

Building power asymmetries in girls' interaction

Marjorie Harness Goodwin

Discourse Society 2002 13: 715

DOI: 10.1177/0957926502013006752

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://das.sagepub.com/content/13/6/715>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Discourse & Society* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://das.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://das.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://das.sagepub.com/content/13/6/715.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Nov 1, 2002

[What is This?](#)

Building power asymmetries in girls' interaction



Discourse & Society
 Copyright © 2002
 SAGE Publications
 (London,
 Thousand Oaks, CA
 and New Delhi)
 Vol 13(6): 715–730
 [0957-9265
 (200211) 13:6;
 715–730; 027752]

MARJORIE HARNESS GOODWIN
 UCLA

ABSTRACT. This study, based on three years of ethnographic research (and over 60 hours of videotaped interaction) in a Southern California elementary school, investigates how enduring asymmetrical relationships among females in a multicultural peer group are built in moment-to-moment interaction. By exploring how relations of power, based on forms of opposition, bullying, and exclusion, are both built interactively and commented upon in female groups, I call into question the generalizability of accounts of female same-sex talk which focus exclusively on cooperative or polite interactive practices. I employ both ethnographically grounded observations and the methodology of conversation analysis to analyze practices for building power asymmetry in naturally occurring same-sex female talk during play and at lunch.

KEY WORDS: *bullying, children's social organization, conversation analysis, dispute, gender and language, peer socialization, peer victimization*

Introduction

For over three decades, the work of feminist conversation analysts has demonstrated concern with issues of power asymmetries in interaction and with developing political commentary. For example, studies of language and gender have documented relations of dominance (de Francisco, 1998; Fishman, 1978; West, 1979) in male–female interaction and how patriarchy is constituted in moment-to-moment cross-sex interaction (Davis, 1988). As yet, however, few studies have examined how relations of power are constituted in all-female interaction. Perhaps because of a lingering dualistic association of female interaction with cooperative interaction among ‘difference’ theorists¹ we have tended to associate relations of power with all-male or male–female interaction.²

Most models of female interaction, based on white middle class participants, have proposed that male speakers are socialized into a competitive style of

discourse, whereas women are socialized into a more cooperative style of speech (Coates, 1994: 72). Maltz and Borker (1982) propose that the gender segregation that girls and boys experience results not only in differing activities which are the focus of their worlds, but also alternative ways of speaking; girls' collaborative talk is said to contrast with boys' competitive talk. Females learn to value relational closeness and avoid relationship-threatening types of criticism. Maltz and Borker's arguments have been updated in Mulac et al.'s (2001) psychological experiments that find 'men's language is relatively *direct, succinct, and instrumental*, whereas women's style is *indirect, elaborate and affective*' (2001: 128). Barnes and Vangelisti (1995: 354) argue that mitigation in female talk expresses female concerns for 'affiliation, reciprocity, and efforts to protect others' face.' Similarly, Tannen (1998: 436) argues that females are more likely to be indirect than males, preferring to reach agreement through negotiation because this allows a display of solidarity 'which women prefer to the display of power.' In this article, I examine how asymmetrical relations of power in same-sex female interactions are co-constructed by looking at: (i) initiating moves which are treated as socially imposing (as attempts to position oneself above another), (ii) next moves to first pair parts of adjacency pairs which are formulated as face-threatening moves, and (iii) commentary on moves of social imposition. By exploring how relations of power are both built interactively and commented upon in female groups I wish to call into question the generalizability of accounts of female same-sex talk which focus on cooperative (Coates, 1994, 1997; Maltz and Borker, 1982) or polite (Holmes, 1995) interactive practices. I also wish to contribute to studies of girls' 'relational aggression' (Crick and Grotpeter, 1995). Psychologists (e.g., Bjorkqvist et al., 1992; Crick and Grotpeter, 1995; Juvonen et al., 2001) have typically used questionnaires and surveys to study forms of aggression, treated as an internal psychological state. Instead, by examining the actual exchanges that constitute forms of bullying or exclusion I wish to examine the interactive processes through which girls delineate asymmetrical relations of power.

Methodology and fieldwork

Conversation analysis (CA) provides a powerful methodology for documenting how people position themselves relative to each other in their moment-to-moment conversation. By examining the sequential organization of the stream of talk-in-interaction (Sacks et al., 1974), as well as the affective alignments towards talk that participants provide (Goodwin and Goodwin, 2000) we can investigate how participants display for each other the meaningfulness of a prior action. By examining actual instances of negotiated interaction, we can document the processes through which social organization of any social group is built, and hopefully avoid perpetuating essentialist generalizations about gender roles which have permeated the literature on language and gender (Bergvall et al., 1996; Freed, 1995).

Arguing from a perspective quite different from that of cultural feminists, in a

recent article Schegloff (1997: 182), with an argument consistent with Sacks (1984), contends that social categories such as male and female should not be imposed by the analyst on materials under investigation; rather through analysis of conversational activities we ought to investigate the 'forms of conduct by which persons . . . display and invoke participants' orientations to features of the interactional context' which index aspects of identity. In tune with arguments made by Schegloff (1997: 166), Stokoe (2000: 556) and Kitzinger (2000: 170) state that rather than uncritically linking particular patterns to gender, or presuming an a priori set of categories, we instead need to attend to the meanings, interpretations, and understandings of the participants themselves observable in the data. Hopper and LeBaron (1998) and Stokoe (2000: 558–9), for example, examine how gender categorization is made explicit in conversational exchanges. Kitzinger (2000: 188), in her study of 'doing coming out', examines women as active agents and 'as participants in the social world, rather than simply as victims of hetero-patriarchal structures.'

McHoul (1998: 230) has argued that CA can address issues important for researchers concerned with the dynamics of power; however, researchers need to locate inequities in actual conversations rather than assuming that power is an inherent property of particular social roles. To investigate how asymmetry is built in interaction I examine sequences organized through one of the most basic forms of conversational social organization: adjacency pairs (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973): two utterances, adjacently placed, produced by different speakers with a relative ordering of parts. Participants display to each other their analysis of a prior action without researchers applying their own categories to the data.

In accomplishing children's social organization, directive/response sequences constitute the primary way that children organize their play with one another. Directives can be formatted either in either highly mitigated or aggravated ways (Labov and Fanshel, 1977). In their discussions of adult conversations, Labov and Fanshell (1977: 84) argue that 'in all discussions of discourse, analysts take into account the subject's desire to mitigate or modify his expression to avoid creating offense'.

Goodwin (1990: 75–108) has analyzed how children can build either symmetrical or asymmetrical relationships in their play. Among African American working class boys aged 9–14 engaged in a task activity, making slingshots, certain patterns are salient. The turns of those who position themselves above others within the boys' group are not built through mitigated action. Instead they utilize bald imperatives, pejorative address terms, insults, accounts that index arbitrary needs and desires of the speaker rather than requirements of the group, and explanations that allude to the speaker's ultimate control. Boys who position themselves as leaders issue directives formulated as direct commands, though they receive indirect requests from others. They contradict proposals and requests of others while expecting and getting compliance to their own. Finally, boys in power can usurp the turn space of others without sanction. Directives and

responses to them affirm and ratify who has the right to make decisions about various optional ways that the game can be played.

Analyzing the activity of cross-sex jump rope among a group of fourth grade girls and boys of mixed ethnicities in a Southern California elementary school, Goodwin (2001) found similar patterns of asymmetry. At the start of the cycle of jump roping, girls were the more proficient players. Girls issued directives and responded to boys' requests to play in ways that demonstrated their control of the activity, for example, accompanying their refusals to requests to play with accounts indexing arbitrary reasons for the boys' exclusion. The girls told the boys what the ground rules were when asked if they could play. The girls stated in no uncertain terms that particular moves had to be made by the boys if they wanted to play with the girls. An asymmetrical situation of power developed in which the rules invoked by girls for boys as mandatory, were ignored by the very girls who articulated their obligatory nature. However, when the boys became more proficient over a month's time, and were no longer in a position of subordination with respect to girls, the forms of speech actions they invoked to construct social identities became more like the girls' forms. Rather than being sex-linked, features of language use were closely related to one's achieved position in a specific context.³

The work reported in this article examines how asymmetrical relationships that endure over time are built in moment-to-moment interaction. It is based on three years of research in the Southern California elementary school. I observed a number of different third through sixth grade children's groups at recess and in class, in all over 30 children. In order to understand the ebb and flow of children's activities in some depth, such as how talk at one point of time influenced subsequent social processes, I focused on a core group of girls of mixed ethnicities and classmates who interacted with them. These girls regularly ate lunch and played together. I observed the group over a three-year period as they passed from fourth to sixth grade, audiotaping and videotaping their interaction with one another; 60 hours of videotape and 20 hours of audiotape form the corpus of the study. The composition of the group was somewhat fluid, depending on who was available for lunch on any particular day. During the fourth grade members of the group included two Japanese American middle class girls, two Caucasian girls, one middle class and one working class girl, an African American middle class girl, and a South Asian middle class girl, who was in the fifth grade. Most of the girls had attended the school since kindergarten, and were considered the most popular girls at the school.

Ethnographically based studies of naturally occurring interaction in the life-world of a particular group permit us to view the range of diverse types of social organization which are possible for that group (Goodwin, 1990, 2001; Kyratzis, 2002; Ochs, 1992). Stereotypes about women's speech fall apart when talk within the fullest array of activities is examined. In constructing social personae appropriate to the events of the moment, the same individuals articulate talk differently as they move from one activity to another (Goodwin, 1988) or become

more skilled in a particular task (Goodwin, 2001). Among the core group of fourth graders I observed not only were cooperative forms of interaction observable in the social organization of talk at lunch or in the orchestration of games; in addition, competitive and exclusionary forms were present as well.

Power asymmetry between older and younger girls

Early work in conversation analysis was concerned with the preference organization of agreements, showing how they are basic to sociality (Silverman, 1998: 160). Conversation analysts have found that in polite adult conversation disagreement is a dispreferred activity (Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks, 1987), marked through such practices as delay of an action within a turn or across a sequence of turns, the qualification or prefacing of an action, mitigation, and accounts.

Such forms are noticeably absent in the conversations of working class African American Maple Street children in Philadelphia (Goodwin, 1990), which more typically displayed a preference for disagreement than agreement. Through oppositional talk children created miniature versions of 'character contests' (Goffman, 1967: 254), enabling them to realign the social organization of the moment. In interactions among older and younger girls' in the multicultural Southern California group in the present study similar patterns were observable. Fourth grade girls were frequently taunted by some of the sixth graders. Sixth graders felt free to jump into a game of rope that fourth grade girls had organized without asking. At lunch, they often insulted members of the fourth grade girls' group by calling them names and tried to entangle them in he-said-she-said disputes with age-mates. A particular example of the power moves by an older girl and the counter-responses of younger girls to such moves will be considered in some detail.

Dionne, a sixth grader, not only invaded the younger girls' play and eating space; in addition she would attempt to confiscate the fourth grade girls' food from their lunch boxes. In the following sequence, we can see rounds of attempts by Dionne to place herself in a position of power and the responses of younger girls to such moves. The fourth graders treat Dionne's observably invasive comments and territorial intrusions as violations.

- (1) ((Dionne approaches a group of five fourth graders who are seated eating lunch. She asks where one of their group members is.))
- | | | |
|---|---------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Dionne: | <u>Where's</u> Aretha. |
| 2 | Janis: | She's- |
| 3 | Lonnie: | In the <u>art</u> room. |
| | | [|
| 4 | Janis: | <u>At-</u> |
| 5 | Janis: | the art room. |
| 6 | Lisa: | <u>Why</u> . |
| | | [|
| 7 | Dionne: | Don't talk to <u>me</u> Janis. |

- 8 Dionne: Can I see what you have in your lunch?
9 (0.6) ((reaching into Lisa's lunch bag))
- 10 Lisa: °Mm hm.°
- 11 Dionne: Oh my go:sh.
12 Can I have this? ((taking drink bottle from Lisa))
[
- 13 Sarah: ((collusive mouth wrinkle toward Janis)
- 14 Lisa: No.((taking bottle back))
- 15 Dionne: You smell.
- 16 Dionne: Okay.=What do you have in your lunch.
17 ((looking in Lonnie's empty lunch box))
- 18 Sarah: Dionne you're such a big bully.
- 19 Dionne: Did you see us-
20 that milk commercial last night?
21 (1.5)
- 22 Dionne: Do you watch tv?
[
- 23 Sarah: ((eyes look down))
24 Yes. I do. ((raising eyes))
25 °But I couldn't leave it on for the milk commercial.°
- 26 Dionne: °I'm sorry Sarah.° ((bends over putting hands on knees))
- 27 Sarah: °Hmph.° ((nodding two small nods)) Now go!
28 ((extends arm, and points towards another part of playground))
- 29 Sherry: eh heh heh heh!
[
- 30 Lisa: hnh hnh hnh hnh!
- 31 Janis: GO BACK TO YOUR- ((palm opens, points to Dionne))
32 Janis: ((extends arm and points towards the direction Sarah had previously))
- 33 Dionne: SHUT UP JANIS.
[
- 34 Janis: (°over there°.)
- 35 Dionne: I don't like talking to you any more.
- 36 Sarah: Eh uhm ((throat clear))
[
- 37 Janis: (° °)
- 38 Dionne: After what you said lastertime when y-
39 yesterday-
40 last week.
[
- 41 Sarah: EH UHM! ((stands up, facing Dionne, spreading arms out as a road block))
42
- 43 Dionne: Sarah, ((stands up, extending arms with palms up))
44 [eh heh heh heh
- 45 Sherry: [eh heh heh!
- 46 Dionne: And nobody here has a good lunch. ((hands on hips))
[

- 47 Lonnie: ((stands up spreading hands imitating Sarah's roadblock))
 48 Dionne: And where's Aretha.

Power is observable in the ways that Dionne physically intrudes into the girls' space, attempts to take their food, delivers a personalized insult (l. 15), and initiates topic shifts that index her status (ll. 19–20) when she is refused food. The girls treat these actions as objectionable in several ways: (i) They address Dionne with a negative person descriptor (Goodwin, 1990: 84–85) in l. 18. (ii) They speak to her with bald imperatives (ll. 27, 31–32), the most face-threatening type of directive (Brown and Levinson, 1978; Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Goodwin, 1990) and gestures signaling their opposition in response to her moves – telling her to leave.

Commonly, when someone initiates interaction s/he provides a first pair part in a greeting, a form of 'supportive interchange' (Goffman, 1971). However, alternatively, as argued by Sacks (1995b: 159), 'one can think of the tactics in the greeting sequence as possible ways to, e.g., control, who gets a first chance to raise a "first topic"'. When Dionne initially approaches the girls, she avoids any of the conventional ways of bracketing entry into an interaction; she begins the interaction with 'Where's Aretha'. Dionne uses a highly aggravated question form, demanding rather than requesting information about one of the group members. Moreover, she provides no warrant for why she is asking this information.

Differentiated responses follow. Two of the girls respond immediately to Dionne's question with an answer, overlapping one another (ll. 3–4), whereas Lisa, a girl who herself challenges others' argumentative mores, responds to Dionne's question with her own question: 'Why:' Providing an answer to a question is one possible trajectory in question/answer adjacency pair sequences, whereas another is the initiation of an insertion sequence (Schegloff, 1972) following the question. Insertion questions treat a question as something requiring more information before it can be addressed. Lisa makes explicit that the initial question posed to the group is one requiring some explanation.

A next series of questions and moves is constructed in oppositional ways as well. In overlap with Lisa's 'Why:' Dionne asks Lisa 'Can I see what you have in your lunch?' as she reaches into Lisa's lunchbag (ll. 8–9). The fact that the question is accompanied by reaching makes it more than a simple request for information. The action that occurs here is visibly an intrusion into someone's 'territory of the self' (Goffman, 1971: 28–61). Lisa's first response to Dionne's invasive action is a whispered '°Mm mm.°' (l. 10). However, when Dionne takes Lisa's drink bottle as she states 'Can I have this?' Lisa responds with a more emphatic negation: 'No.' and reclaims the bottle (l. 14). Sarah, an onlooker to the scene, responds silently and nonvocally with a collusive wrinkle of her mouth towards Janis (l. 13).

Dionne has attempted to build within the interaction a specific slot (Sacks, 1995a: 308) in which the issue of whether or not Lisa will acquiesce to demands

from her can be publicly witnessed. When Dionne is unsuccessful in this attempt, she initiates a dramatic topic shift: a personal insult: 'You smell.' Though Dionne's move shifts topic, it does not shift addressee: it is sequentially relevant in that it sustains the pattern of moves of opposition towards Lisa, moves which position her as subordinate to Dionne. Such types of shifts in frame are useful strategies in children's arguments following refusals (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1990: 95–8).

Dionne's next move is to shift addressee, moving to a next recipient (Lonnie) in her 'round' (Sacks, 1995a: 292–5) of questioning and invasions of lunch boxes. She brackets her move to a new recipient with the word 'Okay': 'Okay. What do you have in your lunch' (l. 16). As we saw with the last request for food, recipients have available various responses, alternative ways of expressing 'no' or commenting through a collusive facial gesture. Here, however, the next move following these intrusive moves by Dionne is an explicit commentary on Dionne's behavior. Sarah categorizes the activity as a form of intrusion – and more explicitly, as a form of domination by using a negative person descriptor, 'big bully,' in her statement 'Dionne you're such a big bully' (l. 18).

Accusations generally make relevant a denial or some type of counter move by their recipients (Goodwin, 1990: 240–1). However, rather than addressing this charge Dionne responds to her addressee by once again radically shifting topic while keeping the floor alive for putdowns and implicit comparisons between herself and the other girls. She asks a question that indexes her identity as an actress in commercials: 'Did you see us – that milk commercial last night?' As none of the other girls are actresses (though they aspire to be them) her question serves to make topically relevant her status vis-à-vis the younger girls. In response to Dionne's question Sarah remains silent and refuses to enter into this new topic. Several moves later Sarah delivers a bald imperative which emphatically affirms her position with respect to Dionne's moves: she states 'Now go!' (l. 27) extending her arm and pointing to a far area of the playground. Other girls evaluate Sarah's bold moves with laughter; Janis, piggybacking (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1990: 101–7) on Sarah's action, states 'GO BACK TO YOUR-' and points where Dionne should go (l. 31). Directives that instruct an interlocutor to leave are perhaps the baldest or most 'aggravated' (Labov and Fanshel, 1977: 84) of all possible directives issued among the girls. Dionne clearly treats Sarah's imperative move as oppositional; she responds to her with a bald, insulting 'SHUT UP JANIS. I don't like talking to you any more. After what you said lastertime when y- yesterday-last week.' in ll. 33–35. For her next move Sarah stands up, spreads her arms out to her side constructing with her body a roadblock. (l. 41) Her action is mimicked by Lonnie and the fourth grade girls laugh at these baldly produced actions.

Relations of power between an older girl and younger girls are negotiated in this sequence. The younger girls provide several moves which are responsive to Dionne's physical invasion of their space and personal insult: the negative person descriptor 'big bully,' the bald imperatives 'GO BACK TO YOUR-' and 'Now go!' as well as the physical actions of pointing to where Dionne should go and making

one's body into a roadblock. Such moves clearly display that the younger girls treat Dionne's actions as moves of domination.

Building asymmetrical relationships in the fourth grade girls' group

While crafting their social relations through talk during play children delineate the boundaries of their group. Children can select ways of interacting that do not treat peers as co-equals. Forms of exclusion were quite evident in the clique with respect to their interactions with a 'tagalong' – a person defined in terms of her efforts to affiliate to a particular group without being accepted by the group. Across a range of different activities including games, ritual insult exchanges, and during lunchtime conversations girls construct a girl named Angela, a working class, physically developed African American girl, as deviant and marginal to the group. In ritual insult sequences which Angela initiates, girls respond with personal insults, depicting her as poor, receiving Welfare assistance, being incapable of eventually getting a job in the future, unable to afford braces for straight teeth, being overweight, having cooties, and without friends.

Angela's status as someone who is not a fully ratified member of the group is explicitly commented on by the girls in the clique as well as by Angela herself. In the following as Angela describes her position relative to others in the group the girls provide an explicit categorization of her and then ask her to ratify this categorization, eliciting from Angela a public confession that she is a 'tag-along.' The following occurs while Angela, Sarah, and Aretha are sitting together after they have been excluded from a baseball game with the boys.

- (2)
- 1 Angela: [I mean like- you guys are like-
- 2 I don't judge anybody because you guys know,
- 3 that like I just, you know, follow you guys. ((*shoulder*
moves in time with words))
- 4 wherever you guys go, but um,
- 5 Sarah: [You're like a tag. You tag along. ((*left palm extended*
with arm bent towards Angela))
- 6 Basically- Angela tags along.=
- 7 Angela: [So,
- 8 Sarah: That's it.=right?
- 9 Angela: So li ke- Yeah. ((*shoulder shrug*))
- 10 Sarah: [Right Angela? Admit it. eh heh heh!
- 11 Angela: Yeah like- whatever.
- 12 Sarah: [ADMIT IT ANGELA!
- 13 Sarah: ADMIT IT! ((*extends arms palm up to Angela*))
- [

- 14 Angela: OKAY! ((*leaning towards Sarah*))
 15 Sarah: Say it. 'You:: (.) are:: (.) I: am a: (.) '
 ((*using hands as if conducting on each beat,*
then extends hands palm up towards Angela
as if asking her to complete the utterance))
 16 Angela: I'M A TAG-ALONG °girl°! ((*jerks body in direction of*
Sarah))
 (0.4)
 17 Sarah: Good girl! eh heh!

In this encounter, Angela (ll. 1–4) describes her position as someone who doesn't enter into group by 'judging' others but merely follows other girls. Sarah (ll. 5–6) then reformulates Angela's talk with a metacommentary on Angela's status in the group with her utterance: 'You're like a tag. You tag along.' Rather than accepting Angela's bid for inclusion, Sarah (ll. 10, 12) next asks Angela to publicly confess her position: 'ADMIT IT ANGELA!' When Angela agrees with 'Yeah' (ll. 9 and 11) and 'OKAY!' (l. 14), this is not treated as adequate. Sarah subsequently provides the explicit frame Angela needs to repeat (l. 15), prompting her with a rhythmically conducted and delivered 'Say it. 'You:: (.) are:: (.) I: am a: (.)'. In this degradation ritual Angela is allowed no role distance from the marginalized identity she is asked to assume as she states 'I'M A TAG-ALONG °girl°!' (l. 16) and Sarah places herself in the position of evaluating Angela's performance (l. 17) with 'Good girl!' using an intonation contour similar to one might use to praise a dog.

Angela's marginal status is evident also in games such as baseball, basketball, and jump rope, where each occasion of play provides opportunities for delineating who is inside or outside of the social circle of friends. The following sequence occurs in the midst of a jump rope contest between fourth grade girls and boys. Angela had played on and off with both boys' and girls' groups for a month and was known to be an accomplished jumper. In fact, once when she jumped with the boys they had exclaimed, 'That was our best ever.' In example 3 below a few minutes earlier Angela had been the person who initiated the suggestion for a contest between the boys and girls. However, she is explicitly told that she is not going to be part of the team:

- (3)
 1 Ron: Who's on the team.
 You, you, you ((*pointing*))
 2 Aretha: Emi and Lonnie.
 3 Lisa: She's NOT. ((*referring to Angela*))
 4 Ron: I know. So get her out of here.
 5 Lisa: Angela go out. You're not in this.
 6 Angela: Yes I am.
 7 Lisa: No you're not!
 8 Angela: If- if you guys can be in it then I can.
 9 Lisa: No you're not.
 10 Angela: Well I'm not leaving the rope.

- 11 Malcolm: Look. There's a jump rope right there!
 12 Lisa: We'll go tell on you then.
 13 Angela: Tell!

Here both girls (ll. 2, 3, 5, 7) and boys (l. 4) explicitly exclude Angela from their play. They issue what has been described as the baldest (Brown and Levinson, 1978) of all possible forms of directives to her – direct imperatives telling her to leave the group: 'So get her out of here.' (l. 4); 'Angela go out.' (l. 5). They state explicitly that she is not included: 'You're not in this.' (l. 5) Angela does not, however, leave the group. Rather than displaying a preference for agreement through delays before disagreements or making use of prefaces that mitigate disagreement, as occurs in polite adult conversation, here children actively display opposition and sustain it across several turns, tying closely to prior turns. They employ strategies similar to those of working class African American (Goodwin, 1990) and Latina (Goodwin, 1998) children. Through polarity markers (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 178), contrastive stress (Ladd, 1980: 78) on 'substitutions' or 'replacements of one item in a sentence with another having a similar structural function' (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 146), and accounts she opposes those who exclude her. She shapes her refusal turn so as to highlight opposition, and positions a marker of polarity (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 178) or opposition smack in the beginning of her turn – 'Yes I am.' – to mark contrast with the part of the prior utterance arguing that she is not included (l. 6). She further highlights opposition through the use of stress on 'am' to provide a substitution for the part of the utterance with which she is disagreeing: 'You're not in this.' (l. 5). In response, Lisa produces a turn making use of similar strategies; she baldly refutes Angela's turn, substituting the word 'No' for 'yes' and the phrase 'you're not' for 'am' and using stress on the negatives 'No' and 'not.' In her next rebuttals Angela provides an account: 'If- if you guys can be in it then I can.' (l. 8) and 'Well I'm not leaving the rope' (l. 10). When the cycle of moves and counter moves is unsuccessful in getting rid of Angela, Lisa escalates the dispute by saying she's going to inform on Angela to one of the playground aides: 'We'll go tell on you then.' This move, however, proves to be ineffective in threatening Angela, as she responds 'Tell!', daring them to carry out their threat, refusing to move.

On other occasions, however, Angela physically leaves the group rather than having to deal with the ways in which she is treated in ritually offensive ways. In the following as the girls are seated having lunch Angela approaches them:

- (4)
 Ruth: Hi Angela! Bye Angela! ((*raising right hand, palm toward Angela*))
 Lisa: Shoo shoo:!
 ((*Angela walks away*))

Goffman (1971: 62) argues that ritual is a perfunctory conventionalized act through which an individual portrays his respect and regard for some object of ultimate value. Greetings and farewells provide ritual brackets around a spate of

joint activity (1971: 79). In example 4 as Angela approaches a group of girls seated on the ground eating lunch, Ruth provides a greeting 'Hi Angela!' produced with a ritualized raised hand. This is followed immediately by a farewell – 'Bye Angela!' – with no intervening conversation. The rituals of greeting and farewell here are not intended to bracket activity or affirm the presence of the approaching party through forms of basic sociality; rather they dismiss her. A next utterance piggybacks onto Ruth's actions: 'Shoo shoo:::!' Such an action resembles those used by persons in a position of superiority with respect to younger children, pets, or pests they want to get rid of. Angela interprets the move as dismissive and walks away. With examples 2–4, across a range of speech activities, girls construct Angela as a marginal member of their group through highlighting rather than mitigating disagreement. Indeed, in children's social organization we find forms of social organization that contrast with those forms that have been argued to be the cornerstone of polite adult as well as female talk.

Conclusion

While most studies of asymmetries of power have focused analysis on interaction in male or mixed-sex groups, in this article I have examined forms of domination with respect to girls' groups. Extended arguments, as in examples 1 and 3, demonstrate how girls negotiate attempts at domination rather than agreement. The examples of an older girl invading fourth girls' lunch space (example 1) and same fourth grade girls attempting to exclude and bully a tag-along girl (examples 2–4), demonstrate anything but the cooperative, polite behavior often identified with females. Example 2 exhibits the performance of a degradation ritual in which Angela is compelled by her fourth grade cohort to publicly confess her soiled identity – her 'tag-along' status. In example 3, when asked to leave the game she herself has called into being, she resists the bald imperatives and threats girls issue to her; however, in example 4 we see how the girls' ritual defilement of Angela results in her departure from the group. From a repertoire of possible ways of using directives, the girls negotiating power select forms that index 'rudeness' (Beebe, 1997) rather than civility. Rude activity is oriented towards by participants who are targets as ritually offensive in their own next moves, not only through talk but also through nonvocal actions, such as leaving the scene.

Recent studies of middle class white male identity construction (Edley and Wetherell, 1995) and 'the language of youth subcultures' (Widdicombe and Woffitt, 1995), studies that make use of transcribed conversations, have been based largely on interview data, interaction between the research subjects and the researcher. Instead, my strategy has been to investigate how participants in interaction constitute their identities for each other in the midst of ongoing interaction. As argued by Sacks (1995a: 27) 'the trouble with [ethnography based on interviewing] is that they're using informants; that is, they're asking questions of their subjects. That means that they're studying the categories that Members use, to be sure, except at this point they are not investigating their categories by

attempting to find them in the *activities* in which they're employed' (emphasis mine). As I have argued elsewhere (Goodwin, 1997: 112), rather than accepting reports as instances of the events they describe, social science researchers need to seriously investigate the process of reporting itself as a situated conversational activity. Like Moerman (1988) I find that extended ethnographic fieldwork in a setting, where one observes what takes place in the interaction of participants without the ethnographer's intervention into the talk, permits us the best starting point for seeing how talk unfolds in the everyday events of people's lives.

In this article I have examined how a group of girls conduct talk-in-interaction as recipients and producers of relations of inequality. In keeping with Sacks' (1984: 22) call for focusing on the mundane practices for achieving social organization, rather than relying on the explanatory categories of culture (Moerman and Sacks, 1971: 3), I have looked at adjacency pair sequences (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973), examining turn-by-turn negotiation of oppositional moves across a range of speech activities. My data demonstrate a preference for disagreement rather than a preference for agreement and an orientation towards sustaining opposition. The larger patterns of power and domination that constitute the concerns of critical discourse analysis can be examined in my data; they also constitute the major concerns of participants in the interactions, as is made visible through how participants respond to their invocation. By bringing to my analysis sustained ethnographic observation I can position specific interactions in the past history of interactions within the girls' group to examine social process.

Flax (1990) has cautioned that we need to avoid seeing women as totally innocent, acted upon beings; such a perspective prevents us from seeing the ways in which some women have and do exert power over others. Studying conflicts across an array of contexts allows the ethnographer to document how social order is both constrained by relations of power and resisted. Conversation analysis, with its close attention to the sequential ordering and co-production of interactive turns provides useful tools for documenting how people build a range of forms of social order.

Rather than postulating that domination exists solely in interactions within the male/female domain, and remaining silent about the darker side of female interactions of exclusion, researchers need to explore the full complement of behaviors that women are capable of producing. In particular, if we want to create environments in which children are not subject to acts of micro-aggression, bullying, or peer victimization, we need to acknowledge what takes place during children's ordinary peer activities, rather than ignoring it; then we can think creatively about ways of fostering environments in which tolerance rather than ridicule colors the ethos of children's play.

NOTES

1. See Cameron (1998) and Bucholtz (1999) for a differentiation of deficit, dominance, and difference views of gender relations.
2. While researchers concerned with dominance relations seek to avoid the essentialist

explanations often present in deficit and difference views. Stokoe (2000: 554) notes they can unwittingly perpetuate dichotomized notions of male and female practices 'blending a constructionist stance with cultural (essentialist) feminism.'

3. O'Barr and Atkins' (1980) study of language use in an American trial courtroom found that variation in women's language features (hedges, polite forms, tag questions, empty adjectives, intonational emphasis on emphatic *so* or *very*) may be related more to social powerlessness or relatively little previous experience in the courtroom setting than to sex.

REFERENCES

- Barnes, M.K. and Vangelisti, A.L. (1995) 'Speaking in a Double-Voice: Role-Making as Influence in Preschoolers' Fantasy Play Situations', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28: 351–89.
- Beebe, L.M. (1997) 'Rude Awakenings: Ways of Responding to Rudeness', *Pragmatics and Language Learning* 8: 1–35.
- Bergvall, V.L., Bing, J.M. and Freed, A.F. (eds) (1996) *Rethinking Language and Gender Research: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman.
- Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspertz, K. and Kaukainen, M.J. (1992) 'Do Girls Manipulate and Boys Fight? Developmental Trends in Regard to Direct and Indirect Aggression', *Aggressive Behavior* 18: 117–27.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S.C. (1978) 'Universals of Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena', in E.N. Goody (ed.) *Questions and Politeness Strategies in Social Interaction*, pp. 56–310. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. (1999) 'Why Be Normal?: Language and Identity Practices in a Community of Nerd Girls', *Language in Society* 28: 203–23.
- Cameron, D. (1998) 'Why Is Language a Feminist Issue?', in D. Cameron (ed.) *The Feminist Critique of Language*, pp. 1–20. New York: Routledge.
- Coates, J. (1994) 'The Language of the Professions: Discourse and Career', in J. Evetts (ed.) *Women and Career: Themes and Issues in Advanced Industrial Societies*, pp. 72–86. London: Longman.
- Coates, J. (1997) 'Women's Friendships, Women's Talk', in R. Wodak (ed.) *Gender and Discourse*, pp. 245–62. London: Sage.
- Crick, N. and Grotpeter, J.K. (1995) 'Relational Aggression, Gender, and Social-Psychological Adjustment', *Child Development* 66: 710–22.
- Davis, K. (1988) 'Paternalism Under the Microscope', in A.D. Todd and S. Fisher (eds) *Gender and Discourse: The Power of Talk*, pp. 19–54. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- de Francisco, V. (1998) 'The Sounds of Silence: How Men Silence Women in Marital Relations', in J. Coates (ed.) *Language and Gender*, pp. 176–84. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Edley, N. and Wetherell, M. (1995) *Men in Perspective: Practice, Power and Identity*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice-Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976) '"Is Sybil There?": The Structure of Some American English Directives', *Language in Society* 5: 25–67.
- Fishman, P. (1978) 'Interaction: The Work Women Do', *Social Problems* 25: 397–406.
- Flax, J. (1990) *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Freed, A.F. (1995) 'Language and Gender: Review Essay', in W. Grabe (ed.) *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face to Face Behavior*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

- Goffman, E. (1971) *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goodwin, C. and Goodwin, M.H. (1990) 'Interstitial Argument', in A. Grimshaw (ed.) *Conflict Talk*, pp. 85–117. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, M.H. (1988) 'Cooperation and Competition Across Girls' Play Activities', in S. Fisher and A. Todd (eds) *Gender and Discourse: The Power of Talk*, pp. 55–94. Norwood NJ: Ablex.
- Goodwin, M.H. (1990) *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organization among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, M.H. (1997) 'Toward Families of Stories in Context', *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7: 107–12.
- Goodwin, M.H. (1998) 'Games of Stance: Conflict and Footing in Hopscotch', in S.M. Hyle and C. Templer Adger (eds) *Kids' Talk: Strategic Language Use in Later Childhood*, pp. 23–46. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goodwin, M.H. (2001) 'Organizing Participation in Cross-Sex Jump Rope: Situating Gender Differences within Longitudinal Studies of Activities', *Research on Language and Social Interaction. Special issue: Gender Construction in Children's Interactions: A Cultural Perspective* 34(1): 75–106.
- Goodwin, M.H. and Goodwin, C. (2000) 'Emotion within Situated Activity', in N. Budwig, I.C. Uzgiris and J.V. Wertsch (eds) *Communication: An Arena of Development*, pp. 33–54. Stamford CT: Ablex.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Holmes, J. (1995) *Women, Men, and Politeness*. London: Longman.
- Hopper, R. and LeBaron, C. (1998) 'How Gender Creeps into Talk', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31(1): 59–74.
- Juvonen, J., Nishina, A. and Graham, S. (2001) 'Self-views versus Peer Perceptions of Victim Status among Early Adolescents', in J. Juvonen and S. Graham (eds) *Peer Harassment in School: The Plight of the Vulnerable and Victimized*, pp. 105–24. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kitzinger, C. (2000) 'Doing Feminist Conversation Analysis', *Feminism and Psychology* 10(2): 163–93.
- Kyratzis, A. (2002) 'Constituting the Emotions: A Longitudinal Study of Emotion Talk in a Preschool Friendship Group of Boys', in B. Baron (ed.) *Gender in Interaction*, pp. 51–74. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Labov, W. and Fanshel, D. (1977) *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ladd, D.R.J. (1980) *The Structure of Intonational Meaning: Evidence from English*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Maltz, D.N. and Borker, R.A. (1982) 'A Cultural Approach to Male-Female Miscommunication', in J.J. Gumperz (ed.) *Communication, Language and Social Identity*, pp. 196–216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McHoul, A. (1998) 'Discourse', in J.L. Mey (ed.) *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*, pp. 225–36. New York: Elsevier.
- Moerman, M. (1988) *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Moerman, M. and Sacks, H. (1971) On Understanding in Conversation. Paper presented at the 70th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New York City, 20 November.
- Mulac, A., Bradac, J.J. and Gilbbons, P. (2001) 'Empirical Support for the Gender-as-Culture Hypothesis: An Intercultural Analysis of Male/Female Language Differences', *Human Communication Research* 27(1): 121–52.

- O'Barr, W. and Atkins, S. (1980) "'Women's Language' or 'Powerless Language'?", in S. McConnell-Ginet, R. Borker and N. Furman (eds) *Women and Language in Literature and Society*, pp. 93–110. New York: Praeger.
- Ochs, E. (1992) 'Indexing Gender', in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds) *Rethinking Context*, pp. 335–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984) 'Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, pp. 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1984) 'Notes on Methodology', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action*, pp. 21–7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Edited by Gail Jefferson from various unpublished lectures.)
- Sacks, H. (1987/1973) 'On the Preferences for Agreement and Contiguity in Sequences in Conversation', in G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds) *Talk and Social Organisation*, pp. 54–69. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, H. (1995a) *Lectures on Conversation I*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. (1995b) *Lectures on Conversation II*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation', *Language* 50: 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. (1997) 'Whose Text? Whose Context?', *Discourse and Society* 8(2): 165–87.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1972) 'Notes on a Conversational Practice: Formulating Place', in D. Sudnow (ed.) *Studies in Social Interaction*, pp. 75–119. New York: Free Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. and Sacks, H. (1973) 'Opening Up Closings', *Semiotica* 8: 289–327.
- Silverman, D. (1998) *Harvey Sacks: Social Science and Conversation Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stokoe, E.H. (2000) 'Toward a Conversation Analytic Approach to Gender and Discourse', *Feminism and Psychology* 10(4): 552–63.
- Tannen, D. (1998) 'Talk in the Intimate Relationship: His and Hers', in J. Coates (ed.) *Language and Gender: A Reader*, pp. 435–45. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- West, C. (1979) 'Against Our Will: Male Interruptions of Females in Cross-Sex Conversation', *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 327: 81–97.
- Widdicombe, S. and Woffitt, R. (1995) *The Language of Youth Subcultures: Social Identity in Action*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.



MARJORIE HARNESS GOODWIN is Professor of Linguistic Anthropology at UCLA. Her work investigates how talk is used to build social organization within face-to-face interaction, with particular emphasis on the social worlds of young girls. Her monograph *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organization among Black Children* is a study of the gendered language practices of African American children. Recently she has focused on how children across different age, gender, class, and ethnic groups organize and delineate their social groups in the midst of spontaneous play through a range of semiotic resources including intonation, gesture, and body positioning as well as talk. ADDRESS: Department of Anthropology, UCLA, 341 Haines Hall, Box 951553, 408 Hilgard Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90095-1553, USA. [email: mgoodwin@anthro.ucla.edu]