iojes
www.iojes.net

International Online Journal of Educational Sciences

ISSN: 1309-2707

Learning Gender Subjectivities through Peer Language Socialization Practices in Pretend Play: The case study of a trilingual child in a Turkish preschool

Şeyda Deniz Tarım[1]

[1]*Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University*

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 23.10.2015
Received in revised form 08.02.2016
Accepted 14.02.2016
Available online 21.03.2016

ABSTRACT

Second language learning includes not only acquiring grammar rules and new vocabulary but also learning the social routines of the culture to specifically project subjectivities in the way that is valued by the culture. This paper is part of a larger ethnographic fieldwork on naturally occurring peer group interactions of Turkish preschool children. The focused participant of the study is a 4 years old boy, Mete, who is trilingual and can speak English, Spanish and learn Turkish in the preschool. The excerpts in the study came from different play activities of children including family play and block play and were analyzed using techniques of talk-in-interaction with ethnography. The results suggest children pay attention to ideologies of gender from their culture, and socialize group members to project valued stances and subjectivities through utilizing a variety of linguistic resources strategically.

© 2016 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:
Gender subjectivities, second language learning, preschool children, peer groups, conversation analysis

Introduction

This study is based on the theory of indexicality, developed by Ochs (1992) indicating that linguistic forms index a range of "situational dimensions" (Ochs, 1996, p. 419) such as social acts, social stances, social activities and social identities. In other words, for example, "tag questions may index a stance of uncertainty as well as the act of requesting confirmation/clarification/feedback; these two contextual features in turn may index/help constitute female gender identity in certain communities" (Ochs, 1992, p. 335). From this perspective, Ochs (1992) further states that "each social group has specific ways of organizing the distribution of stance and indexical action across social identities, relationships, and activities, with different values associated with each set of indexicals" (Ochs, 1992, p. 336). Through interaction with more expert members of a community, novices learn these associations.

A wide body of research has documented how in "separated areas of children's interaction, away from the influence of adults, children socialize one another" (Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2011, p. 381). A set of recent studies reviewed by Goodwin and Kyratzis, (2011) (see also Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2007; Kyratzis, 2004) "give special emphasis to children's agency in attending to and building local hierarchy and social organization" (Goodwin and Kyratziz, 2011, p. 381; see for example de León, 2007; Goodwin, 1990; 2006, Evaldsson, 2002; 2004; 2005; 2007; Evaldsson and Cekaite, 2010; Kyratzis, 2007; 2010; Minks, 2010; Reynolds, 2007; 2010). In their peer group communities, children draw on a range of "cultural images and ideologies of gender, age-based, or language groups that were salient in their communities" (Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2011, p. 381) and

[1] Corresponding author's address: Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Department of Preschool Education.
Telephone: +902522115486
Fax: +902522115486
e-mail: seydatarim@mu.edu.tr
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2016.02.003

© 2016 International Online Journal of Educational Sciences (IOJES) is a publication of Educational Researches and Publications Association (ERPA)

monitor/police one another's behavior including language uses, and sanction members who do not conform to peer group norms (Goodwin, 2006; Thorne, 1993), by way of constructing local social order. In the present study of children's spontaneous peer play interactions in preschool classroom, a peer group of children were observed for socializing a boy, who was being a second language learner of Turkish, a novice to their peer group community.

The study draws upon data collected from a larger ethnographic study which followed everyday peer interactions of preschool age children in their spontaneous play activities to examine these preschool children's gender practices in interaction with peers (Tarım, 2007). In the present study, techniques of talk-in-interaction with ethnography are combined. (e.g., Cekaite and Evaldsson, 2008; Evaldsson, 2007; Evaldsson and Cekaite, 2010; Goodwin, 1990; 2006; Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2007; 2011; Kyratsiz, 2010). Two bodies of prior research bear on this study, studies of gender as performance, and studies of gender and second language learning, so each of these areas are reviewed in turn in the text which follows.

Gender as Performance: Conversation Analytic and Community of Practice Views of Gender

Researchers argue that, like other social identities, gender identity is actively created and constructed (Kyratzis, 2004) through "social and verbal practices that recur innumerable times in the lives of members of social groups" (Ochs, 1992, p.336). However, as Ochs (1992) highlighted, "the relation of language to gender is not a straightforward mapping of linguistic form to social meaning of gender, rather, [it is] constituted and mediated by the relation of language to stances, social acts, social activities, and other social constructs" (p.337).

Early work which mainly focused on gender and language from a dichotomous point of view (Maltz and Borker, 1982; Lakoff, 1973) assumed that gender is fixed, natural and given to human beings. However, recent studies has shown that gender has been seen as performative and through talk-in-interaction, which provides wide array of opportunities to group members, participants are able to construct gendered identity or any other social identities (Cameron, 1997; Stokoe and Smithson, 2001; Kitzinger and Rickford, 2007). As Cameron (1998) states, ""feminine" and "masculine" are not what we are, nor traits we have, but effects we produce by way of particular things we do" (p. 271). Therefore, the importance of context which shape talk-in-interaction emerges in analyzing gendered identity "which are not fixed and invariant" (Thorne, 1993, p.160).

Goodwin (1990) showed in her analysis how "stereotypes about women's speech fall apart when talk in a range of activities is examined; to construct social personae appropriate to the events of the moment, the same individuals articulate talk and gender differently as they move from one activity to another (p.9). In a similar line, Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992) suggest that "how language interacts with gender requires that we look locally, closely observing linguistic and gendered practices in the context of a particular community's social practices" (p.464). Community of practice is defined as "a group whose joint engagement in some activity or enterprise is sufficiently intensive to give rise over time to a repertoire of shared practices" (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1999, p. 185). A key concept in this model is legitimate peripheral participation, which refers to learners' developmental processes from peripheral to full participation in the activities of communities of practice over a period of time.

Gendered identities are seen as emerging from participation in everyday interactional routines, rather than being fixed categories (Evaldsson, 2005). Therefore, in order to analyze these social practices, and identities, many scholars use conversation analytic approach recently. By using ethnomethodological principles (the study of the ways in which people make sense of their own social world), conversation analysis (CA) focuses on talk-in-interaction with participants' gestures, body positions, facial expressions, and ongoing activities in contexts. (Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby and Olsher, 2002). As Schegloff (1987) notes: "[Conversation analysis] takes seriously the relevance of the fact that the interactions we are examining were produced by the parties for one another and were designed by reference to a set of features of the interlocutors, the setting and so on that are relevant to for the participants" (p. 209). In other words, by examining the sequences of action which are produced by the participants vis' a vis' to each other, researchers can make claims how the participants themselves construct social organization or social identities in talk-in-interaction.

From an ethnomethodologically perspective, gender is viewed, not as an essential feature given to a person, but rather as a performative notion constructed and co-constructed through talk-in-interaction (West

and Zimmerman, 1987). Kitzinger and Rickford (2007) showed that gender is invoked and discarded in the interests of local interactional goals through the participants' use of gendered categories, or references to femininity and masculinity as resources in their talk-in-interaction. In the studies of conversation analysis, analysts focus on what participants make relevant in their interactions (Stokoe and Smithson, 2001). If a particular group of people orient to gender in their talk-in-interactions then, CA analysts can argue about the relevance of gender in the particular context for that group of people. As Stokoe and Smithson (2001) showed in the data they analyzed not only explicit use of gender labels such as he, she, the girl, and the guy, but also references to male or female appearances and gendered activities or roles (e.g., by saying "I would not expect my wife just wash and iron", the speaker link the category wife with the category-bound activities like washing and ironing. extract 10, p. 236) may make gender relevant in a particular group of people's interactions.

As Fenstermaker and West (2002) claims that "gender itself is constituted through interaction" (p.6) and gender is exhibited or displayed through using explicit gender labels and performing certain tasks in some contexts but not in others (Danby and Baker, Fenstermaker and West, 2002; Goodwin, 1990; Kyratzis, 2001; Thorne, 1993). Thorne (1993), states that boys and girls strategically use gender labels to negotiate, and/or organize their social organizations. She uses the term "border-work" (64) in order to define "how kids construct "the girls" and "the boys" as boundaries and rival groups through practices that uphold a sense of gender as an oppositional dichotomy" (p. 158). Further, through strategic use of gender labels within a group of girls or boys, gender can be evoked to compete with each other or tease others. Eder, Evans and Parker (1995) showed how a group of boys displayed the value of toughness through ritual insults (p. 63). The boys used names such as "pud", "squirt" or "wimp" (p. 63), which were associated with being weak. These names were mainly used to insult the boys in the group who were unsuccessful (Eder et.al., 1995).

From a conversation analytic point of view, when children explicitly use gender labels, or lexical items which are associated with gendered roles or being feminine or masculine purposefully, then as researchers we can claim that children themselves make gender relevant to their peer group interaction, and evoke gender boundaries to achieve their interactional goals.

Gender and Second Language Socialization

The increasing emphasis on understanding of gender identity and its role in second language socialization has led researchers to focus on language learners within culturally heterogeneous settings. The perspectives of gendered language socialization redefine what it means to learn a second language more than just learning a new set of grammatical, lexical and phonological forms, learners are acquiring social, cultural and gendered norms (Gordon, 2008). Previous studies have documented that since gender identity is a social and cultural construct, in every culture, gender norms, practices and images may differ (Pavlenko, 2001a), and individuals experiencing second language learning in a different culture may go through (re)positioning or transformation of one self.

With their dynamic gendered subjectivities, second language learners may position themselves differently and co-construct their social identities actively through participating in various forms of social and verbal practices in which they learn and contribute reciprocally. For example, the immigrant women in the previous studies (Mena-Warwich, 2004; Norton, 1995) showed that they were motivated to become a part of the target culture and claim their "right to speak" (Norton, 1995, p.25).

Pavlenko's (2001c) analysis of narratives in a study on second language learning memoirs, also showed the differential gendered subjectivities in language learning process. She found that, the male authors' narratives are contented with their success, motivation and desire while learning the language and being part of the group and they "link gender and language learning only marginally or not at all (Pavlenko, 2001c, p. 214). On the other hand, female authors, give more information on their relationships and interactions (e.g., how they struggled against hierarchical organizations in gendered sociocultural system) in their memoirs and therefore, the link between gender and language learning is more salient.

Second language learners individually and or as a group evaluate the target cultural values, beliefs and norms and actively negotiate and re-establish their own multiple identities and ideologies (Norton Peirce, 2000; Pavlenko, 2001a; Pavlenko and Lantolf, 2001). Situated in multifaceted social, political and intercultural constructions, second language learners' secondary socialization interaction go through multiple, dynamic,

challenging, and sometimes conflicting, subjectifying or identification processes. In this dynamic process, a speaker may use the indexical value of language to "position" the self within a particular identity in response to particular interactional moments (Goodwin, 1990). Any facet of speakers' "repertoire of identities" might be fronted or indexed at a particular moment according to the context of an utterance and the specific goals they are trying to achieve (Shi, 2010).

Current Study

Through close analysis of talk-in-interaction, the present study focused on how a peer group of Turkish preschool age children indexes gender during their spontaneous peer interaction and socializes one another (particularly a target child) in projecting appropriate gender subjectivity in a way that is valued by the culture. This study combines methods of ethnography (e.g., Cekaite and Evaldsson, 2008; Evaldsson, 2007; Evaldsson and Cekaite, 2010; Goodwin, 1990; 2006; Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2007, p. 2011) and talk-in-interaction. As the examples from the data show, conversation analysis was conducted to examine the language practices and interpretive procedures that the participants, particularly the preschool children, used in "situated meaning-making" (Cekaite and Evaldsson, 2008, p. 180) to respond to each other and display stances.

The following research questions will guide the present study:

1) How do members of a peer group of children in a preschool in Turkey socialize one another through language? How do they socialize a child who is a novice to their peer group community in being a second language learner of Turkish?

2) Which social practices, acts or linguistic features of the target child are permitted, enhanced or encouraged in order to display the right gendered identity/subjectivity in the peer groups?

Methodology

Participants, Setting, and Data Collection

The data is part of an ethnographic study of a peer group of Turkish preschoolers' spontaneous free play activities which were audiotaped and videotaped for over 1 year in Turkey (Tarım, 2007). There were 12 preschool children (7 girls, 5 boys) in the classroom with a teacher and a teacher assistant. The children are between 4 years 1 month and 4 years 11 months of age. The target child is trilingual, speaks English and Spanish as first languages (dad and mom are from England and Spain, respectively) and learns Turkish as a second language in the classroom context.

Before videotaping started, all of the parents gave consents for their children's participation in the study. Videotaping occurred two to three times up to 2-3 hours in each week. During videotaping, the researcher placed the transmitter microphone next to each friendship group, which provided more accurate audio recordings in the videotapes. The videotapes of friendship groups in different play areas of the classroom were transcribed utilizing the Gumperz and Berenz (1993) transcription system. The excerpts in this study came from different play activities including two mixed-sex family play episodes in which the target child (Mete) enacts a brother role and one same-sex block play episode in which Mete with three other boys construct a tower.

In the qualitative analysis, the instances of behaviors that might be gendered for the children were chosen. Not only explicit gender labels (e.g., "girls and boys don't wrestle") but also practices that might be tied to gender in the culture that occurred without use of an explicit label (e.g., boys' direct commands to mark a hierarchical stance or girls' heightened use of tag questions to mark a collaborative stance) were analyzed. While doing the qualitative analysis these linguistic forms (directives (direct commands), "let's") and gendered labels were not analyzed as isolated sentences in the data, but rather the utterances were analyzed within the spontaneous sequences of action in each activity (Goodwin 1990). Further, the children's references to gender labels (e.g., boys) and specialized items (e.g., being a tough group), which are associated with the gendered practices enacted by the children, were also analyzed. For example, one boy said, "girls and boys don't wrestle", which shows the child's attitude towards what is appropriate for girls and boys. Therefore, when children make use of these terms, it is possible to claim that the children themselves orient to gendered identities and make gender relevant in their play. After identifying the different ways in which children were

using gendered practices in the data, then the representative examples of the children's talk-in-interaction exemplifying each category or type were chosen and analyzed in detail, conducting a line-by-line analysis.

Analyzing the moment-to-moment processes of talk-in-interaction and combining these observations with ethnographic details allowed us as researchers to have a better understanding of how children "index" (Ochs, 1986) and draw on gender as they negotiate power asymmetries within their peer and friendship groups moment-to-moment (Goodwin, 2006; Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2007; 2012). As a unit of analysis, explicit gender labels (e.g., girls and boys) and the practices that might be tied to gender in the culture that occurred without use of an explicit label (e.g., girls' heightened use of tag questions to mark a collaborative stance, or boys' use of direct commands to form hierarchical social organization) were focused.

Results

The data showed that the friendship groups of the children used gender labels strategically for their interactional purposes in some contexts but not in others. By using the gender labels strategically, they displayed the knowledge of what is appropriate for girls and for boys in order to socialize one another, especially the target child Mete, about displaying the appropriate gender subjectivity in their peer group interactions.

Excerpt 1: "These are not for boys"
Participants: Lara (mother), Mete (son)

1. Lara: oğlu::m?
   my son?
2. Aslı: Mete ya::bu eşyalar senin değiı::l/
   Mete ya:: these are nooot yours/
3. Lara: ama ben onlarla oynuyorum/
   but I am playing with them/
4. Lara: alma bunları küçük bunlar/
   don't take these, these are small/
→5. Lara: bunlar erkekler için değil/
   these are not for boys/

This excerpt is part of the family play episode. In this excerpt, Lara and Mete are at the house area. Lara is the mother, Mete is Lara's son who goes to school and when he comes back home he plays with his toys. As seen in line 1, when Lara says "oğluum?, Mete looks at her mother and tries to cover the toys that he has in front of him. Apparently, Lara's face expressions shows that she is not happy about his son's toy choices since he plays with the toys (equipment) that belong to the kitchen area. Lara moves toward Mete and says "Mete ya:: these are no::t yours" (Mete ya:: bu eşyalar senin değil)" in line 2. However, Lara's excuse/reason that she provides for Mete to prevent him to play with the toys is not taken up by Mete. In line 3, he disagrees with what Lara says and tries to cover the toys with his body to make sure that Lara does not take them back. Mete's counter response "but I am playing with them" and his body position shows his willingness to play with the toys. Then, Lara approaches Mete and put her hand on Mete's shoulder and starts talking slowly and affectionately in line 4 and 5. Her responses to Mete project that she gives the sense of acting as a mother and provides another reason why he cannot play with them. She uses explicit use of gender category in line 5 and associates smaller toys (kitchen equipment) with girls not with boys. Lara displays the knowledge of particular toys are not appropriate for boys by formulating the sentence in line 5 strategically. It can be claimed that she makes gender relevant to their peer group interaction and evokes gender category to teach Mete what is appropriate for boys to play with.

The next excerpt also comes from the same family play episode where Lara and Mete welcome Mete's classroom teacher and they have tea party together. The excerpts starts when the teacher gets ready to leave after the tea party.

Excerpt 2: "Boys don't use handbags"
Participants: Lara (mother), Mete (son), T (teacher)

1. Lara: oğlum öğretmenin gidiyor hadi::

my son your teacher is going, come on::
2. Lara: çantanı al sende git/
take your bag and you go with her too/
3. T: Sende gelir misin Mete?
Can you come too with me Mete?
4. Mete: evet/ *((Mete takes a handbag from the closet and walks away))*
yes/
5. Lara: Mete çantan o değil, delirdin mi se::n?
Mete *this is not your bag, are you crazy?*
6. Lara: bu senin çantan bu/ ((she shows different bag to him))
this one is your bag, this/
7. Mete: bu olmaz mı?
Can't it be this?
8. Lara: hayır olmaz, şunu al/
no it can't be, take that/
9. Mete: o benim çantam değil bu benim çantam/
that is not my bag, this is my bag/
→10. Lara: Mete ama o küçüçük çanta hem erkekler kol çantası takmaz/
Mete but that bag is very small and boys don't use hand bags/((when she says boys don't use handbags, Metepicks up the bag that she handed to him))

In line 1, when the teacher wants to leave after they had nice chat together, Lara also wants Mete to get ready and go to school with her. In the following line the teacher conforms to what the mother says and asks Mete whether he could come to school with her. Mete complies with his teacher; he picks up a handbag from the closet and follows her. But as can be seen in line 5, Lara uses a sarcastic question to Mete implying that the handbag that he picks up cannot be his bag. Immediately, she gets the bag from him and hands him another one which looks like a small briefcase. Mete still asks "can't it be this?" pointing the handbag Lara got from him. Lara responds back with a clear negative polarity marker "hayır" (no) and tries to give him the briefcase she is holding. But in line 9, Mete disagrees with her and says "that is not my bag, this is my bag" while he is pointing the handbag he picked up from the closet. That is when Lara provides two justifications; first, she says that the handbag is small (even says smallish "küçücük") and then, she says "boys don't use handbags" in line 10. She encourages Mete to use the appropriate bag for him and choose one of the bags that looks either bigger or masculine. Similar to the previous excerpt, Lara associated smaller handbags with girls or femininity and evoked explicit gender category in line 10 strategically. In this excerpt, Lara, the child enacting the mother role empowers her status in the peer group by providing a very strong justification about gender in the second part of her utterance in line 10. It seems that her justification was successful and was taken up by Mete because when Lara says "boys don't use handbags", Mete picks up the bag that she handed to him.

Excerpt 3:
Participants: Tuğçe (mother), Mete (son), Sena (maid), Serra (daughter)

1. Tuğçe: pikniğe gidiyoru::z benim cüzdanım nerde? ((she looks around the house))
We are go::ing to a picnic, where is my purse?
2. Sena: ben gitmiyorum/
I am not going/
3. Tuğçe: sandviçlerimiz hazır mı?
O*ur sandwiches ready yet?*
4. Serra: ((baby talk)) (unidentified)
5. Mete: ben artık bunu istemiyorum/
I don't want it anymore// ((he talks to himself while playing))
6. Serra: abicim abicim ben koltukta yatıcam ama/
My brother my brother but I am going to sleep on the sofa /
7. Serra: ben koltukta yatıcam/
I am going to sleep on the sofa/
8. Mete: (unidentified talk) ((he talks with his sister))

9. Serra: ben koltukta yatıcam burda yatıcam ben//
I will sleep on the sofa here I will sleep//
10. Mete: hayır onlar o-uyuyamassın çünkü oyuncaklarım orda/
No those- you can't sleep because my toysa re there/
11. Mete: sen orda uyuyabilirsin (1.0) sadece//
You can only sleep over there ((he shows her another sofa))
12. Tuğçe: oğlum pikniğe gidiyoruz pikniğe/
My son we are going to have a picnic, to a picnic/
13. Serra: inga inga ((she cries because Metedoesn't let her to sleep on his sofa))
14. Serra: Ben koltukta uyumak istiyorum anne, abim izin vermiyor//
mom, I am going to sleep on the sofa//
15. Tuğçe: oğlum hadi pikniğe gidiyoruz/
my son come on we are going to have a picnic/
16. Mete: bende bi sürü para-para var//
I have a lot of money-money//
17. Mete: anne bende bi sürü para var//
mom, I have a lot of money///((he shows his money))
→ 18. Tuğçe: zaten sende bir sürü para olması lazım oğlum sen erkeksin//
(in any case) you have to have a lof of money my son you are a boy//
→ 19. Mete: evet/
Yes/
→ 20. Mete: ne almak isterseniz bana söyleyin/
what ever you want to get/buy, tell me/((he puts his money into his pockets))
21. Serra: abi abi abi şunu istiyorum/
brother brother brother /((she acts like she looks at a toys shop))
22. Mete: hangisini istiyorsun kardeşim ona göre para verim/
which one do you want my sister, I will pay for it/

This excerpt is part of a longer family play episode where Tuğçe enacts a mother role, Mete is the son, Serra is the baby and Sena enacts a maid role. The first line of the example starts with Tuğçe's statement for the group members for future action, "going to a picnic". Even, in the second part of her utterance, she asks a question, "where is my purse", as she acts out like she is getting ready and need her purse to go out for a picnic. Sena tells her that "I am not going" and continues her work in the kitchen area. Further, Tuğçe asks Sena whether their sandwiches are ready. But Sena does not respond back to Tuğçe and continues her work. As can be seen in the following lines, (5-13), a conflict occurs between Serra and Mete over a sofa where Serra wants to sleep on it and Mete wants to play with his toys on it. That's why Tuğçe's call to go for a picnic was not agreed upon and complied with by Mete and Serra. While Serra and Mete are arguing over the sofa, Tuğçe's second call is heard in line 13 directed to Mete, "my son, we are going to a picnic, picnic". A repetition of the word "picnic" in Tuğçe's utterance shows that Tuğçe wants to highlight the exciting event, picnic, but she does not receive the expected response from her kids about it when she calls them in line 1. Tuğçe's second reminder for the picnic was not picked up by the children either. Instead Mete and Serra continue arguing and not getting ready. In line 14, Serra starts crying because Mete does not let her sister to sleep on the sofa. Further, in line 15, Serra complains to her mother about what Mete did to her. But, Tuğçe ignores what Serra says and turns to Mete and reminds him again that they are going to have a picnic in line 16. While she is talking to Mete, she stands up and stomps her foot to show them how serious she is about her decision. Her third attempt is successful and Mete gets excited, shows his money in his pocket, and tells his mother that he has a lot of money in line 17 and 18. Mete's moves display that he is also ready to go for a picnic with his mother. Then, Tuğçe uses an explicit gender label, "you have to have a lot of money my son, you are a boy" in line 18. Mete acknowledges in line 19 and further tells them "whatever you want to buy tell me" in line 20.

His offer is agreed upon by Serra immediately and she points out a toy to his brother and says "brother brother brother I want this". Mete approaches his sister and says "which one do you want my sister, I will pay for it" in line 22, showing his willingness to pay for his family members.

In this example, Tuğçe may be associating having money, meeting the needs of the family members with boys or man. By evoking the explicit gender label in her utterance in line 18, Tuğçe makes gender relevant to her peer group. Tuğçe takes up what Mete says in line 17-18 and solidifies Mete's ideas about male subjectivity (in any case, boys have money).

Excerpt 4: "look, if you enter this group, you need to give everything very fast"
Participants: Mete, Bora, Ali and Arda (all-boys group)

1. Ali: Arda bak ne oynuyoruz
   Arda look what we are playing/
2. Bora: Kule yapıyoruz Arda
   We are building a tower Arda//
3. Mete: ben de oynayabilir miyim?
   Can I play too?
4. Ali: maalesef oynayamassın çünkü bunu biz yapıyoruz
   Unfortunately you can't play because we are building this one//
5. Mete: ama-ama niye oyna-hm oynayamam?
   but-but why can't hm I play?
→6. Bora: ooooohooo, sen çok yavaşsın, biz çoktan bitirdik bile/
   oooooo you are very slow, we have already done it/
7. Mete: Tamam hızlı olucam/
   okay I will be fast/
→8. Ali: bak eğer bu gruba girersen herşeyi hızlı vermek zorundasın/
   look, if you enter this group, you need to give everything very fast/
→9. Ali: bu grup hızlı ve sert grup, inanmassan Bora'ya sor/
   this group is very fast and tough group, if you don't believe, ask Bora/
10. Mete: tamam tamam inandım/
   okay okay I believed/
11. Ali: hemen şuraya geç ve bana en büyük bloğu ver/
   go there immediately and give me the biggest block/
12. Mete: bu mu?
   this one?
13. Bora: ya sorma, büyük bloğu ver/
   ya don't ask, give the big block/((he gives the blocks very fast))
14. Mete: [loud]al/
   take it/ ((he also begins to talk very assertively))

This excerpt is a part of block play activity where two boys, Ali and Bora are playing with the blocks and constructing a tower and also talking to Arda who plays with the trucks right next to the block corner. Mete approaches the boys' group at the block corner and observes them for a couple of seconds. Then, Mete attemps to enter the boys' group and asks "can I play too?" in line 3. But in the following line, he receives a negative response from Ali "unfortunately you cannot play because we are building this one [tower]". Bora stays silent and does not add more to Ali's answer but he nods his head which also projects his negative stance toward the idea of securing a permission to Mete to be a part of the play.

When Mete questions whether he could be a member of the group, Ali's justification in line 4, saying that "unfortunately you cannot play because we are building this one" does not satisfy him. Then, in his second attempt, he questions why he can't play with them. But when he asks the question, he stammers and produces the words slowly which draws Bora's exaggerated response in line 6, "ooooohooo you are very slow, we have already done it". Bora's response projects that he indexes Mete's slow talk as being not appropriate for the boys' group. In line 7, Mete orients to the boys and says "okay I will be fast". He even produces his utterance very fast to show the boys that he can be an eligible member of the boys' group since he can talk fast enough. In the following lines, Ali tells Mete more about the group's characteristics that he associated with the boys' group. In line 8, he says "look, if you enter this group, you need to give everything very fast" and in line 9, he says "this group is very fast and tough group, if you don't believe, ask Bora". These give a signal to Mete that

he can only be accepted to the group under these circumstances. Then, Mete projects that he wants to be involved in the boys' group; he physically approaches to Ali and Bora and says "okay okay I believe [this group is very fast and tough group] in response to Ali. Consequently, Ali commands Mete in line 11 to make Mete position himself quickly in the area and give him the biggest block. Mete moves quickly to the area where there are many different size blocks ranged. Mete picks one big block, turns to Ali and asks him whether he chooses the right one that he is asking for. However, Bora again sanctioned Mete again that he should act without asking because even asking a question is seen as a time consuming. In the following line, Mete orients to Bora and he produces loud direct command, "take it" to Ali when he is giving the block. He projects the valued "stance" (1992) in order to be the part of all-boys group.

Discussion

Throughout the analysis of a peer of the children's spontaneous free play interactions, I investigated that gender has a fluid quality, it is socially constructed and meanings of gender may vary (Goodwin, 1990, 2006; Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2012; Kyratzis, 2001, 2004; Thorne, 1993). The children evoked gender boundaries when they used the explicit gender labels (e.g., boys don't use small bags) referring to the "girls" and the "boys" as the opposite groups. The explicit use of gender labels and various linguistics forms such as direct commands can be the evidence of how the children make the gender relevant in their talk-in-interaction and these may be associated with particular stances or personas in different settings or cultures that are valued by the participants themselves (Ochs, 1992).

In the family play, when Mete enacted a brother role, the child in the mother role, Lara, corrected him to use the right size bag and play with appropriate toys for boys which displayed that these items were associated with masculinity or seen appropriate for only boys. Goodwin (2011), also argues that gendered "person formulations" (Goodwin, 2011) such as "girl" or "boy" are invoked by children strategically "to accomplish "a particular action at hand" (Goodwin, 2011, p. 252) within the local activity.

In the play with the boys, first, Mete was not accepted to the group. Bora who acted like a group leader, "frequently construct directives (direct commands) in which he displays himself as competent and the addressee (Mete) as incompetent" (Goodwin, 1990, p. 99), assessed Mete's behaviors and speech as being very slow and not appropriate for the boys' group. Mete's assessment displayed that Mete's subjectivity was not seen appropriate for the boys' group. Pavlenko (1998) argues that "the subjects engage in resistance to or in production of new social identities through repeated performance of various acts that constitute a particular identity (p.440). In a similar line with Pavlenko (1998), as seen in the excerpt 4, to be a part of the "fast and tough" all-boys group, Mete may find the new gendered performances more favorable (Pavlenko, 2001a), therefore, he modified his speech (he used a direct command not a question) and behaviors (he gave the block faster) and displayed appropriate gendered performances. Mete's loud direct command "take it" strategically project the valued stances they discussed, 'indexing' him competently and selectively (only) in certain contexts, in the all-boys group.

Based on the findings of this study, it is suggested that, children pay attention to ideologies of gender from their culture, and socialize group members to project valued stances (Ochs, 1992) and subjectivities through utilizing a variety of linguistic resources (e.g., using directives not questions for tougher speech) strategically (Thorne, 1993). As has been pointed out by many scholars, second language learners' co-construction of their social identities in the new culture has implications for their own ideologies, orientations and attitudes to their first language and the second language, which may help their access to linguistic resources and interactional opportunities available in the target language and in various contexts (Menard-Warwick, 2004; Pavlenko and Piller, 2001; Warriner, 2004).

Further, CA-based microanalysis enables us to uncover details of very young children's peer group interactions that have the potential to clarify how and when language learning occurs. Children actively construct gender and social organization in their peer group conversations and ethnographic studies provide a useful lens for examining how they do it.

References

Cekaite, A. & Evaldsson, A-C. (2008). Staging linguistic identities and negotiating monolingual norms in multiethnic school settings. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 5*(3), 177-196. doi: 10.1080/14790710802387588

Cameron, D. (1997). Theoretical debates in feminist linguistics: Questions of sex and gender. In R.Wodak (Ed.), *Gender and discourse* (pp.21–36). London: Sage.

Cameron, D. (1998) Gender, language, and discourse: A review essay, signs. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *23*(4), 945–67.

Danby, S. & Baker, C. D. (2001). Escalating terror: Communicative strategies in a preschool classroom dispute. *Early Education and Development*, *12*(3), 343-355. doi: 10.1207/s15566935eed1203_4

de León, L. (2007). Parallelism, metalinguistic play, and the interactive emergence of Zinacantec Mayan siblings' culture. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 40(4), 405-436. doi: 10.1080/08351810701471401

Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 21,* 461-490.

Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1999). New generalizations and explanations in language and gender research. *Language in Society, 28*(2), 185-202.

Eder, D., Evans, C. C. & Parker, S. (1995). *School talk: gender and adolescent culture*. Rutgers University Press.

Evaldsson, A. C. (2002). Boys' gossip telling: Staging identities and indexing (unacceptable) masculine behavior. *Text-The Hague Then Amsterdam Then Berlin, 22*(2), 199-226.

Evaldsson, A. C. (2004). Shifting moral stances: Morality and gender in same-sex and cross-sex game interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 37*(3), 331-363. doi: 10.1207/s15327973rlsi3703_3

Evaldsson, A. C. (2005). Staging insults and mobilizing categorizations in a multiethnic peer group. *Discourse and Society*, 16, 763-786. doi: 10.1177/0957926505056663

Evaldsson, A. C. (2007). Accounting for friendship: Moral ordering and category membership in preadolescent girls' relational talk. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *40*(4) 377-404. doi:10.1080/08351810701471377

Evaldsson, A. C., & Cekaite, A. (2010). 'Schwedis' he can't even say Swedish": Subverting and reproducing institutionalized norms for language use in multilingual peer groups. *Pragmatics, 20*(4), 587-604.

Fenstermaker, S. & West, C. (2002). *Doing gender, doing difference: Inequality, power and institutional change.* New York: Routledge.

Gordon, D. (2008). Gendered second language socialization. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd ed., 8*, 231-243.

Goodwin, M. H. (2008). *The hidden life of girls: Games of stance, status, and exclusion*. John Wiley & Sons.

Goodwin, M. H. & Kyratzis, A. (2007). Children socializing children: Practices for negotiating the social order among peers. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *40(4),* 1-11. doi: 10.1080/08351810701471310

Goodwin, M. H. & Kyratzis, A. (2011) Peer socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B.B. Scieffelin (Eds.), *The Handbook of language socialization*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.

Gumperz & Berenz (1993).Transcribing Conversational Exchanges. Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research. In Jane Edwards and Martin Lampert (Eds.) (pp. 91-121). New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Kitzinger, C. & Rickford, R. (2007). Becoming a `bloke': the construction of gender in interaction. *Feminism and Psychology, 17*(2), 214-223. doi: 10.1177/0959353507076554

Kyratzis, A. (2001). Children's gender indexing in language: From the separate world hypothesis to considerations of culture, context, and power. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 34(1)*, 1-13.

Kyratzis, A. (2004). Talk and interaction among children and the co-construction of peer groups and peer culture. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 33*, 625-649.

Kyratzis, A. (2007). Using the social organizational affordances of pretend play in American preschool girls' interactions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 40(4), 321-353. doi:10.1080/08351810701471310

Kyratzis, A. (2010). Latina girls' peer play interactions in a bilingual Spanish-English U.S. preschool: Heteroglossia, frame-shifting, and language ideology. *Pragmatics, 20*(4), 557–586.

Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society*, *2*(1), 45–80.

Maltz, D.N. and Borker, R.A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.) *Language and social identity* (pp. 195-216). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Menard-Warwick, J. (2004). "I always had the desire to progress a little": Gendered narratives of immigrant language learners. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 3*(4), 295-311. doi: 10.1207/s15327701jlie0304_5

Minks, (2006). Mediated intertextuality in pretend play among Nicaraguan Miskitu children. *Texas Linguistic Forum*, (SALSA). 49, 117-127.

Minks, A. (2010). Socializing heteroglossia among Miskitu children on the Caribbean coast of Nicaragua. *Pragmatics*, *20*(4), 495-522.

Norton, P.B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. London: Longman.

Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.) *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp.335-358). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1986). From feelings to grammar. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across culture* (pp. 251-272). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pavlenko, A. (2001a). "How am I to become a woman in an American vein?" Transformations of gender performance in second language learning. In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller and M. Teutsch-Dwyer (eds.). *Multilingualism, second language learning, and gender.* (pp. 133-171). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pavlenko, A. (2001b). Bilingualism, gender and ideology. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, *5*(2), 117-151. doi: 10.1177/13670069010050020101

Pavlenko, A. (2001c). Language learning memoirs as a gendered genre. *Applied linguistics, 22*(2), 213-240. doi: 10.1093/applin/22.2.213

Pavlenko, A. and Lantolf, J.P. (2001). Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J.P. Lantolf (ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 155-178). Oxford University Press.

Peirce, B. N. (1995). Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning. *TESOL quarterly*, *29*(1), 9-31. doi: 10.2307/3587803

Reynolds, J. (2007) Buenos días/ (military salute): The natural history of a coined insult. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 40*(4), 437-466. doi: 10.1080/08351810701471427

Reynolds, J. F. (2010). Enregistering the voices of discursive figures of authority in Antonero children's socio-dramatic play. *Pragmatics, 20*(4), 467-493.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Between micro and macro: Contexts and other connections. In J.C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch & N.J. Smelser (Eds.), *The micro-macro link* (pp. 207-234). Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Schegloff, E. A, Koshik, I., Jacoby, S. & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 3-31.

Shi, Xingsong. (2006). Gender, identity and intercultural transformation in second language socialisation. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 6*(1), 2-17.

Stokoe, E. H & Smithson, J. (2001). Making gender relevant: Conversation analysis and gender categories in interaction. *Discourse and Society, 12,* 217-244.

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Tarım, Ş. D. (2007). *Turkish preschool children's gender practices and interactional styles: The role of context and culture.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Santa Barbara

Warriner, D. (2004). The days now is very hard for my family: The negotiation and construction of gendered work identities among newly arrived women refugees. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 3*, 279-295.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society, 1, 125-151.*

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

The transcription conventions described below, based on Gumperz and Berenz (1993):

//	Final fall
/	Slight final fall indicating temporary closure (e.g., more can be said)
?	Final rise
,	Slight rise as in listing intonation (e.g., more is expected)
-	Truncation (e.g., what ti- what time is it/)
..	Pauses of less than .5 seconds
<2>	Precise units of time (=2 second pause)
=	To indicate latching of speaker's utterances
::	Lengthened segments (e.g., wha::t)
{[ ]}	Non lexical phenomena both vocal and nonvocal, that overlay the lexical stretch (e.g., [ac] for faster talk, [hi] for high pitch, [f] loud voice, [p] for whispering tone)
[ ]	Nonlexical phenomena, both vocal and nonvocal, that interrupt the lexical stretch (e.g., text [laugh] text//)
( )	Unintelligible speech
(( ))	Transcriber comments