Moral reasoning as a resource for resisting impositions in children's everyday interactions

Shuman, Bilyana

2018

Shuman, B. (2018). Moral reasoning as a resource for resisting impositions in children's everyday interactions. Doctoral thesis, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

<http://hdl.handle.net/10356/73505>

<https://doi.org/10.32657/10356/73505>

**NANYANG
TECHNOLOGICAL
UNIVERSITY**

**MORAL REASONING AS A RESOURCE FOR
RESISTING IMPOSITIONS IN CHILDREN'S
EVERYDAY INTERACTIONS**

BILYANA SHUMAN

School of Humanities

2017

**MORAL REASONING AS A RESOURCE FOR RESISTING
IMPOSITIONS IN CHILDREN'S EVERYDAY INTERACTIONS**

BILYANA SHUMAN

2017

**Moral Reasoning as a Resource for Resisting Impositions in
Children's Everyday Interactions**

Bilyana Shuman

School of Humanities

A thesis submitted to the Nanyang Technological University in partial
fulfillment of the requirement for the award of
Doctor of Philosophy

2017

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank my Supervisor, Professor Luke Kang Kwong, who sparked my interest in Conversation Analysis (CA) as a research method. His trust in me, and his patience and attitude have left me motivated for life. I would like to think that we have formed a lasting friendship. I would also like to thank Nanyang Technological University (NTU) for providing me with a scholarship for the last three years of my PhD research. I am equally grateful to all the Data session participants at NTU over the years, who offered valuable feedback whenever I showed my video clips. I am particularly grateful to Ni Eng, who generously offered his time to meet with and give me professional and personal advice, and whose friendship I appreciate greatly.

Moving from Europe to Asia with a young family has been a difficult but most rewarding experience. Emeritus Fellow, Professor Patricia Ashby at the University of Westminster, UK, is responsible for my initial search for supervisors in Asia. She shared with me the names of valuable researchers in the field, namely, her friends and associates, such as Professor Roger Bell in Malaysia and Associate Professor Lim Beng Soon in Singapore, who immediately impressed me with their kindness and willingness to help while they continue to be resourceful with their advice and support. I also thank Associate Professor Biljana Čubrović from The Faculty of Philology in Belgrade in Serbia, who continually showed interest in my research and who initially introduced me to Professor Patricia Ashby at the 3rd Belgrade International Meeting of English Phoneticians (BIMEP) in 2012. I have been lucky to have met many prominent researchers in the CA field very early on in my research, many of whom have inspired and assisted me in one way or another. One of them is my thesis advisor, Professor Jack Sidnell from the University of Toronto in Canada, whose research I

closely follow, and who I find equally inspirational in more ways than one. His views on matters outside of linguistics and anthropology have equally affected me and are in many aspects harmonious with mine. His initial comments on my initial research proposal have provided me with a much clearer path, which I have consciously attempted to follow. I am thankful to Professor Jonathan Hindmarsh from King's College, United Kingdom, who spared time out of his busy schedule to meet me in London and who introduced me to prominent scholars and experts in children's interactions. I am also grateful to Professor Charles Antaki at Loughborough University, United Kingdom, who kindly arranged for me to present my data to the DARG participants at Loughborough.

I am grateful to my supportive parents, who deserve enormous credit for selflessly devoting endless hours to childcare so that I could focus on my research and writing. Without the help of my parents, I could not have travelled all over the world (literally) to collect my data and attend conferences and workshops. Looking after the children has given me that needed peace of mind, and no one else could have done it better than my parents. I would also like to thank my cousin Radenko, who helped with all the technical aspects of my research and assisted me with editing and shortening of my video recordings for easier viewing and selection, for the formatting of my transcriptions and presentations and other IT related issues. I am appreciative of his kind assistance and support.

I am indebted to my husband Michael, who regularly reminded me to think of the contributing factors to my thesis, and kept me concentrated on the research topic, through endlessly challenging questions and discussions. His overall support has been crucial throughout my entire PhD venture. And most importantly, I thank my children, Milla and Alexander, without whom I could not see past this exhausting enterprise as a

researcher and a mother, and whose presence and curiosity continue to enlighten me daily. For this and more, I thank my daughter Milla, who teaches me audaciousness and determination, and who makes me smile whenever she reminds me of the following statement by Nikola Tesla, which she knows by heart, ‘The scientists of today think deeply instead of clearly. One must be sane to think clearly, but one can think deeply and be quite insane’¹. I am equally grateful to my son, Alexander, who, with his incredible sense of humour for a child of his age, teaches me patience and kindness daily. Alex’s frequent pieces of ‘advice’ are often followed by his witty remarks: ‘Get it?’ and ‘Take a deep breath and count to ten’, which always put a smile on my face. And often, after seemingly never-ending and exhausting writing sessions, that smile has kept me going.

¹ <http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/131800-the-scientists-of-today-think-deeply-instead-of-clearly-one>

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Abstract.....	11
List of Tables.....	13
List of Figures	14
List of Excerpts	15
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	18
Research Topic	18
Motivation for the study.....	20
Chapter 2: Literature review	25
Child language development.....	26
Child language socialisation and social understanding	29
Children’s participation in the members’ culture.....	30
Accountable actions and moral accountability.....	32
Resistance to impositions and conflict.....	33
Morality and moral reasoning involving research on children	36
Early works on morality.....	42
Developmental theories in Piaget’s work on morality.....	43
Kohlberg’s six stages of moral development	46
Turiel’s social domain theory.....	48
Selman’s role-taking theory	49

Dunn's work on morality	50
More recent works on morality	51
Recent works on morality using CA.....	53
Shaw and Hepburn's work on moral implications of advice	53
Takada's work on directive sequences.....	54
Sterponi's work on moral positioning in 'vicarious' accounts.....	55
Recent works on morality using MCA	55
Summary	58
Chapter 3: Methodology	61
Research methodology.....	61
Conversation Analysis (CA)	61
Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA)	66
Participants, language(s), and setting(s)	71
Data.....	76
Data collection.....	77
Data processing.....	78
Data analysis.....	80
Chapter 4: Children's Invocation of Rules	83
Object possession and ownership Exc. 1	83
Object possession and ownership Exc. 2	86
Object possession and ownership Exc. 3	88
Object possession and ownership Exc. 4	90

‘An agreement’ Exc. 5	92
‘First come first served’ Exc. 6	94
Rule of the game Exc. 7	96
Fairness and reciprocity Exc. 8	98
‘Ask nicely’ Exc. 9	103
Summary	105
Chapter 5: Children’s use of Extreme Case Formulations (ECFs)	109
‘Always’ and ‘never’ Exc. 10	110
‘All’ and ‘always’ Exc. 11	112
‘All’ and ‘always’ Exc. 12	115
‘Never ever’, ‘always’, and ‘never’ Exc. 13	117
Summary	120
Chapter 6: Children’s use of Membership Categories (MCs) and Membership	
Categorization Devices (MCDs)	122
‘Bad Mummy’ Exc. 14	122
‘Bad Mummy’ Exc. 15	128
‘Bad Mummy’ Exc. 16	132
‘Rude Mummy’ Exc. 17	136
‘Rude Mummy’ Exc. 18	139
‘Silly and naughty Mummy’ Exc. 19	142
‘Mean Mummy’ Exc. 20	144
‘Not being a polite Mummy’ and ‘bad Mummy’ Exc. 21	147

‘Small’ and ‘older’ Exc. 22.....	151
‘Biggest’, ‘smaller’, and ‘bigger’ Exc. 23	155
‘Mummy’ Exc. 24.....	159
‘Mummies and Daddies’ Exc. 25	164
‘Mummy’ Exc. 26.....	167
‘The Queen’ Exc. 27.....	170
Summary	173
Chapter 7: Summary and conclusion.....	181
Summary of findings	181
Conclusion.....	187
Study contributions.....	189
Study limitations.....	190
Future study opportunities	191
References.....	193
Appendices.....	212
Appendix I: Electronic diary back-up screen shot	213
Appendix II: Excel transcription annotations screen shot	214
Appendix III: Calendar(s) language(s) exposure log(s) for years 2012-2016	215
Appendix IV: Recording and data storage devices	218
Appendix V: CA transcription notations and symbols	219
Appendix VI: ‘Really’, Praat screen shot	222

Appendix VII: ‘We always have to listen to you and you never listen to us’, Praat	
screen shot.....	223

Abstract

This thesis reports on how two children use moral reasoning as a resource in order to resist impositions from others in their everyday interactions. Children are frequently met with constraints and impositions placed upon them by parents, caregivers, friends, siblings, and others in their daily lives. Even at a young age, children are able to bring a variety of linguistic and multimodal resources to bear upon these situations in which they find themselves. Data in the form of naturally-occurring video and audio recordings in the children's home setting is collected, transcribed, examined and analysed using Conversation Analysis (CA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) methods, pioneered by sociologist Harvey Sacks in the 1960s. These two methodologies were used in their Ethnomethodological sense, incorporating sequential and categorial work, which open the way to participant-oriented, child-focused analyses. Close examination of the two young children's constructions and applications of moral reasoning reveal that they employ three specific interactional practices. It is found that children invoke rules, or even create them, primarily in situations of conflict and in order to accomplish their interactional goals. In addition, the children employ Extreme Case Formulations (ECFs) as described by Pomerantz (1986). Most prominent of these are 'never', 'always', 'all', 'never ever', etc., which the children employ to defend their arguments, to legitimize or justify their claims, to emphasize their points of view, or/and to exaggerate the 'wrongness' of the actions of their co-participants. Lastly, it is found that children employ Membership Categories (MCs) and Membership Categorization Devices (MCDs) while reasoning with their interlocutors. This involves the use of categories (e.g., 'mummy', 'mummies and daddies', 'the Queen') along with their attending 'category-bound activities' (Sacks, 1979). Our findings show that these two children were very adept at using a variety of

resources in pursuits of their interactional goals. Through a range of discursive practices that engage their co-participants in a series of negotiations and moral reasoning, these children were able to counter impositions to varying degrees of success. It is hoped that an understanding of children's employment of a variety of linguistic and multimodal resources such as invocations of rules, employment of ECFs, MCs, and MCDs will shed light on the learning and development of language and reasoning skills in young children.

List of Tables

Table 1. Piaget's Stages of Moral Development	46
Table 2. Kohlberg's Six Stages of Moral Development.....	47

List of Figures

Figure 1. The two main participants of the study, Mia and Luke	72
Figure 2. Other participants in the study.....	73
Figure 3. Overview of the languages and settings of the participants.....	75
Figure 4. Average percentage(s) of exposure to specific languages.	76

List of Excerpts

Excerpt 1 [151230 Magic trick 23:40].....	83
Excerpt 2 [151230 Magic Trick 23:40]	86
Excerpt 3 [151230 Magic Trick 23:40]	88
Excerpt 4 [141222 Cartwheels 05:40]	90
Excerpt 5 [151230 Magic Trick 16:15]	92
Excerpt 6 [151230 Magic Trick 23:40]	94
Excerpt 7 [151230 Magic Trick 23:40]	96
Excerpt 8 [141028 Leaving Singapore 20:11]	98
Excerpt 9 [151230 Magic Trick 23:40]	103
Excerpt 10 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]	110
Excerpt 11 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57].....	112
Excerpt 12 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57].....	115
Excerpt 13 [160801_Boy channels 02:42].....	117
Excerpt 14 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]	122
Excerpt 15 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]	128
Excerpt 16 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57].....	132
Excerpt 17 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57].....	136
Excerpt 18 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57].....	139
Excerpt 19 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57].....	142
Excerpt 20 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57].....	144
Excerpt 21 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57].....	147
Excerpt 22 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]	151
Excerpt 23 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57].....	155
Excerpt 24 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]	159

Excerpt 25 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]	164
Excerpt 26 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]	167
Excerpt 27 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57].....	170

I dedicate my thesis to Professor Samuel Irving Shuman, an inspirational and loving
grandfather.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Research Topic

The definition of *morality* and *moral*, as found in the Oxford English Dictionaries Online, encompasses principles with regards to ‘distinction between right and wrong, or good or bad behaviour’ and the definition of *reasoning* is described as an ‘action of thinking about something in a logical, sensible way’ (OED, 2017). From an interactional perspective then, *moral reasoning* can be defined as a person’s *action* of treating something as right or wrong, or good or bad behaviour according to some sort of principles that co-participants may invoke in conversations. As Pomerantz (1986) points out, ‘One of the ways of knowing what is acceptable and right is by finding out how people behave. How people behave tells us what is the right way to behave’ (p. 228).

In this thesis, I would like to explore how the two children construct moral reasoning, and the purposes for which moral reasoning is used in their everyday interactions with others. Questions pertaining to children’s moral reasoning and moral judgments, initially raised by Piaget (1965), may be re-framed here as: how morality and moral reasoning is conceptualized, learned, and used as a resource in situated contexts. We observe how children convey their understanding of what they perceive to be ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ behaviour, as well as their moral positioning with regards to specific actions by various others - parents, siblings, other children, other extended family members and other adults.

There is already a vast amount of research on morality in general, but also on children’s development of morality and their moral reasoning skills, primarily from a cognitive and developmental perspective, which has always been a major concern for psychologists. As it will become clear in the following chapter (on literature review),

previous research on morality in general was predominantly conducted through methods such as clinical observations, interviews, and questionnaires, in which subjects were asked to make a difficult decision based on a hypothetical situation, for example (Piaget, 1965; Kohlberg, 1976, 1981, 1984; Turiel, 1983). While the construction of hypothetical situations can and has yielded useful insights, it is just as important, if not more so, to observe and carry out in-depth investigations into interactions in which children can be seen in their engagement with moral issues. For, arguably, children learn how ‘to understand their social world’ in interactions with others (Smetana, Jambon, Conry-Murray, & Sturge-Apple, 2012, pp. 1153 & 1154).

In this thesis, I intend to systematically investigate children’s talk with a view aimed at arriving at a better understanding of their moral reasoning, the moral norms or rule sets that are at their disposal, and which can thus be invoked in situations of conflict or disagreement. What I mean by conflict and disagreement are situations, primarily in the children’s home setting, whereby they are seen to be dealing with various impositions and constraints in their daily lives. My focus is therefore on how the two children employ moral reasoning as a resource in order to resist these impositions and constraints.

Social order *is* moral order in the abstract, and people create it from ‘bottom up’ and they actively construct it by using their common-sense knowledge (Garfinkel, 1967). For any meaning to be accomplished, there must be active participation and commitment from more than one person at a time, which means that social order is therefore reflexive and situated, and it requires continuous, reciprocal attention and collaboration. Social understanding stems from social interactions, and the social, psychological, and linguistic components are embedded within sequential organisation, and as such, should all be incorporated holistically in the analysis,

wherever possible. Moral reasoning is therefore understood in terms of its interactional consequences. The children are not orienting to moral reasoning and moral order because moral order is not organised by these explicit social rules that lay people can formulate (Sidnell, personal communication, 3/2/2015).

Thus far, several interactional research studies have been carried out on single-child interactions with adults or with other children, but predominantly in unfamiliar, institutional settings (Eisenberg & Hand, 1979; Eisenberg & Garvey, 1981; Bar-Tal Raviv & Goldberg, 1982; Main & George, 1985; Sidnell, 2011) or settings with unfamiliar adults, for example (Cummings, Iannotti & Zahn-Waxler, 1985). Some notable exceptions are studies of peer and parent-child interactions (Butler, 2008; Butler & Weatherall, 2006; Butler & Fitzgerald, 2010; Danby, 1999; Danby & Baker, 1998; Goodwin, 1983, 2002; Wootton, 1986, 1997; Forrester, 2002, 2008, 2013, 2014; Gardner & Forrester, 2009). I embrace these findings and aim to go a step further by exploring the interactions between the two children and their family members in the home setting.

Motivation for the study

My initial motivation for the study stems from the mother's experience with the two children (pseudonyms, Mia and Luke), the two main subjects. On one occasion, during school holidays, the mother enrolled the siblings in a school summer camp for a week. She asked the school if both children could stay in the same group so that Mia (06; 04) could look out for her younger brother Luke (03; 10). Two days after the camp had started and the children arrived home, Mia told the mother that Luke had a fight with another boy. The mother worriedly asked Mia what she had done about that, to which Mia immediately responded: 'Don't worry Mum, I reported Luke to the teacher straight away!' On a different occasion, Luke came home from school one day

and told the mother that the polar bears are disappearing, because people are killing them. The mother then questioned Luke about what we should do to protect polar bears to which Luke responded: ‘We should kill people!’

Mia’s and Luke’s instinctive, and arguably ‘logical’ responses intrigued the mother to consider how moral reasoning and morality is formed in these children’s minds, how they convey it, and more importantly how they employ moral reasoning as a resource when they face moral dilemmas, constraints, and impositions placed upon them in their daily interactions. What is it that makes them select one utterance over another to express their moral stance and what is their reasoning or ‘logical and sensible thinking’ behind it? What is it that makes them believe that actions they take through their utterances, and the conduct that they display in interactions is the ‘right’ one, and how they come to understand it as such? Moreover, sheer curiosity to also perhaps unravel and examine practices of intervention and the responses of other agents in the children’s social life has motivated me to carry out this research. And although my thesis may not provide answers to all the above questions, those very questions have inspired and motivated my study.

I begin by asking how often parents or teachers say to a child, ‘How many times have I asked you to do/not to do that?’. It must be difficult for adults to have to refer to the same points continuously while expecting (or perhaps not) immediate obedience and a response, but even more so, children’s prompt understanding of those requests. It must be equally difficult for children to grasp the reasoning behind this incessant exercise placed upon them. Do they wonder how they are supposed to know what the right thing to do is in the first instance, especially when they find themselves in situations they have not been in before? Do parents take these ‘common-sense’ situations they (themselves) have experienced for granted, and are their expectations of

children reasonable? I believe that those ‘taken for granted’ expectations are often the source of conflict emergence incorporating all sorts of morality issues, which occur in conversations with young children.

In Chapter 3 of his book, *Interaction and the development of mind*, Wootton (1997) discusses some of the issues related to the ambivalent nature of interactions with children, specifically related to ‘sequential knowledge’ (pp. 56-96). Undoubtedly, all people, including children, are embedded within the complex webs of social interactions where they are required to engage in daily conversations as participants and social beings, but at the same time, they learn from those experiences. Even very young children can engage in social interactions, and that is even before they start to speak (Carpendale & Lewis, 2012, p. 1). Perhaps, in today’s world, one is expected to become part of the globalised world maintaining an individual, ethnic, religious or national identity, while possibly having to adhere to all kinds of constraints and impositions placed upon them by individuals or society. Presumably, every parent wishes for his or her child to develop into a moral human being by being able to ‘think logically and sensibly’, to reason and to negotiate while they present their viewpoints in interactions with people they encounter throughout their lives.

Traditional theories see ‘children as “consumers” of the culture established by adults’ (Corsaro, 2005, p. 7). Shakespeare (1998) discusses the status of children versus adults and refers to children’s ‘half membership’ status depending on different situations and conversational activities. According to Hutchby and O’Reilly (2010), children in therapy sessions for example, were treated as highly competent participants by the counsellors. Corsaro (2005) claims that children play an important part in our society as any other participating members and it should be every society’s desire to establish the relevant moral fabric in the children. Corsaro (2005) further claims that

‘children are active, creative social agents who produce their own unique children’s cultures while simultaneously contributing to the production of adult societies’ (p. 3).

This is where the need for this type of research proves relevant, and to conduct such research one must consider where to look for morality and moral reasoning, and more importantly how the learning is done. Arguably, children’s moral action, their display of moral reasoning and understanding, are to be found in their talk and social interaction with others. Their ‘language’ (i.e., utterances) is the apparatus that, ultimately, is the only viable display of their moral reasoning and moral actions. Therefore, to understand children’s learning processes, it is essential to closely examine how those reasoning processes are unravelled and made manifest through their actions, which inevitably occur in social interactions. My focus is on situations where children are seen to be facing constraints or impositions, and where they provide some type of moral reasoning as a resource in order to resist those impositions and in order to achieve their interactional goals.

In addition, one cannot ignore the fact that in the global society that we live in today, many children are in fact ‘global children’ who come from a variety of backgrounds and cultures. Many children are bilingual or even multilingual, as well as multicultural, which is significant, considering that ‘culture is likely to matter more than language’ (Wootton, 1997, p. 4). In the case of the two children in this study, my two primary participants are multicultural and bilingual, while continuously being exposed to more than one language (English, Serbian, Greek, Mandarin, and Tagalog), having lived and having spent a considerable amount of time in diverse parts of the world in countries such as Singapore, Serbia, United Kingdom, United States of America, and Greece.

If we consider all of the above, it should be noted that all the video or audio recordings of the two siblings were made at their home setting in Singapore, but also in other countries mentioned above. In addition to regular video or audio recordings, diary notes that were backed up onto the electronic diary (See Appendix I) are also kept, supplementing the analyses. Majority of conversations in the recordings are conducted in English, the children's native language. However, instances or sections of conversations are sometimes conducted in languages other than English. As part of my entire data collection, there are also instances of Serbian, Greek, and Chinese² languages. Approximately 60 hours of video or audio recordings were made. The selection criteria for examination and analysis were to identify the children's moral reasoning practices within those 60 hours. The recordings were then examined further to identify instances whereby a constraint or an imposition of some sort was placed upon the children and they were seen to resist these impositions. Upon final examination of the recordings, eleven hours of those recordings were chosen and fully transcribed. Transcriptions were then examined further, and twenty- seven excerpts were selected for the final analysis.

² Chinese refers to Mandarin Chinese in the thesis

Chapter 2: Literature review

In this chapter, I survey relevant literature on research conducted on morality. In the earlier sections of the literature review, I identify early works on morality conducted within disciplines other than CA (Philosophy, Psychology, Anthropology etc.). In philosophy for example, the most prominent morality features incorporate general and decontextualized principles that explore the individual's and interpretation of others' behavior but fail to explain '*when* and *how*' those principles become relevant in everyday interactions (Sterponi, 2003, p. 79). In social sciences, sociologists and anthropologists have studied customs and traditions as the focal morality features, based on the origin of the word 'mores', referred to as 'traditions' (Durkheim, 1965, 1994). In psychology, morality has been fundamentally studied as an individual, rather than social process (e.g., interactive). It has also been primarily studied as a developmental and cognitive process, based predominantly on observations, hypothetical dilemmas, and interviews (Piaget, 1965; Kohlberg, 1981). However, this approach has been challenged within discursive psychology and linguistic anthropology by Capps and Ochs (1995); Potter (1998); Goodwin (1998) and Bergmann (1998), who questioned the notion of decontextualized and hypothetical concepts and more specifically, the lack of consideration for the correlation between morality and interaction (Sterponi, 2003, p. 80). In the final sections of the literature review, I elaborate on the recent emergence of CA and MCA approaches with regards to matters indexical of morality, as well as how CA and MCA can be utilised as effective tools in order to understand moral action in everyday, naturally – occurring interactions involving young children.

Child language development

Child language presents an important field of investigation in language development at large, and as such, has been the focus of many disciplines, particularly within psychology, linguistics, sociology, and anthropology (Dunn, 1987, 1988a, 1988b; Forrester, 2014; Halliday, 1975; Snow, 1977; Maynard, 1985; Cook-Gumperz, Corsaro, & Streck, 1986; Goodwin, 1990; Whalen, 1995; Wootton, 1997; Danby & Baker, 1998; Carpendale, 2000; Sterponi, 2003, 2009; Corsaro, 2005; Tomasello, 2009; Cushman et al., 2013).

The renewed interest in language development from the mid 1960s onwards illustrates the difference between the two concepts of language and language learning, one as genetically bestowed, the other as environmentally shaped and evolving (Halliday, 1975). Language development study in the 1970s navigated away from this relatively sterile argument. According to Bloom (2000), in the 1970s, linguistic theory was replaced by cognitive theory. The emphasis shifted from the phonological system to the lexico-grammatical system (syntax), then to the semantic system and finally to the cognitive system.

There are several requirements that are relevant for language use and development. Some of those requirements are that one must be sensitive to a 'patterned sound system', to constraints imposed by grammar, and sensitivity to inferred meaning and communicative intentions, with such development arising when children transact interactionally (Bruner & Watson, 1983, p. 31). Language is therefore 'the most important tool' for the construction of the social world because social action is created through language use, and children thus shape their own learning experiences through their interactive responses (Cook-Gumperz & Corsaro, 1986, pp. 7-9). Naturally, language affects us and those around us, and children

develop such understanding at a very early age. This early interactive process requires familiar settings, persons, and linguistic formats, which aid the child's comprehension of situations and experiences (Bruner & Watson, 1983, p. 39). Children draw on their experiences while they develop into social beings as they realise that language use is powerful and could be used to 'control others' (Cook-Gumperz, 1981, p. 38). What is important to take into account is that children's version of language should not be considered a primitive variety of adult's language.

Children utilise language in order to achieve their interactional goals, and in so doing, they negotiate meanings through interaction and learn the ways of the culture, while employing much more than 'just mastering of the code' (Bruner & Watson, 1983, Preface). Furthermore, children's gradually progressive communicative practices cultivate their social knowledge and 'shape their identity' (Cook-Gumperz & Corsaro, 1986, p. 2). As Bruner & Watson (1983) point out, there are three aspects to language learning and development. Firstly, utterances should be structurally well formed and coherent. Secondly, utterances must have capacity to refer and to mean with reference to context and cannot be examined decontextualized. And thirdly, children must learn 'how to get things done with words' and understand what the purpose of the employment of such words is (Bruner & Watson, 1983, pp. 17&18). As well as being a cognitive process, language learning and development is also an interactive process, which stipulates the continuous exchange of meanings, and this in turn, represents a social activity (Halliday, 1975). 'Social context' therefore provides for the development of social competence (Corsaro & Streeck, 1986, p. 22).

Much of the research on children has produced results related to their *communicative competence* which focuses on children's speech strategies and how they 'control and effect communication' as competent social beings (Corsaro &

Streeck, 1986, p. 2). It is not enough for a child to be able to produce ‘an appropriate speech act’ unless their utterances are produced and understood as a joint activity, closely related to context, and as such, this joint activity makes sense to the speaker as well as the hearer. During sequential unfolding of a conversation there is a constant need for adjustment caused by situational properties and for a realisation of meaning and intersubjectivity, all participants, including children, require skills beyond the ability to produce properly formed utterances (Corsaro & Streeck, 1986, p. 14). Children do not just passively receive and process information linguistically. They actively use their ability to construct meaning by learning how to take turns and to design their utterances to accommodate their recipients while using a variety of resources available to them in social interactions with others (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Studying children’s interactional practices at a ‘micro-analytic level’ allows us to explore how children’s social worlds develop and transform (Cook-Gumperz & Corsaro, 1986, p. 10).

In recent years, more researchers have been moving away from the traditional type of research and are taking a more holistic approach by employing more naturalistic and interpretive approaches and this might be due to ‘restraints found in traditional methods’ (Corsaro & Streeck, 1986, p. 15). More recent research developments present findings based on real-life, video and audio recording conversations of children or adolescents interacting with familiar others (Butler, 2008; Wootton, 1997; Forrester, 2002, 2006, 2008, 2013, 2014; Forrester & Reason, 2006; Goodwin, 1990; Sterponi, 2003, 2009) and non-familiar others, in predominantly institutional settings (Maynard, 1985a, 1985b; Whalen, 1995; Danby & Baker, 1998; Hepburn & Potter, 2011).

Child language socialisation and social understanding

The term ‘socialisation’ sprung up in the beginning of the 19th century as being ‘fit for living in society’ (Oxford Dictionary, 1828; cited in Cook-Gumperz & Corsaro, 1986, p. 4). Child language socialisation is demonstrated through a child’s ability to construct and maintain social relations with others and through the growth of their social understandings (Cook-Gumperz & Corsaro, 1986, p. 4). Family, and more specifically, the parent-child relationship, is the child’s ‘first and formative context’ for social, cognitive, linguistic, and moral development (Berk, 1991, p. 559). The child’s world undergoes significant changes once outside the family and once children start socialising with their peers (Corsaro, 1992, p. 162). Child socialisation and child rearing is a universal practice, ubiquitous to all parts of the world. Language gives access to culture and it is not necessarily about capacities but also how people, or in our case, children, are aided in expressing themselves in the ‘medium of culture’ (Bruner & Watson, 1983, p. 23).

There is a significant cultural difference in social situations created by children and the ones that exist in adult worlds (Corsaro & Streeck, 1986; Goodwin, 1983, 1998). Until recently, most research on child language socialisation has claimed that children live in their own children’s worlds separate from the one of adults when it comes to knowledge, meanings and language use.

The significance of examining and analysing features of actual language use, and communicative and social skills, in order to further develop our understanding of children’s socialisation processes, are therefore deemed relevant. Social interaction itself is ‘both self-propelled and self-rewarding’ (Bruner & Watson, 1983, p. 27). Within psychology and sociology, the minute analyses of the unfolding of sequences within interaction among children have been ‘largely neglected’ (Auwärter, 1986, p.

207). In the next section of the thesis, I will discuss some of the main concepts with regards to children's language use, followed by early works on morality involving research on children, and then I will focus on more recent research on morality using CA and MCA approaches.

Children's participation in the members' culture

Language gives access to culture and it is not necessarily about capacities but also how people, or in our case, children, are aided in expressing themselves in the 'medium of culture' (Bruner & Watson, 1983, p. 23). With regards to children's participation in the members' culture, I consider another methodical issue and questions related to how children become members of a culture, as well as other pertinent questions applicable to children's participation membership (Forrester, 2017). It is believed that for children to fully integrate in the members' culture they must learn to recognise and produce speech that will demonstrate to others in their surroundings that 'speech' is a social practice (Corsaro and Streeck, 1986, p. 15). Children, from a very young age and as it will be shown in my data, employ various interactional resources in order to engage in argumentations, debates and negotiations, and through interaction they learn how to produce relevant social practices while progressively becoming members of a culture. More specifically, Forrester (2013) found that children begin to display their understanding of their own accountability in question-answer sequences at the age of three. In their study, Budwig, Strage and Bamberg (1986) show that in peer-play, children design play activities using their 'growing sense of shared understanding', thus demonstrating that a knowledge base is shared and drawn upon for communication between members of a specific culture.

Culture is presented, regulated, and interpreted through 'language use' (Bruner & Watson, 1983, p. 24). Equally, cultural models of what is considered good or bad

parenting for example become explicit in everyday routine interactional practices. Parents attempt to draw on discursive practices that convey cultural norms, and values that fit the relevant cultural context. The relationship in adult-child interactions is considered an asymmetric one. Forrester (2013) describes it by stating that an asymmetric relationship means that an adult possesses more skills than the child and therefore the child is seen to be learning from adults. However, children's active participation and permissiveness to negotiate and argue their points in a reciprocal manner plays an important role in their cognitive, linguistic, and social development despite the 'asymmetric nature of interaction' (Forrester, 2017, p. 57).

Siegert (1986) asserts that there is no unquestioned dominance or submission in peer interactions as opposed to adult-child interaction, which is considered a relationship of 'incomplete reciprocity' (p. 367). Siegert (1986) further claims that the egalitarian process of negotiation of activities is typical of peer-group interaction rather than the adult-child interaction (p. 368). One must take into consideration that there might be an association with how some children might be treated by adults, even when that treatment is 'neglect' considering that neglect is the most commonly reported form of maltreatment, as pointed out by Wolfe (1987).

I argue that a child's social competencies are developed through reciprocal means of cooperation and collaboration with peers, as well as with adults, despite the existence of 'incomplete reciprocity'. Children's actions are part of those reciprocal interactions even within authoritative relationships with adults, and they shape their learning experiences in significant ways. More importantly, children select and construct their utterances based on the person to whom they are speaking, and their knowledge and experience arise from their immediate surroundings (Gordon & Ervin-Tripp, 1984). Children then store accumulated cultural and social knowledge, which

becomes ‘trans-situational’ until its potential use (Wootton, 1997, p. 4). One of my findings with regards to children’s participation and the asymmetrical relationship was that adversative episodes and conflict imminently arise in context where impositions are placed upon children by adults. These types of interactions are, of course, highly dependent on the context, and the notion of resistance therefore becomes prevalent, but with it, opportunities for learning.

Accountable actions and moral accountability

In his *Lectures on Conversation* (1995) Sacks writes about accountable actions in telephone calls to the Emergency Psychiatric Clinic. He noticed that in non-intimate conversations, i.e., when persons do not particularly know each other, they tended to give an account or the reason for their call. Equally, the other party, or ‘the called’, seemed to also provide an account. Sacks refers to these actions as ‘symmetrically accountable’ actions (Sacks, 1995, p. 73). Sacks also writes about other types of accounts involving two classes, ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’. By this, he is referring to for example how one would formulate their utterance when asking a family member (‘insider’) for help, in comparison to asking a stranger or an institution (‘outsider’) for help. Sacks goes on to explain this difference and notes that there is one class of people ‘with respect to whom there was such a bond of obligation’, which means that you could directly address this class of people with ‘I need help’ (Sacks, 1995, p. 75). An example of this class type would be your family members. Sacks (1995) concludes that there must exist a specific ‘sequential organisation’ of how the action of asking for help is regulated (p. 75). The specific ‘sequential organisation’ of a child’s talk to the parent, in which children explicitly invoke membership categories such as ‘mummy’, joined with negative descriptions, such as ‘bad’ and ‘mean’ are used to pass a judgement on the person as a parent, i.e., the person’s behaviour is judged to be

inadequate given the norms and expectations of how parents are supposed to think and behave.

When it comes to children, Sacks (1995) points out that ‘very young children have, from the perspective of adults’ a rather poor notion of causation and that they ‘don’t know how things happen to happen’ (1995, p. 77). He then describes two different classes of rules and the adults’ exploitation of the fact that young children cannot often understand the difference between those two rule classes. Sacks (1995, p. 78) then clarifies that Class 1 rules (e.g., ‘Don’t stick your hand on the stove’) and Class 2 rules (e.g., ‘If you want people to love you, you should love them’) are often exploited by adults, given the fact that children do not quite understand the difference between the two class type rules. In fact, adults, and most often the parents of the children, tend to integrate the two classes of rules. Sacks goes on to explain that the way adults do this is by assimilating one class to another and applying whatever suits their own needs. The fact that adults do not differentiate between these two classes of rules presents ‘a very serious set of problems for children’ (Sacks, 1995, p. 78). Surely enough, for young children, this confusion and ambivalence opens themselves up for never-ending possibilities for mistakes interpreted as ‘trial by error’. Consequently, young children continue these ‘trial by error’ exercises until they get to find out for themselves ‘the right’ or ‘the wrong’ way of doing things. And while drifting from one erroneous scenario to another, they naturally and inevitably end up in all sorts of trouble.

Resistance to impositions and conflict

Conflict, in general terms, is defined as a ‘state of resistance or opposition between (at least) two individuals’ (Shantz & Hartup, 1992, p. 4). Children’s conflict initiation and management has generated a large body of research publications

(Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Shantz, 1987; Dunn & Munn, 1987; Shantz & Hartup, 1992; Miller, 1986; Damon & Killen, 1982; Chapman & McBride, 1992; Dunn & Slomkowski, 1992; Garvey & Shantz, 1992; Ross & Conant, 1992; Katz, Kramer, & Gottman, 1992; Drell & Jaswal, 2015). What is interesting to observe however is that most research on conflict in children's interactions still focuses on compliance to parental directives rather than the children's affirmation of control, which is seen to have prevailed in recent years (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). I agree with documented research which affirms that it is within interactions that children develop their ability to comprehend oppositional views and contradictions, and that during the exposure to adversative episodes, children learn to construct effective arguments and justifications, displayed as their moral reasoning (Smetana, 2013; Turiel, 2006). In so doing, they learn how to tolerate intensive negative emotions, and how to deal effectively with the conflicting situations in which they find themselves. According to Damon and Killen (1982), composing these efficient arguments is what promotes the development of children's morality and moral reasoning. Furthermore, while debating and arguing, children expect a response and they open their oppositional views to scrutiny by others, through which they learn the validity of others' justifications (Ross & Conant, 1992). Thus, another significant factor to consider is that, at each interactional turn, a child's response may alter the possibility of the opponent's reply, which in turn could affect the outcome of the interaction (Ross & Conant, 1992).

Due to asymmetrical relationships and other prevalent factors with regards to dominance and power, impositions and constraints placed upon children are ubiquitous in their everyday lives, and throughout childhood. This sometimes means that children have constraints and impositions placed upon them, not just by adults, but also by

other children, regardless of their ages. Children are often seen to resist those impositions using a variety of linguistic and non-linguistic tools available to them.

The form and composition of *the family* as an institution varies across different cultures and it also changes throughout history (Gillis, 1997). In a situation where there is a sibling in the family, children usually begin to confront their parents and siblings at the age of two, and soon after, their verbal ability is more enhanced, and confrontations gradually become more frequent (Dunn & Slomkowski, 1992). Katz, Kramer, and Gottman (1992) point out that, the main context in which children learn how to deal with conflict is in interactions with their sibling(s) because they do not get a choice to discontinue their relationship, despite the intensity of negative emotions. Katz, Kramer, and Gottman (1992) further emphasize that more research is required on how parents could contribute to siblings' relationships. Apart from instances of conflictual situations between the siblings themselves, in my data, instances of siblings' joint argumentations were found against the parents, in which they cooperated with each other for example, in order to strengthen their claims and arguments, and to achieve their 'shared' interactional goals.

Conflict as a topic has mainly been studied in developmental psychology, sociolinguistics, and anthropology. Goodwin (1983) observes that, within sociolinguistics literature on these topics, what is often found is teasing, and non-serious, playful types of threats and insults of children directed at others, and this is supported by the findings in my data. Dunn and Slomkowski (1992) observe that more study is required of 'natural behaviour', particularly of older children in their middle childhood interacting with their family members, which is what my study addresses.

Morality and moral reasoning involving research on children

Children begin to have an understanding of morals around the age of four when they are considered cognitively and developmentally capable of grasping that other people's beliefs might differ from their own (Smetana, Jambon, Conry-Murray, & Sturge-Apple, 2012, p. 1145). A child is capable of learning and developing their understanding because that learning takes place in a context or situation where there is a direct systematic connection between what a child hears, and what happens in his immediate surroundings. There is an imminent link between talk and environment, which is rooted in the total semiotic structure of the interaction which includes the speaker, what the speaker says and how what was said is treated by the co-participant, thus presenting an on-going activity and the social medium within which the meanings are exchanged.

Naturally, participants presume that there is an 'intention' behind a conversational act and they will endeavour to interpret this intention to respond while incorporating their own intentions. However, interpretations of others' intentions may not and need not always be accurate, as relevance theory has shown (Wilson & Sperber, 2015). There are certainly instances where a child fails to comprehend an interlocutor's utterances considering that some of their social cognitive skills may not be fully developed until the early teens (Siegler & Alibali, 2005). Furthermore, children's social understanding and their ability to maintain social relationships through their discourse skills develops gradually, and it is this gradual progression throughout childhood which informs their reaction to the adult world (Cook-Gumperz, Corsaro & Streeck, 1986). This intersubjectivity is deemed relevant and it is especially pertinent to situations of moral nature when moral reasoning is applied because it carries with it moral implications for the participants.

It is evident that, throughout childhood, children frequently face moral dilemmas and find themselves in adversative episodes in circumstances where moral standards collide, especially when others place impositions and constraints upon them. For example, as previously mentioned, if a sibling has a fight with another child, should their sibling assist their brother/sister, or should he/she report the incident to the teacher (Diary entry, 18/6/2014, p. 32). Guidance and assistance with any type of moral dilemmas are required for children to realise and to take into consideration numerous perspectives, in order for them to consider their own actions and how those actions might affect others in their environment. Naturally, parents are the ones responsible for the employment of various guidance practises during early social interactions, but a process of children's own assembling of 'various orders of sense' within their social world should also be taken into consideration (Wootton, 1997, p. 3). Children must be able to devise appropriate ways, which would assist them in understanding the concepts of fairness, reciprocity, kindness, care, responsibility, justice etc., all related to moral issues. Morality is about possessing the social, cognitive, emotional, and linguistic competency, all of which are necessary to learn how to tackle moral dilemmas in today's versatile and multifaceted society.

There is an element of morality in everything one says or does. Children are born with the ability to acquire knowledge and with it, morality, but they are dependent on routine experiences with other agents in their immediate environment. For a conduct to be described as 'moral' it is implied that that moral action results from a moral judgement (Miller, 1986, p. 429). According to Berk (1991), morality has three main components: emotional (affective reactions to experiences), cognitive (children's cognitive development gives way to sophisticated moral reasoning), and

behavioural (through moral thoughts and feelings a child is more likely to act in accordance to what is considered moral; p. 471).

Berk (1991) further emphasizes the external factors (supervision, rewards, punishments by authority, etc.), which influence moral conduct in children, after which there exists a process of internalization, which encompasses internal principles that govern children's behavior, in the absence of authority. In addition, Berk (1991) discusses three main theories developed, regarding the origins of morality. The first theory stems from a biological perspective and claims that morality is 'rooted in human nature' (Berk, 1991, p. 473). This belief was promoted in the 1960s and 1970s in Sociology. From the psychoanalytic and behaviourist perspectives, it was claimed that morality originated from adhering to societal norms. It was also considered that *induction*, a type of discipline, which claims that effects of the child's behavior towards other people should be pointed out to them, is a very effective type of discipline for children (Hoffman, 1988). The behaviourist perspective considered moral behavior as learnt just like any other behaviour, but it required adult's reinforcement and modelling.

Morality has been a major topic of research predominantly within psychology but also in sociology, anthropology, linguistics, and other fields. In psychology, Haidt and Joseph (2008, p. 382) refer to several aspects, which encompass basic representative concepts of morality; and they are five sets of 'innate' intuitions, such as fairness/reciprocity, authority/respect, harm/care, in-group/loyalty, and purity/sanctity. It is important to note that what is considered 'innate' in Haidt and Joseph's (2008) study does not necessarily refer to the classical notion of innateness, but merely that morality is, to an extent, organized before any experience, with the existence of innate mental content (Marcus, 2004, p. 40). The way in which Marcus

(2004, p. 12) explained it is that, the genes are the ‘first draft’ of the brain, and that the experience then subsequently ‘edits’ that first draft.

From a psychological perspective, morality research can be traced back to 1960s onwards, to psychologists Piaget (1965), Damon (1977), Dunn (1988a, 1988b), Turiel (1983), Smetana (1989, 2013), Smetana and Braeges (1990) among many others. Their work informs of children’s cognitive and psychological moral development, and as such, presents an excellent starting point for me. Indeed, morality processes and moral reasoning cannot be explored without consideration of the psychological grounds, and cognitive development. However, I hope to shed light on other aspects of research on morality and moral reasoning in children by considering linguistic and interactional properties.

Children can engage in meaningful conversations from an early age and they are deemed interactional partners from infancy (Snow, 1977). In recent research on socio-moral reasoning on infants, it was found that infants have anticipations about social interactions, and that even nine-month-old infants can tell ‘good’ from ‘bad’ behaviour, and that children as young as two, have an expectancy of reciprocity (Dunfield & Kuhlmeier, 2010; Baillargeon et al., 2013). This is also confirmed in Bruner and Watson’s (1983) study where they assert that although infant’s attachment is initially exhibited through ‘innate response patterns’, they soon develop their expectations of reciprocity when interacting with their mothers, which subsequently develops into ‘mutual attention’ or ‘intersubjectivity’ (p. 27). Bruner and Watson (1983) further point out another important aspect of this initial interaction between an infant and a mother by claiming that through intersubjectivity, and within these familiar, family- restricted environments, infants soon begin to recognise that actions are orderly and systematic, and infants and young children react ‘culturally’ because

they combine various elements from being in a variety of situations in order to access meanings (p. 29). Moral reasoning and judgements are accomplished through participation of all parties. As Siegert (1986) asserts, moral judgements cannot be found in the minds of the participants but within interactional contexts where they originate, and where they can be seen as moral judgements.

Psychology research usually implies application of strict experimental and hypothesis-testing methods, which have their own limitations. The questions arising from this type of research are related to artificial hypothetical dilemmas, artificial situations imposed onto the participants (which they might have never encountered), the bias of participant selection (only male participants, for example) and research design (various number of children selected at different ages in order to establish what level of moral development they were at, as opposed to a longitudinal study of the same children for example; Piaget, 1965; Kohlberg, 1976, 1981, 1984; Turiel, 1983) . These questions bring relevance and the need for a close examination and research based on concrete, situated interactional activities involving actual participants, doing moral action and moral reasoning in real time, which will provide more substantive details to the current study on insights into morality.

A child's most immediate social unit is the family whose members create a learning environment within which children learn how they should treat each other, how they themselves should be treated, and how to build social relations while establishing identities of their own (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2007, p. 5). Child's logic however follows its own path, which considerably differs from adult interactions (Siegert, 1986, p. 366). Nevertheless, morality is a product of ongoing experiences within which children are introduced to its concept, typically within their family, and later on, with their peers and other adults throughout their childhood (Danby, 1999).

Furthermore, factors such as the family's socioeconomic background and social status will inevitably also influence parent-child interactions and how they are managed. Presumably, children of the same age in one society or culture will differ from children of the same age in another society or culture with regards to any aspects of moral behavior. What is certain though is that in most societies, children are exposed to various 'prescriptive and prospective requirements designed to influence the course of their moral development' in one way or another (Wootton, 1986, p. 147).

Thus far, most research studies on moral issues have been quantitative, generating conclusions based on evidence that provides calculative accuracy and reliability in a technical sense. Very little attention was paid to contextual relevance and finding out how moral conduct was organized, and more importantly recognized by the participants (Wootton, 1997). Wootton (1997) reinforces the significance of interaction, through which children acquire routine, sequential skills, central to their understanding, and the capacity to recognize intersubjective order, which are accessible and afforded through language.

The present research is a case study of one family, as such, is limited to the specific population, and the collected data is far from being representative. It will certainly not fully provide an answer to the 'perpetual' societal question on children's display, learning and understanding of morality, and I doubt that any single study would. Nevertheless, I cherish the opportunity to explore instances of children's display of moral reasoning of the two multicultural children interacting with others, and the opportunity to draw conclusions, which will address some of the more specific interactional matters with regards to moral reasoning, thus providing a different angle to studies on morality.

Early works on morality

First, I will discuss early works on morality involving research on children, and the more representative publications in literature, and then I will focus on more recent research on morality involving children, using CA and MCA approaches, which is my primary objective. Morality has been a topic of long-standing interest for philosophers, anthropologists, and psychologists alike, and only since the 1980s have empirical investigations on moral issues been carried out (Greif & Gleason, 1980; Wilhite, 1983). As discussed by Haidt and Joseph (2008), the first recorded texts on morality mainly involved lists of moral laws and exclusions such as the ‘Code of Hammurabi’ and sections of the Bible. With the Axial Age (800 BCE-200 BCE), the subject of ‘virtue’ is found in much of the famous literature of the time such as Homer, Aesop, Plato, and Aristotle in Greece, or the Mahabharata in India (p. 368). Along with Confucius and Buddha in the East, the early works approached morality with a view to wisdom, emotion, and intuition in achieving a moral life, rather than adhering to specific principles.

Another prominent characteristic of these virtue-based approaches is the importance of tradition and practice instead of knowledge and reasoning. This idea that morality was to be achieved through a ‘virtuous life’ was the prevalent approach until around the middle ages (Haidt & Joseph, 2008, p. 368). The sixteenth century Protestant doctrine assumed that children could only learn how to control their behaviour through ‘strict discipline’, and this notion was similar to Freud’s concepts on how to ensure moral conduct (Berk, 1991, p. 472). The eighteenth century saw a ‘Western-thought’ shift to the specific principles and beliefs regarding human relations. Two theories from that era, which are still influential today, are the Kant style *formalist* theory, which assesses morality by reference to an action’s logical

form, and *consequentialist* theory, which examines the consequences of actions (Kant & Ellington, 1993). Although distinct in their approaches, both theories assert that moral judgments should be applied through logic, rather than sentiment and feeling. These two theories focused on resolving relationships, and hence problems between people, for example, rather than focusing on the earlier emphasis, the idea of virtue and character.

John Locke's (1892) philosophy proposed that a child gets formed and moulded by adults into a moral human being. German philosopher, Immanuel Kant (1991) believed that morality stems from people's reasoning in accordance with principles of fairness, justice, reciprocity and consideration towards others. Piaget's theory resembles the one of Kant, and later the one of his successor Lawrence Kohlberg. Piaget and Kohlberg's theories on children's morality development remain most influential to date. Because of their studies' impact in general, I will dedicate the next two sections to presenting those two theories with regards to children's moral reasoning, in more detail.

Developmental theories in Piaget's work on morality

Piaget (1965) examined the development of moral reasoning and judgment in children and concluded that children develop morally and acquire and learn the rules through cooperation and social interaction, rather than by simply having the rules conveyed to them, or being lectured into obeying them by adults. Through observations of children's social interactions and hypothetical questions posed to them, Piaget (1965, p. 13) examined the process of 'consciousness of the rules' and what kind of obligation the outcome of the increasing ascendancy was exercised by rules within social interactions. Piaget (1965) found two distinctive differences about children's moral behavior based on hypothetical questions. The differences were

related to what children thought of the consequences (outcome) of the agent's actions, and their conception of the motives (intentions) behind the agent's actions. According to Piaget, children below the age of seven cannot understand and assess the intentions of the agent while older children are able to establish and decide among themselves how fair the rules are and then apply those rules.

In his book, *The moral judgement of the child*, Piaget (1965) claims that all morality is represented through a system of rules, and that its relevance stems from the respect that a person develops for those rules (p. 1). Piaget studied children playing with marbles in order to gain insight into children's understanding of rules. As previously mentioned, Piaget showed that a child's development is a product of their continuous contact with the environment, the environment that is constantly constructing and reconstructing their conception and understanding of morality. He therefore focused on patterns of children's reasoning when they were making moral decisions rather than their behavior, and he stated that to do moral reasoning a child must have cognitive but also emotional capacity.

He portrayed how children develop morally by introducing different stages containing identifiable shape, pattern, and organization. This pattern demonstrated how a young child judges the seriousness of an action based on the size of the damage caused (in other words, its consequences) and an intention behind the agent's action. This finding was based on verbal responses of children of different ages when they were questioned about hypothetical dilemmas. The main conclusions were that in the first stage of their development, children up to the age of two were simply displaying their motor ability to play marbles without being guided by the rules of the game. In the second stage, children between the ages of two and six were merely imitating the customs they previously observed. In the third stage, between the ages of seven and

10, the children slowly began to gain pleasure from being involved in a social activity expressing strong desire to understand the rules set upon them. And finally, between the ages of 11 and 12, the children were able to display abstract reasoning, as well as a desire to cooperate and negotiate with others (Piaget, 1965).

Piaget examined children's attitudes from two perspectives: consciousness of the rules and the practice of them. The overview of Piaget's main findings is summarized in Table 1 (adapted from Duska & Whelan, 1975, p. 12). A potentially flawed assumption of Piaget's theory of cognitive development is that the difference in children's responses is 'universal', i.e., a child should be able to apply the same rules to other similar situations, thus creating a consistency in reasoning, in those different but similar situations (Duska & Whelan, 1975, p 7).

Table 1

Piaget's Stages of Moral Development

Kohlberg's six stages of moral development

Kohlberg (1976, 1981, 1984) follows a similar assumption and follows on from Piaget's developmental stages. He believed that 'role-taking' and social interaction were central for moral development, and he established the famous six stages of the three distinct levels of moral development. Moral thought is represented through these six stages, which all individuals display, as shown in Table 2 (adapted from Duska & Whelan, 1975) below.

Table 2

Kohlberg's Six Stages of Moral Development

I Pre-Conventional level	<i>Stage 1</i> The punishment and obedience orientation (Avoidance of punishment)	<i>Stage 2</i> The instrumental relativist orientation (Reciprocity /A matter of "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours" and not of loyalty or justice)
II Conventional level	<i>Stage 3</i> The interpersonal concordance of "good boy-nice girl" orientation (Maintaining the expectations of an individual or a group, one earns approval by being nice)	<i>Stage 4</i> The law and order orientation (Showing respect for authority and doing one's duty)
III Post-Conventional level, Autonomous/Principled level	<i>Stage 5</i> The social-contract legalistic orientation (Right actions are defined in terms of general individual rights and agreed on by ones' society)	<i>Stage 6</i> The universal-ethical-principle orientation (Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accordance with self-selected individual's ethical principles.

Kohlberg (1976, 1981) analyzed the responses to hypothetical moral dilemmas, longitudinally and cross-culturally, and demonstrated that moral reasoning progresses over time through a series of these six stages; thus, supporting his view that the level of moral judgment in individuals is rather consistent. This means that one cannot progress to a higher stage before completing the prior stage. He concluded that children's ability with 'quandary ethics' (Pincoffs, 1986) improves progressively until they reach stage 5 at which point all choices are made with principle of justice, which is universally valid and self-constructed. In summary, this model shows that children act morally in order to escape punishment before they move on to the stage of interpersonal morality, and finally move towards respecting societal norms by developing their own sense of justice from within (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2007, p. 6).

Carpendale (2000, p. 182) emphasized that Piaget and Kohlberg held much importance to a child's ability to understand *empathy*, and they believed that children gradually got better at understanding the actual perspective of other people.

Interestingly, Trivers (1971) believed that the purpose of *empathy* was to instigate altruistic conduct and that it was a genetically prewired emotion. This view is in line with the biological perspective that considers morality as something embedded in human nature. Kohlberg, just like Piaget, did not agree that moral development is just a transmission of moral rules from parents to children, but rather that individuals must construct it within their social environment instead, and that the children's actual form of thought resulting in moral judgments was seen to be universal across all societies and cultures.

One can suggest that children's form of thought is context-bound and that it depends on the environment in which it was constructed. Children may indeed question the various moral labels of the societies they grow up in, and perhaps they are right to question. Even adults periodically experience a period of ethical relativism whereby they question the premises of any moral system knowing that there are many different societies with various systems they believe in.

Turiel's social domain theory

Turiel (1983), a former student of Kohlberg, continued to build on Kohlberg's work by studying and defining how people should relate to each other with prescriptive judgments of justice, rights, and welfare, and suggested that people either help or hurt each other. Turiel (1983) claims that this perspective forms the basis of moral decisions, and that according to his social domain theory, moral judgments can either be serious, based on harm to others, or independent of authority. However, as Haidt and Joseph (2008) point out, if moral domain is *defined* as 'justice, rights, and welfare,' then the conviction that emerges from it could only be a conviction of judgments about the justice, rights, and welfare (p. 371). Turiel (1983) asserts that morality is not relative to social environment nor can it be defined by it, and he also

believed, unlike Kohlberg, that moral and conventional transgressions are differentiated early in life (even by three-year-old children; p. 3). He also claims that children's moral decisions are not dictated by the social structure they are a part of, but from characteristics that are applicable to all social relationships.

Children are exposed to various norms that vary across different societies and those are, of course, influenced by tradition and various social values of the law, religion, and other factors within those societies. In addition, one must also consider what kind of terminology is used by what societies when it comes to ethics, morality, conventions, and sometimes culture. The significance of cultural framework was also brought into consideration by Shweder and Much (1987) who disagreed with both, Kohlberg and Turiel. Shweder and Much (1987) argued that moral and conventional aspects are intertwined and built within the ideology of culture (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2007, p. 7). Dunn (1987) considered the cultural but also social and interactional aspects while investigating morality by studying parent-child conversations from a psychological perspective. I will later discuss how Dunn explored morality in research on parent-child and siblings' interactions, a study more pertinent to the present study.

Selman's role-taking theory

Selman's empirically-supported, sociological theory is based on Flavell's (1968) definition of 'role-taking' which encompasses children's understanding of interactions 'between the self and another as seen through the other's eyes' (Selman, 1971, p. 80). By understanding interactions through someone else's eyes means that a child can make specific references to another's capabilities, attributes, feelings, etc. Selman incorporated Kohlberg's measure for moral judgement, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), and two role-taking skills in order to establish the

relationship between cognitive processes, moral reasoning and role-taking ability (reciprocal social perspective) in the middle-childhood period (8-10 years old). Selman (1971, p. 81) believed that understanding reciprocal social perspectives, which also included other's feelings, was essential for displaying higher levels of moral judgement. The main finding was that there was a correlation between cognitive ability, higher level of moral judgement and increased reciprocal role-taking skills. It is also believed that a child's role-taking ability was an indicator of the child's social relationships, problem-solving skills, and interpersonal functioning.

Dunn's work on morality

Dunn's research approach is the closest type of approach to ours in terms of its applied methodology. Although Dunn presents her findings from a psychological perspective, her analysis reveals that children as young as two, relate to others' feelings and familial, social roles while they openly discuss issues of obligation and blame. In addition, and more specifically, Dunn and Munn (1986) carried out research on siblings' interactions while posing questions regarding siblings' display of compassion towards each other, as well as questions about influence on the development of their social understanding (1986, p. 266). Furthermore, Dunn and Munn (1986) examined cooperation amongst siblings, incorporating sharing, helping, and comforting of each other with regards to their capabilities and motivations. They explicated on children's distress and sibling 'constellation variables' (Dunn & Munn, 1986, p. 267).

The study consisted of observations and tape recordings with suggested labels such as 'shares', 'helps', 'comforts', 'gives appropriately', and 'cooperates' (Dunn & Munn, 1986, p. 271). These labels illustrated the frequency of pro-social behaviour (friendly vs. hostile), responses to distress, the relationship to conflict behaviour and the relationship between the behaviour of child and sibling to show what factors

influence socialising between the siblings. Their key finding was that siblings, who grow up with a sibling who joins them in a cooperative way in a high proportion of their interactions, become themselves more cooperative (Dunn & Munn, 1986, p. 282). However, as LeMare and Krebs (1983) point out, there may be numerous reasons why a child would act in a pro-social manner and whether young siblings are in fact motivated to help and comfort their other sibling, and what causes that motivation: this is a question one must ask.

More recent works on morality

In a recent book by Wainryb and Recchia (2014) entitled *Talking about right and wrong: Parent-child conversations as contexts for moral development*, a collection of papers discuss moral aspects of parent-child interactions in which parents were asked to talk about right and wrong behaviours with their children. The book focuses on conversations because Wainryb and Recchia (2014) consider conversations ‘a prevalent arena for the actual experience of morality and an essential vehicle through which the business of moral socialisation is transacted (p. 1). Wainryb and Recchia (2014) bring up another relevant point when they assert that the type of relationship which children have with their parents is different than any other type of relationship, and that hardly anyone would ‘contest the unique affective bond that exists between parent and child (p. 9).

Another significant and relatively recent research on morality involves Wright and Bartsch’s (2008) study of depictions of ‘early moral sensibility’ in two children’s daily conversation with adults (p. 56). Wright and Bartsch (2008) used archived, family conversations from the Child Language Exchange System (CHILDES) database (MacWhinney, 2000). Their investigation included ‘coding’ of words related to morality and moral context (Snow, 1977; Hickling & Wellman, 2001) within an

archived database, and identifying how children used those words, in what context, and whether they were active or passive participants. Wright and Bartsch (2008) asked what the salient features of daily moral landscape were and emphasised that the case study-style portrayals were indeed scarce in the field of study on moral development.

These studies are very relevant to the approach I am taking. One difference in my approach however is that my data is not collected to be coded, so that a context indexical of morality may or may not contain particular words thought to be associated with morality. For example, in my data, from the collection, although not presented in the thesis, there exist debates between the two children and other family members which presuppose issues of a moral nature, but those interactions do not necessarily contain any specific words directly denoting morality (e.g., ‘nice’, ‘care’, ‘harm’, etc.).

In another recent study, Cushman, Sheketoff, Wharton, and Carey (2013, p. 6) discuss how preschoolers, specifically between three and six years of age, primarily focus on the outcome (‘outcome-only concept of morality’) of an action, rather than the actor’s intentions (‘intent- based concept of morality’), due to children’s egocentricity and lack of capacity for an abstract thought. This was initially established by Piaget (1965) who showed that if for example, a large ink stain was made by accident, it was treated by a child as a more appalling moral act rather than a small stain that was made deliberately by a child. Piaget further found that this was not the case with older children (from the age of 6 to 10), who thought the opposite, because they were focusing more on the actor’s intentions rather than the outcome, thus moving away from the egocentric thoughts. These claims are relevant to my research because of the age group of my main subjects, and it is therefore interesting to examine naturally-occurring interactions of children of similar ages.

Recent works on morality using CA

Over the past 20 years, CA research focused mainly on the institutional settings, which examined how people in everyday social interactions constructed and were subject to evaluations within schools, day care facilities, medical facilities etc. (Drew, 1998; Goodwin, 1998; Hepburn & Potter, 2011; Shaw & Hepburn, 2013). Although predominantly within institutional settings, this type of approach differs from the more abstract and decontextualized approach to morality that has dominated developmental psychology since Piaget (Sterponi, 2009, p. 441).

In line with the recent CA approach, I treat morality as a situated issue. Moral action and discourse cannot therefore be abstracted from its sequential contexts (Sterponi, 2009, p. 442). One of the general roles of the family is to educate children on how to grasp and feel in line with the idea of morality in social situations, and especially to the customary and preferred ways of participation in these situations (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2007, p. 5). Notably, there are CA studies conducted on children's interactions, which may indeed contain some morality features, but in the following section, I will discuss recent CA studies with research focused specifically on morality.

Shaw and Hepburn's work on moral implications of advice

More recently, Shaw and Hepburn (2013, p. 347) examine moral implications of advice in informal interaction whereby telephone conversations between British mothers and their adolescent daughters were analyzed. They emphasize the relevance of morality in advice-giving and explicate on the findings while analyzing the selection of one response over another. Shaw and Hepburn (2013) concluded that the position of an advice recipient is a potentially controversial position to occupy because the recipient's morality can be jeopardized. Their suggestion for further research

identifies the need to extend the analysis to other filial relationships and different types of close relationships, which my thesis has aimed to address. I consider a variety of children's responses, albeit much younger children, in interactions with their parents, but also with other adults and children familiar to one another.

Takada's work on directive sequences

Takada (2013) conducted research on morality in directive sequences and examining distinctive strategies for developing communicative competence in Japanese caregiver-child interactions. Takada (2013) demonstrated that even toddlers could employ sophisticated strategies in order to achieve their purpose in everyday interactions. In addition, Takada (2013, p. 420) noted the significance of "omoiyari" (empathy, sympathy for other's feelings, consideration towards others) when raising children. The focus of Takada's research was to identify and classify caregivers' directive sequences and children's responses, and how intersubjectivity is accomplished in multi-party conversations. His findings revealed that the caregivers often modified the type of directive according to the child's reaction, so they could regulate the child's behavior (Takada, 2013, p. 422).

The reaction of the child would determine the structure of the conversation. The child would also engage emotions in order to appeal to the caregiver, thus forming a context of culturally - shared morality, typical of the Japanese culture. Therefore, the practice of directives is directly related to the practices involved in socialization through moment-to-moment negotiations. Other pertinent features of those practices are 'intersubjectivity' among interlocutors, relevance of the 'speaker's agency', a performed action, and the situation that ultimately prepares the context for the next action (Takada, 2013, p. 436).

Sterponi's work on moral positioning in 'vicarious' accounts

Another focus on morality embedded within a situated activity was investigated by Sterponi (2003, 2009) who examined conversations related to accountability, namely 'vicarious' accounts, as a way of understanding how morality is endorsed and negotiated in everyday interactions. Sterponi (2009) asserted that requesting and providing accounts entails moral positioning of the participants, which in turn, builds the moral identity of the participants (p. 442). The findings revealed that the child represents a moral agent called upon to present their moral positioning in order to share moral responsibility and restore order, thus displaying idiosyncratic characteristics of Italian cultural framework (Sterponi, 2009, p. 455). This further signifies the influence of culture on moral action within social interactions. There still seems to be a lack of cross-cultural research but also from the current work it was found that there are as many pattern variations in children's interactions as in 'other aspects of culture' (Corsaro & Streeck, 1986, p. 21). In Chapter 3, I discuss methodology, participants, languages, settings, and data.

Recent works on morality using MCA

Considerable research has been conducted on children's interactions using Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA; Evaldsson, 2007; Austin & Fitzgerald, 2007; Goodwin, 2002; Butler, 2008; Kyratzis, 2007; Danby, 1999; Danby & Theobald, 2012; Forrester 2001, 2008; Hester & Hester, 2010; Nguyen & Nguyen, 2017). In this section, I will discuss the relevance of this body of literature to the current project.

Danby and Theobald (2012), in a book entitled *Disputes in Everyday Life: Social and Moral Orders of Children and Young People*, present a collection of papers exploring the social worlds of children and their peers, and their dispute practices in school settings, touching on matters concerning ownership, alignment, and social and

moral order. These papers discuss important issues in children's interactions. In their introduction the editors state that 'adults are not always successful in bringing resolution or closure' to conflicts, and that their intervention can often 'initiate or escalate the disputed matter' (Danby & Theobald, 2012, p. xvi). Children therefore often negotiate and construct social and moral orders with peers and adults with a high level of competence. Danby & Theobald also published an article concerning social and moral order among a small group of girls involved in a pretend game of school in the playground. In their data, the girls 'drew on a code of conduct to accomplish their own social and moral agendas' (Danby & Theobald, 2014, p. 2). They further assert that research on morality, in children's interactions has shown that 'morality goes deeper than whether they (children) know right from wrong' (p. 1).

Cobb-Moore (2012) examined pretend play in a group of young girls (4-6 years-old) in a primary school classroom in Australia and describes how they interact within the membership categorization device 'family' to manage their social and power relationships, whereby authority and subordination are identified as moral order. According to Cobb-Moore (2012) 'institutions such as "family"' have moral orders of interaction, with members having certain rights and responsibilities' (p. 87). One of the girls, Dana, pretends to be a mother and gives orders and threatens discipline to avoid arguments, and in this way, she produces 'authority and subordination' as part of the social and moral order through negotiation of categories.

Evaldsson (2007) uses CA and MCA while discussing moral ordering and category membership in pre-adolescent girls' (eleven-year-olds) relational talk. In this study, the girls were primarily concerned with *accounts* while talking about their own and others' actions as breaches of social conduct, and held one another accountable for offensive actions' (p. 378). Hutchby and O'Reilly (2010) have published an article

about children's participation framework in family therapy sessions and how a familial moral order is often at the root of how children's competence as participants is managed. The institutional settings, according to Hutchby and O'Rielly (2010), often invoke 'moral imperatives' which can inform the participation of adults and children (p. 50). One of the issues they bring up is how the parents self-selected themselves to speak after the therapist addressed the child, and they call this type of answering 'interjacent answering' (p. 52). This in turn, constructs the child as a 'half-member' (Shakespeare, 1998). The morality issues in this research stem from the sheer nature of the therapy sessions, since it is aimed at discussions of dysfunctional aspects of the family.

Another similar area of research using CA and MCA approaches involves a very young child (two to three years old) and was conducted by Butler and Fitzgerald (2010) who looked at the relevance and consequences of identities of the *guest* and the *host* during a family meal involving the child, his parents, and his grandparents. More specifically, they discuss analytic problems related to the shifting of the identities over the course of a sequence. In addition, in a book titled, *Talk and Social Interaction in the Playground*, Butler (2008) provides an empirical account of children's play and interaction in school playgrounds, including the organisation of membership and social action. Butler and Weatherall (2006) examine the organisation of play sequences between six and seven-year-old children, and how the children used membership categorization devices in order to organise their games. The children did this through the mapping of children to the category-sets of players. One example is the use of the category 'little sister' which belongs to the device 'family', whereby the sibling categories are positioned in relation to size, which means that there exists a big sister or a brother, for example (Butler & Weatherall, 2006, p. 457). Austin and Fitzgerald

(2007) use MCA in order to investigate how an interviewee with a counsellor utilises categories to resist the potential accusations of being a bad mother and suggesting her mothering to be ‘ordinary or what any reasonable person would do’ (p. 364). Further research based on interviews on girls as moral agents was conducted by Gilligan (1982), and Brown and Gilligan (1992) and it elaborates on predictable patterns of moral behaviours specifically related to gender – the ‘female’ category in this case.

Summary

In this chapter, I have presented a review of a range of publications on morality and moral reasoning in young children. I started by considering publications on more general aspects of children development, including child language development, child language socialization and social understanding, and children’s acquisition of culture. I then discussed Sacks’ treatment of ‘accountable actions’ and ‘moral accountability’ (Sacks, 1995). This is followed by a summary of early works on morality with some of the most representative researchers in child psychology including Piaget and his developmental theories, Kohlberg’s six stages of moral development, Turiel’s social domain theory, Selman’s role-taking theory, and the works of Judy Dunn on children’s interactions with siblings and their mothers. Recent research on morality includes studies by Wright and Bartsch (2008), Ochs and Kremer-Sadlik (2007), and Wainryb and Recchia (2014). Finally, I focused on the recent works on morality using CA and MCA approaches. CA studies in the home setting were conducted by Sterponi, Takada, and Shaw and Hepburn, and they have a specific focus on morality. MCA studies which incorporated some moral aspects, namely moral and social order of the institutions such as ‘family’, and participation frameworks, have been covered by Butler, Butler and Weatherall, Cobb-Moore, and Hutchby and O’Reilly.

From this literature review, we can conclude that research on morality and moral reasoning has been predominantly conducted from a psychological perspective, although there has also been work done in Philosophy, Anthropology, Sociology, and Linguistics. Major methodologies within psychology were based on hypothetical or contrived dilemmas posed to children, through observation and interviews, and predominantly within experimental settings. In my own study, I will incorporate an interactional perspective, using naturally-occurring conversations of children in a home setting.

An awareness of morality begins when children realize that other people have thoughts and emotions that may differ from their own (Gopnik, 1990; Wellman, 1990). This realization apparently sets in at the age of three or four (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2007). It is important to note however, that moral development embodies cognitive, emotional, as well as interactional competence. As Ochs and Kremer-Sadlik (2007) point out, various stages of moral reasoning exist as moral practices, which are directly related to specific social contexts. Therefore, moral development is not a product of a constructive process which is limited to a particular set of linguistic or non-linguistic ‘tools’ that children must use in order to engage in their moral reasoning practices. Instead, moral reasoning and moral development are outcomes of a complex and continuous developmental process, which incorporates social interaction under specific circumstances, and within social and cultural contexts (Tappan, 2006, p. 14).

Placing social interaction and the context of situation at the heart of data analysis is what distinguishes the CA and MCA approaches from other approaches. Moreover, all interaction has ‘moral and ethical dimension’ attached to it because when people communicate, they continually assess whether they are being heard or understood ‘correctly’ (Sidnell, 2010). Next, I will elaborate on the methodologies I

employ, followed by an introduction of the data, including the participants, their background, and the setting, before moving on to data analysis.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Research methodology

In the following section, I will discuss the Conversation Analysis (CA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) methodologies, as well as explain why they are the most appropriate approaches for my study, and why I purposefully combine them, given my study's aims. CA focuses on sequential and structural organisation of talk, while MCA allows the exploration of members' categorization work, which occurs in my data. Combining the two methodologies will provide a more insightful qualitative analysis, which should enhance our understanding of children's use of moral reasoning. As two branches of Ethnomethodology (EM), CA and MCA are both inspired by Harold Garfinkel's work, in particular, 'Studies in Ethnomethodology' (Garfinkel, 1967). It was Garfinkel's overall work that served as a source of inspiration for Harvey Sacks, which led to the establishment of the CA and MCA approaches in the late 1960s.

Following the introductory section of the CA and MCA research methodologies, I proceed by introducing my two main subjects and other participants in the study. I then discuss my data collection and data processing, before I move on to Chapters 4, 5, and 6 where I present my analyses and findings.

Conversation Analysis (CA)

CA is a method for the study of the organisation of social interaction. More specifically, it is a social, scientific approach to the study of talk and social interaction that aims to describe, analyse, and understand verbal and non-verbal conduct as a fundamental and constitutive feature of human social life (Sidnell, 2010, p. 1). By employing a distinct method of analysis, the CA approach allows the researcher to

make observations about naturally-occurring interactions in close reference to the structural organization of talk, and context of situation. Since its emergence, CA has been successfully applied as an established research method in the field of linguistics, anthropology, sociology, psychology, and other fields.

CA research is based on naturally occurring audio or video recordings of casual, everyday conversations, and conversations within institutional settings, including educational settings. Initially, these conversations were collected in domestic, family settings. Over the years, and more increasingly, video recordings in institutional settings have proven to be equally used. Upon the collection of the video or audio recordings, the researcher prepares a detailed transcription predominantly using CA transcription conventions originally created by Gail Jefferson (Jefferson, 2004; Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Hepburn, 2004). CA's most basic principle is that spoken language is orderly and systematic, and this concept originates from Ethnomethodology, which is an organisational study of member's knowledge of their ordinary, common-sensically-structured affairs (Garfinkel, 1967).

CA is based on the notion of a 'turn-taking' system in conversations, which anticipates turn allocation of the participants (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). In their most prominent piece of work in the field of CA, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) explicate the basic mechanisms that govern participants' taking of turns in conversations. Their account came with specific terminology that refers to various components of the 'turn-taking' system, including adjacency pairs. This denotes that after the first turn, another turn, in a form of a response, is due. For example, adjacency pairs are when a greeting is responded to by a greeting, question with an answer, invitation with an acceptance or a rejection, compliment with a response and so on, thus forming *Adjacency Pairs*. Adjacency pairs need not be adjacent directly

next to each other, and could be split over sequences of turns. They can thus consist of First Pair Parts (FPP) and Second Pair Parts (SPP). Another key concept is Turn Construction Unit (TCU), which can be lexical, clausal, phrasal, or sentential. At the end of a TCU is a Transition Relevance Place (TRP), where turn transition (from one speaker to another) becomes relevant. Those turn-taking rules incorporate different possibilities in conversations: that a current speaker selects the next speaker, or that a next speaker can self-select himself or herself, or that the current speaker may continue their turn.

Those turns at talk are realised as *actions* in the forms of assessments, complaints, resistance, compliments, etc., and they have specific structural features (there are certain conversational rules which participants adhere to) and involve intersubjectivity (participant's mutual understanding; Pomerantz, 1984a, 1984b; Schegloff, 1992, 2007c; Jefferson, 1972; Sacks, 1992; Have, 1999; Sidnell, 2010a). These actions are organised into sequences. Another significant aspect of the turn-taking system is 'conditional relevance', which infers that once an action is produced another action will subsequently follow (Heritage, 1984a, 1984b). What must be considered, and which may present an issue for the researcher however, is that within any one turn, more than one action can be produced, and the participants may identify these actions for multiple purposes, depending on how they recognise and treat these actions. Another consideration is that a particular action may not have had an already established vernacular term, and it is then up to the researcher to provide relevant terminology upon identification of such actions, for the purpose of a more accurate analysis and for the ease of reference. This is particularly relevant to children's interactions, where utterances of an ambivalent nature are frequent, and for that reason researchers find them hard to decipher. As a researcher myself, I have the advantage of

having some shared ‘cultural history’ with the family, and this can help inform the interpretations that I offer.

One of the most prominent and significant features of the CA method is that the analysis is based on and illustrated as objectively as possible from the participants’ perspectives. The aim is then to reveal and explicate any discernible methods or resources that participants employ in order to construct shared understandings, and in so doing, make sense of the world.

My initial aim was to investigate how children employ specific interactional practices such as moral reasoning, as a resource to resist impositions and constraints placed upon them by others in interactions and in order to achieve their interactional goal(s). The CA approach fits my aims because it will enable me to examine specific actions within children’s social interactions, analysis of language-use in real time, and activity-context indexical of morality, including relevant multimodal behaviours such as gaze, hand, body, facial gestures, etc., where applicable. Considered a qualitative approach, CA requires a collection of naturally occurring audio or video recordings, followed by a detailed transcription of the recordings using CA transcription conventions initially created and developed by Gail Jefferson, as mentioned earlier. Ultimately, it is the original recording, which forms the basis of the analysis. Transcriptions are produced as a detailed and accurate rendition of what was being said and/or done by the participants, and they serve to assist the research in the analytical process. As Heritage and Atkinson (1984) point out, the main aim of the CA approach is to describe and explicate on ‘the competences’ that speakers display in their organised, actual interactions (p. 1).

For the initial, or the first round of transcribing, I used Microsoft Excel because it conveniently enables functions such as automatic line numbering, specific token

search, filtering options which are available for specific participant's turns, and sheet numbers for multiple browsing and management of files (Appendix II). Following the Excel transcription insertion, I converted each transcription to a Microsoft Word document, which I then further examined in order to align line numbers and to correct any errors or add any further transcription detail which may have been missed in the first round. Selected excerpts are then used in the thesis as a point of reference to complement the analyses.

Using CA important contributions have been made to the study of children's cognitive and linguistic development. Cashman (2008) points out that there are two types of studies that employ CA; one type called 'developmentally focused' which addresses language acquisition questions and the other one called 'ethnomethodologically informed' studies, whereby CA addresses member-oriented social practises. In my study, I aim to consider the latter, although not exclusively. I start by identifying and examining utterances indexical of morality, examining their turn design, sequence organisation, linguistic forms, and finally their functions. Capturing snippets of children's interactive processes within the familial environment, and specifically including moral features, aims to further develop the understanding of children's cognitive, social, and communicative competence with regards to morality and their moral reasoning.

When it comes to children's naturally-occurring speech, the primary source of information on the child's language is his or her spontaneous speech in the child's home environment, which is arguably, the most natural and representative form of language use (Fletcher, 1985). This type of environment lends itself to the possibility of examination of specific features related to children's moral reasoning, and indexical of issues related to morality and how it is construed within turns at talk. Tracing

children's moral reasoning in their actual interactions, while elucidating on their potential source, function, and development, presents a stimulating undertaking. The CA approach will therefore enable examination of structure within sequential and contextual organisation of talk, including its multimodal features. It will also address and consider the intricacies of social interaction with regards to delivery and meaning, without separating utterances from its natural contextual environment.

This study provides an opportunity to examine how children engage in 'moment-to-moment search for intersubjective understanding' (Gardner & Forrester, 2010, p. vii) through recipient- designed turns-at-talk. In the process, I specifically aim to examine how sequential patterns in children's utterances are construed and arranged with reference to moral ideology and social behaviour.

I argue that the CA approach will enhance, complement, and contextualize our understanding of language, social interaction, and cognition with regards to issues pertinent to children's moral reasoning. The CA approach will reveal the intricacies of children's social interactions and their moral reasoning practices. Through examination of internal mechanisms of social interactions and the participants' deontic and epistemic stance, we will be able to see how morality and moral reasoning are 'lived' in everyday, naturally-occurring conversations in the children's home setting.

Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA)

Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) refers to 'the study of the range of practices that members of a given speech community deploy alongside complementary and aligned ethnomethods in the routine accomplishment of everyday social interaction' (Fitzgerald & Housley, 2015, p. 1). Interlocutors thus 'link identity and action descriptors to the interactional tasks and settings that form the context of their talk' (Hester & Eglin, 1997, p. 14). The relevant MCA concepts and terminology

employed in this thesis are Membership Categories (MCs) and Membership Categorization Devices (MCDs). Those two concepts were introduced and later explicated by Harvey Sacks in his works (1972a, 1972b, 1979, 1984a, 1984b, 1992, 1995). The main observable feature of talk in interaction is the engagement of participants in ‘recognition work as a means of accomplishing local social organization’ (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2002, p. 61).

Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) has its origins in the works of Harvey Sacks; however, Hester and Eglin (1997) devised the actual term. Research on children’s interaction using MCA has been conducted with the use of interview data (Baker, 1984), family therapy counselling sessions (Hutchby & O’Rielly, 2010), within educational settings (Danby, 1999; Francis & Hester, 2004; McHoul & Watson 1984; Butler, 2008). Additional works employing MCA including adults yielded interesting findings (Sacks, 1979; Watson, 1978, 1997; Jayyusi, 1984, 1991; Housley & Fitzgerald, 2002, 2009; Fitzgerald & Housley, 2002; Schegloff, 2007b).

MCs and MCDs are used in their Ethnomethodological sense. The best way to present and explain these terms is through the story Sacks used for one of his papers. In his famous paper, Sacks (1972b) explicates how a simple story told by a child (‘The baby cried. The mommy picked it up’) is construed as to invite the employment of MCs and MCDs for its accurate understanding by how we hear, understand and make sense of this story. Here one can observe MCs ‘baby’ and ‘mommy’ which are employed as the MCD ‘family’. Sacks’ explication of the child’s story exemplifies that the picking up of the baby by the mother occurred *precisely* because the baby was crying, and in that order. The descriptive and personal category ‘mommy’ could represent ‘a variety of possible inferential trajectories’ (Jayyusi, 1991, p. 240). But the significance lies in the observation of what is understood by the recipient, and that is,

that ‘mommy’ is the mother of the ‘baby’ in the story. Therefore, there exists both, categorisation and sequential work, which also carries moral implications.

Each MC comes with its category-bound activities (CBAs) or category-bound predicates (CBPs) attached to it, which allow participants to make use of them in order to make sense of members’ actions (Sacks, 1972b, 1995; Stokoe, 2012). The notion of category-bound activities was extended to include other predicates such as rights, obligations, and knowledge (Jayyusi, 1984; Payne, 1976; Stokoe, 2012; Watson, 1997). This means that, in the story, the category ‘mommy’ comes with, what Sacks called category-bound activities, but it also comes with rights and obligations which postulate mother’s moral accountability towards the baby. MCDs are then seen as collections under which certain MCs fall into. One MC can be part of different collections, so an MC ‘baby’ could belong to the MCD ‘family’ or ‘stage of life’ MCD for example.

MCs and MCDs are therefore contextual and they operate as members’ methods utilised for practical sense-making practices. They are also used for ascriptions of persons and category-bound activities that are mutually contingent. Garrot and Berard (2010) further assert that MCs ‘refer to identities’ and MCA essentially focuses on how identities are ‘organized and understood within the practical contexts of social interaction’ but that MCA is also a study of relationships between identities, actions, beliefs and knowledge ascribed to those identities and contexts (2010, p. 131). They also state that MCs can refer to numerous identity descriptions to include, but not exclusively, race, gender, occupation, and various other characteristics. One must therefore take into consideration that a person ‘may be characterized in an indefinite number of ways’ and classified as personalized MCDs (Drew, 1978, p. 3). These descriptions could, however, be extended to non-

personalized MCDs, in the like of institutions and organizations such as schools, clinics, churches, political parties, etc. (Jayyusi, 1984, 1991). For example, in the introduction of her book, Jayyusi (1984) states that certain institutions or persons working for certain institutions such as ‘the Roman Catholic Church’, ‘the Pope’, ‘a doctor’, ‘a commander’ could be ‘treated as having a kind of ‘moral authority’, and that ‘one may still intelligibly disagree morally with that person’ and in that way, one could ‘revoke recognition of that authority’ (1984, p. 15). In another example, Jayyusi (1984, p. 44) discusses the MC of a ‘good doctor’ implicating doctor’s performance, in that ‘what makes ‘a good doctor is often synonymous with *what makes a doctor*’, referring to ‘the moral features of the category’ (duties, commitments).

No research thus far, to my knowledge, has been conducted specifically on how children use MCs and MCDs in everyday interactions in the home setting. Butler and Weatherall (2006) looked into how children used MCDs to organise social action in the school playground, providing the most relevant, albeit scarce, research on the topic. Other relevant research has been discussed in more detail in the Literature review (MCA) section.

I am therefore pleased to have the opportunity to investigate and analyse my own data which has not been analysed before, and demonstrate how the two children, my main subjects, use MCs and MCDs in everyday interactions within their home setting. As Hester and Eglin (1997) point out, MCA allows us to study practices that illustrate culture-in-action with regards to social and moral organization accomplishment. The concept of social and moral organization accomplishment brings several questions into view.

I initially ask how and under what circumstances children invoke specifically selected Membership Categories (MCs) such as ‘Mummy’, ‘Mummies and Daddies’,

‘Baba’, ‘bad Mummy’, ‘small’, ‘older’, ‘bigger’, etc., in their social interactions?

Upon examination and analysis of my data, I then demonstrate how participants’ orientations to MCs and MCDs are related to any subsequent action, and how their use produces consequential outcomes for the participants. Those methodical practices used by the members thus display how common sense and mundane activities are understood in everyday conversations (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2009). MCA, as my chosen methodology, enables me to analyse those mundane activities associated with the children’s moral reasoning. As I pointed out previously, my strategic move to combine the use of CA and MCA was to consider both, categorial and sequential dimensions of the children’s talk.

I acknowledge that there are still ongoing schisms about the CA and MCA relationship, and whether MCA should be recognized as an independent and valuable research method (Fitzgerald, 2012; Stokoe, 2012; Hester & Eglin, 1997; Schegloff 2007a). Ethnomethodologists, anthropologists, sociologists, and conversation analysts have shed light on many of the issues related to the long-polemicized arguments about the use of MCDs and the accomplishment of actions through them (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2015, p. 1). Fitzgerald (2012) proposes that MCA is not tied to CA and should not be seen as either an off shoot of CA, or as independent of EM but agrees with Stokoe (2012) that MCA is a useful analytic tool which could shed light on social categories, and person references and identity (Fitzgerald, 2012, p. 307). In truth, the development of MCA provides innovative opportunities especially because of its international application, and research on languages other than English, including different cultures, as indicated by Garot and Berard (2010). Watson (1997) is of the view that CA and MCA are complementary, and both contain components of sequential analysis and are often focused on practical reasoning and practical action in

the ethnomethodological sense. I argue that research combining CA and MCA methodologies certainly affords a more detailed and systematic investigation for any nuances to be identified and revealed within inference-rich, children's interactions, as it will be demonstrated from my data.

Participants, language(s), and setting(s)

In this section of the thesis, I provide an overview and background information on my two main subjects. I discuss the children's backgrounds with regards to their languages, environments in which they live, and I briefly list other participants with whom the children have been interacting. All the participants in this study have agreed to voluntarily participate because they are all known to the researcher as family members or friends. A symbolic remuneration as a token of appreciation was provided by the researcher for the participants over the age of 18, for some of the video or audio recordings, and whenever the recordings exceeded 20 or 30 minutes in duration. Although the participants were made aware of the recording procedures they often participated in the recordings without any remuneration. They have also often assisted the researcher in conducting the recordings and contributed to my data collection in this way.

The two main participants of the study are the two children (pseudonyms used; Figure 1) Luke (male, age ranging 3-7), and Mia (female, age ranging 4-8). During the period of my PhD study, I documented in the form of video or audio recordings, daily interactions of the two children with each other and others³ (Figure 2) in their home settings. Video and audio recordings take place in various locations worldwide where the children's family have residencies, and where their extended family members live, i.e. Singapore, USA, UK, Greece, and Serbia.

³ Not all participants listed in Figure 2 will appear in the excerpts of the thesis

Figure 1. The two main participants of the study, Mia and Luke.

Both Mia and Luke were born in London, England and they moved to Singapore with their parents at the ages 4;6 and 2;1, respectively, where they live at present (approximately four years at the time of writing). For that matter, it should be noted that both children primarily speak English, their native tongue. The two siblings speak English between themselves, at school, and at home when interacting with both parents (father American/Greek, mother British/Serbian), and in the presence of other English-speaking participants). Occasionally, both also speak Serbian (with their mother, their maternal grandparents and their maternal Uncle). By residing in Singapore, their exposure to Singlish⁴ and Chinese (Mandarin) is substantial at school, with Singaporean friends and within the community. Both children attend British

⁴ Singaporean English - both children have mastered some of the more common particles and sometimes use them in conversations with Singaporeans.

International School where British English is spoken by teachers (98% British, 2% other nationalities, including predominantly Australian, American, Singaporean and Chinese nationalities), and students (70% of students are British nationals). Among the total number of peers, including many British nationals, 56 languages are spoken. Most British nationals at the school are at least bilingual if not multilingual, and have more than one passport, including our two main subjects.

Name (<i>Pseudonym</i>) in the transcript	Other names/labels used within the transcript	Role, languages spoken and place of residence
MIA	Sister, seka, sestra	Target child; English, Serbian, Chinese (acquiring); Singapore
LUKE	Brother, bata, brat	Target child; English, Serbian, Chinese (acquiring); Singapore
MUM	Mummy, Mama, Mamica, Ana	Mother of the children; English, Serbian, Greek; Singapore
DAD	Daddy, Tata, Tatica, Peter	Father of the children; English, Greek; Singapore
LISA	Helper, Aunt	Family Helper; Tagalog, English; Singapore
BABA	Grandmother, Grandma, Babica, Baka	Maternal grandmother; Serbian; Serbia
DEDA	Grandfather, Grandpa, Dedic, Dek	Maternal grandfather; Serbian; Serbia
YAYA	Grandmother, Gradma	Paternal grandmother; English, Greek; Greece
PAPOU	Grandfather, Grandpa	Paternal grandfather; English, Yiddish, German; USA
BOBBY	Uncle Baki, Ujka	Maternal Uncle; Serbian, English; UK
MAT	Uncle Mat	Paternal Uncle; English; Greek; USA
TINA	Tina	Friend and neighbour of the children; English, Chinese; Singapore
ANNA	Cousin, sestra, seka	Maternal second cousin, Serbian; Serbia
YVONNE	Tetka, Jovana, Aunt Yvonne	Maternal first cousin, Serbian, English; Serbia
DR	Dr Robertson, Doctor, Paediatrician	Children's Paediatrician; English; Singapore

● English, UK
 ● Serbian, Serbia
 ● Chinese
 ● Greek, Greece
 ● Tagalog
 ● Yiddish
 ● German
 ● Singapore
 ● USA

Figure 2. Other participants in the study.

Our two main participants have been learning Chinese (Mandarin) daily in the first two years of study, and subsequently two times per week at school. In addition, both children alternatively attend private Mandarin lessons, two hours per week at the local Chinese Language School and at home with their Mandarin Tutor, who lives in the neighbourhood, knows the children well, and often interacts with them in

Mandarin when the families are gathered around their communal outdoor swimming pool. At the time of writing, Mia can recognize, read, and write 150, and Luke approximately 30 Chinese characters, and they can both read simple children's books in Mandarin.

In addition, the Filipino helpers who have been living with the family for four years occasionally address the children in Tagalog, during their routine daily activities and mainly on Saturdays when she spends most part of the day alone with the children. Both children understand some basic utterances when instructed in Tagalog such as 'hello', 'bye', 'I love you', 'let's get dressed', 'are you hungry', 'let's eat' 'let's shower', 'it's time for bed', 'finish your homework', and other similar utterances embedded in their daily mundane activities. The family's Filipino helpers have taught the children several songs in Tagalog, which the children have learnt by heart and can independently sing without the helpers' assistance. A further element, which should not be ignored, is that with the paternal grandmother being Greek and the family spending time at their residence in Greece each year, with their Greek-speaking helper, and Greek neighbours, both children are exposed to Greek. It is worth noting that the children's mother can speak, read, and write Greek, and their father can speak and understand Greek very well. Therefore, it should be noted that there are often occurrences of their parents speaking Greek occasionally between themselves and in front of the children. The overview of the languages and settings is shown in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3. Overview of the languages and settings of the participants.

Nevertheless, I argue that it is necessary to take the multicultural and multilingual aspects into account, a dimension that I believe, could only assist the analysis in advantageous ways. If I already have access to this information, information that is not readily and commonly available to most other researchers who record other children, why not utilise it? In Figure 4, as part of the two main participants' background information, I present an overview of approximate exposure of the two main participants to specific languages over the past five years (See Appendix III for yearly calendar logs).

	2012.	2013.	2014.	2015.	2016.	12/13/14/15/16
English	56,3%	65,8%	59,1%	53,2%	53,2%	57,5%
Serbian	30,6%	30,9%	25,2%	14,3%	14,3%	23,0%
Greek	13,1%	0%	3,2%	3,9%	3,9%	4,8%
Chinese	0%	4,3%	9,8%	14,3%	14,3%	8,5%
Tagalog	0%	0%	2,7%	14,3%	14,3%	5,7%

Figure 4. Average percentage(s) of exposure to specific languages.

It must be noted that all the information above was provided as part of the background information of the two main children participants, and presents an overview of the language(s) exposure based on the researcher's personal diary. Nevertheless, the focus of my thesis remains on matters directly associated with moral reasoning as a resource in children's interactions while they resist impositions placed upon them.

Data

It is my aim to illustrate through my data that morality and moral reasoning are interactionally sanctioned and embedded within conversational practices in highly intricate ways. I demonstrate that children's interactional moves created within sequential patterns are indeed context-bound and are thus formed through moment-by-moment interactions. I emphasize that utterances are designed contingently and are a product of local arrangement among the participants, whereby every subsequent exchange remains conditionally relevant and dependant on the preceding one (Schegloff, 1968). It is therefore significant to note that the environment in which utterances are produced actuate various dimensions of children's moral reasoning, and serve as evidence that children learn through their engagement in social interactions.

Data collection

During the PhD research period, I obtained 60, usable video or audio recordings, involving approximately 30 participants in total. Before video or audio recordings took place, verbal, as well as written consent was obtained from the participants, and in the case of children participants, their guardian's consent, information sheets and participant reimbursement receipt. In addition, we obtained NTU (Nanyang Technological University) IRB (Institutional Review Board) ethics approval for that matter.

Several recording devices were used depending on the setting, availability, convenience, and the adult participant's preference. The recording and storage devices include the JVC Everio Hybrid Camera GZ-MG130, Digital Camera Sony Cyber-Shot DSC-W530 14.1 MP, Apple MacBook Pro OS X Yosemite 10.10.2 V computer, iPhones 5 and 6, iPad tablet computer, two 'My Passport Ultra' portable storage devices 2 TB (See Appendix iv), iCloud monthly storage plan, and the two children's email accounts which were set up by the researcher. The advantage of all the listed devices is that they are all portable, non-intrusive, and can start recordings rather swiftly. Video and audio recordings are stored on 'My Passport Ultra', 2TB storage device and all video and audio recordings are then backed up onto the second 'My Passport Ultra', 2TB storage device. Once the recording was completed, the researcher took notes of contextual details (For example: Mia and Luke are at their grandparents' home; the children are playing a game called 'Chinese Whispers'; the conversation which took place prior to the recording, for example, etc.) into the electronic recording diary saved onto the researcher's private laptop and a private iCloud account.

The number of participants per recording varied from one recording to the next. I never specified in advance any information with regards to who is to be

included in the video or audio recordings. Instead, video and audio recordings were made at any convenient part of the day (approximately every fortnight, sometimes more frequently) and whenever the two main participants were seen as engaged in stretches of talk with whomever they encountered doing their daily, mundane activities. Video or audio recordings are mainly dyadic conversations, but triadic and multi-party conversations were also captured. All video or audio recordings are made with the children's immediate family members, extended family members and their children, family helpers, children's friends, family friends, and a family paediatrician in Singapore (a detailed list for the most frequent participants is shown in Figure 2).

My individual video and audio recordings vary in length and are from two, to approximately 90 minutes long. All the interactions of the two children and other participants are spontaneous and occurred completely naturally, in that the participants were never asked or told to talk about anything specific, and their conversations contain discussions involving many diverse topics. Activities cover a wide range of the two children's daily routines such as meal time, play time, dressing, reading, bathing, TV watching, playing outdoors, going to bed time, etc., so that we could capture diverse settings and varied day-to-day events.

Data processing

After the recording was completed, it was first stored, and the background information was then noted down. It was then viewed and re-viewed several times, and thoroughly inspected for any potential phenomenon, which could be of interest to the researcher. 'Observational viewings' were carried out in order to make any initial, curious observations, and before the phenomenon is selected. Several phenomena or practices may be observed at any one time and they are certainly not exclusive.

The phenomenon I initially observed was children's moral reasoning which was frequently featured in several of the 60 video or audio recordings I collected. Firstly, and possibly because of my own motherly instincts, I was intrigued by how these two children heavily engaged in negotiating, argumentation, and bargaining practices with their parents. Upon further examination, I noticed that the children repeatedly attempted to employ their logic and reasoning whenever they were engaged in conflicting situations. This reasoning seemed to continually occur in contexts which had some sort of moral implications for the children or for other participants. The participants' whose names were brought up in conversations, were either present or absent from the video or audio recordings. Children's display of logic and reasoning observed in the recordings was almost always related to the concepts of justice, fairness, reciprocity, care for others, etc., and were as such inherently moral. Children expressed their convictions about individuals or their actions as 'right' or 'wrong' or 'good' or 'bad' and they used their reasoning in support of these convictions. Given this, I selected 'moral reasoning' as a topic for the thesis.

The final criteria for my selection included the children's interaction with each other or with others in which they used moral reasoning in order to resist impositions. Following these criteria, I further inspected the video and audio recordings, and I eventually selected 16 video or audio recordings from my entire data collection. These 16 video or audio recordings were then fully transcribed (approximating 11 hours of transcription material) using the CA procedural and notational conventions. The transcription symbols used in this thesis incorporate notational conventions, which originate from the works of Jefferson (2004), and Hepburn (2004) but I have also created and employed some of my own symbols for a more accurate representation of the recordings (See Appendix V). Another reason for including my own symbols is

because children's interactions differ in many ways from adult interactions, and there are occasions where children use singing voices, crying voices, wobbly voices, screaming or angry voices, etc. Most CA research is still predominantly conducted on adult conversations, and the CA transcription conventions only mainly provide for these interactions. I therefore had to find a way to represent a variety of voices that the children employed in order to show children's distress and discontent, for example.

Data analysis

My starting point of the analytic process was to observe conversational actions of each turn and the function they fulfil, within a specific context. I then further examined turn design, Turn Construction Units (TCUs), including sequential organisation and other relevant aspects of talk, including any visible or relevant multimodal behaviour. While examining my data, we took into consideration, but not exclusively, the five foundations of intuitive 'ethics', which represent five main morality dimensions such as fairness/reciprocity, in group/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity (Haidt & Joseph, 2008, p. 382). I found categorisations of these five dimensions useful and although they were discussed from a psychological perspective, they represent and encompass some of the main characteristics of moral behaviour and moral action in general.

Through an in-depth analysis of my excerpts, I found that young children employed moral reasoning for a variety of reasons. One of the ways where the children displayed moral reasoning was when they were faced with impositions, limitations and constraints placed upon them by others. Moreover, I discovered several specific practices, in the interactional sense, where children were seen to be applying moral reasoning in their naturally occurring conversations. It was found that children used argumentation, negotiation, and mediation to defy certain actions of adversative nature

and to justify specific behaviours in order to accomplish their interactional goals.

Children's interactional goals became imminent through the interactional practices they engaged in, while they displayed their understanding of moral implications relevant for them and for their interlocutors.

Children's use of moral reasoning and understanding of morality is revealed sequentially, through active processes of contingently ordered utterances, shaped and managed locally within their talk-in-interaction. Consequential outcomes of the previous and subsequent utterances within interaction form a crucial itinerary based on which children demonstrate how moral reasoning is embedded within their daily interactions while they develop their understanding of morality and learn through their experiences.

While there exist understandings about the relevance of persons' identities in conversations for example, what CA and MCA provide, is a way to address questions with regards to *how* participants invoke persons' identities. It also addresses questions pertaining to *how* children use their understanding of identities in order to perform a certain action when the identity in question is made relevant (Fitzgerald, Housley, & Butler, 2009, p. 46). For example, when children invoke the identity of a mother, their understanding of this identity is related to the category-bound activities and what is expected from a mother. This understanding subsequently resulted in certain actions being carried out by the children such as accusation and blame.

In order to resist impositions while interacting with each other and with familiar others in their everyday lives, children use diverse linguistic and multimodal resources available to them. Several specific interactional practices were identified which these two children employed, and my objective is to show how these specific interactional practices are not exclusively employed. It was found that these various

practices are frequently intertwined, and that they represent children's moral reasoning which is understood as such by their co-participants. It was further found that children's moral reasoning is tactfully and intricately employed through utilisation of the following, systematically formulated, specific interactional practices listed below:

- I. Children's Invocation of Rules
- II. Children's use of Extreme Case Formulations (ECFs)
- III. Children's use of Membership Categories (MCs) and Membership Categorization Devices (MCDs)

In the following chapter, I will provide an in-depth analysis of the micro-interactions and participant exchanges containing employment of moral reasoning by the two children resisting impositions in interactions with others, using CA and MCA methodologies. I present 27 excerpts selected initially from the 16 video or audio recordings (final selection includes excerpts from five video or audio recordings) and an in-depth analysis of examples of the children's construction and display of moral reasoning, while they resist impositions placed upon them by others. All excerpts contain conversations of a moral nature, or have some type of moral implications for the participants, and are related to moral concepts, namely, fairness, reciprocity, authority, respect, harm, care, etc. Specifically, I present the analyses from the participants' perspectives, and what the two children saw as 'right' or 'wrong' or 'good' or 'bad' conduct of individuals, and which was as such, evidenced in their talk. The thesis is essentially based on the selection, examination, and transcription of the 27 excerpts, but the analyses are drawn from the actual video or audio recordings.

Chapter 4: Children's Invocation of Rules

In this chapter, I present excerpts that illustrate how children employ their moral reasoning through invocation of rules, and how they use these rules to resist impositions placed upon them by others. I present my analyses according to how these rules were sequentially constructed in interactions, understood by the participants, and for what purposes. Consequently, instead of treating the rules as a topic of enquiry, I will be looking at the invocation of rules as a resource that children make use of, in making actions accountable (Wootton, 1986, p. 150). I illustrate how children construct their reasoning according to what they consider is their entitlement based on some kind of rules that they invoke in conversations.

Object possession and ownership Exc. 1

Excerpt 1 [151230 Magic trick 23:40]

Context. In the following excerpt, Mia is playing with a toy that consists of numerous circular metal rings. The toy was Luke's Christmas present from his grandmother. Luke wants to have a turn at playing with it and he makes a request from his sister to take turns, but Mia is reluctant to do so. Mia, however, challenges Luke by claiming her own entitlement while orienting to the 'first come first served' type of rule in order to continue to play with the toy. Not being able to hold on to the toy or to take turns playing with it presents an imposition to each of the children respectively, and they are both seen to resist these impositions as they try to reason with each other while invoking different rules to accomplish their own interactional goals.

40 Luke Can I have it now?
 41 Mia Wait I am not finished yet-
 42 Luke→ % M::: Well it was my pre:sent when you [don't-
 43 Mia → [And I got it first
 44 Mia £ then it's o:ur sha(h)ring present ugh.: h. h. h.
 45 (0.3)
 46 Mia HUH HUH heh heh he:h

Luke issues a request to his sister ‘Can I have it now?’ with the stress on ‘I’ and ‘now’ at line 40. Luke is orienting to the action of taking his turn at playing with the toy. He employs ‘now’ in order to suggest that Mia has already played with the toy long enough, and that it is ‘now’ his turn to play with it. Mia, however, does not comply with Luke’s request (line 41). Note, that rather than explicitly rejecting or accepting the request, Mia describes the present state of affairs, ‘Wait I am not finished yet-’, which shows that the children’s goals are in opposition. There is raised intonation on ‘Wait’ which indicates Mia’s impatience, followed by Mia’s first justification as to why she could not adhere to the request ‘now’. In so doing, however, Mia does not ostensibly reject Luke’s request. Instead, the way she has constructed her response shows that she agrees with Luke’s proposal to take turns. The questionable part here is *when* she would be prepared to do so (line 41).

Although Mia’s response is of a non-preferred design, a non-granting part of the response is positioned towards the end of the utterance, rather than the beginning, with the expected formatting in terms of preference organization. It is interesting to note that the children are designing their turns with an orientation to sensitivity to preference organization. This is not to say that they are aware of the preference organization but that they are certainly displaying an insight into how sequential ordering may affect the projected talk or action, and perhaps the consequences for the co-participants for that matter.

Luke responds by using his crying voice and a prolonged sound ‘M’ displaying disappointment of Mia’s answer. He then quickly shifts his grounds from orienting to the turn-taking of the toy to appealing to ‘ownership’ of the foresaid object instead, as seen at line 42. From Luke’s initial part of the utterance ‘Well’ we can project that Luke considers Mia’s response as problematic. He then goes on to make an outright claim according to the entitlement of the object ‘it was my present’ (line 42). It is interesting that Luke employs the past tense here, perhaps referring back to the occasion when grandma gave him the toy as a gift. This is followed by a construction ‘when you don’t-...’ which sounds incomplete or not clearly captured in the recording. Instead, Mia interrupts him by attempting to justify her own reasons for not giving the toy to Luke just ‘yet’. She invokes a ‘rule’ with regards to who got the object first and which is based ‘first come first served’. Mia exclaims that apart from not being finished playing with it, which is confirmed with the use of ‘And’ but also that she should be entitled to it because she ‘got it first’ (at line 43). In so doing, Mia dismisses Luke’s rule invocation concerning the entitlement based on ownership of the toy. Moreover, we could also hear a mild form of a complaint in Mia’s tone of voice.

From the question of ownership, Mia swiftly orients to the relevance of who the first person was to obtain the toy in this particular sequence. Mia’s tone of voice alters here and at the same time her facial expression also changes, and she smiles (line 43). She then goes on to propose a conclusive remark injected with laughter, giving this utterance a teasing tone, as seen at line 44, ‘then it’s our sharing present’. This swift transformation sheds a new light onto this adversative episode. It is interesting to observe that at no point does Mia deny the fact that the toy belongs to Luke, which tells us that she does not express disagreement with Luke’s statement. Nevertheless, in order to accomplish her immediate interactional goal, which is to keep the toy in her

hands for longer, Mia introduces and invokes a ‘new’ rule, which could be summarized in the following way, ‘one person owns the object’ but ‘if the other person gets hold of the object’ then that object becomes ‘a sharing object’. We can see from the pause, following Mia’s laughter at line 44, that her reasoning presented to Luke is problematic and therefore there is no immediate response from him. Laughter in interaction often invites laughter and it is perhaps Mia’s goal to display her definition or understanding of the current situation as a non-serious one (Sacks, 1989; Goodwin, 1983).

Object possession and ownership Exc. 2

Excerpt 2 [151230 Magic Trick 23:40]

Context. In the following excerpt, which continues almost immediately after the previous one, and is similar in context, Luke claims the ownership of the object (toy/metal ring) because the toy has his name written on it. Mia is persistent in claiming her entitlement based on the rule ‘first come first served’. Their father explains that children need to share their toys. Both children begin to pull the toy between them and fight over it and the father then advises the children ‘to share’.

48	Luke→	Ξ::: (0.1) %THIS IS ↑MY:: ↑PRE:SE:NT it says <u>my</u> name	
49		((Both children holding onto the toy/ring))	
50	Dad		[Mia [Mia-
51	Mia→		[BUT I got it <u>FI::RST</u>
52	Luke→	It says <u>my</u> <u>na:</u> me on ° the present°	
53	Dad	[You guys need to <u>sha:re</u>	
54	Mia→	I got it <u>↑fi::rst</u>	

At line 48, we hear Luke’s screaming voice, expressing his frustration about Mia not giving up the toy he previously asked for (at line 40, as seen in Excerpt 1). After a brief pause, Luke grabs hold of the toy and while using his crying voice, he

very loudly exclaims that the toy is his present, with rising intonation on ‘my’ and ‘present’ for emphasis. He then employs his reasoning behind his claim to clarify that the present is his because it has his name on it, or at least that the name was written on the wrapping paper as a Christmas present to him from his grandmother (line 48). Luke is attempting to gain acknowledgment and approval from Mia using the following structural model ‘because of X, then Y’. However, Mia does not give in to Luke’s reasoning strategy and both children continue to hold the toy and to pull it away from each other (line 49).

As Luke utters ‘my’ to claim ownership, their Dad intersects and appeals to Mia by calling her name out twice, to perhaps give in and let go of the toy. As father utters Mia’s name for the second time, she responds by starting with an emphasis on conjunction ‘but’ as well as ‘I’ and ‘first’, while exclaiming ‘But I got it first’ (line 51). Luke repeats his previous utterance while emphasizing ‘me’ in his utterance in order to claim the importance of ownership, thus invoking such rule (line 52). The word ‘present’ was said in a quieter voice, almost whispered, this time as opposed to the way he said it at line 48.

Before Luke gets to finish his utterance, his father advises the children ‘to share’ (line 53). Dad’s advice is somewhat ambivalent because the father does not specify whether he means for the children to simply share everything in general or to share that particular toy on that particular occasion. Also, what does ‘sharing’ mean and how are these children to understand it with regards to context at that point? The toy cannot be split in two halves, so it is assumed that the children should take Dad’s utterance to mean that they should take turns with the toy. If that is supposed to be the case, then the entire argument, which was essentially about ‘taking turns’ in the first place, is back to where it had all started. And Mia indeed treats dad’s utterance that

way because she demonstrates the need to repeat herself by re-stating her previous statement which was that that she was the first person to get the toy ‘I got it first’ (line 54). Mia’s invocation of a rule which is based on a ‘first come first served’ basis confirms Wootton’s observation that rule statements usually contain information about what had happened and what was the cause of the argument (Wootton, 1986, p. 152). In addition, invoked rules also ‘constitute a version of the context to which that utterance is relevant’, as shown in this excerpt (Wootton, 1986, p. 153).

Object possession and ownership Exc. 3

Excerpt 3 [151230 Magic Trick 23:40]

Context. In the following excerpt, which continues from the previous sequence, and after several attempts in asking his sister to take turns, Luke issues a command in an imperative form, but his sister Mia does not acknowledge his request and she ignores it initially. Their father asks Mia to share the toy, but Mia provides her own reasoning as to why she should not let Luke play with it.

90	Luke	% <u>NOW</u> give me it <u>ba:ck</u>
91	Mia	((Gazes at the toy trying to focus on putting her hand through the ring, does not look at Luke))
92	Luke	[M::
93	Dad	[Mia Mia Mia why don't you share the toy with Luke
94	Dad	you know ['cause he seems
95	Luke→	%[BECAUSE IT SAID <u>MY</u> : NA:ME ON THE PRESENT
96	Mia→	Yes well it said <u>my</u> :: name on the fly:ing thing?
97	Luke	°Hm:° ((Luke slowly puts his hand on the toy and Mia lets go of it))
98	Mia	And you played with it <u>all</u> DAY

At line 90, Luke uses his crying voice while issuing an order to his sister. Luke begins his utterance with an intonation rise on ‘now’, which he had employed previously in the recording (as seen at line 40). This repeat of the adverb ‘now’ infers

that he has lost his patience and that he has waited too long. He therefore demands an immediate action and expects immediate compliance from Mia (line 90). At that point, Mia gazes at the toy while trying to put her hand through the metal ring in an attempt to continue to play with it. She does not appear to have registered Luke's utterance, nor does she act according to Luke's request (line 91).

Luke expresses his disavowal at line 92, and at that point, Dad interferes while his utterance is in overlap with Luke's disavowal. Dad then repeats Mia's name three times in his attempt to get her attention and this time, Dad specifically targets Mia's ignoring of Luke's request at line 90. Dad employs an epistemic stance marker to appeal to Mia's reasoning (line 93). Dad attempts to explain his reasons for asking Mia to share the toy and as he continues his utterance with ' 'cause ' he is possibly pointing out to Mia that Luke is visibly upset over the situation (lines 93 and 94). However, at exactly that point, Luke intercepts while providing his own reasons as to why Mia should share the toy or give it back to him for that matter. Luke begins his explanation with 'because' and repeats again, just like in the previous excerpt, that the toy had his name on it and because it was his present. Luke does this loudly and using his crying voice and this is his final stance on this adversative episode (line 95). To Luke, there is no other or better reason for Mia to give up the toy while he gently puts his hand on the toy.

Mia seems to have considered Luke's utterance at this point as she gradually releases the toy. However, while letting go of the toy, Mia agrees with Luke initially, but continues with 'well' to indicate that Luke's utterance was problematic. This is evidenced in Mia's proposal that her own toy, 'the flying thing' also had *her* name on it, and that despite that fact, Luke played with it 'all day' (line 96). Apart from the ownership rule, Mia has invoked another rule 'if Luke is allowed to do X' then 'Mia

should be allowed to do X’.

And while Luke expresses his discontent, Mia slowly releases the toy completely (line 97). Mia then employs an extreme case formulation ‘all day’, with which she is, although exaggerating, emphasizing the fact that Luke had probably spent a considerable amount of time playing with her own toy. It appears that Mia did not accept the understanding that the ownership of the toy should be the deciding rule as to who should be entitled to it. For this reason, Mia’s logic is then to continue to play with the toy. However, she eventually gives up the toy and gives it to her brother at the end of this sequence.

Object possession and ownership Exc. 4

Excerpt 4 [141222 Cartwheels 05:40]

Context. In this excerpt, Mia and Luke are playing cartwheels and they are using Luke’s sword as a prop. While Mia is doing a cartwheel, she is asking Luke to use the sword as the pointer on the ground while she cartwheels over it. They are debating where the sword or the line should be placed so that Mia is able to jump over ‘the line’. Mia is trying to show off in her cartwheeling skills while their Mum is watching her do it, so Mia wants the sword to be placed conveniently for her, so she could jump over it with ease. Luke is making it difficult for her by placing the sword either too close or too far and this presents a problem for Mia. Consequently, the argument results in a conflicting episode between the two siblings. Luke sees Mia’s requests as an imposition and he resists it by claiming that because the toy (sword) belongs to him, *he* is entitled to decide where it should be placed. Luke thus invokes a rule concerning ownership of the object and his reasoning is based on this rule.

147 Mia Yes but put it right HERE (0.1) Lu::ke or else I cannot do my cartwheels
 148 Luke [Okay I'm putting it
 149 (0.1)
 150 Mia No ↑he::(.h)re
 151 Luke Okay here
 152 Mia There (.) good (.) And now mummy it-uh (0.1)[Look at this
 153 Luke [I- I light it up so you know where it is
 154 Mia But Luke not the::re (.) It's too close. ((Moves the sword further away))
 155 Luke→ Well it's [MINE now I can de↑cide=

At line 147, Mia responds by agreeing to Luke's previous utterance, she then instructs Luke where to put the sword as a pointer over which she should cartwheel. She makes her request conditional in that she could not do her cartwheels unless Luke complies with her request. Luke verbally agrees with Mia's suggestion but in effect, places the sword in a different place from the one suggested by Mia (line 148). There is a slight pause immediately afterwards during which Luke places the sword (line 149). Mia complains to Luke while she negates his previous action. She repeats where she had suggested for him to place the sword (line 150). Luke finally agrees and places the sword where Mia had suggested (line 151). Mia approves and then asks Mum to look at her cartwheeling, as she is keen to show off her skills judging by the amount of effort she put into asking Luke to place the sword in the 'right' place (line 152). At that point, Luke lifts the sword up and switches the light on. The sword is a toy called a lightsaber, which can perform many functions such as light up or make different sounds as it moves. As Luke switches the light on the sword, he suggests that the light would help Mia see where the sword is on the floor (line 153). Whether the following action was done purposely or not, we cannot be sure, but Luke ends up placing the sword too close to Mia this time. Mia complains and then moves the sword away slightly while she takes a position to carry on with the cartwheel (line 154). At that point, Luke moves the sword again and asserts that because the sword belongs to him

and he is the owner he could therefore decide where to place it (line 155).

‘An agreement’ Exc. 5

Excerpt 5 [151230 Magic Trick 16:15]

Context. In this excerpt, Luke demands that Mia gives the toy to him, using an imperative form. Mia does not treat Luke’s request seriously, and at the same time she continues to insist that she should be entitled to the toy because she was the first person to take it. The imposition comes from a demand (by Mia) to have the sword placed in a different location from the one where Luke has just placed it. Luke then invokes a rule, which comes in the form of an agreement in order to resist an imposition and to further his interactional goal, which is to get his toy back. Luke’s utterance at line 342 is formulated as a rule, a made- up rule.

338	Luke	[>Give <u>this</u> to <u>me</u> <
339	Mia→	[Huh <u>huh huh huh</u> .h ∅I took it [fi::rst≅ A:E::
340	Luke	[<u>heh heh heh</u>
341	Mia→	I TOOK IT [fi::RST
342	Luke→	[There's an <u>agreement</u> whoever has it [fi::rst (.hh)
343	Mia	[Huh <u>huh huh huh</u>
344	Luke→	[the other person gets it.
345	Mia	[£ A::ho <u>ho ho ho</u> a: a: A:::huh <u>huh huh huh h</u>

At line 338, Luke entreats Mia to give the toy to him using an imperative form. His utterance is in overlap with Mia’s, who is laughing while at the same time, trying to pull the toy away from Luke. Immediately after her laughter, Mia switches to her crying voice and subsequently screaming voice, while declaring that she was the first person to take the toy (line 339), at which point Luke begins to laugh (line 340). On the one hand, Luke’s response is unusual in that he clearly finds Mia’s attempt to take the toy from him amusing and his stance is that he does not consider Mia’s entitlement

legitimate. On the other hand, Mia's laughter at line 339, could have been an invitation to laugh but does not guarantee the doing of it by the other party. Luke however, does respond with laughter, at line 340.

As Mia hears Luke laughing, she raises her voice and she repeats her statement from line 339, 'I took it first' to claim entitlement of the toy. Mia might have interpreted Luke's laughter as him not taking Mia's claim seriously hence the repetition. However, Mia's repetition might have occurred because her utterance at line 339 was in overlap with Luke's laughter and he might have not heard Mia properly.

Before Mia gets to complete her utterance at line 341, Luke intersects as he invokes a rule in which he claims that there exists an agreement which states that whoever got hold of the toy first (line 342) should not be entitled to it but the other person should (line 344). In other words, Mia's claim to entitlement, according to the rule she invoked 'first come first served' becomes redundant but also contradicts that rule because of Luke's invocation of the new rule, what he calls an 'agreement'. As Luke utters the first part of the 'agreement' Mia begins to laugh (line 343). Mia does not display awareness of the existence of such agreement. However, she neither accepts it nor rejects it. Instead, Mia begins to cry and laugh interchangeably while she continues to pull the toy away from Luke's hands. It could be that the laughter was sparked following Mia's interpretation of Luke's utterance which she might have found amusing. But it could also be pulling of the toy between them that reminded her of the game called 'tug of war', a playful activity, which could have initiated her laughter.

What we witness here is that the two children invoke different rules in order to achieve their respective goals. What is important here then is not just the content of the

rules but what they are used for. The rules and their applicability are matters of agreement or contestation as seen from this excerpt. Both children reason with the other party while continually invoking and sticking to their own rules rather than disputing the other person's rule. It could be that with the continuous invocation of their own rules they conduct the action of denying or negating the other person's rule invocation but not debating over its content. It seems then that both children invoke rules so as to apply them in such a way as to pursue and further their own goals.

'First come first served' Exc. 6

Excerpt 6 [151230 Magic Trick 23:40]

Context. In this excerpt, which is somewhat similar to the previous one, Luke and Mia fight over a toy, and at first, Luke demands that Mia gives the toy to him. However, while they are pulling the toy from each other's hands, Mia claims that she is entitled to the toy because she was the first person to take it. Mia invokes the rule 'first come first served'. Luke is not satisfied with this claim and Mia then explains how she got hold of the toy. Mia asserts that she has the evidence to prove that she was indeed the first one to grab the toy.

351	Luke		[%l wa::::nt i::t <u>give</u> it
352	Mia		[Huh huh huh huh .h .h .h huh huh .h .h
353	Mia →	↑ I t(h)oo:k <u>i:t</u> fi:rst	
354	Luke	°M::°	
355	Mia →	E:: E:: >I took it fi:rst< it was on the sofa and I grabbed it fi:rst	
356	Luke	# I got it (not you) #	
357	Mia →	↑NO::I have a VIDEO CAMERA TAPE IT [THAT IT WAS ME::::	
358	Luke		§ [Ξ:::::) .h .h
359	Luke	§AU:: °u::°	

At line 351, Luke uses his crying voice and an imperative form while he

demands that he wants the toy and that Mia should give it to him (line 351). In an overlap with Luke's request, Mia produces a prolonged laughter (line 352). Immediately after, Mia claims that she was the first person to take the toy, invoking the rule 'first come first served' with interjected laughter throughout this utterance (line 353). Luke quietly disagrees with Mia's utterance by producing a disavowal marker at line 354 to show his discontent. Mia then repeats her utterance again and in addition she explains exactly where the toy was and how she took it - that she 'grabbed first' it. (line 355).

At that point, Luke uses his angry voice to exclaim that he got it, not Mia, at line 356. Luke's utterance could be interpreted in two ways, however. First, it could be that Luke claims that he was the first person to get hold of the toy and not Mia, like she claims it. Second, it could be that Luke was referring to the fact that he 'got' the toy as a Christmas present from his grandmother, which is more likely the case. Luke knows that both participants, him and his sister, would have access to this information and he uses it as such. However, Mia seems to disregard this possibility while exclaiming 'no' loudly and denying Luke's claim. She then instantly resorts to the fact that the video camera is recording the whole event and she then uses that as her evidence, and to support her claim at line 357. Interestingly Mia employs 'I' when she utters 'I have a video camera tape it that it was me' to stress that what she is claiming is true and legitimate. After Mia's utterance, Luke begins to scream in order to show his distress (line 358). Luke continues to scream, and he does not deny Mia's assertion (line 359). This could mean that he accepts the fact that Mia was the first person to get hold of the toy, but he perhaps does not accept that she should be entitled to the toy according to this rule Mia is invoking, and this is where the dispute arises in the first place.

What we have witnessed here is a conflicting situation with regards to how children invoke and apply rules in interactions and how these rules are context-bound. The video recording of the children was taken as evidence by Mia to show that the rule she invoked was indeed based on the fact that she grabbed the toy first. This situation has been utilized by Mia and dealt with locally by the participants. The main goal for each of the children is to get hold of the toy, and not having it or getting it presents an imposition for both. Children invoke different rules to reason with each other while they insist on why their own rule should apply here and now.

Rule of the game Exc. 7

Excerpt 7 [151230 Magic Trick 23:40]

Context. In this excerpt, Mia and Luke are pulling the toy between them and they are both trying to get hold of it or to ‘win’ it. Mia introduces a new rule in the ‘pulling’ game the children are involved. Making of this rule in that context is a way of getting the toy and a display of physical determination.

361	Luke	<u>Au::</u> Argh::
362	Mia→	The first one to let go of it is <u>not</u> the winner
363		(0.2)
364	Mia	[°Cha <u>cha</u> °
365	Luke	[<u>Au::</u> §Ξ:: ((Pushing Mia with his feet))
366	Mia	<u>§Ξ::</u> A:::
367		(.)
368	Luke	[Well now I can control your ↑ <u>ha:nd</u>
369	Mia	[Huh <u>huh</u> (.)↑ MU:MMY: §A:: MUMMY:::
370	Luke	(°Nice <u>u::</u> °)
371	Mum	Well one of you will have to let go
372	Mia→	LUKE let <u>go::</u> I had it [↑ <u>fi::rst</u>

At line 361, Luke makes strenuous sounds while he is trying to pull the toy

from Mia's hands. At this point, both children are on the floor grappling over the toy. Then Mia swiftly turns this otherwise serious episode into a playful one by making it into a game. Mia invokes a rule to this newly-invented game by proposing that whoever is the first person to let go of the toy is 'not the winner' (line 362). Interestingly, Mia employs negation here, and she raises her intonation on 'not' to ensure her utterance is interpreted properly. There is a slight pause following Mia's rule invocation, while Luke is trying to process Mia's newly created rule. This is now another form of a constraint in the form of this rule invocation. After the pause, Mia then starts to sing a tune quietly while she is still wrestling over the toy (line 364). It appears that both children are now trying to follow Mia's rule because she has provided the rule with which they could both fight the imposition.

At line 365, Luke initially releases a strenuous sound while he pushes Mia with his feet and then begins to scream while continuing to grapple over the toy. Mia gets upset and so she begins to scream at this point (line 366). After a very brief pause, the screaming stops and Luke announces that he now has a grip of Mia's hand, which puts him in a superior position (line 367). In an overlap with Luke's utterance, Mia begins to laugh but soon after she begins to feel the pressure from Luke's foot again, and she appeals to Mum for help (line 369). Mia repeats 'Mummy' twice, using a very loud voice and a scream in between. The scream is significant as Mia displays the urgency of the situation and the need for Mum to interfere (line 369).

Following Mia's appeal, Luke mutters something quietly but it is unclear what he says exactly (line 370). Mum has been called to intervene and she does. An interesting observation here would be the employment of a very calm voice by Mum, which followed on from Mia's very loud screaming (line 371). Mum suggests, what may sound obvious at first, that one of the children would *have to* let go of the toy. Of

course, for the children this moment presents the climax of the game, culminating to its final goal – who will be the winner of the game as per Mia’s rule invocation. It is therefore crucial to win this game, so neither child will want to lose despite Mum’s instruction. And so, both children continue to ‘play’ and to pull the toy between them. At that point, Mia tries to reason with Luke for one last time by invoking another rule ‘first come first served’ in order to accomplish her own goal (line 372).

Mia’s attempt to reason with Luke by invoking ‘the winner’ rule did not secure the toy for her, while Luke is fighting over it. Mia then invokes another rule ‘first come first served’ in order to keep the toy to herself. Her reasoning switches to the play-like activity and starts off as a game and eventually it ends in a more serious tone after Luke starts to resist Mia, and he pushes her with his feet. This results in Mia’s call for adult intervention at line 369.

Fairness and reciprocity Exc. 8

Excerpt 8 [141028 Leaving Singapore 20:11]

Context. In this excerpt, Mia brings up questions of reciprocity and fairness and describes Mum’s conduct as ‘rude’. Mia complains that she and her brother do not want to go to school and that they want to ‘play all day’ instead. She ‘threatens’ Mum that they will leave Singapore for good and go to their grandparents’ house in Belgrade. Mia brings reciprocity into the equation by invoking a rule about fairness in this excerpt, which is that ‘all individuals are equal’.

120 Mia [%Well we don't wanna go to school we wanna jus' (.) play all day we're gonna bo-
 121 Mia %go to Belgrade and never ever come back we don't wanna see you in our whole life h.
 122 Mum Really
 123 (0.2)
 124 Mia %'Cause you are being RU:DE
 125 Mum [I was being rude?
 126→ Mia [%An- and it's not fair we always have to listen to YOU and you never listen to US .h=
 127 Mum [Well
 128→ Mia [%'Cause we say right now w' switch on the TV and you are not listening
 129→ Mum I AM listening but Mia I am the Mummy so I have to decide what's best for you

With her crying voice, Mia makes a declarative statement at line 120, while complaining and adamantly expressing her wish that she and her brother Luke do not want to go to school and that they want to 'play all day'. She begins her utterance with 'Well' in turn-initial position, which indicates a form of disagreement with the previous speaker (Mum, at lines 118 and 119, not seen here) whereby Mum explains that children should rest and go to bed. The employment of 'Well' combined with a crying voice at the beginning of this utterance indicates a nonconforming, and indirect answer and that 'trouble' for mum is forthcoming (Pomerantz, 1984a; Schegloff & Lerner, 2009). It also adumbrates Mia's reluctance to give a straightforward response, in relation to the previous turn, which was Mum's explanation for why the children need to go to sleep early.

The contrastive dispositions of the two parts of Mia's utterance at line 120 are further emphasized by the employment of contrastive phrases 'go to school' vs. 'play all day'. Additionally, the use of the *pro*-term, personal indexical 'we' at line 120, marks the children as 'the two of us', thus signifying unity and perhaps proposing that there are two opposing sides to the argument and that there is 'us' and/against 'you'.

Mia's poignant 'threats' and admonishments aimed at Mum (line 121) are further emphasised by the employment of adverbs 'never' and 'ever', whereby 'ever' appears to have strengthened the negation of 'never'. The 'never ever' phrase is

accentuated with the employment of ‘whole’ to imply ‘permanence’ and ‘entirety’ making it ‘an extreme case formulation’ (Pomerantz, 1986). The significance of this specific word(s) selection, and particularly their final position in the utterance, potentially amplifies the severity of the ‘threat’ and thereby represents the sternest form of impending ‘punishment’ for Mum.

Mum questions Mia’s wishes with a single-worded, “flat-sounding” adverb “Really” (line 122), containing a slight intonation rise at the end, which makes Mum’s utterance sound like a question (See Appendix VI). The calmness of Mum’s voice could be reflecting Mum’s stance towards Mia’s threat, indicating that Mum is not convinced that those threats would materialise, and that Mum might be somewhat sceptical of the previous utterance (lines 120 and 121). Mum’s calmness also represents one way of doing ‘not taking a threat seriously’. There is a brief pause after Mum’s question (line 123) while Mia is coming up with the reasons for her decision to leave.

Mia’s negative assessment of Mum presents a launch of a newly found form of explicit attack of Mum’s behaviour and accusing her of being rude, with the raised intonation on ‘rude’ (line 124). Mum finds this assertion somewhat surprising, so she poses another question to Mia implying that it was perhaps Mia who was being rude on this occasion, and not herself by placing an emphasis on ‘I’ (line 125).

Instead of responding directly to Mum’s question at line 125, which appears to be a rhetorical one, Mia invokes a general-truth type of rule with regards to fairness and reciprocity (line 126). She starts off her utterance with ‘An-’ which is in overlap with Mum’s question at line 125 and she then repairs this because the utterance was probably not heard properly, while being in an overlap with Mum’s. Mia continues with ‘And’ and explicitly states that the relationships should be reciprocal. Mia is

invoking yet another rule which pertains to fairness between two individuals. A strong sense of justice, usually strongly exhibited in children, and pungently instilled here in Mia's utterance, is not at all surprising, considering that she is only six years old in this recording.

At line 127, Mum starts off her turn with 'Well', which indicates that the previous utterance was problematic. She does not get to continue to speak because Mia interrupts her in an overlapped talk in which she extrapolates how fairness, or rather the lack of it, is pertinent to the situation they are in 'right now', thus emphasising the immediacy of the siblings' request while incorporating the *pro*-term 'we' (line 128). Within the same utterance, Mia provides a relevant example to Mum to strengthen and validate her claim. Mia thereby determines that the relationship is asymmetrical, and this has been corroborated and confirmed by Mum at line 129. Mum confirms that although she is listening with an intonation rise on 'am' she asserts that she must make the final decision because she *is* the mother. Herewith, we have a clear invocation of the category mother ('Mummy') which was invoked by Mum 'I am the Mummy', which is an interesting formulation (line 129). It is interesting because it functions on the 'common-sense understanding that parents make decisions relating to their child' and 'an orientation to the rights and responsibilities predicated to the memberships parent-child' (Butler & Fitzgerald, 2010, p. 2467). This formulation brings up the relevance of who is speaking to whom, i.e., child to parent or a parent to child, for example.

Mia's understanding of fairness, or in this case, the lack of it, is displayed through the sequential talk-in-interaction here and now. There is an interesting appeal to abstract notions of fairness, or rules, and relationship rights and responsibilities. The moral rules of this 'here and now' are located in both, the relationship to this object

(toy) and with more abstract ideas of authority, as made concrete in this instance. It is not based on some abstract notion of fairness or a moral code cognitively attributed to participants. This accomplishment has been reached by the participants locally, within the situated interaction.

Let us consider the two constructions at lines 126, 128, and 129, following the accusation of Mum being 'rude'. At line 126, Mia makes a declarative statement in a negative form which is followed by a clause (line 128) and a conjunction 'cause' providing an explanation for why the description of mum's behaviour as 'rude' was employed at line 124. Consider now Mum's subsequent reaction and the construction employed following Mia's explication and the reasons for Mum's rudeness. Mum disagrees with Mia and asserts that she IS listening to her children. This is followed by an adversative conjunction 'but' after which she then goes on to provide an explanation.

With regards to prosodic features of Mia's utterance, it is worth noting that Mia's intonation of 'We' and 'Us' is at approximately the same level (340 Hz), but also of 'you' and 'you' in the utterance 'We always have to listen to you and you never listen to us', (See Appendix VII). The higher pitch and slightly elongated pronouns are a design feature of the utterance giving it the particular character that it has and the way the statement was said. Interestingly, prosody seems to match the reciprocal stance expressed by Mia at line 126.

Mia describes Mum as 'rude' to challenge her behaviour, which she deems unacceptable. She does this on behalf of herself and her brother because they are jointly faced with a constraint they wish to overcome. Mia's reasoning behind her description of Mum's rudeness has been extrapolated to Mum. She accuses Mum of not listening to the children and states that being fair means that all are equal which

means we should all listen to each other. Furthermore, Mia's statement that 'listening to each other' should be reciprocal is emphasized and contrasted with the deployment of 'always' versus 'never' within the same utterance (line 126). Mia is evoking reciprocity and fairness, and the whole basis of her actions is practical reasoning in order to contest Mum's decision to stop the children from watching TV and to resist this imposition.

'Ask nicely' Exc. 9

Excerpt 9 [151230 Magic Trick 23:40]

Context. In this excerpt, the father of the children seeks clarification on whether the children let each other play with their toys and whether children have rules with regards to sharing of the toys. Mia invokes the rule of having to 'ask nicely' for the toy if one wishes to take turns. Sharing the toys or taking turns at playing with them seems to be an imposition to both children and Mia tries to resist this imposition by invoking a certain rule of how one should go about taking turns, as we will see from the excerpt below.

102	Dad	<u>So</u> tell me guys (0.1) do you guys let each other play with your toys?
103	Mia	<u>Yes</u> I do
104	Dad	And <u>so</u> what <u>sh-</u> do you guys have a rule like whoever starts playing
105	Dad	with it should (.) be allowed to play with it?
106	Mia	Yeah
107	Luke	No:
108	Dad	And how about if the guy who owns it (.) can they take it back <u>anytime</u> they want?
109	Luke	Yes
110	Mia→	Yeah well they need to a: - they <u>can</u> but they need to <u>a:sk</u> nicely (.) <u>'cause</u>
111	Mia	Luke just STARTED snatching [it he said I WANT IT

In the sequence just prior to this one, Mia lets go of the toy which the children were fighting over, and Luke now continues to play with it. The father asks the

children to clarify whether they let each other play with their toys (line 102). He starts his utterance in a casual style, evidenced from the use of the address term ‘guys’ when referring to the children, after which there is a slight pause. He proceeds his utterance by repeating the address term using a polar question. However, one can observe that the question itself is structured ambiguously. The father employs the term ‘each other’ to address children separately while referring to their joint action of ‘playing’. The ambivalence stems from the use of a possessive pronoun ‘your’ used with ‘toys’, which could be interpreted in a singular or plural form by the participants. It is assumed that the pronoun ‘your’ is used as a plural considering the employment of the address term ‘guys’ twice prior to it and within the same utterance. The use of the phrase ‘your toys’ infers that the toys belong to both children jointly, and as such, they are automatically understood to be ‘shared toys’. If in turn they are ‘shared toys’, then both children do share their toys and the question itself becomes redundant. ‘Your’ in this context would then refer to a single child and not to both children, which as such would not make sense grammatically. At line 103, Mia gives an affirmative answer, but she also confirms that she, *herself*, does share *her* toys with her brother. Luke however, does not respond.

Father then poses another question and he begins it with ‘and so what sh-’, which could be hearable as perhaps ‘what should you do?’ as an open and generic type of question. Instead, father cuts off his utterance and reformulates his general question into a more specific one of whether the children have a rule that allows the person who starts playing with the toy to continue to play with it (lines 104 and 105). This rule would have put Mia in a favourable position considering that that is what she had done, and she confirms that there is such a rule among the siblings (line 106). Unsurprisingly, Luke’s response is negative, and he confirms that he knows of no such

rule (line 107).

Father's preceding question makes an already ambiguous situation even more abstruse. He asks whether a person can get their toy back based on ownership of the toy (line 108). Of course, this is what Luke has been claiming all along and this is precisely why he provides an affirmative answer at line 109. Mia accepts that this rule does indeed exist, and she appears to agree with it. However, a problematic aspect of the application of this rule is announced with Mia's employment of 'well'. In fact, Mia emphasizes that Luke, her brother, has not exercised this rule 'properly'.

Mia proposes that one indeed should be entitled to their own toy but only if they 'ask nicely'. This in turn suggests that if one does not 'ask nicely' then one should not be entitled to the toy. In so doing, Mia actively seeks confirmation that she has not done anything wrong with holding on to the toy, since Luke did not follow the part of the rule which refers to the use of politeness markers and which were missing from Luke's request, according to Mia.

She immediately offers her justification which is based on the relevance of the following rule: in making a request, the requester must do so 'nicely'. Mia asserts that instead of asking nicely, Luke simply started to 'snatch' the toy from her while stating that he wanted it. Mia incorporates reported speech to demonstrate exactly what Luke had said (line 111). This conduct is contrary to the rule Mia has invoked in this sequence. We do not have evidence of Luke's stance on whether this rule has been mutually established and understood in such way by both siblings. Nevertheless, Mia seems to have served her interactional goal through the invocation of such a rule to benefit herself, which provided justification to her previous action of non-compliance.

Summary

In Chapter 4, I have described how children invoke rules in interactions and

how they make use of them in order to resist impositions and constraints. What we can observe from the excerpts in this chapter is that the children predominantly invoke rules related to object possession and ownership in situations of conflict and disagreements. Garvey (1984) argues that within a nursery group setting ‘the vast majority of toddlers’ clashes arise over the issue of possession or use of objects and that struggles to take over these objects almost always escalate into protests and screaming, and that they always get terminated with an intervention of a teacher or a parent who urges the children to take turns (p. 140). We could see that although the siblings belong to a slightly older age group in the case of my data, an intervention by a parent in a similar fashion to the one proposed by Garvey, was imminent. Another relevant finding which Garvey (1984) points out is that taking of the object often depends on a basic social rule, which is the ‘rule of prior possession’ or the rule we called ‘first come first served’, which Mia tried to utilise and which was shown in Excerpts 1 and 2.

In Excerpt 1, for example, Luke’s sense of entitlement is based on his ownership of the toy and he reasons with Mia by invoking a rule based on the possession of the object. This excerpt is an adversary discourse because there is an argument between the two children. The conflicting situation is created here through establishing of which rule then applies here because these rules are seen as the tool or a resource for the children to advance their own agendas. So, the significant factor is not the content of these rules per se, but how these rules are applied and for what purpose. Siegert (1986) argues that judgment and reasoning are always a ‘joint production by all participants’ and that they must be accounted for in terms of the contexts in which they were created in interactions (Siegert cited in Corsaro & Streeck, 1986, p. 291). The invocation of rules is thus seen through children’s coordination of

their activities within these contexts.

In Excerpt 4, we can see that conflicts can be complex and can involve a variety of issues, which prompt the children to engage in more creative and flexible ways of solving them. What we mean by complex is that some conflicts and impositions can contain layers of meanings, which initially start as one type of imposition but then gradually creates opportunities for bringing up other impositions related to the main imposition. For example, when the mother switches the TV off and does not allow the children to watch it, this is the initial imposition. In order to switch the TV off, the mother asks Luke to pass the remote control to her. Children then see this as another constraint in that the mother is always giving children orders and this is why they cannot do what they want to do. There are therefore 'layers' of impositions which get revealed in situ and in moment-by-moment interaction.

In Excerpt 8, Mia states that fairness is gauged by reciprocity and fairness and feels that inequality exhibited in that particular instance was unjustified. It is interesting to observe that this conception of an objective principle of morality and moral reasoning is conceptualized in a social and situated way. Through moral reasoning, Mia brings up her arguments to show how reciprocity and fairness is understood in interaction, i.e., 'if I must listen to you then you must listen to me'. The notion that all relations should be equal, and that rights and obligations should be reciprocal is tied to a specific interactional moment and is made relevant here and now, in the ongoing interaction. Of course, Mia's conception might seem logical and straightforward to many but what we are witnessing here is in fact application of rules that makes it context-specific. This specific situated activity has provided an opportunity for Mia to test how fairness is or should be distributed, and how this concept is dependent on (familial) relationships for example, and this is precisely what

elucidates how moral reasoning is ‘performed’, shaped, and fostered empirically. We say empirically because there are, of course, two sides to the coin here stemming from the experience, one being Mia’s argument about fairness and justice distribution but also Mia’s awareness of Mum’s familial positioning, as seen at line 129 whereby she states, ‘I am the Mummy so I have to decide what’s best for you’. It is worth noting that Mum is acting as though there is symmetry in their relation, but the mother and the children are clearly not equal partners.

Invoking rules is one of the ways the children used to resist impositions placed upon them. In addition, the children also employ ECFs in order to resist impositions, which will be demonstrated in the next chapter.

Chapter 5: Children's use of Extreme Case Formulations (ECFs)

In this chapter, I will present my analyses of the two children's use of Extreme Case Formulations (ECFs) in their construction of moral reasoning practices when resisting impositions from their co-participants. Pomerantz (1986) begins her article on ECFs by asserting that to legitimize one's claims, a person can describe a state of affairs using ECFs. She points out that people can use ECFs for various reasons and some of the reasons may be to persuade, justify, accuse, defend, or complain, for example. Pomerantz (1986) goes on to propose three uses of ECFs, two of which are relevant to our data samples. One of the examples Pomerantz uses in her paper talks about the use of the ECF 'all day Sunday' in which a woman is complaining about her husband to a person on the phone who had asked to speak to him. She accuses her husband of spending 'all day Sunday' away from home and with another woman. Employing such ECF, the woman 'describes the circumstances and actions that are constitutive of his 'wrongdoings' and she provides the amount of time the husband was away, which was 'all of it' or 'the maximum possible' time (Pomerantz, 1986, p. 220).

In this article, Pomerantz (1986) also talks about Maximum Case Formulations (MCFs), which are formulations indicating 'a sense for what that amount of time is for the matter in question' (1986: 221). She then provides several examples of MCFs and they are 'all day'' and 'always', for example. Another formulation she proposes is a Maximum Case Proportional Measure (MCPM), while referring to the formulations such as 'every time' to indicate that something occurs regularly or frequently, rather than randomly. Another example which Pomerantz (1986) discusses is 'everyone does it' to indicate that it is normal practice, and that action does not need explaining (p. 223).

Considering Pomerantz's (1986) underpinnings of the ECFs' employment, I examined how the two children were seen to use them in interaction with each other and others. It is found that they employed ECFs in order to complain, protest, accuse, justify, and defend their standpoints. They also used them to propose that behaviour is 'right' or 'wrong', because it is commonly done or occurs frequently for example. ECFs thus 'propose behaviours as acceptable and right or unacceptable and wrong' (Pomerantz, 1986:228).

'Always' and 'never' Exc. 10

Excerpt 10 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]

Context. In this excerpt, we focus on Mia's employment of ECFs as a moral reasoning practice. Mia complains that she and her brother Luke do not want to go to school and that they want to play all day instead. She threatens Mum that they will leave Singapore for good and that they will go to their grandparents' house in Belgrade. Considering that this excerpt has already been fully analysed, I will only make additional observations with respect to Mia's use of ECFs. In this excerpt, Mia employs 'always' and 'never' in order to complain to Mum that the children 'always' have to listen to her and that she 'never' listens to them.

120	Mia	[%Well we don't wanna go to school we wanna jus' (.) play all day we're gonna bo-
121	Mia	%go to Belgrade and never ever come back we don't wanna see you in our whole life h.
122	Mum	Really
123		(0.2)
124	Mia	%'Cause you are being RU:DE
125	Mum	[I was being rude?
126→	Mia	[%An- and it's not fair we always have to listen to YOU and you never listen to US .h=
127	Mum	[Well
128	Mia	[%'Cause we say right now w' switch on the TV and you are not listening
129	Mum	I AM listening but Mia I am the Mummy so I have to decide what's best for you

Mia's complaint at line 120 is about an imposition placed by Mum at line 118 (not seen in this Excerpt which states 'But I also want you to get rest so that you can go to school') whereby Mum explains that children should rest and go to bed. Mum has switched the TV off prior to this. As mentioned earlier, the contrastive dispositions of the two parts of Mia's utterance at line 120 are emphasized with two contrastive phrases, 'go to school' vs. 'play all day'.

Mia's poignant 'threats' and admonishments aimed at Mum at line 121 are accusations of Mum's 'wrongdoing'. These threats are further accentuated with the employment of 'never ever', whereby 'ever' appears to have intensified the negation of 'never'. The phrase 'never ever' is highlighted in combination with the adjective 'whole' to imply 'permanence' and 'entirety'. The employment of such vocabulary implies that not seeing someone in their 'whole life' is from start and finish of one's life, and that implies a maximum possible time' and acts as the MCF. The significance of this specific word(s) selection, and particularly their final position in the utterance, potentially amplifies the severity of the 'threat' and thereby represents the sternest form of impending 'punishment' for Mum. It could be said that this formulation is also used 'to provide for the recognisability of the offender's wrongdoing' (Pomerantz, 1986, p. 221).

The calmness of Mum's voice while questioning Mia, could be reflecting Mum's stance towards Mia's threat, indicating that Mum is not convinced that those threats would materialise, and that Mum might be somewhat sceptical of the previous utterance and represents one way of doing 'not taking a threat seriously' (lines 120 and 121). Mum challenges Mia's employment of 'never ever' and 'whole day' by including a 'doubt marker', 'really' while she challenges Mia's accuracy of the description. It is worth pointing out that the use of 'really' in this context, only signals

doubt when used in a particular sequential position, as seen from this excerpt. Mum's calmness also represents 'someone who cannot assume sympathetic hearings' as seen from Mum's sceptical questioning 'Really', at line 122 (Pomerantz, 1986, p. 221).

An example of ECFs is employed by Mia at line 126, in which Mia contrasts 'always' and 'never'. These are referred to as Maximum Case formulations (MCFs) because 'always' indicates a maximum number of occurrences and portrays one extreme end 'always' to the next extreme 'never'. Mia is objecting the fact that the children 'always' have to listen to their mother. She further stipulates that Mum 'never' listens to the children, which could infer that children perhaps expect Mum to listen to them sometimes at least, but she 'never' does. Mia thereby determines that the relationship is asymmetrical and indeed this has been corroborated and confirmed by Mum at line 129. Mia further extrapolates how fairness, or rather the lack of it, is pertinent to the situation they are in 'right now' (line 128).

Within the same utterance, which continues from line 126, Mia provides a relevant example to Mum to strengthen and validate her claim at line 128. Mum confirms that although she is listening with an intonation rise on 'am' she asserts that she must make the final decision on what is best for her children because she is 'the mummy'.

'All' and 'always' Exc. 11

Excerpt 11 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57]

Context. In this sequence, Mum is putting the children to bed. She asked Luke to pass her the remote control, which was on the table next to him in order to switch the TV off. Almost immediately prior to the sequence presented below, both children have asked Mum 'to learn how to behave' and Mum begins this sequence by questioning children about what it means to 'behave'. Mia then lists several things

which would be classed as ‘good behaviour’. In this excerpt, my focus is on Mia’s employment of moral reasoning practices through employment of the ECFs, ‘all’ and ‘always’.

- 109 Mum What does it mean to behave?
110 Mia %To stop shouting and stop jus' lying on your silly
111 (0.1)
112 Mia Just lying on your silly bottom and giving orders
113 Mum .h °huh huh° first of all my bottom is not silly
114 Mia→ [.H %That's all that you are doing lying down on your bottom and giving orders
115 Luke [%And you are being a BAD Mummy
116 Mum And what are you doing right now?
117 Mia %I am crying because you are giving so much orders=
118 Mia→ %and you are always shouting

At line 109, Mum questions the children about what ‘behaving’ means. At lines 110 and 112, Mia proposes that ‘behaving’ means ‘to stop shouting’, ‘to stop lying on your silly bottom’ and to stop ‘giving orders’ (lines 110 and 112). By introducing ‘your’ while addressing Mum, Mia accuses Mum and suggests that she is not behaving, or that this is not what ‘behaving’ means. Mia specifies these criteria using an interesting formulation, by suggesting what Mum should do, or more specifically what Mum should *not* do in order to satisfy the ‘behaving well’ criteria. By formulating her utterance in this way, Mia asserts that Mum is ‘shouting’, ‘lying on her silly bottom’ and giving orders regularly and frequently, by specifying the amount of time Mum spends doing these actions. And although Mum’s initial question was a generic one ‘what does it mean to behave’ at line 109, Mia takes it as the opportunity to attack Mum and accuse her of ‘not behaving’. Thus, whatever the mother is doing is the ‘wrongdoing’.

Not surprisingly then, Luke invokes the MC here by exclaiming ‘you are being a bad Mummy’ (MC invocations will be discussed separately and in more detail in Chapter 6). Interestingly, Mia separates the actions of ‘lying down’ and ‘giving orders’, which she brings up together in one utterance at line 114 in combination with the ECF ‘all’. At the end of this sequence at line 118, Mia brings up the action of ‘shouting’ in combination with the ECF ‘always’. The employment of the aforesaid ECFs denotes that the behaviour Mia is referring to is what Mum is doing most of the time or very often, at least. But, employed in the present continuous tense it implies that it refers to something Mum is doing ‘right now’ and ‘continuously’. Both ECFs are used for exaggeration and to emphasize Mum’s ‘wrong’ behaviour.

According to Mia, it is unfair and unacceptable for Mum to do these things and it infers that a ‘good mother’ would not do such things, since ‘good mothers’ behave. According to Mia, while she is addressing Mum later in the recording, behaving means ‘teaching’ children things (line 122, ‘you are not even teaching us anything’), and ‘helping’ them (line 125, ‘You are not helping us with anything’), instead of ordering them about. We can observe elements of accusation and blame in Mia’s utterance, while she uses her crying voice to ascribe certain predicates to Mum, such as ‘shouting’ and ‘giving orders’. By employing MCFs ‘all’ and ‘always’ Mia signifies the intensity of Mum’s ‘wrongdoings’.

Mum defends her stance at line 116 by asking what Mia is ‘doing right now’. Mum does this on the surmise that, whatever Mia was suggesting about *Mum*’s behaviour at lines 110 and 114, is precisely what *Mia* is doing ‘right now’, i.e., ‘shouting’ and ‘lying on her bottom’. Mum therefore launches her utterance at line 116 as a counterattack of Mia’s behaviour and now accuses Mia of the same type of behaviour.

Interestingly, Mum does not negate or deny Mia's claims at any point in this sequence whereas Mia does. Mia defends her own stance by stipulating that she is in fact 'crying' right now and not 'lying on her silly bottom', which was Mum's initial presupposition. Mia's assertion of this specific action such as 'crying', alludes that she is also accusing and blaming Mum for the state she was in at that moment, and that what she was doing is rather different to what Mum had suggested earlier.

'All' and 'always' Exc. 12

Excerpt 12 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57]

Context. In this excerpt, Mia impersonates Mum's action of giving all kinds of orders to children, and she suggests that that is 'all' Mum is doing. Mum challenges Mia's stance and explains that she was only 'asking' Mia 'politely'. Mia complains that it is always the children having to carry out tasks and Mia characterises Mum as 'lazy' for not doing things herself. Mia employs ECFs 'all' to emphasize the fact that Mum is 'just' doing that and that is 'all' that she is doing. Mia also employs another ECF by suggesting that the children are 'always' doing the things Mum asks them to do, which she sees as unfair and that Mum's actions are in effect 'wrong'.

177	Mia	%An' then while you are kissing Daddy (.) you'll just say =
178	Mia	%Mia go and get me the salt Luke please go and get me the remote control=
179	Mia	% Mia please switch on the air conditioning
180	Mia→	You are just doing that that's all that you are doing
181		(.)
182	Mum	What's wrong with that?
183	Mia→	%You are just giving orders
184	Mum	I was asking you politely
185		(0.2)
186	Luke	Hm::
187		(.)
188	Mia→	%We are <u>a:lways</u> doing that WHY don't do it yourself=
189	Mia	%You are a bit la:zy (.) .h WHY not do it yourself
190		(0.2)

At lines 177, 178, and 178, Mia suggests that Mum, while busy doing other things such as 'kissing Daddy', would issue all sorts of requests to Mia. According to Mia, Mum is 'just doing that' and that is 'all' that Mum is doing (line 180). This use of ECF implies that Mum could not then be doing other things.

Mia makes these exaggerations in order to legitimise her own claim and to justify her accusation of Mum being 'a bit lazy' at line 189. Another aspect of Mia's talk that should be taken into consideration here is that Mia, although using her crying voice, impersonates Mum. In so doing, Mia attempts to portray Mum's tone of voice and to mimic Mum's behaviour while she orders children about. She does that in order to sound cynical because she finds this type of behaviour unacceptable, i.e., that Mum is giving orders to children while doing something else ('kissing Daddy').

After a micropause, Mum questions Mia and implies that she could see nothing wrong with the way she behaved as proposed by Mia (line 182). Mia's response is a complaint that Mum is 'just giving orders' (line 183). At line 184, Mum swiftly corrects Mia and clarifies that she was only trying to be polite while asking children to do things, presumably. There is a problem with Mum's utterance as it appears that Mia

recognises that there is truth in Mum's statement and Mum's clarification is followed by a pause. We could see that at lines 178 and 179, Mia employs a politeness marker 'please' on two occasions while impersonating Mum.

Luke expresses his dissatisfaction after the pause (line 185) and then after a micropause, Mia continues to use her crying voice while she employs another ECF while stating that children are 'always' doing that, hearable as 'following Mum's orders'. And although Mia has not explicitly specified anywhere in this sequence that these two children in fact do succumb to Mum's requests, she asserts that this is indeed the case at line 188. Mia then uses raised intonation to complain asking why Mum does not do those things herself ('get the salt', 'get the remote control' or 'switch on the air conditioning'). She then goes on to assess Mum's behaviour by accusing her that she is 'a bit lazy' (line 189). Note that this utterance appears as a milder version of the more direct accusation. Mia could have said 'You are lazy', for example. Instead, she employs 'a bit'.

Mia then uses raised intonation and her crying voice to repeat her previous utterance, but with a slight modification. Instead of 'Why don't do it yourself', hearable as 'Why don't you do it yourself?', Mia utters 'Why not do it yourself'. After Mia's utterance at line 189, aimed directly at Mum, who was selected as the next speaker, there is a pause. There is no immediate response by Mum, which indicates that Mia's utterance was problematic, and that Mum may object Mia's accusation.

'Never ever', 'always', and 'never' Exc. 13

Excerpt 13 [160801_Boy channels 02:42]

Context. In this Excerpt, Mia and Alex are sitting on the sofa watching TV. Luke is complaining that Mia should never choose any TV channels because she 'never ever' chooses 'lovely' channels. Mia's response is that it is not fair that Luke

‘always’ chooses ‘boy channels’ instead of ‘barby and stuff’. To each child, watching the channels which the other child chooses to watch is an imposition and both children resist it by employing ECFs to make their own claims more legitimate.

- 4 Luke→ You can never choose the channels ever (.) from no:w
 5 Mia WHY NO:T?
 6 Luke→ 'Cause you- 'cause you never ever choose ↑ lovely channels
 7 Mia→ Well you always choose boy channels so it's not fair (.) E:::
 8 Mia→ And we never choose like ba::rby and stuff
 9 Luke Yeah you do
 10 Mia °We don't °
 11 Luke [Yeah we do
 12 Mia [Well we don't
 13 Mia We choo::se it but then you switch it off

At line 4, Luke is informing, as well as instructing Mia that she cannot get to choose the TV channels ‘from now’ on. Luke employs the ECF ‘never ever’ to stipulate that Mia might have been the person who chose the channels in the past but that she should not be the person to do so ‘from now’ on. Mia raises her tone of voice while questioning Luke in order to give her the reasons for that statement at line 5. Luke struggles to come up with his response when he cuts off his utterance after the ‘cause you’. He then starts again by employing the ECF ‘never ever’ to match his initial informing from line 4. At line 6, Luke claims that the reason Mia could not choose the channels is because she ‘never ever’ chooses ‘lovely channels’.

Mia’s reasoning resorts to issues of fairness distribution while she employs the ECF ‘always’ to stipulate that whenever Luke gets to choose the channels, he ‘always’ chooses ‘boy channels’, i.e., channels which are meant for Luke to watch, because he is a boy (line 7). This utterance could be interpreted in two ways. The first

interpretation could be that Mia is suggesting that she should be the one who should continue to be allowed to choose the channels and not Luke, because he ‘always’ chooses ‘boy channels’. The second interpretation could be that both children should be allowed to choose the channels otherwise the ‘choosing’ would not be distributed equally, and that would not be fair. The possibility that the second interpretation is more applicable here stems from the fact that Mia subsequently employs the pronoun ‘we’, implying that neither of the children happen to choose ‘barby’ channels, which are the channels intended for girls, in this case intended for Mia, since she is a girl.

Luke did not register the employment of the pronoun ‘we’ in Mia’s utterance and he responds by claiming and confirming that Mia does choose ‘barby and stuff’ through the employment of the *pro*-term ‘you’, referring to Mia alone (line 9). Mia feels the need to repeat herself, possibly due to Luke’s hearing difficulty, and she denies Luke’s affirmation (line 10).

Having heard Mia’s utterance properly this time was confirmed in Luke’s subsequent response, in which he claims that both children get to choose ‘barby’ channels. At the same time, Mia expresses her discontent through the employment of ‘well’ at the beginning of her utterance to indicate that Luke’s utterance, which is in an overlap with hers, is problematic and that there is an issue with Luke’s claim. This is evidenced from Mia’s subsequent utterance in which Mia explicates the reason for her previous statements. Mia admits that in fact, both children get to choose ‘barby’ channels and this is no longer an issue in this conflicting situation. The issue presented this time is rather different, and it is that once the children do choose ‘barby’ channels, Luke switches that channel off, which presents an imposition for Mia and which she is trying to resist (line 13). According to Mia’s logic, and hence her employment of the ECF ‘never’ at line 8, switching the ‘barby’ channel off equates to the children not

being able to choose the channel in the first place.

Summary

The children predominantly use ECFs to accuse Mum of her ‘wrongdoings’ and to complain of her behavior. The children also discuss issues of fairness and reciprocity. In Excerpt 10, for example, Mia brings up the concept of ‘fairness’ and with the use of ECFs, she develops her arguments to show how reciprocity and fairness is understood in interaction, i.e., ‘If I must listen to you then you must listen to me’. This notion is tied to a specific interactional moment and is made relevant *here* and *now*, in the ongoing interaction.

In Excerpt 11, Mia brings up Mum’s ‘wrongdoing’ and she lists several practices, which are not considered appropriate behaviours, expected from ‘a good Mum’. As is the case in Austin and Fitzgerald’s (2007) paper whereby Mum positions herself as an ‘over-protective mother’ while she distances herself from attributes of ‘a bad mother’, Luke’s and Mia’s Mum does not seem to explicitly reject the children’s claims (p. 36.6). According to Mia, Mum’s inappropriate behaviour, ‘shouting’ and ‘giving orders’ to her children, presents an imposition. As a result, the children are being asked to carry out Mum’s orders while she is ‘lying on her silly bottom’, and this is the behaviour the children do not consider appropriate, fair, or reasonable. The employment of the ECFs ‘all’ and ‘always’ emphasizes Mum’s wrongdoing and provides for the ‘recognisability of the offender’s wrongdoing’ (Pomerantz, 1986, p. 221).

In addition, Mia is doing blaming and complaining on the one hand, and defending and denying, on the other. She resists Mum’s actions by accusing her of someone who is always ‘shouting’ and ‘lying down’ on her ‘silly bottom’ because that is ‘all’ that she is doing, and for that reason it is mother’s fault that Mia’s is crying.

Apart from rule invocations and ECFs, children also employ MCs and MCDs in order to resist impositions, which will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 6: Children's use of Membership Categories (MCs) and Membership Categorization Devices (MCDs)

In this chapter, I illustrate children's use of moral reasoning as a resource while resisting impositions placed upon them by others in everyday interactions. More specifically, I demonstrate how these two children employ MCs and MCDs to perform such actions. Children used MCs and MCDs to resist impositions and to achieve their interactional goals, while they argue and accuse Mum of being 'a bad Mummy'.

'Bad Mummy' Exc. 14

Excerpt 14 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]

Context. In this sequence, Mum is putting Mia and Luke to bed. Having allowed the children to watch TV for a few minutes, Mum switches it off. The children are complaining about the TV being switched off and they 'threaten' Mum that they will leave Singapore and go to Belgrade where their 'Baba' ('Grandmother', in Serbian) and 'Deda' ('Grandfather' in Serbian) live. We show instances of Luke invoking the MC 'bad Mummy' while referring to his own mother and her behaviour. The context here involves a constraint that is based on the fact that the children were not allowed to continue to watch the TV for longer, and the invocation of the MC 'bad Mummy' in this excerpt must be understood in that context.

1 Mia [A:nd
 2 Luke→ [Bad Mummy (.) [bad Mummy and-
 3 Mia [I am giving you a last chance or else we are leaving Singapore
 4 Mum [Where are you g-
 5 Mia [%I'm gonna call Ellen and see if she wants to come with us
 6 Mum Where?
 7 (0.1)
 8 Luke [To Baba's and Deda's house
 9 Mia [To- to Baba (.).h .h
 10 Mia %And if she says YES we're GOing if she says no we're going by ourselves=
 11 Mia %Better to go with somebody than by yourself .h.h
 12 Mia %I am gonna count to three and if you don't switch it o:n we are leaving
 13 ((Phone starts to ring in the background))
 14 (.)
 15 Luke OKA:Y?
 16 Mia %One (0.2) two (0.3) two and a half (0.1)
 17 Mum Mia we can't switch on the TV because it's bed time
 18 Mia %A::ND (.) you have your last chance now
 19 Mia [%Or else
 20 Mum [L- Lu- Luke?
 21 Mia [%Or or you can see us never again (.) A:N:D?
 22 Mum Mia?
 23 (0.1)
 24 Mum [(Y-
 25 Mia [%THREE We are going to Belgrade
 26 Mum You should not be saying this Mia because it's school day tomorrow you need to go to bed
 27 Luke [#BA:D
 28 Mia [%We are leaving to Belgrade tomorrow
 29 Mia %I counted to three and you did not switch it [on
 30 Luke [Hm %and we are never coming back
 31 Mia %And never ever seeing you again
 32 Luke Hm::
 33 Mia ((Coughing)) [(And
 34 Mum [Do you think that would make you happy?
 35 Mia %Yeah
 36 Luke Yeah
 37 Mia %And then we can watch TV as long as we like 'cause we 're not gonna
 38 Mia %go to school there

The recording begins with Luke's negative assessment and the MC invocation 'bad Mummy', with which Luke attempts to resist an imposition placed upon him by Mum. In so doing, Luke accuses Mum of not being a good mother. 'Mummy' is thus describable by the *hearer's maxim* with the Membership Categorization Device (MCD) *family* (Sacks, 1972b). Interestingly, Luke does not employ a pronominal form and a personal deixis 'you' to express his disappointment about Mum's behaviour (switching the TV off). Instead, he formulates his utterance in the third person ('bad Mummy'), and in so doing, he links Mum's action of 'wrong-doing' to her description

in general of some sort, by categorizing her with the adjective ‘bad’, that provides a relational pair of predicted categories of mummy – good and bad, which shows an action in situ.

Luke repeats ‘bad Mummy’ for the second time immediately afterwards within the same turn (line 2), but his utterance is in overlap with Mia’s at line 3. And although Luke’s utterance is aimed at Mum, although in the third person, one cannot help but observe that there is no comment or a request for an account made by Mum. The MC ‘bad Mummy’ receives a silent treatment.

Following Luke’s invocation however, Mia seems to orient to Luke’s description and assessment of Mum’s conduct as ‘bad’ by justifying her subsequent action in the form of a threat. Since Mum’s described behavior is seen as inappropriate, Mia perhaps feels that ‘punishing’ Mum might be a justifiable sort of action to take. In her subsequent utterance (line 3), Mia swiftly reacts by employing a conditional ‘threat’ towards Mum, asserting that Mum has been given ‘a last chance’ to switch the TV back on, otherwise the children will leave, not only the house but also the city or the country they live in. In so doing, Mia accentuates the ‘severity’ of her threat. Just after Luke’s categorization of Mum, Mia offers Mum the opportunity to adhere to her children’s request by beginning the utterance with the pronoun ‘I’, citing her own intention.

The right to tell others to perform a certain action is one accorded to members of certain categories related to authority within familial hierarchy (parent to a child, for example). However, Mia expresses an action of a person entitled to give such orders, presenting herself as a member of the category *parent* or an *older sibling*. This is followed with a conjunction ‘or else’ followed by a ‘threat’ (line 3). The use of conjunction in this way denotes that the next clause may present an alternative to the

previous one. 'Or', on this occasion, would have been sufficient but joined together in the form of 'or else' they are used for emphasis. Similarly, used as an idiomatic expression followed by nothing else, 'or else' may sound aggressive and suggests that if one does not do what was asked of them, the unpleasant consequences would follow.

Mum questions where the children's intended destination would be (line 4) but does not get to complete her utterance because Mia continues her turn (line 5) by stating her intention to call Ellen (Mia's and Luke's friend and neighbor, who is similar age to them). Mum is persistent in wishing to find out where the children intend to go (line 6) and after a short pause, Luke is the first one to respond to Mum's question (line 8), stating that they will go to their Grandparents' house. While Mia goes along with his answer in an overlap, she hesitates 'To- to Baba' (line 9). Mia affirms that the siblings will leave regardless of whether Ellen travels with them or not (line 10), which is contrary to Mia's proceeding statement employed in a singular form and based on a general rule that it is 'better to go with somebody than by yourself'.

And although Mia has previously stated that she has given Mum the last chance to respond, she launches another conditional 'threat' (line 12) by asking Mum to conform to her request to switch the TV back on. She does this by performing a count-down to three and thus introducing a category of time. Mia has even offered Mum some additional time by inserting number 'two and a half' (line 16) in order to give her additional time to comply to her request. Mum provides her reasons for not allowing the children to watch TV. Mum employs the inclusive pronoun 'we' at the beginning of her utterance to perhaps tone down or diffuse the sternness of her, effectively, outright rejection. She might also be emphasizing that this is what *we*, as a family, do. Mia does not respond to Mum's utterance however and continues to count. With a noticeably raised intonation and an extended conjunction 'A::ND (line 18) and

before reaching number three, Mia emphasizes that it is Mum's '*last* chance now' to succumb to her request. Mia continues her conditional threat with 'Or else' (line 19), insinuating what may happen should her request not be fulfilled.

Suddenly, however, because Mum's utterance is in overlap with Mia's (line 19), Mum makes a couple of attempts to call out Luke's name (line 20). Mum does this with a slightly raised intonation to perhaps reason with his sister or take Mum's side (line 20). This shows the connection of 'identity and action descriptors to the interactional task', which provide the context for the interlocutors (Hester & Eglin, 1997, p. 14). It also seems to indicate that Mum might be seeking Luke's attention in order to establish his availability (Wootton, 1981). At the same time, Mia reinstates what the consequence of not switching on the TV would be (line 21). This is followed by an extended and voiced conjunction A:N:D? with which she links her utterance to the subsequent turn (line 25) and stresses that she has not finished her counting. Mum appeals to Mia by calling out her name (line 22) and after a short pause she attempts a new turn but gets interrupted by Mia's completion of the counting and the confirmation of their decision, this time by being more specific and by adding their precise destination, Belgrade at line 25. Here, Mia displays an orientation to *the consistency rule* and the relevance of the countdown completion (Sacks, 1995). It is worth pointing out that Mia's utterances sound nasal and are done using a crying voice, which ultimately generates an exaggerated and effective stance charged with emotions of upset and disappointment. Mum is holding Mia accountable while employing factual reminders that the children must wake up for school the following day and the need for them to go to bed early (line 26).

Mum's utterance at line 26 triggers Luke's negative assessment of Mum who uses a single-worded adjective 'BAD', while exercising his angry voice in order to

express disappointment. This time, the word ‘Mummy’ was omitted and Luke chooses only this one-worded utterance describing Mum, her behaviour, or the situation as ‘bad’. Yet again, just as in the earlier case (immediately after line 2), we see no uptake from Mum. Another observation is that, just before Luke’s assessment ‘BAD’, at line 27, Mum utterance begins with a pronoun ‘You’, referring to one of the children (Mia) and this is followed by a directive. Mum warns Mia that she should not be saying ‘this’. ‘This’ could refer to lines 25, 21, 12, 10 but also to line 3. Mum’s construction is then followed by a conjunction ‘because’ and she provides a reason why Mia should not be saying the things she had said.

Luke’s remark is in overlap with Mia’s repeated statement uttered at line 25, but she employs ‘going’ (line 25) instead of ‘leaving’ (line 28). It is interesting that Mia’s utterance, assembled in this way, appears to be a combination of ‘We are leaving Singapore’ (line 3), ‘We are going to Belgrade’ (line 25) and ‘we are leaving to Belgrade’ (line 28). The use of the *pro*-term, personal deixis ‘we’ makes the siblings ‘members of a collectivity’, thus belonging to the same category (Butler & Weatherall, 2006, p. 456). The use of the *pro*-term ‘we’ also indicates that Mia assumes that the mother has the information about who ‘we’ refers to. Mia’s newly created utterance also contains a temporal deixis ‘tomorrow’, and with its use, she orients to the imminence of their intended action (line 28).

Mia explicates the reasons of her decision by using her crying voice (line 29) while Luke latches on to Mia’s utterance and produces a disagreeing remark ‘Hm’ in an overlap. In so doing, Luke protests and displays his disavowal while adding ‘we are never coming back’ (line 30), thus emphasizing the ‘gravity’ of the threat. However, the ‘Hm’ remark could also be heard as a sign of ambivalence. Has Mia gone too far with her ‘threats’? Perhaps he is displaying his disagreement with regards to all the

threats Mia has made thus far, but he nevertheless continues to go along with her. Is he verifying his stance as the one of a cooperative sibling?

Mia then latches onto Luke's utterance confirming that the children are 'never ever seeing' their mother again (line 31). Luke's dissatisfaction is reinstated with the repetition of the similar-sounding but extended 'Hm::', displaying his continuous disavowal (line 32). At line 33, Mia begins her conclusion with 'And' in an overlap with Mum's question asking whether she, or perhaps they, would be happy not to see their mother again, to which both children respond affirmatively with 'Yeah' (lines 35 and 36). Mia finalizes this sequential episode by concluding that the children will be able to watch TV as long as they like at Baba's house. She adds that the reason for that is because they will not be going to school while they are there (at Baba's house). It is interesting that Mia seems to end this sequence by aligning with Mum's stance after all, which is that the children would be able to watch TV once they do not have to go to school, as seen at lines 37 and 38.

'Bad Mummy' Exc. 15

Excerpt 15 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]

Context. In this excerpt, Mia states that Baba is 'older' than Mum and that she can therefore tell Mum 'what to do' (lines 232 and 236). Mum confirms the fact that Baba is indeed older but reaffirms that Baba is entitled to invoke and apply rules at her own household. Luke then intercepts (line 235) by invoking MC 'bad Mummy' and lodging a complaint about Mum's conduct. In his disavowal, he raises his intonation on 'bad'. Interestingly, the invocation of the MC addressing Mum specifically, gets disregarded by Mum. The focus in this sequence will be on Luke's utterance at line 235 and the employment of the MC 'bad Mummy'.

232 Mia [%She IS older than YOU:
 233 Mum She is older but she's (.)in her house and it was holiday time
 234 Mum and [I wasn't [there
 235→ Luke [and BAD Mummy [.hm
 236 Mia [%Well she ca:n still tell you what to DO:
 237 Mum She can you're right but she didn't tell me not to let you sleep=

Mia makes a comparison of Baba (the grandmother) to her own mother ('Mum') and she brings up pertinent information about Baba while she states that Baba is older than Mum (line 232). In so doing, Mia reasons with Mum by supplying relevant information for the interlocutors and relevant grounds on which Mum is supposed to act in a certain manner, i.e., 'younger should listen to the older' which encompasses the stage-of-life device and refers to the hierarchy within families whereby children should listen to their parents (Sacks, 1992, 1995; Hester & Eglin, 1997).

Mum cannot and certainly does not deny the fact that Baba is older than her (line 233). However, she asserts that Baba has the right to decide at her own household and that the rules when the children are attending school differ from the rules during holiday time, which is something she had explained earlier. What is emerging here is the way the moral reasoning operates through appeals to an abstract logic applied in the particular circumstance – here, the matter of age and authority and in relation to categories 'mother-child'. The reasoning from this is then about how this rule does not fit these circumstances such that the abstract rules are negotiated and modified according to and in the process of their reasoned use and resistance. Here then the children display an ability to deploy rules through reasoned transfer into particular situations –the *in situ* work then is how or how not these rules are operative in this particular situation.

Moreover, Mum adds that she, herself, was not present when Baba allowed the children to watch TV (line 234). In so doing, Mum shifts her own responsibility to Baba. And although Mum offers an outright agreement (line 233) and confirms that she aligns with Mia's statement (line 232), Mum proceeds by using an adversative conjunction 'but' with which she expresses her oppositional stance and provides her reasons why things were done differently at Baba's house. Interestingly, we have observed this type of construction [Pronoun/Noun+ (adversative) conjunction+ explanation/account] employed by Mum before, at line 26, from the recording [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]. With this type of formulation, Mum provides her own stance on the situation just before she employs an adversative conjunction and then she goes on to explain or justify her statement.

Mum does not get to finish her utterance extrapolating to the children that she was not present at Baba's home where the children are allowed to watch TV in the evenings (line 234). And just after she begins her utterance with 'and', she gets interrupted by Luke, who also begins his utterance with 'and' at line 234. This signals that Luke perhaps wishes to finalize Mum's utterance by providing his own conclusion and assessment of the situation, and of Mummy's conduct by describing it, for that matter. His talk overlaps with Mum's and he raises his intonation on 'bad'.

Through the MC invocation, Luke displays his discontent, as shown at line 235, and we can conclude that he agrees with Mia's statement at line 232. Luke probably also agrees that it is not acceptable for his Mum to be disobedient to her own mother when her mother (Baba) is older than her. According to Luke, Mum should have been aware of this rule which advocates that older people and their decisions should be respected. This authoritative positioning of one person over another and according to someone's age, is, according to the children, a non-disputable, observable

feature and should thus stand above the rule with regards to whose household certain rules should be followed and when. Luke shows his further disappointment with ‘.hm’, immediately after his invocation of the MC ‘bad Mummy’ (line 235).

Luke’s disavowal is in overlap with Mia’s utterance at line 236, in which she employs her crying voice. Mia begins her utterance with ‘Well’, and its usage indicates that there is a problem with Mum’s previous utterance at lines 233 and 234. Mia shows that she understands that although there might exist different rules at Baba’s house, she still stands by her statement and by her belief that Baba, because she is ‘older’ than Mum, can still tell her daughter (‘the younger’) what to do (line 236). Mia emphasizes ‘do’ which is at the end of her utterance reconfirming the statement that the rules with regards to one’s age should apply here and should also prevail over any other rules. We also witness here that ‘authority and subordination are not static; rather, relationships of authority and subordination are constantly co-constructed as participants interact and may be challenged or even reversed’ (Cobb-Moore, 2012: 86).

Let us consider what happens with the emergence of Luke’s invocation of the MC ‘bad Mummy’ at line 235. There are two more constructions in direct proximity to Luke’s employment of this category. Both formats of these constructions contain an adversative conjunction ‘but’. This occurs in the prior, as well as the succeeding utterance.

We can also see that Mum firstly issues her stance and initially agrees with Mia in the opening part of both of those utterances, as seen at line 233 ‘She is older’ and at line 237, ‘She can, you’re right’. However, she proceeds by employing the adversative conjunction ‘but’ in both cases and uses negation; thus, expressing the oppositional view. In the first utterance Mum states that Baba was only allowed to do something

because she was at her own household, and not based on the fact that she is ‘older’ than Mum, as suggested by Mia (lines 233 and 234). In the second utterance, Mum initially aligns with Mia and she agrees that Baba should be able to tell her what to do, to an extent. The fact that Mum only partially agrees with Mia’s statement at line 236 is evidenced from the second part of that utterance in which Mum explains that Baba did not tell Mum not to let children sleep (line 237).

It is interesting that Mum uses past tense in this utterance ‘she *didn’t* tell me not to let you sleep’. Mum addresses this to refer to the conversation which took place between Baba and Mum in the past about the children. Mum’s utterance is slightly ambivalent however, as she synopsisizes something that could be hardly disputed even by adults, let alone young children. Mum’s employment of the past tense at line 237 is in contrast with Mia’s use of the present tense, where she asserts through her complaint that ‘she (Baba) *can still tell you* what to do’ at line 236. More importantly, we can observe that Luke’s invocation of the MC ‘bad Mummy’ and the negative description of her conduct does not get responded to by Mum. Instead, Mum resorts to responding to Mia instead.

‘Bad Mummy’ Exc. 16

Excerpt 16 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57]

Context. In this excerpt, Mum is putting the children to bed. Just prior to this sequence Mum asked Luke to pass her the remote control, which was on the table next to him. She asked Luke for it because the remote control was situated closer to him and so that she could switch the TV off. Mum switched the TV off just before this recording took place. Almost immediately prior to the sequence presented below, both children have asked Mum ‘to learn how to behave’ and Mum begins this sequence by questioning the children what it means to ‘behave’. Mia then lists several things which

would be classed as ‘good behaviour’, expected from a ‘good Mum’ and only if Mum stopped the behaviour that she has been displaying currently, would her behaviour be accepted as ‘good’. As a result, and as part of his conclusion based on Mia’s explanation, Luke invokes the MC ‘bad Mummy’ in order to categorise Mum and accuse her of bad behaviour and to resist the imposition, which were Mum’s orders directed at the children but also Mum’s ‘shouting’ and ‘lying’ on her ‘silly bottom’.

- 109 Mum What does it mean to behave?
 110 Mia %To stop shouting and stop jus' lying on your silly
 111 (0.1)
 112 Mia Just lying on your silly bottom and giving orders
 113 Mum .h °huh huh° first of all my bottom is not silly
 114 Mia [.H %That's all that you are doing lying down on your bottom and giving orders
 115 Luke→ [%And you are being a BAD Mummy
 116 Mum And what are you doing right now?
 117 Mia %I am crying because you are giving so much orders=
 118 Mia %and you are always shouting

At line 109, Mum questions the children about what it means to behave.

Mum’s question comes as a response to Luke’s previous utterance earlier at line 95 (not seen here) ‘only would you learn your behaviour’ and Mia’s utterance at line 103 ‘When you learn how to behave’. To Mia, for their mother to satisfy that criteria and to ‘behave’, Mia lists several characteristics which correspond to good behaviour. Mia proposes that ‘behaving’ means ‘to stop shouting’, ‘to stop lying on your silly bottom’, and to stop ‘giving orders’ (lines 110 and 112).

According to Mia, a person who ‘behaves well’ is someone who does not lie on their ‘silly bottom’ and gives orders at the same time, and with this she is implying that her Mum has been doing precisely that, or at least in this sequence (lines 110 and 112). However, the relevant question here is not the question concerning someone’s

lying on their ‘silly bottom’ or their laziness, *per se*. Rather, it is that, this someone, i.e., their mother, has been asking her children to do things such as to pass the remote control to her, for example, instead of doing these things herself. Mia considers this an unfair and unacceptable behaviour from a mother, who is expected to behave well.

Another concern for Mia is reciprocity and fairness distribution among individuals. Thus, if mother can give orders to the children, then the children should also be able to give orders to their parents. The evidence for this stems from the following utterances ‘Now I would like you to go out of this room right now’ (line 130), ‘How about we can start this whenever we give a order you have to do it, ok?’ (lines 169 and 171), ‘Well now *we*’re gonna give orders and then you’ll see how *you* feel’ (line 205).

Apart from Luke’s MC invocation, we can see that Mia’s orientation to the notion of reciprocity is alluded to from these intertwined, interactional sequences, which are shown in the above excerpt. We further observe elements of accusation and blame in Mia’s utterance, while she uses her crying voice to ascribe certain predicates to Mum, such as ‘shouting’ and ‘giving orders’. According to Mia, these predicates are not the predicates of ‘good’ mothers who conduct themselves in an appropriate and acceptable manner.

Mia provides a generic type of answer in an infinitive form, following Mum’s question and her response matches the generic format of Mum’s question, which does not address anyone specifically, as shown at line 109. However, it becomes clear once we look further down in the sequence, that it is Mia’s expectation of Mum that she should be the person expected to ‘behave’. We can see this from how she addresses Mum, through the employment of an indexical pronoun ‘your’, when referring to Mum’s ‘silly bottom’ and accusing her of ‘giving orders’ (line 112). Apart from it

being an expression, Mia's selection of the adjective 'silly' in 'silly bottom' illustrates Mum's unjustified laziness. According to Mia's logic, it is not reasonable or appropriate to ask others to do things that they can do themselves, especially if the person is doing nothing else at the time, or more specifically, lying on their 'silly bottom'.

Moreover, there is an emphasis on 'jus', hearable as 'just', which has been repeated twice (lines 110 and 112). This infers that the behaviour Mia is referring to, is what Mum is doing most of the time or very often, at least. And that this is indeed the case we can tell from line 114, where Mia stipulates that that is 'all' Mum is doing. The employment of 'all' which is pronounced with raised intonation, is as an extreme case formulation (ECF) and is primarily used for exaggeration and for legitimatization of Mia's claims which was discussed in the previous chapter in more detail (see Pomerantz, 1986).

Mia repeats her accusations at line 114, which she uttered previously at line 112. Upon hearing Mia's accusations that Mum is not behaving properly, Luke invokes the MC and categorises Mum and her conduct as 'bad'. Luke uses his crying voice and while in an overlap with Mia's utterance, he utters 'And you are being a BAD Mummy' (line 115). He begins with 'And' to orient to Mum's actions which were characterised in a specific negative way by Mia, prior to this sequence. Luke categorises Mum, through the invocation of the MC 'bad Mummy' and in so doing he encapsulates the type of person she is, because of Mia's previous claims and predicates, which were ascribed to Mum.

Mum ignores Luke's MC invocation and his categorisation of Mum as a 'bad mummy'. By performing the action of 'not doing', Mum possibly does not want to oppose Luke and cause further conflict following his negative remark. Instead, Mum

addresses Mia. At line 116, Mum asks what Mia is ‘doing right now’ (116). Mum does this on the surmise that, whatever Mia was suggesting about *Mum* at lines 110 and 114, is precisely what *Mia* is doing ‘right now’, i.e., ‘shouting’ and ‘lying on her bottom’.

However, whether consciously or not, Mia’s response orients to her present activity (‘crying’), which she then relates to her previous claims, by firstly implying that what she is doing is rather different from Mum’s suggestion. Notably, Mia, in fact, only begins to cry at the start of her utterance ‘I am crying’ at line 117 and in response to Mum’s question ‘And what are you doing right now?’

‘Rude Mummy’ Exc. 17

Excerpt 17 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57]

Context. In this excerpt, Mum is putting the children to bed, and she usually stays in their room until they fall asleep. The children often ask Mum if they could stay awake for longer to watch TV and she occasionally allows this, which was the case just prior to this recording. Mum then asked Luke for the remote control in order to switch the TV off, prior to this sequence. In the excerpt below, Mia questions Mum’s right to decide, while she is on the children’s premises, i.e., their bedroom. Based on this ‘territorial’ rule of ownership and entitlement, both children believe that they should be the ones to make the decision with regards to TV watching. Luke therefore invokes the MC ‘rude Mummy’ and concludes that because their mother is ‘rude’, the children should get ‘another Mummy’.

- 3 Luke Now [∞]go away
 4 (.)
 5 Luke [∞]We hate you (.) we hate you in our bed
 6 Mia %Yeah this is not your room you cannot decide we: can .h
 7 (0.6)
 8 Luke Hm:
 9 (0.6)
 10 Luke Hm:
 11 (0.5)
 12 Luke %Now we are getting another Mummy
 13 Luke→ % 'cause you are being a rude Mummy

At line 3, Luke orders Mum to leave the children's bedroom, using an imperative form. He employs 'now' to emphasize the immediacy of the request but also to display how urgent Mum's 'going away' must be. With this vocabulary choice, Luke shows his discontent, which occurred because of Mum's previous action of switching the TV off just prior to this sequence.

There is a micropause after Luke's utterance after which he continues his speakership by making a categorical statement 'We hate you', which was hearable as a collective action, i.e., that both children hate Mum. However, Luke swiftly repeats this first part of the utterance after a micropause and adds that the children hate Mum lying in their bed (line 5). This utterance appears as though it was a self-repair, on Luke's behalf. By formulating his utterance in this way, Luke complains about Mum's behaviour, rather than her personally, which lessens the gravity and magnitude of his statement. Furthermore, Luke announces his statement by beginning the utterance with the *pro*-term 'we' to include his sister, and this might be because she shares the bedroom with Luke. The use of 'We', however, does something else here. Luke affiliates with his sister's stance and wants to show Mum that the children are together in this activity, and that they are working collaboratively. This also eliminates him as

the sole agent of this poignant action, which in turn, induces joint accountability, distributed by two parties rather than one, which would make him solely responsible for the claim.

Mia complements Luke's claim by endorsing cooperation with her brother, but instead of doing what Luke has done, she decides to aim her utterance at Mum directly, assigning the blame to her (line 6). Mia uses her crying voice to agree with Luke first 'Yeah', followed by another declaration resembling Luke's, 'this is not your room'. There is a raised intonation on the possessive pronoun 'your' for emphasis, but also so that Mia can begin her further argument, based on her reasoning related to entitlement. Mia then employs an entitlement rule, presumably known to all the participants, which states that because the room belongs to the children they are entitled to decide anything that has got to do with the using of their room as seen at line 6. Mia raises her intonation while pronouncing 'cannot' to express her contention based on the fact she previously uttered, and which gives her utterance a tone of confidence. Mia finishes off her utterance by making it clear to Mum who should be able to decide, when she says, 'we can' at line 6. This particular rule, which Mia invokes, could have been the rule established in the household formerly, since neither Mum nor Luke denies it.

Although Mia's utterance at line 6 is aimed at Mum specifically, Mum does not respond, despite a longer pause immediately after (line 7). Mum had sufficient time and opportunity to agree or to object Mia's statement, but she does neither. Instead, we hear Luke's disavowal at line 8, after which, there is another long pause. Luke expresses his discontent one more time after the pause with 'Hm' at line 10. There is yet another long pause after Luke's disavowal marker (line 11) while Mum is given an additional opportunity to react, but this does not occur. Mum remains silent.

At line 12, Luke starts off with his crying voice by making a complaint and proposition to everyone present ‘Now we are getting another Mummy’. Luke reckons since ‘this Mummy’ is non-responsive and does not agree with Mia’s statement at line 6, the solution to the situation at hand would be to simply get ‘another Mummy’. The behaviour of their current Mummy is not acceptable to the children and presents an imposition. Mum’s making decisions to do with their room is a constraint and both children resist this constraint. Luke’s reasoning behind the utterance at line 12 means that getting another person to replace their Mum would perhaps mean that their Mum would be physically removed from their room, and would not be there any longer, even if that meant hypothetically. Luke employs ‘now’ to show how by performing such an action of getting another Mummy ‘now’ would resolve the children’s imposition and their problem would get solved. Luke’s further reasoning behind the request to get another Mummy is displayed thereafter. Luke extrapolates why he put such a proposition forward at line 12. Luke explains that, because the children’s current Mummy is ‘being a rude Mummy’ (line 13) they should get another one. Mums, according to Luke, should not be rude. He uses the MC ‘rude mummy’ to resist Mum’s action. Luke constructs his utterance in a way that lessens his sole liability by employing the *pro*-term ‘we’, with which he successfully manages to include his sister. Successfully, because his sister does not object to Luke’s statement of inclusion. Instead, she displays agreement and affiliation with her brother throughout this sequence. Luke, thus manages to turn this action into a collaborative one.

‘Rude Mummy’ Exc. 18

Excerpt 18 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57]

Context. In this excerpt, while Mum is putting the children to bed, Mia is accusing her of giving orders and Luke is invoking the MC ‘rude Mummy’ because he

considers her behaviour unacceptable. Just prior to this episode, Mia tells Mum that Daddy can give orders because ‘he is the biggest’. Mum explained that things do not work that way and Mia is disputing Mum’s utterance while Mum explains that asking the children to go to bed is not about giving children orders.

- 49 Mum This is not about giving you orders
 50 Mia %You are giving us orders RIGHT NOW
 51 Mum No I am not
 52 Mia %Yeah you are
 53 (0.4)
 54 Mum I am just asking you to go to bed so you can rest
 55 Mia %No you are not asking us you are TELLING us lots of different
 56 Mia %little stories yo- of your little made up land
 57 Mia [.h .H
 58 Mum [Made up what?
 59 Luke→ [%You are being a rude Mummy
 60 Mia [Made up little land
 61 Luke→ [%And you are being a rude Mummy

At line 49, Mum is trying to defend the position she has been placed in by the children who are accusing her of ‘giving orders’ (line 49). Using her crying voice, Mia uses Mum’s explication as a judgment. Mia emphasizes ‘right now’ to show that Mum denies Mia’s claim at line 51, but Mia is persistent in her belief that that is the case, while continuing to cry (line 52). After a long pause (line 53) Mum reformulates her previous claim by stating that she was ‘asking politely’ instead of ‘giving orders’. In her modest application of this assertion, Mum employs ‘just’ to infer that that was all she was trying to do. Mum also provides a reason for such action by explaining that children should go to bed to get rest (line 54). Mia’s interpretation remains the same and she is adamant that Mum was not ‘asking’ the children but ‘telling’ them what to do. Mia raises her intonation on ‘telling’ for a contrastive effect while using her crying

voice to show distress.

Another interesting formulation comes up within the same utterance in which Mia accuses Mum of ‘telling’ the children lots of different stories, but those stories are not just any stories. According to Mia, the ‘little stories’ are of Mum’s own ‘little made up land’. Mia states that Mum lives in a world of her own detached from children’s reality and desires, perhaps a world or a land different from hers and her brother’s (line 56). Mia uses ‘your’ to show that this made up land is only Mum’s. Mum, however, asks for clarification and this could be because she did not hear Mia’s second part of the utterance or perhaps because she was not sure what Mia was referring to (line 58).

Mia has described Mum’s behavior as unacceptable in this sequence, and Luke comes in to make his own conclusion from it. Luke invokes MC ‘rude Mummy’ to challenge Mum’s claim that she was ‘just asking’. Since Mia’s accusation is that Mum was not ‘asking’ but telling them what to do, this is interpreted by Luke as rude behavior and this is his reasoning behind his MC invocation, which happens to be in an overlap with Mia’s previous utterance. Mums should not be rude, according to Luke’s logic, and because their Mum is, Luke shows his distress by using a crying voice (line 59). At the same time, Mia responds to Mum’s question by repeating the second part from her previous utterance (line 60). Mia treats Mum’s question as Mum having an issue hearing it properly, rather than a request for clarification. Since Luke’s previous accusation and attack of Mum’s behavior as ‘rude’ was in an overlap with Mia’s response, Luke repeats his utterance one more time at line 61, using his crying voice ‘And you are being a rude Mummy’. With this, he emphasizes his stance and shows that he firmly stands by his claim.

‘Silly and naughty Mummy’ Exc. 19

Excerpt 19 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57]

Context. In this excerpt, Mia is accusing Mum of ‘chatting so loudly’, which is stopping the children from falling asleep. Mum proposes to remain quiet, but Mia uses Mum’s utterance as an opportunity to assert that ‘that’s not being quiet’. Eventually, Luke sings the tune from the children’s cartoon they had all watched earlier, but he inserts his own version of the lyrics. Mia follows her brother’s steps and joins in the singing while creating her own version of the song while invoking MC as ‘the silly and naughty Mummy’ to categorize her and to complain about her conduct. Mum’s ‘loud chatting’ presents a constraint for the children and Mia resists it through an MC invocation.

136	Mia	%‘Cause right now you are just > <u>chatting</u> so <u>loudly</u> < and =
137		we cannot fall asleep
138		(.)
139	Mum	Ok I’ll be quiet then.
140	Mia	See that’s not being quiet.
141		(0.1)
142	Mum	Well you’re continuing
143	Mia	See you are still being- you’re still not being quiet. H.
144		(1.4)
145	Luke	♪ I’m fighting <u>Mu::mmy</u>
146		(0.7)
147	Mia→	♪ The silly (.)the silly and naughty <u>Mu::mmy</u>
148	Luke	[♪ I am fighting a Mu::mmy

Mia is complaining to Mum, using her crying voice, that it is because of Mum’s loud ‘chatting’ that the children cannot fall asleep (lines 136 and 137). Mia raises her voice while pronouncing ‘chatting’ and ‘loudly’. Emphasis and selection of

the word ‘chatting’ indicates that mother is perhaps using ‘empty talk’, while distracting the children from an activity they are trying to focus on- to go to bed and sleep. It is interesting that it is during this very recording that the mother has asked the children to go to sleep after she had switched the TV off, and it now appears that it is their mother’s fault that the children are unable to do just that.

After a micropause, Mum proposes to be quiet so that there is no distraction on her behalf (line 139). Mum’s action here suggests that she agrees with Mia that she should let the children sleep. However, Mia uses Mum’s ‘talking’ as an opportunity to defy Mum and to suggest that she has just broken her promise, since she has spoken again, instead of being quiet, as she suggested she would do (line 140). After another short pause (line 141), Mum reverts the blame onto Mia by stating that she was the one who broke the silence first and continued to talk (line 142).

Mia now clings onto her previous remark and accuses Mum of doing the same thing yet again, which is distracting the children from getting sleep by not being quiet (line 143). She begins her utterance with ‘See’ orienting to the evidence based on Mum’s prior utterances. Mia continues by directing this utterance at Mum ‘you are being’ but then continues by reverting to her previous complaint ‘you’re still not being quiet’ followed by an outbreath (line 143). Mia employs ‘still’ to emphasize the fact, that despite Mia’s pointing out that Mum is distracting the children, Mum continues to do so. Note that initially and prior to this sequence, it was Mum’s asking the children to sleep that was an imposition placed upon them. And Mia is now orienting to resisting this very imposition, by effectively reversing that scenario.

There is a long pause (line 144) after Mia’s utterance and although Mum was addressed directly by Mia in the previous utterance, Mum does not respond. Instead, Luke impersonates the tune from the children’s cartoon they had all watched earlier

but adapts the lyrics in order to present his stance on the current situation. In so doing, Luke adds a mild sense of humour and a less serious tone to this, otherwise adversative episode, by employing his singing voice and while uttering ‘I’m fighting Mummy’ (line 145). By addressing Mum in his singing voice, Luke is in fact propelling Mum to respond and is challenging her, but Mum does not respond.

Mia then decides to provoke Mum further by providing her version of the tune, which Luke has initiated. With her singing voice, Mia invokes MC in order to attack Mum’s behaviour. She begins her utterance with a definite article ‘the’ followed by two adjectives ‘silly’ and ‘naughty’ to categorize Mum and her conduct as inappropriate. (line 147). Mia characterises Mum as someone who has made a ‘silly’ mistake, by declaring they would remain quiet and then deciding to speak. According to Mia, this type of behaviour is ‘silly’ but also ‘naughty’, resembling something an adult would say to a child, rather than the other way around. Luke reasserts his previous statement by repeating it again at line 148, when this sequence ends. Luke’s word selection in ‘I am fighting a Mummy’ confirms that the children are perhaps metaphorically resisting Mum’s behaviour by ‘fighting’ her. And although Luke’s utterance is said with a singing voice, Luke attempts to put his point across. According to the children’s logic and reasoning, Mum has done something ‘wrong’ and by invoking the MC ‘silly’ and ‘naughty’ they resist Mum and her actions.

‘Mean Mummy’ Exc. 20

Excerpt 20 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57]

Context. Prior to this recording Mum has asked the children to ‘go to bed’, just after she had switched the TV off. Mum usually stays in the children’s bedroom, which the two siblings share, until they fall asleep. In this extract, Luke talks about the children’s programme (cartoon) on TV, which they had watched prior to this

recording, and in which the cartoon characters sing together ‘the phone is ringing’. Their mother told the children that she didn’t like that programme. Luke takes the opportunity to remind the mother of the song, and Mia then tells what Mum’s reaction would be, once the programme comes on the TV next time. Mia then argues that the next time that programme comes on, the children will not change the channel, because their mother deserves that, and that is for being a ‘mean Mummy’. Not allowing the children to watch TV and at the same time not listening to them is a constraint which the children resist by complaining and criticising Mum, through the invoking of the MC ‘mean mummy’, thus assigning negative predicates to Mum and her conduct, as it will be shown in this excerpt. Mum, however, does not respond to Mia’s criticism.

156	Mia	It’s going to be the phone is ri:nging
157		(0.2)
158	Luke	So they say ♪ it’s going to be the phone is ri:nging
159		(0.2)
160	Luke	So they are going to say <u>tha::t</u> ?
161		(.)
162	Mia	Yeah and then Mummy is going to listen to it and=
163	Mia	then she's gonna go=
164	Mia	Oh no: not again.
165	Luke	Yeah
166	Mia	%And then we will not change the programme because you <u>deserve</u> that=
167	Mia→	%You are being like a mean Mummy .h and .h you <u>do not</u> listen to <u>us</u> h.
168		(0.2)

At line 156, Mia is reproducing a tune from a song, from the children’s cartoon they had just watched. Mia starts off with ‘It’s going to be’ because she is referring to the scenario that is going to happen in the future, i.e., the children and the mother will get to watch the TV together and the same children’s programme will play again. Mia does this to set up the scene which is to demonstrate to Mum how the children feel when their mother switches the TV off while they are still keen to continue to watch.

There is some ambiguity in this utterance (line 156), and because of that, there is possibly a pause immediately after, while the participants are perhaps waiting to find out what will be the trajectory of Mia's utterance. If this is the case, and due to the ambivalent nature of this utterance, the first speaker (Mia) would need to provide further clarification or give an account to make 'intelligible what they originally said' (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998b, p. 7). And such attempt for clarification does come, but not from Mia. It is Luke who attempts to clarify the ambiguity (line 158).

At line 158, Luke replicates Mia's utterance but he begins with 'So they say' in order to clarify where this line comes from. He does this by singing the lines from a song from the children's cartoon they had all watched earlier. Moreover, to assist Mum's understanding, Luke impersonates the tune of the lyrics, so that she could identify the programme which both children are referring to (line 158). By performing this action, Luke affiliates with Mia and works collaboratively with her, even though he is perhaps not yet clear of what Mia's succeeding action will be.

There is again a short pause (line 159) following Luke's clarification and he continues to elaborate that 'they' (referring to the cartoon characters) 'are going to say that', (line 160). The expectation here is that Mum makes some sort of negative comment with regards to the song which she does not like. The fact that the children are anticipating such a reaction from Mum is confirmed in Mia's subsequent utterance. First, Mia agrees with Luke and then she inserts that after the mentioned song comes on the TV, Mummy would listen to it and then she would make an unenthusiastic remark (lines 162, 163, and 164). Luke agrees with Mia with an affirmative response (line 165). This demonstrates that both children were expecting Mum's response to be along the lines of what Mia had claimed at line 164.

Mia then begins to cry, and she warns Mum that the children will not change the cartoon channel when it comes on despite the fact that Mum does not like to watch it (line 166). According to Mia's reasoning, Mummy deserves such treatment. Mia then goes on to provide further clarification in support of her claim, by invoking the MC 'mean Mummy'. Mia then further explicates the reasoning behind this MC invocation and claims that this attribute is justified and is based on the fact that Mummy does not listen to her children (lines 166 and 167). Mum is performing an action that is not appropriate.

'Not being a polite Mummy' and 'bad Mummy' Exc. 21

Excerpt 21 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57]

Context. Prior to this recording, Mum has asked the children to go to sleep. In this extract, after sipping water from his water bottle, Luke asks, or rather, tells Mum to put his water bottle back on the table. Immediately prior to this sequence, Mia was arguing that the siblings should be able to 'give orders' to Mum in the same way that Mum does it to the children. Luke therefore issues 'an order' to Mum, and Mum addresses his lack of manners, in the absence of politeness markers. Mum 'giving orders' to her children is what they see as a constraint. Luke's response to this constraint is an invocation of the MC hearable as 'impolite Mummy' (from 'You are not being a polite Mummy'), but also 'bad Mummy'.

211 Luke Put it back
 212 Mum [Excuse me?
 213 Mia [You gonna have to do it yourself
 214 Luke You are not being (.) great [Hm:
 215 Mum [How d'you ask me?
 216 (0.2)
 217 Mum Can you ask me properly plea[se?
 218 Luke [plea:se.
 219 Mum Thank you.
 220 Luke→ You're not being a polite Mummy .hm:.hm:
 221 (0.3)
 222 Mum Good night children
 223 Luke→ And bad Mummy: (0.2) and now I would say good night in the morning
 224 Luke And good morning Mummy: (.) .hm:
 225 (0.2)
 226 Mum Good night Luke
 227 Luke Good morning Mummy:
 228 Mia Good morning Mummy:
 229 (0.1)
 230 Mum Well it won't be long before it's morning
 231 (0.2)
 232 Luke Only when you behave well we would (.) we would let you come inside (.)
 233 Luke our bedroom (.) but now we are not

At line 211, Luke tells Mum to put his water back on the table, to which Mum responds with 'Excuse me?' raising her intonation at the end, which suggests that she is posing a question to Luke (line 212). In so doing, Mum indicates to Luke that his previous turn was perhaps not ruminative enough, and that his previous utterance was 'deficient' in some way and perhaps not following certain standards that apply to this household. It also suggests that there was a missing part in his utterance (Wootton, 1997). At this point, the subsequent utterance looks a bit ambiguous, until we consider what Mia had said at line 208 (not seen here). What Mia was telling Mum was that from now on, things were going to change at their household and that the children would not have to obey Mum's 'orders' any longer because Mum was perfectly capable of doing things herself, according to Mia's logic (line 213).

Luke does not explicitly respond to Mum's plea when she requests that he uses

a polite version of his request. Instead, he makes an assessment by complaining at the same time, 'You are not being great' (line 214). There is a micropause just after 'You are not being', while Luke is considering what to say and just before he selects the adjective 'great'. This is interesting, because he is formulating his utterance by telling Mum what she is *not* ('You are not') rather than stating what she is ('You are', for example). Immediately after the assessment, Luke uses a disavowal marker 'Hm: to show his discontent (line 214). In an overlap with this disavowal marker, Mum issues a reminder, in a form of a question, about how Luke should be addressing her whenever he makes a request (line 215). There is a pause following Mum's question, and although the question is addressed to Luke, he does not respond. We project that Luke treats Mum's utterance as the problematic one.

Because Luke was given sufficient time to respond and the answer was not forthcoming, Mum rephrases her question and formulates it in such a way as to exhibit what the 'correct' version of a request should be (line 217). Mum was insinuating that Luke's initial 'directive' should have been formulated as a question, which should contain a modal verb (can or could) at the beginning of the utterance, instead of the infinitive form which Luke had employed. Mum also proposes that at the end of Luke's utterance there should have been a polite marker 'please', which was missing from his version of the request. And before Mum gets to complete her utterance, Luke swiftly utters 'please' which was coincidentally in an overlap with Mum's employment of the polite marker 'please' (line 218). Mum subsequently shows her appreciation and she thanks Luke for incorporating a polite marker to express polite behaviour (line 219).

However, Luke launches another negative assessment of Mum by invoking an MC hearable as 'impolite Mummy', through exclaiming 'You're not being polite

Mummy’, upon which, he expresses his discontent with a disavowal marker ‘hm’, which was said two times. Luke’s reaction is ambivalent, considering that it was Luke who failed to employ any politeness markers in his request, not Mum. However, it is worth noting that Luke’s assessment could have also been referring to Mum’s previous utterance at line 204 (not seen here), in which Mum failed to employ a politeness marker herself, and in which she used an infinitive form, while addressing Luke ‘Stop giving orders’. It is possible that Luke’s utterance at line 211 (‘Put it back’) was matching the format of the utterance Mum had used at line 204.

The fact that Mum viewed Luke’s utterance as problematic is confirmed with a pause that followed it, shown at line 221. Instead of responding to Luke’s negative assessment, and the category invocation, Mum wishes both children ‘good night’, by silently ignoring Luke’s second negative assessment and an MC in this sequence. Whether because Luke’s assessments were ignored or not responded to by Mum, or whether Luke wanted to express his further dissatisfaction of the situation, he launches another MC ‘bad mummy’ at line 223, by starting his utterance with an ‘and’, which is a construction he used before, at line 235 in Excerpt 2 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11].

After a short pause following the MC ‘bad Mummy’, Luke tells Mum that he would do things differently from now on, as suggested previously by his sister. He would now say ‘good night’ in the morning and ‘good morning’ at night to resist Mum and her behaviour through his rebellious action. Thus, he employs ‘good morning Mummy’, as his response to Mum’s ‘good night (line 224). There is a subtle nature of the contrast that Luke is displaying here – his orientation to resistance is exhibited in using a deliberately contrasting greeting. This could also be interpreted partly as his use of humour in order to perform the action of resistance.

There is a slight pause while Mum is trying to come up with an answer, which this time is addressed only to Luke, when she says, ‘Good night Luke’ (line 226). Luke immediately responds with ‘good morning Mummy’ (line 227) and Mia follows his trend by formulating her utterance the same way ‘good morning Mummy’ (line 228). After another pause shown at line 231, Mum aligns with the children by stating that the morning will come soon anyhow (line 230). There is another pause after Mum’s utterance after which Luke summarises what the consequences of Mum’s good behaviour would be, and he issues a conditional threat to Mum. According to Luke’s reasoning, Mum would be allowed in the children’s bedroom only when she behaves, but for now, his conclusion is that Mum is not ‘behaving’ (line 232).

‘Small’ and ‘older’ Exc. 22

Excerpt 22 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]

Context. In this excerpt, which continues from the previous one, Luke and Mia invoke MCs ‘small’ and ‘older’ to categorize Mum. Luke claims that Mum is ‘small’ and Mia concludes that Baba is ‘older’ than Mum. They are using their reasoning as a resource to resist Mum’s imposition placed upon them, which was not allowing them to watch TV. We observe that a child’s mastery of the membership categories is not ‘perfect’, since membership category ‘small’ employed here is hearable as ‘young’ or ‘younger’. ‘Older’ and ‘younger’ are descriptive terms which belong to the MCD stage-of-life. According to this MCD, the younger ones should listen to the older ones. This could be considered a rule within this household as it is understood as such by the children, but it operates through an MCD. It is these children’s ability to use the categories and construct an argument that shows that they have a clear grasp of relevant concepts such as ‘young’ and ‘old’, and rules’ like ‘the young should listen to the old’ as seen from this excerpt.

227 Luke→ [So that means you are small
 228 Mia [%So that means you need to switch on the TV:
 229 Luke [That means you are small
 230 Mia [%You have to listen to he:r
 231 Mum That is true: (.) but (.) [you
 232 Mia→ [%She IS older than YOU:
 233 Mum She is older but she's (.)in her house and it was holiday time
 234 Mum and [I wasn't [there

Luke's overlapping talk with Mum's agreement (line 226 'Good night Luke', not seen here) that she should listen to her mother (Baba) adds a sense of urgency to Luke's explanation of what being a daughter means (line 227). Luke also shows an agreement with his sister by contributing another supporting argument. He begins with a conclusive conjunction 'so' to try to reason with his interlocutor. The fact that his mother is a daughter of Baba means that the mother must therefore be 'smaller', hearable as 'younger'. He invokes a stage-of-life MCD 'young and old' with relevant categories like 'older people' and 'younger people' to infer that Mummy's Mum is in fact 'the biggest' (the oldest). At the same time, he alludes that Mum is therefore 'next in line' or in 'the middle' of this familial hierarchy, which includes the children themselves. This further implies that Mum's authoritative stance is therefore somewhat devalued in comparison to that of her mother's.

This type of category use brings into equation Luke's moral stance towards specific membership categories (mother, grandmother, etc.) of the participants (Sacks, 1972; Heritage, 1984). The relevance of membership, family identities, and stage-of-life membership is produced and oriented to in situ, which come with their predicated rights and responsibilities. They are not simply invoked and displayed but also challenged and negotiated, and as such, they contribute to the accomplishment of

action and intersubjectivity in this sequence. This is what brings relevance of the context and the membership of a parent (Baba) and a child (Mum) as the operating framework for the activities at hand.

Following Luke's descriptive clarification containing observable features at line 227, Mia comes in with a crying voice employing an imperative and requesting action, which was that the mother needs 'to switch on the TV' (line 228). Mia's utterance is reformulated and resembles Luke's utterance at line 227, and clarifies to Mum what being 'small' entails. Mia's projected utterance (line 228) and her bid is conditional, and depends on Luke's evaluation and a proposed completion which could have been accepted or rejected by the participant, Luke, in this case. It seems that these projected completions are used and as such accepted by both children, and demonstrate cohesion across the different turns (Goodwin, 1983).

Mia's utterance is in an overlap with Luke's, and yet again, just like at line 227, because of the overlapping talk, Luke recycles what he had already said (line 229). However, this time he excludes the coordinating conjunction 'So', while he attempts to produce a collaborative utterance with Mia, but also in order to summarize his previous statement. Mia closes this sequence containing the category 'small' by employing an outright imperative 'You have to listen to her' (line 230), which infers that children should listen to their mothers, a rule which should then also apply to Mia and Luke. However, according to Mia's logic, perhaps if Mum did listen to Baba, perhaps the children would have listened to their own Mum. However, since the relevant categories here are 'young' and 'old', then the relevant should not be stated in terms of 'children' and 'mothers' *per se*.

At line 231, Mum displays an agreement in a 'yes, but' format, which is usually suggestive that 'yes' or 'that is true' (line 231) applies only to the part of what

was claimed in the prior turn (namely, the premise) but not the latter part (namely, the conclusion). However, it is not clear whether this utterance is a response to line 229 or line 230. Mum has her reservations about the statements employed by the children at lines 229 and 230. This is evidenced through the employment of two micro-pauses and a conjunction ‘but’, suggesting that an opposing view is forthcoming. She then continues with ‘you’, which could infer that Mum attempted to suggest that Mia and Luke should therefore listen to her; but Mia’s overlapping talk at line 233 interrupts her utterance.

Mia now asserts a feature she observes and makes a comparison, stating that the grandmother (Baba) is, in fact, ‘older’ than Mum (line 232). Mia emphasises this by raising her intonation on ‘is’ and ‘you’. Mia reasons with Mum by providing grounds for Mum to have to listen to Baba. Again, Mum cannot, and does not dispute this fact but reaffirms that it was during the holiday season that the children could watch TV and that this activity took place at Baba’s house, while Mum was not present (line 233 and 234). In so doing, Mum provides the reason why the rule which was invoked (‘the young should listen to the old’) does not apply in this particular case. Mum’s utterance at line 233 and 234 has moral implications because it possibly refers to justification of Baba’s authoritative positioning within her own household, which in turn infers that Mum should hence have the authority to decide while at her own home, which is what she did. In doing so, Mum shifts responsibility from herself to Baba, and implies that children should understand that different rules apply when the children are ‘on holiday’ vs. ‘term time’ or ‘not-holiday’.

And although Mum offers an outright agreement at line 233, confirming that her statement is aligned with Mia’s at line 232, she continues with an adversative conjunction ‘but’ with which she expresses oppositional move and provides her

reasons why things were done differently at Baba's house. Consider now the construction of Mum's utterance at line 233. She employs a personal pronoun 'she', followed by an adversative conjunction 'but' while offering an alternative option in the second clause and presenting oppositional move while providing an explanation [Pronoun/Noun + conjunction + account/reason/explanation].

As Butler and Weatherall (2006) point out, membership categories 'can invoke certain rights, obligations, and activities of a member of a category as relevant and expected' (p. 460). As seen from my excerpt, employment of the membership category 'small' infers that there exists a category 'big' in the form of size or age, such as categories associated to daughter (small) and mother (big). Mia demarcates the expectation that comes with the category 'small' and the obligation to listen to the 'big' or 'bigger' as demonstrated at line 230.

'Biggest', 'smaller', and 'bigger' Exc. 23

Excerpt 23 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57]

Context. In this extract, Mum is explaining to the children that she is trying to teach them that going to bed on time will have the children rested, but Mia declares that only Daddy can give orders for anything he likes, because he is 'the biggest,' and Mum cannot because she is 'much smaller than him'.

27 Mia [%What are you trying to teach us? you are not teaching us anything
28 Luke Hm:
29 Mum I am trying to teach you that going to bed on time will have you rested-
30 Mia %Well we're not learning anything (.) from YOU especially YOU
31 Mum That's what you think?
32 Mia %We are not learning ANYthing
33 Mum I disagree with that.
34 (0.2)
35 Mia ARGH::: \$Stop TALKING
36 Mia .Hh %You have no right to give the orders for EVERYthing h .H
37 Mia Daddy can give the orders as much as he ÷ likes you cannot
38 Mum Why:?
39 Mia→ %Because he is the biggest (.)h and you are much smaller than him
40 (0.4)
41 Mum That's not how it works
42 (.)
43 Luke Hm::
44 Mia→ %Well it CAN work like that .h 'cause he is bigger than you
45 Mia %so he can give more orders than you .h H.

At line 27, Mia accuses Mum of not performing motherly duties and obligations by claiming that she is failing at teaching her children 'anything', after which Luke asserts a disavowal marker 'Hm:' to express his discontent (line 28). Mum feels the need to counter Mia's accusation, so she delivers an account by providing a specific 'lesson' she is trying to teach the children (line 29). It seems, however, that Mia, who then introduces her crying voice and begins her utterance with 'Well', interrupts Mum's utterance. In this way, Mia shows that Mum's utterance was problematic while she goes on to dispute Mum's statement by reformulating her utterance at line 27. Not only that the mother is not teaching the children anything, the children are also not 'learning anything', according to Mia. This gives Mia's accusation additional weight, in fact, double the weight, since both utterances are formulated as ECFs (Pomerantz, 1986). To make matters more accusatory, Mia then resorts to employing a *pro*-term 'we' at the beginning of her utterance, to then

employing ‘you’ twice immediately after, thus creating an explicit complaint aimed ‘especially’ at Mum, as seen at line 30.

Mum challenges Mia’s accusatory remark by questioning her and she insinuates that perhaps that is only what Mia thinks, but that may not be the case. Mum’s raised intonation on ‘think’ confirms that it is the thinking action Mum is referring to (line 31). At the same time, Mum’s accusation sounds ambiguous and this is perhaps confirmed in Mia’s repetition of only the first part of her utterance. Mum’s utterance could have been interpreted in two ways. Was it that Mum was referring to Mia thinking that the children are not learning anything, or was it that they are not learning anything *from Mum*, that is questionable here? By opting for her answer to be ‘we’ (the children) Mia manages to downgrade her explicit accusation of Mum. Mia uses her crying voice again in order to gain sympathy perhaps (line 32).

Mum confirms that she disagrees with Mia (line 33). Mum’s response here is in effect an upgraded version, in a negative sense, of her previous answer ‘That’s what you think’ at line 31, which was also presented as a mild form of disagreement. There is a slight pause after Mum’s utterance at line 33, which indicates that Mum’s response is problematic to both children since there is no immediate uptake. Mia is angered at Mum’s disagreements through a very loud disavowal marker ‘argh’, showing her frustration and discontent. Mia then continues using her screaming voice (which, in principle, is an upgrade in a negative sense, in comparison to her crying voice she had employed earlier). Note that Mum’s disagreement and Mia’s tone of voice are reflecting a matching similarity in expression. Mia then uses an imperative to stop Mum from talking, by ordering her to do just that (line 35). She raises her intonation on ‘talking’ as she perhaps wishes for Mum to stop the disagreement with Mia.

Mia proceeds in her crying voice by issuing another declaration, used in an adult fashion, 'You have no right' (line 36). Mia does not wish to receive orders from Mum, which present a serious constraint for the children. Mum giving orders would perhaps imply that children are expected to obey them and that is not what they were set to do in this sequence, at least. Mia swiftly realizes that she might have stepped over the line here, and she then adds that Mum has no right to give orders for 'everything', which makes this imperative less severe (line 36). However, this automatically suggests that Mia has settled on the fact that Mum, in fact, *can* give orders *sometimes*. What is interesting here is that Mia's reaction to Mum's disagreement of her utterance produced an immediate attack of Mum as seen at line 36.

Mia reverts to accusing Mum of giving orders instead of addressing the issue of Mum's earlier disagreement. Mia justifies her claim by stating further that it is Daddy who can give orders 'as much as he likes' and repeating that Mum cannot do so (line 37). This new introduction of the authoritative figure who, interestingly, was not present at the time of this recording, has in effect, an equal status to Mum, a status of the other parent. Because of Mia's claim, Mum poses a question to Mia (line 38). But, the fact that Daddy is supposedly equal to Mum in their parental status, does not seem to be of any relevance to Mia, and she provides her own reasoning. Using her crying voice, she introduces the 'size' of an individual, and referring to Daddy as 'the biggest' is hearable as reference to 'age' (line 39). Not only that Daddy is 'the biggest', a superlative form to refer to him being compared to other immediate family members perhaps, but also reinstating that Mum is 'much smaller' than him. Mum, in fact, is much 'smaller' than him and Daddy IS the 'biggest' in the family, according to

size, but Mia's concern is a person's authoritative entitlement and hierarchical structuring as related to their age.

There is a pause after Mia's utterance, after which, Mum clarifies that things do not operate in such a way in their family (line 41). Mum is perhaps attempting to show the children that she is trying to teach them something. Luke shows his dissatisfaction following Mum's statement (line 43). But Mia concludes and stands by her earlier statement that Daddy can give 'more orders' because he is 'bigger' than Mum. Note the interesting use of vocabulary here, whereby 'biggest' is employed within the same utterance containing 'as much as he likes' (37), 'bigger' as comparative adjective stands next to 'more orders'.

'Mummy' Exc. 24

Excerpt 24 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]

Context. In this excerpt, Mia brings up the MC 'Mummy' which belongs to the MCD 'family'. Category-bound activities and attributes related to the category 'mummy' indicate that MCs 'mother' and 'child' come with their rights and obligations, as *standardized relational pairs* of the categories that go together under the *collection R* (relational categories, such as husband- wife, mother-child; Sacks, 1972a). However, this also seems to indicate that the children are faced with all sorts of constraints and impositions because of such categorical items in the family. They defy those constraints by simply trying to take Mummy out of equation, and in so doing, Mia proposes to eradicate the relevance of the 'family' altogether for the sake of her interactional goal. Without Mummies, Mia states, the children could do whatever they liked, they could watch TV for as long as they liked, they could eat sweets, etc. To Mia, having a Mummy is an imposition and Mia resists this imposition

by using her reasoning while she extrapolates that not having a Mummy would mean having no constraints.

206 Mia [%I really wish you didn't even exist
207 Mia→ [%I wish we didn't have a Mummy so we could do whatever we like
208 Luke [I'm gonna tell a witch to turn you into a mouse
209 Mia→ .H %I wish we didn't have a Mummy so we could do whatever we like
210 Mum Do you think that would make you really happy [Mia?
211 Mia [Yea:h
212 (0.2)
213 Mia .H #I wish we could just watch TV a: as long as we like and have sweets
214 Mum And have sweets?
215 Mia [Yeah
216 Mum [Do you think that would do you (.) good?
217 (0.2)

Mia uses her crying voice to complain by announcing that she wished she did not have a Mummy (line 206). This utterance is in overlap with the previous utterance (line 205, not seen here), as such, it gets recycled but reformulated in the subsequent line, line 207. Mia employs emphasizees 'really' and 'even' to express her emotions and the intensity of her wish. Furthermore, she employs the indexical *pro*-term 'you' to address Mum specifically (line 206). According to Mia, 'you' is the responsible individual for the impositions placed upon her and her brother. And although this utterance is aimed at Mum directly, there is no immediate uptake by Mum.

Mia therefore re-gains her speakership by deploying an early start, accomplished by a reduced transitional space at the end of line 206. By gaining speakership, Mia creates other interactional effects. As Sacks et al. (1974) point out; one of the interactional effects could be a form of disagreement or rejection in relation to the prior talk, which seems to be the case here. At line 203 (not seen here) Mum makes a declaration and re-asserts her status as a Mummy, and not surprisingly, Mia is

contesting the relevance of the category ‘mummy’ and her subsequent plea to not have one at all.

Furthermore, by gaining speakership, Mia re-formulates her previous turn (line 207). Herewith, instead of the pronoun ‘you’ she has used previously, Mia employs MC ‘Mummy’. This utterance (line 206) was in an overlap with the previous one (line 205, not seen here), and her utterance at line 207 happens to be in an overlap with her brother’s subsequent utterance (line 208). This might be why it looks almost replicated but reformulated at the same time.

Mia’s statement at line 207 is a further complaint and it is significant to the unfolding of the subsequent conclusion made by her at lines 209 and 213, relevant to the category Mummy. Mummy’s actions are consequently category-bound, as they seem directly related to the category Mummy. If there was no Mummy, the children could do whatever they liked. Mia’s complaint and her wish that Mummy did not exist presents a basis to Mia’s further arguments in which she provides her reasoning behind her statement at line 206. Mia’s reasoning as to why it would be better not to have a Mummy indicates that Mummies should do exactly what their children wish, and if not, the existence of a Mummy, presents a massive constraint.

Luke agrees with Mia indirectly, as seen from his utterance at line 208. He also orients to the category Mummy, which translates into not allowing children to do whatever they like. He thereby proposes a solution to the children’s problem by suggesting that Mummy gets turned ‘into a mouse’ (line 208). Luke is aware that this is a fictional proposal, and he therefore introduces the concept of magic by suggesting that he tells the witch to turn Mum into a mouse. Luke is indicating that no one else would have that kind of power but the witch, in his opinion. Since it is unlikely that (most) Mums allow their children to do *whatever* they like, it is equally unlikely that

their own Mum would turn into a mouse, so Luke has no other option but to resort to the hypothetical world (line 208). In fact, throughout this sequence, both, Mia and Luke are constructing hypothetical worlds in which they can ‘do whatever they like’.

Although Luke employs a personal pronoun, address term ‘you’ while addressing Mummy on this occasion, Mum does not respond to his comment. Mia regains her speakership yet again by repeating her utterance from line 207 while using her crying voice (line 209). At this point, Mum poses a question to Mia, but not asking her explicitly if what Mia wished would be something she would really want but rather, Mum formulates her question in a colloquial way asking her to re-consider her position (line 210). This type of formulation makes Mia ultimately responsible for her own behaviour, i.e., her wishes.

Moreover, Mum questions whether Mia would be happy with the choices she had made. This is slightly ambivalent, but it seems that Mum is referring to the part of the utterance containing the pronouns ‘I’, which Mia employs at lines 206, 207, and 209 because Mum uses a personal pronoun ‘you’ twice in her response (line 210). What is interesting here is that Mia includes her brother by suggesting that those wishes are in fact mutual, by incorporating the pronoun ‘we’ three times within the same utterance (line 207) ‘I wish *we* didn’t have a Mummy, so *we* could do whatever *we* like’. This provides a sense of unity with her other collaborator, which then presupposes that he will be orienting to the same goal and wanting the same things as Mia. By including Luke in the formula, Mia is attempting to strengthen her case, thus giving it more weight and making her statements more legitimate.

However, before Mum gets to finish her utterance at line 210, Mia responds positively, which is a preferred answer, structurally. A succeeding pause following Mia’s affirmation denotes that this answer was problematic to her. Mum does not

comment but Mia realizes that she needs to provide an account or a reason for her answer at line 211. Mia clarifies what she means by her phrase ‘whatever we like’, employed earlier (line 213). She begins by explicating that she wishes that both her and her brother ‘could just watch TV’. She then continues but stops at a prolonged ‘a:’ which could have been an ‘as’ or an ‘and’ considering that she uses ‘as’ and ‘and’ later within the same utterance.

Subsequently, Mia uses a repair and adds ‘as long as we like’. This is important because leaving it at ‘just watching TV’ would not suffice. Mia knows that children are indeed allowed to watch TV. The relevant question here was for how long they could do so. And the fact that the mother had switched the TV off after a certain amount of time, just before this recording session, indicates that there is an immediate imposition placed upon both children, which is problematic to Mia. She therefore resists this imposition by suggesting that having no Mummy would solve children’s problem.

Mia then continues by proposing an additional wish, which is ‘to have sweets’ (line 213). It is likely that the children are in fact allowed to eat sweets generally, and that Mia’s utterance was suggestive of the fact that they simply cannot eat as many sweets as they would like. It is not unreasonable for Mia to invite the reading of ‘eating sweets’ in the context of watching TV for ‘as long as we like’.

Interestingly, quantity or the amount of sweets to be eaten was not of concern to Mia and she does not stipulate this here. Mia does not seem to indicate the relevance of eating sweets and TV watching, which presents a major constraint. However, it is important to note that ‘watching TV as long as the children would like’ is not the only limitation placed upon children by Mummies, and this poses as further justification and reasoning as to why Mummies should not exist.

Mum appears to be somewhat surprised at Mia's utterance and she questions this (line 214). And before Mia gets to confirm that this indeed is the case, that the children wished they could have sweets (line 215), Mum poses another question, which is in overlap with Mia's previous confirmation. Mum asks Mia whether she thinks that eating sweets would be beneficial for her, again holding Mia accountable for what she said at line 213. Mum gets no response from Mia and instead, there is a pause after Mum's question (line 217). An affirmative answer to Mum's question would simply have been unreasonable if provided here and Mia probably knows that. She therefore chooses not to respond at all and the discussion about sweets ends here.

It is worth noting that Mia's construction in which she brings up the category 'mummy' contains conjunction, and another pattern we notice is that the utterance related to the category also begins with a personal pronoun ('I'), which was also the case with the previous two ('you' and 'we'). This type of structure resembles Mum's constructions, which she has used in the previous excerpts [Pronoun/Noun + conjunction + account/reason/explanation].

'Mummies and Daddies' Exc. 25

Excerpt 25 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]

Context. In this excerpt, Mum asks the children whether they would find it difficult to wake up on time in the morning for school. Mia's response constitutes a complaint and she employs the MC 'Mummies and Daddies' and she wishes that they did not exist, so the children could do whatever they liked. Mum questions this statement twice but Mia is adamant about her stance.

258	Mum	You don't, find it difficult?
259		(.)
260	Luke	[.Hm
261	Mia→	[%I just wish you'd never exist (.) or no Mummies and Daddies
262	Mia	%never exist so we can just do whatever we like
263	Mum	I don't- I'm not sure if that would rea::lly make you happy Mia [I really don't
264	Mia	[It would
265	Mum	It would?
266	Mia	Yeah

Mum is asking Mia whether her and her brother find it difficult to wake up in the morning for school (line 258). After a micropause, Luke is sulking in a disavowal of Mum's question (line 260). At the same time, Mia makes a complaint using a crying voice and suggests that she wished that their Mummy did not exist, by employing an indexical personal pronoun 'you', after which there is another micropause. 'You' identifies Mum as being an incumbent of a specific category, and consequently having to perform relevant and appropriate predicates or category- bound activities (Danby & Baker, 1998). One of the predicates would be to have control over children's behaviour more generally and more specifically, ensuring the children go to sleep on time and get rest.

It could be speculated that Mia uses a self-repair immediately afterwards by softening her claim and making it less personal. She therefore continues her complaint and wish that Mummies' and Daddies' did not exist (line 261). Mia says this using a crying voice while she introduces the utterance with 'I wish'. This is interesting because Mia had many alternative options available to her such as 'I hope', for example, which might have yielded a different outcome for the participants. Moreover, Mia uses 'never' in both clauses formulating an extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986) with which she expresses her frustration, as well as her stance towards a constraint placed upon her. Mia feels that not having Mummies and Daddies would be

synonymous with being able to do whatever the children liked (line 262). It is also interesting how she achieves a contrastive effect with the choice of words such as ‘never’ in the first clause versus ‘just’ in the second clause, corresponding to ‘no Mummies and Daddies’ and ‘doing whatever we like’.

Mum then begins to formulate her response with ‘I don’t’, which she then cuts off and repairs it with ‘I’m not sure’. We speculate that the beginning of this utterance could have been heard as ‘I don’t think’ or ‘I don’t know’ (line 263). ‘I don’t’ semantically denotes uncertainty and portrays disapproval, and so using ‘I’m not sure’ instead, softens a potentially conflictive outcome. Mum questions whether this kind of wish would make Mia happy and she interestingly ends the utterance the way she started, employing ‘I really don’t’. This is interesting since the expected format should have been ‘I really am not’ –sure. The latter part of this utterance is in overlap with Mia’s affirmative response at line 264. Mum questions Mia again (line 265) and Mia provides an affirmative response yet again (line 266).

What we witness here is the employment of category ‘Mummies and Daddies’ and its category-bound activities. Children cannot do whatever they like in Mummies’ and Daddies’ presence, and their existence therefore presents an imposition and a constraint these children face. These two children wish to lead their lives without constraints and for this to ever happen, both, Mummies and Daddies must disappear. Category Mummies and Daddies come with rights and obligations accorded to each. Butler and Weatherall (2006) assert that categories ‘can invoke certain rights, obligations, and activities of a member of a category as relevant and expected’ (p. 460). Mia demarcates the expectation that comes with the MC ‘Mummies and Daddies’ and their obligations and rights within their household.

‘Mummy’ Exc. 26

Excerpt 26 [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]

Context. In this excerpt, Luke complains about Mum not allowing the children to do what their Baba (Grandmother) does, for example, watch TV in the night. Luke brings up the MC ‘Mummy’ while referring to Baba and he uses this MC to resist an imposition placed upon the children by Mum. In so doing, Luke is trying to use his reasoning as a resource to resist the imposition.

218	Luke	And Baba lets us watch in the ni::ght
219	Mum	That's because you are on holiday at Baba's house
220		(0.1)
221	Mum	[And you have no school
222	Luke	[So:? (.) you have to let US
223	Mum	Only because Baba lets you I have to let you?
224		(0.1)
225→	Luke	%Yeah 'cause she is your MUMMY::
226	Mum	That is (.) [true:

Luke begins his utterance with the conjunction ‘and’ to emphasize the additional ‘benefits’ children enjoy while at Baba’s house (line 218). This is possibly because of the many other things that Baba lets the children do while at her house, in addition she also allows them to watch TV ‘in the night’. That is also why there is a raised intonation on the word ‘night’, something which apparently, their mother does not allow, and this is an imposition placed upon both children (line 218). This utterance could be interpreted as a request or an accusation of Mum because she is not doing something she is supposed to do, according to Luke. He therefore cites another authoritative figure and someone who has more power than Mum by successfully bringing up relevance of the hierarchical structure within their household.

The mother illuminates the reasons why TV watching is permissible at Baba's house, i.e., the children usually go to her house during holiday season and can therefore go to bed later than usual (line 219). There is a short pause after Mum's utterance, possibly because the children cannot dispute those facts and are trying to come up with their own reasons with which they could contend Mum's point. Mum adds that apart from the fact that the children go to Baba's house during holiday time, they can do things they would not normally be able to do. They also have no school while they are at Baba's house, and consequently there is no need to go to bed early or wake up early (line 221).

In an overlap with Mum's utterance, Luke's employment of a discourse connective 'So' functions as a consequential particle with which he is beginning to make a conclusive observation (line 222) while continuing his previous utterance (line 218), and this is indeed proven to be the case when he determines that Mum should do what her mother does (line 225). A slight intonation rise, at the end of 'So', seems to also function as a questioning device directed at Mum, with which Luke is possibly expecting some form of agreement from Mum, considering the subsequent micro-pause between 'so' and 'you have to let us'.

Luke mentions his grandmother as a point of reference and a reason which should be sufficient for Mum to understand that she should do what her own mother does, and his employment of the imperative operates as 'an order' to Mum (line 222). By doing this, he is assigning Mum a form of reciprocal responsibility – if Mum's Mum allows something, then Mum should also allow it, in this orderly, authoritative familial hierarchical chain. Luke's logic has been presented to Mum through the invocation of a pre-established rule, which according to him, should be known to all the participants (lines 218 and 222). He has done this in order to resist a constraint

placed upon him and his sister and he uses a legitimate argument which could not be disputed.

Furthermore, using the address term and a personal pronoun ‘you’ at line 222, Luke identifies the responsible agent, but at the same time, ‘you’ functions as an emphatic marker, accentuating Mum’s personal liability. It makes the recipient (Mum), liable for this problematic episode, as argued by Sterponi (2003, 2009) in the family dinner conversation episodes. Sterponi (2003) states that the identification of a behaviour as problematic not only summons the responsibility of the one whose behaviour is implicitly interrogated, but it assumes a specific moral positioning and responsibility by the one who initiates the move, thus making an accusation pertinent (p. 448). Moreover, a vocal emphasis is placed on the word ‘us’ (line 222), which clarifies the role of the patient/experiencer and suggests how other’s behaviour has affected Luke in this circumstance.

This rule invocation (‘If Baba lets us, you have to let us’) tacitly brings into attention the hierarchical familial structure with relevance to size or age, for that matter. Luke is invoking a familial hierarchical rule related to reciprocity, previously established in this household and managed locally. Both, the rising tone and a micro-pause after ‘So’ at line 222, potentially create a Transitional Relevance Place (TRP), which means that Mum is provided with an opportunity to perhaps align with Luke at this point since she should have knowledge of their household rules. But there is no uptake by Mum until Luke’s turn gets completed.

Mum questions Luke’s rationale by beginning her utterance with ‘Only’ (line 223), thus indicating disalignment with Luke and disagreeing (at least on this occasion) that she should do what Baba does. The employment of ‘only’ also indicates that Mum does not think it is justifiable for her to do something only because someone

else does it, even when that person is her own mother. Mum's utterance is followed by a brief pause which allows Luke to come up with the reasoning behind his utterance at line 222. Luke's explication and his reasoning, which contain moral implications as to why Mum should do what Baba does, comes at line 225. Using his crying voice Luke cites authority while employing MC 'Your Mummy' while referring to Baba. 'Your Mummy' is a category of the MCD 'family' with categories such as mum, daughters, children, etc. One of the category-bound activities is 'to listen to the mother' which is what the children are suggesting their Mum should do.

It is worth noting that another prosodic feature is observable at line 222, whereby "You" and "Us" is at the same intonation level (340 Hz) while Mum equally emphasizes "Baba", "You", and "I" at line 223 (See Appendix IX). This prosodic matching seems to have a contrastive effect emphasising two different sides of the argument here. Mum cannot and does not contest Luke's logic and reasoning with which it is implied that 'children should listen to their parents' (line 226). It would be morally wrong for Mum not to listen to her mother and Luke successfully brings this up as part of his negotiation strategy.

'The Queen' Exc. 27

Excerpt 27 [141111_Silly Bottom 12:57]

Context. In this excerpt, Mia accuses and criticises Mum for 'giving orders' and asking children to do things for her such as fetch the remote control, for example while Luke is criticising Mum for not listening. Mia asserts that Mum should not be behaving in such manner because she is not the 'Queen'. Mia employs the MC 'Queen' to show Mum's behaviour as inappropriate because only the Queen is entitled to give orders. Mia resists Mum's action by assigning her the 'non-queen-like' status which strips Mum off all the undeniable powers only attributed to the queen.

183 Mia %You are just giving orders
 184 Mum I was asking you politely
 185 (0.2)
 186 Luke Hm::
 187 (.)
 188 Mia %We are a:lways doing that WHY don't do it yourself=
 189 Mia %You are a bit la:zy (.) .h WHY not do it yourself
 190 (0.2)
 191 Mum I often do things [by myself
 192 Luke [%You are not listening
 193 Mia [No you don't
 194 Luke You are NOT listening
 195 Mia ['Cause (.)you'r just-
 196 Luke %We are going to get [like a Mummy will listen
 197 Mia [%You're just like(.) lying down there when you're=
 198 Mia %closer (.) you're closer to the re- remote control and we are further
 199 Mia %When you could just GRAB it
 200 Mia We don't have to go a::ll the way and then get the remote control for you=
 201 Mia → It's not like you are a Queen oka:y? .h .h

At line 183, using her crying voice, Mia is accusing Mum of giving orders. She employs 'just' to infer that Mum does that all the time. Mum defies Mia's accusation by admitting that she was asking the children to do things in a polite way (line 184). In so doing, Mum agrees that Mia's accusation is partially true because she shows in her response at line 184 that she might have understood Mia's utterance to mean that Mum does give orders, i.e., asks children to do things, but that Mia's accusation is referring to absence of politeness markers. There is a slight pause after Mum's utterance to denote that children may find it challenging to respond to Mum's utterance (line 185). Luke utters 'Hm:' to display his disavowal after which there is a micropause.

Mia continues to use her crying voice while she employs yet another extreme case formulation with the employment of 'always' affirming that the children are the ones who 'always' do that, referring to having to fetch things for Mum (line 188). She then immediately questions Mum by asking her why she could not do such chores herself (line 189). She then launches a negative assessment by attacking Mum and her

behaviour explicitly, and accusing her of being 'a bit lazy'. She snuffles slightly after the word 'lazy' only to continue in a crying voice 'Why not do it yourself' (line 188).

There is a slight pause (line 190) after Mia's question and Mum asserts that she 'often' does the chores herself, but the way Mum formulates her response also infers that sometimes she does not (line 191). Before Mum gets to complete her utterance, Luke makes another accusation about Mum's behaviour at line 192, 'You are not listening', using his crying voice. He uses present continuous tense, which suggests that Luke is referring to the current state of affairs and that Mum is not listening to what the children are telling her at that moment.

Mia agrees with Luke, in an overlap with his talk, but she uses an utterance in the present simple tense 'No, you don't', perhaps insinuating that Mum does not listen, not just on this occasion, but that this is a regular occurrence and that this is the type of behaviour she displays often (line 193). This type of construction makes Mia's utterance sound even more problematic as her accusation turns out to be more severe than Luke's.

Luke repeats his accusation, and this time there is an intonation rise on 'not' (line 194). Luke does not get to finish his utterance when Mia intersects by attempting a collaborative ending and by beginning with a conjunction 'cause' which denotes that an account and extrapolation is due and forthcoming. Mia begins to formulate her claim, 'you're just' but gets interrupted by Luke, who starts a new utterance using his crying voice. Luke proposes that the children will get a Mummy that will listen to them (line 196).

Mia then accuses Mum of 'just lying down' and ordering children about, such as asking them to fetch a remote control, for example (line 198). Mia uses her reasoning to explain that it is not right for a mother to behave in such a way, especially

when she is closer to the remote control and she could reach it herself (lines 197-199). As a pinnacle of this amalgamation of accusations, Mia makes her assessment of Mum brought in as a conclusion at line 201. Mia claims that the children should not have to follow Mum's orders because, 'order giving' is a predicate which could only be ascribed to one person allowed to do so, the Queen. Mia finishes her utterance by seeking affirmation from Mum when she says 'Okay?' with an intonation rise at the end.

Summary

In this chapter, I examined the two children's use of MCs and MCDs, which they employed in order to resist impositions placed upon them by others. Schegloff (1972) discusses the notion of *recipient design*, which means that participants take into account who they are talking to in the design and organization of their turns. What we witness from the data is that there is a correlation between child-child, parent-child, or child-parent interactions, and that is what creates various consequences for the participants.

Another aspect to consider is that there has been much research on how identities and relationships are made relevant in talk without the use of explicit category terms (Butler, 2008; Stokoe, 2010, 2012). I have had the opportunity to examine and analyse the explicit category use in children's interactions in their home setting. Furthermore, my analysis has illustrated that membership related to age and relational categories are often potentially relevant and consequential for the participants, but so is 'the analyst's membership within a culture shared by the people they study' (Butler & Fitzgerald, 2010, p. 2465).

From Excerpt 14, we can conclude that categories are linked to activities, making them 'category-bound', which means that members of a category usually

perform the actions in expected ways, and they mutually define each other (Sacks, 1972b). According to Butler and Weatherall (2006), categorisation is a 'systematic practice and a situated action' (p. 444). Luke could have classified Mum in any number of ways available to him but having selected a specific category ('bad Mummy') orients to the interaction produced and accomplished locally. This indicates that performed action and the associated meaning are therefore not fixed or given. Instead, they are developed, managed, and understood locally, within sequences of social interaction.

In the same extract, Mia employs the *pro*-term 'we' to infer collectivity. Goodwin (1990) argues that such format tying and the use of 'we' formulations demonstrates alignment and collaboration between children in their attempt to do whatever they are doing together, and in this case, as brother and sister. Mia also employs the *pro*-term 'we' in Excerpt 20 in utterances 'We are leaving Singapore' (line 3), 'We are going to Belgrade' (line 25), and 'we are leaving to Belgrade (line 28). The use of the *pro*-term, personal deixis 'we' makes the siblings 'members of a collectivity', thus belonging to the same category (Butler & Weatherall, 2006, p. 456). The use of the *pro*-term 'we' also indicates that Mia assumes that the mother has the information about who 'we' refers to. The way 'we' operates here therefore collects the two children and excludes the parent. In his lectures, Sacks (1992) writes about 'we' and explains the different usages of the 'we' pronoun. The one usage relevant here would be to refer to 'we' as 'a set name' whereby one member would be 'I' and then, there would be other members, A and/or B, for example, where these letters could be replaced with names (p. 334). In this case, what Mia's claim asserts is 'I (Mia) do X' and 'A (Luke) does X', which means that each of the statements 'have to be correct for the other to be correct' (Sacks, 1992, p. 334).

As I mentioned earlier, Jayyusi (1984), Payne (1976), and Watson (1978, 1997) have discussed and extended the notion of category-bound activities (CBAs) to include other predicates such as rights, obligations, and knowledge. This is particularly relevant in Extract 20 because we observe that Mum's action is evidently not a desirable one according to her children's preference and she contests the children's conditional threats, while she justifies the reasons for her actions (lines 17 and 26).

On the one hand, and with regards to Sacks' discussion on moral accountability, we can see at line 26 that Mum is holding Mia morally accountable. On the other hand, the categorical identity selection 'Bad Mummy' presents all activities associated with a Mummy who does not allow the children to do what *they* want, i.e., watch TV whenever, and for as long as they want, go to bed late, eat sweets, etc. Equally however, 'Bad Mummy' could signify the actions of a 'Bad daughter' since Mummy, as Baba's daughter does not seem to adhere to Baba's rules and she, as the daughter, should listen to her own mother, according to the children. Luke's MC invocation could therefore refer to all the activities associated with Mum's action as *the mother* to the children as well as *the daughter* of Baba.

Children show the relevance and they reason by deploying membership categories, which they use as a resource to advance their immediate interactional goals. As Forrester (2015) notes, 'the idea of membership and MCA provides a particularly fruitful line of inquiry for understanding the relationship between an archeological analysis of subject positionings, and the pragmatics of social context', which is demonstrated in this excerpt (p. 225). This excerpt analysis illustrates deployment of MCs and MCDs relevant to the orderliness of doing moral reasoning, while demonstrating how localized practices are formed in children's interactional practices of resistance to impositions.

From Excerpt 20, we can also observe that Mia's morally-implicative conclusion is drawn from Mum's 'despicable' behaviour, and according to her, she deserves such treatment, and this is the 'right' thing to do. Furthermore, Mia's categorisation of Mum and the use of the MC 'mean Mummy' is interesting in that Mia employs 'like' just prior to this MC invocation. In so doing, Mia does not make an explicit accusation that her Mum IS 'a mean Mummy'. By formulating her utterance in this way, Mia perhaps lessens her denunciation by complaining about Mum's behaviour, instead of Mum's personality *per se*. This ultimately makes Mia's criticism less personal and thus less provocative.

With the employment of one membership category, it is usually inferred that another one with contrastive features is also implied. Mia's employment of 'mean Mummy' would suggest that there is a category 'kind mummy' and its associated characteristics. These characteristics would involve 'listening to children' and perhaps 'allowing the children to watch TV'. It is Mum's responsibility and duty to be kind, according to the children. Speakers select one category over another in order 'to perform and manage various kinds of interactionally sensitive business, including their motives and reasons for doing things and saying things, and this was shown in this excerpt (Edwards, 1998, p. 19). And after a slight pause after Mia's utterance (line 168) there is an opportunity for Mum to respond to this attack, but Mum remains silent.

From Excerpt 15 we observe the invocation of categories of age with regards to the rule 'younger should listen to older', which was inferred by the children from this sequence; we can observe that this has resulted in an invocation of the MC 'bad Mummy'. The children have undoubtedly displayed awareness and knowledge of the roles within their familial hierarchy which apply to Baba and Mum. Moreover, both

children seem to possess the necessary skills to ‘negotiate authority’ while referring to age, and with the rights and obligations that come with it. Both children resist the imposition placed upon them by Mum. Luke does it through the invocation of the MC, and although Mum does not respond to it, Luke attempts to achieve his own interactional goal, which is that Mum switches the TV back on. His reasoning is then based on the fact that, if Mum were a ‘good Mummy’, she would have perhaps done what the children wanted her to do, and she would have behaved differently. In calling his Mum, a ‘bad Mummy’, Luke is accusing her of not fulfilling the obligations and duties of a good mother, which, according to him, a mother should.

Another accusation may have to do with the fact that Mum in this sequence could have been seen as a ‘bad daughter’ because she is not listening to her own mother (Baba). This in turn is directly related to the fact that the imposition placed upon them stems from the reasoning brought up by the children and with regards to the fact that the mother’s mother does allow TV watching, and this in parallel is not an imposition at Baba’s household. In his lectures, Sacks (1992,1995) discusses the stage-of-life devices, and according to categorial-based reasoning, if the stage of life devices work one way, such as ‘Children-Mum’, then by reason they should work the other way ‘Mum-Baba’.

It is also interesting to observe how children’s orientation to ‘younger should listen to older’ contrasts to how the two children position themselves within this familial hierarchy. Both children must be aware that they are younger than their own Mum, and that their Mum is, for that matter, ‘older’ than them, and that they should consequently do what their mother says. It appears that knowledge and application of categories has moral implications for the membership of the specific participants involved, and as Butler and Weatherall (2006) point out, this ‘provides a means of

establishing how to map oneself or be mapped into an available category, and orienting to the rights and responsibilities this membership involves (p. 459).

The invocation of the MC ‘bad Mummy’ is therefore explicitly context-bound and is made relevant for the participants and for the situation *in situ*. In this excerpt, we illustrate children’s understanding of characteristics such as age, size, relation (e.g., ‘child- mother’, ‘younger-older’), etc., and the children seem to make a connection to those categories according to their interactional motivations and seem to employ this knowledge successfully. We further observe that rules are also context-dependant, i.e., their formulation and application is made relevant within a specific situated activity and are therefore enacted in practical action (Heritage, 1978). The invocation of rules is thus seen as an interactional practice, and it is understood in terms of their interactional consequences as seen from this excerpt (Wootton, 1997).

In Excerpt 16, Mum’s inappropriate behaviour, such as ‘shouting’ and ‘giving orders’ to her children presents an imposition for them. As a result, children are being asked to carry out Mum’s orders while she is ‘lying on her silly bottom’, and this is the behaviour the children do not consider appropriate, fair, or reasonable. The children are resisting this imposition by arguing that Mum should presumably behave like a ‘good Mum’, and not like a ‘bad Mum’ as Luke was suggesting. Both children attack Mum’s behaviour while they attempt to reason, and by proposing that Mum’s role should be to ‘teach’ them things instead of ‘telling’ them to do things. They are resisting Mum’s actions by accusing her of being and doing things which are ascribed to a Mummy who is being ‘a bad Mummy’. This MC ‘bad mummy’ yet again conflicts with predicates assigned to ‘a good Mum’, and Mum is for that reason directly responsible for the consequences, i.e., Mia’s crying, as we have shown in this excerpt.

The analysis of Excerpt 22 is based on Mia's orientation to the relevance of social identity of the person of certain age, containing systematic properties pertaining to that category. Zimmerman (1998) asserts that identity concept is an 'independent variable accounting for participants' used as a means of referring to and making inferences about self (p. 87). Categories of age ('small' and 'older') are invoked and made available and relevant here because of their 'local' production, situated in talk itself, and they are seen to operate as an inferential resource in pursuit of children's interactional goals. They are produced, as well as managed locally and in systematic ways, with potential moral implications and consequences for the participants, through which all parties had to navigate.

Furthermore, category 'small' could impinge on children's own membership as 'smaller' in comparison to Mum, who is 'bigger'. This category may threaten the children's position as being even smaller' than Mum. Employing the category 'small' means that there is category 'big' in the form of size, or age categories associated to daughter (small) and mother (big). Listing other category members 'small' must listen to 'big', 'older' suggests there is category 'younger' which stipulates that 'younger' must listen to 'older'. Category smallest and youngest were missing in the description. Could this suggest that the children are purposefully employing this familial hierarchical order of categories by excluding the category 'smallest'?

In Excerpt 27, according to Mia's logic, the moral implication is that if anyone else aside from the Queen does the 'ordering', they are not doing the right thing and their behaviour is consequently considered inappropriate. Her mother's behaviour cannot be justified nor tolerated and there is a valid reason for that and Mia's utterance 'It's not like you are the Queen' is heard as a strategy for exclusion, because Mum does not belong to the category Queen, and cannot therefore behave like one. Instead,

what we have here is an example of something completely the opposite 'It's not like you are', which identifies Mum as not being a member of that category, so any designated rights and entitlements of that category cannot belong to that member, i.e., the mother.

Chapter 7: Summary and conclusion

Summary of findings

The focus of this thesis was to find out how the two young children, as the main subjects of this study, ‘do’ moral reasoning in everyday interactions. My data revealed that the children employed moral reasoning in a variety of ways, as a resource, in order to resist impositions placed upon them by others. It was found that moral reasoning was always used in adversative episodes and situations of conflict. Three specific interactional practices related to children’s use of moral reasoning were identified and analysed in their interactional settings.

One way in which the children tended to construct moral reasoning was through rule invocations and even creation of rules in situations of conflict or whenever some form of argumentation or negotiation with co-participants took place. As Wootton (1986) points out, rules are mostly invoked in the settings associated with ‘untoward events’ and most rules invocations seem to ‘locate recipient as a fault in some way’ (p. 153). We could see that Mia’s accusations of Mum’s conduct with regards to ‘always’ giving orders and not listening to the children would be a good example of that. Wootton (1997) also asserts that young children, as young as two, appeal to parents for assistance whenever adversative episodes happen to escalate, which often involved a child’s screaming, for example. I found this to be the case in my data, specifically when one of the siblings required the parent’s assistance and whenever they wanted that parent to intervene, by calling out ‘Mummy’, often more than once (e.g., line 369, in the recording entitled [151230 Magic Trick 23:40], and line 224, in the recording entitled [141222 Cartwheels 09:02]).

Referring to the definition of moral reasoning in the beginning of my thesis which involves an ‘action of thinking about something in a logical, sensible way’

(OED, 2017), and that it has to do with some sort of principles that the individuals invoke in conversations, it is found that the invocation and application of rules were profoundly dependant on the context in which they were invoked. Another observation was that it was not the content of the rule that was significant, but how the rules were used. The main purpose of rule invocations was the accomplishment of interactional goals, which the children were seen to be orienting to, turn by turn. This shows that, what is at issue, is learning the social practices associated with displaying and recognising morally accountable actions.

In the data, we could see that one of the main impositions for the children was Mum's behaviour, which involved her switching the TV off and not allowing the children to watch it. Because of that imposition, the children were resorting to a variety of interactional moves in order to resist this imposition. Furthermore, 'layers' behind that main imposition would then get revealed and would become relevant and recognised by the children as additional constraints. This newly brought circumstance then required further argumentation and negotiation, but all in relation to the main imposition. For example, when Mia accused the mother of giving orders to children and asking them to pass the remote control to her in order to switch the TV off, Mum's conduct, related to 'giving orders' then became another constraint for the children. This 'order giving' then revealed another underlying issue, which the children were seen to resist by bringing up concepts and rules related to fairness and reciprocity. This is evidenced through Mia's complaining and blaming Mum for being 'unfair', specifically when she accused Mum that she 'never' listens to the children and that they 'always' have to listen to her. However, the main imposition was the TV being switched off.

We could therefore witness how children conveyed their conviction of what

they perceived to be right or wrong behaviour, and in this way, they constructed their social order by orienting to common-sense knowledge (Garfinkel, 1967). This was brought about through sequential positioning of utterances, which required the children's gradual and progressive local engagement in practices of negotiation and argumentation, in contexts indexical of morality. This interactional engagement is what enabled the children to recognise potential moral implications. Moreover, that recognition allows them to develop an understanding of their social world and what they, and others ought to do in any given situation, as pointed out by Smetana et al. (2012).

For example, in Excerpt 8 [141028 leaving Singapore 20:11], at line 124, when Mia accuses her mother of being 'rude', what constitutes 'rude' is not immediately obvious. There is a rule but there is always the goal, which then becomes more relevant. The choice of the rule is therefore pertinent because of the goal the children want to achieve. The significance therefore lies in how it was proposed to apply these rules and how these rule invocations were contextualised. In other words, the 'right' and 'wrong' is the context, and application of rules and their formulation are performed *in situ* on a given occasion and through a particular sequence of turns.

A second main issue that has been highlighted is that most rule invocations in my data were related to different forms of entitlement, and these entitlements were based on possession or ownership of objects (toys), which is considered the most common type of conflict caused among toddlers for example (See Wootton, 1991). Edwards (1978) asserts that children's understandings about possession are shaped by people in their immediate surroundings. In his book, *Interaction and the development of the mind*, Wootton (1997) talks about possession, where he brings up several issues with regards to various kinds of entitlements such as 'entitlements to be asked for

things that “belong” to you, entitlements to ask for things back when others have been allowed to use them, entitlements to have a say in the ways in which others are using them’ (1997, p. 36). From my data, it was revealed that the children resorted to rules in order to claim their entitlement to objects. Luke’s invocation of the rule, which states that because he is the owner of the toy, he is entitled to get it back from Mia, and Mia’s orientation to the rule ‘first come, first served’, meant that she would be entitled to the toy she was holding, because she got hold of it first. Both rules were invoked to suit the children’s goals. The rules are then context-dependant, i.e., their formulation and application are made relevant within a specific situated activity and are enacted in practical action (Heritage, 1978). Moral reasoning constructed here is therefore understood in terms of its interactional consequences in the context of the situation. A child’s learning occurs because it is conducted as a social activity and that learning is gradual and *in situ* on a given occasion, and as it unfolds in the course of a sequence of turns. This gradual progression throughout childhood is what informs and develops children’s moral understanding (Cook-Gumperz, Corsaro, & Streeck, 1986).

Children learn that, within utterances, and through selection of the specific vocabulary there will be consequences for the co-participants, and this is best understood from children’s use of ECFs, which we found to be another way with which children constructed moral reasoning. These formulations included expressions such as ‘never ever’, ‘always’, ‘never’, ‘all’, ‘just’, etc. Children employed ECFs for various reasons and some of the main reasons were to accuse a person of their ‘wrongdoings’ or to complain about a person’s conduct. For example, at line 114 of the recording entitled [141111 Silly Bottom 12:57], Mia accuses Mum of ‘lying down on her silly bottom’ and ‘giving orders’. Mia employs ECF ‘all’, which is a Maximum Case Formulation (MCF), considering that Mia proposes that the behaviours she has

mentioned are ‘*all*’ that Mum is doing. Mia also proposes that Mum is ‘always’ shouting. With the use of these ECFs Mia suggests that Mum’s behaviour is not appropriate, and this is not how a mother should behave. A mother should not be ‘lying down’ or be idle, and she should not be just ‘giving orders’. She should also not be ‘shouting’ at her children. Mia’s goal was for Mum to leave the children’s bedroom and Luke’s criterion was that Mum should only be allowed to stay if she ‘behaves’. According to Mia, Mum does not satisfy this criterion, and this is suggestive from Mia’s use of ECFs ‘all’ and ‘always’, which ‘provide for the recognisability of the offender’s wrongdoing’, as pointed out by Pomerantz (1986, p. 221).

Finally, it is found that the children’s use of moral reasoning was through the invocation of MCs and MCDs. The children employed MCs and MCDs such as ‘bad Mummy’, ‘rude Mummy’, ‘silly and naughty Mummy’, ‘mean Mummy’, ‘not being a polite Mummy’, ‘small’, ‘older’, ‘smaller’ and ‘biggest’. They are indeed ‘presupposed on category membership distinctions’, in the example: bad mummy/good mummy, which are employed interdependently with the on-going dynamics of co-engagement. For Sacks (1995), the use as well as invocation of categories is equally relevant because they exhibit detailed instances of the ‘culture-in-action’ while unraveling category work (Hester & Eglin, 1997). In the excerpts on MCs and MCDs, I have demonstrated the children’s engagement in membership categorisation practices and activities, and how they resist impositions and constraints, how they negotiate, disagree and employ argumentative practices while reasoning with others. Wootton (1986) talks about how argumentation and verbal aggression become a more prominent feature between the ages of two and four, following which children begin to employ offensive techniques as seen in my data. The children used MCs such as ‘rude Mummy’, ‘bad Mummy’, ‘mean Mummy’, etc., and in so doing, they were able to

bring in the relevance of the category ‘good Mummy’ which stands in opposition, because this is what the children want their Mummy to be. In the recording [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11], Mia threatens Mum that the children would leave their home and that they would never return; both children used offensive remarks such as ‘you are not being a polite Mummy’ or ‘silly and naughty Mummy’, and ‘bad Mummy’, in order to accuse Mum of her ‘bad’ behaviour, and these could all be considered as conditional threats, but not necessarily serious.

Children invoked MCs and MCDs such as ‘Mummy’, ‘Mummies and Daddies’, ‘Your Mummy’ to refer to these categories as collections of the MCD ‘family’. They did this to bring in the relevance of the category-bound activities and predicates associated with the parents and their children, and what their expectations are. Another interesting example is children’s use and invocation of MC ‘the Queen’, which brings in the relevance of the MC from the MCD collection ‘the Queen and her subjects’, which is what Mia was referring to in the recording [14111 Silly Bottom 12:57] when she states that only the Queen can give orders. According to Mia, Mummy does not satisfy that criterion and because she is not the Queen, she is not entitled to give orders.

Besides the findings specified above, matters related to patterns in the way the utterances were structured and produced were found. One of the patterns is related to the MC use. Whenever MCs with negative connotations were used in addressing Mum’s conduct, Mum seemed to have not responded. This seemed to be the case on a number of occasions, and some of these occasions were when Luke was addressing Mummy ‘bad Mummy’ at lines, 2, 235, 248, and 395 in the recording [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11], for example. Another observation was the interesting type of formulation with regards to the structure of the utterances, in which

we can see a repeated pattern [Pronoun/Noun + conjunction + account/reason/explanation]. Conjunctions are usually placed within utterances which illustrate oppositional moves or some type of conflict and this is what was found to be the case in my data. Some of the examples listed here demonstrate such patterns, for example, when Mum says to Mia ‘I am listening but Mia I am the Mummy so I have to decide what’s best for you’, at line 129 in the recording [141028_Leaving Singapore 20:11]). There are many more occurrences of this type of structure being employed predominantly by Mum, but occasionally by the two children as well.

Conclusion

As discussed in my literature review, questions related to children’s moral reasoning and moral judgement were predominantly studied within Psychology and initially raised by Piaget (1965) and then re-examined by Kohlberg (1976, 1981, 1984), Turiel (1983) and others. After Piaget, most research on morality and moral reasoning has been conducted using hypothetical scenarios, experimental methods, interviews, and questionnaires. This type of research has yielded very useful observations pertaining to moral reasoning in young children. However, one of the main issues with these methods was placing children in hypothetical situations unfamiliar to them. For example, in Kohlberg’s (1981) questioning of the children on what they would do if placed in a situation of a married man who stole the medicine for his wife (‘Heinz dilemma’). A second issue with constructed scenarios refers to the relevance of what children on this occasion said they would do and what they would actually do in real situations, but this in turn is difficult to establish considering that children have never been in a situation of the subject they were asked to discuss. A final issue is *how* children actually learn and acquire social understandings because children draw on their experiences and negotiate meanings through interaction and this

is how they learn the ways of culture (Bruner & Watson, 1983). As Piaget (1965) puts it, 'you cannot make a child act in a laboratory in order to dissect his moral conduct' but 'you can make a child reason about a problem' and this is what 'brings you into contact with thought in action' (p. 112).

These are some of the main reasons why an in-depth examination of naturally occurring talk in which children can be seen in their engagement with moral issues deem relevant. The emphasis is therefore on the local sequences of *moral action* in which the child is engaged in social interactions (Wootton, 1997). Moral action is shown through sequential and categorisation practices employed and managed by co-participants which display an orientation to questions of good or bad, or right or wrong behaviour, as seen in my data.

Through an in-depth analysis of the data I have shown how moral reasoning is transacted in social interaction with others. I unravelled the two children's interactional practices which they employed in order to reason with their interlocutors. My data analysis shows that moral reasoning is a joint production and it is embedded in social interactions. It unfolds turn by turn within sequences of talk, as children deploy strategic moves to resist impositions placed upon them. In addition, it could be that constructing moral reasoning was one of the prevalent uses in adversative episodes or when conflicts arise and as such, it is worth further investigation. This is significant considering that children learn about social structures through adversative episodes in interactions (Maynard, 1985; Cicourel, 1970; Eisenberg & Garvey, 1981).

To conclude, children learn very early that language is an important and powerful tool that they can use to 'control others' (Cook-Gumperz, 1981, p. 38). Children must learn 'how to get things done with words' and understand the purpose of specific vocabulary selection (Bruner & Watson, 1983). This in turn, develops their

social knowledge and social skills in general, and this is what ultimately shapes their identities (Cook-Gumperz, Corsaro & Streeck, 1986, p. 2). The question is therefore *how* they learn to express themselves in this process (Bruner & Watson, 1983).

The children in this study may use argumentation, negotiation, and mediation to counter certain actions of adversative nature, and to justify specific behaviours in order to accomplish their interactional goals. Their interactional goals are defined or set in specific contexts, and actions are formulated and designed as a means towards achieving these goals. Thus, children's use of moral reasoning and understanding of morality is done through sequentially ordered utterances, shaped and managed locally within talk-in-interaction. Prior and subsequent utterances within interaction form a framework, on the basis of which, children engage in (and learn through doing) moral reasoning within their daily conversations.

Study contributions

This thesis is based on the data set collected, stored, and analysed for the very first time by the researcher. As such, this thesis provides a new, interactional perspective on moral reasoning of the two young children (ages ranging 3 to 8) when engaging with familiar others in a domestic setting. It shows how children do moral reasoning while interactional turns unfold within sequences of talk as a sequential and categorial phenomenon. I consider moral reasoning a social phenomenon because it is through the children's use of moral reasoning that one can see how social understanding, and switching of interest and perspectives is learned in situ.

Furthermore, this study makes further contributions to our understanding of children's use of MCs and MCDs. I hope to have convinced the reader of the effectiveness of combining the CA and MCA approaches for the benefit of a more in-depth analysis of nuances revealed through sequential and categorisation work. I

consider numerous inferences from the MCs and MCDs employed by the children, and the implications for the co-participants, demonstrating how they are understood based on the participants' rather than the analyst's perspective.

This study also captures how rules are invoked and for what purposes. Wootton (1997) addresses such issues in his book, *Interaction and the development of mind* where he emphasizes the significance of sequential unfolding from which a two-year-old child, his daughter Amy, bases her shared understanding on the previously made understandings established in prior turns. And although some of the issues on rule invocations were addressed from a psychological and sociolinguistic perspective, I hope to have offered an interactional perspective of rule invocations of children from a different age group than was previously done. Another contribution is demonstrated through children's use of ECFs, which to my knowledge is a study that has not been conducted before. Within psychology and sociology, the minute analyses of the unfolding of sequences within interaction among children has been 'largely neglected' (Auwärter, 1986, p. 207). Our focus on the topic of morality and children's skills, which exemplify children's use of moral reasoning, provides a more succinct and thorough identification and understanding of children's convictions deployed within moral contexts, in the interactional settings which focuses on turn by turn sequences. As Wootton (1997) points out, a child's development of moral sensibilities is an 'epigenetic outcome of the kind of communication system that the child is operating with and that sequential skills plays a pivotal role in this process' (p. 199).

Study limitations

Due to time and size constraints, my study is limited to the indicated number of excerpts and participants involved, and focuses on the two children as the main subjects. As such, it cannot be representative of studies on moral reasoning in general

and could not apply to all children or as a comparative study. However, I hope to have provided enough scope for future study opportunities by tackling some of the intricacies of morality and moral reasoning in children's talk.

Future study opportunities

This study could provide a basis for further study opportunities in several areas. For example, this study could be expanded to include children's multicultural and multilingual backgrounds. Although the excerpts in my thesis include only conversations in English, I do not exclude the possibility of exploring morality aspects or other phenomena to include different linguistic and cultural settings in the future. I have valuable data that can be used for research of other topics, which presents a potential in terms of further studies.

Potential questions with regards to the presence of more than one language and culture are how children display moral reasoning in multicultural settings and languages are relevant. Which moral norms and conventions do those two children invoke, how do they apply those in everyday conversations, and for what purposes are further considerations of inquiry. I recognise the limitations arising from matters surrounding comparative research for example, as it may be pragmatically difficult to pinpoint samples containing similar moral referencing within similar contexts displayed and recognised in different languages, and at approximately equal competency levels. But I hope that this challenge could be tackled in some ways.

Future studies could also include children with developmental issues, for example. There are several other possibilities which could address more specific issues with regards to rule invocations, ECFs, MCs, and MCDs. Furthermore, since it was found that these two children employed moral reasoning in adversative episodes and situations of conflict, it would be beneficial to find out in what other circumstances

children employ moral reasoning. Finally, it would be interesting to consider the interactional strategies and patterns employed by the parents and how this affects the consequential outcomes for the participants.

There are many potential study opportunities that could be drawn from the concepts laid out in this study; thus, I hope to have provided a foundation on which further studies can develop when it comes to studies on morality and moral reasoning in children's interactions.

References

- Antaki, C. & Widdicombe, S. (1998a). *Identities in talk* (1st ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Antaki, C. & Widdicombe, S. (1998b). Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (1st ed., pp. 1-14). London: Sage Publications.
- Atkinson, J. M. & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, H. & Fitzgerald, R. (2007). Resisting categorisation: An ordinary mother, in *Language as action: Australian studies in conversation analysis* (Johanna Rendle- Short, Maurice Nevile, eds.), 30(3)
- Auwärter, M. (1986). Development of communicative skills: The construction of fictional reality in children's play. In J. Cook-Gumperz, W. Corsaro & J. Streeck (Eds.), *Children's worlds and children's language* (1st ed., pp. 205-230). Berlin: M. de Gruyter.
- Baillargeon, R., Scott, R. M., He, Z., Sloane, S., Setoh, P., Jin, K., . . . Bian, L. (2014). Psychological and sociomoral reasoning in infancy. In M. Mikulincer, P. R. Shaver, E. Borgida, & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *APA handbook of personality and social psychology: Vol. I. Attitudes and social cognition* (pp. 79-150). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Baker, C. D. (1984). The 'search for adulthood': Membership work in adolescent-adult talk. *Human Studies*, 1, 301-323.
- Bar-Tal, D., Raviv, A., & Goldberg, M. (1982). Helping behavior among preschool children: An observational study. *Child Development*, 53(2), 396-402.

- Bergmann, J. (1998). Introduction: Morality in discourse. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 31(3-4), 279-294.
- Berk, L. (1991). *Child development* (2nd ed.). Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon
- Bloom, L. (2000). Intentionality and theories of intentionality in development. *Human Development*, 43(3), 178-185.
- Brown, L.M. & Gilligan, C. (1992) *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, J. S. & Watson, R. (1983). *Child's talk: Learning to use language*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Budwig, N., Strage, A., & Bamberg, M. (1986). The construction of joint activities with an age-mate: The transition from caregiver-child to peer play. In J. Cook-Gumperz, W. A. Corsaro, & J. Streeck (Eds.), *Children's worlds and children's language* (pp. 83-108). Berlin: M. de Gruyter.
- Butler, C. (2008). *Talk and social interaction in the playground*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Butler, C. & Fitzgerald, R. (2010). Membership-in-action: Operative identities in a family meal. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(9), 2462-2474.
- Butler, C. & Weatherall, A. (2006). "No, we're not playing families": Membership categorization in children's play. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 39(4), 441-470.
- Capps, L. & Ochs, E. (1995). Out of place: Narrative insights into agoraphobia. *Discourse Processes*, 19(3), 407-439.
- Carpendale, J. (2000). Kohlberg and Piaget on stages and moral reasoning. *Developmental Review*, 20(2), 181-205.
- Carpendale, J. & Lewis, C. (2012). *How children develop social understanding*. Oxford: Wiley.

- Chapman, M. & McBride, M. (1992). Beyond competence and performance: Children's class inclusion strategies, superordinate class cues, and verbal justifications. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(2), 319-327.
- Cicourel, A. (1970). Language as a variable in social research. *Sociological Focus*, 3(2), 43-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00380237.1970.10570739>
- Cobb-Moore, C. (2012). 'Pretend I was Mummy': Children's production of authority and subordination in their pretend play interaction during disputes. In S. Danby & M. A. Theobald (Eds.), *Disputes in everyday life: Social and moral orders of children and young people: Sociological studies of children and youth*, (pp. 85-118). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Cobb-Moore, C., Danby, S., & Farrell, A. (2009). Young children as rule makers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(8), 1477-1492.
- Cook-Gumperz, J. (1981). Persuasive talk – The social organization of children's talk. In J. L. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings*, (pp. 25-50). Norwood, N.J: Ablex Publishing.
- Cook-Gumperz, J., Corsaro, W. A., & Streeck, J. (1986). *Children's worlds and children's language*. Berlin: M. de Gruyter.
- Corsaro, W. A. (1992). Interpretive reproduction in children's peer cultures. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 55(2), 160. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2786944>
- Corsaro, W. (2005). *The sociology of childhood*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Corsaro, W. A. & Streeck, J. (1986). Studying children's worlds: Methodical issues. In J. Cook-Gumperz, W. A. Corsaro, & J. Streeck (Eds.), *Children's worlds and children's language* (pp. 13-35). Berlin: M. de Gruyter.
- Cushman, F., Sheketoff, R., Wharton, S., & Carey, S. (2013). The development of intent-based moral judgment. *Cognition*, 127(1), 6-21.

- Damon, W. (1977). *The social world of the child*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Damon, W., & Killen, M. (1982). Peer interaction and the process of change in children's moral reasoning. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 28(3), 347-367.
- Danby, S. (1999). The serious business of play. In J. Mason & M. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Taking children seriously*, Proceedings of a National Workshop, 12–13 July. University of Western Sydney, Macarthur: Childhood and Youth Policy Research Unit.
- Danby, S., & Baker, C. (1998). How to be masculine in the block area. *Childhood*, 5(2), 151-175.
- Danby, S., & Theobald, M. (2012). *Disputes in everyday life: social and moral orders of children and young people*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
- Drell, M. B., & Jaswal, V. K. (2016). Making amends: Children's expectations about and responses to apologies. *Social Development*, 25(1), 742-758. [http://dx.doi: 10.1111/sode.12168](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/sode.12168)
- Drew, P. (1978). Accusations: The occasioned use of members' knowledge of 'religious geography' in describing events. *Sociology*, 12(1), 1-22.
- Drew, P. (1998). Complaints about transgressions and misconduct. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 31(3-4), 295-325.
- Dunfield, K., & Kuhlmeier, V. (2010). Intention-mediated selective helping in infancy. *Psychological Science*, 21(4), 523-527.
- Dunn, J. (1987). The beginnings of moral understanding: Development in the second year. In J. Kagan & S. Lamb (Eds.), *The emergence of morality in young children* (pp. 91-112). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Dunn, J. (1988a). Sibling influences on childhood development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 29(2), 119-127.
- Dunn, J. (1988b). *The beginnings of social understanding*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dunn, J. & Munn, P. (1986). Siblings and the development of prosocial behaviour. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 9(3), 265-284.
- Dunn, J. & Munn, P. (1987). Development of justification in disputes with mother and sibling. *Developmental Psychology*, 23(6), 791-798.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.23.6.791>
- Dunn, J. & Slomkowski, C. (1992). Conflict and the development of social understanding. In C. U. Shantz & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Conflict in child and adolescent relationships* (pp. 70-92). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1965). *The elementary forms of the religious life*. New York: Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1994). Social facts. In M. Michael & L. C. McIntyre (Eds.), *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- Duska, R. & Whelan, M. (1975). *Moral development*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Edwards, D. (1978). The sources of children's early meanings. In I. Markova (Ed.), *The Social Context of Language*, (pp. 67-85). London: Wiley
- Edwards, D. (1998). The relevant thing about her: Social identity categories in use. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (1st ed., pp. 15-33). London: Sage Publications.
- Eisenberg, A. & Garvey, C. (1981). Children's use of verbal strategies in resolving conflicts. *Discourse Processes*, 4(2), 149-170.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01638538109544512>

- Eisenberg-Berg, N., & Hand, M. (1979). The relationship of preschoolers' reasoning about prosocial moral conflicts to prosocial behaviour. *Child Development*, 50(2), 356-363.
- 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.
- Fitzgerald, R. (2012). Membership categorization analysis: Wild and promiscuous or simply the joy of Sacks? *Discourse Studies*, 14(3), 305-311.
- Fitzgerald, R., & Housley, W. (2002). Identity, categorisation and sequential organisation: The sequential and categorial flow of identity in a radio phone-in. *Discourse and Society*, 13(5), 579-602.
- Fitzgerald, R., & Housley, W. (2015). *Advances in membership categorisation analysis* (1st ed.). London: Sage.
- Fitzgerald, R., Housley, W., & Butler, C. (2009). Omnirelevance and interactional context. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 36(3), 45-64.
- Flavell, J. (1968). *The development of role-taking and communication skills in children*. New York: Wiley.
- Fletcher, P. (1985). *A child's learning of English*. Oxford, UK: B. Blackwell in association with A. Deutsch.
- Forrester, M. (2001). The embedding of the self in early interaction. *Infant and Child Development*, 10(4), 189-202.
- Forrester, M. (2002). Appropriating cultural conceptions of childhood: Participation in conversation. *Childhood-A Global Journal of Child Research*, 9, 255-276.
- Forrester, M. (2006). Projective identification and intersubjectivity. *Theory & Psychology*, 16, 783-802. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959354306070530>

- Forrester, M. (2008). The emergence of self-repair: A case study of one child during the early preschool years. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41, 99-128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08351810701691206>
- Forrester, M. (2013). Mutual adaptation in parent-child interaction. *Interaction Studies*, 14, 190-211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/is.14.2.03>
- Forrester, M. (2014). *Early social interaction: A case comparison of developmental pragmatics and psychoanalytic theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Forrester, M. (2017). Participation and engagement: Some possible challenges for research on early social interaction. *Research on Children and Social Interaction*, 1(1), 55-76.
- Forrester, M., & Reason, D. (2006). Competency and participation in acquiring a mastery of language: A reconsideration of the idea of membership. *Sociological Review*, 54, 446-466.
- Francis, D., & Hester, S. (2004). *An invitation to ethnomethodology: Language, society and interaction*. London: Sage.
- Gardner, H., & Forrester, M. (2009). *Analysing interactions in childhood*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Garrot, R., & Berard, T. (2010). Ethnomethodology and membership categorization analysis. In B. Johnstone, R. Wodak, & P. E. Kerswill (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of sociolinguistics*, (pp. 125-138).
- Garvey, C. (1984). *Children's talk*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Garvey, C., & Shantz, C. (1992). Conflict talk: Approaches to adversative discourse. In C. Shantz & W. Hartup (Eds.), *Conflict in child and adolescent development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gillis, J. (1997). *A world of their own making*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual* (1st ed.). Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Goodwin, C. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19(1), 283-307.
- Goodwin, M. (1983). Aggravated correction and disagreement in children's conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 7(6), 657-677.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(83\)90089-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(83)90089-9)
- Goodwin, M. (1998). The governance of rural areas: Some emerging research issues and agendas. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 14(1), 5-12.
- Goodwin, M. (2002). Exclusion in girls' peer groups: Ethnographic analysis of language practices on the playground. *Human Development*, 45(6), 392-415.
- Gopnik, A. (1990). Developing the idea of intentionality: Children's theories of mind. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 20(1), 89-113.
- Gordon, D. P., & Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1984). The structure of children's requests. In R. L. Schiefelbusch & J. Pickar (Eds.), *The acquisition of communicative competence* (pp. 295-322). Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Greif, E., & Gleason, J. (1980). Hi, thanks, and goodbye: More routine information. *Language in Society*, 9(02), 159-166.

- Halliday, M. (1975). *Learning how to mean; Explorations in the development of language*. London: E. Arnold.
- Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2008). How five sets of innate intuitions guide the development of many culture-specific virtues, and perhaps even modules. In P. Carruthers, S. Laurence & S. Stich (Eds.), *The innate mind, Volume 3: Foundations and the future*. (pp. 367-391). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Have, P. T. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis. A practical guide*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hepburn, A. (2004). Crying: Notes on description, transcription, and interaction. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 37(3), 251-290.
- Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2011). Designing the recipient: Managing advice resistance in institutional settings. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 74(2), 216-241.
- Heritage, J. (1978). Aspects of the flexibilities of natural language use: A reply to Phillips. *Sociology*, 12(1), 79-103.
- Heritage, J. (1984a). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1984b). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (1997). Membership categorization analysis: An introduction. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis* (pp. 1-24). Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Hester, S. & Hester, S. (2010). Conversational actions and category relations: An analysis of a children's argument. *Discourse Studies* 12(1), 33-48.

- HofHickling, A. & Wellman, H. (2001). The emergence of children's causal explanations and theories: Evidence from everyday conversation. *Developmental Psychology*, 37(5), 668-683.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1988). Moral development. In M. H. Bornstein & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Developmental psychology: An advanced textbook* (2nd ed., pp. 497-548). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Housley, W. & Fitzgerald, R. (2002). The reconsidered model of membership categorisation analysis. *Qualitative Research*, 2(1), 59-83.
- Housley, W. & Fitzgerald, R. (2009). Membership categorization, culture and norms in action. *Discourse & Society*, 20(3), 345-365.
- Hutchby, I., & O'Reilly, M. (2010). Children's participation and the familial moral order in family therapy. *Discourse Studies*, 12(1), 49-64.
- Jayyusi, L. (1984). *Categorization and the moral order* (1st ed.). Abingdon: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Jayyusi, L. (1991). Values and moral judgement. In G. Button (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology and the human sciences* (pp. 227-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. N. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 294-338). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Kant, I. (1991). *The metaphysics of morals*. (M.J. Gregor, Trans.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kant, I., & Ellington, J. W. (1993). *Grounding for the metaphysics of morals; With on a supposed right to lie because of philanthropic concerns*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.
- Katz, L. F., Kramer, L., & Gottman, J. M. (1992). Conflict and emotion in marital, sibling and peer relationships. In C. V. Shantz & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Conflict in child and adolescent development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior: Theory, research, and social issues* (pp. 31-53). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice. (Essays on moral development. Vol. 1)*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages. (Essays on moral development. Vol. 2)*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Kyrtziz, A. (2007). Using the social organizational affordances of pretend play in American preschool girls' interactions. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 40(4), 321-352.
- LeMare, L., & Krebs, D. (1983). Perspective-taking and styles of (pro) social behavior in elementary school children. *Academic Psychology Bulletin*, 5(2), 289-298.
- Locke, J. (1892). Some thoughts concerning education. In R. H. Quick (Ed.), *Locke on education* (pp. 1-236). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press
- Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol.*

4. *Socialization, personality, and social development* (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.
- MacWhinney, B. (2000). *The CHILDES Project: Tools for analysing talk. Third Edition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Main, M. & George, C. (1985). Responses of abused and disadvantaged toddlers to distress in age mates: A study in the day care setting. *Developmental Psychology*, 21(3), 407-412.
- Map of the world (2015). In *Free vectors*. Retrieved from http://all-free-download.com/free-vector/download/vector-world-map-design-graphics-set_573341.html
- Marcus, G. (2004). *The birth of the mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Maynard, D. (1985a). How children start arguments. *Language in Society*, 14(01), 1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500010915>
- Maynard, D. (1985b). On the functions of social conflict among children. *American Sociological Review*, 50(2), 207-233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2095410>
- McHoul, A., & Watson, D. R. (1984). Two axes for the analysis of “commonsense” and “formal” geographical knowledge in classroom talk. *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, 5(3), 281-302.
- Miller, M. (1986). Learning how to contradict and still pursue a common end – The ontogenesis of moral argumentation. In J. Cook-Gumperz, W. Corsaro, & J. Streeck (Eds.), *Children’s worlds and children’s language* (pp.425-478). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Morality. (2017). In *English Oxford living dictionaries*. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/morality>

- Nguyen, H. T. & Nguyen, M. T. (2017). "Am I a good boy?": Explicit membership categorization in parent-child interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 121, 25-39.
- Ochs, E. & Kremer-Sadlik, T. (2007). Introduction: Morality as family practice. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 5-10.
- Payne, M. S. (1976). Preparing for group interviews. *NA – Advances in Consumer Research*, 3(1), 434-436.
- Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral judgment of the child*. (M. Gabain, Trans.) New York: Free Press. (Original work published in 1932).
- Pincoffs, E. (1986). *Quandaries and virtues*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984a). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984b). Pursuing a response. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 152-164). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies*, 9(2-3), 219-229.
- Potter, J. (1998). Discursive social psychology: From attitudes to evaluative practices. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 9(1), 233-266.
- Reasoning. (2017). In *English Oxford living dictionaries*. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/reasoning>
- Ross, H. S. & Conant, C. L. (1992). The social structure of early conflict: Interaction, relationships, and alliances. In C. U. Shantz & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Conflict in*

- child and adolescent relationships* (pp. 153-185). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1972a). An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 21-74). New York: Rinehart & Winston.
- Sacks, H. (1972b). On the analyzability of stories by children. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 325-345). New York: Rinehart & Winston.
- Sacks, H. (1979). Hotrodder: A revolutionary category. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 7-14). New York: Irvington.
- Sacks, H. (1984a). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 21-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1984b). On doing "being ordinary". In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 413-429). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1989). Lecture twelve: Sequencing: utterances, jokes, and Questions. *Human Studies* 12(3/4), 351-361, 363-364.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversations, volumes I and II*. G. Jefferson (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on conversation* (vols. I and II). G. Jefferson (Ed.). London: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(40), 696-735.

- Schegloff, E. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70(6), 1075-1095.
- Schegloff, E. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place. In: Sudnow, D. (Ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*. (pp. 75-119). New York: Free Press.
- Schegloff, E. (1992). Introduction. In H. Sacks (Ed.), *Lectures on conversation* (Vol. 1: Fall 1964- Spring 1968). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. (2007a). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 462-482.
- Schegloff, E. (2007b). Categories in action: Person-reference and membership categorization. *Discourse Studies*, 9(4), 433-461.
- Schegloff, E. (2007c). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis, Volume I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E., & Lerner, G. (2009). Beginning to respond: *Well*-prefaced responses to *Wh*-questions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42(2), 91-115.
- Selman, R. (1971). The relation of role taking to the development of moral judgement in children. *Child Development*, 42(1), 79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1127066>
- Shakespeare, P. (1998). *Aspects of confused speech: a study of verbal interaction between confused and normal speakers*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shantz, C. U. (1987). Conflicts between children. *Child Development*, 58(2), 283-305. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1130507>
- Shantz, C. U., & Hartup, W. W. (Eds.). (1992). *Conflict in child and adolescent development*. Cambridge: University Press.

- Shaw, C., & Hepburn, A. (2013). Managing the moral implications of advice in informal interaction. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 46(4), 344-362.
- Shweder, R. A. & Much, N. C. (1987). Determinations of meaning: Discourse and moral socialization. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral development through social interaction* (pp. 197-244). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sidnell, J. (2011). The epistemics of make-believe. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada, & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The morality of knowledge in conversation* (pp. 131-155). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siegert, M. T. (1986). Adult elicited child behaviour: The paradox of measuring social competence through interviewing. In J. Cook-Gumperz, W. Corsaro, & J. Streeck (Eds.), *Children's worlds and children's language* (pp.359-376). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Siegler, R. S. & Alibali, M.W. (2005). *Children's thinking* (4th ed.). Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Smetana, J. (1989). Adolescents' and parents' reasoning about actual family conflict. *Child Development*, 60(5), 1052. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1130779>
- Smetana, J. (2013). Moral development: The social domain theory view. In P. Zelazo (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of developmental psychology*, Vol. 1: Body and Mind (pp.832-866). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smetana, J. G., & Braeges, J. L. (1990). The development of toddlers' moral and conventional judgments. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 36, 329-346.

- Smetana, J., Jambon, M., Conry-Murray, C., & Sturge-Apple, M. (2012). Reciprocal associations between young children's developing moral judgments and theory of mind. *Developmental Psychology*, 48(4), 1144-1155.
- Snow, C. (1977). The development of conversation between mothers and babies. *Journal of Child Language*, 4(01), 1-22.
- Sterponi, L. (2003). Account episodes in family discourse: The making of morality in everyday interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 5(1), 79-100.
- Sterponi, L. (2009). Accountability in family discourse: Socialization into norms and standards and negotiation of responsibility in Italian dinner conversations. *Childhood*, 16(4), 441-459.
- Stokoe, E. (2010). Gender, conversation analysis, and the anatomy of membership categorization practices. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(7), 428-438.
- Stokoe, E. (2012). Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 14(3), 277-303.
- Takada, A. (2013). Generating morality in directive sequences: Distinctive strategies for developing communicative competence in Japanese caregiver-child interactions. *Language & Communication*, 33(4), 420-438.
- Tappan, M. (2006). Moral functioning as mediated action. *Journal of Moral Education*, 35(1), 1-18.
- Tomasello, M. (2009). *Why We Cooperate*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Trivers, R., L. (1971). The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 46(1), 35-57.
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Turiel, E. (2006). Thought, emotions, and social interactional processes in moral development. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 7-36). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Watson, D. R. (1978). Categorizations, authorization and blame- negotiation in conversation. *Sociology*, 12(1), 105-113.
- Watson, R. (1997). Some general reflections on categorization and sequence in the analysis of conversation. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis* (pp. 49-76). Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Wainryb, C. & Recchia, H., E. (Eds.). (2014). *Talking about right and wrong: Parent-Child conversations as contexts for moral development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Wellman, H. (1990). *The child's theory of mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Whalen, M. (1995). Working toward play: Complexity in children's fantasy activities. *Language in Society*, 24(03), 315.
- Wilhite, M. (1983). Children's acquisition of language routines: The end-of-meal routine in Cakchiquel. *Language in Society*, 12(01), 47-64.
- Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. (2015) Outline of Relevance Theory. *HERMES - Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, 3(5), 35.
- Wolfe, D. A. (1987). *Child abuse: Implications/or child development and psychopathology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wootton, A. J (1981). Children's use of address terms. In P. French, & M. Maclure (Eds.), *Adult-child conversations* (pp. 142-158). London: Croom Helm.

Wootton, A. J. (1986). Rules in action: Orderly features of action that formulate rules.

In J. Cook-Gumperz, W. Corsaro, & J. Streeck (Eds.), *Children's worlds and children's language* (pp. 147-168). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wootton, A. J. (1997). *Interaction and the development of mind*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Wright, C. & Bartsch, K. (2008). Portraits of early moral sensibility in two children's

everyday conversations. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 54(1), 56-85.

Appendices

Appendix I: Electronic diary back-up screen shot

	Date	Place	Background	Name	Utterance	Comments
1						
2	3/26/2012	London, UK	Milly holds a toy snail and drags it across the carpet talking to Mum and Nanny		I don't want to leave any 'trags'. We say 'trags' in English.	Word construction: trag (Sr)=trail
3	3/26/2012	London, UK	Milly was upset with her younger brother's (baby) crying and said to Mum		I can't wait for Milly to grow up and once he does, I will put a sign up: No more babies(0.3)	Realisation/Humour
4	3/27/2012	London, UK	While playing with some face masks Milly said to her Nanny		Let's put our 'maskes' on.	Word construction: maske (Sr,p)=masks
5	3/27/2012	London, UK	On our way to the hairdresser Milly said to Mum		Why are we going to the 'frizer'?	Word construction: frizer (Sr)=hairdresser/freezer (En)
6	11/20/2012	London, UK	Milly overheard her Nanny saying that she wanted to go to Manchester to a concert		Why are you going to another city?	
7			Nanny was trying to avoid telling Milly that she would be leaving her.		I'm just going to buy something and I'll come back.	
8					I don't just go to another city to BUY something! Why are you going to another city?	Realisation/Humour.
9	5/5/2013	Singapore	While in the swimming pool Milly asked her Serbian/English speaking friend.		Are you allergic to 'ornuts'?	Word construction: orasti (Sr)=walnuts/orrnuts
10	7/6/2013	Belgrade, SR	Mum was in her Belgrade apartment and she phoned the grandparents' house to speak to Milly who was there.		Milly what are you doing?	
11			Later on in the same conversation Mum asked Milly again:		I am just growing up!	Humour/Realisation
12			Milly beginning to speak Serbian having spent some time at his grandparents' home		How are you Milly, what are you doing, tell me?	
13					I am getting bigger!	
14	7/20/2013	OC, SR	Baba inserts Tom & Jerry cartoon DVD for the children to watch.		Pa to nije Tom i Jerry.	
15			DVD starts to play.		Jeste.	
16					Sad je Tom i Jerry.	This was the first sentence in Sr Alex produced since July 2012. Up to then I
17	7/20/2013	OC, SR	While getting ready for a shower baba asks Milly:		Milly, sta je ovo? (pointing at his willy)	
18					Milly (1.0) Milly has a 'pipa'.	Kica and pipa=willy and noony (colloqial)
19	7/20/2013	OC, SR	Deda lifts Milly up over the entrance gate to look onto the street.		Sta vidis Milly?	Code switching
20					Ja mogu da vidim 'bander'.	Word construction: bandera (Sr)=lamp post
21					Deda ti ces da me 'slagas'.	Word construction: slagati(s)=to lie/slagas instead of slazes(2nd pers.sing)
22	7/30/2013	OC, SR	Baba is calling Milly to come over.		Ajde dodji kod mene Milly.	
23					Pa neću ja sam 'dodjela' kod tebe.	dosla/dosao/dodji=come>dodjela
24	8/13/2013	OC, SR	Milly and Milly want to draw. Milly grabs a notepad and says:		I'll 'cep' a piece of paper for you.	Word construction: cepati (Sr,inf)=to tear
25	8/20/2013	Singapore	Milly was running around our living room. He stumbled and fell on the floor and hit his foot/toe. He started to cry saying:		Jao, jao. Ne mogu da (0.3), ne mogu da 'walkam'	hodam (Sr, 1st pers.sing.)=walk/walk+am
26						
27	8/21/2013	Singapore	Looking at our turtle in the aquarium.		Sta je turtle colour?	Instead of 'Koje je boje komjaca?' /direct translation from En 'What is the co
28	9/12/2013	Singapore	As Mum was putting Milly and Milly to bed, Mum said to Milly how her English teacher will be coming the next day at 5 for her lesson (Friday). Mum forgot that Milly already had her lesson and Milly reminded her of that:		Ona je dodjela vec.	instead of 'Ona je vec bila/dosla', direct transl. from En (She has come/been
29					A, vec je bila?	'Already' at the end of the utterance is commonly used in Singlish.)
30					Da.	
31						
32						
33	1/18/2013	Singapore	Milly pick up a wrapped present and said:		Ko je ovo za?	Instead of 'Za koga je ovo?' /direct transl. from En 'Who is this for?'
34	9/19/2013	Singapore	Mum was telling Milly and Milly a story in Serbian about the woodcutter		Gde je on dosao od?	Structural convergence
35			lived alone in the woods when Milly asked:		Kako to mislis Milly?	Instead of 'Odakle je on?' Meaning 'who gave birth to him?'
36			Mum asks for clarification:		Pa, ja sam dosla od tebe, gde je on dosao od?	Instead of 'Pa ti si mene rodila a ko je njega rodio?' /direct transl. from En '
37					Otkud ti ova igračka?	Structural Convergence
38	9/20/2013	Singapore	Milly is playing with a new toy. Mum asks:		Od dugo sam to kupila.	Instead of 'Odavno sam to kupila.' /split inf. or from 'A long time ago'
39						Structural convergence
40	9/26/2013	Singapore	Milly was telling Mum how when he went to the toilet at school, his teacher wiped his bottom but not properly.		Mummy, when I had a poo at school and the teacher did not wipe me 'rightly'.	Word construction: 'rightly'
41					Mummy, they were going 'slower' than me!	Word construction: 'slower'
42	9/28/2013	Singapore	Milly was telling Mum how his friends were going down the slide at school.		Mummy, I don't like my life.	
43	10/14/2013	Singapore	While Mum was putting Milly to bed she came close to Mum and whispered in her ear.			

Appendix II: Excel transcription annotations screen shot

Adding of additional rows and columns

Filtering options for convenient searching of specific participant's turns

Search option for a particular token within an utterance

Line number insertion and ordering

Well Ice-cream should be (0.4) freezing cold yes.

	A	B	C	D	E
1	Mia	You can't, cause it's meant to be cold? (.) right?			
2	Tina	[* yach*			
3	Luke	No you do:n't?			
4	Mia	↑ Yes you do. Mummy tell us -can you eat it when it's cold or when it's hot.			
5	Mum	Ice-cream?			
6	Mia	Yah.			
7	Mum	Well Ice-cream should be (0.4) freezing cold yes.			
8	Mia	↑ See:: it's cold.			
9	Mum	But you also have -ah (0.1) aaah dry ice-cream			
10	Luke	[but (0.2) but ice-cream (0.2) but but			
11	Mia	[↑ A:			
12	Mum	[have you ever tried [it? (0.1) astronauts eat dry ice-cream (.) [in space.			
13	Mia	Ha? [↑ No:::]			Looking at Tina
14	Luke	but cold (.) but but we ca' but but they have co:ld ↑ ice-cre:::am			
15	Mia	Not funny at all right?			
16	Tina	You are joking.			
17	Mia	Yeah not funny at all.			
18	Luke	I am not ↑ jo::king			
19	Mia	[And it's not even funny (.) right			
20	Tina	[* yach*			
21	Luke	[↑ I'm I am not going to [talk to you::			
22	Mia	[Mummy see: I also have a eraser see: -you just open the lid and erase			
23	Mum	Can you erase my (.) colourful.			
24	Mia	*Ok* it's good that I bring eraser oops			
25	Luke	And it's good I bring a telescope.			
26	-0.5				Car engine roars
27	Luke	[↑ Wow.			
28	Mia	[And this is a little box where I keep my eraser (.) it's erased (.)			
29	Mum	Thanks			
30	Mia	U::h			
31	-0.5				

Sheet1 Sheet2 Sheet3 +

Sheet numbers allow access to multiple transcripts

Appendix III: Calendar(s) language(s) exposure log(s) for years 2012-2016

Calendar(s) language(s) exposure log for year 2012

Calendar(s) language(s) exposure log for year 2013

Calendar(s) language(s) exposure log for year 2014

Calendar(s) language(s) exposure log for year 2015

Calendar(s) language(s) exposure log for year 2016

Appendix IV: Recording and data storage devices

Appendix V: CA transcription notations and symbols

These conventions were originally devised by Gail Jefferson (Jefferson, 2004); (See also Hepburn, 2004; Atkinson and Heritage, 1984); My own symbols* were also used.

.	The period denotes a falling intonation, not necessarily the end of a sentence
,	The comma denotes 'continuing' intonation, not necessarily a clause boundary
:	Colons denote stretching of the preceding sound, proportional to the number of colons
-	A hyphen after a word or a part of a word indicates a cut-off or self-interruption
?	The question mark denotes rising intonation, not necessarily a question
<u>word</u>	Underlining denotes some form of stress or emphasis on the underlined item
WOrd	Upper case denotes loudness
° °	Degree signs denote segments of talk that are markedly quiet or soft-spoken
> <	The combination of right and left pointing angled brackets symbols denotes that the talk between them is compressed or rushed
< >	The combination of left and right pointing angled brackets symbols denotes that a stretch of talk is markedly slow
=	An equals sign denotes no break or delay between the words it

	connects
(())	Double parentheses describe participants' conduct
(word)	When all or part of an utterance is in parentheses, this denotes uncertainty on the transcriber's part
()	Empty parentheses denote an entirely inaudible stretch of talk
(0.2)	Numbers in parentheses measure silences in tenths of a second
(.)	A dot in parentheses denotes a 'micropause', ordinarily less than two-tenths of a second
[	Separate left square brackets, one above the other on two successive lines with utterances by different speakers, denote onset of a point of conversational overlap
hh	The letter 'h' denotes audible aspiration.
	An upright line indicates the start of the multimodal behaviour description in line with talk, such as gaze, body posture, etc.; not necessarily describing participant's conduct, for which (()) are used
Huh or Hah Or (h)	Laughter or infiltrated laughter within words marked with an (h)
➔	Arrow indicates the phenomenon within a sequence
↑	Arrow pointing upwards indicates sudden intonation rise or high pitch
%	Crying or sobbing sound, usually throughout the entire utterance
~	Wobbly voice
÷	*Muffled voice
≡	*The Schwa sound, loud.

♪	*Singing or singing voice.
#	*Angry voice.
§	*Screaming or screaming voice

Appendix VI: ‘Really’, Praat screen shot

Appendix VII: ‘We always have to listen to you and you never listen to us’, Praat screen shot

List of Tables

Table 1

Piaget’s Stages of Moral Development

Table 2**Kohlberg's Six Stages of Moral Development**

I Pre-Conventional level	<i>Stage 1</i> The punishment and obedience orientation (Avoidance of punishment)	<i>Stage 2</i> The instrumental relativist orientation (Reciprocity /A matter of "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours" and not of loyalty or justice)
II Conventional level	<i>Stage 3</i> The interpersonal concordance of "good boy-nice girl" orientation (Maintaining the expectations of an individual or a group, one earns approval by being nice)	<i>Stage 4</i> The law and order orientation (Showing respect for authority and doing one's duty)
III Post-Conventional level, Autonomous/Principled level	<i>Stage 5</i> The social-contract legalistic orientation (Right actions are defined in terms of general individual rights and agreed on by ones' society)	<i>Stage 6</i> The universal-ethical-principle orientation (Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accordance with self-selected individual's ethical principles.

List of Figures

- 1 The two main participants of the study, Luke and Mia
-

2 Other participants in the study

Name (<i>Pseudonym</i>) in the transcript	Other names/labels used within the transcript	Role, languages spoken and place of residence
MIA	Sister, seka, sestra	Target child; English, Serbian, Chinese (acquiring); Singapore
LUKE	Brother, bata, brat	Target child; English, Serbian, Chinese (acquiring); Singapore
MUM	Mummy, Mama, Mamica, Ana	Mother of the children; English, Serbian, Greek; Singapore
DAD	Daddy, Tata, Tatica, Peter	Father of the children; English, Greek; Singapore
LISA	Helper, Aunt	Family Helper; Tagalog, English; Singapore
BABA	Grandmother, Grandma, Babica, Baka	Maternal grandmother; Serbian; Serbia
DEDA	Grandfather, Grandpa, Dedic, Deka	Maternal grandfather; Serbian; Serbia
YAYA	Grandmother, Gradma	Paternal grandmother; English, Greek; Greece
PAPOU	Grandfather, Grandpa	Paternal grandfather; English, Yiddish, German; USA
BOBBY	Uncle Baki, Ujka	Maternal Uncle; Serbian, English; UK
MAT	Uncle Mat	Paternal Uncle; English; Greek; USA
TINA	Tina	Friend and neighbour of the children; English, Chinese; Singapore
ANNA	Cousin, sestra, seka	Maternal second cousin, Serbian; Serbia
YVONNE	Tetka, Jovana, Aunt Yvonne	Maternal first cousin, Serbian, English; Serbia
DR	Dr Robertson, Doctor, Paediatrician	Children's Paediatrician; English; Singapore

● English, UK ● Serbian, Serbia ● Chinese ● Greek, Greece ● Tagalog ● Yiddish ● German ● Singapore ● USA

3 Overview of the languages and settings of the participants

4 Average percentage(s) of exposure to specific languages

	2012.	2013.	2014.	2015.	2016.	12/13/14/15/16
English	56,3%	65,8%	59,1%	53,2%	53,2%	57,5%
Serbian	30,6%	30,9%	25,2%	14,3%	14,3%	23,0%
Greek	13,1%	0%	3,2%	3,9%	3,9%	4,8%
Chinese	0%	4,3%	9,8%	14,3%	14,3%	8,5%
Tagalog	0%	0%	2,7%	14,3%	14,3%	5,7%