads, and also their competence in becoming independent from these networks when desired. This is established through the children's contribution to the establishment of the context through applying the relevant verbal and non-verbal actions depending on the moral values present within the available members. Through this approach an insight into the production of interactions which the children value and count as meaningful in their everyday lives can be discovered.

2.15 Conclusion:

Throughout the review of literature that focuses on the antisocial and prosocial interactions of children it is apparent that a majority of research has used a psychological approach to address specific predetermined aspects of prosocial and / or antisocial behaviour. These areas of interest include investigations into how children initiate and maintain group and dyadic relationships and the behaviour used within. The reviewed literature offers information concerning the negative and positive behaviours displayed by sample groups of children through a deficit model using varying methodologies.

However, sociological research using an emic perspective to directly observe children's social interactions in naturalistic settings presents an alternative perspective. Research in sociology and linguistic anthropology shows children to be experts in the co-construction of their own social worlds and competent in using a wide range of social behaviours in the co-construction of unique social contexts. Through approaching these individual types of behaviour as co-existing aspects of social interaction an informed appreciation can be established.

The following research is initiated to further understanding in this area. In order to understand children's use of verbal and non-verbal actions in the construction of social organisation it is evident that data driven analysis is effective as it provides a unique insight into what are perceived as meaningful actions to the children themselves. A more comprehensive introduction to a sociological approach is presented in the following chapter where an argument for the use of an emic perspective is discussed.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The literature review revealed that a majority of the relevant literature which investigated children's antisocial behaviour did so through a psychological perspective. The etic perspective of a positivist paradigm results predominantly in the presentation of

children's behaviour as either prosocial or antisocial. This leads to children being categorized as being either consistently prosocial or antisocial (for example Nelson and Crick, 1999). It was argued that this view encourages stigma and the labeling of children rather than offering further insight into children's social worlds (Bateman and Church, 2008). Therefore, this research addresses the presentation of a limited dichotomy of children's prosocial and antisocial behaviours in current and past research through adopting a sociological approach.

The present research aims to investigate children's social interactions through an inductive approach to discover what is meaningful to the children themselves. This chapter explores the usefulness of an emic perspective in the identification of aspects of children's socialisation from within their unique culture. This chapter makes an argument for the use of conversation analysis (henceforth CA) and membership categorization analysis (henceforth MCA) as investigative tools which afford an insight into how children orient to, initiate and maintain social interactions with peers (Sacks, 1992). A study into the resources which children use in the co-construction of their everyday social lives can then be achieved.

This chapter begins with a discussion about the use of a sociological, emic perspective rather than a psychological, etic approach for the investigation of children's social interactions. Issues concerning the use of an ethnomethodological framework, and a more detailed investigation into the benefits of CA and MCA are then presented. The chapter will conclude with a summary of the advantages which CA and MCA can offer to an investigation into children's use of verbal and non-verbal behaviour in social organisation.

3.1 Ethnomethodology

Ethnomethodology (henceforth EM) has emanated from the sociological work of Schutz, Goffman and Mead whose interests were in the reflexive analysis of everyday social interaction (Atewell, 1974; Hassard, 1990). Goffman's research interests became

specifically focused on the syntactic organisation of human behaviour in everyday activities (Pomerantz and Fehr, 1997). This line of work was developed by Garfinkel who had a shared interest in how people interacted (Atewell, 1974) and founded the concept of EM (Pomerantz and Fehr, 1997). Garfinkel (1967) presents EM as a tool with which people's sense-making, interpretation and reaction towards others' interactions can be analyzed through actions-in-context.

This model of studying social order not only affords a closer look at how people construct their social worlds but also involves the detailed analysis of what is assumed as normal daily interactions to the people being observed (Silverman, 2006). The inductive characteristic of EM avoids preconceptions which may influence analysis, yet it encourages the emergence of data which guides the researcher (Garfinkel, 1967). Through observing unique incidents of children's social interactions directly as they occur, the individual uses of these behaviors can be seen first hand and in context through the emerging data. In this thesis, an ethnomethodological framework allows for the study of, 'the orderliness of social life as experienced, constructed and used from within' (Pollner and Emerson, 2001: p119). An inductive approach to the analysis of children's social orientations and interactions offers a unique data driven insight which would otherwise be limited by predefined hypothesis (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006).

CA is 'perhaps the most visible and influential form of ethnomethodological research' (Maynard and Clayman, 1991; p396). Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson's development of CA and MCA affords the ability to finely analyze the details of talk-in-interaction which are evident in social organisation (Dowling, 2007). This more specific focus on the co-construction of social organisation through membership in EM research has been highlighted, 'EM studies the world exclusively as a members' phenomenon. It is concerned with what members find there and what members do with what they find, with members' problems then, and members' solutions' (Eglin, 2002; p819).

With regard to the investigation of children's social conduct, Hester (1991) supports the use of an ethnomethodological framework in the analysis of deviance in schools and informs that, 'The social facts of deviance, from an ethnomethodological point of view, are constituted through the use and operations of members' methods of practical reasoning.' (p. 443). This suggests that, rather than simply labeling children's behaviour as 'deviant', ethnomethodology offers a more detailed analysis of what the children are actively achieving through their interactions. This methodological approach is therefore appropriate for the analysis of children's social interactions within their playground culture as it offers a unique insight into how behaviour is used to co-construct social organisation and establish membership through social networking.

Unlike the concept of context being a physical environmental space, as is evident in the literature throughout chapter two, this ethnomethodological perspective offers the perception of context as being co-constructed by the participants through their immediate interactions (Goodwin and Duranti, 1992). This interpretation initiates a move away from the broader, macro perspective of context to a more specific focus on the interactions between the participants themselves (Dupret and Ferrie, 2008).

'Instead of viewing context as a set of variables that statically surround strips of talk, context and talk are now argued to stand in a mutually reflexive relationship to each other, with talk, and the interpretative work it generates, shaping context as much as context shapes talk' (Goodwin and Duranti, 1992, p31).

In the current research, context is viewed as being co-produced by each participant's unique interactions with one-another; context is perceived here *as* immediate social order. The physical environment is then made relevant by a person's acknowledgement of it through their talk, rather than the environment imposing on, and influencing peoples conversation and interactions (Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002). That is, children will use the playground through their own personal interpretation and social requirements. Through verbal orientation to specific features, they are made contextually relevant by the members and the context is established through this conduct (Schegloff, 1992b). The

issues between the wider, 'external' and more specific 'intra-interactional' contexts in CA (Schegloff, 1992b) are discussed in more depth in section 3.4 in the latter part of this chapter.

3.2 Conversation analysis

As CA has a wide range of elements in its framework, this chapter does not aspire to provide a thorough review (see Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998; Schegloff, 2007b; Sidnell 2010 for introductions). Rather, the following discussion sets out the key features of conversation analysis which are relevant to the current study and instrumental to the subsequent analysis of data. This synopsis aims to familiarize the reader with the sequential aspects of CA which are used in everyday interactions to establish the co-construction of context. This is pertinent to the investigation into children's conduct as the social interactions of each child work to co-construct each social situation. The review will include: turn taking; adjacency pairs; summons-answer sequences; conversation objects; openings; overlap; repair; closings and non-verbal turn taking. To begin this discussion the import of an insistence on data-driven analysis is considered.

CA encourages unmotivated looking when approaching the analysis of talk-in-interaction, where repetitive themes emerge from data through the iterative process of investigation. This aspect of data-driven analysis is imperative in the use of CA as a method, where the risk of the researcher applying their own set of categories prior to the analysis is highlighted as unacceptable (Schegloff, 1996a). The concept of unmotivated looking has been challenged where it is argued that the analysis of data emanates from the researcher's motivation for investigation, therefore declaring the 'looking' motivated (see Psathas, 1990 for a discussion). In CA research, the topic under investigation must serve as the motivational aspect of the research process. The subsequent data analysis should then be approached with an open mind where no pre-theorized categories are used, therefore allowing the data to guide the emerging themes found within (ten Have, 2000). This perspective allows the data to inform the researcher, and in doing so provides an essential insight into the phenomena which motivated the investigation.

CA is used for researching the daily organisation of social interactions as it allows the researcher to, 'take singular sequences of conversation...and examine them in such a way as to find rules, procedures, inferences, and category devices that have been used to generate orderly features' (Owenby, 2005; p57). Everyday interactions are established through the order of turn taking, an element of which is identified as an adjacency pair whereby a first pair part (FPP) utterance from one person initiates an interaction from another person in the form of second pair part (SPP) utterance (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). These interactions are relatively ordered and can be seen in everyday interactions such as a question going before an answer, 'there is plainly, hearably, a first greeting and a greeting return; they're said differently' (Sacks, 1992a; p521). Adjacency pairs are produced when a SPP utterance is accepted as being 'discriminatively related' to a FPP utterance (Sacks, 1992a; p521) as the nature of the FPP defines the SPP (Silverman, 1998). This 'mutual orientation between speaker and hearer is the most basic social alignment implicated in spoken interaction' (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990; p292). Through their sequential turns at talk the members make demonstrably relevant issues which are perceived as important to them through their verbal orientation.

Language emanates from an individual's cognitive and emotional categorizations and is recognized as a tool in the co-construction of social organisation in all cultures including youth subcultures (Widdicombe and Wooffitt, 1995). These cognitive and emotional processes are also sequential in nature as they are influenced by prior experiences and are applied to everyday situations by the participating members (Garfinkel, 1967). In these verbal exchanges, or turns at talk, social organisation is co-constructed by the participants to produce the context. Through engaging in a conversation each member displays an understanding of the organisational rules which accompany that interaction such as beginning to speak when it is their turn (Schegloff, 1992a).

Conversational turn-taking sequences which people engage in everyday are initiated through conversational openings (Schegloff, 1968). When a person initially notices another person, 'an individual is categorically recognized as a member of an ethnic

group, a race, a social class, and so on, and such a sorting-out process helps to differentiate potential from non-potential interactions' (Schiffrin, 1977; p680). Schiffrin (1977) refers to the processes involved in interactional openings as 'ritual' (p 679). Goffman (1981) explores the instigation of interaction by focusing on the differences between ritual and systematic talk where, on recognition of a person, a 'cognitive recognition display' follows whereby an interaction is usually required. This interaction is described as an 'access display' where a greeting is offered and a subsequent interaction is achieved (Schiffrin, 1977).

When a person initiates an interaction with someone through a FPP utterance they will often use a pre-sequence to ensure that they have the attention of the targeted person before progressing to continue with the interaction. Sacks (1992b) suggests that a FPP utterance involves the use of a pre-sequence in order to gage how their sequential utterance will be received; this also works to prepare the targeted person for an ensuing offer or request. Schegloff (1980) extends this observation of pre-sequences used as introductions to other sequential conversational items other than being preliminary to offers and requests. Schegloff (2007a) informs that there are various types of pre-sequences which are used to establish various activities in the initiation of a preferred, agreeable interaction. For example, pre-announcements can be used in the same format where it is usual that when someone makes a statement they prepare the listener with a pre-announcement, allowing the speaker to determine whether what they are about to disclose is in fact news to the listener (Schegloff, 2007a). A targeted person will show their contribution to the interaction through their sequential reply which can either be verbally expressed through a second pair part (SPP) answer or non-verbally through a glance and bodily alignment (Goodwin 2006; Goodwin 2007).

Schegloff (1968) refers to the role of FPP and SPP utterances in his investigation into the opening sequences in telephone calls. Here, Schegloff found a deviant case in his analysis which encouraged him to re-structure his findings and thus discover the 'summons-answer' phenomena. Schegloff (1968) found that when one person summons another through the use of a name, it is the sequential action of the summoned who will

determine whether the interaction can progress by either providing an answer in reply to their name being called, or not. One person may initiate an interaction with another through summoning them, as the summoned person responds this produces a summons–response sequence in the form of an adjacency pair (Schegloff, 1968). In a summons–answer sequence each participant is aligned into the role of speaker or hearer in their interaction; this alignment provides a context which allows the initiation and maintenance of an interaction (Schegloff, 1968). The use of a name in conversational story telling works to assist the choosing of an identification classification for the summoned member (Sacks, 1992b). The process of this initial identification selection is presented as two components, ‘for Type 1, obvious instances are things like first names: Jim, Joe, Harry, etc. and obvious instances of Type 2 are things like “a guy,” “someone,” etc’ (Sacks, 1992b; p443). It is further acknowledged that the use of a name is the preferable identification selection and is used wherever possible (Sacks, 1992b). Through using names to refer to people, it is implied that the speaker and the named person know each other well enough to be on first name terms.

Sacks (1992b) also suggests that in the opening of an interaction people may refer to conversational tickets or objects which can be used as an account for why one person initiates contact with another. Hypothetical conversation items, such as reference to the weather, are used at the beginning of an interaction as verbal tools which ‘provide the makings of activities. You assemble activities by using these things’ (p xxv). Literal ‘props’ are also used in the same way as conversation objects where they are employed to steer the course of conversation (van Dijk, 1997). The member’s orientation to these conversational objects work to access interactions and are also present in the co-construction of social organisation as sequential utterances can further employ the chosen conversation object. This is apparent when a person orients to a conversational object in an utterance which is sequentially touched off by a second person in their next turn at talk. The term ‘touched off’ means that when one member uses a conversation item in their utterances it is sequentially used by the person whom they are interacting with in their next turn at talk. This orientation to a conversation item makes its importance in that context noticeable by the participants and other observers.

Questions regarding chosen objects can legitimately initiate an interaction through conversational turn taking as the use of a question regarding the item will initiate a reaction from the second person as they are required to provide an answer to the prior question (Schegloff, 1992a). Questions are often used in order to encourage an interaction where a person makes an inquiry to initiate a conversational sequence as they are aware of the rule that a question requires an answer; a FPP produced as a question is more likely to provoke an SPP in the form of an answer (Schegloff, 2007a). When a question is not answered the person may repeat their question until some recognition is referred to by the recipient; this is recognized as a 'try marked' attempt at establishing an interaction (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979; p18). When an answer is given, it can be done through the use of an assessment whereby the second person aligns themselves as either agreeing or disagreeing with the first person (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992). These assessments which are produced through the activity of conversational turn taking enable the establishment of social order as the participants display their congruity (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992).

In relation to children's conversational openings, Sacks (1992a) suggests that children 'have restricted rights to talk' (p256) and so they often open an interaction with an adult by asking a question such as 'guess what' as this requires a sequential question from the adult, 'what?'. The child is therefore required to speak a second time and has achieved their goal of a secured interaction. Sacks (1992a) describes the use of greetings in conversational interactions and acknowledges the brief exchange of the word 'hello' as the minimal conversation. Sacks suggests that children observe and learn this as is evident on their meeting with a friend where they repeat the word 'hello' until they receive a sequential 'hello' in return. On completion of this exchange the initiator of the interaction is then satisfied.

In these interactions, when a person has initiated a turn through a FPP utterance, a hesitant response in a SPP utterance is recognized as a dispreferred second turn (Pomerantz, 1984). This hesitant opening can be heard as separate from the natural

progression of the conversation and problematic in the co-construction of the context (Jefferson, 1974). The false start also qualifies for a dispreferred second turn as it not only starts cautiously but it also goes on to provide a justification and explanation for the prior conduct (Pomerantz, 1984). A dispreferred response to a FPP utterance has also been noted when silence or a hearable pause follows (Schegloff, 2000a). Silence can be used to indicate that the silent party is unwilling to offer an agreeable answer to a question (ten Have, 2000) and this lack of sequential conversation through a SPP utterance is heard as problematic (Schegloff, 1968). A hearable pause is recognized as an inter-turn gap which is an overlong space in a conversational turn between a first and second speaker and is used prior to a dispreferred response (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007a). However, Macbeth (1991) also suggests that within-turn pauses can be used as a way to assert power in the interaction as is often observed in the teacher – pupil context. A within-turn pause is used whilst in the middle of speaking, whereas a between-turn pause is the term used for a noticeable silence between two speakers where one member begins an utterance to break the silence (ten Have, 2000). Where no speaker is selected in a turn it is an open situation where anyone can speak.

This transition space has been identified as a common place for conversational overlap (Jefferson, 1984; 1986). Although silence can represent a potential problem in the flow of interactional turn taking, the presence of two or more people speaking at the same time in conversational overlap can also be problematic (Schegloff, 2000b). Schegloff, (2000b; p5-6) suggests that when members do not orient to an overlap as problematic there are four known reasons why; these include ‘terminal overlaps’ where the speaker is coming to the end of their sentence and ‘continuers’. The latter are utterances such as ‘mmhm’ which show support and understanding of the speakers utterances and are not seen as competition for the floor as they do not imply ‘shift’ in the turn of speech (cf. Jefferson 1984 for more on this). ‘Conditional access to the turn’ where the speaker invites another member to interrupt their not-yet-complete utterance in order to support and/or extend what they are saying (p5) and ‘choral’ utterances which are done simultaneously not serially such as laughter, greetings, congratulations etc (p6) are also included. Although these are all acceptable reasons for overlap there are some aspects of conversation which

are seen as problematic and oriented to as such by the members in their conversational turn.

These problematic conversational turns are recognized as such through conversational repair which are often initiated through a breakdown of communication where a joint understanding of the situation is unsuccessful (Schegloff, 1992a). In CA it is unnecessary for people to verbally announce their intentions of actions to other people as they rely on the person taking the next conversational turn to point out any misunderstanding which is in need of repair (Eglin and Hester, 1999). Conversation repair is evident in the organisation of talk whereby one member of the interaction initiates the repair sequence by orienting to the trouble source, otherwise known as the repairable (Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell, 2010; ten Have, 2000). This miscommunication is oriented to by either the speaker in a self-correction or by another member through other-correction (Schegloff, 1999) therefore initiating the sequence of repair through verbal turn taking (Weatherall, 2002). This application of conversational repair is referred to by Jefferson (1974) as 'Error Correction Format' (p188) where self correction involves a person cutting off their sentence and reorganizing their words. This self-initiated repair is the preferred form of correction over other-initiated repair as it is less disruptive to the flow of conversation (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977). A repair which is initiated by other correction is found to be the non-preferred strategy due to it being less effective compared to self-correction (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977). A preference for self-correction has been found as this form of repair is attended to immediately and is the most successful whereas other-correction may take a number of turns to rectify (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977). Through the repair of conversational errors the interaction can progress.

With regard to conversational closings, it was initially recognized by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) that conversations do not come to an abrupt end, but are closed through a series of noticeable turns of talk by the participants. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) investigate how the natural event of turn taking comes to an end without the ensuing silence being a noticeable problem for the participants in the conversation. As the closing of a conversation is therefore perceived of as problematic, Schegloff and Sacks (1973)

describe conversational closings as being achievements. Through investigating the sequential turn taking between adjacency pairs it was found that a particular format is employed for closing a conversation where one person's utterance limits what can be done by the next person in their turn (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).

Conversational closings are produced by closing-beginnings and closing-endings (Sacks, 199b). There are places in conversations where a closing beginning is asserted whereby 'somebody signals that perhaps the conversation should close' (Sacks, 1992b; p88). In the sequential rules of closings, when one person introduces the sequence of closing with a FPP utterance, the other person indicates that they have heard and understood that the FPP utterance is 'doing' a closing in their SPP utterance (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).

Although it is acknowledged that two party utterances are needed for a closing and that a unilateral foreshortened closing doesn't work (Schegloff 2007a), a unilateral *initiation* of a closing is recognized as an acceptable arrangement for instigating a move towards the end of an interaction (Button, 1991). One such closing-beginning is initiated through the use of 'formulating summaries' (Button, 1991; p 254) which is initiated by one participant as an assessment of the topic discussed in the interaction. This works to provide a conclusion to the prior discussion. Subsequently a SPP utterance is limited to also orienting to the summary, establishing a joint conclusion to the interaction by both members and an understanding that the interaction is complete. Pre-closures are also hearable as an intention to close the interaction by one party (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). The use of 'empty objects' (ten Have, 2000; p22) such as the words 'right' and 'okay' along with a downward intonation, work as pre-closures to a current topic and when they are followed by an agreement the topic is understood as closed (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).

When investigating the aspect of the initiation of the closing sequence it is of interest as to whether this responsibility lies with the interaction initiator or 'the caller or the called' (Sacks, 1992b; p366). Schegloff (2000b) suggests that through the investigation of 'sequence closing thirds' the person who opens the conversation sequence is accountable

for initiating the closing. The initiation of a closing through a FPP utterance is sequentially touched off by a SPP utterance which also orients to the utterance as an acceptable closing before the conversation can be drawn to an end. This then presents a closing-ending which is accomplished through the sequential turn taking utterances from each participant. This is needed to ensure that each member is aware that the closing of an interaction is occurring and also allows the participants to demonstrate that they are in agreement about bringing the conversation to a close.

Along with the recognition that verbal turn taking constructs the immediate context of the interaction, conversational turns can also be displayed as a physical action (Goodwin, 2006). In order to maximize a mutual understanding between members verbal actions are often accompanied or even replaced by physical gestures (Goodwin, 2006). Although the name CA evokes an image of a method which is limited to the analysis of spoken language, it is the talk-in-interaction which allows a detailed investigation into everyday interactions in situ (Francis and Hester, 2004; Schegloff, 2007a). The non-verbal exchanges which speakers display when engaging in interactions are also regarded as a product of the organisation process (Rutland et al, 2006) and have equal importance in the co-construction of social interactions (Pomerantz and Fehr, 1997; ten Have, 2004). Both verbal and non-verbal exchanges are orderly actions in everyday social organisation as the turn by turn interactions of each member build on each-other to establish the context (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). This concept is of particular relevance for research concerning childhood interactions as it is recognized that each 'action requires a responsive action' (Schegloff, 2007a; p4). In other words, social order can be constructed by sequential turns through the use of either verbal or physical actions.

Maynard (1985) refers to alignment in his study investigating the initial openings of children's arguments; an area which Maynard felt was often neglected in research addressing disputes. This research oriented to the sequential nature of arguments which Maynard suggests begin either verbally or non-verbally prior to the opposition response. Physical turns which have been observed in research include the use of gaze (Goodwin, 1981) and head nodding (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992) to display engagement in an

interaction. It has also recently been observed that the use of bodily alignment and stance are used by girls to demonstrate a member's association with peers (Goodwin, 2007). The sequences involved in these physical gestures are equally as productive as verbal turn taking in the co-construction of social organisation by the members involved.

3.3 Conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis combined

Whereas CA focuses on the turn-by-turn sequencing and organisation of talk, MCA pays attention to the situated and reflexive use of categories in everyday and institutional interaction (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006; p38). This is further explained by Francis and Hester (2004) who state that, 'one basic 'difference' between CA and MCA is that whereas CA's explicit focus is on such things as turn design and sequence organisation, MCA is 'concerned with the organisation of common-sense knowledge in terms of the categories members employ in accomplishing their activities in and through talk' (Francis and Hester, 2004: p21). Therefore, investigations into social interactions have either been analyzed through the person's sequential involvement in talk through CA, or by a member's orientation to categories with which each person constructs their social networking (Francis and Hester, 2004).

A brief overview of research which also analyzes people's orientation to categories through sequential organisation in conversation is also provided by Butler (2008). In research concerned with children's use of social interactions in the co-construction of social organisation, the use of both CA and MCA together provide a rigorous investigation into the categories which children orient to and how these are sequentially touched off and extended through ensuing turns at talk by other members. Butler (2008) addresses the issue between the use of either CA or MCA in research and argues that, in her study, 'Categorization is thus understood to be embedded in, produced through, and relevant for the sequential organisation of talk' (Butler, 2008; p40). Through the combined use of CA and MCA the sequential co-construction of context through the children's orientation to immediately relevant categorization can be revealed.

3.4 Membership Categorization Analysis

It has been established that CA is concerned with the sequential turn taking which produces the social context in everyday interactions. Relevant aspects of MCA are now introduced in order to provide further familiarity of the concept. This enables further insight into children's conduct through the use of membership categories which the children make relevant in their production of context. This section will include an overview of elements of membership categorization analysis which are pertinent to the subsequent data analysis (chapter 5). The issues which will be investigated include: membership categorization device; category bound activities; the consistency rule; intersubjectivity; collective proterms and possessive pronouns; standard relational pairs; bond of obligation; institutional behaviour; systems of internal control; positioned categories; context free and context sensitive talk; and context specific categories.

MCA investigates the 'categorization activities involved in interaction' (Butler, 2006; p443). Membership categories are established through member's common sense knowledge which all people infer about other people (Schegloff, 2007b). Although there are many categories which one person can belong to such as mother, lawyer, wife or athlete, MCA is concerned with investigating members' categorization in interactions in order to further understand the co-construction of social organisation. This is achieved through observing the member's orientation to the use of specific categories in specific contexts (Sacks, 1992a; 1992b).

A membership categorization device (henceforth MCD) is described as an 'apparatus' (Schegloff, 2007b p467). Each person has this apparatus along with a collection of categories with which they apply to the people and situations they encounter through inference-richness (Schegloff, 2007b). Schegloff (2007b) refers to inference- richness where all people assume an understanding about people through the way in which they behave. A person can be identified as a member of a specific group or dyad through the category bound activity (CBA) they engage in (Francis and Hester, 2004). This is described as common sense knowledge and is achieved through membership

categorization which is informed by people's observation of physical and auditory interactions (Schegloff, 2007b).

Sacks (1972) defines the concept of MCDs, 'A *device* is then a *collection* plus rules of application' (Sacks, 1972; p32 original italics). An MCD can be applied to people who form organized groups and also those who do not (Sacks, 1992a). Furthermore, an MCD is used when a person insinuates that they are a member of a certain group in society; we then make inference-rich evaluations of what that person must be like due to their membership to that particular group. This is relevant to the membership inference-rich representative (MIR) device where a person's name is replaced with a category. For example, rather than using the personal identification of an individual, the category to which they belong is used such as 'a soldier' or 'a Gypsy'. This is evident when a person is described as a woman, a mother or a teacher. Sacks notes that in the MCD, there are 'not some exclusively appropriate or required choice of devices' (Sacks, 1992a; p206). There are alternative devices which can be employed when people are involved in social situations where the most appropriate category is used to accomplish and justify an individual's goals (Sacks, 1992a). As there are multiple categories that a person can belong to there is an order of relevancy to distinguish which category is the most important at that time. This is termed as a hierarchy of relevance as the most obvious aspect of a person's identity is used to describe them (Sacks, 1992a).

In the event of a game the first order of relevance is whether an action is illegal or legal, 'If an action in a game is attempted, and is done illegally, then the attempted action does not count at all' (Sacks, 1992a; p500). This co-construction of moral order in social interactions displays the 'omni-presence of right-wrong considerations for actions' (Sacks 1992a; p500). In the context of children's interactions, an 'illegal' action is one which is shown to be problematic by the children through their orientation to it as unacceptable behaviour for a specific situation; legal actions are not usually oriented to by the members who accept the behaviour as conventional conduct. With regard to children's social interactions, children who are unfamiliar with each-other ask questions regarding MCDs on meeting; these involve inquiries into the other person's place of

residence or age so that inference can be made about that person (Maynard and Zimmerman, 1984). This sharing of personal information between people is acknowledged as 'doing description' (Schegloff, 2007b: p463) where MCDs hold the resources for these narratives. Through using these resources for the classification of a person, children demonstrate their social competency and ability to construct social networks in their own culture (Butler, 2006).

When a person is socially located using a MCD, then other categories from the same MCD can be applied to the other members using the consistency rule (Sacks, 1972). The consistency rule suggests that what can be said about one member of a group or culture can be said about all of the other members (Sacks, 1972). Asserting membership to a group makes 'stateable about yourself whatever is stateable about the group you belong to' (Sacks, 1995; p46). When a person believes that it is improper to belong to a certain group they may propose membership through mentioning occupational categories (things which are done by members of certain groups) therefore making membership known without actually saying it.

This mutual understanding regarding which category a member belongs to in individual contexts is achieved through intersubjectivity. A person's understanding of the intentions of another person, or intersubjectivity, is displayed through their turn taking of actions where one person builds on the prior actions of their partner (ten Have, 2004). Intersubjectivity has been used in sociology to address how children learn about cultural rules in their surroundings through the people whom they interact with (Schegloff, 1992b). It is a mutual understanding in an interaction whereby more than one person interprets the situation in the same way as displayed through verbal and non-verbal turn taking (ten Hav, 2004). A break down of intersubjectivity needs to be repaired in order for a mutual understanding of the situation to be shared, and in order for communication to be successful (Schegloff, 1992a). Intersubjectivity is important for group members as it is their congruity and shared knowledge which constructs their co-membership (Fitzgerald, Housley and Butler, paper 109).

Garfinkel (1967) suggests that intersubjectivity is achieved through announcements which are made by members as a way of understanding and sharing the meaning of the interaction they are 'doing'. The use of announcements works to enable a 'rationality of his achievement' through the joint action of 'doing' an interaction and 'telling' about it (Garfinkel, 1967; p3). This is supported by Goodwin (1981) who also suggests that observations of interactions show verbal and non-verbal actions being used collectively in the course of communication. The use of both verbal and non-verbal actions allows members to practically demonstrate that they belong to a specific category through category bound activities (CBA). When people display a CBA it makes their membership to categories visible to other people who are observing them. If a member of a category behaves in a way which is not recognized as CBA for that category they are seen as an exception rather than the common sense knowledge about that category being changed (Schegloff, 2007b).

Through the use of verbal and non-verbal exchanges the mapping of social roles is formed and social organisation is co-produced to establish individual contexts. This is particularly evident in the use of collective proterms with words such as *everyone*, *we* and *us* which are used by members to place themselves and others in desirable categories (Leudar, Marsland and Nekvapil, 2004). This works to develop affiliation through members associating themselves to a category, or to distinguish a separation between members of society by suggesting that, we do this but they do that (Sacks, 1992a). Collective proterms are used when 'establishing a cohort' and in the organisation of a collective action (Butler, 2008; p95). By verbally orienting to membership categories through reference to MCA people align themselves and actively participate in constructing social order. Children can map themselves as belonging to the categories 'leader' and 'followers' in their games (Butler and Weatherall, 2006) and this creates a standardized relational pair (SRP) whom belong to the same group and have obligations to one another (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006).

Possessive pronouns are also used to include members through affiliative, possessional and relational identification (Sacks, 1992a). The affiliative use of a possessive pronoun

works to establish membership to a specific category such as “My family”, “my country”, and the like’ (p383). Possessive pronouns can be used to ascertain a person’s claim over an object as is apparent in the utterances, ‘my car’ or ‘my house’. The relational use of the possessive pronoun includes instances such as a tying to a family member, for example, ‘my brother’ (Sacks, 1992a; p383). This relational possessive pronoun asserts a relational pair, which works to demonstrate that the person who has spoken the utterance is a part of that pair. When taking into consideration these three uses of possessive pronouns, each one is declared in an utterance which makes it recognizable that there is a connection between the speaker and the asserted pronoun. This is evident as the speaker makes the connection between the relational pair demonstrably relevant in their use of the chosen possessive pronoun.

An SRP can be described when two children are interacting as a part of a coequal relational category otherwise termed as collection device ‘R’ as they have an equal friend – friend relationship (Sacks, 1992a). Collection ‘R’ members have rights and obligations for giving help to one another in a specific place at a specific time (Silverman, 1998). This makes a relationship as part of the Collection ‘R’ device indexical and occasioned as the members use prosocial behavior in a specific situation with particular people to co-construct the context. In a collection ‘K’ device the members belong to the category of people who are knowledgeable and can therefore offer help through a cognitive awareness of how to approach the trouble, rather than in the collection ‘R’ category of people where there are emotional bonds of rights and obligations.

A bond of obligation between people means that each person in that bond has a responsibility to the other and that they can call on that person for help as they are in some way obliged to be of assistance. These are evident through friendships and family members and are referred to as classes of ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ (Sacks, 1992a). When requesting help from outsiders a different format of asking for assistance is procured than if a person was asking for help from an insider. It is suggested that an outsider is only asked for help as a last resort; if an insider is approached for help but no offer is secured an ‘outsider’ will be referred to. However Schegloff (2007b) suggests that sometimes

people view an outsider as more knowledgeable in the experienced area of trouble and therefore more proper to confide in. This instigates the troubled person to approach a member from the more knowledgeable outsider category of people before initiating contact with a member who belongs to the 'insider' category such as a friend. An example of this can be observed in preschool institutions where a child will typically approach a teacher with a problem rather than a peer.

A member's identification of the specific roles and identities of the members in an institution is demonstrated by their orientation to these observable identities in order to make the context (Drew and Heritage, 1992). In primary schools and early years settings it is recognized that the social organisation within is specific to each individual institution as it is co-constructed through the participants' talk and actions (Butler, 2008). Although this is apparent, there remain some similarities in each institution such as the teacher instigating the allotment of turns between themselves and the children through question and answer scenarios. In these institutional interactions there is a more formal pre-structure to the conversational turns than is evident in non-institutional environments (Francis and Hester, 2004) where actions are presented by the teacher to produce a formal, 'institutionalized order of action' (Butler, 2008; p27). These allocated turns of talk map the utterances of the teacher and children as an SRP which enforces the rules of conduct which are tied to each role. However, these institutional roles of conduct do not remain in the classroom setting. Children also construct institutions in their play at school break-time where there is evidence of the mapping of one 'person in charge' which is similar to the teacher/pupil SRP in the classroom (Butler, 2008). This therefore suggests that, 'institutional talk is an interactional practice rather than a feature of a setting' (Butler, 2008; P28).

In individual settings there are internal systems of social control which are operated and enforced (Sacks, 1992a) by the group members themselves through their interactional practices; however, a person can also be categorized without belonging to an organized group. If a person recognizes themselves as being associated with a group which has members who have committed a morally inappropriate act they become united through

justifying the wrongdoer's actions, therefore justifying their own personal alliance with that group (Sacks, 1992a). Even members of a group or SRP who are silent support negative behaviours enforced by the mapped leader as they actively do nothing to defuse the situation (Andreou and Metallidou, 2004). This is due to the internal system of control whereby the existing members enforce the rules of CBA which are acceptable for membership in their own group (Sacks, 1992a). The displayed CBA sequentially offers solidarity as it is known that certain groups have members who act in a specific way (Sacks, 1992a). This is associated with Goffman's concept of 'ratification' which is where, 'The identity assumed by one party is ratified, not by her own actions, but by the actions of another who assumes a complementary identity towards her' (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990; p292). The actions of each member are therefore held accountable by the other members as what can be said about one member of a category can be applied to subsequent members by the consistency rule (Sacks, 1992a; 1992b).

The aspect of members asserting affiliation with peers through CBA is addressed by Sacks who presents the philosophical question, 'if you assert some moral rule, are you doing anything more than asserting your affiliation?' (Sacks, 1992a; p195). This suggests that if a member agrees with a particular moral rule which is accepted as legal within a group, that member actively affiliates themselves to that group category. Equally, by disagreeing with a moral rule the member will display their disaffiliation from the group category. Members assert their application of a rule to the category to which they are a member, therefore showing their affiliation to that specific category and accepting the CBA which is tied to being a member.

Further co-construction of an environment is produced by the positioned categories (Sacks, 1992a) in these category sets where higher and lower category positions are observable in relationships. The same aspect of 'ratification' is also present in positioned categories as a members behaviour will be assessed either positively or negatively by comparing them to a lower or higher category than they actually belong to depending on their behaviour (Sacks, 1992a). This is possible as positioned categories are produced by two set classes whereby one set has power and the other has less (Sacks, 1992a). For

example, a baby has a lower power position in the 'family' category than the mother, and a teenager can be referred to as grown up by acting like an adult or a baby. The person who holds the power in the set is legitimately entitled to assess and comment on the behaviour of the person with less power, therefore organizing the social environment. As the members available in each individual context change in different situations, so the power symmetries change. A person who has very little power in one situation with particular members may be the most powerful in another social situation with different members.

As well as power relations being relevant to the talk-in-interaction, words can hold different meanings depending on the context which the participants have created. This involves how words are invoked by the members in their turn-by-turn co-production, through FPP utterances and their response as this is 'context in action' (McHoul, Rapley and Antaki, 2008, p831). The perspective of the co-construction of social order actually *being* context is emphasized throughout this research. Within this co-creation of context some words are indexical as they do not carry the same meaning in all contexts; the context defines the meaning of the word (Garfinkel, 1967). This concept of talk being context free and context sensitive was illuminated by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974).

'It is the context-free structure which defines how and where context-sensitivity can be displayed; the particularities of context are exhibited in systematically organized ways and places, and those are shaped by the context-free organisation' (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974; p 699).

Conversation is engaged in within the multiple situations which a variety of people attend, therefore making it context free, but it is the individual conversation items which are responsive to the immediate participants that makes conversation also context sensitive. Through the nature of conversation being context free and context sensitive, the analysis of it, 'seeks to reveal how speakers draw upon universal procedural rules to create locally relevant shared understanding' (Lepper, 2000; p 55). It is therefore understood that in each individual social situation the context will be co-constructed

through the turn taking of the members within (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). When people are brought together in a new environment they will use MCDs to categorize other members so to understand the situation better where their, 'categorization reflects not the structure of the world but the order that humans impose on it.' (Markman, 1989: p8-9). The categorization of members sequentially establishes social organisation as, 'what does matter about a category is its indexical use...what is made of it there and then' (Antaki and Widdicombe, 1998 p80), thus further supporting the notion of context being 'intra-interactional' (Schegloff, 1992b, p195).

Schegloff (1992b) discusses the 'intra-interactional' versus 'external' perceptions of context in conversation analysis where he argues that external, or environmental, surroundings should only be brought into analysis if the members themselves orient to them in their interactions. Where the environment is mentioned in analysis, but not oriented to by the participants, 'its status remains profoundly equivocal' (Schegloff, 1992b, p215). However, this perception is argued with as it is thought to be too restrictive, whereas using an ethnomethodological approach along with CA presents a clearer picture through external and intra-interactional details of context (de Kok, 2008; McHoul, Rapley and Antaki, 2008). Within the current research, context is understood as the ever-changing co-construction of social order through verbal and non-verbal interactions. This enforces an intra-interactional account of context where the wider aspects of the external environment are brought into play when the participants make references to them.

These categorizations are recognized as context specific (Lepper, 2000) as a category can be used to describe a person in an explicit situation; in another situation at another time that person may be categorized differently. When referring to some categories there are recognizable category contrasts, such as standing and sitting (Sacks, 1992b). Orienting to a person as belonging to one part of a category contrast implies that there is also a category which the person does not belong to, where being associated to one, 'excludes the other in some logical way' (Sacks, 1992a; p679). 'Category contrasts are 'occasioned' devices' (Hester, 1998; p136) and are co-produced and applied to an existing occurrence.

This emphasizes the difference between two different category sets which have been applied as they are made as hearable contrasts such as, the difference between other children and the way a particular child does something (Hester, 1998). This differentiation is produced through the use of a 'transition marker' (Hester, 1998; p137) in the talk involving category contrasts such as 'but' or 'with this child'. A child can also stand out as deviant if he acts in a way which contrasts to the usual category bound activity appropriate for the context. As it has already been established, the concept of 'indexical and occasioned' activities indicates that this behavior is only relevant in its local setting. Therefore, a child who uses deviant behavior in one situation may use prosocial behaviour in another. An indexical utterance can be interpreted to have different meanings depending on the hearers' perspective and the context in which it takes place (Schegloff, 2007a).

With reference to the work of Schultz (1962) it is implied that when children begin school they bring with them existing assumptions about how other children conduct their lives through their own personal experiences. Therefore they will expect peers and adults to behave in certain ways depending on how they themselves act and how they have seen others act in conjunction with the category to which they perceive those others to belong (Schultz, 1962). The synthesis of predefined knowledge from each child then creates a collective social co-construction of categories through common-sense knowledge which is available through catalogues of experience (Garfinkel, 1967; Owenby, 2005)

3.5 The use of CA and MCA for this study

In order to investigate the use of membership categories in social organisation it has been suggested that the analyst is a member of the society in which the talk was made and therefore is aware of the rules for interaction which are applied in the shared society. This cultural familiarity was a concept used by Sacks to defend his analysis in his early work (Anataki and Widdicombe, 1998). However, Schegloff (1991) addressed this issue by emphasizing the importance of how the hearer translates the talk, by analyzing the categories that people orient and make relevant to. This clarifies that the identity and

categorization is made relevant by the participants rather than the analysts; if an observation is made of 'something culturally familiar in the data' you should 'be obliged to say how it is there for the participants' (Schegloff, 1991; p10). This perspective is important for the use of CA and MCA in childhood research where the adult observer is recognizable as not belonging to the immediate culture of being a child. The participant's orientation to categories in social contexts highlights what is perceived as important to them, and this is subsequently observable to the researcher.

Problems associated with the method of CA and MCA involve using the analysis of conversations to try to determine what is understood by the observed people as it is argued that only the speaker themselves would fully understand what they mean by their utterance (Anataki, and Widdicombe, 1998). It is subsequently argued that this rarely happens as a majority of people do tend to correctly interpret what the other person is intending to convey in order for society to work. If there is a misunderstanding it is oriented to by either the speaker or the hearer and a repair is initiated (Francis and Hester, 2004). It is also recognized that the use of CA and MCA as analytical tools focuses on how the people who are involved in the interaction orient to sequential communication in order to make sense of the social situation (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). A misinterpreted response in a conversation may lead to the hearer requesting the speaker to further interpret their contribution in order to clarify their intentions (Schegloff, 2007a).

The rigorous nature of CA and MCA is particularly useful for an investigation into young children's social conduct as 'understanding analytically what action is (or actions are) being done by some unit of talk is not accessible to casual inspection and labeling; it requires examination of actual specimens of naturally occurring talk in interaction' (Schegloff et al. 2002; p5). Through employing the method of MCA and CA, aspects of children's social worlds which they themselves perceive as relevant can be observed and made accessible for analysis through their everyday activities. CA and MCA equip researchers with a tool for the investigation of the sequential orderliness of children's social activities through their talk-in-interaction. This provides researchers of childhood disciplines access to their unique culture which would otherwise be inaccessible. Through

the investigation into the sequential turn taking in children's social interactions important findings can be revealed as talk-in-interaction alignment is oriented to and built upon in children's cultures.

The use of MCA as a research method allows an adult observer access to the everyday interactions which form the social organisation in children's worlds as they make certain issues demonstrably relevant and not others. The speakers actively display their intentions both verbally and non-verbally to other members of their community, including the researcher, therefore allowing insight into their social lives which would otherwise not be accessible. The use of MCA offers benefits for research with young children as direct observations of children's social construction through their orientation to categories is offered (Butler, 2008). Through using MCA the children's physical and linguistic perceptions of events are directly recorded therefore providing an essential insight into their understanding of daily interactions in situ (Hester and Francis, 1997). The children's immediate use of resources which are applied to their everyday social organisations can in turn offer further understanding of the social activities which constitute relations in their own unique culture. Children's orientations to attended categories are built upon to produce social order and this can be investigated through the use of CA and MCA as analytic tools. Whereas other methods make available a review of a situation through children's and researcher's interpretation of events, the analysis of the use of everyday verbal and non-verbal interactions offers an insight into how social networks are co-constructed through direct observations of talk-in-interaction (Goodwin, 1990). This methodology is therefore particularly relevant for an investigation into children's prosocial and antisocial behaviour as the various types of actions which are evident can be revealed. The perspective of children having limited types of behaviours is then challenged and a more informative picture of the complexities involved in children's interactions can be afforded.

3.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, prominent research methods which have been used for the analysis of children's interactions have been reviewed and have found to be restricted by the researcher's predefinitions of behaviour categories. This was viewed of as problematic as it encouraged a restricted view of children as either prosocial or antisocial. An emic perspective for the investigation of social interaction has been outlined through an introduction to Ethnomethodology, CA and MCA. An argument for the use of CA and MCA has been offered for the study of children's conduct as the sequential turn taking and orientation to membership categories provide a unique insight into how children produce their on social worlds.

In relation to the present study, observations of how children initiate and maintain membership and actively allow or deny access to groups and dyads can offer further information into the establishment of peer networks. Direct observations of children's interpretations of social interactions can be analyzed using CA to investigate the sequential nature of how and why children use specific behaviours through establishing what is happening directly between the children. The use of MCA offers further benefits for this study as observations of how children use group membership in social construction can be revealed through their orientation to actions with peers, and how they interpret the actions of others in order to co-construct their context.

Therefore, the study of the immediate interpretation of an interaction is analyzed rather than the researchers' hypothesis of the participants' intentions providing a data driven analysis of everyday social situations. This is a suitable method to use for the present study as, 'only by examining in detail the children's talk and interaction in the absence of the teacher do we come to an understanding that there is, in fact, a different set of moral models at work for them, as well as how that moral code is instantiated in practice.' (Hutchby, 2005; p 70). Through employing the use of CA and MCA for an investigation into children's conduct the children's use of behaviour in their co-construction of context can be revealed. This subsequently leads to an insight into the behaviour which is considered meaningful to the children themselves in their everyday lives.

Chapter 4

Design of study

The literature review identified the problematic representation of children as having limited resources of either antisocial or prosocial behaviour. Through a review of relevant literature, it was found that dichotomies of either antisocial or prosocial children were presented as a consequence of the research methods and psychological approach used in those studies. In chapter three, it was argued that a sociological, emic perspective using CA and MCA allows data driven analysis of social interactions as they naturally occur. This approach can therefore be effective in the investigation of early childhood conduct as it affords a detailed investigation into children's interactions.

In order to conduct a study into how children use prosocial and antisocial behaviors, a detailed plan of action was created to fit the purpose of the investigation. The following chapter describes details of the procedure which was carried out to explore children's interactions as it is important for the replication and validity of the research design.

The organisation of the research procedure is reflected in the structure of this chapter, beginning with the pilot study, moving on to the informed main study and including ethical considerations and the role of the observer. Details of the pilot study include the environmental context of the research, participants and procedure which were reviewed to inform the design of the main study. These procedures and considerations were then applied to the consecutive main study, the details of which are outlined below. Ethical issues include how consent was achieved and an argument for the use of audio and visual recordings in the data collection. The observational technique and procedures include the role of the observer and the relevance of the chosen methodology employed to analyze the data.

4.1 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted prior to the main study as it is recognized as an essential way of testing the practical aspects of data collection, such as the efficacy of chosen equipment and logistics of observations (Bell and Opie, 2002). The use of a pilot study in qualitative research is also important as it allows for 'introductions to unknown worlds' (Sampson, 2004; p399). This is of particular significance to the current research where the social worlds of early childhood are valued as unique cultures in society (Corsaro, 1990; 1997). Through including a pilot study the design of the study was tested for the reliability of data collection as it was pertinent to the study that each target child's verbal and non-verbal actions were caught precisely. The sample data from the pilot study could therefore inform the main study as to how best to collect the data.

4.1.1 Environmental context:

The pilot study school was chosen as the researcher had achieved prior access on a number of occasions while on placement as an undergraduate student in early childhood studies. The staff and children were therefore welcoming as they had grown familiar to the researcher's presence and this aided the research process (Edwards, 2004). The school was located in a small Welsh village in Mid-Wales where there were approximately 1,181 residents, two-hundred of which were aged fifteen years and under (National statistics, 2001). The socio-economic classification of the residents indicated that they were within the C2 band, with 78.2% of residents reporting to be of Christian faith and 15% of no particular faith (National statistics, 2001). All the children attending the school were of white British ethnicity. The school provided Welsh language lessons in the curriculum but families wanting their children to be taught through the medium of Welsh attended a school approximately one mile away in a neighboring town. The total number of pupils attending the pilot study school and specific numbers of pupils in each class are given below:

Reception year:	3 pupils
Year 1:	3 pupils
Year 2:	3 pupils
Year 3:	6 pupils
Year 4:	9 pupils
Year 5:	9 pupils
Year 6:	9 pupils
Total number enrolled:	42 pupils

The school playground is a unique place as it provides an environment which has little intervention and influence from adults therefore allowing children to develop independence and become accountable for their own actions when interacting with peers

(Pellegrini and Blatchford, 2000). With this in mind, the school playground was perceived as an ideal place to observe how children co-construct social networks in early childhood. Organisations which younger children attend, such as playgroups and nurseries, are often closely guided by adults and so were deemed inappropriate for the present study.

The playground in the chosen school for the pilot study provided large play areas and a small building referred to by the children as 'the fort'. The fort had previously been observed by the researcher as an area which afforded privacy and seclusion for the children when they required it; larger spaces such as a tarmac football area and grassy field were also available for the children's social interactions. Access to large social and smaller private areas were also afforded by the playground where children could be observed using the wide social spaces and also the smaller private areas.

4.1.2 Participants:

Having identified the playground as suitable for the purposes of the pilot study, participants were then selected. The four-year-old children were chosen as this age group begin full-time attendance to primary school in September and therefore offered an opportunity for the observation of how prosocial and antisocial behaviour are used in an unfamiliar environment. Through observing children's interactions in an environment which is new to them it demonstrates how their actions are used to co-construct a new social order. The selection of the four-year-old children also proved to be advantages to the study as this age group of children had a small number, therefore providing a manageable number of participants for testing the reliability of the equipment.

The rationale for choosing the sample size was conducive with the reason for conducting the pilot study; the sample size reflected that this study was a trial for the efficiency of the equipment where a smaller number of participants were needed. As the pilot study was therefore intended to be a small scale of the main study the participants included were a much smaller number. As a small sample size was called for the chosen school offered

the benefit of having a small number of four-year-old children. Due to the small number of age-appropriate children, the sample enabled all of the four-year-old children in the school to be involved in the study. This eliminated ethical and sampling issues concerning the selection process of which four-year-old children were to be included in the study and which were not. Three children aged four years participated in the pilot study and included two girls and one boy.

4.1.3 Pilot study sample group: The participants involved in the pilot study included:

Child	Age	Gender
Child A:	4 years, 8 months	Female
Child B:	4 years, 11 months	Female
Child C:	4 years, 11 months	Male

4.1.4 Procedure:

Initially, a date for the collection of data was decided for the pilot and main studies. The pilot study and the main study were undertaken to collect different types of data; the pilot study was initiated to test the practical aspects of observation and equipment whereas the priority of the main study was to collect data on children's interactions at the start of a new academic year. Therefore, different dates in the academic school year were scheduled. The pilot study was planned to be conducted at the end of the academic school year in July as this provided time for the equipment and observation methods to be assessed prior to the main study. In the pilot study the data was collected over the period of one week for the three participating children rather than three days so that any adjustments to the data collection procedure or equipment could be addressed in the remaining days. The main study was subsequently scheduled for September following the preliminary analysis of the pilot data.

In the pilot study school there were three separate periods of outdoor playtime; morning play, dinner play and afternoon play. The morning and afternoon play times were twenty

minutes long, whereas the dinner play time was for approximately forty-five minutes. For the purpose of the research, the dinner play time was thought to have been impractical due to the length of time the children would have to wear a microphone and be videoed. The amount of data this would have generated was also taken into consideration when deciding which play time to observe. Dinner play time was impractical as the children had a staggered amount of time interacting in the play ground as some children took longer to eat than others. A decision between the remaining morning and afternoon play times was then decided. Due to the study being concerned with details of children's social organisation the morning playtime was chosen as it was the first time the children were all present together in the school grounds each day. This afforded an insight into how the children initiated and maintained social interactions with one-another at the beginning of each specific day. The lunch and afternoon playtimes did not afford this early establishment of social organisation as the children would have spent a significant amount of time together prior to these playtimes.

In the pilot study a small hand held Dictaphone and JVC digital video recorder were used simultaneously to collect the data. The video camera had a pull out screen which enabled the researcher to observe the footage which was being recorded without looking directly at the children. This enabled more detailed observation of the children as, although they were informed that they would be recorded before they entered the playground, the researcher was able to overt her gaze from looking straight at the children to looking directly at the camcorder. This allowed the children to be less conscious about their interactions as it provided a more inconspicuous form of observation (Pepler and Craig, 1995). The zoom lens on the camcorder also allowed the researcher to step away from the observed child's play space, yet zoom in to record the subtle and detailed interactions between the children. This method enabled the observer to capture indirect behavior and revisit specific social interactions repeatedly through later analysis (Tapper and Boulton, 2002) highlighting the importance of the use of the video camera in this specific study. It is also important to note here that a small hand held camcorder was used as in the study by Tapper and Boulton (2002) rather than a larger camera as used by Pepler and Craig (1995) as this allowed the researcher freedom of movement and reduced the likelihood of

losing contact with the target child. A microphone was also necessary to ensure that the audio footage was accurately recorded due to the wide distance between the researcher and the participant whilst the observer kept a low profile. Each target child wore the microphone for the full twenty minute period of the duration of morning play. Issues related to the use of the microphone, including how the children carried the equipment are discussed below.

As the pilot study had a small number of participants, the order in which each child would wear the microphone and be recorded was decided between the children. The children's involvement in the research design was incorporated in the study as it encourages empowerment and makes them aware that they are competent and valued citizens (Alderson, 2001; Clark and Moss, 2001; Department of Health, 2000). On the first day of the pilot study one of the girls elected to be the first to wear the microphone and placed it in her coat pocket. The decision of how much data to collect was made through incorporating how long the morning break time was. As the morning break time lasted for fifteen minutes it was decided that audio and visual data of the entire morning playtime would provide a true account of the interactions which occurred between the children throughout this time. The MP3 player was therefore started as soon as the target child was wearing it after the morning bell rang, and it was stopped once the children returned to their classroom following morning play. The entire data collection period of time would be stopped once each child had an opportunity to participate.

As three children were included in the pilot study, forty-nine minutes of data were collected. Once the playtime was over the video camera and the Dictaphone were taken to the researcher's home where the visual images and the audio footage were downloaded from the video camera and microphone onto the researchers' private laptop. These sets of data were stored in their own digital folder with the date used as a folder name to ensure that the information could be easily found for later analysis (Rolfe and Mac Naughton, 2004). A word document containing the participant's names and the date on which they were observed was also compiled in a separate word document in order to keep a record for further reference.

The pilot study highlighted a number of potential problems involved in the data collection of video images as the sample group did not all play together as predicted prior to the observations. The children split into gender segregated groups where the girls played with same sex peers and the boy separated to play on his own. This made videoing potentially useful interactions between the participants difficult. Therefore, a specific observational focus on the social interactions of one child per morning break was initiated. Rather than attempting to video all of the participating children interacting together, a more effective collection of data would involve focusing on videoing and recording one participating child each day. Through initiating this strategy of observation only one child would be observed daily, therefore each individual day would be dedicated to the observation of the interactions of the child who was participating on that day. By doing so both audio and visual observations of each individual child could be gathered simultaneously and their entire interactions throughout that playtime would be available for later analysis. However, as one participating child was wearing the microphone each day, there was a potential problem of the child feeling obtrusive in their peer groups. To avoid this limitation for the study the child was given the choice to hide the microphone under their school jumper or in their coat pocket. It was therefore up to each individual child to wear the microphone however they felt comfortable. The procedure of observing one individual child a day also provided consistency between the small sample group and the larger number of potential participants involved in the main study.

Further problems which were identified in the pilot study involved the collection of audio footage as this was found to be slightly inaudible due to either the location of the microphone or microphone type. There were also reoccurring problems of the children accidentally switching the Dictaphone off whilst handling it or through movement due to the protruding on/off switch. This proved a potential problem for accurate transcription which could ultimately affect the validity of the analysis. It was assessed that the problems encountered were due to the type of microphone used and so a different recording device was employed for the final day of the pilot study. The chosen MP3 player was flat and had no protruding buttons which could be accidently touched and

proved to offer a much clearer recording sound which was more effective for transcription.

4.2 Main Study

4.2.1 Environmental context:

The participating school for the main study was located in a town in Mid-Wales with approximately 1,421 residents, with approximately 225 of these being fifteen years and under (National statistics, 2001). 77.3% of residents reported that they were of Christian faith and 15.3% reported to be of no particular faith. The socio-economic background of the residents showed that the majority were of white ethnicity and were classified as social grade C1 (National statistics, 2001). A community is classed as a social grade C1 where the chief income earner belongs to the employment category of 'supervisory, clerical and junior managerial, administrative or professional' (Collis, 2009; p3).

In the school, a Welsh medium stream was available for children whose first language was Welsh. The children who spoke Welsh as their first language were educated in a separate section of the school to the children whose first language was English. As the researcher only spoke English the study was conducted with the four-year-old children who attended the English stream of the school. However, as the children from both Welsh and English streams utilized the playground at the same time it was possible for the target child to approach, or be approached, by a member of the Welsh unit at any time. The number of children in each class in the English stream is indicated below.

Reception year:	23 pupils
Year 1:	24 pupils
Year 2:	22 pupils
Year 3:	31 pupils
Year 4:	24 pupils
Year 5:	27 pupils

Year 6:	31 pupils
Total number of Welsh stream children	92 pupils
Total number of pupils enrolled:	274 pupils

As with the pilot study, the sample group were chosen in accordance with their age as it was required that the four-year-old children were to participate in the study. Sample size is an important issue in social research as the data must provide a true representation of the group studied in order to provide validity (Siraj-Blatchford and Siraj-Blatchford, 2004). The main study was conducted in a larger school than the pilot as this afforded a larger number of potential participants, therefore increasing the validity and occurrence of usable data (Mac Naughton and Rolfe, 2004). Therefore, in order for a true representation of the four-year-old children's everyday interactions to be collected, the sample size included all of the four-year-old children in the school.

As the current research is conducted in one school, issues of validity are addressed through the use of conversation analysis and membership categorisation analysis. As these forms of analysis require thoroughly detailed accounts of verbal and non-verbal actions through repeated access to audio and visual footage they encourage a valid representation of the interaction as experienced by the participants (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990; Schegloff, 2007b). Although only one school was used in the study, it provides an area where the rich and varied interactions of each participating child can be observed in relation to the interests of the study (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1996). Through the detailed analysis of the data of the participating children a true representation of their everyday lives is achieved.

This particular school was also selected due to the playground offering a similar structural layout as the pilot study where a variety of areas afforded opportunities for various social interactions. Places for the children to hide or have private interactions were provided in the form of eight basic huts on the outskirts of the playground which were easily accessible. Space for structured play such as the football and basketball were also available as well as a large tarmac area which offered space for the children to run freely.

4.2.2 Participants:

As the main study was interested in observing how children use their behavior to initiate and maintain social interactions and organisation, the four-year-old children who were beginning school in the month of September were selected. It was anticipated that the new school context would present an opportunity for children starting school to display social organisation strategies to configure social relationships. This would therefore provide opportunities for the observation of how children co-construct their new social worlds.

The end of September was selected for the main study as it was felt that the children would have had a chance to become familiar with leaving their parents for an entire school day before the study was initiated. This settling in period was accommodated as it was felt that some children may have been upset when starting school for the first time; therefore observations conducted in this period may be better suited to an investigation into children's adjustment to their new school setting. Additional time was required for the distribution and collection of consent forms (for details of consent forms see 4.3 Ethical issues) which were returned by thirteen children, nine parents did not return their letters of consent. The thirteen children who returned their consent forms included six girls and seven boys, giving an almost equal number of both genders. It was perceived as important to include a fair representation of each gender for this study as research in the literature review had indicated a distinct difference in the use of prosocial and antisocial behaviour between the two sexes. The dates of birth of each of the participating children are given below.

4.2.3 Sample group of main study participants:

Child's codename	Age	Gender
Sally	4years, 3 months	Female
Aaron	4years, 11 months	Male

Tina	4 years, 4 months	Female
Sue	4 years, 10 months	Female
Mark	4 years, 9 months	Male
Harry	4 years, 2 months	Male
Zac	4 years, 9 months	Male
Emma	4 years, 10 months	Female
Jenny	4 years, 6 months	Female
Lee	4 years, 8 months	Male
Katie	4 years, 6 months	Female
Ricky	4 years, 2 months	Male
Jon	4 years, 3 months	Male

4.2.4 Procedure:

The procedure for the main study was the same as stated in the pilot study with a few exceptions which are now highlighted.

The large number of children involved in the main study encouraged a different approach to that adopted in the pilot study with regard to the procedure. Although allowing the children to decide who would wear the microphone and be recorded first was a feasible strategy to incorporate in the small sample group of the pilot study, it was felt that this may have caused problems in the larger sample group of the main study and so another strategy was chosen. Rather than the children deciding the order in which they would wear the MP3 player, the children in the main study were listed in alphabetical order for their day to be observed and wear the microphone. Each consented child wore the microphone and had their interactions visually recorded for one playtime; the data was collected in the morning and stored in the afternoon as in the pilot study.

As the JVC video recorder produced clear visual footage in the pilot study, it was used again and in the same way for the main study. However, as problems with the original microphone were identified in the pilot study, an MP3 player with recording facilities

was employed for the collection of audio data in the main study. The MP3 player was placed in a protective plastic case to further ensure that the equipment was not inadvertently switched off. This pocket also had a cord attached to it like a necklace, enabling the children to wear it around their necks, close to their mouths, and unobtrusively under their school jumper or coat. The target child was then recorded throughout morning outdoor play. The data was downloaded to a private laptop in the afternoon, as with the pilot study. The new equipment resulted in clear, distinguishable audio recordings and was particularly useful when synchronized with the visual images from the video recorder. Altogether four hours and five minutes of audio footage, and three and half hours of visual footage were collected over the three-week period. The audio footage was slightly longer than the visual as the MP3 player was started prior to the children entering the playground and stopped once they were back in the classroom whereas the visual recording was started once the children were in the playground and stopped when they were going back into the school.

As nine consent forms were not returned (see discussion below), approximately two weeks remained in the scheduled research plan. When discussing this with the class teacher it was suggested that, as some children had asked for another turn, this extra time may be used to observe those children who had specifically requested a second date. The procedure for organizing the extra observations involved asking the teacher's permission to arrive in the classroom five minutes before morning break time and asking each child if they would like to participate in wearing the microphone and being observed a second time. It is acknowledged here that this would potentially impact on the data if the children who repeated their participation were perceived as more antisocial or prosocial behaviour than the children who were observed once. However, as this study was interested in observing the use of all social behaviours between children in the playground the repeated participation of some children and not others was not perceived as problematic. It was also recognized that the children were all interacting with each-other during the course of each playtime and so it was possible that more observations of some children, and not others, would naturally be recorded.

4.3 Ethical issues

4.3.1 Consent

Consent forms were devised for the head-teacher and class-teacher of the chosen schools and parents of the sample group along with explanatory statements (see appendix # 1a-f for copies of these). These forms were submitted to the University Ethics Committee for approval. Once the forms were approved, copies were made for the selected sample group.

Meetings with the Head Teachers of the participating schools for both the pilot and main study were scheduled prior to the onset of the studies. These meetings were arranged in order for any questions about the study to be addressed and for permission to be granted to conduct the research in the schools. Both Head Teachers gave consent for the school's participation on the selected dates and took the consent forms to distribute to the class teacher and the parents of the English speaking four-year-olds. In order to inform the non-participating children's parents that research involving video and audio footage would be taking place in their child's school a general explanatory letter was drawn up (see appendix # 1g) and a copy was given to the Head Teacher of each school.

In the pilot study group all three families of the four-year-old children gave their consented to participate. In the main study thirteen out of twenty-two parents filled in and returned consent forms.

In preparation for the data collection, further ethical issues were addressed. A review of the child protection policy was conducted where it stated that any incidents of a sensitive nature which the researcher observed should be reported to the child protection teacher. The designated child protection teacher was, therefore, identified prior to the data collection in preparation for possible sensitive information being discovered throughout the research process (Masson, 2004). It was consequently noted that, should any incidents be deemed necessary to report, the child protection teacher would be made aware of the

incident (Coady, 2004; National Children's Bureau, 2006). In relation to infringements of the children's privacy being an issue here, the children were informed by the researcher when gaining consent that the information which was gathered would be shared with other adults (Coady, 2004; National Children's Bureau, 2006). This ethical procedure allowed the researcher to potentially inform the child protection teacher of any sensitive information disclosed throughout the data collection. The researcher also passed a police check prior to the data collection in the school.

Once the preparation was complete a meeting was arranged with the selected sample group of children in order to gain their personal consent. The children were informed that the study was taking place in order for the researcher to see how they played in the school playground. The microphone and video recorder were shown to the children with a discussion about how they worked in order to achieve familiarity with the devices; the children were then asked if they would like to handle them. Whilst the children familiarized themselves with the equipment they were told that once the data was collected it would be stored on the researcher's personal laptop for analysis. The children were also told that their own names would not be used in the study so that no-one would know their identity and they were reassured that, should they opt to participate in the study, they could withdraw at any time. Following this, each child was asked if they would be willing to wear the microphone and be videoed for one morning playtime each.

4.3.2 Use of video camera

The use of video and audio equipment was essential in order to fulfill the aims of the study where episodes of natural occurring data could be observed as they unfold within the context of the children's interactions. Collecting visual images of the children's social interactions allows repeated access to the footage to ensure that the interpretation of the observed events from a single incident is verifiable (Forman, 1999). Through repetitive access to a chosen episode of interaction a detailed 'thick description' of the event is afforded which, 'includes everything needed for the reader to understand what is happening' (Siraj-Blatchford and Siraj-Blatchford, 2004; p195). With the combined use



of a microphone and a video camera, the data is available for synchronization where the whole picture of the interaction could be seen unobtrusively. Many families own a video recorder which increases the children's familiarity with the equipment and being filmed. This makes the presence of the camcorder less of a distraction and arguably has less impact on the children's natural behavior.

However, the use of video cameras in a school playground raises ethical issues concerning consent. As children's social interactions were being observed the target child had the opportunity to approach any child in the school playground. This included children in the child's class who had not received parental consent and other children who had not been asked to provide parental consent to participate, as they were not in the sample age category. This potential problem could be avoided by editing the children who did not have consent out of the footage or by preventing the children entering the playground whilst the filming commenced. However, Pepler and Craig (1995) address these issues by arguing that 'the former strategy requires the costly and difficult task of identifying all children. The latter strategy places artificial constraints on children's interactions: Friends of the target may not be present on the playground' (p551). To address this ethical dilemma in the present study a copy of an informative cover letter was given to the head teacher to administer to the families of each non-participating children in the school (see appendix #1g). This allowed parents to be aware that their child's image or voice may be caught on the research equipment and that it would not be used in the study unless it was part of an interaction with the target child. It was further explained that, in the event that the target child interacted with their child, the data would be anonymous. The letter also included a contact telephone number and address allowing the opportunity for parents to discuss any issues of concern which they had with regard to the study. As no parents contacted either the head teacher or the researcher, the research process continued as planned.

In the study the use of both audio and visual footage was imperative. This is because they provide an exact dialogue of events which could not be captured any other way. The audio and visual records of immediate interaction were also essential for the accurate

transcription of data for analysis where the footage could be returned to on many occasions to ensure reliability (MacWhinney, 2007). Through repetitive access to the footage the transcription of the event would be reliable as each detailed action could be described in depth. The accuracy of the transcription could then be tested through returning to the footage multiple times if required. It is further noted that the combined use of audio and video are 'still the most accurate record of an interaction that we have available' (MacWhinney, 2007, p17). Therefore, with regards to the purpose of the study it is suggested that, 'Time blunts the impact of the outside observer, and careful selection of unedited portions can be made. The benefits of access to such conflict talk and the added benefit of the visual information captured on video seem to outweigh the possible problems' (Leung, 2002; p15).

4.3.3 Role of the observer

Prior to the data collection it was decided that the researcher would avoid intervening in the participants' social interactions and would only communicate with the children briefly if approached, allowing the staff to implement rules of conduct (Pink, 2001). This study therefore adopted a reactive approach where the researcher limited her response to interactions which were only initiated by the children (Corsaro, 1985b). It was felt that this was essential in order to minimize the impact, which the researcher had on the behavior of the children. Rolfe (2004) suggests that it is important for researchers to assess how their presence impacts on the study. Although the researcher attempted to become as unobtrusive as possible, her presence would still have *some* impact, particularly at the beginning of the study. This included the possibility that the participating children may have consciously interacted in a deliberately positive or negative way because they were aware that they were being observed (Fine and Sandstrom, 1988). In order to practically minimise the level of impact the researcher's presence had on the children's behavior, the researcher avoided the staff's prominent position in the playground and remained on the periphery. This provided an adequate distance for the researcher to display an obviously different role to that of the playground supervisors who regularly initiated contact with the children throughout the recreational area. The researcher's interactions with the

children were further limited by avoiding eye contact and consistently focusing on the camcorder. When approached by children the researcher made the contact brief by limiting verbal interaction (Corsaro, 1985b) and eye contact.

Although this non-active role was adopted by the researcher there were also issues which encouraged a more participative position when investigating the school procedure for reporting an incident of the account, or observation of sensitive information (this is discussed further in the ethical issues subheading above).

The researcher's role was discussed in the initial meeting with the teachers where it was explained that the researcher was present to observe the children rather than to act as a member of playground supervision staff. This provided clarity that the researcher would remain neutral in the occurrence of any event which needed the attention of a member of playground staff (Pink, 2001).

4.4 Data transcription:

An ethnomethodological framework was adopted for the research in order to observe how children create their social worlds in their normal everyday behavior (Garfinkel, 1967). It was decided that within this framework, CA and MCA would be used to examine the data as the research was concerned with how children used their behavior to initiate and maintain social interactions. These methods encouraged data driven analysis of how children interpreted and responded to interactions as they happened rather than reflective and third party reports where these aspects may become distorted over time (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006). In order to apply this method of data analysis a detailed account of the transcription process is now offered.

To begin the process of data analysis the audio and video footage were examined and specific reoccurring theses which the children demonstrated as relevant were extracted. This initial selection of data included the more obvious incidents in the playground which were noticeable through the process of recording the data over a number of days. These included the children oriented to such as entrance to huts, reference to gender and everyday objects as well as using physical gestures such as putting arms around each-other, holding hands and also pushing and hitting. Further themes were found through the subsequent transcription once the data was collected where less obvious reoccurrences between the children were found. These incidents included the children's use of specific words to associate or disassociate themselves with peers and calling names prior to an interaction.

The repeated access to the audio and video footage of the collected data allows the researcher to provide a true representation of the footage (Leung, 2002; MacWhinney, 2007). However, although researchers attempt to provide an unbiased approach to the analysis of their data, they will inevitably view events subjectively through their own perspective (Ochs, 1979). In order to minimize the subjective affect on the data analysis, the footage was transcribed using CA and MCA symbols as developed by Gail Jefferson (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). The accuracy of the transcription is essential for conversation and membership categorization analysis and so the symbols are used to inform the reader of how the speech was conducted, 'because they're "there" in the talk' (Jefferson, 2004; p23).

The transcripts were written whilst examination of the recorded footage was undertaken where each specific detail was transferred into writing. Each excerpt was transcribed into a .cha file, a documentation file for storing the detailed verbal and non-verbal interactions of a particular child as part of the Computerized Language Analysis CLAN program (McWhinney, 2007). The CLAN .cha files offer further detailed analysis as it recognized the CA symbols which mark the intricate detail of each utterance. The .cha files allowed the data to be presented in a logical and thorough order which enables instant access. This transcription provided a thorough and detailed account of the data through the use of

symbols which afford the transcriber the ability to get as close to an exact representation of each utterance as possible.

The CA transcription conventions used in this study are from the model developed by Gail Jefferson (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). Each person who is involved in the observed episode is identified at the beginning of the transcript so that the reader is aware of all the members involved. The audio and visual footage are then studied and the name of the person who is speaking is entered on a new line in the .cha file followed by their verbal utterance. The convention symbols are inserted into the text during transcription to allow the reader to see where the person places emphasis on their speech, raises or lowers their tone, whispers and laughs (for a list of conventions used in this study see the 'list of tables' at the beginning of the thesis). Below the verbal transcription a new line can be started to report non-verbal actions which the members engage in. The inclusion of both verbal and non-verbal actions is of particular benefit to the current study where antisocial and prosocial behaviour are investigated as these interactions are expressed both physically and verbally between children (Goodwin, 2000; Goodwin 2006). Through the use of the CLAN .cha files the fine details of each interaction afford a greater insight into the actual events involved in each interaction between the participating children. Through the iterative process of transcription of data in .cha files reoccurring themes emerge which may not have been noticeable to the researcher. Consequently, further insights into the co-construction of children's peer group memberships were available for analysis and presented in detail in the subsequent chapter.

The limitations which are evident in this process involve the validity of the researcher's transcription (Edwards, 1993; Ochs, 1979). In order to minimise the potential of the researcher's perspective being influential over the data, the transcription processes involved repeated access to the audio and video footage to ensure that each episode was documented as closely to the actual events as possible (Silverman, 2004). This required the researcher to regularly return to the data to make slight amendments to the transcriptions throughout the analysis.

4.5 Validity and Reliability

The validity and reliability of using CA and MCA as a research methodology are discussed by Perakyla (2004) who argues that to ensure the validity and reliability of the observed interactions, the combined use of video and audio footage should be secured to provide detailed representations of events. This is adhered to in the present study through the detailed transcription of the verbal and non-verbal gestures displayed in each episode included in the study.

The particular aspect of reliability has been an instrumental factor in the development of CA (Perakyla, 2004) as the direct and detailed accounts of interactions represented in CA provide a reliable representation of each episode as displayed by the members themselves (Sacks, 1992a; 1992b). It is further argued that CA is more reliable than other methods of sociological data collection as it offers the benefit of providing a detailed account of interactions between people rather than 'summarized representations' (ten Have, 2000: p9). However, Perakyla (2004) warns that it is imperative that the researcher ensures that the equipment which is used provides good quality data and that the transcription includes as much detail as possible to ensure reliability. This is supported by Pellegrini et al. (2004) who suggest that '*Good* descriptions meet criteria of being reliable and valid' (p3 original italics). Repeated access to video and audio footage ensures that the researcher has accurately transcribed a true representative of the children's interactions. The reliability of the data is ensured in the present study as it is consistent and repeatable (Martin and Bateson, 1986) through the iterative process of transcription.

In order to achieve reliable data the same research procedure was conducted each day and the video and audio footage were collected with the same reactive approach to data collection throughout the study (Rolfe, 2004). The recorded footage also ensures validity is gained through providing evidence of the children's everyday social interactions.

4.6 Conclusion:

This study is interested in investigating children's antisocial and prosocial behaviour in greater depth in order to understand how children co-construct social organisation between themselves and others. It was therefore designed with these specific requirements in mind where the children's uses of verbal and non-verbal actions provide further insight into these issues. This chapter has discussed aspects of the research process which were particularly relevant for the present study and addressed contentious issues which occurred in the process.

The first issue which was addressed involved the appropriate selection of sample group. Through including children who were being initiated into their first year of primary school the sample group could be observed using their verbal and non-verbal social interactions in the co-construction of the new context. Once issues of selecting a sample group were addressed the details of the research procedure was approached. In order to ensure that the logistical aspects of the fieldwork were accurate for the main data collection, a pilot study was conducted. This initial study worked to highlight the problems which were evident in the data collection in order to inform the preparation for the main study. The pilot study offered great importance in informing the main study with regards to the use of equipment. Important ethical issues were then approached and included that of consent. Prior to the implementation of the fieldwork, consent was obtained for each participant in chronological order of the Head Teacher, class teacher, parents and finally the children. A description of the procedure was then discussed. Each child wore the microphone and was videoed in the school playground each day and the data was then downloaded onto a laptop ready for transcription the afternoon after it was collected.

Following the data collection and transcription, the data was analyzed using CA and MCA in order to investigate the children's sequential use of actions and how these actions were interpreted by their peers. The findings which subsequently emanated from the data through the detailed iterative process of the data analysis are found in the following chapter.

Chapter 5

Presentation and Discussion of Results; Identified Resources

It was discussed in chapter two that children have been observed to be engaged in a dichotomy of either prosocial or antisocial behaviour. It was then further discussed in chapter three that an emic perspective would be advantageous to the study of children's use of verbal and non-verbal actions in their co-construction of social order. The data driven analysis would provide empirical data which provides further information regarding children's direct social interactions and avoids predefined discrimination about children. In order to initiate this study, it was suggested in chapter four that the data collection should use audio and video recordings of each participating four-year-old child

during their morning playtime in primary school. The data was then transcribed using CA conventions in order for the findings to emanate from the thorough and iterative process. The detailed and specific findings are now presented and discussed in detail in this chapter.

Through the rigorous and repetitive analysis of the observations of the participating children this chapter works to investigate the specific means by which the children are co-constructing their social environments. This chapter identifies the children's use of resources which they employ in their everyday lives in their primary school playground. Through the analysis of these identified resources a unique insight into the children's co-construction of context is demonstrated.

This chapter presents and discusses the findings of the study by applying a consistent structure for each of the six sections provided. The six sections include: name calling; access tools; possessive pronouns and collective pro-terms; referencing gender; physical contact; the children's use of huts. The structure of each of these resources begins with an introduction to the topic discussed in order to place it in context. This is followed by a series the excerpts which demonstrate the children's use of that particular identified resource found in the current study. How the children use each identified resource to affiliate, disaffiliate and exclude peers is then discussed. In each identified resource the excerpts presented are structured with a description of the individual interaction, the data transcription and finally the analysis.

5.1 Name Calling

Sacks (1992a) refers to the initiation of social contact which is often secured through the initial use of a greeting and is sequentially 'touched off' to establish an interaction through sequential turns at talk. In the observations below there are eight instances of the children using a greeting in the form of a name calling to establish contact with each other through a 'summons-answer' sequence (Schegloff, 1968; 2007a). Through this sequence production one person uses a FPP utterance to become affiliated with another member through their sequential SPP reply 'to form a 'pair type'' (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973; p 296). In these interactions each member is mapped out as having a role; the summoner is established through their initiation of a first pair part (FPP) utterance and the answerer is the child who replies to the summoner through their second pair part

(SPP) utterance. When a name calling is initiated through a FPP utterance and answered by a SPP utterance this sequence establishes an adjacency pair (Silverman, 1998).

The use of a name of a member prior to a sequential interaction ensures the maximum possibility of a preferred response in the context of a summons-answer sequence. In the summons-answer sequences used by the children in the following excerpts, it is observed that they use the name of their peer as a summons and often receive an answer in the form of eye-contact (Goodwin, 1981; Schegloff, 2007a). The children's use of eye-contact with the summoner as a non-verbal answer gives the summoner the go ahead to continue as, 'maintaining gaze at co-participant can promote sequence expansion' (Schegloff, 2007a, p118). This use of gaze as a non-verbal answer in a summons-answer sequence is often found to be used in early childhood interactions (Filipi, 2009). The third conversational turn is then returned to the summoner in a three-turn summons-answer sequence which determines this sequence of actions as different to that of a name calling being used as an attention solicit (Wootton, 1981). The children's use of name calling as an initiation of a three-turn summons-answer sequence is further differentiated from that of general address terms as simply, 'addressing a party will not necessarily, in itself, select him (the addresser) as next speaker' (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974, p717).

Through using their peers name the children are summoning their peers for an interaction. In response to this, the summoned child can choose to answer verbally or by using their gaze and bodily alignment, block the interaction by purposefully doing none of these answers, or forestall the interaction in their next turn (Schegloff, 2007a). The initiators willingness to engage in an interaction is noticeable by the child answering the name calling as they will display their understanding in their next turn (Schegloff, 2007a). This can be displayed in the eye contact of the participants as it has been found that a mutual gaze is important in the co-construction of an interaction (Filipi, 2009; Goodwin, 1981). The given response of the answerer is touched off by the summoner as they notice that affiliation has been secured by a reply, therefore this initiation of a summons-answer sequence affords the opportunity for several turns of interaction and as such, 'emerges as an extraordinarily powerful social item' (Schegloff, 1968, p.1091). Disaffiliation is also

demonstrated through a child blocking any further contact with the summoner by refusing to answer verbally or non-verbally through withdrawing their gaze (Schegloff, 2007a). When disaffiliation is displayed this way it is marked by the summoner with a repeat of the name calling until it is observable to them that they have secured their peers' attention in the form of an answer (Sacks, 1992a; Schegloff, 1968). The interaction can then proceed.

These aspects are discussed further and can be observed through an analysis of the excerpts below where the summons-answer sequences are used to affiliate members but can also mark a member's disaffiliation from a peer through a blocking of an answer, therefore breaking the summons-answer sequence. It is also observable that the summons-answer sequence works to exclude members of the playground when only one member of a dyad or group is summoned.

Observation 5.1.1 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Zac and Ricky' – see appendix #2)

An interaction between Zac and Ricky was noticed by Sue who approaches Zac on line 98 and refers to an object which she has with her which gains Zac's attention as he looks at her and orients his questions to involve the object in his subsequent sentence.

- 90 Ricky: () ((*steps back away from the hut and talks to a boy*))
91 → Sue: za:c?
92 Sue: I've () got something from my letterbo::x. ((*stands up and walks*
93 *towards Zac*))
94 → Zac: (you) you got it with you now. ((*looks at Sue*))

- 95 → Sue: yes
- 96 Sue: () ((moves back to where she was and sits down))
- 97 Zac: have you brung it to play with you.
- 98 Sue: its in my bag. ((shakes her head to indicate no. gets up and moves
99 closer to Zac.))
- 100 Sue: ((puts hand next to her cheek to hide her mouth)) °don't (play)°
- 101 Zac: ((looks down at the floor))
- 102 → Sue: za:c ((moves closer to Zac with her face in front of his for eye-contact))
- 103 → Sue: °don't play with billy° ((steps backwards))
- 104 Zac: °ok°
- 105 Zac: look what I got ((reaches inside his jumper and holds out the MP3
106 player))
- 107 → Zac: sue ((makes eye contact with Sue))
- 108 → Zac: look

In these interactions between Zac and Sue there are three separate incidents of a three-part summons-answer sequence. These interactions are defined as summons-answer sequences as they each contain a three part sequence of turns where, 'the initial summons sets up an expectation for a particular type of next turn, not just an answer but an answer designed to inform first speaker that he should go ahead and say what he had to say (Wootton, 1981, p143).

The first summons-answer sequence is initiated by Sue as she interacts with Zac in the transitional space which occurs once Zac's interaction with Ricky has ended and Ricky moves away from the hut. Initially Sue calls Zac's name as a summons (line 91) but Zac's gaze remains fixed on Ricky. Sue's summons has not been answered and so she moves towards Zac, aligning herself so that she is directly in front of him. As she does this Sue refers to an item which provides a conversational object to further gain Zac's affiliation through an interaction. This action of name calling directly followed with reference to an object works as a summons as it captures Zac's interest and prompts him to return the next turn back to Sue which he does in line 94. This affiliation is marked as

successful to Sue who displays this understanding as she continues her third turn in the summons-answer sequence on line 95 and moves away from Zac to her original position; as the affiliation is now secured she no longer needs to have such close proximity. However, in his next utterance on line 97, Zac asks Sue if she has it with her and Sue replies that she has not. Although Sue successfully initiated an interaction with Zac by calling his name, the affiliation could not be maintained as the access tool which Sue verbally introduced was not present.

This realization is shown by Sue as she attempts affiliation with Zac by initiating a second summons-answer sequence through summoning him again (line 102). Sue then moves very close to Zac so that they have eye-contact. This meeting of gaze works as an answer from Zac which gives Sue the go ahead to continue her next turn in the summons-answer sequence (Goodwin, 1981; Schegloff, 2007a). In Sue's third turn she verbally instructs Zac not to play with Ricky in a whisper (line 103). Sue's name calling works to ensure affiliation between herself and Zac which is shown as Zac subsequently agrees not to play with Ricky. Sue's second attempt at affiliation with Zac works to take Zac's attention away from Ricky, and at the same time, affiliates Sue with Zac in their subsequent interaction. Not only does Sue directly tell Zac not to play with Ricky here, but she does so in a whisper which increases the exclusivity of Zac and Sue's affiliation. Sue's confidential use of a whisper to affiliate herself with Zac can be seen as an attempt at securing a close dyadic friendship (Rose and Asher, 1999). Alternatively, through prior literature, the secrecy involved in Sue's instruction for Zac not to play with Ricky would have been perceived as camouflaged aggression (Abdennur, 2000) or indirect aggression (Garandau and Cillessen, 2006). Here, however, Sue's use of a summons-answer sequence in the form of a name calling is seen as a way for Sue to initiate a series of conversational turns (Baker and Freebody, 1986) which work to secure affiliation between herself and Zac.

The third occurrence of a summons-answer sequence is initiated by Zac (line 107) as he calls Sue's name. Sue answers and gives Zac the go ahead for his next turn by making eye-contact with him (Goodwin, 1981; Schegloff, 2007a). Zac further displays his

interest in being in an interaction with Sue as he reaffirms their affiliation through his third utterance in the three part summons-answer sequence where he asserts the MP3 player as a conversational object with which to maintain the interaction with Sue. Unlike an attention solicit, the use of a name calling in these interactions work to return the conversation back to the first speaker (Wootton, 1981) as is seen throughout these observations.

At the beginning of these interactions Sue shows her understanding that the interaction between Ricky and Zac was threatening to her own relationship with Zac, reaffirming the suggestion that Sue is using indirect aggression towards Ricky. Subsequently, Sue uses name calling to successfully gain affiliation with Zac through a series of conversational turns, and in turn Zac uses a name calling to also secure affiliation between their dyad. In prior research using other methods, Sue's verbal instruction to Zac to exclude Ricky would be interpreted as indirect verbal aggression (Garandeau and Cillessen, 2006). By looking at the sequential aspects of the interaction it is observable that the exclusion of Ricky was used in the maintenance of Zac and Sue's affiliation.

Observation 5.1.2 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Katie, Sally and Lee' – see appendix #2)

The children are queuing up in a line to go back into school after morning break. Lee asks Katie three consecutive questions about the MP3 player and this is followed by Katie responding by using his name.

40 Lee: i had the microphone on fi:rst.

41 Katie: no sally () did

42 Lee: what

43 Kate: sally on my::↑ table had it.

44 ((*Jenny starts playing with the children who are standing behind her*

45 *in the queue*))

46 Lee: why you () the microphone?
 47 Kate: coz it's my: [tu:rn.]
 48 Lee: [is (it) is it on::]?
 49 Katie: ()
 50 (3.2)
 51 Lee: have you had that before?
 52 Katie: no:::uh.
 53 → Katie: Lee
 54 → (0.5) (*Lee looks at Jenny*)
 55 → Katie: just stop asking about it
 56 (10.4)
 57 → Jenny: ↑Lee.
 58 → (*Lee looks at Jenny*)
 59 → Jenny: do want to play?
 60 (*Lee and Jenny look at each-other. Katie looks at the MP3 player. Lee*
 61 *pushes backwards against Phil who is behind him in the queue whilst*
 62 *keeping his feet in the same place. Lee looks away from Jenny and*
 63 *they continue to line up.))*

Lee has been asking Katie questions about the MP3 player which she is wearing. A three part summons-answer sequence is then initiated by Katie as she calls Lee's name (line 53). Katie summons Lee through calling his name and waits for him to answer before asserting any other verbal interaction (Baker and Freebody, 1986; Schegloff, 1968). This brief verbal pause also works to emphasize that what she is about to say is important (Macbeth, 1991). Lee responds in his turn by making eye-contact with Katie which works as an answer in the summons-answer sequence (Filipi, 2009; Goodwin, 1981; Schegloff, 2007a). This is demonstrated by the participants as Katie directly continues with her third turn as she instructs Lee to stop asking about the item. Although a summons-answer sequence usually opens the possibility for several turns of interaction in this situation Katie's assertion of restrictions on what Lee can talk about next limits the possibilities of further verbal interaction. This is demonstrated by Lee's reaction to Katie's utterance as

he does not attempt any further interaction with Katie. Katie has secured a successful summons-answer sequence with Lee but as a conversational closing is then co-constructed no further interaction ensues. Therefore, this is consequently followed by eleven seconds silence until Jenny approaches.

Jenny initiates an interaction with Lee through the use of a summons-answer sequence. Jenny looks towards Lee, who is not in an interaction with anyone, and proceeds to initiate an interaction with him through calling his name. Lee's answers Jenny's name calling as he orients his gaze towards Jenny, giving her the 'go-ahead' to take her next turn (Filipi, 2009; Goodwin, 1981; Schegloff, 2007a). Jenny acknowledges Lee's approval for her to continue in her next action as she uses an offer of affiliation in the form of an invitation 'do you want to play?' on line 63. Through these verbal actions Jenny demonstrates her willingness to be affiliated with Lee by engaging in a series of actions with him, as is associated with summons-answer sequences (Schegloff, 1968; Wooton, 1981). However, Lee responds by averting his gaze from Jenny and does not verbally answer her. Therefore no play ensues between Lee and Jenny, thus demonstrating that there has to be cooperation between all members in the creation of affiliation (Cromdal, 2001). Lee's disaffiliation from Jenny's offer is extended by the lack of communication between Lee and Jenny in the subsequent space of time. As with the interaction between Katie and Lee, although a summons-answer sequence was successfully produced between the members, no further interaction ensued.

Through analyzing this observation with predetermined categories of behaviour, Katie's action (line 55) is a verbally aggressive exclusion of Lee. Lee's reluctance to enter into an affiliation with Jenny following her prosocial offer is consequently prompted by the negative experience his exclusion from an interaction with Katie generated (Fabes et al. 1999a). The indication of a sequence of events is therefore apparent in the interaction between Katie, Lee and Jenny. This is further explored using CA and MCA where it is found that both Katie and Jenny call Lee's name as a summons prior to a further action (Baker and Freebody, 1986; Schegloff, 1968). Although Katie's subsequent interaction with Lee was to exclude him whereas Jenny's was an offer of affiliation, both needed to

secure the appropriate alignment before either subsequent action could be produced. The analysis using CA and MCA indicates that, not only is a summons-answer sequence evident in the use of name calling, but that the same sequence is used to affiliate as well as to exclude.

Observation 5.1.3 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Emma' – see appendix #2)

Emma leaves the hut that her and Rowan are occupying and walks across the playground to talk to two girls. Emma initiates an interaction with Kerry by calling her name.

- 32 → Emma:kerry=do you want to play mums and da:ds.
33 → Kerry: =no we're playing fa:milies. ((*very brief eye contact with Emma when*
34 *Emma calls Kerry's name*))
35 Kathy: no
36 ((*Emma walks back to the hut which is now occupied by two boys as*
37 *well as Rowan*))
38 → Emma:rowan don't let anyone i::n:
39 → Rowan: =I di:dn't they just pushed through:: ((*meets Emma's gaze*))
40 Dave: I didn't I just (1.7) went around and (2.2) up through there ((*points at the*
41 *window on the side of the hut*))
42 Rowan: that one pushed in ((*points at one of the boys*))
43 Emma: right.
44 → Emma: ↑can I sit there now Row.
45 ((*Rowan moves across the bench and Emma sits next to the entrance*))
46 Dave: ()
47 ((*Sue is standing outside the hut, looks at Emma, enters the hut and*
48 *sits opposite Emma. Emma looks at Rowan*))
49 Emma: only from our class is allowed (0.4) in isn't it

Emma physically aligns herself next to Kathy and Kerry in the school playground and calls Kerry's name in her approach (line 32). Kerry's sequential response to Emma's

summons involves a very brief look to see who was calling her name (line 33). This very brief eye-contact is understood as an answer to Emma which is shown as she quickly delivers her third turn in the three part summons-answer sequence. Emma's third turn is an offer of affiliation as she asks 'do you want to play mums and dads' (line 32). Although this interaction is very brief and fast moving it follows the structure of a summons-answer sequence as it works to secure Kerry's attention and bring the conversational turn back Emma (Schegloff, 1968; Wootton, 1981).

However, Kerry's brief look at Emma is quickly followed by a lowering of her gaze so that no more eye-contact is secured. This drop of gaze is recognised as indicating that no further interaction can proceed (Schegloff, 2007a). Kerry's reluctance to be affiliated with Emma is further demonstrated by Kerry latching on to the end of Emma's offer of affiliation to decline the offer. Although Emma's name calling worked to secure a summons-answer sequence with Kerry's, this is as far as the interaction continues as Kerry's eye contact is quickly dropped and Kerry declines Emma's invitation for affiliation. Emma is excluded from Kerry and Kathy's exclusive dyad. This exclusion could be identified as antisocial towards Emma where Kerry and Kathy use relational aggression to reject her.

Emma's exclusion from the dyad after her offer has been rejected is shown as she returns to the hut immediately after this interaction without any further communication. When Emma reaches the hut she makes reference to the fact that there are two boys sitting inside through producing a verbal complaint to Rowan. Emma does this by initiating a summons-answer sequence as she calls Rowan's name when she enters the hut (line 38). Rowan immediately answers Emma non-verbally through mutual eye contact and this is directly followed by Emma's complaint to Rowan which is spoken straight away (line 39) and orients to the problem of Rowan illegally allowing the boys access to their exclusive play space.

The exclusive membership to the hut has been violated and so Emma's name calling to secure a sustained interaction comprising of several turns is important here in order to

address the illegal situation. Emma does this to ensure that Rowan is aware that there has been a violation of acceptable and agreed upon rules for the affiliation of other members of the hut. This has to be addressed immediately in order to prevent a subsequent similar violation occurring (Sacks, 1992a). Emma has not secured affiliation with Kathy and Kerry and the exclusive affiliation which had been secured through her and Rowan's use of the hut was also no longer exclusive.

On line 44 a very different use of name calling is used by Emma as she places the abbreviated term of Rowan's name 'Row' at the end of her utterance. Unlike the prior instances of summons-answer sequences, this utterance uses a name as an appended address term or 'final position address term' (Wootton, 1981, p143). This provokes a very different situation where, rather than using a name to initiate a sequence of turns which bring the conversation back to the initiator, the appended address term requires the recipient to analyse the prior utterance and respond accordingly (Baker and Freebody, 1986; Wootton, 1981). This is observed in the next turn following Emma's utterance as Rowan interprets Emma's remark as a request for her to move. Shortly after, Sue enters the hut and Emma reiterates the hut rules to Rowan on line 49 where she reminds Rowan 'only from our class is allowed - in isn't it'.

Observation 5.1.4 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Harry, Dean and Mark' – see appendix #2)

It is morning playtime in primary school playground. Harry, Dean, Mark and Phil are kicking a metal panel inside their hut and laughing as it makes a funny noise. Phil attracts the attention of a peer outside of the hut in the playground by calling his name.

- 16 Phil: Stephen come ere? (*looks outside of hut*)
17 (*Stephen, Gareth and Carl are older boys. They approach the hut*
18 *whilst looking inside at the members*)
19 Phil: look

20 Phil: look stephen.
 21 Phil: stephen you can play in ↑here if you ↓want to?
 22 Phil: [we're playin silly fings]
 23 Stephen: [Raowwwer] ((*enters the hut first and makes a growling sound.*
 24 *he looks at Dean whilst growling and then looks at Harry and smiles*))
 25 Phil: ((*guides Gareth and Carl to a bench as they enter the hut*))
 26 Mark: that's not [stephen]
 27 Harry: ↑[ah]↑
 28 Dean: ↑[ah]↑
 29 → Stephen: hello harry? ((*smiling*))
 30 Harry: ((*has eye contact with Stephen and smiles*))
 31 Mark: you're not allowed () ((*looks at Stephen, puts his arms around him*
 32 *and guides him onto a bench opposite Harry*))
 33 → Stephen: hiya harry? ((*still smiling and has eye contact with Harry*))
 34 Mark: ↑lets °()° ((*speaks quietly to Stephen. Stephen stops smiling*))

Phil calls Stephens name to secure his attention through using the summons-answer sequence before giving him an offer of affiliation by inviting him to become a member of the hut. Stephen accepts Phil's invitation of affiliation physically by entering the hut, rather than verbally. However, rather than continuing the affiliation through subsequently interacting with Phil, Stephen initiates an interaction with Dean who is also inside the hut. Stephen does this by making eye contact with Dean and growling at him on entrance to the hut whilst smiling to gain understanding that he is a friend. Dean accepts Stephen's gesture of affiliation by placing his arms around Stephen and sitting him down on the bench next to him.

Stephen looks across the hut to Harry, to whom he is directly opposite, and addresses Harry in a summons-answer sequence. Stephen does this by calling Harry's name along with the courtesy term 'hello' (Schegloff, 2007a) which initiates a gesture of affiliation. However, although Harry makes eye-contact with Stephen, this is not reacted to as an

answer as in the prior observations. Mark uses this transitional space to interact with Stephen himself and initiates affiliation with Stephen both verbally and physically as he moves Stephen onto a bench inside the hut. However, Stephen's next utterance is aimed back at Harry as he reattempts a summons-answer through using a name calling again. Stephen initiates affiliation a second time by calling Harry's name and making a slight variation on his former courtesy term using 'hiya' (line 33) rather than 'hello' (as on line 29). The repeat of a summons due to lack of an answer is referred to by Schegloff (1968) who states that,

'A (answer) is conditioned upon the occurrence of an S (summons) and should it not occur it is officially absent and warrants a repetition of the S. Hearing, now, the "Hello" as such a repetition provides for its status as a second summons in such an occurrence. The structure of the datum thus is seen to be S, no answer, S, A' (p 1088).

A physical gesture of affiliation is also initiated by Stephen in order to further support his summons as he smiles at Harry as he calls his name. Stephen repeats his name call and courtesy term to Harry in an orderly attempt to gain affiliation with him through securing an answer (Sacks, 1992a). Stephen's actions towards Harry may have been perceived as a display of prosocial gestures which are used in order to accelerate Stephen's acceptance into the group (Gruman et al. 2006).

Throughout this episode, the members use name calling to the various peers whom they wish to interact with. The use of name callings here work to ensure that the attention of their target peer is secured before further interactions are implemented. Phil is the first member to use a name calling to Stephen prior to an offer of affiliation to the hut members. This is followed by Stephen calling Harry's name and smiling. As Stephen's initiation of affiliation towards Harry was not touched off and oriented to by Harry, Stephen tries a name calling a second time. This repeat of a summons demonstrates the importance of an answer for the sequence to be completed.

Observation 5.1.5 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Sue' – see appendix #2)

It is the beginning of morning playtime. Sue runs across the playground towards an empty hut and sits inside the entrance. Sara approaches the hut as Sue drinks from her container. Sara initiates the interaction with Sue by using her name.

- 13 Sue: *((looks at Sara as she approaches the hut, drops her leg down and*
14 *moves her gaze so that she is looking straight ahead into the*
15 *playground))*
- 16 → Sara: Sue I got this first.
- 17 Sue: *((looks down at the floor of the hut))*
- 18 (1.8)
- 19 → Sara: I did I got this hut first?
- 20 → Sara: Sue? *((shakes Sue's coat sleeve))*
- 21 Sue: *((looks at Jess approaching))*
- 22 Jess: *((approaches Sara and speaks to her out of the range of the*
23 *microphone))*
- 24 Sue: *((looks away again))*
- 25 Sara: *((has her back to the hut as she replies to Jess))*

Sara and Jessy interact. Jessy runs off into the playground and Sara turns back face Sue.

- 33 → Sara: Sue?
- 34 Sara: can you: ↑look after our hut.
- 35 (2.6) *((Sara looks at Sue. Sue is still looking away))*
- 36 → Sara: Sue
- 37 Sue: *((turns to look at Sara))*
- 38 → Sara: can you look after the hut.
- 39 Sue: *((shakes her head whilst looking at Sara and then looks away))*
- 40 Sara: aw::: *((walks away from hut into the playground))*

Sue finds an empty hut in the playground and sits inside. It was observed that the first person to enter a hut has explicit rights in connection to that hut throughout that specific playtime; this is further addressed in the subsequent discussion chapter.

Sue is approached by Sara who walks towards her. Sue looks at Sara very briefly and then averts her gaze to look straight forward into the playground. Sara calls Sue's name to summon her before informing Sue that she had the hut first (line 16). Sue shows her disaffiliation from an interaction with Sara through the use of her gaze aversion. Sara hears Sue's blocking to be non-cooperative as Sue has not provided an answer for Sara's summons and so the sequence is incomplete. This is shown in the pause and her next utterance (line 19) where she reaffirms her claim on the hut. As this is still not responded to by Sue, Sara tries initiating another summons-answer sequence by calling Sue's name again (line 20) along with the support of a physical gesture as she shakes Sue's sleeve. Sara's summons is not responded to by Sue as she continues to block an interaction with Sara by not establishing eye contact to give her the go ahead to continue. As with the previous observation, 5.1.4, the lack of an answer in this summons-answer sequence is noticed by Sara as she repeats her summons in the form of a name calling (Schegloff, 1968). Again, this supports the suggestion that the children use name callings as a summons-answer sequence as the lack of an answer is deemed as problematic in the sequences.

Sue demonstrates that the interaction has indeed been blocked in her next action where she continues looking away from Sara and 'does' not listening as she avoids reacting to her name being called. When a person does not want to be involved in an interaction they will use avoidance by not engaging in talk, 'If some practice of talking is used to do some action, then there will be occasions on which a participant will undertake to avoid that action, and that will involve avoiding that practice of talking' (Schegloff, 1996a; p192). Sue's refusal to answer Sara's name calling is noticeable here as an avoidance of an interaction as Sue actively disaffiliates herself. This blocking of a summons-answer sequence inhibits affiliation as the several turns of conversation afforded by such an arrangement have been prevented due to Sue's disaffiliation (Schegloff, 1968).

Following a brief interlude with Jessy, Sara attempts to interact with Sue again (line 33) through initiating the same summons-answer sequence as before. Sue continues disaffiliating herself from Sara by blocking any further interaction with her gaze aversion (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990) and by not verbally answering Sara's summons. Sara repeats her name for a third time on line 36 as she applies the continual use of name calling to secure affiliation with Sue (Sacks, 1992a; Schegloff, 1968). This time the name calling is successful as Sue looks at Sara. Sara displays her understanding that she has been answered through Sue's eye-contact as she continues to engage with Sue in her next turn where she directly asks Sue if she will look after the hut. Sue's disaffiliation with the hut and its members is now physically displayed as she shakes her head to indicate that she will not be affiliated with the hut or its members by taking on the responsibility of looking after it in Sara's absence.

Observation 5.1.6 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Jon' – see appendix #2)

The bell rings for the children to go into school after morning play. Jon walks over to line up. Zac runs in front of Jon, pushes him slowly backwards and initiates an interaction with Sue by calling her name.

- 16 → Zac: sue=sue ((looks at Sue))
17 → Sue: ((meets Zac's gaze))
18 → Zac: come here? ((slaps his hand on his leg four times whilst speaking))
19 Sue: ((runs between Zac and Jon))
20 ((Zac and Sue look at Jon and Jon looks at them both))
21 Zac: just push him ((pushes Jon hard backwards))

Jon goes to line up to go into school after the school bell has rung. Zac jumps in front of him in the queue and calls Sue's name to summon her (line 16) before any other action is performed (Baker and Freebody, 1986; Schegloff, 1968). Zac's summons is answered by Sue as she makes eye contact with Zac (line 17) displaying her interest in interacting with

him (Filipi, 2009; Goodwin, 1981; Schegloff, 2007a). Through Zac's initiation of this summons-answer sequence through calling Sue's name the conversational turn is now returned back to Zac (Schegloff, 1968; Wootton, 1981). This is observed in the transcript (line 18) where Zac now implements his command to Sue as he calls her over to him and she obliges. Sue and Zac show their affiliation as they are now physically aligned next to each-other in the queue. As Jon's gaze remains on Zac and Sue, Zac demonstrates that he does not want to be affiliated with Jon in his next action where he verbally announces the exclusion of Jon by saying 'just push him'. Jon's exclusion is further supported through Zac's physical action of pushing Jon backwards, away from the alignment he has with Sue and Zac.

This demonstrates that Zac's summons-response action establishes an adjacency pair where Sue and Zac are involved in an adjacent activity. The occasioned and indexical use of these actions by Zac and Sue are noticeable as hostile in the specific context of 'lining up to go into school'. This is because the everyday understanding of 'doing' lining up involves the rule of joining at the end of the queue (Garfinkel, 2002). By joining the queue in front of someone, Zac has involved Sue in breaking this established rule. Zac and Sue now have solidarity through this category bound activity. Zac's name calling in his opening utterance works to establish affiliation with Sue as the structure of a summons-answer sequence comprises several turns, therefore offering the opportunity for a prolonged interaction. This affiliation between Sue and Zac also consequently excludes Jon. Zac and Sue's affiliation remains present in their subsequent interactions.

Observation 5.1.7 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Katie1' – see appendix #2)

Katie and Mel are playing in the climbing frame area. Mike and Jim come running over to them. Mike approaches Katie and Mel with a name calling of 'sissy girls' as he looks in their direction.

14 → Mike: sissy girls. ((looks in Mel and Katie's direction))

15 → ((Mel and Katie look at Mike))

16 → Mike: you're not allowed that. ((*points to the MP3 player*))
 17 (1.8)
 18 Katie: we:ll ((*steps backwards and holds onto the MP3 player*))
 19 (2.2)
 20 Katie: I ((*steps backwards again so she is right next to Mel*))
 21 (1.7))
 22 Katie: we:ll [any↑way.]
 23 ((*Jim walks up to Katie and looks closer at the MP3 player*))
 24 Jim: [what is it]

In this interaction Mike appears to open the sequence through being verbally aggressive to Katie by calling her a name and asserting power over her by telling her that she is not allowed to have the MP3 player. Through the use of predetermined categories Mike's behaviour could label him as a bully. A more detailed analysis is offered below.

The use of name calling insults has been found in research by Goodwin (1998) and referred to as terms of address. However, although Mike uses an insult in this interaction it is recognised here as an initiation of a summons-answer sequence and acknowledged as such due to the three-turn sequence involved (Wootton, 1981). The sequence begins with Mike approaching Mel and Katie and shouting the name 'sissy girls'. Katie makes brief eye contact with Mike which works as an answer as it allows him to continue with the interaction (Filipi, 2009; Goodwin, 1981; Schegloff, 2007a). This is demonstrated in Mike's third turn on line 16 where he informs Katie that she is not allowed to wear the MP3 player. Mike has successfully initiated a summons-answer sequence through his name calling. Mike has used the name calling 'sissy girls' in his opening sequence with Katie and Mel, this is answered by the securing of eye-contact and followed by Mike justifying his initiation of an interaction with them. In this context, Mike uses an access tool in his announcement to inform Katie that she is not allowed to have the MP3 player as a reason for interaction. This announcement also asserts Mike to have the more powerful position in this adjacency pair with Katie through the alignment of the positioned categories (Sacks, 1992a).

Following this summons-answer sequence Katie makes several attempts to reply with a SPP utterance but abandons each as she forestalls any further progress of the interaction (Schegloff, 2007a). This hesitant response has been recognized as a dispreferred second turn as it not only starts hesitantly but also goes on to begin to provide a justification and explanation of why she has the MP3 player. As Katie speaks she physically re-aligns herself, stepping backwards so that she is standing next to Mel. The very brief eye contact, re-alignment towards Mel and forestalling of a verbal interaction with Mike, shows Katie's display of disaffiliation with Mike and his friends.

Through the analysis of the sequential aspects of this interaction it is observed that Mike uses a name calling to attract the attention of Katie and Mel through the summons-answer sequence. This established contact was then progressed to maintain the interaction with Katie through the use of an access tool. Katie displayed that she did not want to be in an interaction with Mike and was competent in communicating this to him through her physical alignment, gaze aversion and verbal forestalling of an interaction. Whereas Mike's choice of words which he used in his name calling to initiate an interaction with Katie could label him as being verbally aggressive, it is apparent through investigating the orderly turns of the interaction that he uses the same resources for securing an interaction with Katie as other members use to secure affiliation in similar situations. Katie's sequential response demonstrated her unwillingness to continue in an interaction with Mike as she competently disaffiliates herself from him.

5.1.8 Conclusion and discussion

The microanalysis indicates that children use the calling of a peers name to initiate a summons-answer sequence. Name calling as a FPP utterance works to align the speaker with the person to whom they want an interaction with in a way that ensures that the conversational turn will be returned to them directly after the summons has been answered (Schegloff, 1968; Wootton, 1981). These sequential actions provide an adjacency pair observable to all. The identified resource of name calling initiates the

affiliation, exclusion or disaffiliation of members in the playground through the co-construction of each participating member.

With regard to affiliation, when a child was approached by a peer using a name calling their subsequent reaction indicated whether affiliation was going to be successfully secured or not in that situation. This summons–answer sequence co-constructs affiliation between members through the use of a specific peer’s name even if the affiliation is only maintained for a short period of time. In this study affiliation was initiated by the children through name calling where an adjacency pair was secured through a summons–answer sequence. Although the member’s name is used in the name calling wherever possible, there are instances of this action being initiated through the use of a substitute name (such as ‘sissy girls’ in observation 7). Although alternative names can be employed to provoke a summons–answer sequence, it is implied through the above observations that the use of a member’s actual name is more likely to secure an affiliation. The child’s name was used wherever possible as this demonstrated that the members had already gained affiliation as they were on first name terms (Sacks, 1992a). As the children had achieved affiliation prior to their current interaction there was no specific need to have an excuse for approaching, such as reference to an access tool. This was evident in the subsequent reaction of the called person who indicated whether affiliation was likely to be established between the two children in that specific context through their reaction to being called. When a called child reacted positively, by calling back or making a physical indication such as outstretched arms, affiliation was achieved in that context. Once a successful affiliation has been established, other sequential actions work to either maintain the affiliation or to close the interaction.

Disaffiliation can also be demonstrated through the use of name calling when a member refuses to acknowledge, or respond to a summons. If the called child ignored the approaching child then no interaction ensued in that specific episode, therefore demonstrating the importance of an answer in the summons-answer sequence (Schegloff, 1968; 2007a). Their intention not to engage in an interaction with that specific peer at that specific time was made demonstrably observable. This was confirmed by the sequential

action of the approaching peer who repeated their attempted interaction, or moved away from the target child. It is the reaction of the answerer that either establishes affiliation or disaffiliation.

When the name of a specific peer is called any surrounding peers are excluded due to the establishment of a particular dyad. Unlike disaffiliation, an approached peer demonstrates their unwillingness to be in an interaction through engaging in a series of verbal and/or non-verbal interactions to exclude that peer. It is observable here that 'complaints about third parties can be at least as much about affiliating with the recipient of the complaint, as they are about displaying a disaffiliation and disalignment with some other person' (Butler, 2008; p160).

These findings indicated that issues of power equality were evident in the children's social organisation. Although one person could open an interaction through initiating a summons, it was the subsequent reaction to this initiation which indicated whether the interaction could proceed or not (Schegloff, 1968). This finding was supported in the present study when a child was approached by a peer in the playground. The subsequent actions of the approached child demonstrated that they had the power to choose whether to affiliate with, disaffiliate from or exclude the approaching child. The use of name calling aided the approaching child to gain affiliation with their target peer as the summons-answer sequence ensures that the conversational turn will be returned to the approaching summoner once an answer has been presented.

These findings support the findings of Danby and Baker (1998) who also found that young children are socially competent in organizing their social order without adult intervention. The power of children's co-construction of social order is acknowledged in the work of Danby and Baker (1998) and here in these findings. Without microanalysis using CA, interactions between members of the playground may be perceived as verbally aggressive (for example, Sue and Sara in observation number 5 where they are having an argument about hut ownership). However, this methodology provides a more detailed understanding of the complex processes achieved in the co-construction of the context

rather than applying a blanket analysis of a child 'being verbally aggressive'. Through this analysis it is observable that although the interactions could be described as antisocial, aggressive or prosocial through a superficial first glance, a more detailed analysis provides more information about the complexities of the co-constructed situations. This detailed analysis informs of the importance which children place on being a part of an exclusive dyad where the initiation of such a structure can become problematic if an exclusive dyad is approached by an extra, superfluous member.

5.2 Access tools

Corsaro (1979) has suggested that, 'social interaction is dependent upon social actors gaining access to each other's interpersonal space' (p 315). This indicates that prior to an interaction there are sequences which are socially constructed which enable two or more people to engage in a conversation. When one person notices another they are categorically recognized as being members of specific social categories and this cognitive evaluation assists in the decision of whether a sequential interaction should be initiated (Schiffrin, 1977). If an interaction is sought after, the members will continue to attempt contact by initiating a conversational opening through an 'access display' (Schiffrin, 1977; p 679) which informs the recipient that an interaction is permitted.

There are certain thematic topics which are discussed in societies, 'within cultures there are topics that are intrinsically rich, in the sense that whatever it is that members of that culture tend to talk about – that is, whatever themes they talk about – they can talk about via that thing' (Sacks, 1992a; p 178). This suggests that people engage in talk about particular items which are of relevance to the members of their society. These objects are therefore instrumental in the co-construction of social organisation as they become the centre point of interest from which social interactions emanate.

When referring to the interactions between people who are unfamiliar with each-other, Sacks acknowledges that when a stranger talks to another stranger they initiate their interaction through speaking in a way which is understood as 'not beginning a conversation' (Sacks, 1992b; p195). This is accomplished through the concept of conversational 'tickets' (Sacks, 1992b, p257). These tickets are items of talk that are used as a way for people to initiate contact with each-other. Conversational tickets are not spoken with a greeting as with most other conversational openings, but that they are structured so that they orient to the reason why one person is approaching another for an interaction when the members are not familiar with each-other (Sacks, 1992b). Subsequently, tickets can also imply a sequential closing of the interaction as, once the reason for an interaction has been satisfied, the interaction can be ended and therefore the additional benefit of not tying a person to an unwanted interaction is afforded. As this is understood by all members in the social situation, the initiation of a first pair part (FPP) utterance using a conversational ticket is more likely to secure an interaction with a person in a second pair part (SPP) utterance by using this structure of conversation.

As this is the case, the use of a conversational ticket legally allows a person access to an interaction with a desired other which may otherwise be problematic. This is of particular relevance in children's interactions as Sacks (1992a) suggests that children are often aware that they have restricted rights to talk in society, particularly with adults, and so interactional tickets are used to legally initiate an interaction. It is also specifically relevant when studying children's co-construction of social organisation in a new

environment. Although a minority of children may be familiar with each-other from prior social situations, on entry to primary school the children are initiated into being members of a new community where many of them will be strangers.

Below are observations of children orienting to objects on initiation of access to an interaction with a peer or group. These access tools are mentioned at the beginning of an interaction as a conversational opening and serve to give the children a legal reason for approaching a desired person/group. Through the detailed analysis of each observation, the children's use of the chosen access tool to affiliate, disaffiliate and exclude peers is revealed.

Observation 5.2.1 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Ricky' – see appendix #2)

Ricky and Scot are standing in the playground watching children play. Tina is walking around next to them. Tina looks at Ricky and Scot, moves in a circle around them then folds her arms and shuffles up to them. Tina begins the interaction by physically approaching Scot and asking him a question about his snack.

- 15 Tina: ↑mm↓mm↑mm.
16 Tina: ↑wh::y you ↓li::ke ↑apple.
17 (0.6)
18 Scot: what?
19 Tina: ↑wh::y you ↓li::ke ↑apple.
20 Scot: coz i **do::** ((reaches forward and puts his hand on her arm))
21 ((Ricky takes sudden and large steps backwards away from Tina and
22 Scot. Scot looks at Ricky. Tina pushes Scott's hand off her
23 folded arms and looks at Ricky. Scot looks at Tina and then
24 back to Ricky. Ricky continues stepping backwards)) (5.4)
25 Ricky: ↑run away from her.
26 Ricky: ↑run away.

Tina's behaviour can be perceived of as prosocial as she initiates an interaction with Scott through approaching him and talking about his snack. These utterances work in establishing an adjacency pair interaction between Tina and Scot through an insertion sequence (Sacks, 1992b). Tina displays the action of 'encirclement' which was observed by Corsaro (1979; p 322) as she watches Scott and Ricky and moves into their play space using a circling motion before she attempts initiating access to their dyad. Tina selects Scott to initiate an interaction with which is shown by her verbal action of a pre-sequence 'mmm' and then a question 'Why you like apple?' This is supported physically through Tina's bodily alignment as she stands in front of Scott and her eye contact with him. The verbal utterance which Tina selects is in the form of a question about an object which Scott has, his apple. Tina's orientation to Scott's apple involves the object as an access tool as it is used as a possible object with which to establish an affiliation with Scott. Through these actions, Tina has selected Scot as the next speaker and does not orient physically or verbally to Ricky. Ricky shows his disapproval of Scott and Tina's new dyad as he instructs Scott to run away (line 25 and 26) and begins to move away as observed in the picture below in figure 1.1.



Figure 1.1

Through one person asking a question, a sequential interaction is initiated (Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson, 1974). In this interaction, Tina initiates the interaction through asking Scot a question in a FPP; Scot's sequential answer in a SPP maps him as being

aligned with Tina's project (see Stivers and Rossano, 2010). This sequence works here as Tina asks Scot a question accommodating the use of the chosen access tool, which in this instance is Scot's apple, through a base FPP (Schegloff, 2007a). Scott responds as he answers Tina's question with another question in a FPP insertion sequence (Sacks, 1992b). This marks Scot's utterance as 'other initiated repair' (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977) which is evident in the sequence of pre-rejections (Schegloff, 2007a). However, Tina does not hear Scot's utterance as a pre-rejection which is displayed through her sequential response; Tina continues to repeat the same question again to Scot with a SPP insertion sequence rather than formulating an alternative conversational structure. Scot answers Tina's question with a base SPP which secures an interaction.

Tina's initiation of an interaction with Scott through the use of an access tool has gained her affiliation with him through their co-construction of the immediate context. Tina's use of a question regarding an access tool has worked to secure an interaction and affiliation with Scot.

Observation 5.2.2 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Tina and Jess' – see appendix #2)

Tina and Jess have walked across the playground to a hut which is occupied by two children from their class, Sally and Ian, who are sitting next to each-other. Tina opens the interaction with Ian by physically approaching him and verbally orienting to his snack, asking Ian's permission to have one.

- 30 Tina: **can I have o::ne**
31 (2.6)
32 Tina: >can=i=av=one<
33 (2.3)
34 Tina: >can=i=av=one<
35 ((Jess and Tina move into the hut and stand next to ian. Ian gives them
36 each one of his snacks))

- 18 Mark: i'm even bigger ↑i'm a ↑big↑ger four years old. *((approaches Jon and*
19 *puts his face next to Jon's face. Mark takes small steps towards Jon as*
20 *Jon steps backwards))*
21 (1.8)
22 Jon: *((takes a larger step back so that he is side on to Mark and wipes his*
23 *face with a big sweeping motion))*
24 Mark: *((steps away from Jon))*
25 *((Harry approaches the group but stands on the periphery. Mark and*
26 *Chris watch Lee and Jon.))*
27 Lee: *((crouches down))* i'm bigger an you mark? *((jumps up))*
28 Jon: *((looks at Lee jumping up, smiles and jumps twice))*

When Lee approaches the group the members are involved in a discussion concerning the membership categorization devices (MCD's) age and size. On his initial contact with the group Lee uses the MP3 player as an access tool as he makes verbal orientation to it. This verbal action indexically employs the MP3 player as a tool with which to access the group. Lee further supports his verbal action as he holds out the MP3 player towards Jon, which selects Jon as the next person to speak. This secures Jon's attention as he looks at the MP3 player.

Although Lee has selected Jon as the next speaker and has also provided an object to be used as a conversational item, Jon looks at the MP3 player but does not make reference to it. Lee's orientation to the MP3 player as a tool with which to access affiliation with Jon is not 'touched off' (Sacks, 1992a) or oriented to by any other member of the group, including Jon, and the conversational topic remains centered on the MCD's 'age' and 'size'.

Although no reference has been made to the MP3 player in order to establish an affiliation, there has also been no reference to Lee's access to the group. As no members have oriented to there being a problem with Lee entering the group, Lee interprets this as

successful affiliation and joins in with the CBA of comparing size with the other members. Lee no longer needs to make reference to an access tool as there is already an established conversational object which he can use to affiliate himself to chosen members. Subsequently, Lee's second utterance does not continue to use the MP3 player as a conversational tool, but orients to the context relevant discussion about 'size'.

Prior to Lee entering the group Jon, Mark and Chris were interacting together. However, towards the end of this interaction the group split into two dyadic groups comprising of Chris and Mark, and Jon and Lee. Lee's affiliation with Jon has been achieved through Lee's initial selection of choosing Jon to present the MP3 player to and his subsequent actions of alignment.

Observation 5.2.4 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Tina, Katie and Mel' – see appendix #2)

Tina and Katie run into the playground together and stand next to a hut. Tina is eating a packet of berries. Katie opens an interaction with Tina as she asks her a question about her snack.

- 11 Katie: hhh?
12 Katie: ↑what are they.
13 Tina: ↓berries?
14 (15.3)

Katie notices Mel enter the playground and runs up to her while Tina follows. Tina places her hand on Mel and Katie excludes her by telling her 'no' but when Katie bends down Mel initiates an interaction with Tina through reference to her MP3 player.

- 27 Mel: have you got that thing. ((looks at the MP3 player around Tina's neck))
28 Tina: °yeah (0.6) it's there°
29 Katie: ((*stands upright and turns to face Tina*))
30 Katie: ↑don't ↓pla:y with us ((*creaky voice*))

Katie and Tina are standing together in the playground. Katie initiates a verbal interaction with Tina through a pre-sequence laugh followed by a question which orients to Tina's snack, using it as an access tool to initiate an interaction. Katie's use of a question to initiate an interaction is more likely to provoke a sequential utterance and therefore increases the probability of a successful interaction through an adjacency pair. This establishes an interaction in the form of a question / answer sequence as Tina provides an answer for Katie's question. Tina has been selected to speak in the form of an answer and in doing so co-constructs affiliation between the two members as an adjacency pair. However, once Tina has replied the conversation ends and there is no sequential verbal or physical interaction to maintain their affiliation. This marks the interaction as a momentary bond (Schiffrin, 1977) whereby the use of an access tool is employed as an object which they can both talk about and therefore centre a brief interaction around. This could be perceived as a prosocial interaction at first glance. However, the subsequent actions involve Katie excluding Tina when a new friend (Mel) appears, and then being offered affiliation by Mel. This demonstrates that interactions are much more complex than simply being perceived of as either prosocial or antisocial.

Although Tina experiences an abrupt exclusion from Katie, when Katie is physically crouched down Mel makes an initiation of an interaction on line 27. To initiate an interaction with Tina, Mel orients to an access tool which in this instance is the MP3 player which Tina is wearing. Mel uses the format of a question/answer sequence as her utterance is in the form of a FPP question. Tina then replies using a preferred answer, 'yeah' in her SPP utterance, although she uses a very quiet voice. Tina then goes on to secure further affiliation with Mel through giving her permission to look at the MP3 player (Figure 1.2).



Figure 1.2

This question/answer pairing through orientation to an access tool now establishes affiliation between Tina and Mel as an adjacency pair. Tina makes further reference to the access tool when she answers Mel, therefore also using it to maintain her affiliation with Mel. Mel hears this extension of affiliation and physically re-aligns herself so that she is standing in front of Tina looking at the MP3 player. Katie verbally ends this affiliation between Mel and Tina by excluding Tina in her next action saying 'don't play with us'. Without taking the sequence of events into consideration, Katie's verbal exclusion here could be defined as antisocial behaviour towards Tina.

In these excerpts, Tina's use of an access tool with Katie (Katie's berries) afforded her a brief interaction at the beginning of the observation. Mel's orientation to an access tool with Tina (in this instance the MP3 player) offered a longer interaction and brief affiliation. This affiliation between Tina and Mel provokes Katie to verbally define the social organisation in their group; Katie and Mel are affiliated with each-other in an exclusive dyad and Tina is excluded. Access tools have been oriented to in this observation initially by Katie who uses a snack to establish affiliation with Tina prior to Mel's appearance when she was no longer needed, and then by Mel to secure affiliation with Tina after she had been excluded by Katie.

Observation 5.2.5 (taken from the transcription entitled ‘Zac and Ricky’ – see appendix #2)

Jon and Sue are playing in a hut, Zac approaches them and begins talking to them through the left window. Ricky pushes his head through the back window of the hut and speaks to the members inside. Ricky orients to a coin as he physically holds one out towards the members of the hut and asks a question.

- 16 Ricky: () ((Ricky puts his head through the side window of the hut, he
17 is smiling))
18 ((Zac and Jon look at Ricky))
19 Zac: =shut up?
20 (2.8)
21 Ricky: ↑who ↓wa::nts ↑a- ((still smiling, Ricky holds out a coin towards the
22 children inside the hut))
23 Jon: **s::h::u::t u::p** ((gets off the bench and shouts in Ricky's face))
24 Ricky: =↑who wants a money prize. ((takes a step backwards but
25 continues holding out his coin))
26 ((Ricky is still smiling. Zac walks over to Ricky and hits the coin
28 out of Ricky's hand. Ricky stops smiling, lifts up his hand
29 whilst looking at Zac and shows Zac that he still has the coin.
30 Ricky looks downwards and puts the coin in his pocket. Zac and Jon
31 look at Ricky whilst he does this and then move back to their
32 original places. Ricky walks away.))

Zac is looking through the left window of a hut which is occupied by Jon and Sue. Ricky enters the scene by pushing his head through the back window of the hut and self-selecting himself to speak to the members inside. Zac latches on to the end of Ricky's utterance by telling him to 'shut up' (line 19), therefore excluding him from interacting with Jon, Sue and himself. However, Ricky does not accept this as an act of exclusion as he continues speaking to the members of the hut in his next turn.

Ricky's second attempt to interact with the hut members is evident on line 21 where he begins to offer of an item to them and holds up a coin as he begins to speak. Jon interrupts Ricky this time as he steps up to Ricky to shout a louder and extended 'shut up' which repeats Zac's prior utterance in an attempt to exclude Ricky. However, Ricky still does not acknowledge this exclusion and continues to orient to his coin as an access tool with an offer 'who wants a money prize?' on line 24. Ricky's completion of his sentence shows him using an object, in this instance a coin, as a tool with which to attempt to gain access to an interaction with the members of the hut.

This gesture of affiliation from Ricky is responded to by Zac who does not affiliate himself to Ricky or use any further verbal utterance. Zac walks up to Ricky and hits the coin out of Ricky's hand. Ricky now hears the interaction as exclusion and shows his understanding that he is being excluded in his subsequent action as he lowers his gaze downwards from Zac and Jon, although they are still looking at him, and moves away from the hut.

The verbal exclusions by Zac and Jon could label them as antisocial, especially when these are accompanied by the verbal exclusion of hitting Ricky's coin out of his hand. However, these verbal and non-verbal actions are viewed here as instrumental in achieving the social order. Ricky was excluded from becoming affiliated with the hut members on his initial interaction and so subsequently tried using an access tool with which to gain admission. However, Ricky's use of an access tool did not work in this social situation as he was subsequently excluded both verbally and physically by Jon and Zac in the successive interactions.

5.2.6 Conclusion and discussion

With reference to Sack's (1992a) observation that there are certain objects in specific cultures which have cultural relevance as conversational topics, it is evident from the above excerpts that these children utilized the MP3 player and sharing of snacks as such

in their playground culture. In these observations the children orient to their snacks, the MP3 player and money in their initial verbal openings in their interactions with peers. These interactional tickets are verbally structured in the form of question–answer sequence in excerpts one and two, twice by different members in excerpt four and also once in excerpt five. As with the use of name calling in the prior chapter, the use of a question works to increase the probability of securing an interaction with a peer. The children’s systematic marking of an item through verbal reference to it in the initiation of an interaction presents it as an interactional tool in the construction of a conversational opening (Van Dijk, 1997).

Access tools are observed to be used in the co-construction of the social organisation where they are oriented to in order for children to gain access to interactions with one or more peers. Affiliation, exclusion or disaffiliation subsequently ensues. Orientation to an access tool secures affiliation in observations one through to four; exclusion is shown in observation five and disaffiliation is shown in observation one by Ricky where he physically moves himself away from Tina.

The findings demonstrated that affiliation was initiated through the use of orienting to an access tool as a conversational ticket, as was evident in prior research (Birkbeck and LaFree, 1993; Charlesworth and Hartup, 1967). The items which were used by the children in the present study included the MP3 player, snacks and the playground huts as these were all present in the specific contexts. Building a conversation through making reference to these items afforded the children a legitimate reason for approaching the desired person or group. This strategy was enforced when members were aware that they did not have the right to initiate an interaction with their target (Sacks, 1992a). Orientation to an access tool was employed in situations where a child attempted access to a group or dyad through the use of an object as a reason for approaching. The structure of this initiation of affiliation was arranged in the form of a question – answer sequence or as an announcement (Sacks, 1992a). Initiating a question about an access tool worked to establish a question – answer sequence where affiliation was gained by the sequential turn taking involved in such an interaction. The use of an announcement about an access

tool provided a reason for the child to legitimately initiate an interaction with a peer whom they would not ordinarily be affiliated with (Sacks, 1992a).

When a child was approached by a child using an access tool whom they did not want to be affiliated with the child will demonstrate their disaffiliation by running away or limiting their interactions with that peer, as with Ricky in observation one, This is very different to when an approached child excludes the approaching peer. Exclusion is observable in observation five where, although Ricky attempted affiliation with the hut members he was excluded through several turns of verbal interaction which escalated into several non-verbal turns later in the observation. This demonstrates that access tools can be used to initiate an interaction with peers, but it is the reaction of the approached peer that will determine whether affiliation, disaffiliation or exclusion will proceed.

As with the resource of name calling, more issues of power equality were evident in the children's use of access tools for social organisation. Access tools were used to promote the possibility of affiliation with a chosen peer as the tools offer themselves as culturally relevant conversational tools (Sacks, 1992). The finding in this section highlights the importance which the children place on resources to open an interaction with their chosen peer. This insight into children's social competencies also offers further support for the acknowledgment of children being effective in arranging their local social order (Danby and Baker, 2000). Therefore, the findings of the current study align with the work of Danby and Baker (1998; 2000) where children are observed to capably co-create their own social organization.

Other instances of children's competence in asserting power relations with their peers were evident where the children were observed to map themselves as owners of an item. This is observed in the current research as the children orient to items such as the playground huts, the MP3 player, snacks and stickers. These findings are in alignment with prior research which also found children employing everyday items to construct power relations through their ownership (Cobb, Danby and Farrell, 2006). Within both research findings the declared ownership was subsequently touched off by peers as they

oriented to that child as having power as the owner. In the current study, children were ignored as their peers demonstrated their disaffiliation from engaging in the power relations. The children's use of these items indicated that they were competently employing the use of everyday items to organize the social order in their playground. This is also evident in research by Cromdal (2001) where the children's orientation to a ball is used as an access tool with which to initiate and interaction. As with the current study, it is acknowledged by Cromdal (2001) that these tools are used to align the social order of the members as they accept or deny entry through reference to these access tools.

5.3 Possessive pronouns and collective pro-terms

Possessive pronouns assert membership and affiliation to a chosen category to emphasize that such a pair exists. The use of possessive pronouns work to affiliate a person with another person through establishing a relational pairing, 'You can use 'possessive pronouns' when you're engaged in *affiliation*. And that could be done with some membership category plus a possessive pronoun' (Sacks, 1992a; p605). This establishes a verbal connection to another group or person who may not be physically present at the time. Sacks states that, 'possessive pronouns are not exclusive means for asserting or claiming possession' (Sacks, 1992a; p610) as other resources can also be employed for establishing affiliation, as demonstrated throughout this chapter.

Collective pro-terms are also used by members to affiliate themselves in the same way that possessive pronouns are. Members orient to collective pro-terms when associating themselves with a group or, 'establishing a cohort and organizing collective action'

(Butler, 2008; p94). Collective pro-terms such as 'we' are used to establish a unified collection of members (Sacks, 1992a). This verbal affiliation to a category set is therefore demonstrable in aligning members who are a part of the referenced group, and those who are not. The use of collective pro-terms facilitates the social organisation between members and establishes order within the local context.

Observation 5.3.1 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Tina and Jess' – see appendix #2)

Tina, Jess, Ian and Sally are inside a hut in the school playground. Tina begins her sentence through the use of a collective proterm on line 40 whereas Ian makes reference to a family member with a possessive pronoun 'my mum' (line 41).

- 35 *((Jess and Tina move into the hut and stand next to ian. Ian gives them*
36 *each one of his snacks))*
- 37 Tina: hhh?
- 38 Ian: ()
- 39 Ian: you cant av (0.2) that.
- 40 Tina: i said why don't we [just]
- 41 Ian: [my mum]
- 42 Ian: =my mum said you can only have one
- 43 Bev: when you come in come and get me *((Bev leans into the hut to shout))*
- 44 *((Sally looks at Bev and moves from sitting next to Ian towards the*
45 *opposite side of the hut))*
- 46 Tina: (um)
- 47 Tina: will (yo:u) will you come to my pa:rti:.
- 48 Ian: huh?
- 49 Tina: will you come to my pa:rti:.
- 50 Ian: ↑o:ka::y.

Following Tina and Jess's successful access to the hut Tina begins a suggestion which ties herself and Ian to the same category by using the collective proterm 'we'. Tina echoes the original format of the prior successful interaction by self-selecting herself to initiate the topic for conversation and selecting Ian to take the next verbal turn (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974). Tina uses the collective proterm 'we' to affiliate herself to Ian as she begins to suggest a collective action (Butler, 2008) which they could participate in together.

However, Tina's utterance is overlapped by Ian who employs the use of the possessive pronoun 'my' as he begins saying 'my mum'. This possessive pronoun coupled with the orientation to a member from the MCD 'family' presents an exclusive affiliation between Ian and his mum as a dyad which is independent of the playground context (Sacks, 1992a). This utterance separates Ian from the current members in the present social context, and in doing so excludes Tina's suggestion of herself and Ian having an exclusive affiliation.

Ian then activates a self-initiated repair as he breaks off from his announcement (line 41) and then quickly latches on the end of the cut off to extend it (line 42). Although Ian has co-operated in sharing his snack with Tina and Jess he now initiates a rule which is tied to this sharing. This rule only permits Tina and Jess to have one snack as Ian informs them that it is his mother's choice that he is not allowed to share more than one. Here, Ian is verbally orienting to his mother as a figure of authority who supports Ian's earlier announcement that Tina cannot have another snack. This external affiliation gives Ian support in asserting his announcement as it is no longer recognized as Ian's suggestion to exclude Tina and Jess, but the decision of a person of authority. In suggesting that it is his mother's idea to only allow his peers one snack, Ian legally evades any responsibilities which his actions may provoke. This is accepted as a legal rule by the other members as it is not touched off or questioned (Cobb-Moore, Danby and Farrell, 2008).

Following a brief announcement from Bev, Tina returns to her interaction with Ian. In this turn Tina initiates a conversational repair sequence as she uses a pause filler 'um' in

the transitional space available and goes on to employ a question/answer sequence with Ian. In her question to Ian, Tina uses an offer of an invitation to her party using the same possessive pronoun as Ian had used in his prior turn, 'my'. Tina also mimics Ian's prior utterance structure by making reference to an affiliation with an external category which in this instance is her party. This use of a possessive pronoun together with an invitation to an external gathering beyond the social context of the playground works as an offer of affiliation to Ian. Ian replies with an insertion which serves to deflect asserting an immediate answer (Schegloff, 2007a). Tina marks this as other-initiated repair as she repeats her utterance with the same intonation and emphasis. Ian uses his next turn to accept Tina's offer by saying 'okay'.

Tina began the sequence by a suggestion of affiliation between Ian and herself through the use of a collective proterm but this was not immediately taken up as Ian disaffiliated himself by orienting to his affiliation with a member of the 'family' category. Tina subsequently uses a possessive pronoun with an offer to her party to initiate affiliation with Ian. This second attempt at asserting affiliation with Ian is successful as Ian accepts her offer. Tina has achieved her desired result. Although Tina's invitation could be perceived as an act of prosocial behaviour, this detailed analysis offers further insight into how this interaction benefits Tina (through establishing affiliation with her target peer) maybe more so than Ian who demonstrates his affiliation with a family member.

Observation 5.3.2 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Zac and Ricky' – see appendix #2)

Ricky has just been rejected from accessing the hut by Zac and Jon and has walked away. Zac initiates a conversation about Ricky on his departure by referring to the collective proterm 'everyone'.

33 Zac: everyone (does) ((*shakes his head whilst talking and looks at Sue*))

34 Zac: everyone doesn't like ricky °does° (1.2) does they

35 ((*Sue shakes her head from side to side whilst keeping her drinking*

36 *beaker in her mouth))*
37 Zac: don't they
38 Zac: everyone
39 Zac: they don't like to () friends with him
40 (14.2)
41 Sue: *((takes her beaker out of her mouth and looks behind her, in the*
42 *direction that Ricky went. Sue then turns back to look at Zac))*
43 Sue: my brother sam doesn't like ricky. *((has eye contact with Zac.))*

Later in the observation

125 *((Jon leaves the hut*
126 *followed by Sue. Ricky reaches into the hut and puts his hand on*
127 *Zac's back. Zac reaches out of the hut and hits Ricky in the eye.*
128 *Ricky steps back, puts his hand up to his face and covers his eye.*
129 *Zac looks at Ricky for six seconds and then crouches down to speak*
130 *to him.))*
131 Zac: sorry↑ rick:.
132 Zac: do you want to come to my party.
133 Zac: you want to come to my party.
134 Ricky: *((continues to rub his eye))*

Zac continues to talk with Ricky.

140 *((Sue and Jon enter the hut. Zac speaks to Sue and Jon whilst nodding*
141 *his head))*
142 Zac: lets see if ricky can play nicely (0.6) I'm letting him come to my
143 party.

Prior to this interaction, Zac and Jon have both told Ricky to 'shut up' leaving Sue as the only group member who has not engaged in the CBA of excluding Ricky. As Sue has not joined in with the verbal exclusion of Ricky, Zac implies that he is aware that Sue does

not know that it is a legal action to exclude Ricky in his next action. Zac does this through establishing eye contact with Sue and then using the collective pro-term 'everyone' by announcing that 'everyone does' which he breaks off to initiate self-repair. Zac then shakes his head whilst looking at Sue and continues his sentence 'everyone doesn't like Ricky' (line 34). Through using this collective proterm and directing his utterance to Sue, Zac informs Sue of the present social order which involves Ricky being mapped as excluded by a large number of people. This verbal action justifies the excluding of Ricky to be acceptable and a legal CBA which is produced by the majority.

There is a brief pause which is followed by Zac finishing his sentence 'does they'. This second 'does they' is heard as a question by Sue who demonstrates her understanding through answering Zac by shaking her head to indicate no. Through doing this Sue demonstrates her physical agreement with Zac's assessment of Ricky (Schegloff, 1996a) and therefore aligns herself as affiliated with Zac's perspective about Ricky (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992). Zac continues 'don't they' (line 37) and then 'everyone' (line 38) where he places emphasis on the beginning of the word 'every' to stress the importance of his reference to a group of people with the same opinion. Although Zac's utterance would be perceived as asserting relational aggression in as he manipulates social power against Ricky (Vaillancourt and Hymel, 2006) it is seen here as active in achieving alignment with Sue and Jon. This is further supported as Zac uses the collective proterm 'everyone' in his reference to Ricky's unpopularity. A collective proterm is used when 'establishing a cohort' (Butler, 2008; p95) which, in this social situation, is a 'them and us' segregation between everyone and Ricky. The use of the word 'everyone' also employs 'an infinite population' (Sacks, 1992a; p335) which altogether presents a category with a powerful number of members who support Zac's exclusion of Ricky. Zac's assessment that 'everyone doesn't like Ricky' established Ricky as having stigma attached to him as being a member of the school who is unpopular. When the consistency rule is applied it indicates that if Ricky is a member of Zac's group, what is said about Ricky can be said about Zac, therefore making Zac a part of the collection 'unpopular' too. This assessment of Ricky's unpopularity by Zac initiates the alignment of the present social context to Sue where Ricky is positioned to be excluded.

Following this, Sue affiliates herself into the category of people who do not like Ricky through the use of a CBA; this is achieved by Sue using a possessive pronoun along with reference to a member of the category 'family' as she announces 'my brother Sam doesn't like Ricky' (line 43). Sue's orientation to her brother not liking Ricky establishes Sue as being affiliated to a category set of people outside of the current social situation. This utterance presents Sue's family as another category collection whose members also support Zac's statement. Sue's identification that her brother does not like Ricky together with the use of a possessive pronoun aligns her as being affiliated with the opinion her brother shares through the consistency rule (Sacks, 1992a). Sue's present affiliation with these peers and her verbal orientation to family members who are of the same opinion about Ricky shows Sue engaging in the same CBA as her peers as she orients to excluding Ricky. Ricky has been excluded from this group through the member's affiliation to the infinite category of 'everyone' and the 'family' category. Sue has displayed her congruity with Zac's initial assessment about Ricky and their group is aligned to exclude Ricky.

In the second part of the observation there is a sequence of physical interactions which work to dramatically change the social order in a small number of turns (lines 125 - 130). When Ricky reaches into the hut and touches Zac on the back, Zac responds by hitting Ricky in the eye to further demonstrate that he is excluded from an interaction with Zac. After Zac has hit Ricky there is a six second silence. In this conversational space Ricky does not offer a verbal or non-verbal turn, resulting in Zac acknowledging that he has behaved inappropriately and showing this recognition through verbally offering an apology to Ricky. The apology is offered to Ricky as an account for Zac's socially illegal action and works to demonstrate Zac's remorse. Zac's account is an example of a rule – don't hit others - which is enforced in both the adult and child community (Cobb-More, Danby and Farrell, 2009). Therefore Zac's apology demonstrates his regret for performing what could be perceived as an aggressive action towards a peer to both children and adults. Ricky sustains his silence which provokes Zac to follow his apology with a subsequent gesture. This is done through the offer of affiliation as Zac invites

Ricky to have access to his party by using the possessive pronoun to 'my party'. Although Zac has been instrumental in the establishment of Ricky's social exclusion, Zac now makes a gesture of affiliation to Ricky by inviting him to have co-membership to his exclusive group. Zac also uses a question-answer tactic here to try to encourage Ricky to speak as when a question is asked it is usual that the second pair part will offer an answer (Schegloff, 1992a). Zac's action towards Ricky is now visible as prosocial behaviour, and so demonstrates the complex nature of interactions.

However, Ricky remains silent by avoiding a sequential verbal turn (Schegloff, 1996a) and continues to rub his eye. Zac makes a second attempt at affiliation by repeating his invitation along with a second use of the same possessive pronoun 'my party'. Ricky continues to be silent and in doing holds power as it provokes more offers of affiliation from Zac. When Sue and Jon enter the hut, Zac speaks to them whilst nodding his head 'lets see if Ricky can play nicely'. Zac uses the collective proterm 'lets' as he establishes a unified group with Sue and Jon (Butler, 2008). Zac continues with establishing affiliation with Ricky in the immediate context in his next verbal action as he informs Sue and Jon that Ricky is now going to Zac's party, 'I'm letting him come to my party'. This use of a possessive pronoun notifies Sue and Jon that Ricky has now been granted affiliation to Zac and therefore membership to their group.

This membership to Zac's group through the orientation to a possessive pronoun provokes a collection 'R' relationship (Sacks, 1992a) which presents Ricky with a bond of obligation to his co-members to not get them into trouble by telling the teacher about the dispute. Although Ricky was excluded at the beginning of the observation for being unpopular, he is now affiliated as the hierarchy of relevance (Sacks, 1992a; 1992b) indicates that it is more beneficial to be affiliated with an unpopular person than it is to be in trouble with a teacher.

Observation 5.3.3 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Harry' – see appendix #2)

Dean and Harry are holding hands and sitting in a hut in the school playground. Harry has verbalized that he wants to leave the hut but Phil and Gareth are preventing him from leaving. Natasha approaches the hut and moves Phil's leg to allow Harry to leave, argues with Phil and then leaves.

- 42 *((Harry and Dean stand together in the hut holding hands watching*
43 *Natasha's interaction))*
- 44 Natasha: () and put leg down. *((speaks in a slow rhythmic tone and*
45 *points her finger at Phil repeatedly then walks out of the hut))*
- 46 Dean: come on Harry (0.4) lets go now. *((speaks very quickly and follows*
47 *Natasha out of the hut and towards a teacher, still holding Harry's*
48 *hand))*
- 49 teacher: alright ↑Harry?
- 50 Harry: yeah
- 51 Dean: Harry (0.9) um her friend and ↑my friend.
- 52 teacher: al::ri:ght good
- 53 *((Natasha, Dean and Harry walk into the playground together holding*
54 *hands))*

Dean demonstrates that Natasha is affiliated to himself and Harry as he suggests that they move out of the hut when Natasha leaves. Dean uses the collective proterm 'lets' to affiliate himself with Harry in his utterance 'let's go now'. In using a proterm in this way Dean organizes a collective action (Butler, 2008) between himself and Harry as they actively follow Natasha out of the hut. The initiation of this affiliation between specific members of the hut realigns the social order to produce two separate groups. Through the CBA of leaving the hut, Natasha, Dean and Harry align themselves as being affiliated through CBA.

This affiliation is also shown in the sequential action as Dean, Harry and Natasha immediately approach a teacher after leaving the hut. The teacher subsequently asks

Harry if he is all right when he approaches her. This question allows Harry to make an assessment of his current situation and he replies that he is 'alright' with the answer 'yeah'. The affiliation between this collection of children is then verbally announced to the teacher by Dean in his utterance that Harry is 'her friend and my friend' (line 51). Dean places emphasis on the word 'my' at the beginning of his use of a possessive pronoun 'my friend' to draw attention to their affiliation.

Dean's use of a collective proterm together with the action of holding hands asserts himself and Harry as being physically aligned as affiliated through their collective action when they leave the hut together. This affiliation is oriented to by Dean in a possessive pronoun as they speak to a teacher and he announces that Harry is his friend.

Observation 5.3.4 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Tina, Katie and Mel' – see appendix #2)

Katie notices that Mel and Tina are involved in an interaction and reacts to this by telling Tina 'no'. However, when Katie bends down to tie her shoelace Mel initiates an interaction with Tina.

- 26 Katie: ((*bends down to tighten her shoe laces*))
27 Mel: have you got that thing. ((looks at the MP3 player around Tina's neck))
28 Tina: °yeah (0.6) it's there°
29 Katie: ((*stands upright and turns to face Tina*))
30 Katie: ↑don't ↓pla:y with us ((*creaky voice*))
31 Tina: °↓why↓°
32 Katie: ↑co:::↓z i=said so ((*creaky voice*)) ((*holds Mel's hand and runs, pulling*
33 *her across the playground*))

Tina holds on to Mel and runs with them. Katie notices that Tina has joined them and stops running and tells Mel that she doesn't want Tina to play. Katie pulls Mel into the playground again and Tina stays on her own for four seconds. Tina runs towards Mel and Katie and catches them up.

- 43 *((Tina reaches*
44 *Mel and Katie. Katie takes a couple of steps in between Tina and Mel))*
45 Tina: you haven't got one of them have you?
46 (6.3)
47 *((Mel starts walking toward the climbing frame. Tina follows with Katie*
48 *behind her)) (4.7)*
49 Tina: i () we don't need our coats look (0.6) we don't need our coats on
50 it's not that cold?
51 *((Katie has a coat on, Mel and Tina do not))*
52 Mel: i was freezing this morning but now it's gone warm.
53 *((Mel walks back into the playground. Katie runs to catch up with Mel*
54 *and holds her hand. Tina falls behind slightly but runs to catch*
55 *up with Mel and Katie. Tina puts her hand out and Mel holds it. The*
56 *girls continue into the playground together))*

Tina and Mel's brief interaction is noticed as an affiliation by Katie who subsequently demonstrates that she perceives an affiliation between Mel and Tina as threatening to her exclusive affiliation with Mel in her next action where she tells Tina 'don't play with us' (line 30). Katie uses the collective pro-term 'us' in her utterance to affiliate herself and Mel into an exclusive category which Tina is not a member of. This works to exclude Tina from Katie and Mel's dyad. This verbal exclusion of Tina is subsequently supported with a physical gesture as Katie holds Mel's hand and runs into the playground with her, away from Tina. Although Katie and Mel have demonstrated that they are in an exclusive dyad, Katie initiates all of the actions.

Katie's exclusion is hearable by Tina who asks Katie for an account for this behaviour in her sequential utterance, 'why' (line 31). Katie provides an account for excluding Tina in her utterance, 'coz I said so'. The use of the deictic expression 'I' in Katie's account works to assert her as the person of authority in this indexical context (Hanks, 1992). In doing so, Katie maps herself (Butler, 2008) as having more power than Tina and Mel. However, Tina does not hear this as a legitimate reason for being excluded which is seen in her sequential action where she physically holds onto Mel to follow Katie and Mel into the playground. When Katie notices the physical interaction between Mel and Tina she stops running and reiterates her intention to have exclusive affiliation with Mel by physically separating Tina and Mel and telling Mel 'come on'. Tina hears that she has been excluded from this interaction as she remains on her own whilst the girls run off together.

After four seconds, Tina runs up to Mel and Katie and opens a new interaction with Mel as the exclusion she has received so far has been initiated by Katie. Tina begins her utterance with the indexical word 'I' and immediately changes this to the collective pro-term 'we' (line 49). In doing so, Tina changes her potential alignment from being an independent member, to affiliating herself and Mel as a collective dyad. Tina continues this alignment verbally as she uses the collective pro-term 'we' in her assessment 'we don't need our coats look, we don't need our coats on it's not that cold' (lines 49 and 50).

In Tina's assessment of the current situation, not only does she affiliate herself and Mel through the collective proterm 'we', but she also orients to the CBA of wearing coats as Katie is the only one out of the three to be wearing one. The CBA of not wearing a coat therefore establishes Tina and Mel as being affiliated through belonging to the same category set and excludes Katie as she does not conform to the correct CBA to be a member of the same category. Through using the collective proterm 'we' in reference to herself and Mel, Tina establishes affiliation between them both and in doing so, excludes Katie. This strategy for affiliation with Mel works as Mel agrees with Tina in an agreement to her assessment that they do not need to wear coats because 'now it's gone

warm'. Through offering this assessment Mel aligns herself as having the same opinion as Tina and affiliation is gained.

Katie asserts exclusive affiliation with Mel at the beginning of the interaction through using the collective pro-term 'us' when referring to herself and Mel. The use of a collective proterm works to place herself and Mel in the same category and in organizing this dyad she also excludes Tina. This initiates a pattern of exclusion as Tina affiliates herself and Mel as belonging to the same category through also using a collective pro-term which now excludes Katie. At the end of this interaction Tina has achieved her goal of being affiliated to Mel. This is demonstrated as they display physical affiliation by holding hands and walking into the playground together. Although predefined categories of behaviour would suggest that Tina has experienced actions which could be perceived as both antisocial and prosocial from Katie and Mel, this detailed analysis indicates that Tina is actively involved in the production of the social organisation of the group.

Observation 5.3.5 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Jon' – see appendix #2)

The bell rings for the children to return to school after morning playtime. Jon walks towards the line of children waiting to go back into school. Zac runs in front of Jon, pushes him slowly backwards and calls Sue to stand next to him. Sue runs over to Zac and stands next to him, in front of Jon. They exchange glances.

- 20 ((Zac and Sue look at Jon and Jon looks at them both))
- 21 Zac: just push him ((pushes Jon hard backwards))
- 22 Jon: I can (0.5) push (0.8) really hard (and)? ((takes slow steps towards Zac
- 23 whilst looking at him))
- 24 Alan: ((puts his hand on Zac's shoulder and turns Zac around to
- 25 face him))
- 26 Alan: don't do that ((smiles at Zac straight after this utterance))
- 27 Zac: ((smiles straight back at Alan))

28 Jon: my ↓daddy can push hard and ()↑ (0.2) () (0.4) (). ((stands right
29 in front of Zac))

Zac initiates the interaction with Jon as he approaches the queue and physically pushes Jon backwards from his position in the line. Zac then goes on to invite a friend, Sue, to join him in Jon's space. Zac and Sue now have affiliation through their CBA of illegally queue jumping in front of Jon. Jon, Sue and Zac engage in eye contact which is acted on as a threat to Zac's affiliation with Sue and his place in the queue. This is shown through Zac's reaction to the eye contact as he announces 'just push him' which is supported by a physical gesture as Zac pushes Jon backwards. Through these actions Zac makes his exclusion of Jon understood by everyone involved.

Jon demonstrates his understanding that he has been excluded in his sequential interaction with Zac as he makes an assessment to Zac that he can also push hard. In this utterance Jon uses the indexical expression 'I' to claim himself as having power (Hanks, 1992). Jon also places emphasis on his use of the words 'push' and 'hard' which suggests that he is specifically drawing attention to these actions. This verbal assessment of the situation works to align Jon as having as much power as Zac as Jon suggests that he can also engage in this type of activity.

Jon continues with his interaction with Zac by orienting to his affiliation with a member of the 'family' category through the use of a possessive pronoun in his utterance 'my daddy' (line 28). This possessive pronoun used in conjunction with a member from the category 'family' affiliates Jon with a member outside of the current social context. Through doing this Jon displays his understanding that he has been excluded from membership to Sue and Zac's dyad and so he asserts his affiliation with a member from an external category outside of the school context.

Observation 5.3.6 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Harry, Dean and Mark' – see appendix #2)

On entry to a playground hut Stephen notices Harry and says hello to him whilst smiling. Mark begins to talk to Stephen and this utterance progresses into a whisper.

- 33 Stephen: hiya hARRY? ((*still smiling and has eye contact with Harry*))
34 Mark: †lets °()° ((*speaks quietly to Stephen. Stephen stops smiling*))
35 Stephen: no

Mark begins to push and pull Harry around the hut whilst Harry verbally protests.

- 50 Mark: ((*pulls Harry across the hut and puts him next to Stephen. Mark*
51 *attempts to put his arms around both boys but stops when Stephen*
52 *shouts at him*))
53 Stephen: **no** mark **no**
54 (1.4)
55 Stephen: leave my friend [alo:ne.] ((*sits down on the bench*))
56 Mark: [la:la:la:]

Stephen enters the hut and initiates affiliation with Harry by saying 'hiya hARRY' (line 33). Although no reciprocal action is offered by Harry, the mutual gaze and smiles between Harry and Stephen are marked to be a gesture of affiliation by Mark which is shown in his next action. Mark responds by looking at Stephen and using the collective proterm 'lets' in his utterance. Stephen's use of the collective proterm 'lets' works to place himself and Stephen in the same category as Mark begins to suggest the organisation of a 'collective action' (Butler, 2008; p94) at the beginning of his utterance. Through doing this Mark initiates the suggestion of affiliation with Stephen; this action therefore excludes Harry. However, Mark's utterance then progresses into a whisper which Stephen reacts to by demonstrating his disapproval as he stops smiling. Mark further aligns himself as being disaffiliated from Mark as he says 'no' indicating that he does not agree with Mark's suggested proposal.

Mark does not react to Stephen as he continues to physically move Harry off his bench and around the hut even though Harry tells him that he does not want to. Stephen

supports Harry by telling Mark not to continue his actions. In line 53 Stephen tells Mark 'no' twice and uses Mark's name to emphasize his disagreement with Mark's actions. This verbal action aligns Stephen as being disaffiliated from Mark and affiliated with Harry. This is further demonstrated in Stephen's next verbal action as he uses a possessive pronoun in conjunction with the category 'friend' as he tells Mark 'leave my friend alone' (line 55). This use of a possessive pronoun affiliates Stephen as a friend of Harry as well as indicating to Mark that they belong to an exclusive dyad, therefore excluding Mark.

Observation 5.3.7 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Emma'- see appendix #2)

Emma approaches Kerry and Kathy and asks Kerry if she wants to play mums and dads. Kerry rejects Emma's offer and explains that they are already involved in a game of families. Kathy aligns with Kerry's explanation with a simple 'no'.

- 32 Emma:kerry=do you want to play mums and da:ds.
33 Kerry: =no we're playing fa:milies. ((*very breif eye contact with Emma when*
34 *Emma calls Kerry's name*))
35 Kathy: no
36 ((*Emma walks back to the hut*))

Emma begins the interaction by calling Kerry's name and immediately giving an offer of affiliation as she asks Kerry if she would like to play mums and dads (line 32). Kerry responds by declining Emma's offer and uses the collective pro-term 'we're' in her explanation for why she cannot play with Emma. This establishes Kerry and Kathy as belonging to an exclusive dyad, and in doing so Kerry excludes Emma. Kerry's rejection also orients to a distinction between playing 'mums and dads' and playing 'families'. Although these games may be perceived of as similar due to them both incorporating imaginary play involving members belonging to the family category, they are recognized as different category sets by Kerry in the present context. This differentiation is used by Kerry as an account for the decline of Emma's offer. Through this interaction Kerry and

Kathy demonstrate that they are affiliated through the use of a collective proterm and CBA. Kerry and Kathy's exclusive affiliation is heard as exclusion by Emma and this is displayed in her subsequent reaction as she walks away from the girls, back towards her hut (line 36).

5.3.8 Conclusion and discussion

This study demonstrated that once affiliation was secured, the children maintained affiliation through a number of resources. Verbal reference to being an affiliated member of a dyad or group was made by the children using possessive pronouns and collective proterms as a resource. The children used possessive pronouns to verbally affiliate themselves with another person in order to make it observable that such an affiliation existed (Sacks, 1992a). In these observations, the children's orientation to possessive pronouns employs the use of reference to family members and friends. These utterances are used by the children to express a display of affiliation which the children have with other members. Through the use of possessive pronouns these affiliations are made observable and demonstrably relevant to both peers and teachers.

Further affiliation is initiated through the use of collective pro-terms where the children align themselves as being a member of a group or dyad. These verbal representations of affiliation are used in order for the speakers to assert and make their affiliation known to the people who were present. In the use of these resources the affiliated members may have been present or not, but the need to express an affiliation with the member was made relevant by the speaker in the context. Collective proterms have been observed by the children to initiate a collective action which affiliates the members through CBA. Collective proterms work to demonstrate an affiliation with another member or members, and subsequently also excludes members who are not accepted as being part of the group presented.

In an established interaction, the participating children were observed to disaffiliate themselves in specific situations by verbally aligning themselves with other members

who were not present. This was achieved by the children's reference to absent family members or peers along with the use of a possessive pronoun (Sacks, 1992a). This verbal action worked as a disaffiliation from the children present in the existing context through the use of possessive pronouns. Collective proterms were also used in this way where reference to a specific group of people was asserted through words such as 'we' (Sacks, 1992a). This action selected certain members who were included in the collective proterm, therefore leaving some other members out. Collective proterms and possessive pronouns were both used by children in similar ways to assert the verbal action of disaffiliating specific members in specific contexts.

Children were excluded through the use of collective proterms where affiliations to other members were established using extended interactions over several turns with words such as 'we' and 'us' (Sacks, 1992a). These words worked to establish a cohort (Butler, 2008) of which the excluded child was not a member. Alternatively, collective proterms were used by the excluded child to assert affiliation with members other than those who were excluding him/her.

Possessive pronouns are also used to assert power in interactions as the children affiliate themselves with a category collection of members who are available to them outside of the current situation. In doing this, children gain power in their interactions as they disaffiliate themselves from an unwanted interaction with the members available, and suggest that they have an important relationship independent of the immediate situation. This is significant as they demonstrate that although they are not valued in the immediate situation they are valued outside of it. These actions indicate that alignment with another person (otherwise termed a prosocial relationship) can be used in conjunction with the assertion of excluding or disaffiliating from another person (or being antisocial). Offers of party invitations are another way in which possessive pronouns are used by the children to assert power in their interactions. The orientation to party invitations is used in these observations as an offer of affiliation which allows the person invited access to the host's life outside of the school playground. Possessive pronouns are therefore used in conjunction with an offer of a party invitation as a matter of importance and privilege.

However, in the observations it is also noticeable that the invitations are used as a way for a member to affiliate themselves with the person they are inviting as a possible disaffiliation has occurred prior to the offer. This specific context is present in observations 5.3.1 and 5.3.2.

Throughout these observations the children are aligning themselves as being affiliated to a category set which is of demonstrable relevance to them in each context. This is done through the children's use of collective pro-terms and possessive pronouns. Another aspect which is of relevance is that the children's reference to affiliation also works in the exclusion of a peer, or in the child's disaffiliation away from a group. This finding is mirrored in the work of Butler (2008) who recognizes that a child's demonstrable affiliation with a peer can be instrumental in the process of excluding other children (Butler, 2008). This complex structuring of social order is acknowledged here and also in the work of Danby and Baker (1998; 2000) who recognise that relationships and identities within these networks are always changing and rearranging through the organization of the members within. The inclusion of friends and ownership over specific items are found to be used in the co-construction of power and social order here and in other research (Cobb-Moore, Danby and Baker, 2006; Danby and Baker, 2000) where, 'conflict and argument are essential elements for determining such social order' (Danby and Baker, 2000, p94).

5.4 Referencing gender

When meeting people, our common sense knowledge places individuals into social categories through the use of membership categorization devices (MCD); one of the most prominent category collections which people are noticed as belonging to is that of gender (Sacks, 1972). Prior research concerning language and gender has focused on the linguistic style of talk which is spoken by the two genders whereas more recent studies have been concerned with member's actual reference to gender in everyday social organisation (Stokoe and Weatherall, 2002). The latter uses an EM and CA approach to naturally occurring data where the members' verbal orientation to gender displays its importance to the participants in their co-construction of context (Stokoe and Weatherall, 2002).

Schegloff (1991; 1997) suggests that when reference to gender is made in conversation it displays that it is demonstrably relevant to the members in that particular social situation. However, Billig (1999) argues that it is limiting to only acknowledge gender as important if the members directly refer to it. This is because people rarely refer to the social

interaction which they are engaging in whilst they are actively involved (Billig, 1999). Billig's perspective argues that aspects of social interaction can still be important in the co-construction of a situation even if it is not verbally oriented to by the participating members. With regard to gender, this suggests that if the participants do not verbally orient to aspects of gender in their social interaction it is not of significance to them in that specific context. In Schegloff's (1999) reply to Billig (1999) Schegloff addresses this issue by reiterating the import of observing and analyzing, 'the orientations of the people who matter the most – the ones who engaged in that conduct, and on whose understanding of its relevances the actual ensuing trajectory of the interaction was built' (p 579). This suggests that the participant's verbal reference to categories should primarily inform the research wherever possible (Schegloff, 1999).

A further analytic issue in the method of CA is the discussion of when verbal reference *is* made to the MCD gender, why that particular MCD was used in that specific context. This introduces the concept of 'relevance' in the co-construction of social organisation (Schegloff, 1991). Schegloff (1991) suggests that the relevance of a member being referred to by a specific aspect of their identity, such as being a boy or a girl, works in establishing the relevant conduct in the social construction of the interaction. When reference to gender is produced and made relevant by the children in their interactions it is therefore understood that they are using the MCD as a tool in the co-construction of their social organisation.

The following observations show the children's exclusion, affiliation and disaffiliation through their orientation to gender in their school playground in morning playtime.

Observation 5.4.1 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Mark' – see appendix #2)

It is morning playtime in the primary school playground. Mark is walking around alone and observes an empty hut which he runs towards, shouting before he enters.

14 Mark: This is my hut. ((*continues running over to the hut*))

15 Mark: ↓I'm goin in ↑my::: hut. ((*enters the empty hut and sits inside*))
 16 (18.2)
 17 Mark: ()
 18 ((*Sally and Ricky approach the hut*))
 19 Mark: [I'm goina]
 20 Sally: [can ↑I come in Mark].
 21 Mark: yes and go get hi:m to come in
 22 (3.6)
 23 Mark: ↑tell the boys they're allowed in.
 24 Mark: tell the ↓boys.
 25 ((*Sally enters the hut followed by Ricky. Sally sits opposite Mark and*
 26 *Ricky sits next to the entrance of the hut by the side of Mark. Megan,*
 27 *Rachel and a friend approach the hut*))
 28 Ricky: ((*places his foot across the entrance*))
 29 Rachel: Isn't that the girls? ((*points her finger at Marks hut*))
 30 Mark: no no no [no]
 31 Ricky: [yes] yes ↑that's the girls and this is the boys. ((*Ricky looks*
 32 *at the bench opposite him and Mark which Sally is sitting on. He than*
 33 *drops his leg down leaving the entrance clear*))
 34 (8.4)
 37 Megan: I don't like you I like the ↑girls ((*the girls walk away*))

Mark begins the interaction by claiming exclusive ownership of the empty hut through his orientation to the possessive pronoun 'my' in his utterance 'my hut'. This action initiates the MCD of owner / non-owner where each member has specific rights, responsibilities and obligations (Sacks, 1992a). This type of ownership asserts power relations as, 'the participants established rules to regulate the space, the materials and their peers within the area' (Cobb, Danby and Farrell, 2006, p 5). In this context, Mark has mapped himself as the owner and this invokes the right for him to choose who is and is not allowed to enter the hut (Bulter, 2008). This intersubjectivity is shown by Sally

who displays her understanding of this rule (Cobb-Moore, Danby and Farrell, 2008) by asking Mark for permission to gain access and affiliation to his hut.

Mark affiliates himself to Sally as he permits her to be a member of the hut and in the same sentence instructs her to 'go get him to come in' (line 21). In his utterance Mark places emphasis on, and extends the word 'him' which draws attention to the category gender. This category is then oriented to in Mark's next utterance three seconds later as he instructs Sally to 'tell the boys they're allowed in' (line 23). Further emphasis on the word 'boys' is applied in Mark's third command to Sally to 'tell the boys' (line 24). Sally's request for affiliation has been granted but she has been given the specific obligation to enlist more boys into the hut if she is to be a member. Apart from Sally, the establishment of the hut is restricted by the gender segregation which is instigated by the hut owner. This is evident as Mark extends offers of membership to some peers and also excludes others from becoming a member of the hut.

As the owner of the hut, Mark enforces positioned categories whereby the boys' category holds the power as they have been assigned by the owner to have a distinct right to be an affiliated member of the hut through their membership to the gender category (Sacks, 1992a). Subsequently, this positions the category of girls as having less authority in the current social context. Therefore, although Sally is granted permission to become a member of the hut she does not have the same rights or authority as the boys. This is displayed as Mark maps Sally's role as a recruiter of more boys for the hut and in doing so legitimizes her membership.

As more girls approach the hut (line 27), Ricky closes off the entrance to them by placing his leg across the doorway. This exclusion of entry is understood and oriented to by Rachel who subsequently orients to the gender of the collection of members in the hut. Rachel challenges the boys' domination of the hut by asking 'isn't that the girls' (line 29). Through this action Rachel demonstrates her understanding that Mark is creating his hut on a gender specific basis and that affiliation to Mark's hut is limited to the gender category to which a person belongs. Rachel accepts the issue of restricted affiliation and

exclusion of gender segregation in the hut but questions the selected category of gender as she suggests that the hut belongs to the girls.

As Mark is the owner of the hut he is obliged to defend and justify the legality of his hut being dominated by male members. Mark profusely denies that his hut belongs to the girls by repeating the word 'no' (line 30), but this is overlapped by Ricky with a 'yes' who helps Mark defend his hut through a continuous overlap (Schegloff, 2000b). It is suggested by Ricky that in the hut there is a boy's bench where Mark and Ricky are sitting, and a girl's bench which Sally is sitting on. Ricky therefore indicates that members of this particular hut can be girls or boys, but the members are obliged to sit on their designated sides. Ricky also drops his leg at this point, physically opening the entrance to the hut to allow the girls access.

There is silence for seven seconds as the girls remain outside of the hut. Finally Megan verbally disaffiliates herself from the members of the hut as she announces her preference for a strictly female gendered group in her utterance 'I don't like you I like the girls' (line 37). This verbal closing of the interaction is supported with a physical disaffiliation as the girls walk away. In this excerpt gender categories are used by the children to affiliate with, exclude and disaffiliate from members of a specific physical location in the playground.

Observation 5.4.2 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Katie1' – see appendix #2)

Katie and Mel have been in an interaction with three boys who have suggested that Katie has illegal ownership of the MP3 player. The girls remain next to the climbing frame whilst the boys move into the playground. Mel speaks to Katie telling her to 'come on' and physically putting her arm around her while they walk, they then hold hands.

- 56 *((the boys have walked away and the girls are still next to the*
57 *climbing frame holding hands))*
58 Mel: *come on ((puts her arm around Katie's shoulders and walks with her.*

- 59 *they hold hands*))
- 60 Mel: ↓if any of those boys come again (0.5) ↓run away (0.8) ↑ok babe?
- 61 Katie: just go in the girls toilets.
- 62 Mel: ye:a:h
- 63 *((both girls start smiling))*
- 64 Mel: cos then↑- cos ↑b:oys are not allowed in the ↑girls toilets.
- 65 Mel: now that's where we should go::

Mel initiates the conversation by making reference to gender categories and verbally discussing strategies for avoiding further unwanted interaction with the boys. In this utterance, Mel refers to the boys as 'those boys' and in doing so orients to category segregation, as 'those boys' indicates they belong to a category separate to the one which Mel and Katie belong. The use of the utterance 'those boys' suggests that there is also the category 'us girls'. This category segregation employs the use of reference to gender identities. In the same utterance Mel further suggests that Katie should run away from the boys if they should return. This suggestion to 'run away' marks further physical disaffiliation which can be implemented to avoid any sequential interaction with the boys.

This orientation to the exclusion of a gender collection is touched off by Katie who adds to the preparation for further unwanted contact in her suggestion to use the gender difference between her and Mel's dyad and the group of boys in her favor. Katie does this by suggesting that they go to a place where girls have exclusive access: the girls' toilet. As Mel and Katie belong to the gender collection 'girls' Katie verbally utilizes the girls' toilet as an exclusive place where boys cannot legitimately gain access.

Mel displays her intersubjectivity with Katie's suggestion as she verbally announces her understanding of the reason for using the girls' toilet to avoid the boys. Mel does this by producing an assessment of Katie's suggestion (see Pomerantz, 1984). This is displayed on line 62 where Mel shows her agreement with Kate's idea and again on line 64 where she reiterates the point about the use of gender segregation made by Katie. Through

doing this Mel aligns herself as having congruent understanding and as sharing the same opinion as Katie (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992). This gender segregation therefore establishes affiliation between Mel and Katie.

Gender categorization is used in this context as a tool for avoiding further threatening social situations with a group of boys and for reaffirming Katie and Mel's exclusive affiliation.

Observation 5.4.3 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Sue')

Sue is sitting inside one of the huts in the playground. Sara approaches Sue to talk to her. Jess approaches and speaks out of the MP3 player range. Sara informs Jess that one of the other huts in the playground belongs to the boys and that the hut which Sue is occupying belongs to the girls; Sara points to clarify which hut she is referring to. Jess then runs off into the playground.

- 22 Jess: *((approaches Sara and speaks to her out of the range of the*
23 *microphone))*
24 Sue: *((looks away again))*
25 Sara: *((has her back to the hut as she replies to Jess))*
26 Sara: yes.
27 Sara: tha:t's the bo:ys?
28 Sara: and this is the girls. *((points to another hut in the playground))*
29 *((Jess runs off into the playground.*

Later in the observation Jess returns to the hut.

- 57 Sara: but remember[↑](0.3) **only gi::rls.**
58 Sara: and don't let **no boys** ok ()

Sue is sitting inside the hut and Sara is speaking to her through the doorway. Jess approaches Sara and speaks to her out of range of the microphone. Sara turns away from the hut to speak to Jess. Sara's first utterance is an agreement to Jess' remark. Sara then goes on to orient to gender collections as she informs Jess that one of the huts is exclusive to male members as she physically points to a hut in the playground. Sara makes further reference to gender in her next utterance as she informs Jess that the hut which Sue is in is exclusive to the girls. Jess accepts that this is a legal segregation as she runs into the playground without any further argument or discussion. Through this action, Sara demonstrates that gender identities are applied to the playground huts by the members of the playground as an aspect of social organisation.

Later in the observation Sara asks Jess if she will look after the hut and Jess agrees. Sara then orients to the responsibilities tied to looking after the hut (lines 57 and 58) which include only allowing access to girls and not permitting the boy's access. Sara places emphasis on the part of her utterances where she refers to gender categories as she makes it clear that it is only girls who are legally permitted to become affiliated to the hut. This gender segregation is reiterated by Sara in her next utterance (line 58) where she places emphasis on the exclusion of boys.

This outlines the gendered legal rules which the children tie to the use of huts where in order to gain affiliation to either hut you must be of the same gender. Through developing and enforcing these rules the girls enforce their solidarity. If you are not of the same gender when trying to gain access, your attempted affiliation will be perceived of as illegal by the existing members and you will be excluded. This highlights the importance which the children place on gender in social organisation, not only for the affiliation of girl members, but also in excluding any boy members.

Observation 5.4.4 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Harry, Dean and Mark' – see appendix #2)

This interaction is situated in a hut in the school playground which is occupied by male members. Mark has been physically moving Harry around the hut in a way that Harry has reacted negatively to, shown by cries, shouting to 'get off' and pushing Mark away. Harry has verbally and physically displayed his disapproval of Mark's actions towards him.

- 76 Mark: *((hugs Harry then lets go and looks at him))*
77 Harry: o:w::w.
78 Harry: ↑o::w↑
79 Mark: sit on my lap
80 Mark: sit on my lap
81 Mark: [sit on my lap]
82 Harry: [n::o].
83 Mark: °sit on my lap° *((stands in front of Harry as he speaks to him))*
84 *((All the boys in the hut gather around and watch Mark and Harry.*
85 *Mark speaks to one of them))*
86 Mark: can I have one
87 Phil: you're on the- (0.4) you're on the girl?
88 *((Mark moves forward towards Harry and bangs his head on the hut*
89 *roof. Mark rubs his head and then sits on Harry's lap and dances*
90 *back and forth whilst singing. Harry pushes Mark off his lap.*
91 *Mark has an angry facial expression as he turns to face Harry.))*
92 Mark: mwwaa::hh *((grabs Harry very hard and kisses him hard on the*
93 *cheek, lets go and looks at Harry))*
94 Mark: ha:: *((smiles at Harry and leaves the hut))*

Mark initiates a physical interaction with Harry by hugging him for a second then letting him go and looking at him. Although an embrace like this is often used as a gesture of affiliation or prosocial behaviour, in this specific context it is interpreted negatively by Harry, the receiver. This is displayed by Harry as he reacts by shouting 'ow' twice after

the physical interaction with Mark. Mark also reaffirms that it was intended as a negative interaction as he does not orient to Harry's complaint with remorse for the act.

Mark instructs Harry to sit on his lap. This physical gesture is also usually used as a mark of affiliation but, as with the prior hug, Harry interprets it as a negative interaction and shows this in his silent refusal to co-operate. As Harry does not fulfill Mark's request, Mark repeats his instruction four times in a try-marked attempt for Harry's compliance. Mark's third repeat is overlapped by Harry finally saying 'no' which Mark hears as a refusal to co-operate. This is shown through Mark's sequential forth and final repeat of the utterance which is spoken in a quieter voice.

All members of the hut gather around and watch Mark and Harry's interaction (figure 2.1). Phil verbalizes a noticing 'you're on the' and then breaks off, pauses and self-repairs and finishes his utterance 'you're on the girl' (line 106). Through this action Phil demonstrates his understanding that Mark is displaying CBA which treats Harry as a girl by hugging and kissing him. This noticing places Harry in the gender collection of girls which invokes an incongruity in the social situation; Harry has been previously (correctly) accepted as a boy in order to achieve access to the exclusively male hut. This incongruity works to exclude Harry from the gender collection of boys to which all the other members are affiliated. This form of exclusion is achieved by boys as they promote their own leadership qualities in their group by mapping themselves into positive category sets, whilst affiliating other members with negative categories (Kyratzis, 2007). This type of ridicule has also been found in the process of exclusion in girls' groups (Goodwin, 2006). Here, Mark has mapped himself in a positive leader role whereas he maps Harry as belonging to a negative role as the member of incongruity in the hut. Phil further supports this exclusion through the use of gender categories.

Mark continues to assert this interaction as he sits on Harry's lap and dances back and forth whilst singing. Harry uses a reciprocal physical gesture to display his disaffiliation with Mark by physically pushing Mark off his lap. Mark persists as he kisses Harry very hard on the cheek and follows this with an utterance of 'ha' as he leaves the hut.



Figure 2.1

Mark's physical gestures which are ordinarily perceived as signs of affiliation are interpreted as a negative interaction by Harry. Mark initiates the interaction with Harry by hugging him, dancing with him and ordering him to sit in his lap. This is touched off by Phil who notices the conflict between Mark displaying affiliative gestures to Harry and Harry's negative reaction to them as an incongruity. This exclusion of Harry from the group of boys is then extended by Phil who uses gender segregation as he verbally places Harry in the gender category of 'girl'. This works to exclude Harry from affiliation to membership of the group of boys in the hut. Sequential orientation to this gendered membership categorization is produced by Mark who sits on Harry's lap and then kisses him. In this social context, gender categories have been used to assert an incongruity which presents the exclusion of Harry and affiliation between the other male group members as they gain solidarity through the intersubjectivity of the humorous situation.

A superficial glance at this interaction may provoke the image of prosocial behaviour as the boys engage in the predefined characteristics which define prosocial behaviour. However, when analyzing the sequences involved in the interaction it is evident that Harry interprets Mark's gestures negatively, not as an alignment of affiliation.

5.4.5 Conclusion and discussion

These observations show the children's demonstrations of affiliation and disaffiliation through membership to specific gender categories. Gender is also used to exclude members from gaining affiliation to groups. The children made verbal reference and physically aligned themselves to display their preference to membership with their own gender group. These affiliations through the gender MCD were verbally oriented to by the children who made reference to not liking the opposite gender and verbally aligned themselves to membership with their own gender. This verbal alignment to gender categories was further emphasized through the children's use of the playground huts which were gender segregated by the playground members. In the gender segregated huts it was understood by the children that membership would only be granted to the children who belonged to the specific gender category of the hut. However, the gendered huts changed each break time. Huts which belonged exclusively to girls in one playtime accommodated only boys or mixed genders in subsequent playtimes. This indicates that rather than the huts dictating the gender of its members, the children actively employ the hut as a gender based unit in specific playtimes. This was achieved through the children's own interpretation of the structures (Butler, 2008; Butler and Wetherall, 2006; Goodwin, 2006) and talking them into being of relevant use to the children (Schegloff, 1992a; Seedhouse, 2005). Whether a hut was employed as all girl, all boy or mixed gendered was also dependant on the available children at each specific playtime.

Disaffiliation was observed through the children's reference to gender categories where they made verbal reference to their membership to a specific gender. Through these actions particular members of the playground were disaffiliated from due to their gender. The children were observed to disaffiliate themselves from peers through verbal reference to their aversion to the opposite gender category than they belonged to and also physically by walking away (for example, Megan in observation 5.4.1. This study therefore provided evidence of children's reference to gender in their co-construction of context. The children made gender segregation demonstrably relevant through their

alignment in specific contexts (Schegloff, 1991; 1997). Gender segregation was also made demonstrably relevant through the children's physical actions by using the huts to emphasize the disaffiliation from opposing gender categories and unwanted members.

In these observations the children discussed exclusions of any member who did not belong to the same gender category as themselves. The members provided ground rules for members of the playground who were going to be excluded by stating quite clearly that their groups were to be single gendered only. This was due to categorising by the 'economy rule' through hierarchy of relevance (Lepper, 2000). The children made their categorization of peers demonstrably relevant on the most obvious characteristic of their identity which, in some instances was shown to be gender. However, gender segregation was observed to be context specific as it only occurred in certain situations. Although children were excluded because of their gender in one interaction their gender was not oriented to as a reason for exclusion in a subsequent interaction with the same peers. This reinforces the importance of understanding children's relationships as locally negotiated rather than as fixed entities.

Gender segregation was practiced by the participating children in the observations where the exclusion of peers due to their gender was also sequential. One child would align themselves as belonging to a specific gender category and this would be subsequently touched off by another member. The children therefore made belonging to a gender category demonstrably relevant in their playground culture and this was used in the co-construction of social order. The huts were once again employed to promote the organisation of playground members and became oriented to by the children's categorization as being either a 'boys hut' or a 'girls hut'. Once a specific gender had dominated a hut, the members were obliged to abide by the rule of maintaining the gender specific membership of the hut and to exclude members of the opposite gender from entering the hut. This responsibility had sequential implications as, if a member broke this rule, they would be reprimanded by the other members and risk being excluded themselves.

Schegloff (1991) notes that in order to accurately state that members use their talk to organize social structure, analysts must 'show how the parties are embodying for one another the relevancies of the interaction and are thereby producing the social structure' (p51). In the above observations of children's interactions it is noticeable that the children demonstrate intersubjectivity with regard to the importance of gender as they make reference to it in the segregation of peers in their co-construction of social organisation in the playground. This reference to gender segregation in the social organization of the playground was also found in research by Cromdal (2001) where the girls were observed to, 'invoke gender categories to form their opposition' (p537). It is apparent that gender plays an important part in the production of becoming affiliated to a peer, in the disaffiliation from a peer or when excluding peers through social alignment. Through asserting this segregation the children may be perceived as engaging in prosocial behaviour when constructing gendered groups and antisocial behaviour to exclude members who are of the opposite sex. However, as these both of these actions are being implemented throughout the course of each interaction the labeling of the interaction as either antisocial or prosocial is insufficient.

It is noticeable that the children are organizing their playground through the use of exclusive places to which boys and girls are assigned, such as individualized gendered huts and the use of the girls' toilet in observation 5.4.2. This shows the children's early demonstration of social competence where, at the age of four, they are able to organize themselves into specific gendered groups using their new environment. It is shown through these observations that gender is an important and demonstrably relevant social category to the children in the school.

5.5 Physical contact

In ethnomethodology it is acknowledged that the verbal utterances which are spoken between people work as actions which establish social context through common understanding (Garfinkel, 1967). In order for an interaction to be successful and productive there needs to be a collective understanding in the co-construction of the context (Sacks, 1992a; 1992b). This is imperative as ‘a basic normative assumption about talk is that, whatever else, it should be correctly interpretable in the special sense of conveying to the intended recipients what the sender more or less wanted to get across’ (Goffman, 1981; p10). In order to achieve this level of understanding in a social interaction, people announce their comprehension and sense making for each-other as they perform an activity and tell about it identically (Garfinkel, 1967). It is further understood that people facilitate their intentions through the use of physical gesture in an interaction in order to achieve a universal comprehension between members of the

conversation (Birdwhistle, 1970). Both verbal and non-verbal actions are produced in everyday interactions to maximize communication between members, and non-verbal actions are often used as an effective substitute for verbal utterances in specific situations (Goffman, 1981).

In children's social interactions physical gestures are used to support and to emphasize verbal actions in the school playground (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992). These actions work to demonstrate the children's willingness or reluctance to be involved with the other members of their social environment. This social alignment is initiated and maintained using physical, non-verbal actions such as stance and bodily alignment as well as verbal utterances, which together play an important role in structuring the social environment (Goodwin, 2007). The level of participation which a member is willing to commit to an interaction is demonstrated by their posture and bodily positioning and is noticeable to other members of the social environment as well as the intended recipient (Goodwin, 2007).

Children's use of physical action as a resource for the co-construction of context is now observed in the following excerpts which are taken in a primary school playground.

Observation 5.5.1 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Katie1' – see appendix #2)

Katie and Mel have been approached by three boys who have been questioning the legitimacy of Katie wearing the MP3 player. During this interaction Katie has moved physically closer to Mel as the boys have approached and has been replying to their questions hesitantly and briefly.

39 *((Mike steps forward. Jim steps forward towards Katie. Mel looks at*
40 *Jim. Mel puts her arm across Katie's chest and turns her*
41 *around so that she has her back to the boys. Mel moves her arm*
42 *down and holds Katie's hand as she starts walking off into the*
43 *playground. The boys follow whilst speaking. Mel and Katie stand*

44 *still whilst holding hands. The boys continue talking as they*
45 *move into the playground.))*

The boys continue into the playground as they talk about ownership of phones.

56 *((the boys have walked away and the girls are still next to the*
57 *climbing frame holding hands))*
58 Mel: *come on ((puts her arm around Katie's shoulders and walks with her.*
59 *they hold hands))*
60 Mel: ↓if any of those boys come again (0.5) ↓run away (0.8) ↑ok babe?

Katie's use of pre-closing utterances in her communication with the boys along with her physical stance suggests her reluctance to be in this interaction with the boys and her attempt to disaffiliate from them. Mel shows her interpretation of Katie's actions as a display of attempted disaffiliation from the boys as she intervenes by physically turning Katie around so that she has her back to the boys (figure 3.1). Subsequently Mel displays her affiliation with Katie through a physical gesture as she drops her arm down to hold Katie's hand and begins walking off into the playground with her. These actions work to disaffiliate Katie from an interaction with the boys and display the affiliation between Katie and Mel. The boys respond to this demonstrable alignment by subsequently walking away into the playground.



Figure 3.1

Once the boys move away into the playground, Mel offers further affiliation in her physical gestures to Katie as she holds her hand. The use of physical gestures by Mel displays Mel and Katie as part of the same dyad through their exclusive affiliation which is presented through physical touch. Where the verbal act of closing was not legitimate in the present interaction, the physical act was. Katie's verbal pre-closings were touched off and supported by Mel's non-verbal physical actions. All parties now understand that this interaction has now been closed through their physical alignment where they walk off in opposite directions of each-other. This physical interaction between Katie and Mel works to emphasize their affiliation as well as their exclusion of the boys. This sequence of actions offers an explanation for why children demonstrate physical actions which make them noticeable as 'in a prosocial relationship'.

Observation 5.5.2 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Jon' – see appendix #2)

The children are lining up to go into school after morning playtime. Zac runs in front of Jon and pushes him slowly backwards. Zac makes eye contact with Sue who is behind Jon and slaps his hand on his leg whilst calling her.

- 16 Zac: sue=sue ((looks at Sue))
17 Sue: ((meets Zac's gaze))
18 Zac: come here? ((slaps his hand on his leg four times whilst speaking))
19 Sue: ((runs between Zac and Jon))
20 ((Zac and Sue look at Jon and Jon looks at them both))
21 Zac: just push him ((pushes Jon hard backwards))

Once Zac has secured Sue's attention he progresses to give her a verbal request to 'come here', whilst supporting this request with a physical gesture as he slaps his leg. Zac's summons of Sue works as she gives a positive response to Zac by approaching him (figure 3.2) and standing between him and Jon in the queue. Sue takes up this position even though Jon is currently in that particular place in the queue. This verbal and physical interaction presents a display of affiliation between Zac and Sue as Zac calls Sue to be physically closer to him than she was previously and Sue complies. This relationship could be observed as a prosocial invitation, but it is evident that Sue and Zac have broken the everyday rule of the playground by taking a peer's place in the queue (Garfinkel, 2002).



Figure 3.2

It is noticeable from the alignment on line 20, that Zac and Sue are displaying themselves in a dyad as they both stand looking at Jon whereas Jon has been excluded from his physical place in the queue and his social position as he stands looking at the dyad. When Jon looks across to Zac, Zac demonstrates that Jon's direct gaze is a threat to his affiliation with Sue and their new physical alignment by verbalizing his desire to remove Jon from the situation through saying 'just push him'. This statement from Zac is not heard as an order by Sue as she does not respond. Following the statement, Zac pushes Jon himself which indicates that this utterance is spoken as an announcement (Garfinkel, 1967). Zac is therefore observed to use an initial verbal utterance to exclude Jon which is followed by a supporting physical gesture as he pushes Jon backwards.

Further analysis is applied to the investigation of the emphasis which Zac places on the word *push*. When this is taken into account it is suggested that by both 'telling' and 'doing' Zac makes a 'rationality of his achievement' (Garfinkel, 1967; p3). Through the use of these verbal and non-verbal actions Zac communicates an incorporated display of exclusion to Jon. Zac physically pushes Jon backwards away from Sue and himself and in doing so sustains their affiliation whilst excluding Jon from the present social context. Therefore, the physical action of pushing which Zac engaged in, would be a characteristic of antisocial behaviour even though the sequence of events indicates that Zac was asserting protection over his affiliation with Sue.

Observation 5.5.3 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Katie, Sally and Lee' – see appendix #2)

The children are queuing up to go into school after the morning playtime. Sally shows Jenny her hand and tells her that she has cut herself.

- 72 Sally: [look i've] cut myself on () ((looks at
73 Jenny and holds her hand out to show her))
74 Katie: ((looks back at Sally's hand and touches it))
75 Sally: i cut myself on (a) ↑**n:o** don't touch it ((pulls her hand sharply away))

- 76 Bev: let me touch it
77 Sally: =n:o ((moves over to Jenny and Lee and shows them her hand))
78 Bev: i'm no:t yo:ur fri::end↓ (0.2) no more ((uses a baby voice. pretends to be
79 upset and cry. keeps her gaze fixed on Sally))
80 ((Sally moves back over to Bev, looks at her and shows her hand to her))
81 Sally: see it's ble:eding.

Sally turns away from Bev and overlaps Katie's utterance to verbally announce to Jenny that she has cut herself whilst physically extending her hand towards Jenny to show her. These actions work together to enable Sally to communicate her situation successfully to her chosen peer. Katie notices this interaction and orients to Sally's cut physically as she touches it. However, Sally shows that a physical response to her announcement is illegitimate as she breaks off from her repeat to tell Katie 'no don't touch it' (line 75) on pulls her hand away (figure 3.3). Katie has had no prior affiliation with Sally and so there is no bond of obligation between them. Therefore Sally's refusal to allow Katie permission for physical contact is accepted as legal as it is not touched off or questioned by any other members.



Figure 3.3

Sally's heavy emphasis on the word 'no' attracts the attention of Bev who is also still in the queue and is now standing behind Sally. Bev observes Sally rejecting Katie's physical attempt to touch her hand and subsequently uses a verbal request for permission to touch Sally's hand herself. However, Sally very quickly replies 'no' to Bev who reacts by announcing that she is no longer Sally's friend. As Bev and Sally have been affiliated through their interaction prior to this, they have an established bond of obligation to one another through their friendship. As Sally has reacted to Bev's request for physical contact in the same way that she reacted to Katie, she has ignored her obligation to allow Bev this special right as part of their affiliation. Bev acknowledges this illegal action and subsequently responds by disaffiliating herself from their friendship.

However, Bev's disaffiliation is spoken in a way which indicates that she is acting as she uses a false voice and pretends to cry. Bev's verbal utterance is further treated as a warning rather than an action as Bev keeps her gaze fixed on Sally which indicates her interest in interacting with Sally (Sacks, 1992a) rather than looking away as usually occurs when a person does not want to be in an interaction with another (Goodwin, 1981). Sally therefore hears this as a false disaffiliation which is a threat and shows this by moving back over to Bev to show her hand and announces 'see it's bleeding'. In doing this Sally demonstrates that her hand is hurt and that is the reason why she does not want *anyone* to touch it. This therefore provides an account for Sally disallowing both Bev and Katie the right to physical contact.

This observation demonstrates that physical touch is a mark of affiliation between children, as when it is denied between two friends their affiliation comes into question. Through one friend denying the other physical contact it represents a source of trouble and they can no longer be friends unless a legitimate reason for the action is presented.

Observation 5.5.4 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Tina, Katie and Mel' – see appendix #2)

Katie runs towards Mel in the playground and Tina follows. Mel shouts Katie's name and picks her up off the floor in an embrace.

- 15 Katie: Mel ((Katie starts running across the playground towards Mel. Tina
16 runs with her))
17 Mel: Katie.
18 ((Katie and Mel hug each-other. Mel lifts Katie slightly off the
19 floor and then puts her down. Tina moves close to Mel, puts her
20 hand on Mel's shoulder, leans in and speaks to her))
21 Tina: ()
22 Katie: no. ((lets go of Mel and turns to speak to Tina))
23 Tina: °↓mmhm↑° ((lifts her hand off Mel and lifts her heels off the floor and
24 back down as she backs away from Mel))

Tina remains in the same location of the playground with Katie and Mel.

- 30 Katie: ↑don't ↓pla:y with us ((creaky voice))
31 Tina: °↓why↓°
32 Katie: ↑co::↓z i=said so ((creaky voice)) ((holds Mel's hand and runs, pulling
33 her across the playground))
34 Mel: a:r:g:h
35 ((Tina grabs on to the sleeve of Mel's jumper and runs along with
36 them, smiling. Katie looks at Tina, stops running and lets go of
37 Mel's hand. Mel and Tina stop running))
38 Katie: i don't wa:nt tina to pl:a::y. ((walks between Mel and Tina, grabs Mel's
39 hand and pulls her away from Tina))

Katie and Mel have been observed playing as an exclusive dyad in other playtimes prior to this observation. When Katie notices Mel she shouts to her and runs towards her. Mel responds to Katie by shouting her name in reply. Katie and Mel display their affiliation as they hug each-other and Mel briefly lifts Katie off the ground (figure 3.4).



Figure 3.4

When Katie and Mel let go of each-other, Tina steps in closely towards Mel and places her hand on Mel's shoulder, displaying her own physical affiliation with Mel. Although this gesture is not as intense as Katie and Mel's embrace, it is interpreted and acted on as an illegal action by Katie. Katie becomes aware that the exclusivity of her relationship with Mel is threatened here by Tina's physical affiliation and so rejects Tina's approach to Mel by saying 'no' with heavy emphasis. Tina hears this as an exclusion from Katie and Mel's exclusive dyad and shows that she understands that she has been excluded as she physically withdraws and removes her hand from touching Mel. Tina also makes a quiet utterance 'mmhm' which communicates her understanding that Katie has the floor in Tina's 'passive reciprocity' (Jefferson, 1984; p4).

Tina has been excluded by Katie and shows this understanding by not attempting any sequential interaction with Katie. This is further displayed in Tina's next action as she interacts with Mel as she has made no exclusion towards Tina. When Katie notices Mel and Tina interacting she intervenes with a clear exclusion as she tells Tina 'don't play with us'. In doing this Katie uses the collective pro-term 'us' to place herself and Mel in the same category set of which Tina is not a member. When Tina asks Katie for an account of why she is not allowed to play with them, Katie answers 'coz I said so'. Katie

then supports her verbal exclusion of Tina with a physical exclusion as she holds Mel's hand and pulls her into the playground (figure 3.5). Katie demonstrates her exclusive rights over friendship with Mel as she displays sequential preference to playing exclusively with Mel without Tina. This is emphasized through the gesture of exclusive physical contact initiated by Katie when she pulls Mel across the playground away from Tina.



Figure 3.5

Through these physical actions Tina appears to be experiencing antisocial behaviour instigated by Katie. However, Tina shows that Katie's answer is not legitimate in her next action as she holds onto Mel's sleeve and runs with them into the playground. Tina also shows that she is legitimately allowed to be affiliated to Mel as she physically attaches herself to Mel's sleeve as they run around the playground led by Katie. When Katie realizes that Tina has affiliated herself to them Katie stops running and holding on to Mel. In this action Katie shows that she is not willing to share her exclusive affiliation to Mel with Tina. Katie drops Mel's hand when she becomes aware that Mel is also holding Tina's hand, indicating that Mel is not allowed to show physical affiliation with Katie and Tina at the same time. Katie reaffirms her position as Mel's exclusive dyadic partner by verbally announcing that she does not want Tina to play and supports this physically by pulling Mel away from contact with Tina. This is heard by Tina as exclusion and a closing of further interaction in that particular sequence as Tina remains on her own as the other girls run off together.

Throughout this observation Tina has shown her affiliation with Mel and demonstrated that they are in an exclusive dyad which Tina is excluded from. This is displayed by Katie who uses verbal and physical alignment in support of one another to deliver a comprehensive understanding between all parties. However, although Tina shows her awareness of being excluded by Katie, she remains with the dyad as she has not yet been excluded by Mel.

Observation 5.5.5 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Tina, Jon and Lee' – see appendix #2)

Tina has been standing alone in the playground observing her peers for three minutes. The bell rings and Tina runs to the increasing queue of children who are beginning to line up to go back into school. Rather than joining the back of the queue, Tina joins on the side and stands in front of Jon, facing him. Jon looks at Tina and tells her that he does not like her and pushes her backwards.

- 12 Jon: I don't li↑ke you. *((pushes Tina backwards))*
13 Tina: sto:p it *((walks forwards towards Jon))*
14 Jon: pushes Tina backwards again
15 Tina: anyway
16 *((Lee is standing behind Jon in the queue. Lee pushes Jon and then Jon pushes Tina))*
17
18 Tina: i got a lady's fing. *((walks forwards towards Jon and reaches inside jumper where the microphone is located))*
19
20 *((Jon pushes Tina. Lee pushes Jon. Jon turns around and smiles at Lee then turns to face Tina. Lee pushes Jon. Jon walks towards Tina and pushes her very hard resulting in her falling backwards onto her back))*
21
22
23 Tina: stopit *((Tina speaks whilst on the floor then gets up and approaches Lee))*
24
25 *((Lee and Jon look at each-other and smile))*

- 26 Tina: ↓hate you↓ ((*Tina looks at Lee*))
27 Lee: ((*pushes Tina backwards*))
28 Tina: °↓stop it↓°
29 ((*Tina walks over to a group of girls at the front of the queue. Jon*
30 *turns to face Lee and pushes him. Lee chases Jon around the queue,*
31 *both boys are smiling*))

Throughout this interaction Jon's physical actions towards Tina could be defined as antisocial as he repeatedly pushes her. However, applying a blanket term does not assist in developing further insight into the sequences which are employed to produce such an interaction. In order to understand the interaction from the members' perspective in context, the following analysis is presented.

Tina begins this interaction by approaching Jon as he lines up in the queue to return to school after morning play. Tina and Jon directly face each-other whilst Lee is standing closely behind Jon, also looking at Tina. Jon makes a verbal announcement 'I don't like you' to Tina and supports this with a physical gesture as he pushes Tina away. These verbal and physical actions exclude Tina from affiliation with Jon. However, Tina replies to Jon's actions by returning to him and instructing him to stop. This time Jon does not use any verbal interaction and pushes Tina away again in a physical action. This series of actions construct the process of exclusion between Tina and Jon. Tina returns to Jon again and attempts to disaffiliate herself from this interaction as she uses the word 'anyway' (line 15) in an assessment of the sequence which is used in this context for, 'withdrawing from this state of heightened mutual involvement' (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992; p 182).

However, Lee, who is still standing behind Jon and facing Tina, becomes involved in this sequence of exclusion as he initiates the next turn as he pushes Jon. This action is touched off by Jon who treats it as a chain in a new sequence as he subsequently pushes Tina again in his next turn. As Jon and Lee stand closely together facing Tina, they act as a single unit through their category bound activity (CBA) where they are both involved in

the process of excluding Tina through their combined turn by turn pushing force (figure 3.6). Jon and Lee's physical position and their shared CBA present them as an exclusive dyad, and as such, the joint activity of pushing Tina affiliates them.



Figure 3.6

Tina notices Lee and Jon's affiliation and her exclusion through her next action where she attempts to disaffiliate herself a second time as she orients to her affiliation with another person who is not in the current situation by explaining that she is wearing the 'ladies' fing' (the MP3 player). This verbal affiliation to an external member is also supported by Tina reaching in her jumper to physically show the item to which she has referred.

However, this does not legitimately stop the sequence of pushing as Jon pushes Tina and Lee pushes Jon again in the next actions. This time as Lee pushes Jon, Jon shows that the action is interpreted positively as he smiles at Lee. Although the physical action of pushing is being experienced by both Jon (by Lee) and Tina (by Jon), the action is interpreted differently by the recipients. Tina interprets being pushed negatively which is shown by her verbal protests as she tells Jon to stop, whereas Jon displays his orientation to the action as a fun interaction as he smiles at Lee. The sequences involved in each

interaction work in the processes of affiliation and exclusion through the interpretation of the receiver of the physical action of pushing.

Lee pushes Jon again and this time the action provokes Jon to approach Tina and push her very hard so that she falls to the floor (figure 3.7). Tina uses the utterance 'stop it' before she gets up and approaches Lee. The boys look at each-other and smile again, indicating their intersubjectivity that the sequences of interactions are a fun game to them. Tina directs a further utterance 'hate you' to Lee once she is standing up. This demonstrates Tina's acknowledgment that Lee is responsible for initiating the pushes and exclusion which she has received from Jon.



Figure 3.7

This sequence indicates that Lee and Jon are affiliated through the physical CBA of pushing, whilst Tina has become excluded. Lee and Jon use action as their conversational turn whereas Tina uses her language. Tina's understanding of Lee and Jon having equal responsibility for her exclusion is shown through her actions as she orients her 'hate' to Lee, even though Jon has been responsible for pushing her throughout the observation. Lee shows his affiliation with Jon through physical CBA in his sequential action as he pushes Tina this time rather than Jon pushing her again.

Tina chooses to end this interaction through a physical action by disaffiliating herself from the boys as she walks away from them and joins a group of girls. Lee and Jon continue their affiliation through their exclusive dyad as they chase each-other in their subsequent action. As there are the correct number of members in Lee and Jon's exclusive dyad, Tina is excluded from joining in when she approaches Jon (Sacks, 1992b). Tina is also excluded throughout consecutive interactions where she is used to further secure Jon and Lee's affiliation with each-other through their united CBA.

The structure of this interaction, when viewing it in its entirety, represents a sequence of actions which are interpreted by some people as an aggressive incident which also provides a display of the orderliness of aggressive interactions. It is observable here that although Tina begins the interaction by approaching Lee, he verbally maps the consecutive alignment through his initial announcement to Tina that he doesn't like her. This is then immediately followed by a physical representation of this exclusion as he pushes Tina backwards. Throughout the subsequent interactions a sequence is demonstrated whereby Tina uses verbal actions to attempt to stop the sequence in her turns whereas Lee uses physical actions to demonstrate his position in his turns.

Observation 5.5.6 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Ricky' – see appendix #2)

Ricky and Scot are standing still, watching children play. Tina looks at Ricky and Scot and approaches Scot; Scot places his hand on Tina's arm while they talk. Ricky steps backwards away from them and tells Scot to run away from Tina twice.

25 Ricky: ↑run away from her.

26 Ricky: ↑run away.

27 Scott: ((looks at Ricky and starts walking towards him, away from Tina))

28 Tina: **no** ((turns to Ricky. Scott looks back at Tina but continues to walk away
29 with Ricky))

30 Scot: yes

31 Scot: run away ((Scott and Ricky start running away from Tina into the
32 playground))
33 ((Tina chases both boys around the playground. Tina runs
34 in-between Scott and Ricky and continues to run after
35 Scott. Ricky continues to run behind Scot and Tina, but quickly
36 runs in-between them as they pass him. Tina runs past Ricky and
37 touches his arm as she passes him and then continues to run
38 after Scott. Tina catches up with Scott and grabs the sleeve of his
39 jumper. Ricky runs up to them))
40 Ricky: get **off** ((looks cross and pulls Scot and Tina's hands apart))

Tina attempts affiliation with Scot by initiating an interaction with him but this is noticed as an illegal action by Ricky who subsequently instructs Scot to run away from Tina. This physical alignment marks Ricky and Scot's disaffiliation with Tina. Tina shows her acknowledgment that Ricky is responsible for their disaffiliation as she looks at him as she shouts 'no' as Scot starts walking away. However, Scot maintains his eye contact with Tina as he walks away with Ricky. Tina interprets this mutual gaze as a sign that Scot is still interested in an interaction with her which is shown through her subsequent interaction as she continues interacting with the boys through a game of chase. Although an exclusive verbal interaction with Scot is deemed as illegal, this affiliation with both Scot and Ricky through physical interaction is accepted as the three children run around the playground together.

Tina's interaction with Scot resulted in her being excluded and could have been observed as an antisocial interaction which Tina was on the receiving end of as the boys ran away from her. However, through analyzing the sequence of events, Scot's existing interaction with Ricky was threatened when Tina initiated a perceived prosocial interaction with Scot. This indicates that although Tina's interaction could be observed by an outsider as prosocial, it was not interpreted as such by the members involved.

Following her verbal orientation to establishing affiliation with Scott, Tina continues to orient her attention to Scot as she shows preference for following him in the game of chase. This is further observed when Tina briefly touches Ricky's arm when she catches up with him and then continues to follow Scott. When Tina does catch Scott she stops running but continues to hold onto his sleeve therefore producing an extended physical interaction with Scot in comparison with Ricky. Ricky displays his disapproval of this physical representation of affiliation between Scot and Tina for the second time in the observation. This is demonstrated as Ricky looks angry as he approaches Scot and Tina and verbally tells Tina to 'get off' with emphasis on the word 'off'. Ricky separates them in a physical confirmation of his verbal action (figure 3.8).



Figure 3.8

In this observation Ricky and Scot were initially affiliated, but this was challenged by Tina when she approached Scott and began an exclusive verbal interaction with him, excluding Ricky. This was then further supported by Tina as she physically oriented to chasing Scott in preference to Ricky and physically holding on to him in a gesture of affiliation when she caught him. Ricky displays his disapproval of this affiliation on the two occasions where physical affiliation was displayed between Scot and Tina.

Observation 5.5.7 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Lee' – see appendix #2)

Chris, Mark, Lee and Jon are standing in the playground together. Chris makes an announcement regarding his age and Mark announces that he is a bigger four years old.

- 17 Chris: =i'm four ↓().
- 18 Mark: i'm even bigger ↑i'm a ↑big↑ger four years old. (*approaches Jon and*
19 *puts his face next to Jon's face. Mark takes small steps towards Jon as*
20 *Jon steps backwards*)
- 21 (1.8)
- 22 Jon: (*takes a larger step back so that he is side on to Mark and wipes his*
23 *face with a big sweeping motion*)
- 24 Mark: (*steps away from Jon*)
- 25 (*Harry approaches the group but stands on the periphery. Mark and*
26 *Chris watch Lee and Jon.*)
- 27 Lee: (*crouches down*) i'm bigger an you mark? (*jumps up*)
- 28 Jon: (*looks at Lee jumping up, smiles and jumps twice*)

Chris makes reference to the MCD age when he announces that he is four years old. Mark touches off Chris' reference to the MCD 'age' and declares that he is an even bigger four years old than Jon. Mark supports his verbal statement by physically aligning himself to be directly in front of Jon to emphasize his point. Through this physical action Mark actively evolves the MCD to change from age to size as he demonstrates that he is bigger than Jon (figure 3.9). Jon reacts to this by also using a physical gesture as he aligns himself so that he is sideways on to Mark and wipes his face with his arm, displaying his disaffiliation from Mark (figure 3.10). This disaffiliation is noticed by Mark who takes a step away from Jon and makes no further attempt to interact with Jon in a next turn.



Figure 3.9



Figure 3.10

Lee observes Jon's disaffiliation from Mark and affiliates himself with Jon in his next turn by also making a verbal disaffiliation with Mark. Jon demonstrates his disaffiliation by announcing to Mark that he is bigger than him. This verbal announcement is supported by a physical action as Lee crouches down and jumps up so that he is literally taller than Mark. Through this verbal and physical expression Lee aligns himself as being in a more advanced stage of the category 'size' than Mark is, indicating that they are not equal. Jon notices this, smiles and shows his affiliation with Lee as he joins in the action

of jumping to be bigger than Mark. These physical actions work to enforce both alleged antisocial behaviour as Lee asserts that he is more powerful than Mark, while simultaneously demonstrating prosocial behaviour as Lee reaffirms his alliance with Jon.

Observation 5.5.8 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Zac and Ricky' – see appendix #2)

Zac and Jon are standing inside a hut in the playground. Ricky approaches on the outside and looks through the window towards Zac. Zac notices Ricky outside of the hut window and lifts his umbrella up whilst maintaining eye contact with him.

71 *((Zac walks into the hut and stands next to the window where Jon*
72 *is and holds his umbrella up. Ricky quickly moves back away from*
73 *the window. Zac points the end of the umbrella at Ricky and*
74 *pushes it sharply forward. When Zac puts the umbrella down Ricky*
75 *moves back to the window, putting his hand on the ledge.*

Ricky makes loud noises through the window of the hut.

83 Zac: *((hits Ricky's hand with the umbrella three times))*
84 Ricky: *ow that hurts ((does not move his hand))*
85 Zac: *((hits Ricky's hand with the umbrella once more))*
86 Ricky: *ow ((moves his hand and points at Zac whilst maintaining eye contact*
87 *with him))*
88 *((Sue talks to Jon whilst Zac and Ricky interact))*
89 Sue: ()
90 Ricky: () *((steps back away from the hut and talks to a boy))*

The initial interaction between Zac and Ricky (lines 71 – 75) shows Ricky moving quickly away from the window where he is standing as Zac holds the umbrella up and jabs it sharply in the direction of Ricky (figure 3.11). Ricky's action of moving away

indicates that Zac's use of the umbrella is threatening. This is further supported in Ricky's next action as he moves back towards the window once Zac has put the umbrella down. This contact between Zac and Ricky is observable as a dyadic interaction and has been accomplished through the use of physical gesture.



Figure 3.11

Ricky remains standing next to the hut window with his hand on the window ledge and makes loud noises through the hut window. Ricky has not stayed away from the hut and has drawn attention to this fact by shouting loudly and so Zac takes his physical threat a level higher to a physical action. Zac reacts to Ricky's verbal utterances with a physical action as he hits Ricky's hand with the umbrella three times (figure 3.12). This physical action is a subsequent escalation to Zac's initial interaction with Ricky where Zac holds up the umbrella and points it toward Ricky in an attempt to exclude him from the hut by warning him away.



Figure 3.12

In reaction, Ricky chooses to make a verbal protest by telling Zac that it hurts (line 84) and also reacting physically by leaving his hand where it is positioned. Zac remains where he is. Ricky's refusal to change his stance and move his hand communicates to Zac that he is not responding to Zac's exclusion of him. This is responded to by Zac in his next turn as he reiterates his exclusion of Ricky through a further physical action as he hits Ricky's hand with the umbrella one more time. This time Ricky reacts verbally by saying 'ow' (line 86) as he accompanies this verbal communication with a physical action by moving away from the hut.

Through a series of sequential physical actions Zac communicates his exclusion of Ricky from the hut. Ricky finally shows that he interprets Zac's actions as excluding him as he backs away from the hut at the end of the excerpt. This interaction shows Zac's successful use of physical actions to interact with Ricky and demonstrate that he is being excluded without the use of verbal communication. Zac effectively substitutes verbal utterance for physical action in his role in the co-construction of context.

5.5.9 Conclusion and discussion

It is demonstrated in these observations that verbal actions are supported, emphasized and substituted with the use of physical gestures. This is observed in the process of securing

and displaying affiliation as the children embrace one another, put an arm around each others shoulders, hold hands and sustain mutual gaze. Affiliation through touch is further evident when a friend is not allowed to touch her friends hurt hand in observation 5.3. Further displays of affiliation are shown through direct physical contact and were demonstrated through touching an item. Instances of affiliative gestures were used by the children to emphasize their verbal alignment to another member of the playground and their willingness to be affiliated with them (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992). This was particularly effective for maintaining affiliation between an exclusive dyad when the exclusivity of the friendship was threatened by an approaching member. The children's physical demonstrations of affiliation were observable by all members of the playground and worked in establishing the participating children as visibly affiliated.

Physical support of verbal disaffiliation was observed in other areas. This was demonstrated by the children as they refrained from eye contact and rearranged their bodies to block interactions. Disaffiliation was also observed in the children's use of huts where a child ignored a request from her peer to look after the hut in her absence. Through refusing to become a member of the hut, the child disaffiliated herself from becoming affiliated with the group of children who were hut members. Physical disaffiliations were also present in observation 5.5.6 where Ricky runs away from Tina and in observation 5.5.4 where Katie pulls Mel away from Tina in the playground. These actions work to remove the members from any further interactions with the peer they are detaching themselves from.

Physical exclusions are unlike disaffiliations as they involve several turns between two or more members whereas a disaffiliation has very limited number of turns. With regard to exclusion, an exclusion from a group or dyad is initiated when the legal number of players in a game is sufficient (Sacks, 1992b) and this is shown through the exclusion of members who approach an exclusive dyad which has a limited number of two members. It is therefore shown as a legal action to verbally exclude unwanted members and when this does not work, physical gestures are used to emphasize or substitute verbal utterances to convey the intentions of the members. Exclusions are supported by physical gestures in

observation 5.5.5 where Jon initially states that he doesn't like Tina and subsequently begins to push her away in a number of consecutive turns. Observation 5.5.8 also demonstrates the series of actions evident in an exclusion as Zac excludes Ricky from becoming a member of his group through several turns between both children.

With regard to issues of power inequality, the use of physical gestures was understood here as sequential as the participating children were observed using physical gestures to support their verbal actions. This was observed as the children initially engaged in verbally demonstrating their power when excluding a peer but when this was unsuccessful physical actions were used to support and emphasize communication. These physical exclusions were also found to be progressive in some instances as they begin with a gentle action and escalated to a more severe act through the turn-by-turn interactions of each participating member. This suggests that when power was asserted verbally, but not acknowledged by a recipient peer, the assertion of power was demonstrated through physical representation in order to achieve intersubjectivity of the situation between all involved.

The use of physical gestures are interpreted differently by different members and are also touched off as legal or illegal in subsequent actions. Where an illegal action is presented with regard to the bond of obligation between an affiliated dyad, disaffiliation is used as a threat in the social construction of the context. Through applying microanalysis to the series of events which are involved in the physical interactions of children further insight into the co-construction of these phenomena is achieved.

5.6 The children's use of huts

Much of the literature regarding children's use of the school playground has involved investigations from the researcher's perspective which analyze how the playground environment influences the types of behaviour displayed by the children (eg Eisenbraun, 2007; Hart and Sheehan, 1986). However, more recent research has investigated how children utilize the playground through their interpretation of the structures and people in it (Butler, 2008; Butler and Weatherall, 2006; Goodwin, 2006). This is achieved through observing how the children talk their environment into being through making reference to aspects of the environment which are important to them (Seedhouse, 2005b) and observing which aspects of the primary school environment are of 'demonstrable relevance to the participants' (Schegloff, 1992b; p 215). This, the emic perspective, informs of how children use specific areas and features of their playground during the social organisation process.

Observing the children in their recreational area also makes apparent the way in which the children perceive the actions of their peers to be legal or illegal when using the playground facilities. Whether a peers' behaviour is deemed to be acceptable or not by the participating members is associated with the specific activities which are category bound to different cultural groups (Sacks, 1992a; 1992b). As the primary school

- 17 Emma: you're not allowed in to play ((*looks directly at Jess and Tina*))
18 Kim: who
19 Emma: them ((*points at Tina and Jess*))
20 Emma: get out
21 Emma: =you're supposed to ask one of these () before
22 you come in ↑aren't you.
23 Tina: what?
24 Emma: you're supposed to say the magic word (0.2) ple::ase (0.2) when
25 you come in this hut
26 Jess: °let's go in another part.° ((*Jess and Tina run to another hut*))

The first person to speak in this interaction is Emma who orients to the illegal entry of Tina and Jess as they walk into the hut without asking permission from the already established members of the group. Emma's use of the word 'those' in her utterance (line 15) excludes Tina and Jess from the already established members of the group who are allowed to use the hut. Emma also draws attention to the word 'asking' through placing emphasis on the word by increasing her volume and placing stress on the first syllable. This utterance draws attention to the rule of entry which was broken; in order for Jess and Tina to gain access to the group they must first ask permission from a group member. As no members of the hut orient to Tina and Jess's illegal entry Emma makes this verbal announcement to draw attention to the violation.

Emma's announcement is not responded to by any of the hut members and so Emma maps herself as group leader and rule enforcer (Butler and Weatherall, 2006). This is displayed in Emma's next utterance where she takes the responsibility to exclude Tina and Jess. Emma's role is not contested by the other members of the hut or by Jess and Tina and so it continues throughout the observation. Emma demonstrates her understanding that Tina and Jess do not display the correct CBA which accommodates the rules required for access to her group (Schegloff, 2007a).

Jess and Tina had not asked to be allowed into the group and so consequently there had been no sequential opportunity for the members to give their permission for access. Tina and Jess did not comply with the rules which were to be used when gaining access to becoming legitimate members of this specific group. However, Tina and Jess do not hear this remark from Emma as access denial as they remain in the hut. This results in Emma making the exclusion clear to them by telling them both to 'get out' (line 20). Tina and Jess do not react to this comment and remain in the hut, indicating to Emma that they do not understand that they are being excluded by the group leader as they do not display any verbal or non-verbal reaction to this comment. Emma goes on to further support her instructions with an extension on an explanation of the rules for entrance to justify her exclusion of them (line 21). Emma refers to this rule to enforce the concept that non-members are obliged to ask permission from one of the existing members before they are accepted or declined entrance to the hut. The initiation of this interaction could be categorized as Emma using verbal aggression as she begins with excluding Tina and Jess, and subsequently tells them to 'get out'. This would consequently provoke negative stigma about Emma and possibly label her as a bully. A closer investigation reveals that, in the context of the playground, it is Tina and Jess who are the perpetrators of the illegal action as they have violated a playground rule.

Tina initiates the sequence of conversational repair here by saying, 'What?' This utterance indicates that there is a break down of intersubjectivity between Tina and Emma which needs to be repaired in order for a mutual understanding of the situation to be shared and communication to be successful (Schegloff, 1992a). This need for repair is heard by Emma who explains that Tina and Jess are 'supposed to say the magic word, *please*, when you come into this hut' (line 24). This is observed through the outcome of the next turn where Jess and Tina hear this as an indication that the rule which would have allowed them access had been broken and therefore permission to join in the hut could no longer be achieved. Jess' understands that herself and Tina are being rejected from group membership is demonstrated through her next action as Jess says to Tina, 'let's go in another part', and they subsequently leaving the hut. The hut has been used

here as an establishment which has rules tied to its membership and is subsequently used to exclude members who do not abide by these rules.

Throughout this interaction Emma has been recognized as the leader of the hut which in turn delegates the other members of the group to use the category bound activity of followers. Both of the categories 'leader' and 'followers' create a standardized relational pair whom belong to the same group and have obligations to one another (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006). As leader, Emma's decision to exclude Tina and Jess from being members is not contested by the other members who notably do not speak in this observation. The silent members in the standardised relational pair support the negative behaviour enforced by the mapped leader as they do nothing to actively defuse the situation (Andreou and Metallidou, 2004). Further analysis through MCA indicates that this is due to the internal system of control whereby the existing members enforce the rules of category bound activities which are acceptable for membership in their own group (Sacks, 1992a; 1992b). As Tina and Jess did not follow these rules they were excluded and so they move on.

Observation 5.6.2 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Tina and Jess' – see appendix #2)

Tina and Jess approach a hut which is occupied by Sally and Ian. Sally moves to sit opposite Ian and puts her leg across the doorway, physically cutting off access in or out of the hut.

- 60 *((Sally moves within the hut to sit next to the entrance*
59 *opposite Ian and puts her leg across the entrance. Tina and Jess*
60 *stand outside the hut looking around the playground for twelve*
61 *seconds))*
62 Jess: *((moves over to entrance, looks at Sally's leg and steps over it into*
63 *the hut))*
64 Sally: *((puts her leg down to let Jess inside the hut and then raises it to*

65 *block the entrance again))*
66 *((Tina looks over to the hut and looks at Sally's leg which is blocking*
67 *the entrance. Tina moves towards the entrance to the hut. Sally*
68 *doesn't move her leg. Tina moves around to the side of the hut and*
69 *then moves to the front of the hut and pushes Sally's leg out of the*
70 *way by walking in))*
71 Sally: *don't come in ((grabs the back of Tina's coat as Tina makes her way to*
72 *sit next to Jess. Sally then lets go))*
73 Sally: *don't come in:: ((looks at Tina))*
74 Sally: *you need to ring the bell on here ((puts her leg back across the entrance*
75 *and points to her toe))*
76 *((Ian puts his leg up underneath Sally's. Jess stands up and moves*
77 *towards the entrance looking at Sally's leg and smiling))*
78 Sally: *↑ ring the bell that's on by there. ((Sally points to the toe of her shoe. Jess*
79 *presses the toe of Sally's shoe. Sally and Ian both drop their legs and*
80 *Jess walks out. Sally and Ian put their legs back up once Jess is out))*
81 Sally: *hhh.*
82 Tina: *((stands up, moves towards the entrance and pushes her way through the*
83 *legs))*
84 Sally: *() ((grabs Tina's coat as she pushes through and looks very angry))*
85 *((Jess and Tina run off into the playground))*

Sally positions herself so that she is sitting next to the entrance of the hut and raises her leg across as a barrier whilst Tina and Jess stand outside (figure 4.1). Sally's action of placing a barrier across the hut entrance demonstrates that Sally has mapped herself as the group leader as she controls who is granted access to membership of this specific group (Butler and Weatherall, 2006). This physical action employs the hut to order the group dynamics as Sally and Ian are the exclusive members of the hut whilst Tina and Jess are excluded.



Figure 4.1

Sally's barrier is initially noticed by Jess who moves towards the entrance of the hut and attempts to step over Sally's leg. Jess carefully lifts her leg over the top of Sally and Ian's legs resulting in a reciprocal cooperative gesture led by Sally who drops her leg in order for Jess to access easily (lines 62 – 65). Jess' attempted access to the hut is undisruptive and this legitimizes her affiliation with members inside the hut. This is displayed in Sally's next action as she lowers her leg, thus enabling Jess to enter successfully. Sally allows Jess access to the hut and in doing so Jess becomes affiliated with Sally and Ian.

Sally moves her leg back across the doorway as soon as Jess has entered. Tina approaches the entrance and pushes onto Sally and Ian's legs in order to gain access to the hut. This results in a reciprocal aggressive response by Sally who shouts 'don't come in' (line 71) at Tina and physically pulls her coat. The words used by Sally indicate that Tina is being excluded from becoming affiliated with the other hut members. Sally repeats this phrase again (line 73) to reaffirm Tina's exclusion. This time Sally places emphasis on her last word 'in' to express to Tina that she must stay outside of the hut as she has not been granted access by the leader. Even though Tina and Jess both attempt to access the hut they are reacted to differently.

Sally makes an account for Tina's exclusion in her next turn by instructing Tina that there are rules of CBA which must be used in order to gain successful entrance and affiliation to Sally's hut. In this social context Sally maps the CBA rules as having to press a pretend bell on the toe of Sally's shoe prior to entrance (line 74). Although this is a new rule which Sally has just created, none of the children orient to this as illegal. Instead, when Sally places her leg back across the entrance, Ian supports the group leader's rules through a physical gesture of affiliation to her as he places his leg underneath Sally's. Jess shows her support of the new rule created by the leader in her next action as she stands up inside the hut and approaches the entrance whilst smiling at Sally. Sally reaffirms the appropriate CBA which must be displayed in order for the entrance to be accessible in her utterance, 'ring the bell that's on by there' and physically pointing to the toe of her shoe (lines 78). Jess complies with this CBA (figure 4.2) resulting in a sequential action from Sally and Ian who drop their legs; Sally shows further approval to Jess by laughing. Through following the group leader's rules and using the instructed behaviour concerning entering and exiting the hut the members of Sally's group remain affiliated to her.



Figure 4.2

Once Jess has left the hut Sally and Ian spring their legs back into the original barrier position. Tina moves towards the doorway of the hut to follow Jess into the playground. However, Tina does not abide by the CBA set by Sally which requires her to ring the imaginary bell on Sally's shoe. Instead Tina pushes through the legs forcefully as she did before (lines 82 and 83). This subsequently results in Sally grabbing at her coat, giving an inaudible utterance and looking angrily at Tina.

Throughout this excerpt, Sally uses the hut to allow members to become affiliated through permitting access, or excluded through verbally telling them not to enter the hut and creating physical barriers. Exclusion is evident in Tina's attempt to gain membership where she is excluded verbally as she is told not to come in and physically through Sally and Ian's leg barriers. Whereas Jess abides by the correct CBA time set by the hut owner for that particular playtime, and subsequently gains affiliation. Although Tina attempts to follow Jess in and out of the hut she fails to use the context relevant CBA which is set by Sally and is therefore further excluded. In this context the hut is utilized to express the exclusivity of the members within and the importance of the correct CBA for each particular playtime is displayed and oriented to by the members. The members subsequently chose whether an approaching child was affiliated, excluded or disaffiliated from through using CBA as an account for their decision. Consequently, a child could use any behaviour when approaching a hut, but it was the affiliated hut members who decided if their behaviour was acceptable or not. In this observation CBA was applied for securing membership into the exclusive hut group and aggressive behaviour was displayed to Tina with the reason being that she did not comply with the rules which were in place at that time.

Observation 5.6.3 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Emma' – see appendix #2)

Emma has approached a hut occupied by Rowan and asks for permission to enter which Rowan grants her. Rowan asks Emma if she will look after the hut in her absence to which Emma agrees. Emma blocks the doorway to the hut by placing her leg across the entrance and remains as the only resident for thirty-one seconds until Rowan returns.

22 *((Emma sits at the entrance of the hut and lifts her leg up across*
23 *the entrance of the hut, blocking the way. Emma sits alone for*
24 *thirty-one seconds. Rowan returns. Emma and Rowan exchange eye*
25 *contact. Emma lowers her leg and Rowan walks into the hut and sits*
26 *down))*

27 Emma: will you sit by yer with your fing up while I go and get kerry?

28 Rowan: °yep° *((moves to the entrance where Emma was sitting and puts*
29 *her leg across the doorway))*

Rowan is in charge of the hut whilst Emma walks into the playground and approaches two girls asking them if they would like to play with her. They reject Emma's offer and so she walks back across the playground towards the hut.

36 *((Emma walks back to the hut which is now occupied by two boys as*
37 *well as Rowan))*

38 Emma: rowan don't let anyone **i:::n:**

39 Rowan: =I di:dn't they just pushed through:: *((meets Emma's gaze))*

40 Dave: I didn't I just (1.7) went around and (2.2) up through there *((points at the*
41 *window on the side of the hut))*

42 Rowan: that one pushed in *((points at one of the boys))*

43 Emma: right.

44 Emma: ↑can **I** sit there now Row.

45 *((Rowan moves across the bench and Emma sits next to the entrance))*

46 Dave: ()

47 *((Sue is standing outside the hut, looks at Emma, enters the hut and*
48 *sits opposite Emma. Emma looks at Rowan))*

49 Emma: only from our class is allowed (0.4) in isn't it

In the first excerpt on lines 27 – 29 a reciprocal turn taking is displayed where Rowan and Emma agree to take on the responsibility of looking after the hut individually whilst one of them is absent. Emma uses her leg as a barrier to protect the exclusivity of the hut and the members who are affiliated to it. In this context the affiliated members are Rowan and Emma and although only one at a time is present, each member has a bond of obligation to continue the huts exclusivity in the absence of the other member. This is demonstrated by Emma's instruction to place a physical barrier across the doorway (line 27); being in charge of the hut brings with it rules of CBA such as defending the exclusivity of membership. The members in the hut are consequently bound by their bond of obligation through their affiliation to one-another. This is shown through the use of their legs as barriers which are a physical representation of the exclusivity to other peers in the playground. Emma and Rowan actively use the hut in the protection of their affiliation and this is demonstrated as Emma lowers her leg to allow Rowan access on her return where no further access strategies are needed by Rowan to gain entry. In this instance, Emma has protected their affiliation and ownership of the hut whilst Rowan has been absent and now she requires Rowan to return the favor whilst she leaves temporarily. This act could be described as prosocial but actually involve characteristics of antisocial behaviour as peers are verbally rejected.

In the sequential excerpt on lines 36 – 49 there is a discrepancy initiated by Rowan's illegal entry of two boys in Emma's absence, therefore breaking the exclusivity of the hut. Directly after Emma has experienced rejection from Kerry and Kathy through their use of a forceful tone and abrupt response to her question, she returns to the hut and uses the same tone with Rowan, showing sequentially aggressive behavior. Emma initiates the interaction with Rowan by orienting to the illegal residence of the boys as she approaches the hut. Emma's disapproval is shown through her initial utterance as she looks at Rowan and calls her name to ensure her attention and follows this with, 'don't let anyone in' (line 38). Emma places emphasis and extends the words *don't* and *in* to further communicate to Rowan that she is not allowed to let anyone into their private space. This is touched off immediately by Rowan who latches onto the end of Emma's utterance to defend herself. Rowan does this through orienting to the illegal behaviour of the boys as

she informs Emma that they pushed through. Through her utterance Rowan indicates that she is not to blame for the boys entry to the hut as she did not break any bond of obligation to keep the hut exclusive; she did not give the boys permission to enter.

The topic of conversation remains centered on the boys' illegal access to Rowan and Emma's exclusive play space, the hut. Emma now attempts to move away from this issue in a sequence closing third (Schegloff, 2007a) as she uses the word 'right' in a downward intonation as a pre-closure to the topic (line 43) (ten Have, 2004). This is followed by Emma asking Rowan if she can sit at the entrance. Rowan does not verbally answer but agrees by complying non-verbally as she moves across the bench away from the entrance. Through initiating this action, the girls demonstrate a change in the role of leadership which is emphasized by their physical position in the hut. Rowan has not fulfilled her 'bond of obligation' (Sacks, 1992) to the position of owner of the hut as she did manage to keep the hut exclusive to herself and Emma. Rowan's category bound activity did not match the behavior associated to being the leader of this specific hut and for this position of responsibility. Emma has now reclaimed the position of leader of the hut and protector of the exclusive affiliation of the members within.

Following this, on line 47, one of the members of Emma and Rowan's class, Sue, stands outside of the hut and makes eye contact with Emma. Sue subsequently enters the hut without speaking. In allowing Sue access to the exclusive hut Emma has engaged in the same behaviour that she reprimanded Rowan over. Emma subsequently displays her awareness of this action as she looks at Rowan and defends herself (line 49) by making an account. This account for an action is produced by Rowan through orienting to the fact that Sue is a member of their class and so already has an existing affiliation with the members of the hut.

Throughout this observation the hut has been employed as a physical place for Rowan and Emma to have an exclusive affiliation while legitimately excluding other non-members. Emma and Rowan's use of the hut to protect their exclusive affiliation is demonstrated when there is an illegal access gained by other peers. The boys were

marked as committing illegal entrance to the hut as the hut owners made no reference to them having any prior or existing affiliation with them. Subsequently, Sue is allowed membership to the hut as she already shares membership to the same school class as Emma and Rowan. Sue is therefore permitted further affiliation through legal access to Emma and Rowan's exclusive play space. Access to the hut represents affiliation to Rowan and Emma's exclusive group.

Observation 5.6.4 (taken from the transcription entitled Harry – see appendix #2)

Harry and Dean enter the hut together. Dean exits the hut leaving Harry, Phil and Gareth as the sole occupants. Phil places his leg across the entrance to the hut as soon as Dean leaves. Harry approaches the entrance and announces that he can't get out. Phil does not lower his leg to let Harry out. Natasha, a girl from Harry's class, approaches and tells Phil to move his leg and physically supports this by moving Phil's leg from the entrance.

- 29 (*Natasha approaches the hut*)
- 30 Natasha: °() move your leg° (*lifts Phil's leg down so that the entrance*
- 31 *to the hut is open*)
- 32 Phil: (*looks at Natasha and lets her lower his leg*)
- 33 Natasha: Harry outside
- 34 (*Dean approaches the hut. Harry smiles when he sees Dean.*
- 35 *Dean puts his head through the entrance, looking at Harry*)
- 36 Dean: a::rgh (*smiles and walks into the hut towards Harry, reaches out and*
- 37 *holds Harry's hand*)
- 38 Dean: [°come on°]
- 39 Natasha: [Harry get out]
- 40 Gareth: no he can::**not** come out (*walks towards Natasha*)
- 41 (*Natasha puts one foot inside the hut and turns to look at Phil.*
- 42 *Harry and Dean stand together in the hut holding hands watching*
- 43 *Natasha's interaction*)
- 44 Natasha: () and put leg down. (*speaks in a slow rhythmic tone and*

45 *points her finger at Phil repeatedly then walks out of the hut))*
46 Dean: come on Harry (0.4) lets go now. *((speaks very quickly and follows*
47 *Natasha out of the hut and towards a teacher, still holding Harry's*
48 *hand))*
49 teacher: alright ↑Harry?
50 Harry: yeah
51 Dean: Harry (0.9) um her friend and ↑my friend.

The observation begins with an established social situation whereby Phil is restricting Harry's right to leave the hut. Phil does this by employing the hut as an apparatus in his social organisation process as he places his leg across the entrance to create a physical barrier to prevent people from either entering or exiting the hut. By observing Phil and Harry playing together the label 'prosocial friendship' could be applied. However, in this context Harry is attempting to leave Phil's hut and Phil is prohibiting him. Phil's decline of Harry leaving the hut could therefore be characteristic of antisocial behaviour where Phil uses his power to trap Harry. Natasha hears Phil's refusal to allow Harry to exit as illegitimate which can be seen as she approaches the hut, physically moves Phil's leg and calls Harry to come out. Phil accepts this order from Natasha as he keeps the hut doorway open with his leg lowered and does not attempt to place it back across the entrance.

Natasha subsequently instructs Harry to go 'outside' (line 33) which informs him that she has cleared the barrier to the doorway and that he is now free to exit the hut. However, Dean returns to the hut at this point and makes eye contact with Harry, who subsequently shows his pleasure at Dean's return by smiling and remaining in the hut. This action demonstrates that Harry is happy to be a member of the hut when his friend Dean is present. When Harry was without Dean he showed his unhappiness at being a member of the hut and wanted to disaffiliate himself by leaving, but on Dean's return Harry shows that he is happy by smiling at Dean (lines 34). Phil uses the hut to assert power over Harry as he holds him against his will to disaffiliate.

Once Dean is inside the hut he whispers 'come on' (line 38) to Harry as Natasha simultaneously orders Harry to get out (line 39). Through these similar commands Natasha and Dean show their intersubjectivity of the situation where they are both helping Harry to leave the hut. Through assisting Harry to leave the hut, Natasha and Dean align themselves as being affiliated with each-other. This demonstration of social alignment is subsequently touched off by Gareth who aligns himself as being in affiliation with Phil as he self-selects to speak to Natasha saying 'no he cannot come out' (line 40). Gareth places emphasis on the word *not* to communicate his understanding of the illegal action performed by Natasha and Dean by them enabling his exit. In this context the hut is employed as an aspect of the social order as Natasha and Dean are united in encouraging Harry to leave whilst Phil and Gareth are affiliated in preventing Harry from exiting.

Natasha disaffiliates herself from an interaction with Gareth by ignoring his utterance. However, Dean hears this as a possible threat as he remains where he is, holding hands with Harry. Natasha continues her interaction with Phil as she verbally orders Phil to put his leg down even though he has not replaced his leg as a barrier since Natasha moved it. This is therefore a warning to Phil to keep his leg down indefinitely. Natasha then exits the hut. Dean observes Natasha's physical disaffiliation from the hut and takes the opportunity for himself and Harry to leave also. Harry is aware of the affiliation between himself, Dean and Natasha which has been displayed in the present situation and continues this affiliation by leaving the hut with Natasha and Dean.

Through physically leaving the hut together, Dean, Harry and Natasha have physically displayed their affiliation to one another and have also shown their disaffiliation to being a member of Phil's hut group. The affiliation between the members is verbally announced by Dean to a teacher shortly after leaving the hut. In this observation the hut was instrumental in establishing divided affiliations between the members through their orientation to the legality of Harry being allowed to leave. This situation then progressed to the formation of two separate groups.

Observation 5.6.5 (taken from the transcription entitled 'Zac and Ricky' – see appendix #2)

Zac is inside one of the playground huts. Ricky pushes his hand through the hut window and touches Zac's back. Zac reacts to this by hitting Ricky in the eye.

- 126 *((Ricky reaches into the hut and puts his hand on*
127 *Zac's back. Zac reaches out of the hut and hits Ricky in the eye.*
128 *Ricky steps back, puts his hand up to his face and covers his eye.*
129 *Zac looks at Ricky for six seconds and then crouches down to speak*
130 *to him.))*
131 Zac: sorry↑ rick:.
132 Zac: do you want to come to my party.
133 Zac: you want to come to my party.
134 Ricky: *((continues to rub his eye))*
135 Zac: are you gonna play with me?

Zac continues to speak to Ricky.

- 144 (2.9)
145 Zac: do you wanna come in the ↑hut?
146 Ricky: *((nods his head))*
147 Zac: do you?
148 Zac: come come on come in the ↓hut
149 Ricky: *((moves from behind the hut to the entrance and steps inside*
150 *past Sue and Jon who are sitting either side of the entrance and*
151 *looking at Ricky))*
152 Zac: *((Zac smiles at Ricky as he enters))* see you happy now?
153 *((Ricky sits next to Jon but does not smile. the school bell rings*
154 *for end of morning play. the children exit the hut))*

At the beginning of this observation Zac and Ricky are separated by the hut as Zac is inside and Ricky is outside. Ricky reaches into Zac's space in the hut to touch him and Zac reacts by reaching out of the hut to hit Ricky in the eye. Once Zac has observed Ricky's reaction to being hit he realizes that he has committed an illegal act which he needs to rectify which is shown in his sequential actions. This observation demonstrates the ease in which a child can change from using perceived antisocial behaviour to perceived prosocial behaviour in the space of just a few seconds.

Zac's first attempt to amend the situation is to make a verbal gesture by apologizing to Ricky (line 131). Ricky does not reply and so Zac progresses to an offer of affiliation in the next two turns. Zac's initial offer of affiliation is to invite Ricky to his party but these offers do not provoke a reply from Ricky and so Zac makes another attempt by asking Ricky if he is going to play with him. Zac continues talking to Ricky in the next few turns.

In the next section (lines 144 – 154) Zac orients to the hut as a gesture of affiliation. Zac orients back to a conversational item which Ricky had oriented to in a prior utterance which involved reference to playing in the hut. Zac uses the hut as a tool for affiliation as he offers Ricky an invitation to enter (line 145). This works as Ricky replies to Zac's offer non-verbally by nodding his head. This positive reply to Zac's invitation is repeated in part with the utterance 'do you' (line 147) to reiterate this successful offer. Following this, Zac goes on to further orient to the hut as he tells Ricky to come in (line 148) which offers further support for Ricky's acceptance of affiliation.

Ricky enters the hut with Zac's permission as Zac smiles at him. On entry, Zac reminds Ricky that his affiliation with Zac's group has made him happy as he says 'see you happy now' (line 152). Zac is aware that his aggressive action had made Ricky unhappy and moves to rectify the situation which has been co-constructed by employing the hut as an affiliation gesture to make Ricky happy.

At the beginning of this observation Ricky initiates physical contact through reaching into the hut to touch Zac and Zac subsequently reaches out of the hut to hit Ricky. Zac demonstrates his awareness that his action could create consequences in his next actions as he offers Ricky affiliation through an invitation to his immediate social group in the hut. Zac's offers indicate that he was aware of Ricky's various attempts to gain affiliation and membership to the hut throughout his previous actions, but Zac chose to exclude him until Ricky's affiliation to the hut was also beneficial for Zac.

The hut is employed throughout these sequences as a physical representative of the exclusivity of the affiliated hut members Zac, John and Sue. Ricky is finally granted legal permission to enter and become an affiliated member of the hut at the end of the playtime just before the bell rings. Zac uses membership to the hut to provoke a collection 'R' relationship (Sacks, 1992a) which includes the provision of prosocial acts, such as making each-other happy, as a CBA. Although this means that Zac now has a bond of obligation to Ricky to make him happy, it also works in Zac's favor as Ricky is now a member of the hut he also has a bond of obligation to keep Zac happy by not getting him in to trouble by telling on him.

Although this interaction begins with Zac using behaviour which had the characteristics of antisocial behaviour as he hits Ricky, to an almost immediate action of remorse and perceived prosocial gestures of affiliation. This therefore supports the argument that children are competent in using a complex selection of actions in order to produce the desired context.

5.6.6 Conclusion and discussion

In this study it became evident that the children were utilizing the huts as a physical representation of their affiliation through the legal acceptance of specific children (Sacks, 1992a). The legal acceptance of members into a hut was initiated by the children who were in possession of the hut at that time. The children were only accepted into the group if they displayed the correct CBA to the existing members (Sacks, 1992a). The 'correct'

CBA was also dependant on what was deemed acceptable at that specific time with a specific collection of children. What was deemed acceptable behaviour in one context may be unacceptable to a different group of people in another context. Once the children secured entry to a hut they gained solidarity through their affiliation with peers and demonstrated their membership through category bound activities. This was particularly observable through the children's use of huts in the current research where they behaved in a certain way to gain affiliation with their desired group. The children's demonstrations of specific CBAs were displayed to one another in order for them to be accepted as a member to their desired group or dyad. Once affiliated, the children achieve solidarity and their collective CBA makes the group 'be seen' as a unified entity.

In these observations the huts are used by the children to exclude peers as well as establish affiliation. Rules are created and enforced by children to structure the social organisation of the playground (Cobb-Moore, Danby and Farrell, 2008). In the observations rules which were specific to the immediate members in each particular playtime and hut were applied to the accessing and exiting of huts. When a child's attempt to access a hut was oriented to as illegal behaviour for the immediate situation they were excluded by the members. Alternatively, when the children display legal access to the huts through demonstrating correct CBA for the context they were accepted by the members. The children were observed to use their legs to physically block off the entrance as 'owners' of each individual hut. CBA were tied to being a member of the hut and were also expected from the potential new members of the huts.

This was evident in observations showing the children using their environment to assert affiliation, exclusion and disaffiliation. In some observations the children moved to the entrance of the hut and lifted their leg across the doorway to create a barrier. This action made the hut exclusive to the members inside as blocking the entrance of the hut physically excluded any other members from admittance. The huts were utilized by the children to assert power and affirm exclusive membership. Disaffiliation was also demonstrated through the use of the environment. This was evident where children declined an offer of affiliation to the hut and its members and in doing so, disaffiliated

themselves from association with the children occupying the hut. Some children were observed to disaffiliate themselves from becoming members of the huts and their members by avoiding accessing the huts. This is related to prior research with regard to the children's use of space where it was established that people will often avoid interaction in public places through choosing to occupy the largest and most remote place available (Francis and Hester, 2004). These actions were understood as a deliberate use of the immediate environment to actively disaffiliate themselves

The huts which are situated in the school playground are utilized as a physical extension of the exclusive affiliation co-constructed by the children. The huts are talked into being by the members in their social organisation process where illegal and legal entry is established by the members to be of central importance. To be accepted into a hut by the owner is to become affiliated with the members within (as in observation 6.5) whereas to be rejected from a hut is to be excluded by the members (as in observation 6.1).

5.7 Chapter conclusion

In this chapter the transcriptions of the participating children have been analyzed in detail using CA and MCA. Through an initial investigation into the focal issue of children's antisocial and prosocial behaviour the findings present another focal issue, that of children's competence in the co-construction of social order. In the analysis of the data, six resources were found to be used in the co-construction of the context. The children were observed initiating an interaction by referring to an access tool and names were called as a way of securing the attention of a peer prior to a sequential interaction. Verbal actions were used to orient to gender segregation, possessive pronouns and collective proterms, and physical gestures were used to support and emphasize verbal actions. The huts in the playground were utilized as areas where CBA were tied to their exclusive membership.

These six resources were used by the participating children in the exclusion, affiliation and disaffiliation of their peers. Although children attempted affiliation through using an

access tool and name calling the response from the target child established whether affiliation was successful or whether exclusion or disaffiliation ensued. The context was co-constructed by the children as the sequential action of a peer demonstrated the level of willingness to be in an interaction with the initiator. Affiliation was also attempted through requesting membership to a hut, but if incorrect CBA were presented then the offender was excluded. Disaffiliation was also asserted through the hut resource as a child refused to become a member. Affiliation was displayed through physical contact where peers held hands and put arms around each-other but physical contact also marked exclusion as children pushed and hit peers. Disaffiliation was also shown physically as children ran away from peers and physically aligned themselves to be turned away with refusal to make eye contact or interact. Verbal reference to possessive pronouns and collective proterms were made for children to mark affiliation with other members but this consequently worked to disaffiliate the child from other peers and exclude members who were not referred to. Orientation to gender also worked to systematically organize members of the playground as reference was made to affiliation with specific gender categories and the exclusion and disaffiliation of the opposite gender.

It was evident in the observations that the children each played a part in the co-construction of context where the children used their actions as a reaction to a subsequent event. This systematic production of context was developed through each child's use of a collection of resources. Each child was observed to use a wide range of actions, often at the same time, in the co-production of social order. This finding indicates that each singular interaction between children consists of a complex and multifaceted range of behaviours.

This chapter has reported and discussed an in-depth investigation into the deliberate worlds of children's culture. It is argued that these findings are significant as they offer an important insight into why children become excluded from peer networks, refuse to interact with peers and also how affiliation to peers is successfully gained. It is evident through these findings that children use the same identified resources in context specific ways. The same resources are used by the participating children to co-construct social

order in a variety of contexts, indicating the context free nature of the identified resources. The observed contexts are also sensitive to the immediate social situations, giving them a context sensitive aspect. Through awareness of these resources an awareness of children's behaviour being both context free and context sensitive is asserted. This offers an alternative view of children's behaviour as being either consistently antisocial or prosocial children. In order to present a greater depth of understanding into these issues, a broader discussion is developed in the following chapter (chapter 6).

Chapter 6

Discussion

In society people observe children's social behaviour and categorize those children as behaving either prosocially or antisocially, presenting a limited dichotomy (Bateman and Church, 2008). However, in the observations analyzed in this study, the participating children were observed to display general social behavior in the co-construction of their daily lives. The actions which the children displayed were far more complex than the limited dichotomy of behaviours often presented in research and discussed in practice. This was demonstrated in chapter five where the children's use of six resources were identified through microanalysis.

This chapter aims to provide a broader discussion of the emerging themes which have been found to be evident in the six identified resources. Through extending the findings regarding how the children used the six resources to co-construct social order, a more detailed understanding of children's unique social worlds is presented.

In this chapter the findings concerning the children's six identified resources will be expanded to provide a more detailed discussion of the sequential order in children's interactions and their co-construction of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion. This is followed by a discussion of the context free and context sensitive nature of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion. The occurrences through the assertion of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion are then discussed and include: issues of power inequality; how verbal actions are supported by physical gestures; the children's use of their environment; exclusive dyads; and children's social competence. Finally, the findings of the study are brought together to acknowledge children's social competence in their organisation of social order.

6.1 The sequential order of children's interactions

In children's interactions in the school playground the sequential nature of the establishment of social order was observed. When a child initiated contact with a peer, the peer's reaction dictated whether affiliation was possible, or if they would disaffiliate from engaging with the initiating child or whether the child would be excluded. Affiliation was gained between children through each participant's demonstration of their willingness to engage with each-other through their successive interactional turns. The sequence of exclusion was often initiated when children were perceived as a threat to an established affiliation in a group or dyad. Disaffiliation was demonstrated by an approached child through their restricted engagement. It was also found that when children had established affiliation in prior interactions in and out of the school playground, affiliation was more likely to be achieved throughout subsequent encounters. This was evident through the children making their affiliation verbally demonstrable through use of their name and discussions involving known family members and friends who were not members of the school. When a child was previously excluded or

disaffiliated away from they were also referred to as unpopular and avoided or excluded in the future.

Earlier research found that children display acts of prosocial behaviour when they initiate an interaction with their peers in order to enable acceptance (e.g. Gruman et al., 2006). This study's findings regarding the *sequential* organisation of children's interactions indicated that if children display the CBA which was positively enforced by the target group they were more likely to be accepted. The importance of the use of 'correct' behaviour in children's social organisation was also found in prior research where children were expected to behave in a certain way when they were a part of a group (Gini, 2006; Warden et al, 2003) and were excluded from that group if they deviated from the governing rules (Christensen, 2004; Garandeanu and Cillesen, 2006). The socio-cultural context of children's are therefore evident as their actions are reacted to by the other members who share their immediate environment (Rogoff, 2003) and this sequence of events contributes to the co-construction of context.

The children's use of resources to affiliate, disaffiliate and exclude peers was observed to be sequential as a FPP action provoked a SPP action. Each utterance built upon a prior utterance resulting in the member's active co-construction of the context. This was initiated as the children made verbal reference to specific categories which they made demonstrably relevant in their immediate environment. The children then demonstrated their affiliation, disaffiliation or exclusion of their peers with reference to those specific categories. This social alignment which each child demonstrated in their everyday interactions worked in the organisation of social order. Social order was constructed through the children's categorization of their peers on the most obvious characteristic of their peers' personality (Owenby, 2005). The children oriented to categories which were then 'touched off' by other members who participated in the development of the social context by demonstrating their alignment with, or against peers. This sequence of actions worked to produce the use of further categories as the conversation incorporated their use in the sequence of alignment.

6.2 The children's use of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion

The findings in chapter five have shown that the children were using six identified resources to exclude, affiliate or disaffiliate themselves from peers. These actions were initiated through name calling and the children's orientation to access tools such as snacks or the MP3 player. Once an interaction was secured, the children made verbal orientation to associations with family members, peers and gender categories to affiliate, disaffiliate and exclude. Affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion were further achieved through the children's employment of the playground huts, and were made observable to all through physical contact.

Although it was very useful in the analysis to discuss each resource individually in order to provide a detailed account, it is important to emphasise here that the children drew on, and coordinated these multiple resources when engaging in a variety of interactions with each-other. This demonstrates the children's social competence in utilising a complex range of actions to successfully establish many varying social situations.

6.2.1 Affiliation

Throughout the study, the children were observed to be establishing and maintaining affiliation to achieve unique contexts of playground culture. Through acknowledging the sequence organisation in the children's affiliation this research identifies how it is achieved in everyday social situations. Children's actions provoke a subsequent action from their peers that demonstrates the hearer's orientation not only to the prior talk but also to the prior speaker (Maynard, 1985; Maynard and Zimmerman, 1984).

The sequential aspect of affiliation was observable in the participating children's initiation of an interaction as these were subsequently reacted to by the recipient who accepted the affiliation verbally and physically. This co-construction of affiliation between two members was evident in the observations where children initiated an interaction using the utterance 'hello' as this is the minimum requirement for establishing

an interaction (Sacks, 1992a). A sequence is established when the approached peer replies with a verbal gesture of 'hello' or through a physical gesture with a smile. This acceptance of affiliation was observable by other members of the playground and provided a basis for sequential affiliation to be established. Where the situation did not seem to progress, a repeat of the word 'hello' was observed to be used to continue the affiliation. This sequential initiation of an interaction was used until a subsequent response was gained in order to secure their affiliation. This repeat of the word 'hello' until a reciprocal 'hello' was exchanged was also recognized by Sacks (1992a) who made reference to the consecutive turn taking in children's interactions (Sacks, 1992a).

The sequential co-construction of affiliation was also observed in the data to be produced following a claim of leadership in a social group. In these situations the CBAs of the leader involved the issuing of rules, and therefore mapped the identities of other members who were affiliated to the group. Once a leader was acknowledged, the children who aspired to become members of the hut were obliged to display specific behaviour to the leader. This included asking permission to become an affiliated member. When the request was appropriately constructed in a direct appeal to join, the leader subsequently granted affiliation. These acts of affiliation were beneficial to the leader as they subscribed members who displayed the appropriate CBAs of the group and who would be of subsequent use in supporting the group in their consecutive actions. A child's affiliation to a group also offered sequential benefits to the joining children as they achieved membership to a group of likeminded supportive peers.

In the children's dyads and groups it was observed that the friends maintain affiliation to the members and disaffiliated themselves and excluded unwanted peers. The maintenance of these social networks could be perceived as a way of achieving personal goals for effective solidarity. The sequential impact of members failing to maintain affiliation in a dyad or group resulted in a less exclusive friendship which could have been detrimental to the member's social support. Understanding the sequential nature of children's interactions is further reinforced in studies which show that young children are cognitively aware that their prosocial actions reinforce their close friendships (Gini,

2006). The maintenance of dyads and groups by the members was also due to a 'bond of obligation' (Sacks, 1992a; p75) by members who belong to the same category set as the person such as friends and family members. The fact that members of a group or dyad are obliged to help one another could be attributed to recognition of the sequential turn by turn nature of interactions as one member shows affiliation to another in the hope that this is reciprocated.

6.2.2 Disaffiliation

In the study, when children were observed to be disaffiliating themselves from a peer, different verbal and physical actions were used than was observable when they were reciprocating a willingness to be engaged in affiliation. When a child was approached by a peer whom they do not wish to be affiliated with the disaffiliating child blocked the interaction with gaze aversion, limited speech and bodily alignment (Schegloff, 2007a) therefore actively disaffiliating themselves. Disaffiliation is differentiated from excluding an approaching peer through the child's reluctance to engage in an interaction during a specific context. This represents a distinct difference between the children's actions of disaffiliation and exclusion, as to exclude someone the child would enter into a verbal or/and non-verbal interaction with their peer. Although a child may display their disaffiliation by non-engagement with a specific peer in the immediate context they may become affiliated during a different context.

The sequential aspects of disaffiliation were apparent in the observations, as when an interaction was initiated by one child approaching another, the recipient demonstrated subsequent affiliation, disaffiliation or exclusion of that child. With regard to disaffiliation, the children demonstrated that they did not want to engage in an interaction with a peer by blocking any further sequential interactions following the initiation. This was achieved verbally by the disaffiliating child making restricted SPP utterances to the initiating child's FPP utterances, or by not replying at all. Disaffiliation was subsequently supported by the children avoiding eye contact and physically aligning themselves so that they are positioned away from the initiating child.

As with affiliation and exclusion, whether a disaffiliation was successful or not was reflected in the subsequent action of the peer. If a child understood that a disaffiliation had been initiated they either moved away from the disaffiliating peer or reattempted affiliation in their next turn. In some interactions the disaffiliated child continued to attempt affiliation until they were accepted. This often encouraged a further sequence in the form of a physical action which was implemented in order to support the verbal action.

6.2.3 Exclusion

When a child was approached by a peer whom they did not want to affiliate themselves with the child either disaffiliated themselves by restricting their responses, or became engaged in the action of exclusion through verbal and physical turn taking. The verbal exclusion of a peer was displayed through language such as 'go away', 'I don't like you' or 'don't play with us'. When this occurred, a reattempt at affiliation was initiated through the use of a resource such as orientation to an access tool. Where exclusion was still asserted the excluded children showed their understanding of the situation in their subsequent action as they moved away from the group or child. These interactions demonstrated that the alignment of social organisation was co-constructed by all participating members in an interaction.

Exclusions were also emphasised and supported through physical contact. This was displayed through the children pushing away and hitting other children whom they did not want to be associated with during that particular context. Physical exclusions were often found to be asserted following a verbal exclusion which was not effective. This type of physical exclusion was also demonstrated through the use of the huts. When a child approached a playground hut the existing members had the power to decide if they were affiliated to the group or excluded from it. Exclusion was physically implemented by the hut members by placing their legs across the entrance to the hut. This deterred

unwanted members from approaching as it was a physical representation of the exclusive group inside and hampered the ability of excluded children to enter.

Further investigation into the sequential aspects of exclusion suggested that children were aware that when they initiated an interaction their actions provoked a sequential action. This supports prior research (Wilson, 1999) where children were found to be reluctant to reattempt social interactions with peers following an episode of rejection or aggression due to fear of further rejection. The sequential order of social interactions were evident in this study when the children did not display the correct CBAs appropriate when initiating an interaction as this provoked their exclusion by the existing members. The child consequently did not achieve affiliation to the member of the group or dyad which they chose to approach; this is particularly evident in the use of playground huts.

6.3 The context free and context sensitive nature of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion

Through an emic perspective the sequential elements of the co-construction of contexts were exposed. This microanalysis revealed the context free and context sensitive nature of children's social interactions where the use of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion emanated from the data. The context free nature of these interactions were demonstrated through the observations where the children engaged in sequences which excluded, affiliated or disaffiliated in the different contexts of various social gatherings. Through analyzing the establishment of these social situations, it was advantageous to examine the situated activities which were produced to make the situation as the sequential processes which instigated and promoted exclusion, affiliation and disaffiliation then became clear (Goodwin, 1990).

Through asserting affiliation with peers, children distinguished and made relevant categories which they and their peers belonged to. This related to research regarding friendship preference where children chose friends through recognizing the similarities

between themselves and their peers such as race, gender and socioeconomic status (Martin et al, 2005). This finding was supported in the present study where the participating children demonstrated their affiliation to specific children through their verbal and non-verbal actions. However, it was also observed that this was dependant on which children were available during their morning break period, therefore making friendship preference context sensitive. These selective affiliations were also not restricted to one observation. The children were observed to assert affiliations to different children in various areas of the playground through verbal and non-verbal alignments. The social dynamics of children's relationships change throughout each playtime, therefore when an assertion of affiliation is made in one context, it may not be in another. This implies that the children's conduct was free from a specific context. This context sensitive yet context free nature of affiliation was demonstrated by the children throughout this study.

Exclusion, affiliation and disaffiliation were context free in that they were used by 'different participants in different circumstances' (Hutchby and Woofit, 1998; p35). They were also context sensitive as they were shown to be used in the co-construction of each individual context by the members immediately present. In the observations of the sample group evidence of affiliation, exclusion and disaffiliation were observed to be displayed by each member in different situations. The context sensitive contribution of each child in the establishment of each immediate context was also apparent in the observations.

Relating back to the theoretical perceptions of the concept of context discussed in section 3.4 of the thesis, the children were employing items from their environment to arrange their talk and social order in an intra-interactional way (Schegloff, 1992b) which was context free as many different children used the resources at different times, and context sensitive as the context was co-created depending on which participants were present. However, this conclusion may also be perceived as problematic by some CA analysts where the concept of context involves including the wider cultural environment and participants tacit knowledge into the analysis (for example de Kok, 2008;

McHoul, Rapley and Antaki, 2008) as the current analysis does not account for detailed descriptions of the environment within which the resources were used. The claim of a context free and context sensitive use of resources therefore does not account for the tacit cultural knowledge of the members, but the intra-interactional use whereby the resources are referred to in the turn taking of the participants (Schegloff, 1992b). Whilst this may be perceived as 'treating social actors as 'turn-taking dopes' because the turn-taking system is portrayed as driving conversations' (de Kok, 2008, p889) by some CA analysts, it is important to include the members actual orientation to conversational items wherever possible (Schegloff, 1997).

Through demonstrating affiliation with someone, members aligned themselves to being like that person who they were affiliated with by application of the consistency rule (Sacks, 1992a). Affiliations were sensitive to the context in which they were constructed as different members were available in different situations; it was also more socially acceptable to establish friendships with specific peers in different social contexts. It was observed in this study that affiliation was context free as it was established between ranges of children at different times in various areas of the playground. However, when affiliation was initiated and maintained by peers they consequently excluded other members who were not a part of the established group or dyad. By excluding a peer it was observable through the consistency rule that the excluded peer was not perceived to hold the same social standing as the children excluding them. Exclusion was also context sensitive as it was often asserted in an immediate sequence of interactions whereby the turns of each person worked to establish the context leading to exclusion. The context free nature of exclusion was evident in the many unique instances of exclusion which occurred between different children at different times. By disaffiliating themselves from an approaching peer the children avoided any interaction, and in doing so the consistency rule indicated that they were not like that peer. The context sensitive character of disaffiliation was demonstrated by the children who selected the members that they did not want to interact with from the children who were present. Disaffiliation was also context free as it occurred throughout the different playtimes with many individual children.

Although the children's actions worked to exclude, affiliate and disaffiliate peers, all of these resources could be used in one interaction to create the social order of each individual context. For example, children were observed to exclude a member of the playground in order to affiliate themselves with another member. These actions were not limited to individuals but rather systematically used by all children of this age in their school playground.

6.4 Occurrences through the assertion of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion

Through approaching children's interactions from an emic perspective, the children were found to be using six specific resources in their establishment of social order. The investigation of these resources in more depth revealed that the resources were found to be used in the children's co-construction of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion. Further analysis into these findings are now provided as, 'it is only now as the findings are reflected on that we may revisit the implications of the analyses in relation to the broader corpus of research' (Butler, 2008; p191).

6.4.1 Power inequality in children's openings

Assertions of power relations in the children's openings of interactions were also present in the children's use of huts. At playtimes the children were observed to map themselves as the owner of a hut if they were first to occupy one. The peers of the hut owners demonstrated their understanding of this power in the situation through their subsequent actions. These actions involved asking the hut owner permission to enter and reacting legally to the subsequent decision of the hut owner. The child who was mapped as the hut owner in that specific situation subsequently had the power to include or exclude the approaching peer at that time.

6.4.2 Power inequality in children's closings

Further insight into children's power inequalities can be offered when looking at the closings of children's interactions, or 'sequence closing thirds' (Schegloff, 2000). When an interaction has been initiated by one person, two parties must produce utterances which orient towards a closing in order for a closing to be successfully produced (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). It was further found that a unilateral foreshortened closing of an interaction does not work (Schegloff, 2007) although each participant can offer an initiation of the closing sequence (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).

This offers further insight into how children manage unwanted interactions such as in 'bullying' situations. Although the child may want to disaffiliate themselves from an interaction it may not be made possible for them to do so due to the sequential nature of conversational closings (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). Disaffiliation may be asserted by sequential reactions to an unwanted FPP action, but unless the disaffiliation has been oriented to and accommodated by both parties of an adjacency pair it is unsuccessful. One way to ensure that a disaffiliation is understood is to physically remove oneself from an interaction as this physical alignment enhances the communication between individuals.

6.4.3 Assertions of power

Further sequences in orientations to positions of power were presented when the children queued to return to school following the morning playtime. In each queue there was a member of each school class who was named 'the helper' by their teacher. The helper was designated to provide subsequent assistance to the children in the queue during the length of time they were lining up in the playground. In the study, the members of the queue oriented to who the helper was. This identification of the helper worked in the sequence of interactions in the queue as the children were aware that the chosen helper was the child of authority in that specific situation. An understanding of the social organisation in this occasioned social group enabled the members of each class queue to subsequently adapt their behavior to fit in accordingly when initiating and maintaining their membership with the peer who had the most powerful position in that particular

context. Therefore, the sequential nature of the hierarchy of power in each queue is demonstrated by the members.

In the sequential establishment of context, the children were observed to verbally assert categories of power through their orientation to their supremacy with words such as 'bigger', 'higher', 'oldest' and 'I can push hard'. These words were used by the children to secure their desired position in the social order in reaction to a threat to their personal ability and therefore social identity. The sequential use of these words made it observable that the children displayed their competency to their peers to exercise their power when their social standing was threatened.

The children further demonstrate their ability for establishing power relationships through their reproduction of teacher's actions in the primary school classroom. This action is elsewhere referred to as institutional behaviour (Heritage, 2005) and was observed in the present research as the children co-constructed one person of power in their social gatherings. This was achieved through one child holding the power by asking who wanted to be involved in a game, and the other members of the group putting their hands up to indicate their willingness to be included. This type of behaviour is evident in school classrooms where the teacher holds the power to ask a question, and the children respond by putting their hands up to answer. Although the playground was relatively unsupervised the children carried with them the institutional bound power relations of the classroom into the playground.

The finding that the assertion of power relations in children's interactions is sequential offers a unique insight into how power hierarchies are established in early childhood culture. The display of power issues which children are often observed to be involved in are co-constructed through a sequence of events in order to establish a clear understanding of the social order to the members in each context.

6.4.4 Verbal actions supported by physical gestures

Prior research involving investigations into children's use of physical gestures have categorized the actions as either antisocial or prosocial behaviour. However, through using an emic perspective, Goodwin (2003b) found that bodily gestures and physical interactions were used by children in order to align themselves with friends and exclude peers. In public places people appear to be either engaged in noticeable interactions with friends or independently alone (Francis and Hester, 2004). New participants to a community are 'thoroughly interactive' as 'they use their bodies to create participation frameworks' (Goodwin 2003b; p26). In the present study, the four-year-old participants were new members to the school environment and also needed to initiate new social networks with peers. Verbal gestures were found here and elsewhere (Birdwhistell, 1971; Goodwin, 1981) to be supported by physical gestures as one unit of combined communication. It was therefore argued here (following Goodwin, 1981; 2003b), that in order for children to be successfully heard when communicating they often used their physical gestures to support their verbal utterances. In this study, physical actions were frequently used to increase comprehension when a child's intention through their FPP verbal utterance was not responded to as understood by the recipient child's SPP response. This was evident in the hand gestures and bodily movements which the children used to accompany their verbal utterances. It was also observed that the participants in this study demonstrated affiliation, exclusion and disaffiliation through the use of bodily alignment.

Affiliation was also recognized as being gained through both verbal and physical actions. This was demonstrated through observations of children's actions in dyads and groups. Being a member of a group allowed specific bonds of obligation and power equality between the members where one of these was observed to be the right to have physical contact with one another. These rights to physical contact demonstrated an equal power relationship and were displayed through actions such as touching items which belonged to an affiliated peer eg stickers, the MP3 player and also holding hands. The physical interactions which accompanied verbal interactions reaffirmed and acted as a reminder of the power equality between affiliated peers. This was demonstrated when a child was not allowed to touch the peer to whom she was in an established friendship with (Observation

5.3). In this situation a complaint was made by the prohibited child along with her threat of disaffiliation from the dyad. In this instance, when the inequality of power between the affiliated peers was challenged in the dyad the illegality of the action was oriented to by the wronged peer.

Eye contact, or meeting of gaze, was understood to be important to children in their interactions as it was used as an answer to continue affiliation in a summons-answer sequence in reply to name calling (Goodwin, 1981). Also found in this study was a lack of, or bare minimum of gaze connection when a child was disaffiliating themselves from a peer or peers. Interactions in everyday social worlds involve occasional glances to others in the same environment in order for movement to be accident free (Francis and Hester, 2004). However, this 'mutual non-engagement' (Francis and Hester, 2004; p84) served as an active interaction in two ways; a glance emanated from an individual's respect that the members were both present in the same environment whereas the speed indicated that there was no need of further interaction. This marked a mutual disaffiliation in social alignment in that particular context. Gaze aversion was present in this study when children were approached peers whom they do not want to become affiliated with. In these instances the child looked at a peer very briefly just to establish who it was that was calling them, and then the gaze was dropped and the bodily alignment was shifted along with very brief conversation exchanges. These actions worked to demonstrate the power inequality between the two peers where the approached peer held the most power in the interaction opening. The lack of gaze was shown to indicate to the initiator of the interaction that the child was disaffiliating themselves away from an interaction with them. Power inequalities in the assertion of disaffiliation were also observed to be displayed through both verbal and physical actions where verbal failures to close an unwanted interaction lead to a physical action to close. This was seen to be initiated as the children with the power to disaffiliate ran away from the approaching children who had less power to maintain an interaction.

The children were observed in this research to support their verbal utterances with physical gestures in order to maximize comprehension of power equalities between peers.

Verbal actions were also observed to progress to a physical gesture when intentions needed to be clarified. This was evident when children made their affiliation demonstrably observable through holding hands, hugging, placing arms around each other or generally being allowed to touch items belonging to their affiliated friends. Exclusion was also made visible when the excluder pushed, hit or used objects to strike another peer.

6.4.5 Children's use of their environment

Garfinkel (1967) believed that rather than perceiving the environment as influencing and shaping the interactions of the people located in it, it was the social actions of the people who construct their social worlds from within. People's orientation to specific categories and environmental items makes them demonstrably relevant to the speaker at that time, in that context (Sacks, 1992).

The children in the present study were found to utilize the playground huts as specific areas which were employed as a physical representation of the exclusivity of the members within. Particular CBA was demonstrated by the members in order to maintain and initiate their group solidarity. In surrounding literature concerning group access it was found that children used prosocial actions as group access strategies to ensure social acceptance with their desired peers (Gruman et al, 2006). Prosocial behaviour was also instrumental in sustaining group solidarity (Francis and Hester, 1998). The findings of the present study supported this suggestion as it was found that when children did not make verbal or non-verbal gestures which were accepted by the members on entry to the hut, their attempt resulted in their exclusion by an existing member. Whether a child was affiliated to or excluded from becoming a member of a playground hut represented whether they were affiliated or excluded from being associated with the children who were existing members.

Other items which were in the immediate environment were also oriented to in order to draw attention to the fact that a child was the owner of the item. This was evident through

the child's orientation to the MP3 player, snacks and stickers. The children's orientation to their ownership of items organized the social order of authority due to it presenting one person of power (Cobb, Danby and Farrell, 2006) similar to that in the school classroom. This institutional behaviour was demonstrated through the children's mapping of one person being in charge of the others in a group such as the hut owner who had the power to exclude an unwanted peer. The institutional behaviour from the classroom was also observed where one member of the playground suggested the implementation of a game and the other members put their hand up to join in. Through these findings it is realised that, although the playground is relatively unsupervised the children carry with them the institutional bound behaviour of the classroom into the playground. This finding is also supported by prior research in children's school playgrounds (Butler, 2008).

In the observations of the four-year-old children in their primary school playground, aspects of the environment such as the huts were oriented to and used in the co-construction of social organisation by the members from within. The huts were employed as tools to emphasise power and the exclusive membership to affiliated groups and dyads where exclusion was actively demonstrated through blocking the doorway. Children mapped out their roles in their social environment through affiliating, excluding or disaffiliating themselves from peers. Affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion were all actions used in the children's co-construction of their context through the use of their immediate environment.

6.4.6 Exclusive dyads

When looking at the interactions of each participating child the exclusive dyadic relationships which some children share were revealed. In the study several children were observed to move around their playground space interacting with many peers during their break times, whilst other children persistently affiliated themselves with the same peer throughout each morning break.

The children who were observed to be engaging in exclusive dyads included Zac and Sue, and Katie and Mel who interacted exclusively with each-other through many individual play times. Prior research suggests that the children who are a part of a close dyadic relationship maintain their friendships by reacting differently to conflict situations which arise between the two members (Rose and Asher, 1999). Although it was also found that the openness of a dyadic relationship also raises problems with confidentiality due to the potential for social manipulation through rumors (Bjorkqvist and Osterman, 2000). In order for children to have a close friendship with a peer as an exclusive dyad, it was necessary to exclude the peers who were surplus to requirements in the process. Although being a member of an exclusive dyad enabled the continuity of a secure relationship through the sequential affiliation built upon in each episode of interaction, it was also potentially problematic due to the limited number of children available in each dyad. This was evident in observations where one member of an exclusive dyad was not present. In these observations the remaining member of the dyad was observed to be argumentative in interactions with other peers when they were without their exclusive partner. It was also observed that there was often a lack of affiliation with other peers where the remaining member of the dyad was observed to be attempting to disaffiliate themselves from other members.

Through the analysis of how children were demonstrating exclusion in their social organisation the importance of close friendships became relevant. This was found in prior literature which found that close friendships promoted emotional wellbeing through awareness of external social support (Gifford-Smith and Bownell, 2003; Grotberg, 2001). It was also suggested that close friendships protected the members from being approached by other members of the playground (Fox and Boulton, 2006). This was also found in the current study where, in friendships, the affiliated members were observed to exclude peers when they were interpreted as being intrusive and threatening to their social position in a dyad. This was observed in the children's interactions of exclusive friendships where there were a small number of members. The limitation on the number of members belonging to a group is significant as, 'the system favors, by virtue of its design, smaller numbers of participant (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). In the

observations the exclusion of an unwanted peer was usually asserted by one member of an exclusive dyad who rejected an approaching peer when they attempt to affiliate themselves. Exclusion was used to protect the exclusivity of a dyad and affiliation was used in the dyad to maintain the exclusivity of a friendship in that context. The concept of friendships having restricted numbers is related to work by Sacks (1992) and extended by Butler (2008) who found that children's games have a limited number of places for members. It was further recognized that when the correct number of children needed for a game was complete, any children there after would be excluded. Although children's close friendships are perceived positively by society, the physical and verbal display of affiliation with specific members sequentially produces the exclusion of other members.

One of the children observed to interact with many children rather than having an exclusive affiliation with a specific peer in their break time was Tina. When Tina moved around the playground, she was observed to interact with many of her peers on different occasions. However, rather than being successfully popular through these multiple interactions, Tina's exchanges with her peers often resulted in her being excluded in a majority of episodes. Through the close analysis of Tina's exclusions it is revealed that when Tina initiated contact with a peer, the peer in each instance was a member of an already established exclusive dyad. From these observations of Tina's interactions it was evident that the initiation of affiliation to a child who was already in an established dyad was followed by exclusion of the intruder. However, Tina approached one member of an exclusive dyad in one interaction which resulted in her affiliation through the resource of an access tool (see observation # 2.2). This exception indicated that although exclusive dyads were generally noticeable in the playground they were also sensitive to the individual context in which they are co-constructed. Even though Tina was excluded from accessing an exclusive dyad in the majority of cases, this was not true in every situation. This offers further understanding in the area of children's exclusion from social groups in early childhood where a child may be excluded by their peers who are already in an existing dyad.

These findings are also evident with Sacks' (1992b) work on adjacency pairs where it was found that 'conversations begin with adjacency pairs and are brought to a close with adjacency pairs; that for turn-taking organisation the means for selecting next speakers involve the use of adjacency pairs; that for story organisation the preference response will involve adjacency pair organisation' (Sacks, 1992b, p 531). This recognition of the importance of two party communications in interactions supports the findings in the analysis of children's exclusive dyadic interactions in the primary school playground. These two party systems were also observed by Goodwin (2006) in girls groups where 'best friends' (p90) were identified.

With regard to the exclusion of peers when approaching an established exclusive dyad, Sacks (1992a) recognized the programmatic relevance in children's games where the number of people involved were imperative in the structure of the game. If there were already an established correct number of players, a child was excluded from accessing the game. This was also apparent in the current study where a correct number of members in an exclusive dyad predicted the exclusion of any subsequent members. Alternatively, access to exclusive groups was offered to members as a gesture of affiliation where recognition of the importance of exclusive affiliation was demonstrated. These peer exclusions were also observed by Goodwin (2006) who found that, as in the present study, the exclusion of a child was often collaborative between affiliated members of a group or dyad.

More support was given to children's exclusive affiliation with Sacks' (1992) acknowledgement of possessive pronouns. Sacks (1992a) found the use of pronouns noticeable in children's mapping of social order in games. The use of possessive pronouns in this study was found to achieve affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion. It was observed that when children were being excluded by their peers they affiliated themselves with a person who was not present in the immediate context through using possessive pronouns. This worked to demonstrate the child's membership to an exclusive dyad separate of the present one. Through doing this the children verbally demonstrated that although they were being excluded in the present context, they had affiliations with

other people in other contexts. This action allowed the child to demonstrate that they had external social support (Grotberg, 2001) away from the peers who were present.

Reaffirmations of exclusive friendships were also emphasized through the children's physical interactions. Physical representations of exclusive dyads were displayed in the observations where exclusive dyads were noticed between Harry and Dean and Kate and Mel where they walked around the playground holding hands and hugging. Harry and Dean's exclusive dyad was also displayed as they walked into the centre of a spiral which was painted on the playground floor. Once Harry and Dean had reached the centre of the spiral they sat inside the playground markings together whilst holding hands. Physical gestures were also used to emphasise the exclusivity of other relationships through physical alignment with bodily position and by holding hands whilst walking around the playground.

In the observations the children mapped social dyads which were maintained through verbal and physical gestures of affiliation, and protected through actions which excluded unwanted members who threatened the exclusivity of the dyad in that context. Children who were already recognised as being associated with a peer in an exclusive dyad disaffiliated themselves from other peers who attempted affiliation with them. The observations of the children initiating and maintaining these exclusive dyads made them demonstrably relevant to the children themselves. These exclusive dyads are not limited to the unique cultural worlds of early childhood though as they are also displayed throughout everyday society where they are evident in the form of couples and spouses. Exclusive dyadic relationships are as important in early childhood social order as they are in adulthood.

6.5 Children's social competence

Children's social competence in constructing and living by their own social lives is acknowledged in prior research (eg Corsaro, 1997) and supported here. Throughout this study it was found that social rules were implemented and maintained by the participating

members from within. This finding supports prior research which has investigated children's unique social worlds using an emic perspective (Butler 2008; Butler and Weatherall, 2006; Church, 2007; 2009; Cobb-Moore, Danby and Farrell, 2008; Cromdal, 2001; 2009; Danby, 2008; 2009; Evaldsson, 2005; Goodwin, 2002; 2003b; 2006; Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987; Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2007; Hester, 1991; 1998; Hester and Francis, 1997; Theobald and Danby, 2009). In the present study, the rules governed by the children worked in the establishment of each context in the varied range of situations which the children co-constructed. The children demonstrated their social competence through their ability to produce effective social organisation using identified resources independent of adult construction. This active initiation and maintenance of social order and control has been identified as an underlife (Goffman, 1961) where the members of the culture manage their own social networks proficiently.

In these social networks the children exhibited CBA which worked to affiliate them to categories such as being a member of a hut or part of an exclusive dyad. The children were observed to be displaying CBA to align themselves with the social standpoints demonstrated by their peers in their social situations. Their peers then reacted to these actions by reaffirming the social order through the affiliation, exclusion or disaffiliation of the peer. This is related to prior literature which found that the sample group of children perceived themselves to have more reciprocated friendships over a specific period of time in relation to when they were initially interviewed (Martin et al, 2005). In the present study children observed their peers CBA and competently chose whether to evolve friendship networks with them through their sequential turn taking activities. In the study the children were aware of whom they shared commonalities with through their displays of CBA which asserted them as belonging to the same group as other children who participated in those activities (Schegloff, 2007). As children recognised CBA which they affiliate to, further sequential implications held. This was evident as becoming affiliated to a peer group defined the member's personality through the consistency rule and so also enforced certain rules of behaviour to which each member had to prescribe to (Sacks, 1992). This demonstrated how children's displays of behaviour to each-other

worked to establish friendship connections and how the children used their behaviour to initiate and maintain affiliation with peers.

This links to the children orienting to illegal and legal interactions as a hierarchy of relevance where rules for being accepted as a member are made demonstrably relevant by the participants. In prior research (Mooij, 1999) found that teachers who co-constructed classroom rules with the attending children had more success in enforcing the rules as the children were bound through their input to behave appropriately. It was also acknowledged in the present study that children have specific rules which they reinforce as illegal or legal in their playground. Children's competencies in establishing social order through the use of peer disputes has also been found in research by Church (2009). Examples of this were found in the present study in the children's opening of an interaction with their chosen peers. If a child did not correctly implement the appropriate rules for initiating an interaction with the desired group or person on their initial attempt at affiliation, it resulted in their exclusion. This was because the opening of an interaction was evaluated as either legal or illegal by the approached members. A subsequent course of action followed where the approached member decided whether an affiliative response should be given or not. If an exclusion was implemented the children oriented to the illegal action as an account for their exclusion. This was evident in observations which involved the hut where children were excluded from becoming affiliated with the hut due to them not abiding by the legal rules for access. In these interactions it was usually the child who had been mapped as the owner of the hut in that context who had the power to choose who could become a member. This display of social organisation by the children further suggested that they were competent citizens who were actively involved in the co-construction of their own cultures.

In the present study children were observed to be competently using specific resources and applying rules to organize the social order of their playground. This indicated that even though adults impose rules for social play to the children in their care the children ultimately adapt or ignore these rules. This was demonstrated in this study where the children actively co-constructed their own underlife (Goffman, 1961) with rules which

they co-constructed and enforced themselves, such as gender segregation. Although adults may ban the use of specific words or physical actions the children ultimately engaged in the actions which were instrumental in their organisation of the social structure of their playground world (Church, 2009). In this study it was evident that the participating children implemented and enforced their own socio-cultural networks in their playground. The children were competently co-constructing their social environments independent of adult involvement. There were concrete behavioural patterns which the children used as resources to co-construct social groups and this was apparent as the children themselves orient to them.

Through this study it has been found that children competently co-construct their social worlds through affiliating to, disaffiliating from and excluding other members of the playground. Through the use of CA and MCA it was observed that these actions were used systematically by the participating children to enforce the maintenance of a group or dyad in each specific situation. Peers were excluded to protect the group from members who did not display the appropriate characteristics of CBA in specific circumstances. Affiliation was enforced to maintain group and dyadic solidarity between peers in specific social situations whereas the children also disaffiliated themselves from joining certain groups or dyads. These actions were intertwined and often used in parallel with each-other. Each child was observed to be competent to engage in affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion.

The analysis of data which was collected from individual children in their everyday lives indicated that verbal and physical actions were used in an indexical manner which was reactive to the immediate social situation. These social relationships were both context free and context sensitive in their making. Affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion were co-constructed through the turn by turn process of interactions asserted by the members in each immediate social situation, but were also engaged in by a range of children through a variety of playtimes. Rather than a dichotomy of prosocial and antisocial children who display consistent behaviour in all situations, it has been revealed here that all children are capable of engaging in a variety of actions which are implemented to

organize immediate social relationships. The observations in this research therefore emphasize the importance of microanalysis which takes account of the verbal and non-verbal turns of each person throughout the sequence of an interaction. Even though interactions could be perceived as antisocial behaviour through an outsider's perception, from analysing the situation from within it is evident that these actions work to co-construct social organisation in the children's cultural world. The children in the observations all actively engage in sequences of interactions together to create individual contexts. This methodology offers more information regarding children's complex interactions than a limited labeling of behaviour which uses predefined categories.

6.6 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the emerging social organisation present in the participating children's everyday use of affiliation, exclusion and disaffiliation. In order to establish social organisation the children were all observed to be engaged in affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion, making these social organisation processes both context free and context sensitive. In each context, the children's sequence of interactions revealed that when a child approached a peer they actively engaged in a gesture of affiliation, but the reaction of the peer dictated whether affiliation, exclusion or disaffiliation would ensue. The children's verbal actions were supported by physical gestures to emphasize intentions and this was also apparent through the children's use of their environment. In their playground space the children employed the huts to highlight the exclusivity of affiliated groups and dyads where unwanted peers were excluded. This insight into the children's effective co-construction of social organisation independent of adult participation indicates that the children are competent members of their unique culture.

Through the broad data driven discussion in this chapter it has become apparent that, 'People use language and concomitant forms of conduct to *do* things, not only to transmit information; their talk and other conduct *does* things' (Schegloff et al, 2002; p5 original emphasis). The findings from this research reveal what the children are actually *doing* when they interact in everyday situations and the social order which emanates from these

activities. From this study it is evident that social relationships are co-constructed to build immediate, individual contexts. It is also evident that when a child affiliates themselves with a peer they are also excluding other peers, indicating that there is not a universally 'good' way to act.

Prosocial behaviour' is often perceived as a positive way for children to behave and is promoted whereas 'antisocial behaviour' is referred to as negative and to be prevented. In prior research, children who are observed to be using specific predefined categories of behaviour are themselves labeled as being either prosocial or antisocial (for example Nelson and Crick, 1999). Through investigating the social relationships amongst young children from an alternative perspective this research has provided a more detailed analysis of the social activities engaged in by children in their school playground. In this chapter it has been found that children do not behave prosocially or antisocially without consequence, children are actively co-constructing their social worlds through demonstrating social organisation processes. It is the various sequential actions of the children which work to co-construct each individual context.

Chapter 7

Implications of the study

Through employing an emic perspective to the study of children's social interactions, this thesis has demonstrated that children work together competently to initiate and maintain immediate contexts through sequences of interactions. Affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion were initiated and maintained through each child's actions and subsequent reactions. Physical gestures were used to support the children's verbal actions in order for the successful establishment of social order. Social order was also organized through the children's use of their immediate environment where they employed the huts to physically represent membership. The children's exclusive memberships to dyads were also discussed in the prior chapter.

This chapter reviews the overall findings of this study and presents the significance of the results. It proposes directions for future research in early childhood studies which would benefit from the use of an emic perspective in order to provide an inductive insight into issues which the children themselves orient to as of importance. Recommendations for practice in early years settings which derive from the findings of the present study are discussed in this chapter.

The following chapter draws together the conclusions of the study in order to address the aim of the research stated in chapter two, to further investigate children's social behaviours in the primary school playground. This chapter will begin with an overview of the findings throughout the study in order to reestablish a general familiarity with the research as a whole. This will be followed with a drawing together of the significance and implications of the findings from the detailed analysis of chapter five and the more general, wider findings from chapter six. Recommendations for further studies leading from this research are then suggested.

7.1 Overall findings

This study set out to address issues of increasing prevalence of antisocial behaviour in early childhood (BERA SIG, 2003; Berger, 2007; Farrington, Leober and Kalb, 2001; NCB, 2006; Pellegrini and Blatchford, 2000; Scott et al, 2001; Tapper and Boulton, 2005). In chapter two, the review of literature which investigated antisocial behaviour through comparing it to prosocial behaviour as a comparative dichotomy was found to be problematic due to the limitations of the predetermined definitions. While this research was informative, the results were found through the use of predetermined categories of behaviour designed by adults and reflective accounts which did not address the children's immediate interpretation of events. Literature which used an emic perspective was then reviewed where it was found that this methodology offered the benefit of an insight into children's initiation and maintenance of a variety of social interactions from an insider's perspective (Seedhouse, 2005).

In the methodology, chapter three, it was found that many methods had been used in many different studies to investigate a variety of concepts related to children's behaviour and social interactions. From this investigation into prior research, it was perceived that a dichotomy of antisocial and prosocial behaviour in children had been presented through the use of an etic perspective. In order to establish what the children were actively *doing* in their interactions with each-other, the present research used an emic approach to the investigation through using CA and MCA. This approach was employed to investigate the interactions which the children themselves oriented to as meaningful in their everyday experiences in their playground.

The design of the study was presented in chapter four, and the results which emanated from the thoroughly detailed data transcription were discussed in chapter five. The iterative process of investigation into the children's observed interactions revealed how the children organized their everyday social worlds from within their unique culture (Schegloff, 1987). This detailed micro analysis of children's interactions found the participants using specific actions in their exchanges with peers. Children used the very particular resources of access tools, name calling, possessive pronouns and collective proterms, reference to gender, use of huts and physical gestures to support verbal acts in their achievement of social order. Chapter five therefore indicated that there were systematic tools that the children oriented to in order to govern their social order in their culture.

A move from a detailed, specific analysis in chapter five to a wider discussion in chapter six found that, through using the six resources, the children actively affiliated themselves with peers, disaffiliated themselves from peers and excluded peers. This demonstrated that the children were competently engaging in the co-construction of immediate contexts through the sequential turn taking in their interactions. The finding of children's interactions being both context free and context sensitive was then discussed to reveal that children engaged in various actions to co-construct unique situations. This chapter

concluded with a final discussion of the competent, social organisation which was present in children's interactions independent of adult intervention and through their own rules.

These findings are significant as they encourage a shift away from the perception of consistent antisocial and prosocial behaviour and children, and inform of the sequential, turn by turn actions which co-construct each individual context.

7.2 Implications

This study has demonstrated that all children engage in and are capable of producing a repertoire of actions in contradiction to much of the prior research which identified behaviour and children as consistently prosocial or antisocial. Rather than placing children in predetermined categories of behaviour, this investigation into what the children were actually *doing* in their everyday interactions has proven far more illuminative of children's cultures. The microanalysis of CA and MCA have provided a more specific understanding of what is being achieved as the children make their intentions verbally visible in their immediate interactions and to other members of the playground. Although the children oriented to specific resources as important elements of the playground, they were employed in order to manage social order with their peers. The children's continual interactions with their peers indicated the importance of relationships with other children in the primary school playground as paramount. Through the analysis of the children's interactions it was observable that each episode was very complex as many different actions happened in one incident. Therefore, one blanket definition for an interaction such as 'prosocial' or 'antisocial' is insufficient.

This study has found that the same resources of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion were implemented by the children during different playtimes for different purposes. This indicated that these resources were context free in that they were employed by different children at varying social situations. However, it was also observed that the use of the resources were also context sensitive as their use was responsive to which children were immediately present and the immediate situation due to prior sequences of action. Each

child uses a range of strategies to achieve affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion in the co-construction of each individual context, and often these resources were used simultaneously. This finding demonstrates that all children engage in actions to organize social relationships which are provoked by the members of the immediate context and consequently conflicts with the suggestion that children are either consistently prosocial or antisocial. It is therefore suggested that referring to children as either prosocial or antisocial is inappropriate.

Throughout these findings it is observable that the children are competently organizing their social worlds independent of adult rules. This finding is of significance in the area of early childhood as it informs practitioners of the co-construction of social order which is evident in children's worlds. Although certain behaviours may be discouraged and not tolerated while other behaviours are promoted in early childhood settings, the children use their own set of rules which are deemed as legal and illegal to them. Through discovering an insight into the cultural world of early childhood, practitioners can become aware of the interactions which are important to the children themselves. Although practitioners are keen to banish incidents of conflict and promote 'prosocial' behaviour between members of the playground it was found here, and in Goodwin (2006), that children actively seek out conflicts to establish exclusions of peers and 'prosocial' behaviour is often falsely applied to girls' interactions. Through an inductive approach it was evident that the exercise of power is oriented to as an important part of early childhood interaction in the co-construction of context through a variety of actions. This research is therefore important in the study and practice of early childhood as it provides an in-depth insight into the intricate production of social organisation. Through increasing practitioner's understanding of the reasons behind children's engagement in interactions practitioner's can approach these playground situations from an informed perspective.

'Information about the specific behaviours and peer group dynamics of children's groups will not only provide us with a better picture of children's worlds, but also help guide policy and

intervention strategies, including awareness training' (Goodwin, 2008; p254).

This is particularly important with regard to the implementation of the Foundation Phase in Wales where 'Personal and Social Development, Well-Being and Cultural Diversity' is identified as an area of learning (WAG, 2008). By becoming aware that all children assert affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion to co-construct social order it informs practitioners of the resources that children are drawing on to regulate their social relationships and interactions in the playground. This is important for the implementation of 'Personal and Social Development, Well-Being and Cultural Diversity' in the Foundation Phase as, through labeling children, it limits practitioner's perspectives of each child's potential. Subsequently, labeling provides a context where this limited behaviour is reaffirmed through social reinforcement (Prinstein and Dodge, 2008). The negative impact of labeling children either negatively or positively is further addressed through research by children themselves (NCB, 2008). The portrayal of children in the media as being either extremely prosocial or antisocial does not acknowledge the full range of actions evident in children's social relationships and this is damaging as 'negative, sensational reporting can have a negative affect on young people's lives' (NCB, 2008; p22). It is important to acknowledge the indexical and occasioned use of actions which children use in order to supply a fair and unbiased provision of service for each child in early childhood services.

Through using a sociological approach to the study of children's interactions, we arrive at an understanding of the sequences involved in the establishment of each social context. This informs practitioners that their reaction to a child's action works to establish the context. The practitioner's acknowledgment of their role in the co-construction of context is imperative as their verbal and non-verbal response to a child's interaction will, in turn, initiate a subsequent action from the child (Goodwin, 2007). Therefore the implications for practice are to promote practitioners awareness that their actions are directly instrumental in the development of the context between themselves and the children in their care. This co-construction of context recognizes that the child and practitioner together create the culture of the context (Duranti, 1994, 1997; Ochs, 1988). Though engaging in an exchange of actions with the child, the practitioner enforces which actions

are acceptable in the culture of their specific school environment (Rogoff, 2003). This offers potential for the management of co-constructions of context where, if a practitioner feels that they need to intervene, a course of action which accounts for the child's contribution to the establishment of the immediate context is implemented. Whilst these turn by turn interactions are engaged in, the practitioner's role in the initiation and maintenance of the immediate context is being established.

To support intersubjectivity in a social situation the children were observed to use physical gestures to support their verbal actions throughout their turn-taking. Whereas the category of physical aggression is suggested to be a physical representation of an expression of power in prior research (eg. Abdennur, 2000; Blair et al, 2004), this study suggests that both verbal and physical actions are used to support each-other in order to maximize the understanding intended between parties. When a child is aware that their intended communication has not been understood, they will use a physical gesture to reiterate their intentions. It is evident that children use physical actions to make a close affiliation with a peer, the exclusion of peers, and a disaffiliation from a peer observable to other members of the playground. This finding offers an insight into why children use physical actions when interacting with peers.

Although these physical displays demonstrate the children's ability to successfully communicate their intentions with one-another in their organisation of social order, children's aggressive actions are not condoned in school situations and are the most likely interaction to be intervened by a practitioner (Xie et al, 2002). However, the growing body of research addressing children's conflicts and disputes using CA and MCA (Butler and Weatherall, 2006; Church 2009; Evaldsson, 2005; Goodwin, 1990, 2006; Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987; Maynard, 1985; Theobald and Danby, 2009) argue that these types of interactions are often competently managed by the children themselves, independent of adult intervention. Therefore, it is suggested that practitioners should observe the interactions between children prior to intervention in order to monitor whether it is necessary to mediate.

Through understanding why the children are engaging in physical displays of communication, practitioners can be aware of the children's social competence and allow them more autonomy in their social worlds. It is imperative that practitioners are aware that each child is capable of using a range of actions and that these physical exchanges are implemented in the children's co-construction the context so that they do not label children as being either antisocial or prosocial. An awareness of the wide range of actions which all children have is imperative for practice in order for a consistent and unbiased care is given to all children. To assume everything there is to know about a child through categorizing them through one aspect of their identity subsequently affects the way in which practitioners behave with each child. It is imperative that each child is valued for their social competency and this can be gained through the recognition of the complex nature each child's interaction entails.

Implications for future research

This thesis offers further understanding of children's use of behaviours through the application of CA and MCA and therefore adds to the growing body of research investigating children's social interactions through this methodology (Butler 2008; Butler and Weatherall, 2006; Church, 2007; Danby, 2008; Goodwin, 2002; 2006; Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987; Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2007; Hester, 1991; 1998; Hester and Francis, 1997; Theobald and Danby, 2009;). Through the use of an emic perspective the social organisation of the children's interactions from within their culture has been accessible. Rather than viewing specific actions with the blanket term of 'antisocial' or 'prosocial' behaviour this research informs that there are many actions which children use to establish social organisation. This is evident in the study where there are a range of actions which are involved in one interaction over the duration of a few minutes. Although each social context in the primary school playground is unique, the use of affiliation, disaffiliation and exclusion are implemented by all children through their sequence of actions. This study therefore demonstrates the benefits of the use of CA and MCA in early childhood research where the inductive approach reveals information which would not ordinarily have been found.

It is suggested that research using CA MCA does not make itself accessible to practitioners outside of their discipline (Seedhouse, 2005). However, there is increasing recognition of the usefulness of CA and MCA in the field of early childhood research which is apparent in the research available (Butler 2008; Butler and Weatherall, 2006; Church, 2007; Cobb-Moore, Danby and Farrell, 2008; Cromdal, 2001; 2009; Danby, 2008; 2009; Evaldsson, 2005; Goodwin, 2002; 2003b; 2006; Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987; Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2007; Theobald and Danby, 2009). This methodology provides a detailed and important representation of the co-construction of early childhood contexts which may otherwise be omitted. The intricate detailing of each single episode of each child's verbal and non-verbal interaction offers a true illustration of the complex lives of children in situ. This is of particular importance for research addressing the proposed limited behaviour of children, otherwise termed as 'antisocial' or 'prosocial', as children are recognized as members of their own unique cultures (Corsaro, 1985a) where each culture governs the acceptability of behaviours within their own culture (Tobin et al, 1989; Tobin et al, 2009). Therefore, children's worlds should be studied through a data-driven, inductive approach so that we can learn which verbal and non-verbal actions the children themselves orient to as significant as they make them demonstrably relevant. This approach grants future research the freedom to discover new and important insights into children's co-construction of context.

References List:

Aarsand, P. A and Aronsson, K. (2009) Response cries and other gaming moves— Building intersubjectivity in gaming, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 41, pp 1557–1575.

Abdennur, A. (2000) *Camouflaged Aggression: the hidden threat to individuals and organisations*. Canada: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Alderson, P. (2001) Research by Children, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, Volume 4, Number 2, pp 139-153.

Anataki, C and Widdicombe, S. (1998) 'Identity as an Achievement and as a Tool' in C. Anataki and S. Widdicombe (eds.) *Identities in Talk*, London, Sage.

Andreou, E., & Metallidou, P. (2004) The relationship of academic and social cognition in behaviour in bullying situations among Greek primary school children, *Educational Psychology*, 24, 27-41.

Antisocial Behaviour Act (2003) Section 87, 6a.
http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2003/ukpga_20030038_en_11#pt9

Atewell, P. (1974) Ethnomethodology since Garfinkel, *Theory and Society*, Volume 1, Number 2, pp 179 – 210.

Avgitidou, S. (2001) Peer culture and friendship relationships as contexts for the development of young children's pro-social behaviour. *International Journal of Early Years Education* Volume 9, pp 145-152.

Baker, C. D. and Freebody, P. (1986) Representations of Questioning and Answering in Children's First School Books. *Language and Society*, Volume 15, Number 4, pp 451-483.

Barry, C. M. and Wentzel, K. R. (2006) Friend Influence on Prosocial Behaviour: The Role of Motivational Factors and Friendship Characteristics, *Developmental Psychology*, Volume 42, Number 1, pp153-163.

Bateman, A. and Church, A. (2008) Prosocial Behavior in preschool: the state of play, *Educational and Child Psychology*, Volume 25, Number 2, pp 19 – 28.

Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I. and Vohs, K. D. (2003) Does High Self-Esteem Cause Better Performance, Interpersonal Success, Happiness, Or Healthier Lifestyles? *Psychological Science In The Public Interest*, Volume 4, Number 1, pp1-44.

Bell, J. and Opie, C. (2002) *Learning from Research: Getting more from your data*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Benwell, B and Stokoe, E (2006) *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

BERA SIG (British Educational Research Association Early Years Special Interest Group) (2003) *Early Years Research: Pedagogy, Curriculum and Adult Roles, Training and Professionalism*. Southwell, Notts: BERA.

Berger, K. S. (2007) Update on bullying at school: Science forgotten? *Developmental Review*, Volume 27, pp 90-126.

Billig, M. (1999) Whose Terms? Whose Ordinarity? Rhetoric and Ideology in Conversation Analysis, *Discourse and Society*, Volume 10, pp 543 – 58.

Birdwhistell, R. L (1970) *Kinesics and Context; Essays on Body-Motion Communication*. London, Penguin Press.

Birkbeck, C and LaFree, J (1993) The Situational Analysis of Crime and Deviance, *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 19, pp. 113-137

Bjorkqvist, k and Osterman, K. (2000) Social Intelligence – Empathy = Aggression? *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, Volume 5, Number 2, pp191-2000.

Blair, K. A., Denham, S. A., Kochanoff, A. and Whipple, B. (2004) Playing it cool: Temperament, emotion regulation, and social behavior in preschoolers, *Journal of School Psychology*, Volume 42, pp 419–443.

Blatchford, P and Sumpner, C (1998) What Do We Know about Breaktime? Results from a National Survey of Breaktime and Lunchtime in Primary and Secondary Schools, *British Educational Research Journal*, Volume 24, Number 1, pp. 79-94.

Boxer, P., Tisak, M. S. and Goldstein, S. E. (2004) Is It Bad To Be Good? An Exploration of Aggressive and Prosocial Behaviour Subtypes in Adolescence, *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Volume 33, Number 2, pp 91 – 100.

Brief, P and Motowidlo, S. J. (1986) Prosocial Organisational Behaviours, *The Academy of Management Review*, Volume 11, Number 4, pp 710-725.

Butler, C. W. (2008) *Talk and Social Interaction in the Playground*. Hampshire: Ashgate.

Butler, C. W. and Weatherall, A. (2006) “No We’re Not Playing Families”: Membership Categorization in Children’s Play, *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, Volume 39, Issue 4, pp 441-470.

Button, G. (1991) ‘Conversation-in-a-Series’, in D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (eds.) *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Cairns, R. B., Leung, M., Buchanan, L and Cairns, B. D. (1995) Friendships and Social Networks in Childhood and Adolescence: Fluidity, Reliability and Interconnectedness. *Child Development*, Volume 66, pp 1330 – 1345.

Charlesworth, R and Hartup, W. W (1967) Positive Social Reinforcement in the Nursery School Peer Group, *Child Development*, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 993-1002

Christensen, P.N., Rothgerber, H., Wood, W., Matz, D.C. (2004). Social norms and identity relevance: A motivational approach to normative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1295-1309.

Church, A. (2009) *Preference organisation and peer disputes: How young children resolve conflict*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Cillessen, A. H. N and Rose, A. J. (2005). Understanding Popularity in the Peer System, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, Volume 14, pp 102 – 105.

Clark, A. and Moss, P. (2001) *Listening to Young Children: The Mosaic approach*. London: National Children's Bureau.

Coady, M M. (2004) 'Ethics in early childhood research', in G. Mac Naughton, S A. Rolfe and I. Siraj-Blatchford (eds.) *Doing Early Childhood Research: International Perspectives On Theory and Practice*. London: Open University Press.

Coats, J. (2007) Talk in a play frame: More on laughter and intimacy, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 39, pp 29–49.

Cobb, C., Danby, S., & Farrell, A. (2006). Young children enacting governance: Child's play? *Australian Association for Research in Education*, Volume 28, November -1 December.

Cobb-Moore, C., Danby, S. and Farrell, A. (2008) Young children as rule makers, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 41, pp 1477 – 1492.

Coie, J., Dodge, K., and Coppotelli, H. (1982) Dimensions and types of social status: A cross age perspective, *Developmental psychology*, Volume 18, pp557-570.

Collis, D. (2009) *Social Grade, A Classification Tool; Bite Size Thought Piece*. Ipsos MediaCT.

Conway, A. M. and McDonough (2006) Emotional Resilience in Early Childhood Developmental Antecedents and Relations to Behavior Problems, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Volume 1094, pp 272-277.

Corsaro, W. A (1979) 'We're Friends Right?': Children's Use of Access Rituals in a Nursery School, *Language in Society*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 315-336.

Corsaro, W. A (1985a) *Friendship and Peer Culture in the Early Years*. Ablex Publishing Corporation, U.S.

Corsaro, W. A. (1985b) 'Sociological approaches to discourse'. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.) *Handbook of discourse analysis, Volume 3: Discourse and dialogue*. London: Academic Press.

Corsaro, W. A (1997) *The Sociology of Childhood*. London: Sage Publications.

Corsaro, W. A and Eder, D. (1990) Children's Peer Cultures, *Annual Review of Sociology*, Volume 16, pp 197-220.

Cromdal, J (2001) *Can I be with?* : Negotiating play entry in a bilingual school, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 33, pp 515-543.

Cromdal, J. (2009). Childhood and social interaction in everyday life: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 41, pp 1473-1476.

Danby, S. J. (2008) The Importance of Friends; the value of friends; friendships within peer cultures. In Brooker, L and Woodhead, M (eds.) *Developing positive Identities: Diversity and Young Children*. Open University, Milton Keynes.

Danby, S. J (2009) Childhood and social interaction in everyday life: An epilogue, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 41, pp 1596–1599.

Danby, S. and Baker, C. D. (1998). 'What's the Problem? Restoring Social Order in the Preschool Classroom'. In: I. Hutchby, J. Moran-Ellis (eds.), *Children and Social Competence: Arenas of Action*. London, Falmer: 157-86.

Danby, S. and Baker, C. D. (2000) 'Unravelling the fabric of social order in block area'. In: S. Hester & D. Francis (Eds.), *Local educational order: Ethnomethodological studies of knowledge in action*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 91-140.

Dasgupta, N. (2004) Implicit Ingroup Favouritism, Outgroup Favouritism, and Their Behavioural Manifestations, *Social Justice Research*, Volume 17, Number 2, pp 143-169.

David, T. (2004) Young Children's Social and Emotional Development' in T. Maynard and N. Thomas (eds.) *An Introduction to Early Childhood Studies*. London: Sage.

Davies, C. E. (2003) How English-learners joke with native speakers: an interactional sociolinguistic perspective on humor as collaborative discourse across cultures, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 35, pp1361–1385.

de Kok, B. C. (2008) The role of context in conversation analysis: Reviving an interest in ethno-methods, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 40, pp886-903.

Department of Health (2000) *Research in Practice, Making Research Count: Quality Protects Research Briefing Number 3*; Young Peoples Participation. Available: <http://www.rip.org.uk/publications/documents/QPB/QPRB3.asp>

Donaldson, M. (1987) *Children's Minds*. London: Fontana Press.

Dowling, M. (2007) Ethnomethodology: Time for a revisit? A discussion paper, *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, Volume 44, pp 826–833.

Drew, P and Heritage, J. (1992) 'Analyzing talk at work: an introduction' in Paul Drew and John Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Book series: Studies in Interaction Sociolinguistics 3, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Dupret, B. and Ferrie, J-N. (2008) Legislating at the shopfloor level: Background knowledge and relevant context of parliamentary debates. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 40, pp 960–978.

Duranti, A. (1994). *From Grammar to Politics: Linguistic Anthropology in a Western Samoan Village*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, J. A. (1993). Principles and contrasting systems of discourse transcription. In J. A. Edwards & M. D. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and coding in discourse research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Edwards, A. (2004) 'Qualitative designs and analysis' in G. Mac Naughton, S A. Rolfe and I. Siraj-Blatchford (eds.) *Doing Early Childhood Research: International Perspectives On Theory and Practice*. London: Open University Press.

Eglin, P. (2002) Member's Gendering Work: 'women', 'feminists' and membership categorization analysis. *Discourse and Society*, Volume 13, Number 6, pp 819 – 825.

Eglin, P and Hester, S (1999) "You're all a bunch of feminists." Categorization and the politics of terror in the Montreal Massacre, *Human Studies*, Volume 22, pp 253-272

Eisenbraun, K. D. (2007) Violence in schools: Prevalence, prediction, and prevention, *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Volume 12, pp 459–469

Eisenberg, A., and Garvey, C. (1981). Children's use of verbal strategies in resolving conflicts. *Discourse Processes*, Volume 4, pp 149-70.

Eisenberg, N., Carlo, G., Murphy, B. and Court, P. V. (1995) Prosocial Development in Late Adolescence: A Longitudinal Study, *Child Development*, Volume 66, Number 4, pp 1179-1197.

Evaldsson, A. (2005) Staging Insults and mobilizing categorizations in a multiethnic peer group, *Discourse Society*, Volume 16, pp 763-786

Fabes, R, A., Carlo, G., Kupanoff, K. and Laible, D. (1999a) Early Adolescence and Prosocial/Moral Behavior I: The Role of Individual Processes, *Journal of Early Adolescence*, Volume 19, Issue 1, pp 5-16.

Fabes, R. A., Eisenberg, N., Jones, S., Smith, M., Guthrie, I., Poulin, R., Shepard, S. and Friedman, J. (1999b) Regulation, Emotionality, and Preschoolers' Socially Competent Peer Interactions, *Child Development*, Vol. 70, No. 2, pp. 432-442.

Fabian, H. and Dunlop, A-W (2007) *Outcomes of good practice in transition processes for children entering primary school*. Working Paper 42. Bernard van Leer Foundation: The Hague, The Netherlands.

Fantuzzo, J. W., Bulotsky-Shearer, R., Fusco, R. A., and McWayne, C (2005) An investigation of preschool classroom behavioral adjustment problems and social emotional school readiness competencies, *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, Volume 20, pp 259–275.

Farrington, Leober and Kalb (2001) 'Key Research and Policy Issues', in R. Leober and D. P. Farrington (eds.) *Child Delinquents: Development, Intervention and Service Needs*. London: Sage Publishing.

Filipi, A. (2009) *Toddler and Parent Interaction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Philadelphia.

Fine, G. A., & Sandstrom, K. L. (1988). Knowing children: Participant observation with minors. *Sage University Paper Series on Qualitative Research Methods*. Sage: Beverly Hills, California.

Fitzgerald, R., Housley, W. and Butler, C. Paper: 109, *Omni-relevance and Interactional Context*. ISBN: 978-1-904815-74-7. www.cardiff.ac.co.uk/socsi

Forman, G. (1999) Instant Videoing Revisiting: The Video Camera as a 'Tool of the Mind' for Young Children, *Early Childhood Research and Practice*, Volume 1, Number 2, pp

Fox, C. L and Boulton, M. J. (2006) Longitudinal Associations between Submissive / Nonassertive Social Behaviour and Different Types of Peer Victimization, *Violence and Victims*, Volume 21, pp 383 – 400.

Francis, D and Hester, S. (2004) *An Invitation to Ethnomethodology*, London, Sage.

Garandau, C. F. and Cillessen, A. H. N. (2006) From indirect aggression to invisible aggression: A conceptual view on bullying and peer group manipulation, *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Volume 11, pp 612– 625.

Gardner, H and Forrester, M. (2010) *Analysing Interactions in Childhood: Insights from Conversation Analysis*. Chichester: John Wiley and sons Ltd.

Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Oxford, Prentice-Hall.

Garfinkel, H. (2002) *Ethnomethodology's Program*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Gifford-Smith, M.E. and C.A. Brownell (2003) Childhood Peer Relationships: Social Acceptance, Friendships, and Peer Networks, *Journal of School Psychology*, Volume 41, pp 235-284.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y., Gadfield, N. J., Davies, G. J. and Davies, A. P. (1976) 'Cognitive Aspects of Humor in Social Interaction: A Model and Some Linguistic Data' in A. J. Chapman and H. C. Foot (eds.) *Humour and Laughter: Theory, Research and Applications*. London: Wiley and Sons.

Gini, G. (2006) Bullying as a social process: The role of group membership in students' perception of inter-group aggression at school, *Journal of School Psychology*, Volume 44, pp 51–65.

Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich S. A. and Pugh, M. D. (1986) Friendships and Delinquency, *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 91, No. 5, pp. 1170-1202.

Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Pennsylvania; University of Pennsylvania.

Goldstein, S. E., Tisak, M. S., Persson, A. V. and Boxer, P. (2006) Children's Evaluations of Ambiguous Provocation by Relationally Aggressive, Physically Aggressive and Prosocial Peers. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, Volume 24, Number 4, pp 701 – 708.

Goodwin, C (1981) *Conversational Organisation: Interaction Between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, C. (2000) Action and Embodiment within situated human interaction, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 32, pp 1489-1522.

Goodwin, C (2003a) Pointing as Situated Practice' in S. Kita (Ed.) *Pointing: Where Language, Culture and Cognition Meet*, New Jersey; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goodwin, C. (2003b) 'The Body in Action' in J. Coupland and R. Gwyn (eds.) *Discourse, the Body and Identity*. Hampshire; Palgrave.

Goodwin, C. (2007) Participation, stance and affect in the organisation of activities, *Discourse and Society*, Volume 18, Number 1, pp 53 – 73.

Goodwin, C and Heritage, J (1990) Conversation Analysis, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Volume 19, pp 283-307.

Goodwin, C and Duranti, A. (1992) 'Rethinking Context: An Introduction' in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Goodwin, M. H. (1998) "Games of Stance: Conflict and Footing in Hopscotch." In S. Hoyle and C. Temple Adger (eds.) *Kids' Talk: Strategic Language Use in Later Childhood*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Goodwin, M. H. (2002) Building power asymmetries in girls' interaction, *Discourse Society*, Volume 13, pp 715-730.

Goodwin, M. H. (2006) *The Hidden Life of Girls: Games of Stance, Status and Exclusion* (Blackwell Studies in Discourse and Culture). London: Wiley Blackwell.

Goodwin, M. H and Goodwin, C (1987) 'Children's Arguing' in S. U. Philips, S. Steele and C. Tanz (eds.) *Language, gender & sex in comparative perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C and Goodwin, M. H (1992) 'Assessments and the construction of context' in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.) *Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Goodwin, W. L. and Goodwin, L. D. (1996) *Understanding Quantitative and Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education*. Teachers College Press, New York.

Goodwin, M. H. and Goodwin, C. (2000) 'Emotion within Situated Activity' in N. Budwig, I. C. Uzgris and J. V. Wertsch, *Communication: An Arena of Development*, Stamford CT: Ablex, 2000.

Goodwin, M. H. and Kyratzis, A. (2007) Children Socializing Children: Practices for Negotiating the Social Order Among Peers, *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, Volume 40, Number 4, pp 279-289.

Gordon, T., Holland, J. and Lahelma, E. (2000) *Making Space; Citizenship and Difference in Schools*. London: MacMillan Press.

Gottfredson, D. C. (2001) *Schools and Delinquency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greener, S., and Crick, N. R. (1999). Children's normative beliefs about prosocial behavior: What does it mean to be nice? *Social Development*, Volume 8, pp 349-363.

Grotberg, E. H (2001) Resilience programmes for children in disaster, *Ambulatory Child Health*, Volume 7, pp 75-83.

Gruman, J. A., Saks, A. M. and Zweig, D. I. (2006) Organisational socialization tactics and newcomer proactive behaviors: An integrative study, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Volume 69, pp 90-104.

Hanks, W. F. (1992) 'The Indexical Ground of Deictic Reference' in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.) *Rethinking Context, Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hargreaves, D. H., Hester, S. K and Mellor, F. J (1975) *Deviance in Classrooms*. London; Routledge.

Harris, J. K (2006) Ethical Perspectives In Information Security Education, *Issues in Information Systems*, Vol VII, Number 1, pp 179-181.

Hart, C. H and Sheehan, R. (1986) Preschoolers' play behaviour in outdoor play environments: Effects of traditional and contemporary playgrounds, *American Educational Research Journal*, Volume 23, Number 4, pp 668-678.

Hartup, W. W. (1996) The Company They Keep: Friendships and Their Developmental Significance, *Child Development*, Volume 67, Number 1, pp. 1-13.

Hartup, W. W., Glazer, J. A. and Charlesworth, R. (1967) Peer Reinforcement and Sociometric Status, *Child Development*, Volume 38, Number 4, pp 1017-1024.

Hartup, W. W., Larsen, B., Steward, M. I., and Eastenson, A. (1988) Conflict and the Friendship Relations of Young Children. *Child Development*, Volume 59, pp 1590 – 1600.

Hassard, J (1990) 'Ethnomethodology and organisational research: an introduction' in J. Hassard and D. Pym (eds.) *The Theory and Philosophy of Organisations: Critical Issues and New Perspectives*, Routledge.

Hay, D. (1994). Prosocial development, *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, Volume 35, pp 29–71.

Hay, D. F., Castle, J., Davies, L., Demetriou, H. and Stimson, C. A. (1999) Prosocial Action in Very Early Childhood, *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, Volume 40, pp 905-916.

Hebl, M. R. and Dovidio, J. F. (2005) Promoting the “Social” in the Examination of Social Stigmas, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, Volume 9, Number 2, pp 156-182.

Hecke, A. V., Mundy, P. C., Acra, C. F., Block, J. J., Delgado, E. F., Parlade, M. V., Neal, A. R., Meyer, J. A., and Pomares, Y. B. (2007) Infant Joint Attention, Temperament, and Social Competence in Preschool Children, *Child Development*, Volume 78, Number 1, Pages 53 – 69.

Hester, S. (1991) The Social Facts of Deviance in School: A Study of Mundane Reason, *The British Journal of Sociology*, Volume 42, Number 3, pp. 443-463.

Hester, S (1998) ‘Describing ‘Deviance’ in School: Recognizably Educational Psychological Problems’ in C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe (eds.) *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage.

Hester, S. and Francis, D. (1997) Reality Analysis in a Classroom Storytelling, *The British Journal of Sociology*, Volume 48, Number 1, pp 95-112.

Holmes, J. and Marra, M. (2002) Having a laugh at work: how humour contributes to workplace culture, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 34, pp1683–1710.

Home Office (2004) '*Defining and Measuring Antisocial Behaviour*', Development and Practice Report 26: Research, Development and Statistics Directorate. ISBN: 1 84473 332 7.

Housley, W. and Fitzgerald, R. (2002) The Reconsidered Model of Membership Categorization Analysis. *Qualitative Research*, Volume 2, Number 1, pp 59 – 83.

Hutchby, I (2005) Children's Talk and Social Competence, *Children & Society*, Volume 19, pp. 66–73.

Hutchby, I and Woofit, R. (1998) *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*, Cambridge, Blackwell Publishers.

Jackson, M and Tisak, M. S (2001) Is prosocial behaviour a good thing? Developmental changes in children's evaluations of helping, sharing, cooperating, and comforting, *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, Volume 19, 349–367.

Jacoby, S and Ochs, E (1995) Co-Construction: An Introduction, *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, Volume 28, Number 3, pp 171-183.

Jefferson, G. (1974) Error Correction as an Interactional Resource, *Language and Society*, Volume 2, pp181-199.

Jefferson, G. (1984) Notes on a systematic Deployment of the Acknowledgment tokens 'Yeah' and 'Mmhm', *Papers in Linguistics*, Volume 17, Number 2, pp 197 – 206.

Jefferson, G. (1986) Notes on latency in overlap onset, *Human Studies*, Volume 9, pp 153 – 183

Jefferson, G. (2004). 'Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction' in G. H. Lerner (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

John, M. (2003) *Children's Rights and Power: Charging Up for a New Century*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers

Kalish, C. W. and Shiverick, S. M. (2004) Children's Reasoning About Rules and Preferences as Motives for Behaviour. *Cognitive Development*, Volume 19, pp 401 – 416.

Kiesner, J., Poulin, F. and Nicotra, E. (2003) Peer Relations across Contexts: Individual-Network Homophily and Network Inclusion in and after School, *Child Development*, Vol. 74, No. 5, pp. 1328-1343

Kitzinger, C. (2007) Is 'woman' always relevantly gendered? *Gender and Language*, Volume 1, Number 1, pp 39-48.

Kyrtzis, A. (2004) Talk and Interaction Among Children and the Co-construction of Peer Groups and Peer Culture, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Volume 33, pp 625-649.

Kyrtzis, A. (2007) 'Using the Social Organisational Affordances of Pretend Play in American Preschool Girls' Interactions, *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, Volume 40, Number 4, pp 321 — 352.

Ladd, G. W. (1999) Peer Relationships and Social Competence During Early and Middle Childhood, *Annual Review of Psychology*, Volume 50, pp 339-359.

Lepper, G. (2000) *Categories in Text and Talk*. London, Sage Publications.

Leudar, I., Marsland, V and Nekvapil, J. (2004) On Membership Categorization: 'us', 'them' and 'doing violence' in political discourse, *Discourse and Society*, Volume 15, Number 2-3, pp 243-266.

Leung, S. (2002) Conflict talk: A discourse analytical perspective, *Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, Volume 2, Number 3, pp 1-19.

Lindenberg, S., Fetchenhauer, D., Flache, A. and Buunk, A. P. (2006) 'Solidarity and Prosocial Behavior: A Framing Approach' in D. Fetchenhauer., A. Flache., A. P. Buunk and S. Lindenberg, (eds.) *Solidarity and Prosocial Behavior: An Integration of Sociological and Psychological Perspectives*, America: Springer.

Macbeth, D. (1990) Classroom Order as Practical Action: The Making and Un-Making of a Quiet Reproach, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Volume 11, Number 2, pp 189-214.

Macbeth, D. (1991) 'Teacher authority as practical action', *Linguistics and Education*, Volume 3, pp 281-314.

MacNaughton, G and Rolfe, S. A. (2004) 'The Research Process' in G. Mac Naughton, S A. Rolfe, and I. Siraj-Blatchford (eds.) *Doing Early Childhood Research: International Perspectives on Theory and Practice*. London: Open University Press.

Major, B and O'Brien, L. (2005). The Social Psychology of Stigma, *Annual Review of Psychology*, Volume 56. pp 393-421.

Malone, K and Tranter, P. (2003) Children's Environmental Learning and the Use, Design and Management of Schoolgrounds, *Children, Youth and Environments*, Volume 13, Number 2, pp 1-39.

Markman, E. M. (1989) *Categorization and Naming in Children: Problems of Induction*, London. The MIT Press.

Martin, P. and Bateson, P. (1986) *Measuring Behaviour: An Introductory Guide*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Martin, C. L., Fabes, R. A., Hanish, L. D., and Hollenstein, T. (2005) Social dynamics in the preschool, *Developmental Review*, Volume 25, pp 299- 327

Masson, J. (2004) 'The Legal Context' in S. Fraser, V. Lewis, S. Ding, M. Kellett and C. Robinson (eds.) *Doing Research with Children and Young People*. London: Sage.

Mauthner, M. (1997) 'Methodological aspects of collecting data from children: lessons from three research projects', *Children and Society*, Volume 11, pp16-28.

Maynard, D. W. (1985) How Children Start Arguments, *Language in Society*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 1-29

Maynard, D. W and Clayman, S. E (1991) The Diversity of Ethnomethodology, *Annual Review of Sociology*, Volume 17, pp 385-418.

Maynard, T and Thomas, N (2004) 'Introduction' in T. Maynard and N. Thomas (eds.) *An Introduction to Early Childhood Studies*. London: Sage.

Maynard, D. W and Zimmerman, D. H (1984) Topical Talk, Ritual and the Social Organisation of Relationships, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No. 4, pp. 301-316.

McHoul, A., Rapley, M and Antaki, C. (2008) You gotta light? On the luxury of context for understanding talk in interaction, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 40, pp827-839.

McMahon, S. S., Wernsman, J., Parnes, A. L. (2006) Understanding Prosocial Behaviour: The Impact of Empathy and Gender Among African American Adolescents, *Journal of Adolescent Health*, Volume 39, pp 135–137.

McWhinney, B. (2007) *The CHILDES Project: Tools for Analyzing Talk - Electronic Edition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Ministry of Education. (1996). *Te Whāriki: He Whāriki mātauranga mō ngā mokopuna o Aotearoa: Early childhood curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.

Mooij, T. (1999a) Promoting prosocial pupil behaviour: 1-A multilevel theoretical model, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Volume 69, pp 469–478

Mooij, T. (1999b) Promoting prosocial pupil behaviour: 2 – Secondary school intervention and pupil effects, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Volume 69, pp 479 – 504.

Moss, P and Petrie, P. (2002) *From Children's Services to Children's Spaces: Public Policy, Children and Childhood*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

NCB National Children's Bureau 'Antisocial Behaviour'
<http://www.ncb.org.uk/issues/detail.asp?PID=217> (accessed online
February 2006)

NCB National Children's Bureau [www]
http://www.ncb.org.uk/ourwork/research_guidlines (accessed online
February 2006).

NCB (National Children's Bureau) (2008) *Media Portrayal of Young People – impact and influences* http://www.youngncb.org.uk/PDF/yrn_final_report.pdf

National Statistics (2001) www.neighborhood.statistics.gov.uk

Nelson, D and Crick, N. R, (1999). Rose-coloured glasses: Examining the social information processing of prosocial young adolescents, *Journal of Early Adolescents*, 19, 17-38).

Ochs, E. (1979). 'Transcription as theory' in E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin (eds.), *Developmental pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.

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

OFSTED. (2005) '*Managing challenging behaviour*' (HMI 2363), London: HMSO.

Olweus, D. (1977) Aggression and Acceptance in Adolescent Boys: Two Short-Term Longitudinal Studies of Ratings, *Child Development*, Vol 48, Number 4, pp 1301 – 1313.

Owenby, M. D (2005) *Linguistic Diversity: A qualitative analysis of foreign language teachers' category assembly*, Published PhD dissertation

Olweus, D., Block, J and Radke-Yarrow, M. (1986) 'Introduction' in D. Olweus., J. Block and M. Radke-Yarrow (eds.) *Development of Antisocial and Prosocial Behaviour: Research, Theories and Issues*. London: Academic Press.

Parrott, D. J and Giancola, P. R (2007) Addressing "The criterion Problem" in the assessment of aggressive behaviour: Development of a new taxonomic system, *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Volume 12, Number 3, pp 280–299.

Perakyla, A (2004) 'Reliability and validity in research based on naturally occurring social interaction' in D. Silverman (ed.) *Qualitative Research: theory, method and practice*. London: Sage.

Pellegrini, A. D and Blatchford, P. (2000) *The Child at School: Interactions With Peers and Teachers*. London, Arnold.

Pellegrini, A. D. and Bohn, C. M. (2005) The Role of Recess in Children's Cognitive Performance and School Adjustment, *Educational Researcher*, Volume 34, pp 13-19.

Pellegrini, A. D., Symons, F. J and Hoch, J. (2004) *Observing Children In Their Natural Worlds: A Methodological Primer* (second edition). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Penner, L. A., Dovidio. J. F., Piliavin, J. A. and Schroeder, D. A. (2005) Prosocial Behaviour: Multilevel Perspectives, *Annual Review of Psychology*, Volume 56, pp 365-92.

Pepler, D. J and Craig, W. M (1995) A Peek Behind the Fence: Naturalistic Observations of Aggressive Children with Remote Audiovisual Recording, *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 31. No. 4, pp 548-553.

Pink, S. (2001) *Doing Visual Ethnography: images, media and representation in research*. London: Sage Publications.

Pollner, M. and Emerson, R. (2001) 'Ethnomethodology and ethnography', in P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland and L. Lofland (eds.) *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: Sage.

Pomerantz, A. (1984) 'Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes' in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A and Fehr, B. J. (1997) 'Conversation Analysis: An Approach to the Study of Social Action as Sense Making Practices' in Teun A. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse As Social Interaction*. London: Sage.

Prinstein, M. J and Dodge, K. A. (2008) 'Current Issues in Peer Influence Research' in M. J. Prinstein and K. A. Dodge (eds.) *Understanding Peer Influence in Children and Adolescents*. Guilford Press: Guilford.

Prout, A. (2000) Children's Participation: Control and Self-realisation in British Late Modernity, *Children and Society*, Volume 14, pp 304-315.

Psathas, G (1990) *Interactional competence*. Washington D.C., University Press of America.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation Analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction* (Qualitative Research Methods Series 35). London: Sage.

Psathas, G. (1999) Studying the Organisation in Action: Membership Categorization and Interaction Analysis, *Human Studies*, Volume 22, pp 139–162.

Rasmussen, K. (2004) Places for Children – Children’s Places, *Childhood*, Volume 11, Number 2, pp155-173

Rogoff, B. (2003) *The Cultural Nature of Human Development*. Oxford; Oxford University Press.

Rolfe, S. A. (2004) ‘ Direct Observation’ in G. Mac Naughton, S A. Rolfe, and I. Siraj-Blatchford (eds.) *Doing Early Childhood Research: International Perspectives on Theory and Practice*. London: Open University Press.

Rolfe, S A. and Mac Naughton, G. (2004) ‘Research as a Tool’ in G. Mac Naughton, S A. Rolfe, and I. Siraj-Blatchford (eds.) *Doing Early Childhood Research: International Perspectives on Theory and Practice*. London: Open University Press.

Rose, A. J and Asher, S. R (1999) Children’s Goals and Strategies in Response to Conflicts within a Friendship, *Developmental Psychology*, Volume 35, pp 69 – 79.

Rose, A. J., Swenson, L. P and Carlson, W. (2004) Friendships of aggressive youth: Considering the influences of being disliked and of being perceived as popular, *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, Volume 88, pp 25–45.

Rutland, A., Brown, R. J., Cameron, L., Ahmavaara, A., Arnold, K. and Samson, J. (2006) Development of the positive–negative asymmetry effect: In-group exclusion norm as a mediator of children’s evaluations on negative attributes, *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Volume 37, pp 171–190.

Sacks, H. (1972) ‘An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology’ in D. Sudnow (ed.) *Studies in social interaction*. New York: Free Press.

Sacks, H. (1992a). *Lectures on conversation (Vol. I)*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H. (1992b). *Lectures on conversation (Vol. II)*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H and Schegloff, E. A (1979) ‘Two preferences in the Organisation of Reference to Persons in Conversation and Their Interaction’ in G. Psathas (ed.) *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Irvington Press, New York.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A and Jefferson, G. (1974) A Simplest Systematics for the Organisation of Turn-Taking for Conversation, *Language*, Volume 50, pp 696 – 735.

Sampson, H. (2004) Navigating the Waves: the usefulness of a pilot in qualitative research, *Qualitative Research*, Volume 4, Number 3, pp 383-402.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968) Sequencing in Conversational Openings, *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 70, No. 6, pp. 1075-1095

Schegloff, E. A. (1980) Preliminaries to Preliminaries “Can I Ask You a Question”, *Sociological Enquiry*, Volume 50, Issues 3 – 4, pp 104 – 152.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991) 'Reflections on Talk and Social Structure' in D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (eds.) *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992a) Repair After Next Turn: The Last Structurally Provided Defense of Intersubjectivity in Conversation, *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 97, No. 5, pp. 1295-1345

Schegloff, E. A. (1992b). 'In another context' in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.) *Rethinking Context: language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996a) Confirming Allusions: Toward an Empirical Account of Action, *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 102, No. 1, pp. 161-216.

Schegloff, Emanuel (1996b) Turn organisation: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In: E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff, and S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997) Whose text: Whose context? *Discourse and Society*, Volume 8, Number 2, pp 165 – 187.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999) Naivete vs Sophistication or Discipline vs Self-Indulgence: A Rejoinder to Billig, *Discourse Society*; Volume 10, pp 577-582.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000a) Getting Serious: Joke – serious 'no', *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 33, pp 1947 – 1955.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000b) Overlapping Talk and the Organisation of Turn-Taking for Conversation, *Language in Society*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 1-63.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007a) *Sequence Organisation in Interaction: A Primer in Conversational Analysis* (Volume 1), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007b) A tutorial on membership categorization, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 39, pp 462–482.

Schegloff, E. A. and Sacks, H (1973) Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, Volume 8, Number 4, pp 289 – 327.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G and Sacks, H. (1977) The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organisation of Repair in Conversation, *Language*, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 361-382

Schegloff, E. A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S. and Olsher, D. (2002) Conversation Analysis and Applied Linguistics, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Volume 22, pp 3 – 31.

Schiffrin, D. (1977) Opening Encounters, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 42, No. 5, pp. 679-691.

Schultz, A. (1962) collected papers 1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Scott, S., Knapp, M., Henderson, J. & Maughan, B. (2001). Financial cost of social exclusion: follow up study of antisocial children into adulthood, *British Medical Journal*, Volume 323, pp 1-5.

Seedhouse, P. (2005a) 'Conversation Analysis as Research Methodology' in K. Richards and P. Seedhouse (eds.) *Applying Conversation Analysis*. Hampshire; Palgrave Macmillan

Seedhouse, P. (2005b) Conversation Analysis and language learning, *Language Teaching*, Volume 38, pp 165-187

Shantz, C. U. (1987) Conflicts between Children, *Child Development*, Vol. 58, No. 2, pp. 283-305.

Sheridan, S. M., Buhs, E. S. and Warnes, E. D. (2003) Childhood Peer Relationships in Context, *Journal of School Psychology*, Volume 41, pp 285-292.

Sidnell, J. (2010) *Conversation Analysis: An introduction*. Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.

Silverman, D. (1998) *Harvey Sacks; social science and conversation analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Silverman, D. (2004) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. London, Sage.

Silverman, D. (2006) *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London: Sage.

Simpson, R., & Cohen, C. (2004). Dangerous work: The gendered nature of bullying in the context of higher education. *Gender, Work and Organisation*, Volume 11, Number 2, pp 163–186.

Sinclair, S., Huntsinger, J., Skorinko, J. and Hardin, C. D. (2005) Social Tuning of the Self: Consequences for the Self-Evaluations of Stereotype Targets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Volume 89, No. 2, pp 160–175.

Siraj-Blatchford, I and Siraj-Blatchford, J. (2004) 'An ethnographic approach to researching young children's learning' in G. Mac Naughton., S. A. Rolfe, and I. Siraj-Blatchford (eds.) *Doing Early Childhood Research: International Perspectives on Theory and Practice*. Berkshire, Open University Press.

Sluckin, A. (1981) *Growing up in the Primary School Playground*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Stevenson, J. and Goodman, R. (2001) Association between behaviour at age 3 years and adult criminality, *British Journal of Psychiatry*, Volume 179, pp 197-202

Stevenson-Hinde, J., Hinde, R. A and Simpson, A. E (1986) 'Behavior at Home and Friendly or Hostile Behavior in Preschool' in D, Olweus., J. Block and M. Radke-Yarrow (eds.) *Development of Antisocial and Prosocial Behaviour: Research, Theories and Issues*, London, Academic Press.

Stivers, T. and Rossano, F. (2010) Mobilizing Response, *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, Volume 43, Number 1, pp 3-31.

Stokoe, E. (2006) On ethnomethodology, feminism, and the analysis of categorical reference to gender in talk-in-interaction, *The Sociological Review*, Volume 54, Number 3, pp 467-494.

Stokoe, E. H and Weatherall, A. (2002) Guest Editorial: Gender, language, conversation analysis and feminism, *Discourse and Society*, Volume 13, Number 6, pp 707–713.

Tapper, K. and Boulton, M. J. (2002) Studying aggression in school children: The use of wireless microphone and micro video camera, *Aggressive Behaviour*, Volume 28, pp 356-365.

Tapper, K. and Boulton, M. J. (2005) Victim and Peer Group Responses to Different forms of Aggression Among Primary School Children, *Aggressive Behaviour*, Volume 31, pp 238-253.

Ten Have, P. (2000) *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: Sage.

Ten Have, P (2004) *Understanding Qualitative Research and Ethnomethodology*. London: Sage.

Theobald, M, A and Danby, S. J (2009) "Well, Now I'm Upset": moral and social orders in the playground. In Cromdal, J and Theobald, M. (eds.) *Morality and Interaction*. Equinox Publishing Ltd, New York.

Thornborrow J. 1998. 'Children's participation in the discourse of children's television' in I. Hutchby and J. Moran-Ellis (eds). *Children and Social Competence: Arenas of Action*. Falmer Press: London.

Thorne, B. (2004) 'Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School' in V. Lewis., M. Kellet., C. Robinson., S. Fraser and S. Ding (eds.) *The Reality of Research with Children and Young People*. London: Sage.

Tobin, J.J., Wu, D. Y. H., and Davidson, D. H. (1989) *Preschool in Three Cultures*. Yale: Yale University Press.

Tobin, J.J., Hsueh, Y., and Karasawa, M. (2009) *Preschool in Three Cultures Revisited*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Vaillancourt, T. and Hymel, S. (2006) Aggression and Social Status: The Moderating Roles of Sex and Peer-Valued Characteristics, *Aggressive Behaviour*, Volume 32, pp396 – 408.

Van Dijk, T. A (1993) Principles of critical discourse analysis, *Discourse and Society*, Volume 4, pp 249- 283.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997) 'Discourse as Interaction in Society' in van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse Studies, A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage.

Veenstra, R. (2006) 'The Development of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Adolescence' in D. Fetchenhauer., A. Flache., A. P. Buunk and S. Lindenberg, (eds.) *Solidarity and Prosocial Behavior: An Integration of Sociological and Psychological Perspectives*. America: Springer.

WAG. (2008). *Foundation Phase; Framework for Children's Learning for 3to 7-year-olds in Wales*. Department for Children, Education and Lifelong Learning Skills. Ref: AC/CM/0825. ISBN: 978 0 7504 4429 3

Warden, D., Cheyne, B., Christie, D., Fitzpatrick, H., and Reid, K. (2003) Assessing children's perceptions of prosocial and antisocial peer behavior, *Educational Psychology*, Volume 23, number 5, pp 547 - 567.

Weatherall, A. (2002) Towards understanding gender and talk-in-interaction, *Discourse and Society*, Volume 13, Number 6, pp 767-781.

Weinberg, M., Tronick, E., Cohn, J., & Olson, K. (1999). Gender differences in emotional expressivity and self-regulation during early infancy, *Developmental Psychology*, 35, 175–188.

WHO (World Health Organisation) (2002) '*Prevention and Promotion in Mental Health*' (WM 31.5), Geneva, WHO

Widdicombe, S and Woofit, R. (1995) *The Language of Youth Subcultures: social identity in action*. London, T J Press.

Willoughby, M., Kupersmidt, J. and Bryant, D. (2001) Overt and Covert Dimensions of Antisocial Behavior in Early Childhood, *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 177–187.

Wilson, B. J. (1999) Entry Behaviour and Emotion Regulation Abilities of Developmentally Delayed Boys, *Developmental Psychology*, Volume 35, pp 214 – 222.

Xie, H., Swift, D. J., Cairns, B. D., Cairns, R. B. (2002) Aggressive Behaviors in Social Interaction and Developmental Adaptation: A Narrative Analysis of Interpersonal Conflicts During Early Adolescence. *Social Development*, Volume 11, Number 2, pp 205–224.

Young, R (1980) Autonomy and Socialization, *Mind*, Volume LXXXIX, pp 565 – 576.

Appendix 1 – Consent forms

1a - Explanatory statement (Head Teacher)

Project: An investigation into the inclusive and exclusive pro-social behavior of four-year-old children in the school playground.

NOTE: Please keep this explanatory statement and researcher contact details

Amanda Bateman
C/O Department of Childhood Studies
Swansea University
Singleton Park
Swansea, SA2 8PP
Home: 01982 55 1053
Mobile: 07890 151818

[Date]

Dear,

I am currently organising a research project for my PhD dissertation which involves the observation of four-year-old children regarding their social interactions in the school playground. The research is designed to provide a better understanding of children's prosocial behaviour with peers. I would be very grateful if you would allow me access to complete my study in your school. The time framework would involve one observation session a day (eg morning playtime) for several weeks throughout one academic year, scheduled at the convenience of children and teaching staff. The research project would involve using video camera images and audio recordings of the children's speech where access to the original data (video and audio recordings) will be restricted to myself and my supervisor.

A letter to the parents/carers seeking consent and informing about dates and times of research will be provided on your acceptance. If you wish to discuss any issues please contact me either through the Department or on one of the telephone numbers above.

Thank you very much for your time.

Amanda Bateman.

Signature:

Date:

1b - Consent Form (Head Teacher)

Project: An investigation into the inclusive and exclusive pro-social behavior of four-year-old children in the school playground.

NOTE: This consent form will remain with the Swansea University researcher for their records

I agree to take part in the Swansea University research project specified above. I have had the project explained to me, and I have read the Explanatory Statement, which I keep for my records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I give consent for the four-year-old children within my school to have their social interactions observed through the use of video and audio recordings.

I understand that my consent and my pupil's participation is voluntary, that we can choose not to participate in part or all of the project and withdraw at any stage of the project.

I understand that any data for use in reports or published findings will not, under any circumstances, contain names or identifying characteristics.

Name of School:

Head teacher's name:

Head teacher's signature:

Date:

1c - Explanatory statement (Teacher)

An investigation into the inclusive and exclusive pro-social behavior of four-year-old children in the school playground.

NOTE: Please keep this information sheet and contact details.

Amanda Bateman
C/O Department of Childhood Studies
Swansea University
Singleton Park
Swansea, SA2 8PP
Home: 01982 55 1053
Mobile: 07890 151818

Dear,

I am currently organising a research project for my PhD dissertation which involves the observation of four-year-old children regarding their social interactions in the school playground. I would be very grateful if you would allow me access to observe the four-year-old children from your class at playtime in order for me to complete my study. The time framework would involve one playtime a day for several weeks throughout one academic year, scheduled at the convenience of children and teaching staff. The research project would involve using video camera images and audio recordings of the children's speech at playtime.

A letter to the parents/carers seeking consent and informing about dates and times of research will be provided on your acceptance. If you wish to discuss any issues please contact me either in person or on my home phone number above.
Thank you very much for your time.

Amanda Bateman,

Signature:

Date:

1d – Consent form (Teacher)

Project: An investigation into the inclusive and exclusive pro-social behavior of four-year-old children in the school playground.

NOTE: This consent form will remain with the Swansea University researcher for their records

I agree to take part in the Swansea University research project specified above. I have had the project explained to me, and I have read the Explanatory Statement, which I keep for my records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I give consent for the four-year-old children within my class to have their social interactions observed through the use of video and audio recordings at playtime.

I understand that my consent and my pupil's participation is voluntary, that we can choose not to participate in part or all of the project and withdraw at any stage of the project.

I understand that any data for use in reports or published findings will not, under any circumstances, contain names or identifying characteristics.

Name of School:

Class teacher's name:

Class teacher's signature:

Date:

1e - Explanatory statement (parent/guardian)

Project: An investigation into the inclusive and exclusive pro-social behavior of four-year-old children in the school playground.

NOTE: Please keep this explanatory statement and researcher contact details

Amanda Bateman
C/O Department of Childhood Studies
Swansea University
Singleton Park
Swansea, SA2 8PP
Home: 01982 551053
Mobile:07890 151818

[Date]

Dear Parent / Guardian,

My name is Amanda Bateman and I am a qualified nursery nurse currently studying a PhD at Swansea University. As part of my research I am investigating four-year-old children's social interactions in the school playground in order to observe how positive behaviour is used individually and within peer groups. This research aims to provide a proactive approach to the study of antisocial behaviour development due to the recognition that it is a problem within even the youngest children within our society.

As your child is of this age s/he will be given the opportunity to take part in the study which will involve their social interactions being videoed and their speech being recorded for one playtime a day. The gathered information will be kept confidential as only myself and my supervisor will have access to it, and anonymous as no names will be used within the research. Should you choose to give consent for your child to participate in this study, you and your child reserve the right to withdraw at any time. If there are any questions you would like to ask me about this research please do not hesitate to contact me at the address or telephone number above.

Thank you for your time.

Amanda Bateman.

Signature:

Date:

If – Consent form (parent/guardian)

Project: An investigation into the inclusive and exclusive pro-social behavior of four-year-old children in the school playground.

NOTE: This consent form will remain with the Swansea University researcher for their records

I agree to take part in the Swansea University research project specified above. I have had the project explained to me, and I have read the Explanatory Statement, which I keep for my records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I give consent for my child to have their social interactions observed through the use of video and audio recordings.

I understand that my consent and my child's participation is voluntary, that my child can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that s/he can withdraw at any stage of the project.

I understand that any data for use in reports or published findings will not, under any circumstances, contain names or identifying characteristics.

Child's name:

Parent/Guardian's name:

Parent/Guardian's signature:

Date:

1g - Explanatory statement for the parent/guardian of non-participating children

Project: An investigation into the inclusive and exclusive pro-social behavior of four-year-old children in the school playground.

NOTE: Please keep this explanatory statement and researcher contact details

Amanda Bateman
C/O Department of Childhood Studies
Swansea University
Singleton Park
Swansea, SA2 8PP
Home: 01982 551053
Mobile:07890 151818

[Date]

Dear Parent / Guardian,

My name is Amanda Bateman and I am a qualified nursery nurse currently studying a PhD at Swansea University. As part of my research I am investigating four-year-old children's social interactions in the school playground in order to observe how positive behaviour is used individually and within peer groups. This research aims to provide a

proactive approach to the study of antisocial behaviour development due to the recognition that it is a problem within even the youngest children within our society.

This letter is to inform you that video and audio recordings of the four-year-old children will be taken within the school playground for one playtime a day during the week 2nd – 6th July. Although your child is not aged four years, and so not required for the study, it is possible that their images or voices may be partially recorded during the research process with the participants. If this does occur the gathered information will be kept confidential as only myself and my supervisor will have access to it, and anonymous as no names will be used within the research. If there are any questions you would like to ask me about this research please do not hesitate to contact me at the address or telephone number above.

Thank you for your time.

Amanda Bateman. Signature: Date

Appendix 2 - Transcription Documents

2a - Emma

1 @Begin
2 @Languages: en
3 @Participants: Emma Playmate, Rowan Playmate, Kerry Playmate, Kathy
4 Playmate, Dave Playmate, Sue Playmate
5 @ID: Emma/targetchild
6 @ID: Rowan/female
7 @ID: Kerry/female
8 @ID: Kathy/female
9 @ID: Dave/male
10 @ID: Sue/female
11 @Date: 17-OCT-2007
12 @Situation: morning playtime in primary school playground. Emma walks
13 over to a hut which is occupied by one girl, Rowan. She stands at the
14 entrance.
15 Emma: ↑can I come i:n:
16 Rowan: =yes ((stands up and walks towards the entrance where Emma is
17 standing))
18 Emma: () ke↑rry↓ ()
19 Rowan: ↑can I just go get my petit fleur.
20 Emma: ((nods head))
21 Rowan: hhh? ((runs into the playground))
22 ((Emma sits at the entrance of the hut and lifts her leg up across
23 the entrance of the hut, blocking the way. Emma sits alone for
24 thirty-one seconds. Rowan returns. Emma and Rowan exchange eye
25 contact. Emma lowers her leg and Rowan walks into the hut and sits

26 down))

27 Emma: will you sit by yer with your fing up while I go and get kerry?

28 Rowan: °yep° ((moves to the entrance where Emma was sitting and puts

29 her leg across the doorway))

30 ((Emma walks across the playground and talks to two girls, Kerry and

31 Kathy))

32 Emma: kerry=do you want to play mums and da:ds.

33 Kerry: =no we're playing fa:milies. ((very breif eye contact with Emma when

34 Emma calls Kerry's name))

35 Kathy: no

36 ((Emma walks back to the hut which is now occupied by two boys as

37 well as Rowan))

38 Emma: rowan don't let anyone i:::n:

39 Rowan: =I di:dn't they just pushed through:: ((meets Emma's gaze))

40 Dave: I didn't I just (1.7) went around and (2.2) up through there ((points at the

41 window on the side of the hut))

42 Rowan: that one pushed in ((points at one of the boys))

43 Emma: right.

44 Emma: ↑can I sit there now Row.

45 ((Rowan moves across the bench and Emma sits next to the entrance))

46 Dave: ()

47 ((Sue is standing outside the hut, looks at Emma, enters the hut and

48 sits opposite Emma. Emma looks at Rowan))

49 Emma: only from our class is allowed (0.4) in isn't it

@End

2b - Katie 1

1 @Begin
2 @Languages: en
3 @Participants:Katie Playmate, Mel Playmate, Mike Playmate, Jim Playmate,
4 Cole Playmate
5 @ID: Katie/targetchild
6 @ID: Mel/female
7 @ID: Mike/male
8 @ID: Jim/male
9 @ID: Cole/male
10 @Date: 09-OCT-2007
11 @Situation: morning playtime in primary school playground. Katie and Mel
12 are playing in the climbing frame area. Mike and Jim come running
13 over to them.
14 Mike: sissy girls. ((looks in Mel and Katie's direction))
15 ((Mel and Katie look at Mike))
16 Mike: you're not allowed that. ((points to the MP3 player))
17 (1.8)
18 Katie: we:ll ((steps backwards and holds onto the MP3 player))
19 (2.2)
20 Katie: I ((steps backwards again so she is right next to Mel))
21 (1.7))
22 Katie: we:ll [any↑way.]
23 ((Jim walks up to Katie and looks closer at the MP3 player))
24 Jim: [what is it]
25 Katie: a ↓mi:crophone
26 Jim: .hhh

2c - Ricky

1 @Begin
2 @Languages: en
3 @Participants: Ricky Playmate, Scot Playmate, Tina Playmate, Kate Playmate,
4 Mel Playmate
5 @ID: Ricky/male/targetchild
6 @ID: Scot/male
7 @ID: Tina/female
8 @ID: Kate/female
9 @ID: Mel/female
10 @Date: 11-OCT-2007
11 @Situation: morning playtime in primary school playground. Ricky and
12 Scot are standing still, watching children play. Tina looks at
13 Ricky and Scot, moves in a circle around them then folds her
14 arms and shuffles up to them. Tina speaks to Scot.
15 Tina: ↑mm↓mm↑mm.
16 Tina: ↑wh::y you ↓li::ke ↑apple.
17 (0.6)
18 Scot: what?
19 Tina: ↑wh::y you ↓li::ke ↑apple.
20 Scot: coz i **do::** ((reaches forward and puts his hand on her arm))
21 ((Ricky takes sudden and large steps backwards away from Tina and
22 Scot. Scot looks at Ricky. Tina pushes Scott's hand off her
23 folded arms and looks at Ricky. Scot looks at Tina and then
24 back to Ricky. Ricky continues stepping backwards)) (5.4)
25 Ricky: ↑run away from her.
26 Ricky: ↑run away.
27 Scott: ((looks at Ricky and starts walking towards him, away from Tina))

28 Tina: **no** ((turns to Ricky. Scott looks back at Tina but continues to walk away
29 with Ricky))
30 Scot: yes
31 Scot: run away ((Scott and Ricky start running away from Tina into the
32 playground))
33 ((Tina chases both boys around the playground. Tina runs
34 in-between Scott and Ricky and continues to run after
35 Scott. Ricky continues to run behind Scot and Tina, but quickly
36 runs in-between them as they pass him. Tina runs past Ricky and
37 touches his arm as she passes him and then continues to run
38 after Scott. Tina catches up with Scott and grabs the sleeve of his
39 jumper. Ricky runs up to them))
40 Ricky: get **off** ((looks cross and pulls Scot and Tina's hands apart))
41 ((Tina is still smiling. Mel and Kate approach Tina))
42 Kate: do want to play with us mr wolf.
43 Mel: ()
44 Kate: ()
45 ((the girls run off into the playground together))
46 Scot: lets go ((the boys walk off into the playground))
@End

2d - Tina, Katie and Mel

1 @Begin

2 @Languages: en

3 @Participants: Tina Playmate, Katie Playmate, Mel Playmate

4 @ID: Tina/female/targetchild

5 @ID: Katie/female

6 @ID: Mel/female

7 @Date: 19-OCT-2007

8 @Situation: morning playtime in primary school playground. Tina and
9 Katie run into the playground together and stand next to a hut. Tina
10 is eating a packet of berries.

11 Katie: hhh?

12 Katie: ↑what are they.

13 Tina: ↓berries?

14 (15.3)

15 Katie: **Mel** ((Katie starts running across the playground towards Mel. Tina
16 runs with her))

17 Mel: **Katie**.

18 ((Katie and Mel hug each-other. Mel lifts Katie slightly off the
19 floor and then puts her down. Tina moves close to Mel, puts her
20 hand on Mel's shoulder, leans in and speaks to her))

21 Tina: ()

22 Katie: **no.** ((lets go of Mel and turns to speak to Tina))

23 Tina: °↓mmhm↑° ((lifts her hand off Mel and lifts her heels off the floor and
24 back down as she backs away from Mel))

25 Mel: ((looks at Katie and then back to Tina))

26 Katie: ((bends down to tighten her shoe laces))

27 Mel: have you got that thing. ((looks at the MP3 player around Tina's neck))
 28 Tina: °yeah (0.6) it's there°
 29 Katie: ((stands upright and turns to face Tina))
 30 Katie: ↑don't ↓pla:y with us ((creaky voice))
 31 Tina: °↓why↓°
 32 Katie: ↑co:::↓z i=said so ((creaky voice)) ((holds Mel's hand and runs, pulling
 33 her across the playground))
 34 Mel: a:r:g:h
 35 ((Tina grabs on to the sleeve of Mel's jumper and runs along with
 36 them, smiling. Katie looks at Tina, stops running and lets go of
 37 Mel's hand. Mel and Tina stop running))
 38 Katie: i don't wa:nt tina to pl:a::y. ((walks between Mel and Tina, grabs Mel's
 39 hand and pulls her away from Tina))
 40 ((The girls stand and look at each-other)) (3.6)
 41 Katie: come on ()
 42 ((Katie runs, pulling Mel with her. Tina stands on her own for 4
 43 seconds and then runs in the direction of Mel and Katie. Tina reaches
 44 Mel and Katie. Katie takes a couple of steps in between Tina and Mel))
 45 Tina: you haven't got one of them have you?
 46 (6.3)
 47 ((Mel starts walking toward the climbing frame. Tina follows with Katie
 48 behind her)) (4.7)
 49 Tina: i () we don't need our coats look (0.6) we don't need our coats on
 50 it's not that cold?
 51 ((Katie has a coat on, Mel and Tina do not))
 52 Mel: i was freezing this morning but now it's gone warm.
 53 ((Mel walks back into the playground. Katie runs to catch up with Mel
 54 and holds her hand. Tina falls behind slightly but runs to catch
 55 up with Mel and Katie. Tina puts her hand out and Mel holds it. The
 56 girls continue into the playground together))
 @End

2e - Harry, Dean and Mark

1 @Begin
2 @Languages: en
3 @Participants: Harry Playmate, Dean Playmate, Mark Playmate,
4 Phil Playmate, Stephen Playmate, Gareth Playmate, Carl Playmate
5 @ID: Harry/targetchild/male
6 @ID: Dean/male
7 @ID: Mark/male
8 @ID: Phil/male
9 @ID: Stephen/male
10 @ID: Gareth/male
11 @ID: Carl/male
12 @Date: 16-OCT-2007
13 @Situation: morning playtime in primary school playground. Harry, Dean,
14 Mark and Phil are kicking a metal panel inside their hut and
15 laughing as it makes a funny noise.
16 Phil: Stephen come ere? (*looks outside of hut*)
17 ((Stephen, Gareth and Carl are older boys. They approach the hut
18 whilst looking inside at the members))
19 Phil: look
20 Phil: look stephen.
21 Phil: stephen you can play in ↑here if you ↓want to?
22 Phil: [we're playin silly fings]
23 Stephen: [Raowwwer] (*enters the hut first and makes a growling sound.*
24 *he looks at Dean whilst growling and then looks at Harry and smiles*)
25 Phil: (*guides Gareth and Carl to a bench as they enter the hut*)
26 Mark: that's not [stephen]
27 Harry: ↑[ah]↑

28 Dean: ↑[ah]↑
 29 Stephen: hello harry? ((smiling))
 30 Harry: ((has eye contact with Stephen and smiles))
 31 Mark: you're not allowed () ((looks at Stephen, puts his arms around him
 32 and guides him onto a bench opposite Harry))
 33 Stephen: hiya harry? ((still smiling and has eye contact with Harry))
 34 Mark: ↑lets °()° ((speaks quietly to Stephen. Stephen stops smiling))
 35 Stephen: no ((looks away from Harry))
 36 ((Mark moves towards Harry))
 37 Stephen: don't ((shakes his head whilst looking back at Harry))
 38 ((Mark puts his arms right around Harry))
 39 Mark: come on () ((Mark pulls Harry forwards off the bench))
 40 Harry: a:h:g:h ((tries to push Mark away and looks distressed))
 41 ((Mark drops something and lets go of Harry to pick it up off the
 42 floor. Harry moves backwards to his original place))
 43 Stephen: hello harry ((looks over and smiles at Harry))
 44 Harry: hhh
 45 ((Harry smiles back at Stephen. Mark stands back up and grabs Harry
 46 by the front of his coat and pulls him over to Stephen))
 47 Mark: come on.
 48 Harry: ow get off
 49 Harry: =I don't want to dance silly.
 50 Mark: ((pulls Harry across the hut and puts him next to Stephen. Mark
 51 attempts to put his arms around both boys but stops when Stephen
 52 shouts at him))
 53 Stephen: **no** mark **no**
 54 (1.4)
 55 Stephen: leave my friend [alo:ne.] ((sits down on the bench))
 56 Mark: [la:la:la:] ((grabs the arms of Harry's jacket and
 57 moves them back and forth in a dancing motion whilst singing))
 58 ((Harry and Stephen have distressed facial expressions as Mark
 59 forcefully dances Harry's arms around and sings. Mark attempts to
 60 put his arms around Harry))
 61 Harry: ((pushes Mark backwards))
 62 Stephen: don't.
 63 Mark: °watch this° ((speech directed at Stephen. Mark puts his arm around
 64 Harry's shoulders and shakes him hard))
 65 Harry: a:h:g:h
 66 Stephen: he doesn't like it. ((stands up to speak))
 67 Stephen: stopit.
 68 ((Harry sits down in his original place. Mark hugs Harry tightly and
 69 forcefully kisses Harry on the mouth whilst he screams and tries to
 70 push him away))
 71 Harry: a:h:::g:::h?
 72 Mark: ((lets go of Harry, steps backwards and leans forward so
 73 that he is face to face with Harry)) ha ha

74 Dean: *((hears Harry shouting, looks at Mark and puts his arm around Harry as*
75 *he is sitting next to him))*
76 Mark: *((hugs Harry then lets go and looks at him))*
77 Harry: o:w::w.
78 Harry: ↑o::w↑
79 Mark: sit on my lap
80 Mark: sit on my lap
81 Mark: [sit on my lap]
82 Harry: [n::o].
83 Mark: °sit on my lap° *((stands in front of Harry as he speaks to him))*
84 *((All the boys in the hut gather around and watch Mark and Harry.*
85 *Mark speaks to one of them))*
86 Mark: can I have one
87 Phil: you're on the- (0.4) you're on the girl?
88 *((Mark moves forward towards Harry and bangs his head on the hut*
89 *roof. Mark rubs his head and then sits on Harry's lap and dances*
90 *back and forth whilst singing. Harry pushes Mark off his lap.*
91 *Mark has an angry facial expression as he turns to face Harry.))*
92 Mark: mwaa::hh *((grabs Harry very hard and kisses him hard on the*
93 *cheek, lets go and looks at Harry))*
94 Mark: ha:: *((smiles at Harry and leaves the hut))*
95 Harry: *((smiles and sits back on the bench))*
96 Harry: °hhh°
97 Stephen: () *((looks very serious and points at Mark as he leaves the*
hut))

@End

2f - Katie, Sally and Lee

1 @Begin
2 @Languages: en
3 @Participants: Katie Playmate, Sally Playmate, Bev Playmate, Jenny Playmate,
4 Lee Playmate, Teacher Adult
5 @ID: Katie/female/targetchild
6 @ID: Sally/female
7 @ID: Bev/female
8 @ID: Jenny/female
9 @ID: Lee/male
10 @ID: Teacher/adult
11 @Date: 09-OCT-2007
12 @Situation: morning playtime in primary school playground. Sally, Katie,
13 Lee and Jenny are in a queue of children from their class waiting to
14 go back into school after morning play. Sally and Katie have just had
15 an argument over a sticker. Katie turns to look behind her in the
16 queue and begins an interaction with Jenny and Lee.
17 Katie: you two: haven't got one of ↓the::↑se (0.3) on have you () ((uses a
18 rhythmic tone. sticks her chest out and points to the sticker on her
19 jumper))
20 Jenny: yeah we had that and we are old enough aren't we? ((looks at Lee))
21 Katie: ((turns her back on Jenny and Lee))
22 Jenny: ((lifts Katie's hood up))
23 ((Katie turns around quickly and looks at Jenny. Jenny drops Katie's
24 hood))
25 Katie: do↑::n't. ((turns back around))
26 Jenny: ((lifts Lee's hood up))

27 *((Lee doesn't react. Katie turns back around to face Jenny and Lee*
28 *again))*

29 Katie: ↓any↑way you haven't got a ↓mi(c) (0.3) you haven't got a
30 ↓micro↑pho:ne *((holds the MP3 player out towards Lee and Jenny and*
31 *then lowers it back down))*

32 Lee: so:

33 Jenny: stop it () *((spoken in a rhythmic tone. moves head and body in a*
34 *dancing kind of motion))*

35 Lee: huh?

36 Lee: i ↑had the microphone on it was fun.

37 Jenny: me too. *((reaches forward and touches the MP3 player))*

38 Katie: hu yea:h↑ (0.4) i'm not afraid a you:? *((quickly turns around to face*
39 *Jenny))*

40 Lee: i had the microphone on fi:rst.

41 Katie: no sally () did

42 Lee: what

43 Kate: sally on my::↑ table had it.
44 *((Jenny starts playing with the children who are standing behind her*
45 *in the queue))*

46 Lee: why you () the microphone?

47 Kate: coz it's my: [tu:rn.]

48 Lee: [is (it) is it on:~]?

49 Katie: ()
50 (3.2)

51 Lee: have you had that before?

52 Katie: no:::uh.

53 Katie: Lee
54 (0.5) *((Lee looks at Jenny))*

55 Katie: just stop asking about it
56 (10.4)

57 Jenny: ↑Lee.
58 *((Lee looks at Jenny))*

59 Jenny: do want to play?
60 *((Lee and Jenny look at each-other. Katie looks at the MP3 player. Lee*
61 *pushes backwards against Phil who is behind him in the queue whilst*
62 *keeping his feet in the same place. Lee looks away from Jenny and*
63 *they continue to line up. Sally has been talking to the girls*
64 *at the front of the queue and showing them her hand. Sally now*
65 *turns to Katie and shows her hand to her.))*

66 Jenny: ()

67 Katie: °you haven't had this microphone have you° *((holds the MP3 player*
68 *towards Sally))*

69 Sally: yes ↑i have.

70 Katie: () in our class coz somebody [hasnt] *((looks at Bev and turns to face*
71 *her))*

72 Sally: [look i've] cut myself on () *((looks at*

73 *Jenny and holds her hand out to show her*)

74 Katie: *((looks back at Sally's hand and touches it))*

75 Sally: i cut myself on (a) ↑**n:o** don't touch it *((pulls her hand sharply away))*

76 Bev: let me touch it

77 Sally: =**n:o** *((moves over to Jenny and Lee and shows them her hand))*

78 Bev: i'm no:t yo:ur fri::end↓ (0.2) no more *((uses a baby voice. pretends to be upset and cry. keeps her gaze fixed on Sally))*

79 *((Sally moves back over to Bev, looks at her and shows her hand to her))*

80 *((Sally moves back over to Bev, looks at her and shows her hand to her))*

81 Sally: see it's ble:eding.

82 Teacher: em, mrs Jones' class

83 *((A child from the queue makes fun of Sally by mimicking her. Sally sticks her tongue out at him. The teacher approaches))*

84 *((A child from the queue makes fun of Sally by mimicking her. Sally sticks her tongue out at him. The teacher approaches))*

85 Teacher: shh shh shh

86 Teacher: mrs jones' class nice and quiet please line up for mrs

87 jones quietly that's lovely

88 Sally: guess what i've cut [myself]

89 Teacher: [*she'll think*] you've gone ↑in you're so lovely and

90 ↓qui↑et now well done.

91 Sally: mi:ss?

92 Teacher: ↓yeah↓

93 Sally: I cut myself.

94 Teacher: aa::hh.

95 *((the teacher leads the children into the school building))*

@End

2g - Sue

1 @Begin
2 @Languages: en
3 @Participants: Sue Playmate, Sara Playmate, Jess Playmate, Carol Playmate
4 @ID: Sue/targetchild/female
5 @ID: Sara/female
6 @ID: Jess/female
7 @ID: Carol/female
8 @Date: 27-SEP-2007
9 @Situation: morning playtime in primary school playground. Sue runs
10 across the playground towards an empty hut and sits inside the
11 entrance and puts her leg across the doorway. Sue drinks from her
12 container as Sara approaches.
13 Sue: *((looks at Sara as she approaches the hut, drops her leg down and*
14 *moves her gaze so that she is looking straight ahead into the*
15 *playground))*
16 Sara: Sue I got this first.
17 Sue: *((looks down at the floor of the hut))*
18 (1.8)
19 Sara: I did I got this hut first?
20 Sara: Sue? *((shakes Sue's coat sleeve))*
21 Sue: *((looks at Jess approaching))*
22 Jess: *((approaches Sara and speaks to her out of the range of the*
23 *microphone))*
24 Sue: *((looks away again))*
25 Sara: *((has her back to the hut as she replies to Jess))*
26 Sara: yes.
27 Sara: that's the boys?

28 Sara: and this is the girls. ((points to another hut in the playground))
 29 ((Jess runs off into the playground. Sara looks into the
 30 playground for five seconds. Sue takes her water bottle out of her
 31 mouth for two seconds. as Sara turns around to face Sue, Sue puts
 32 her water bottle back into her mouth))
 33 Sara: Su:e?
 34 Sara: can you: ↑look after our hut.
 35 (2.6) ((Sara looks at Sue. Sue is still looking away))
 36 Sara: Su:e
 37 Sue: ((turns to look at Sara))
 38 Sara: can you look after the hut.
 39 Sue: ((shakes her head whilst looking at Sara and then looks away))
 40 Sara: aw:.. ((walks away from hut into the playground))
 41 ((Jess approaches the hut, walks in past Sue and sits opposite her at
 42 the hut entrance. Sara approaches the hut again))
 43 Sara: will you↑ look after the hut Jess.
 44 Jess: and sue ((points to Sue and then moves back inside the hut to
 51 stand opposite the entrance))
 52 Sue: ((looks at Jess and then away and continues drinking from her
 53 container))
 54 ((Carol enters the hut))
 55 Carol: Aw
 56 Carol: I just banged my head on the () of the hut
 57 Sara: but remember↑(0.3) **only gi::rls.**
 58 Sara: and don't let **no boys** ok ()
 59 ((Sara walks away into the playground. Sue moves out of the hut and
 60 takes her water bottle out of her mouth for two second, then puts
 61 it back to her mouth. Jess moves to sit at the entrance to the hut,
 62 putting her leg across the doorway. Sue walks into the playground
 63 away from the hut))
 @End

2h - Zac and Ricky

1 @Begin

2 @Languages: en

3 @Participants: Zac Playmate, Jon Playmate, Sue Playmate,

4 Ricky Playmate

5 @ID: Zac/targetchild/male

6 @ID: Jon/male

7 @ID: Sue/female

8 @ID: Ricky/male

9 @Date: 03-OCT-2007

10 @Situation: morning playtime in primary school playground. Jon and
11 Sue are in one of the playground huts where Zac was previously
12 playing in with just boys. Zac approaches Sue and Jon in their
13 hut and begins talking to them through the left window.

14 Zac: only boys allowed in this hut (0.5) a:ren't they. ((looks at Jon))
15 (8.4)

16 Ricky: () ((Ricky puts his head through the side window of the hut, he
17 is smiling))
18 ((Zac and Jon look at Ricky))

19 Zac: =shut up?
20 (2.8)

21 Ricky: ↑who ↓wa::nts ↑a- ((still smiling, Ricky holds out a coin towards the
22 children inside the hut))

23 Jon: **s::h::u::t u::p** ((gets off the bench and shouts in Ricky's face))

24 Ricky: =↑who wants a money prize. ((takes a step backwards but
25 continues holding out his coin))

26 ((Ricky is still smiling. Zac walks over to Ricky and hits the coin

28 out of Ricky's hand. Ricky stops smiling, lifts up his hand
 29 whilst looking at Zac and shows Zac that he still has the coin.
 30 Ricky looks downwards and puts the coin in his pocket. Zac and Jon
 31 look at Ricky whilst he does this and then move back to their
 32 original places. Ricky walks away.))
 33 Zac: everyone (does) ((shakes his head whilst talking and looks at Sue))
 34 Zac: everyone doesn't like ricky °does° (1.2) does they
 35 ((Sue shakes her head from side to side whilst keeping her drinking
 36 beaker in her mouth))
 37 Zac: don't they
 38 Zac: everyone
 39 Zac: they don't like to () friends with him
 40 (14.2)
 41 Sue: ((takes her beaker out of her mouth and looks behind her, in the
 42 direction that Ricky went. Sue then turns back to look at Zac))
 43 Sue: my brother sam doesn't like ricky. ((has eye contact with Zac. looks
 44 down at her beaker whilst she shuts the lid. looks towards Jon))
 45 (5.8)
 46 Sue: jo:n?
 47 Jon: what?
 48 Sue: do you know my brother sam?
 49 (2.3)
 50 Jon: ((shakes his head))
 51 Zac: no::
 52 Sue: =there he is? ((points out of the hut))
 53 Sue: watch there he is?
 54 Sue: my brother's down there ((stands up and walks out of the hut into the
 55 playground))
 58 Sue: °where's my brother°
 59 Sue: there.
 60 ((Sue turns around and enters back into the hut. Zac stands at the
 61 entrance and speaks to Jon))
 62 Zac: do you know sue's brother do, sue's, sue's brother, do you?
 63 Sue: (do) do you (know) do you know sam?
 64 Jon: ((shakes his head to indicate no))
 65 Zac: do you know (0.3) grace's big brother called richard?
 66 Sue: well you know im↓ don't you?
 67 Jon: I know↑ rich[ard.]
 68 Ricky: [ya:a:a:] ((runs up to the window of the hut and pushes his
 69 head through to make the noise))
 70 Sue: yeah, he ↑knows rich↓ard he does?
 71 ((Zac walks into the hut and stands next to the window where Jon
 72 is and holds his umbrella up. Ricky quickly moves back away from
 73 the window. Zac points the end of the umbrella at Ricky and
 74 pushes it sharply forward. When Zac puts the umbrella down Ricky
 75 moves back to the window, putting his hand on the ledge. Sue and Jon

76 *continue talking as this happens))*

77 Sue: do you

78 Ricky: ha cha:a:a:

79 Sue: do you [()??]

80 Ricky: [ha cha:a:a:]

81 Sue: do you?

82 Jon: I don't know

83 Zac: *((hits Ricky's hand with the umbrella three times))*

84 Ricky: ow that hurts *((does not move his hand))*

85 Zac: *((hits Ricky's hand with the umbrella once more))*

86 Ricky: ow *((moves his hand and points at Zac whilst maintaining eye contact*
87 *with him))*

88 *((Sue talks to Jon whilst Zac and Ricky interact))*

89 Sue: ()

90 Ricky: () *((steps back away from the hut and talks to a boy))*

91 Sue: za:c?

92 Sue: I've () got something from my letterbo::x. *((stands up and walks*
93 *towards Zac))*

94 Zac: (you) you got it with you now. *((looks at Sue))*

95 Sue: yes

96 Sue: () *((moves back to where she was and sits down))*

97 Zac: have you brung it to play with you.

98 Sue: its in my bag. *((shakes her head to indicate no. gets up and moves*
99 *closer to Zac.))*

100 Sue: *((puts hand next to her cheek to hide her mouth))* °don't (play)°

101 Zac: *((looks down at the floor))*

102 Sue: za:c *((moves closer to Zac with her face in front of his for eye-contact))*

103 Sue: °don't play with billy° *((steps backwards))*

104 Zac: °ok°

105 Zac: look what I got *((reaches inside his jumper and holds out the MP3*
106 *player))*

107 Zac: sue *((makes eye contact with Sue))*

108 Zac: look

109 Ricky: °you are a crab° you are a cra::b↓ you are a crab *((moves to the window*
110 *where Zac is standing, reaches inside and puts his hand on Zac's neck))*

111 Zac: no i'm not

112 Ricky: cra::b you're a crab

113 Zac: *((hits Ricky on the shoulder))*

114 Ricky: crab crab crab crab crab crab

115 Sue: hey

116 Sue: ricky do:n't do that *((turns to look at the microphone))*

117 Zac: don't ricky *((turns, frowns at Ricky and then turns back to the*
118 *microphone))*

119 Zac: [don't]

120 Sue: [is that yours]

121 Zac: no↑ (0.4) the lady give it us

122 Sue: ↑ oh i drunk it all up in my beaker↑ ((points to her beaker))
123 Sue: drunk it up.
124 ((Zac puts the MP3 player under his coat and zips his coat up, he has
125 his back to Ricky who is still outside the hut. Jon leaves the hut
126 followed by Sue. Ricky reaches into the hut and puts his hand on
127 Zac's back. Zac reaches out of the hut and hits Ricky in the eye.
128 Ricky steps back, puts his hand up to his face and covers his eye.
129 Zac looks at Ricky for six seconds and then crouches down to speak
130 to him.))
131 Zac: sorry↑ rick:.
132 Zac: do you want to come to my party.
133 Zac: you want to come to my party.
134 Ricky: ((continues to rub his eye))
135 Zac: are you gonna play with me?
136 Ricky: °not in the hut there's no room°
137 ((some older children are standing in the hut doorway))
138 Zac: are (you) ((turns around and looks at the older children moving out of
139 the entrance))
140 ((Sue and Jon enter the hut. Zac speaks to Sue and Jon whilst nodding
141 his head))
142 Zac: lets see if ricky can play nicely (0.6) I'm letting him come to my
143 party. ((turns back to face Ricky))
144 (2.9)
145 Zac: do you wanna come in the ↑hut?
146 Ricky: ((nods his head))
147 Zac: do you?
148 Zac: come come on come in the ↓hut
149 Ricky: ((moves from behind the hut to the entrance and steps inside
150 past Sue and Jon who are sitting either side of the entrance and
151 looking at Ricky))
152 Zac: ((Zac smiles at Ricky as he enters)) see you happy now?
153 ((Ricky sits next to Jon but does not smile. the school bell rings
154 for end of morning play. the children exit the hut))
@End

2i - Harry

1 @Begin
2 @Languages: en
3 @Participants: Harry Playmate, Dean Playmate, Natasha Playmate, Phil
4 Playmate, Gareth Playmate, teacher Teacher
5 @ID: Harry/male/targetchild
6 @ID: Dean/male
7 @ID: Natasha/female
8 @ID: Phil/male
9 @ID: Gareth/male
10 @ID: teacher/female
11 @Date: 16-OCT-2007
12 @Situation: morning playtime in primary school playground. Harry and
13 Dean are sitting together on in a hut. Phil and Gareth are also
14 in the hut. Gareth is standing at the back of the hut and Phil is
15 sitting next to the entrance, they are talking to each-other. Dean
16 stands up and exits the hut. Phil puts his leg across the exit.
17 Harry stands up and watches Dean walk away, then looks at Phil, then
18 Phil's leg and then at Dean again. Harry walks towards the exit and
19 looks at Phil.
20 Harry: i can't get back out:t *((looks at Phil and jumps up and down in front of*
21 *Phil's leg then lifts Phil's top leg down, leaving Phil's other leg blocking*
22 *the exit))*
23 Phil: *((is silent and looks at Harry))*
24 Harry: ple::ase.
25 Phil: =Dean's coming back here now Harry
26 Harry: *((turns around and sits down where he had been sitting with Dean))*
27 Phil: De::ea::n

28 Phil: De::ea::n
 29 ((Natasha approaches the hut))
 30 Natasha: °() move your leg° ((lifts Phil's leg down so that the entrance
 31 to the hut is open))
 32 Phil: ((looks at Natasha and lets her lower his leg))
 33 Natasha: Harry outside
 34 ((Dean approaches the hut. Harry smiles when he sees Dean.
 35 Dean puts his head through the entrance, looking at Harry))
 36 Dean: a::rgh ((smiles and walks into the hut towards Harry, reaches out and
 37 holds Harry's hand))
 38 Dean: [°come on°]
 39 Natasha: [Harry get out]
 40 Gareth: no he can::not come out ((walks towards Natasha))
 41 ((Natasha puts one foot inside the hut and turns to look at Phil.
 42 Harry and Dean stand together in the hut holding hands watching
 43 Natasha's interaction))
 44 Natasha: () and put leg down. ((speaks in a slow rhythmic tone and
 45 points her finger at Phil repeatedly then walks out of the hut))
 46 Dean: come on Harry (0.4) lets go now. ((speaks very quickly and follows
 47 Natasha out of the hut and towards a teacher, still holding Harry's
 48 hand))
 49 teacher: alright ↑Harry?
 50 Harry: yeah
 51 Dean: Harry (0.9) um her friend and ↑my friend.
 52 teacher: al::ri:ght good
 53 ((Natasha, Dean and Harry walk into the playground together holding
 54 hands))
 @End

2j - Lee

1 @Begin
2 @Languages: en
3 @Participants: Lee Playmate, Chris Playmate, Jon Playmate, Mark Playmate,
4 Harry Playmate
5 @ID: Lee/male/targetchild
6 @ID: Chris/male
7 @ID: Jon/male
8 @ID: Mark/male
9 @ID: Harry/male
10 @Date: 08-OCT-2007
11 @Situation: morning playtime in a primary school playground. Lee looks
12 across the playground to a group of boys from his class and runs
13 over to them.
14 Jon: ↑i'm four years ↓o:ld?
15 Lee: =i've got the microphone on= ((holds MP3 player out towards Jon. Jon
16 looks down at the MP3 player))
17 Chris: =i'm four ↓().
18 Mark: i'm even bigger ↑i'm a ↑big↑ger four years old. ((approaches Jon and
19 puts his face next to Jon's face. Mark takes small steps towards Jon as
20 Jon steps backwards))
21 (1.8)
22 Jon: ((takes a larger step back so that he is side on to Mark and wipes his
23 face with a big sweeping motion))
24 Mark: ((steps away from Jon))
25 ((Harry approaches the group but stands on the periphery. Mark and
26 Chris watch Lee and Jon.))

27 Lee: *((crouches down)) i'm bigger an you mark? ((jumps up))*
 28 Jon: *((looks at Lee jumping up, smiles and jumps twice))*
 29 Lee: *((on his second jump Lee drops his apple))*
 30 Lee: *↑oh dear=oh dear=oh dear. ((picks apple up and brushes it off))*
 31 Jon: *i can jump (0.5) higher an (0.3) higher an (0.8) ↑e:ven hi:gh:er↑ (0.5)*
 32 *then i can.*
 33 *((Jon crouches down within a circle wich has been painted onto the*
 34 *playground floor. Lee crouches down next to him. They both jump up*
 35 *at he same time and continue jumping within the circle*
 36 *markings. Lee stops when he reaches the place in the circle where*
 37 *Mark is standing. Lee looks towards Mark and walks towards him. Mark*
 38 *jumps off the circle marking. Jon and Lee continue jumping within*
 39 *the circle in a spiral pattern. Mark and Chris walk off together))*
 @End

2k - Tina and Jess

1 @Begin
 2 @Languages: en
 3 @Participants: Tina Playmate, Jess Playmate, Emma Playmate, Kim
 4 Girl, Ian Playmate, Sally Playmate, Bev Playmate
 5 @ID: Tina/Targetchild/female
 6 @ID: Jess/female
 7 @ID: Emma/female
 8 @ID: Kim/female
 9 @ID: Ian/male
 10 @ID: Sally/female
 11 @ID: Anne/female
 12 @Date: 26-SEP-2007
 13 @Situation: morning playtime. Tina and Jess are followed by Emma as they
 14 approach a hut which is occupied by two children from their class.
 15 Emma: *↑those just went in without a:sking. ((eye contact with girl sitting by the*
 16 *entrance of the hut))*
 17 Emma: *you're not allowed in to play ((looks directly at Jess and Tina))*
 18 Kim: *who*
 19 Emma: *them ((points at Tina and Jess))*
 20 Emma: *get out*
 21 Emma: *=you're supposed to ask one of these () before*
 22 *you come in ↑aren't you.*
 23 Tina: *what?*
 24 Emma: *you're supposed to say the magic word (0.2) ple::ase (0.2) when*
 25 *you come in this hut*
 26 Jess: *°let's go in another part.° ((Jess and Tina run to another hut))*

27 *((This next hut is also occupied by two children from their class, Sally*
28 *and Ian, who are sitting next to each-other. Ian is sitting at the entrance*
29 *to the hut and is eating))*
30 Tina: **can I have o::ne**
31 (2.6)
32 Tina: >can=i=av=one<
33 (2.3)
34 Tina: >can=i=av=one<
35 *((Jess and Tina move into the hut and stand next to Ian. Ian gives them*
36 *each one of his snacks))*
37 Tina: hhh?
38 Ian: ()
39 Ian: you cant av (0.2) that.
40 Tina: i said why don't we [just]
41 Ian: [my mum]
42 Ian: =my mum said you can only have one
43 Bev: when you come in come and get me *((Bev leans into the hut to shout))*
44 *((Sally looks at Bev and moves from sitting next to Ian towards the*
45 *opposite side of the hut))*
46 Tina: (um)
47 Tina: will (yo:u) will you come to my pa:rtly:.
48 Ian: huh?
49 Tina: will you come to my pa:rtly:.
50 Ian: ↑o:ka::y.
51 Ian: have you: (had) ag a gog, a gog (dog) at your house?
52 *((Jess runs away from the entrance of the hut into the playground))*
53 Tina: ummm, ↑yes↑
54 Ian: and does (it) does it bite
55 Tina: umm:
56 *((Tina moves towards the entrance of the hut away from Ian. Jess runs*
57 *back to the entrance of the hut. Tina exits the hut and stands next*
58 *to Jess. Sally moves within the hut to sit next to the entrance*
59 *opposite Ian and puts her leg across the entrance. Tina and Jess*
60 *stand outside the hut looking around the playground for twelve*
61 *seconds))*
62 Jess: *((moves over to entrance, looks at Sally's leg and steps over it into*
63 *the hut))*
64 Sally: *((puts her leg down to let Jess inside the hut and then raises it to*
65 *block the entrance again))*
66 *((Tina looks over to the hut and looks at Sally's leg which is blocking*
67 *the entrance. Tina moves towards the entrance to the hut. Sally*
68 *doesn't move her leg. Tina moves around to the side of the hut and*
69 *then moves to the front of the hut and pushes Sally's leg out of the*
70 *way by walking in))*
71 Sally: don't come in *((grabs the back of Tina's coat as Tina makes her way to*
72 *sit next to Jess. Sally then lets go))*

73 Sally: don't come in: ((looks at Tina))
 74 Sally: you need to ring the bell on here ((puts her leg back across the entrance
 75 and points to her toe))
 76 ((Ian puts his leg up underneath Sally's. Jess stands up and moves
 77 towards the entrance looking at Sally's leg and smiling))
 78 Sally: ↑ring the bell that's on by there. ((Sally points to the toe of her shoe. Jess
 79 presses the toe of Sally's shoe. Sally and Ian both drop their legs and
 80 Jess walks out. Sally and Ian put their legs back up once Jess is out))
 81 Sally: hhh.
 82 Tina: ((stands up, moves towards the entrance and pushes her way through the
 83 legs))
 84 Sally: () ((grabs Tina's coat as she pushes through and looks very angry))
 85 ((Jess and Tina run off into the playground))
 @End

21 - Jon

1 @Begin
 2 @Languages: en
 3 @Participants: Jon Playmate, Zac Playmate, Sue Playmate, Alan Playmate,
 4 teacher Teacher
 5 @ID: Jon/male/targetchild
 6 @ID: Zac/male
 7 @ID: Sue/female
 8 @ID: Alan/male
 9 @ID: teacher/female
 10 @Date: 12-OCT-2007
 11 @Situation: morning playtime in primary school playground. The bell
 12 rings for the children to go in. Jon walks over to line up. Jon
 13 walks towards Alan, the boy whom he has been playing with
 14 throughout this playtime. Zac runs in front of Jon and pushes him
 15 slowly backwards. Zac makes eye contact with Sue who is behind Jon.
 16 Zac: sue=sue ((looks at Sue))
 17 Sue: ((meets Zac's gaze))
 18 Zac: come here? ((slaps his hand on his leg four times whilst speaking))
 19 Sue: ((runs between Zac and Jon))
 20 ((Zac and Sue look at Jon and Jon looks at them both))
 21 Zac: just push him ((pushes Jon hard backwards))
 22 Jon: I can (0.5) push (0.8) really hard (and)? ((takes slow steps towards Zac
 23 whilst looking at him))
 24 Alan: ((puts his hand on Zac's shoulder and turns Zac around to
 25 face him))
 26 Alan: don't do that ((smiles at Zac straight after this utterance))

27 Zac: *((smiles straight back at Alan))*
 28 Jon: my ↓daddy can push hard and ()↑ (0.2) () (0.4) (). *((stands right*
 29 *in front of Zac))*
 30 *((Jon drops his water bottle. Alan picks it up and hands it back*
 31 *to Jon. Zac watches the teacher as she approaches))*
 32 teacher: get back in the line Scott
 33 Jon: *((moves to the back of the line and plays with his water bottle))*
 34 *((the teacher moves the line of children into the school))*
 @End

2m - Mark

1 @Begin
 2 @Languages: en
 3 @Participants: Mark Playmate, Sally Playmate, Ricky Playmate,
 4 Rachel Playmate, Megan Playmate, Ian Playmate
 5 @ID: Mark/targetchild/male
 6 @ID: Sally/female
 7 @ID: Ricky/male
 8 @ID: Rachel/female
 9 @ID: Megan/female
 10 @ID: Ian/male
 11 @Date: 28-SEP-2007
 12 @Situation: morning playtime in primary school playground. Mark runs
 13 towards an empty hut.
 14 Mark: This is my hut. *((continues running over to the hut))*
 15 Mark: ↓I'm goin in ↑my:: hut. *((enters the empty hut and sits inside))*
 16 (18.2)
 17 Mark: ()
 18 *((Sally and Ricky approach the hut))*
 19 Mark: [I'm goina]
 20 Sally: [can ↑I come in Mark].
 21 Mark: yes and go get hi:m to come in
 22 (3.6)
 23 Mark: ↑tell the boys they're allowed in.
 24 Mark: tell the ↓boys.
 25 *((Sally enters the hut followed by Ricky. Sally sits opposite Mark and*
 26 *Ricky sits next to the entrance of the hut by the side of Mark Megan,*

27 Rachel and a friend approach the hut))
28 Ricky: ((places his foot across the entrance))
29 Rachel: Isn't that the girls? ((points her finger at Marks hut))
30 Mark: no no no [no]
31 Ricky: [yes] yes ↑that's the girls and this is the boys. ((Ricky looks
32 at the bench opposite him and Mark which Sally is sitting on. He than
33 drops his leg down leaving the entrance clear))
34 (8.4)
37 Megan: I don't like you I like the ↑girls ((the girls walk away))
38 ((the girls walk away. Sally walks towards the entrance of the hut and
39 turns around so that she is looking into the hut))
40 Sally: ↑lift your other leg now Ricky. ((looks at Ricky and sweeps her arm
41 across the entrance))
42 ((Ricky does not block the entrance with his leg. Ian approaches,
43 enters the hut and sits opposite Ricky at the hut's entrance. Ian
44 puts his leg across the entrance whilst Sally is outside. Sally
45 pushes through the leg barrier into the hut))
46 Ian: that's for gir:ls
47 Sally: no it isn't its for bo::ys ((stands in front of Mark inside the hut))
48 Sally: can I av some ((referring to Mark's snack))
49 Sally: and then you can av a bit of this ((lifts her snack towards Mark's face))
50 Mark: I don' like yogurt
51 Ricky: ()
52 Sally: do you want some Rick
53 Ricky: no °no no no° ((shakes his head and exits the hut))
54 ((Mark follows Ricky out of the hut into the playground))
@End

2n - Tina, Jon and Lee

1 @Begin
2 @Languages: en
3 @Participants: Tina Playmate, Jon Playmate, Lee Playmate
4 @ID: Tina/targetchild/female
5 @ID: Jon/male
6 @ID: Lee/male
7 @Date: 26-SEP-2007
8 @Situation: Tina has been standing alone in the
9 playground observing the school children for three minutes.
10 The bell rings and she runs to queue to go into school. Tina stands
11 in front of Jon and faces him. Lee is standing behind Jon.
12 Jon: I don't li↑ke you. (*pushes Tina backwards*)
13 Tina: sto:p it (*walks forwards towards Jon*)
14 Jon: pushes Tina backwards again
15 Tina: anyway
16 (*Lee is standing behind Jon in the queue. Lee pushes Jon and then Jon*
17 *pushes Tina*)
18 Tina: i got a lady's fing. (*walks forwards towards Jon and reaches inside*
19 *jumper where the microphone is located*)
20 (*Jon pushes Tina. Lee pushes Jon. Jon turns around and smiles at Lee*
21 *then turns to face Tina. Lee pushes Jon. Jon walks towards Tina and*
22 *pushes her very hard resulting in her falling backwards onto her back*)
23 Tina: stopit (*Tina speaks whilst on the floor then gets up and approaches*
24 *Lee*)
25 (*Lee and Jon look at each-other and smile*)

26 Tina: ↓hate you↓ ((Tina looks at Lee))
27 Lee: ((pushes Tina backwards))
28 Tina: °↓stop it↓°
29 ((Tina walks over to a group of girls at the front of the queue. Jon
30 turns to face Lee and pushes him. Lee chases Jon around the queue,
31 both boys are smiling))
@End