Child language data collection has changed rapidly, due both to methodological innovations and to technology. Psycholinguistic child language methods began with the invention of standard comprehension and elicitation frames that could extend researchers' observations of children's knowledge beyond what they were able to produce in more natural interactional exchanges. These methods differed from traditional normative psychometrics because they were not focused on "right" or "wrong" answers but on discovering the child's linguistic constructs. Brown (1957), for example, asked children to match a picture to a nonsense word in various syntactic frames. Berko's (1958) WUG study became the most widely known of the first standardized elicitation in this new vein of research.

Technological changes also led to method changes. From note-taking by linguists listening to children, which led to brilliant results, to wax cylinders, wire recording, tape recording, digital and video recording,
and wireless transmission, the data available for accurate transcriptions have shifted rapidly. Whereas the wax cylinder forced an artificial exchange between adult and child, the wireless transmitter allows researchers to transcribe children at play in natural environments even with no adult present. Each of these changes has made possible new views of children's talk.

Two advances in studies since the 1960s have heightened pressure to develop more situation-sensitive speech collection methods in the study of children. The first is the evidence from sociolinguistic research on adolescent and adult speech that the setting and activity context, the topics, the addressee, and the audience heavily influence the properties of language, raising issues about the type of sampling of the child's speech. The second is a new focus in child language studies on linguistic socialization, pragmatic development itself, and context of speaking as enabling and altering many aspects of language development.

CONTEXT OF SPEECH SITUATION

At the same time as changes in methods and technology were taking place in the study of child language, dialectologists and sociolinguists were going through these developments too. Hymes (1962) had a highly influential proposal concerning the variety of factors in the situation of speech that can alter speech itself, a proposal I fleshed out with examples from my own and other's research (Ervin, 1964) and Cazden (1970) connected to the study of child language. Earlier work on the naturalistic observation of children by Barker and Wright (1954) had made it clear that settings had a powerful effect on "standing behavior patterns" of children and, hence, on their speech.

Methodological changes were also coming to linguistics. Although dialectologists at first kept meticulous hand transcriptions of the lexical and phonetic features they elicited by various methods in interviews, Labov (1966) used a tape recorder and a systematic probability sample of speakers. He noticed that people do not always speak in the same way, and he argued that this was especially the case when there is a superposed variety in contact with a vernacular. He found that when people "monitor" speech they tend to move toward the superposed variety. In this view, the chief factor influencing linguistic variables in a single speaker is attention paid to speech. Labov was a leader in establishing the quantitative study of linguistic variation, showing that many features of language, although perceived to be categorial, are empirically variable. This innovation allowed systematic study of subtle effects of contextual changes on linguistic features.

Labov's solution to finding the most vernacular style during a sociolinguistic interview involved two innovations. One was to build into his adult data collection new techniques for eliciting spontaneous speech that he hoped would be unmonitored, by eliciting danger-of-death narratives and childhood rhymes. He paid attention to the "channel cues" such as rapid speech that might show a reduction in monitoring, and he was attentive to serendipitous events such as phone calls and sudden visitors that might precipitate casual vernacular speech. The other innovation was the style cline. This was studied using systematic eliciting methods, with these vernacular events at one end, and interviews, reading, and specifically contrasted items to highlight the features being considered. His clines in variables such as post-vocalic r according to these contextual conditions are well known. However, it was not always easy, even with the "channel cues," to separate monitored from casual vernacular speech.

In the late 1960s, under the influence of the pioneering methodology used by Gumperz (1966), Labov (1972) changed his data collection methods while working with adolescents:

We focus upon natural groups as the best possible solution to the observer's paradox: the problem of observing how people speak when they are not being observed. The natural interaction of peers can overshadow the effects of observation, and help us approach the goal of capturing the vernacular of every-day life in which the minimum of attention is paid to speech. This is the most systematic level of linguistic behavior and of greatest interest to the linguist who wants to explain the structure and evolution of language. (p. 256)

Rickford and McNair-Knox (1994) emphasized going beyond the formal-informal cline, systematically examining changes in speech with interlocutor and topic. They trace these ideas to the methods used by Labov (1972) and by Blom and Gumperz (1972), which manipulated who was present and, sometimes, what topics were taken up.

---

2 Is adult speech a superposed variety to children? I once asked a child who had just said he brang it if there was another way to say that. Yeah, adults say brought, but kids say brang. Her reply did not privilege one or the other as a better way, but presented them as different group varieties. We know from role play that children notice such small differences.
CONVERSATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Why should we as researchers observe peer interaction in children? We may study conversational data from children for a wide range of goals—to examine phonetic shifts in informal speech, syntactic features brought in for different interactional functions, topical concerns, and larger issues of child pragmatics or child discourse development. Peer interaction shows us how children provide structure to talk when they are on their own. In play and in conversations, children deploy what they know about syntax and sound variation to accomplish a great variety of speech acts, and children integrate them into cohesive exchanges and larger sequences such as role play, narratives, joking, and arguing. With peers they control the timing and the topic; and if adults do not interfere, they display their own means of dealing with conflict. With studies of peer interaction, we clearly have much more access to the features of talk that are aspects of child culture transmitted from child to child.

FACTORS AFFECTING NATURAL CONVERSATION

What is a good conversation? In our highly verbal society we think of good conversation as animated, lively, fast paced, with participation by many. We can tell when something is not working in face-to-face conversations when there are noticeably long lags between turns, rhythmic disruptions, lack of response to first turns, and little topical follow-up. The criteria of a good conversation are culturally variable after a certain age. We do know that the conversational attributes vary with setting, partner, and witnesses, as well as with activity, task, or topic, so to set the scene for a good conversation we must attend to these attributes.

A methodological handbook prepared by a Berkeley working group (Slobin, 1967) advocated collecting "100 lines of natural conversation." My colleagues and I gave no advice as to how this might be done. For many years, it was the custom to get data for child grammar or mean length of utterance (MLU) estimates by sending in a researcher with a tape recorder to talk with the child until 200 turns occurred, often in an unfamiliar setting. Another method was to instruct a parent to carry on a conversation.

13. CONVERSATION: NATURAL PEER INTERACTION

What is peculiar about such data? Adult elicitating brings to bear at least four factors that can potentially alter the nature of data: (a) the familiarity of the interlocutor, (b) the adult as a social category leading to speech changes by the child, (c) the eliciting style of the adult, and (d) the model of language provided by the speaker. These factors can lead to special types of responses and alter both the formal and functional attributes of speech. Familiarity is known to cause change in language features, as illustrated by the morphological shifts found by Fischer (1958) between -ing and -in as children got to know him. Almost any form of talk that children engage in is adjusted when the partner is a child rather than an adult. Shatz and Gelman (1973) showed that children as young as age 4 were sensitive to addressee in systematic ways that affected the deployment of syntactic features such as subordination.

In studying children's discourse practices, conversations with peers give the best evidence of what children do with the features of discourse without modeling or scaffolding by adults. In naturalistic telephone conversations of preschool children, I found that in adult-child dyads the adult usually controlled topics and timing. In child-child dyads there could be long silences while one participant went off to do something else, then coming back to report, and there might be protracted misunderstandings and startling topic shifts. These features would not have been apparent if only adult-child interaction was studied.

Adult eliciting of child speech can also lead to a special style, including the "elicitation question" noted by Corsaro (1977) and by Blount (1972). My students have observed similar questions in speech to animals in a zoo, although with less response. It is obvious that elicitation questions produce data that are functionally and syntactically special.

Recording Under Natural Conditions

Equipment. Obtaining excellent data for analysis requires high quality microphones and stereo recording devices. In the analysis of conversation, loss of any segments can seriously compromise the study of continuity and conversational structure. Equipment is undergoing rapid and constant improvement. A major goal is to get a high quality

---

3In many languages, familiarity can cause altered speech forms. In Korean, the epistemic particle -er that refers to shared knowledge is more often used with a familiar addressee by children and may be hard for a stranger to elicit.
Research on young children's interaction usually requires radio transmitters, because they allow children to move freely yet yield a high fidelity audio record. Labov noted that even sotto voce speech could be captured by an individual lavaliere microphone attached to a transmitter. In many of my own conversational studies since 1972, each speaker carries a transmitter. I have even successfully taped children playing jump-rope, so I know the equipment is versatile for use during activity (Ervin-Tripp 1986).

There is a wide range of flat and lightweight wireless microphones available for making high quality recordings. The battery pack is usually quite small, about the size of a pack of cards, and is either pinned on the child, put in a pocket of a vest or apron worn by the child, or put in a small pouch-type pack that is strapped on the child. There is typically a short stringlike antenna that must be free for the equipment to work properly. The receiver can be in another room. Each receiver is connected by line separately to the input jack of a channel of a stereo recorder. It can also be used as input to a camcorder, of course. The transmitter must have a power indicator and an on/off switch that can be taped to prevent the child from turning it off. Between uses it is desirable to disable the batteries, because a battery failure can mean loss of data.

This equipment is designed for media performers, and in some cases there are receivers that can receive input from more than two transmitters, but it is important that the receiver be configured to separate rather than mix the voices. At the time of purchase, the supplier makes sure that the transmission is on separate wave lengths and checks the wave lengths in particular regions to avoid radio interference. In some countries there are regulations regarding private use of radio transmission. The transmitters are of low strength, rather like a cordless telephone, or else they would not be safe to carry on the body.

Rampton (1991) used radio transmitters in his work on linguistically heterogeneous adolescent peer groups:

It is often hard to know how much recordings of recreation have been affected by the wearing of radio microphones. Informants were normally given these on three or four consecutive days in the expectation that their novelty would need time to wear off, ... and the fact that episodes were played back to informants made it easier to decide whether or not they gave a fair picture of normal practice. (p. 393)
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In a pinch, in a limited space when the transmitters are in repair, high quality monophonic Electret condenser microphones can be distributed at different locations again for separate input to different channels. However, the distance from the speaker's mouth gives these lower signal-to-noise than the transmitter system does.

After the microphone-transmitter is turned on at the beginning of the episode, a way should be found for each child to give a name, so that the transcriber can identify the voice qualities and the channel for each participant. The separate channel for each voice allows either (a) the use of a balance control on the playback device, or (b) listening to the input to each ear when using earphones so as to identify the speaker for each turn by figuring out which channel is loudest.

For certain circumstances, such as telephone taping, an attachment from a phone receiver to a high quality tape recorder serves well. The recording field is changing rapidly. Many researchers find digital recorders are lightweight and provide data that can be used as input for computer sound analysis or linked to a transcript and played back at meetings from portable computers. There is a recommendation to copy to analog form for backup storage and for transcription from foot-pedal analog transcription devices, but for recording purposes DAT is superior to cassettes. At present, analog reel-to-reel or CD is the best archiving format, because digital recordings degrade in 15 to 20 years.

Video-recording is possible with young children in settings where there is a camera fixed too high for children's access or placed behind a window. Whether it is possible to do this without inhibiting talk, I have not ascertained. Video is of course necessary whenever activity is an essential component, as in Goodwin (1998) or in our work on directives of children (Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1985), in which we videotaped children with friends and family. In these cases, children were not alone and the researcher was noticeable.

We have found it prudent when videotaping to have a simultaneous audiotape recorder, from which we make the audio transcripts using foot-pedal transcription machines. There are multichannel courtroom transcription machines; most office transcribers are monaural, losing the advantage of the multiple voiced input from the transmitters.

Transcription. The usual estimate for time to transcribe an audiotaped conversation adequately in normal orthography rather than phonetic script is on the order of 20 times the time of the recording. Our
transcription practices were described by Gumperz and Berenz (1993). Where languages other than English comprise the text, or where code switching occurs, we add for each text line (t-line) a morpheme gloss (m-line) and a free translation into English (e-line). These lines are superposed so that they can be compared—for example, to identify markers and syntactic features at codeswitches.

The reason for choosing this transcription format is that it is well designed to preserve the most important conversational interaction features on the text line in computers, including stress and intonation, overlap features, vocal and stylistic characteristics, and timing, and it is very easy to read. Normally, it is necessary to use Courier font to keep superposed lines and overlapped segments in the same position. These transcription features are present in some of the transcripts that follow in this chapter.

RESEARCH ON PEER INTERACTIONS

Observer’s Paradox

Can the researcher be present at a family dinner without affecting talk? Can a person observe a couple talking and have no effect? Both adults and children can become involved in activities and forget or “background” the presence of another, but researchers too often presuppose that talk is the same with and without observation. The effect of an observer on children’s talk is probably different at each stage of development, because complex notions of what might be the attitude of the other to the self develop gradually. If children value privacy, the ethics of research require the child’s permission to tape. The hope is that children will acclimate to the presence of the microphone, as Rampton hoped they would to the camera. Because of this problem, in working with grade school children my colleagues and I either remove all adults from the room or put them apparently out of earshot.

The familiarity of the participants in talk is likely to have many effects on interaction. In adult talk it has been found that the discourse markers used are different, with more pragmatic markers used with friends and more semantic markers used with strangers (Redeker, 1990). It is not known how early this effect appears. The content of talk is changed by shared knowledge, including both “common knowledge” references and the use of metaphoric speech.

In the case of children, my colleagues and I have found that close friends or mutually selected dyads produce the most fluent conversations without external stimuli. This is presumably because they share the most common referential and emotional bases for talk and are well tuned to the cues given by the other.

Setting

A new setting alters the energy for talk. Settings may have strong demand characteristics or convey talk-related cultural pressures (e.g., for silence or shouting); they cannot be considered neutral. A room with toys has strong demand characteristics for a young child. Some toys lend themselves to talk, others to solitary play. In our research, we have found that minimizing objects is conducive to conversation as a time-filler and reduces the risk that all talk will be about objects. Positioning of the children can also affect talk; for example, wings on car seats reduce children’s conversation.

An adult comparison can be found in Soskin and John’s (1963) early experiment on the radio transmission of the natural conversation of a newlywed couple at a resort. The talk in places such as rowboats and craft shops was primarily directive and explanatory; the talk while eating or in a waiting line was much more wide-ranging in topical variety.

Language

If bilingual speakers are told, or believe, that only one of their languages is appropriate to a setting or audience, they may be prevented from using the language or style most congruent with their conversational partner. For this reason, my students use a code-switching style in the introductory segments of research with bilingual children, to open up for them the option to use either language.

---

4 Graves and Glick (1978) showed that American mothers in a waiting room used more baby talk with children when they believed they were being observed.

5 Elena Escalera in our lab found that the seats accounted for reduction in talk.
Activity/Task/Topic

The activity that is ongoing during the collection of talk samples has a profound effect on the talk that occurs. In the Soskin and John study (1963), rowing was conducive to imperatives. If "pure talk" that is based on conversational interaction rather than on directives, description, narrative retellings, or other task-related genres is sought, it is necessary to discover the circumstances under which conversation is the sole activity of children.

A fertile site for the study of the activity of conversation is the waiting room. Martin Lampert, Ilana Reyes, and I used this as a strategy in several studies of elementary school children, summarized by Lampert:

To organized groups for study, we asked the second- and fifth-grade children to nominate the friends with whom they would like to do a science project. On the basis of their nominations, we then assigned the children to groups of two and three children each, and on selected days, we invited a different group to eat lunch in an activity room located at their school, and afterwards to participate in a brief chemistry experiment. . . .

On their assigned day, groups brought their lunches to the activity room where a research assistant met and invited them to eat their lunch at a table with microphones attached to a ceiling lamp overhead. The researcher . . . then left the room under the pretext of having to prepare for the science experiment and returned 20 minutes later to conduct the experiment with the children. We recorded the children's talk while they ate their lunch and while they participated in the science experiment (Lampert, 1996, p. 591).

PEER CONVERSATIONS IN DIFFERENT SETTINGS

Phone calls

Children can learn before age 2 the external conventions of telephone use and have been heard teaching these conventions to immigrant children (Ervin-Tripp, 1981). In the following example, the children have no adult scaffolding to solve various problems that arise. Marko, age 3;6, and Sonia, age 3;3, are old friends.

6 The notation used here is for overlaps, <3> for a 3 second silence, == for fast response latching, [[feature]] for scope of feature, * for contrastive stress, :: for normal stress, ::: for sound prolongation, ... for silences, and (xxx) for inaudible segments.

Marko does not listen for feedback during his long narrative composed of expressive meows, and he ignores Sonia's attempts to interrupt him. She finally tells him the conversational rules explicitly in line 19.

13. CONVERSATION: NATURAL PEER INTERACTION

(1) Phone conversation

1 M: = you want a um = <3> what? = i mean know what? =
2 S: = what are you = doing, Marko? = what are you doing? =
3 M: (screaming) you know what?
4 M: you know what happened last = night? =
5 S: = what are = you doing now?

This phone conversation between friends provides many examples of telephone norms known to children. Instead of "how are you," the most common child-child initiator is "what are you doing?" Because Marko and Sonia speak simultaneously, each deploying a topic initiator, they do not hear each other even though Marko screams in line 3.

6 M: um uh y'know what happened last night? there was a
7 M: there was a cat. = we saw a cat =
8 S: = what are you doing now? =
9 M: (long narrative mostly expressive meows)
10 = because = um uh th = e oth =
11 S: = Marko =
12 M: = Marko =
13 M: our kitty hit the oth = er = ca = t = and went.
14 M: [(crying tone] crying all the way home].
15 th = e ba-ti=e = bnd c = -i-t.
16 S: = Marko =
17 S: Marko, don't no no. no.
18 M: what?
19 S: i can't talk to you if you talk to me. Marko.

Marko does not listen for feedback during his long narrative composed of expressive meows, and he ignores Sonia's attempts to interrupt him. She finally tells him the conversational rules explicitly in line 19.

20 M: why don't you tell your mother that, 'kay? = OK? = OK? = OK? =
21 S: = no. =
22 S: = no., = Marko... = bye, Marko. = (hangs up)
23 M: = OK? = ..then tell = Sally? that = and tell her what I uh
24 M: tell um your Daddy.

Ervin-Tripp Telephone Corpus (06-03-2)

7Sally is unknown to Sonia.
Until the end, Marko is oblivious to the indicators that Sonia does not like his story. A phone conversation a year later when Marko is 4;5 and Sonia is 4;2 shows far more elaborate and subtle collaboration on interaction. The contrast is a striking illustration of many dimensions of pragmatic development.

Phone conversation

1 M: [(singing) do adoodoodiodoo] hey Sonia.
2 S: <1.1> hoi Marko.
3 M: <2> do you have a different kind of
4 M: do you have a different swing?
5 S: <1.2> again a bully ring?
6 M: do you have a different **si::wing?
7 S: <1.2> no.
8 M: you didn’t have any swing? all right

In line 1, Marko uses an attention getting method, hey + name, showing advancement beyond hey alone typical of younger children (Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1985). In line 6 he repairs a misunderstanding by slow, stressed articulation, and in line 8 he confirms Sonia’s reply.

9 M: bye by::e. <4.2> hi Sonia.
10 S: hi Marko.
11 M: [(laughing) i’m just kidding].
12 hey hey Sonia. didn’t you hear me say bye-bye?
13 S: <2.5> no, i didn’t say bye-bye.
14 M: i-i said bye-bye. i-i just **trickling you.

Here a playful tone that was evident in the sound play in lines 1 and 2 is taken up in a mock speech act in line 9 that was not successful, so in line 12 Marko checks on why it failed, again using an effective attention-getter. He lexicalizes what he was doing by naming his speech act in lines 11 and 14, suggesting some metapragmatic skill.

In the next section each child spins off on a separate theme, with Marko drawing in his breath as he struggles to put together a new invention. What he does is common at this age; he makes a creative permutation on shared cultural material from Mother Goose, which leads into the longer section following in which another playful permutation is presented. Sonia is as inattentive to him as he is to her and indicates her new departure with nonsense word play for the next few moments.

25 M: Miss Muffet was eating her {{laughing}} Christmas pie.)
26 M: (giggles)
27 S: {{high voice} = baba ba ba= babab = baq} =
28 M: Ja = ck and Ji- = here = here here here =
29 S: = Marko =
30 M: = here’s = Jack and Jill. {{sings} = Jack and- hey Ja =
31 S: = ta dada ta da dao =
32 M: {{sings} hey Ja=} hey Sonia, this is Jack and Jill.
33 M: {{sings} Jack and Jill went up the hill
34 M: to get a pail of water:down he came and
35 M: {{laughing} up he came and down he came}
36 M: the ladder, {{singing} and den he’s under wa::ter}.

In line 27–31 the two children overlap, until Marko grabs the floor with an attention call and succeeds in holding the floor for the next five lines with a more elaborate attempt at a new version of a familiar nursery song, with a new rhyming of water with ladder, and a new image of what happened with water.

40 M: ya know what (xxx)
41 S: Jack and Jill went up the hill to {{hi} fetch a pail of
42 water}. Jack fell down and Ja- and Jill was out the . . .
43 ha huh (giggles)
44 M: {{singing} Jack and Jill went up the hill to g-}
45 i’m gonna write the lines. Jack, and Jill,
46 went **up the hill, to **get a pail of **wa::**ter.
47 then down he he—then up he came
48 {{laughing} with Sonia in the pa::lor.} hehhehehe

By line 41 Sonia joins in to invent new variations on the Jack and Jill story, and Marko after bringing in the writing notion (he seems to have pencil and paper at hand) produces the ultimate performer ploy by including Sonia in the story.

Although it cannot be said that the children collaborate in the production of each new version, they each get pleasure out of sharing the game of invention on similar themes. What is striking in seeing the change in Marko is that even though he still tries to get the floor and perform, he displays more varied methods and more awareness of the listener in a variety of ways. This is a good demonstration of pragmatic development.
within the genres of natural play. It illustrates as well the kind of creative play drawn from literature read to children, which young boys and girls develop and appreciate on their own.

Role Play With Play Objects

More familiar are examples of unsolicited child role play that occurs spontaneously when children play with certain materials. In the situation that follows, a brother and sister and friend use a tennis racket as a crutch and set up roles.

(3) Doctor–patient play of 4 to 5-year-olds

1 K: pretend there's something wrong with my leg, my leg—
2 K: let's pretend that i tell you that my leg’s—um—
3 K: let's pretend i tell you— first, you operate on it.

This is the voice of the director, setting up a narrative line for the role play. The first line contains a directive; the rest is couched (as is often found in girls' speech) as a shared suggestion.

4 K: um, but before you operate on it,
5 K: let me tell you something, okay nurse?

Here a contrastive pragmatic marker halts the action directed in line 3 for the insertion of a narrative. Stories about injuries are common, so this is a standard context for an account (Ervin-Tripp & Kuntay, 1997.) The director's voice switches either in the middle of line 3 or the beginning of line 4 to the voice of the actor enacting the role. This role includes addressing the nurse. Role names are common as address terms in role play, perhaps helping anchor the typicality of roles more than personal names would.

6 J: um, 'kay.
7 K: um, when I was walking down the street,
8 K: i saw this piece of glass and i picked it up,
9 K: then i didn’t see too well, then it goes way up to here.

This is a characteristic narrative, starting with the setting of a place for the event, using a durative verb for backgrounding information in a temporal clause. This contrast in verb types is apparent from the beginning of temporal clauses before age 3 (Ervin-Tripp & Bocaz, 1989).

10 K: see now. it's—now it's over there.
11 K: can you—can you operate on it, nurse?
12 A: i can.
13 K: can you not—i said—um—
14 K: somebody has to operate on on on

Ervin-Tripp Family Transcripts: Bowyer

Lines 10 to 14 illustrate children's skill by this age in mitigating requests appropriately according to addressee. In this case a mitigated conventional request is addressed to the nurse, but apparently she remains in role in making an indirect request in line 14, which does not return to her director's voice in deciding who will do the operation. Role play is particularly rich in displaying a wide variety of pragmatic skills, here unsupported by adult direction.

Waiting Room Role Play

(4) Courtroom play of 10-year-old girls

1 E: i'll be the *jury, here. i'll be the *jury.
2 L: this court will *now *come *to *order. [laugh]
3 E: yeah.. let's do that..okay?
4 E: but then you gotta think about it *okay?
5 E: you'll be the judge.. *okay?
6 L: okay.

The two girls have no problem understanding the frame for the role play, which is as familiar to them (presumably from TV) as doctor play is for the 4-year-olds. They decide on a rape theme.

37 L: you may take your seat now. [laugh]
38 L: this case will now come to order. [laugh]
39 L: you may make your opening statement.
40 E: your honor.. my first
41 E: my first defense will be the witness . . .

At this point the girls shift from legalese into a vivid and protracted description of a sexual encounter, modified by the "judge's" insistence, while laughing, on courtroom proprieties and language.

8Jill's age was 4.4. Kit and Jill's brother Andy were 5 years old.
E: Mary.. can you tell us what absolutely happened?
56 E: (hi) well.. um.. i was at home
57 E: and i was feeling lonely and i...
58 L: ==what did you do *[fast] *rape that *[man?]* [laugh]
59 E: *[hi] and i wanted my boyfriend to come
60 E: and i didn’t think he would force me to have *[sex
61 E: with him so i told him *[no.]*
62 L: *sshhh.* *[no. you cannot use that word in this court.]*
63 L: *[laugh]
64 E: *[hi]*he wanted to do the wild thing.*
65 L: *[laugh]
66 E: *[hi]*but i said i didn’t want to.. i was married.
67 E: he slapped me and he punched me in my face.)*
68 E: *[mock crying]*

The role-playing victim not only uses highpitched voice but a flapped /r/ in “married.” The “judge” is laughing most of the time.

81 L: well.. why are you pressing charges for rape? [laugh]
82 E: 2<2>he.. uh.. he.. *yeah. he *forced me to.
83 L: he forced you but-
84 L: but that is called *[sexual]* harassment.
85 L: but did you press charges for that?
86 E: yes.
87 L: *[no. you pressed charges for rape.*
88 L: which he did *[not *do so.* [laugh]*

UC Berkeley Disc Lab L.5.19.5

To summarize this chapter: in school age children especially, who are more tuned to audience than are toddlers, the study of discourse development and sociolinguistic variation requires developing ways to access peer and sibling talk without adult presence. As these uncensored examples show, peer talk gives us un scaffould and often surprising evidence of what is on the minds of young people, what types of linguistic and pragmalinguistic skills they have developed, and what their models of language are.
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