Language play, a collaborative resource in children's L2 learning

Asta Čekaitė and Karin Aronsson

Linköping University Post Print

N.B.: When citing this work, cite the original article.

This is a pre-copy-editing, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in Applied Linguistics following peer review. The definitive publisher-authenticated version is:

Asta Čekaitė and Karin Aronsson, Language play, a collaborative resource in children's L2 learning, 2005, Applied Linguistics, (26), 2, 169-191.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amh042>

Copyright: Oxford University Press (OUP): Policy E

<http://www.oxfordjournals.org/>

Postprint available at: Linköping University Electronic Press

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-13993>

Language play, a collaborative resource in children's L2 learning

Cekaite, A. & Aronsson, K. (2005). Language play: a collaborative resource in children's L2 learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 26, 169-191.

ABSTRACT

Within *communicative language teaching*, “natural” language has had a privileged position, and a focus on form has been seen as something inauthentic or as something that is inconsequential for learning (for a critique, cf. Kramsch and Sullivan 1996; Cook 1997, 2001).

Yet, in the present study of an immersion classroom, it was found that children with limited L2 proficiency recurrently employed form focused language play in spontaneous peer conversations.

Our work involves a distinct focus on multiparty talk, and it is shown how language play is, in many ways, a collaborative affair, initiated by the children themselves. Playful mislabelings and puns often generated extended repair sequences, that could be seen as informal “language lessons” focused on formal aspects of language. Simultaneously, shared laughter and shifting alignments between peers were central aspects of the local politics of classroom life.

The joking was quite rudimentary. Yet, it included artful performance and the collaborative use of poetic forms involving alliteration and other forms of parallelisms, as well as code switching, laughing, and artful variations in pitch, volume and voice quality. The paper illustrates the need to integrate language play in models of L2 learning.

Key words: language play, joking events, collaborative performance, second language learning, immersion classroom.

Recently several scholars (e.g. Kramsch and Sullivan 1996; Cook 1997; 2000) have challenged some of the learned wisdom of L2 teaching and theorizing, pointing to the need of integrating language play and fiction within models of language teaching. Kramsch and Sullivan (1996) have shown how fiction may play an important role in L2 learning. In a reappraisal of *communicative language teaching*, Cook (1997; 2000) has criticized some of its assumptions and shown us that we need to take non serious language more seriously. One of the assumptions is that communicative language teaching – with its focus on meaning – is more natural and “authentic” than the reading of fiction and form-focused language such as grammar practices. What has been discussed as “authentic” learning “through exposure to

meaningful input“ has led to a belief that authentic interaction does not involve conscious attention to rules, and that spontaneous language use and communication does not involve a focus upon linguistic form (Cook 2000: 189-190). Thereby language play is seen as something unauthentic or at worst deficient. In contrast, Cook (1997; 2000) sees it as ‘natural’ and important in L2 learning, and he defines language play in terms of both a formal level and a semantic level (Cook 1997: 228):

“At the formal level, there is play with sounds (or with letter shapes, though this is less common) to create patterns of rhyme, rhythm, assonance, consonance, alliteration, etc. and play with grammatical structures to create parallelisms and patterns (Jakobson 1960). At the semantic level there is play with units of meaning, combining them in ways which create worlds which do not exist: fictions“.

Yet, although playfulness and joking are pervasive features of everyday conversations, linguists have not explored the ludic aspects of language use in any great detail. Recently, though, there has, in fact, been something of, what we will call a *ludic turn* in that several scholars have argued for a novel focus on language play and fictive language in L2 learning (Crystal 1998; Cook 2000; Kramsch 2002a). In line with such work, several studies have documented spontaneous language play during the L2 acquisition of adults (Kramsch and Sullivan 1996; Sullivan 2000a; 2000b; Ohta 2001; Belz 2002). Also, it has been documented that private language rehearsal, that is, private language play is an important feature of learners’ acquisition of a second language (Lantolf 1997; Ohta 2001). Moreover, teachers’ joking and playful formats in L2 classrooms have been addressed in investigations by Sullivan (2000a; 2000b) and van Dam (2002).

Within such ludic models of language learning, language play is seen as a pedagogic tool that is intrinsically motivating and that facilitates L2 learning. It is affectively charged, and it therefore makes L2 discourse more noticeable and thus memorable (cf. Cook 1997; 2000; Sullivan 2000a; Broner and Tarone 2001). It not only encourages students to expand their vocabulary, but it also

provides authentic language use situations and can be seen as linguistic preparation for conversations outside the classroom (Cook 2000; Sullivan 2000a). Moreover, language play may serve as a face-saving device (van Dam 2002). We would argue that language play is relevant to language learning in yet another way. Because language play may trigger extended multiparty interactions, it can be instrumental in creating continued collaborative attention toward language forms as such.

On a theoretical note, language play can thus be seen as an important element in language learning. There is, however, not much empirical work on young children's language play in L2 (but see Peck 1980; Broner and Tarone 2001). Much of the recent work has concerned adult students (Kramsch and Sullivan 1996; Lantolf 1997; Sullivan 2000a; 2000b) or it has primarily focused on the role of the teacher (van Dam 2002). The present study constitutes an attempt to situate children's spontaneous language play and L2 learning in a multiparty context, that of an immersion classroom. More specifically, we will explore the interactional architecture of how language learners – at a basic proficiency level – collaboratively focus on form in their everyday L2 interactions.

Metalanguage, poetics and collaborative performance

Language play is closely related to metalanguage, which provides one of the theoretical links between play and learning. The metalingual function includes “speaking of language” (Jakobson 1960), that is, speaking about formal aspects of language organization. The poetic function, on the other hand, focuses “on the message for its own sake” (Jakobson 1960: 356). Metalanguage overtly, and the poetic function covertly, alludes to the nature of the code and can even be seen as “strategies for reproducing or guiding the acquisition of grammar” (Mannheim 1986). In sum, language play exploits poetic and metalingual functions of language in a reflexive stance towards language and social interaction (cf. Jakobson 1960).

Metalanguage is, in fact, a constitutive feature, not only of language teaching, but also of jokes, such as puns and riddles, in that these genres all draw on an awareness of language. For instance, in informal everyday conversations, spontaneous speech errors elicit joking repetitions, repairs, and laughter, e.g.: error -> repair -> laughter, that is, more language play (Hopper 1992). The present empirical data suggest that there is a need to look at the aesthetic aspects of language play in a multiparty classroom context.

Language play in classroom conversations often involves elements of verbal performance (cf. Sullivan 2000a; Broner and Tarone 2001). On a theoretical note, work on performance has suggested that artful language or verbal performance must be studied interactionally, as sequential phenomena – linked to repetition (cf. Jakobson 1960 on parallelisms) and other conversational recyclings. Bauman and Briggs (1990) have discussed performance in terms of artful ways of speaking and the reflexive nature of talk in everyday ways of using language in the face of an audience, including oratory, teasing, gossiping, bragging, joking, and language play.

Second language play in children's peer group interactions

Child language research has primarily explored language play in relation to the learning of a first language. Aspects of morphological, phonological, and syntactic substitutions have been explored both in children's social play (Garvey 1977; Iwamura 1980), and in the solitary 'language rehearsals' of crib monologues (Weir 1962; Nelson 1989). Language play is seen as a practice that influences children's mastery of a first language at all levels – the lexical, phonological, and grammatical (Weir 1962; Chukovsky 1963; Cazden 1976; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1976; Garvey 1977; Iwamura 1980; Jakobson 1988).

Moreover, research on the use of a first language in sociodramatic play (Heath 1983; Sawyer 1997), verbal contests (Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan 1977; Goodwin 1990), rope chants (Heath 1983), and riddles (Sutton-Smith 1976) have illustrated how language play is indexical of

children's sensitivity to the features of social organization. In fact, anthropological studies of children's play suggest that language play represents "one of the greatest influences the peer group has on the acquisition of communicative competence" (Saville-Troike 1989: 250).

Yet, as pointed out, language play in children's L2 learning has not received much attention. Although such phenomena have recurrently been reported in studies on children's L2 interactions, they have not been discussed or foregrounded in terms of language play. In the following, we will briefly report a series of such studies. In her analysis of different language learning styles among five second language learners, Wong Fillmore (1979) noted that one of the children recurrently employed playful formats, acquiring access to her co-participants by being amusing. In an analysis of speech acts involving children learning English as a second language, Ervin-Tripp (1981) showed that joking formats were recurrently employed in children's play. In this study, she also documented how children, who were beginner L2 learners of French, jokingly construed stylized teacher talk, doing role play in French. Cathcart-Strong (1986) has similarly shown how it is important for the L2 learner to be entertaining in multiparty contexts, where participation is not guaranteed, and even discusses a conversational maxim among peers 'be entertaining'. In an ethnographic case study of a Polish boy learning English, Krupa-Kwiatkowski (1998) has similarly documented how a young language learner employed entertainment as a resource in his interactions with peers.

By and large, peer group interactions have generally remained somewhat underanalyzed in studies of L2 acquisition. Yet, there is some recent work where pupils' group interactions have been studied in their own right as a site for multiparty language play and foreign language acquisition. In an ethnography of a first grade classroom, Willet (1995) showed how peer interactions were important in early L2 acquisition. When compared to child-adult interactions, peer interactions were, in fact, "more playful, provided more varied discourse roles, and resulted in greater elaboration of the core interactional routine" (p. 489). In a study of fifth graders'

interactions in a Spanish immersion classroom, Broner and Tarone (2001) have similarly documented peer group language play during classroom work. For instance, they showed how play was an important resource for language learning in that the children used nonsense forms, alliteration and playful rhyming (e.g. ‘Ricola tricola’ and ‘Cerebro cerebro’), high pitch and a villainous voice in creating classroom jokes (Broner and Tarone 2001). Rampton has also documented how mixed groups of adolescents (Anglo and Panjabi descent) at times co-design playground interactions into informal Panjabi language lessons – for instance, modeling target phrases and repairing nonnative expressions (Rampton 1999a). Similarly, classroom knowledge of German (taught as a foreign language) was drawn on as a resource for mild mocking and fun in UK peer contexts (Rampton 1999b).

In line with such recent work on peer group interactions, the present study is based on analyses of children’s language play in spontaneous classroom conversations. Our aim is to contribute to a more complex understanding of the relationship between language play and language learning.

METHOD

Methodologically, the choice of naturalistic conversations was inspired by studies within the language socialization paradigm (cf. Schieffelin and Ochs 1996; Garrett and Baquedano-Lopez 2002), that focus on language learning as a social and situated phenomenon.

Setting

The data were collected in an immersion classroom for refugee and immigrant children, a so called ‘mottagningsklass’ (literally: ‘*reception classroom*’) in a Swedish school, constituted by children aged 7 to 10 years. All the children (four girls and five boys) were beginner learners, who had recently arrived in Sweden. The class met five days a week, 4-6 hours a day.

Most of the children had arrived in Sweden from Iraq, Lebanon, Thailand or Turkey (speaking Arabic, Thai, and Kurdish). Swedish was the official *lingua franca* of the classroom, as well as the main language of instruction, and the main teacher, Vera, was a native Swedish speaker. An assistant teacher, Fare, assisted the Arabic-speaking children. All children except Nok, a girl from Thailand, also spoke some Arabic (which was thus an *unofficial lingua franca*). Nok was well integrated in the class, though. The names of the teachers and students have been anonymised.

In the classroom, children's spontaneous contributions were encouraged throughout individual work, as well as during teacher-led activities. Hand raising was rare, and peer group talk, if not disturbing classroom activities, was tolerated. Educational games (e.g. Memory) were recurrently initiated by the teachers.

Recordings and data

The data for the study are recordings of children's on- and off-task interactions. The children's classroom interactions as well as their play activities were video recorded during three periods during the school year, covering an early, mid- and late phase of the school year (in all 90 hours of recordings). In the present analyses, the data from the mid-phase are used. During the mid-period of the data collection, the children had spent between 4 months and 1 year in Sweden at school.

Analytic unit - language play sequences within children's joking events

The analytic units of our study are language play sequences. Within a larger study on children's joking and L2 socialization, we identified all joking events where children laughed, or commented on something as funny, thereby acknowledging laughables (cf. Glenn 1989). We thus adopted an emic perspective in that the participants' own orientation to something as funny helped us identify joking events. Our findings were that, besides nonverbal forms of situational humor (e.g. buffonery, clowning), a large subset of children's spontaneous joking was based on playful

mislabelings and puns, or ways of speaking which exploited linguistic ambiguity and phonological, semantic and syntactic features of language.¹ The children thus exploited several dimensions of language in performing and participating in joking events.

Translations

The translations have been made by a native speaker, and our ambition has been to preserve the children's original style of speaking to the greatest extent possible, including errors (e.g., number congruency errors as in Ex.1 'a mittens'; Ex. 2 'a shoes'). We have, however, not translated mispronunciations and gender errors (such as 'ett fisk' instead of 'en fisk' in Example 3).

FINDINGS

The present children were all beginner learners of Swedish. Yet, a playful stance toward formal aspects of language was an integral feature of the children's classroom discourse. The pupils often initiated language play, as did the teachers. In the busy and demanding social situation of a classroom with many parallel activities, attention is not something that can be taken for granted. Joking seemed to be one of the ways in which the children secured the attention of their co-participants.

Most of the children's language play involved quite rudimentary forms of joking, rather than elaborate genres such as riddles, puns or standardized ('canned') jokes. These findings are in line with other work on children, as it has been shown that children's spontaneous humor does not include the telling of jokes (on children's L1 joking events, cf. Lampert 1996).

For their amusement, the children exploited incongruities and rule distortions (cf. McGhee and Chapman 1980 on incongruity as a basic element of humor). They played with language in

many ways – producing playful nonsense variations of words and deliberate mislabelings, as well as simple puns. They drew upon sound play (phonological rules; cf., Examples 1, 2, 5 and 6), word composition (morphological rules; Examples 1, 2, 5 and 6), word substitutions (paradigmatic rules; Examples 1-4) and word order (syntactic rules; Examples 5 and 6). Various elaborations and transformations of language form thus constituted resources for constructing ‘laughable’ matters.

In so doing, the children employed a broad range of expressive means for embellishing their performance: alliterations, parallelisms, code switching, word elongations, onomatopoeia, loud talking (and other voice and pitch variations), as well as laughing and repetitions. In the following, we will present fine-grained analyses of such play within the multiparty complexity of a classroom setting. For the sake of presentation, language play has been classified according to its formal organization in our discussion of the findings.

Phonological and morphological language play in mislabelings

According to developmental research on children’s comprehension of humor (Bjorklund 1989), the simplest types of jokes involve mislabeling, that is, calling something by an erroneous name. Such a competence emerges when children are 2 years of age (ibid.). Among school age children, as in the present data, mislabelings can be seen as one of several examples of ‘willful violations’ being used as ways of acting funny (cf. Garvey 1977; Broner and Tarone 2001).

In the present study, the children extensively exploited mislabelings as laughable matters, involving phonological and morphological play. In our first example, such a mislabeling can, for instance, be found in nonsense constructions or neologisms (Example 1; lines 14 and 17). In this example, the joking event occurred in a game activity called ‘Memory’. A group of children were playing ‘Memory’ on their own, while the teacher’s aid was moving around the classroom, monitoring the activities of two groups of children. At the

time of the recording, the nominal phrase ‘ett par x’ (‘a *pair of x*’) was frequently being practiced in the classroom, especially during ‘Memory’ game activities. Through this game, the children had, for instance, become familiarized with plural constructions related to ‘pairs’.

Ex. 1 Participants: the girls Fusi (7)*, Layla (10), Rana (8) and a boy Hiwa (8)*. Number in parenthesis refers to the child’s age.

- 1 Fusi: Ah: NE:J! ((picks a card that does not match))
O:H NO:!
- 2 Hiwa: En fågel ((labels Fusi’s card))
A bird
- 3 Fusi: °En få-°
 °A bi-°
- 4 Layla: En [eh eh (.) eh eh] ett pa:r
A [eh eh (.) eh eh] a pai:r ((picks a card of mittens; singing))
- 5 Hiwa: [E:i x säg! (.) säg namnet!]
[E:i x say!(.) say its name!]
- 6 Hiwa: Ett e:h vantar
A e:h mittens
- 7 Layla: Vanta:r. (.) x *qamiis*
Mitte:ns. (.) x blouse
- > 8 Hiwa: E:n två sko:l ((picks a card of shoes, smiley voice))
A: two shoe:l
- 9 Layla: En he he par skor
A he he pair of shoes
- > 10 Hiwa: En par skol ((smiley voice; picks a matching card))
A pair of shoel
- > 11 Fusi: Det [är två skol he he he he he he
It [is two shoel he he he he he he
- 12 Hiwa: [he he
- 13 Layla: ((smiles))
- > 14 Hiwa: En fågelskol [en fågelskol ((picks cards, smiley voice))
A birdshoel [a birdshoel

15 Fusi: [Ne:j ((looks at Hiwa))
 [No:
 16 Layla: xxx?
 -> 17 Hiwa: ***Khani mani*** (.) ***shanja kani*** he[he ((playfully labeling the
 cards))
hocus pocus (.) ***shanja kani*** he[he ((nonsense formula))
 18 Layla: ((to Hiwa)) [he he
 19 Fusi: Jag! ((claims her turn))
Me!

In line 8, Hiwa is picking a card (probably with a picture of a pair of shoes). However, he labels the shoes 'e:n två sko:l' ('*a: two shoe:l*') instead of the target phrase 'ett par skor' ('*a pair of shoes*')². Thereby, he is also violating the morphological rules for Swedish plurals. The playful character of his nonsensical mislabeling is indicated in the prolonged vowel 'sko:l' ('*shoe:l*') and his smiley voice. As can be seen, Hiwa's utterance contains phonological, morphological and syntactic-semantic distortions. Layla responds to his utterance as funny, when laughingly repairing it, employing the target noun phrase ('*a pair of shoes*'). In ordinary conversations, speech errors and overt corrections frequently trigger play episodes (Hopper 1992; Jefferson 1996). Layla's repair can be seen as calling attention to the form of the utterance and exploiting its humorous potential.

Although Hiwa (line 10) makes use of her repair, incorporating it into his subsequent turn, he still continues in a playful mode, laughing before repeating the phonological distortion (his neologism 'skol'). Language play is sustained when Fusi (line 11) picks up his original construction (from line 8 'det är två skol'). In recycling his funny neologism ('skol'), she aligns with him. In so doing, she can be seen to be joking, which is corroborated by Layla's and Hiwa's responses (smiles, laughter). By and large, Fusi and Hiwa thus appear as co-authors of the present joking episode. The playful character of this encounter continues when Hiwa makes up a nonsense word compound 'fågel skol' ('*a birdshoel*') (line 14) when he picks a card of a bird. Apparently, his sound play is based on assonance, drawing on the phonological parallelism between the two 'l'-s

(‘fågelskol’; our underlinings). His neologistic word compound conforms to the rules of Swedish phonology, even if it represents a nonsensical derivation. In this episode, the entertaining potential of varying a simple nominal phrase ‘a pair of shoes’ is thus exploited in a series of word parallelisms (‘a pair’ – ‘it is two shoes’), as well as sound parallelisms (the phonemic contrasts between ‘l’ and ‘r’). Poetic performance is also involved in the nonsense word derivations (‘fågelskol’ as well as ‘*shanja kani*’).

Moreover, Hiwa is switching to Arabic (which is not his native language) as a discursive resource (line 17). Hiwa’s code switching (line 17) involves the magic Arabic formula ‘*khani mani*’ (‘*Hocus pocus*’) and a matching improvised nonsense phrase ‘*shanja kani*’, which is apparently based on a spontaneous poetic transformation of the Arabic formula. It is created through sound parallelism in the form of a rhyme, embedded in a grammatical and phonological parallel construction, using words that have the same length and same alternation of consonants. When employed in this picture labeling routine, the nonsense formula as well as the magic Arabic formula can be seen as playful commentaries on classroom picture labeling practices. His language play is acknowledged as funny in that Layla joins in on his laughing. This episode thus involves collaborative joking and a poetic use of language.

In the present case, Hiwa employed code switching as part of the design of his language play. He thus also exploits his emergent multilingual competence (Rampton 1999a; 1999b; Belz 2002). At large though, the children did not employ code switching to any great extent in language play during the present period of initial L2 acquisition (see however Example 3:line 12 and Example 4:line 6, for some other instances). As can be seen, the children did produce joking based on language play, building upon each others’ contributions on a turn by turn basis. Their collaborative performances drew upon the children’s shared knowledge of routine picture naming and grammatical drills (e.g., the learning of a nominal phrase ‘a pair of x’) and their inventive

manipulation of these practices, creating a broad range of entertaining events. The next example offers another illustration of joking mislabelings during a Memory game.

Ex. 2 Participants: the girls Rana (8), Layla (10), Fusi (7), and a boy Hiwa (8).

- 1 Fusi: ((picks a card showing trousers))
- 2 Hiwa: Titta.
Look.
- 3 Fusi: E[:
A[:
- > 4 Hiwa: [Blu:s ((deep voice, about Fusi's card))
[Blou:se
- 5 Fusi: Ne:j he he he
- 6 Hiwa: [he he he
- 7 Layla: [he he he
- 8 Rana: En bar bar x bar bo- ((serious, to Fusi))
A bair bair x bair tr-
- > 9 Hiwa: [Bar he he bo he
[Bair he he tr- he
- 10 Layla: [E:n e:n en pa:[r byxor ((teaches Fusi))
[A: a: a pai:[r of trousers
- 11 Fusi: [En
[A
- 12 Fusi: En par byxor ((then picks another card, that of a fish))
A pair of trousers
- 13 Hiwa: [En fisk
[A fish
- 14 Layla: [En fisk
[A fish
- 15 Fusi: En fisk
A fish

When Fusi picks a card (of trousers), Hiwa produces a deliberate mislabeling by calling the card 'blus' ('blouse'; line 4). By adopting a speech register that is marked in this

conversational context (deep voice, markedly elongated vowel and falling rising pitch), Hiwa presents his picture naming in a mocking key, enacting a 'silly' answer, as it were.

Simultaneously, though, he actually interrupts and steals Fusi's turn and he can thus be seen to 'enact' her failure to find a matching pair of cards. Thereby, he can also be seen to partly discredit Fusi's skill as a competent player. Memory is a competitive game, and the jocular mislabeling can thus be interpreted as a kind of tease, a ridiculing of the co-player. In any case, his mislabeling is accompanied by Fusi's playful denial and laughter, which is then taken up by Layla. They thus both align with his joking key (lines 5 and 7).

Hiwa's mislabeling is corrected by Rana in line 8, who, in a serious mode, says 'bar bo' when she starts to produce her version of the target phrase 'a pair of trousers'. Hiwa presents a playfully keyed rendition of her talk, when he laughingly repeats her mispronunciation 'bar' (of the target word 'par' ('a pair', line 9). Hiwa's mimicry of Rana's error is accomplished as a mild mocking of her mispronunciation, in the form of a sound play that transforms a nominal phrase 'en par' ('a pair') into a nonsensical gloss 'en bar'. The other participants do not orient to his joking mode, though. Layla continues Rana's repair sequence, instructing Fusi, providing her with a nominal phrase 'en par byxor' ('a pair of trousers', line 10). Fusi in her turn, repeats this. In fact, Rana and Layla are here engaged in a collaborative sequence of other-repair (cf. Kasper 1985, on the preference of other-initiated repair in form-focused activities). The two girls (Rana and Layla) can be seen to position themselves as 'teachers', when they instruct Fusi, the least competent L2 speaker in this group. Thus Hiwa's mislabeling can be seen to trigger a peer-run "language lesson". As can be seen, there is yet another lesson of this type when Hiwa and Layla label Fusi's next card ('fisk', lines 13-14), and when Fusi again positions herself as the language learner, repeating the target word (line 15).

The children thus creatively used newly introduced lexical items and phrases that were the focus of form-centered classroom activities (e.g., training the nominal construction ‘ett par x’). The children’s playful variations of linguistic form can be seen as error repairs (Jefferson 1987) and as metalinguistic comments on linguistic acceptability (Norrick 1994).

Moreover, the first two examples illustrate the collaborative aspects of language play in multiparty interaction. Such aspects can, for instance, be seen in the cross-utterance patterns (Sacks 1992) in the first two examples, when the children collaboratively create something of a stanza across speaker utterances (Ex. 2, lines 8-15; cf. Hopper 1992):

En bar bar bar bo-

Bar bo

E:n en en par byxor

En

En par byxor

En fisk

En fisk

En fisk

As can be seen, alliteration and other forms of sound parallelisms (bar – bo, bar – par) are central elements in this type of cross-utterance poetics. Also, the repetitions as such create a distinct rhythm, performed on a turn-by-turn basis (on rhyming and alliteration, cf. Broner and Tarone 2001). Related stanzas could also be seen in Example 1 (lines 2-3 and 8-14). In the present children’s interactions, nonsense word formation (e.g. ‘fågelskol’ Example 1, line 14) was another feature of collaborative play. As pointed out by Cook, neologisms create “worlds which do not exist: fictions” (1997: 228). In her study of a preschool boy’s peer interactions, Krupa-Kwiatkowski (1998) has similarly documented nonsense word formations in this boy’s invented play language ‘Sinurta’, which he used as a way of keeping L2 conversations going. The fiction of

nonsense forms has also been documented among fifth graders in a Spanish immersion classroom (Broner and Tarone 2001), that is, among older children. Play with nonsense language thus seems to be an aesthetic and social resource in L2 interactions among children of quite different ages (preschool - early school- and late school age).

Poetic and other playful variations of language form (e.g. dramatic exaggerations) are performed for an audience, which can be seen in different embellishments: they are marked by, for instance, smiling or laughter (Example 1, lines 8-14), and voice modulations. Also, the jokes as such can be seen as a type of collaborative performance in that the children co-constructed “fictive worlds” in their language play. When there is such audience participation, language play is extended by repetitions, further poetic play or laughter (cf. Hopper 1992, on the trajectory of play episodes). The language used in these instances is not an individual matter, rather it is a multiparty performance, an audience-shaped collaborative aesthetics.

Peer group interactions in a multiparty classroom setting provide for a variety of possible alignment constellations. Thus, although Hiwa’s mild teasing apparently invites laughter (line 9), the co-participants resist his joking framing of the interaction in that they do not accept the invitation.

Semantic language play and subversion

The next example illustrates a mislabeling that involves word play during a Memory game activity. Moreover it entails subversive joking in that it includes a ‘bad’ or rude word.

Ex 3 Participants: teacher aid FARE, the girls Fusi (7), Layla (10), Rana (8), and a boy Hiwa (8).

- 1 FARE: Vad är det?
 What’s that?
- 2 Layla: En en jacka och e:n p[ar
 A a jacket and a: p[air
- 3 FARE: [Ett par strumpor. ((goes away))
 [A pair of socks.

4 Hiwa: Ett par strumpor ett par strumpor. Ett par strumpor
A pair of socks a pair of socks. A pair of socks

-> 5 (.)ett fisk(.)((picks a fish)) ett (.) eh gris.°hehe°
 (.) a fish (.)((picks a fish)) a (.) eh pig. °hehe°

6 Rana: EKORRE:!
SQUIRRE:L!

7 Hiwa: he he he he

8 ((Fusi is picking a card))

9 Layla: En[katt. ((to Fusi about her card))
A [cat.

10 Fusi: [ETT KATT. ((then picks a new card))
[A CAT.

-> 11 Hiwa: En gris. ((smiley voice; mislabels Fusi's new card))
A pig.

12 Rana: ***Khalastuni anaa!*** ((to Hiwa))
I'm tired of that!

In line 5, Hiwa fails to pick a matching second card (of a fish). Instead he picks a card of a squirrel and makes a deliberate mislabeling, calling it 'gris' (a 'pig'). The mislabeling is designed as a 'joke' (note his post-utterance laughter), but Rana corrects it, displaying irritation through markedly increased volume and an angry voice (line 6). Language play thus triggers an other-repair when Rana contests Hiwa's mislabeling. There is no 'pig' card in the present set of cards. Hiwa was clearly making a deliberate mislabeling, playing off the situational expectations. Again, we see a mislabeling practice being used to invoke humorous incongruence, as can be seen in Hiwa's laughing (lines 5, 7 and 11). His laughter invitations as well as repeated mislabelings (lines 5 and 11) can be seen as persistent attempts to interfere with the activity proper (creating 'time out' from the classroom task) or, at least, to solicit laughter or other joking responses from the other children. On a more speculative note, the humorous potential of his mislabeling can be related to the fact that, for the Muslim children in this group, the word 'pig' connotes something 'bad' or 'disgusting'. In any case, Rana once again displays her annoyance with Hiwa's ridiculing of the

labeling procedure. This time she switches to Arabic, thereby enforcing her disapproval through code switching (cf. Cromdal and Aronsson 2001).

As can be seen in Examples 1-3, the classroom activity as such (the game ‘Memory’) is exploited as a resource for certain types of language play events. Specific classroom activities provide for specific types of joking. ‘Memory’ game activities, for instance, set the pattern for producing mislabelings and sound play in that the children have to name each card as part of the game as such.

On other occasions though, the children produced spontaneous mislabelings that were not immediately related to the ongoing classroom activities. Such mislabelings were at times subversive in relation to existing hierarchies, e.g., age or gender hierarchies.

Ex 4 Participants: the girls Layla (10), Nok (7), Rana (8), Fusi (7), and the boys Hiwa (8), Sawan (9).

- > 1 Hiwa: Xxx Rana du pojke xx pojke
XXX Rana you boy XX boy
- 2 Rana: Nej he he nej nej [X
No he he no no [X
- 3 Hiwa: [he he (du är)
[he he (you are)
- 4 Layla: xxxxxxx((sings in Arabic))
- 5 Hiwa: xxxxx ((imitating Layla’s singing, pretend weeping))
- 6 Rana: What’s this? ((speaks in English))
- 7 Hiwa: ((rising from his place, prepared to fight with the girls))
- 8 Nok: Titta flicka pojke fli- ah ((to Sawan, pointing at a girl, a boy and a boy, Sawan))
Look girl boy gi- oh
- > 9 Sawan: Ne:j Jag flicka! ((playfully, smiling to Nok))
No: I girl!
- 10 Nok: Titta flicka Fusi flicka= ((pointing at a girl, Fusi))
Look girl Fusi girl=
- > 11 Sawan: =Du flicka! he he ((pointing at Nok))
=You girl! he he

12 Nok: A:H ((protesting))

13 Rana: Baby:s (.) Hiwa::: ((whining voice, teasing Hiwa))

-> 14 Hiwa: Jag flicka. ((to Rana; smiling))

I girl.

-> 15 Sawan: Fusi också flicka. ((smiling at Nok))

Fusi girl too

16 ((Sawan turns away))

17 Nok: °x flicka pojke pojke flicka° ((self-talk, points at the

 children, smiling))

 °x *girl boy boy girl*°

In line 1, Hiwa teases the girl Rana by mislabeling her as ‘du pojke’ (‘*you boy*’). Rana responds to the tease as a joke, laughingly rejecting the gender mismatch. He then repeats that she is a boy (line 3). Within this classroom community, as also noted by Thorne (1993), such teasing recurrently occurred cross-gender).

Briefly after this exchange, Nok initiates another gender labeling sequence (line 8). Apparently inspired by Hiwa, she creates a gendered list of children in the classroom. She is playfully teased by the boy Sawan (line 9), who jokingly protests, claiming an alternative gender identity to her labeling of him as ‘boy’ (‘*no, I girl*’). Somewhat later (line 12), she recycles this joke in that she protests loudly when he (correctly) calls her a girl (line 11). In both cases (Sawan line 9 and Nok line 12), the children are turning the tables as it were, in that they treat the appropriate gender label as a joke.

As can be seen, the children created two separate teasing sequences: involving Hiwa, Rana and Layla (lines 1-7), and Sawan and Nok (8-17). Both sequences featured collaborative language play in the form of gender label mismatches, as well as playful repair work, involving both “real” repairs (line 2) and joking repairs, such as deliberate mislabelings as in Sawan’s joking repair (line 9).

The children thus engaged in joking and teasing each other, playfully exploiting labeling and mislabeling procedures for entertaining an audience. Moreover, Nok's silent labeling (line 17) can be interpreted as a solitary language exercise (rehearsal in private speech, cf. Lantolf 1997; Broner and Tarone 2001). As can be seen, the peer group is a recurrent site for routine drills (see also Ex. 2, lines 25-27), repair work and informal "language lessons". These peer activities reveal the children's spontaneous attention to linguistic form and language rules within a playful format, thereby corroborating what we have called ludic models within SLA theorizing (e.g. Cook 2000: 173-177; Sullivan 2000b; Broner and Tarone 2001).

Semantic-syntactic language play in rudimentary puns

Mislabelings require little language proficiency in that the speaker may assume a joking stance even when s/he has acquired only a very basic vocabulary. In contrast, puns draw on syntactic or semantic ambiguities, as when homonyms may index not only different meanings, but also different syntactic functions. Drawing on a study of school age children's joke productions, Sutton-Smith (1976) has discussed how riddles constitute a dominant type of joke among children in the first three grades of elementary school. In contrast, children in grades 4 – 8 produce a greater number of canned jokes or funny stories. Riddles drawing on homonymy, that is, *puns*, constitute a canonical type of joke, e.g., 'Question: Why did the dog go out into the sun? Answer: He wanted to be a hot dog' (Sutton-Smith 1976). Such riddles require linguistic awareness on the part of the listener, who has to attend to the syntactic ambiguity (here, in the case of 'hot', which can either refer to the adjective 'hot' or to the compound noun 'Hot Dog').

In the present recordings, the children produce simple types of puns. In the following, we will present two such events. Both examples also illustrate how the exploitation of ambiguity (homonymic forms; here 'kissa' – 'kisse') is an amusing and entertaining group activity. In this episode, Fare and the children are singing a song "We are little ...".

Ex 5 Participants: teacher: aid FARE, the girls Layla (10), Nok (7), Rana (8), and the boys Hiwa (8), Sawan (9), Miran (9).

- 1 FARE: Vi gråter och piper när kissar [oss griper för vi är små
We are crying and squeaking when pussies [are catching us.
- 2 råttor vi. ((singing))
for we are little mice are we.
- > 3 Sawan [he he he he he he he
4 ((Hiwa and Miran look at Sawan through his laughter))
- 5 Miran Varför eh Fare X skrattar? ((looks at Sawan, then FARE,
'harsh' voice))
Why eh Fare X laughing?
- > 6 Sawan: Piper och kissar! he he he he
Squeaking and peeing! he he he he
- 7 Miran: Varför hon x Fare skrattar? ((irritated))
Why is she x laughing Fare?
- 8 FARE: Kisse vad betyder kisse?
Pussy what does pussy mean?
- 9 Hiwa: Jag vet.
I know.
- 10 FARE: Vad är det?
What is it?
- 11 Layla: Det betyder [kissekatt. [Det betyder
It means [pussycat. [It means
- 12 Rana: [Mjau mjau
[miaow miaow
- 13 FARE: [Katt! Det är katter!
[Cat! It's cats!
- 14 Layla: bl bl ks ((nonsense syllables))
- 15 FARE: Kisse! Det är inget att skratta åt [x
Pussy! It's nothing to laugh about [x
- 16 Hiwa: [°Ki:ssssss(e)°
- 17 Nok: °Inte kissa kisse°! ((smiling at the teacher))
°Not peeing pussy°!
- > 18 Sawan: he he he kisse kissa!
he he he pussy peeing!

19 FARE: För vi är små grodor vi ((sings a new couplet))
 For we are little frogs are we

In line 3, Sawan starts to laugh when the word ‘kissar’ appears as part of the song. Evidently, he is orienting to the homophonic qualities of the plural noun form ‘kissar’ (Sw: ‘*kittens*’) and the verb ‘kissar’ (Sw: ‘*peeing*’). Apparently, Miran, another boy, is not aware of the ambiguity of ‘kisse-kissa’ – or he is, in fact, aware of the ambiguity, but not amused – which can be seen in his displayed irritation about Sawan’s laughter (lines 5 and 7). His question to the teacher’s aid about the reason for Sawan’s laughter can be seen as a way of inviting him to discipline Sawan because of inappropriate joking in the classroom. Yet, Sawan persists in his attempted joking and repeats the subversive song line ‘piper och kissar he he he he’ (‘*squeaking and peeing*’; line 6).

Then, the teacher’s aid initiates a collaborative word explanation, ‘vad betyder kisse?’ (‘*what does pussy mean?*’). Note the emphasis on the last vowel, which could be used to disambiguate the pun, differentiating between the two forms, the singular noun, ‘kisse’ (‘*pussy*’), as opposed to the verb, ‘kissa’ (‘*to pee*’). The word explanation is accomplished as a collaborative achievement of the children (Hiwa, Layla and Rana) with the teacher’s assistant (lines 8-17). For instance, Rana exemplifies the meaning of ‘kisse’ when onomatopoetically meowing like a cat (line 12). Layla, in her turn, produces parallel nonsense syllables, creating a rhythmic phrase (‘bl bl ks’; line 14).

Ultimately, the teacher indirectly reproaches Sawan, pointing out that there is ‘nothing to laugh about’ (line 15). At this point, Hiwa makes an equivocal sound imitation of peeing (line 16). Thereby he can be seen to align with Sawan’s joking mode. Hiwa’s contribution is artfully designed in that it contains a playful exaggeration and collusive elements, while it simultaneously conforms to the expected format of a classroom vocabulary exercise. No one laughs though, and in a *sotto voce* contribution, Nok protests, the word is not ‘kissa’ (‘inte kissa kisse’; line 17). Now Sawan realigns with Hiwa’s joking mode. By reversing the word order of Nok’s contribution to ‘kisse kissa’ (‘*pussy peeing*’), he manages to design yet another equivocal and subversive joke.

Apparently, the present language play event (rudimentary pun) introduced a topic shift in the classroom activity, disrupting the ongoing interaction (cf. Sherzer 1978; Norrick 1994). Sawan's laughter and subversive recycling of a specific song line served the purpose of drawing the other pupils' attention to the ambiguity of language forms, invoking a taboo word in the classroom. However, the other participants were reluctant to align with the joking mode. Instead, they willingly assisted when the teacher initiated an explicit metalinguistic exploration of language form, thereby aligning with his overall project of reestablishing classroom order. As in Example 2, it can also be seen how peer invitations to laugh are not always accepted by peers, who may instead align with the teacher.

In the meantime, though, participants designed jokes that drew on poetic parallelisms and onomatopoeic qualities of words, that is, aspects of language that may also enhance the co-participants' metalinguistic skills. Again, it can be noted how a collaborative language play may facilitate pupils' attention getting and their creation of 'time out' from official classroom business.

In another example of a rudimentary pun sequence, the teacher and the children were talking about pictures from a magazine, practicing vocabulary skills. The teacher introduced a new word 'nosa' ('*sniffing*'; lines 4 and 6), that triggered pun-related joking on the children's part.

Ex 6 Participants: teacher: VERA, assistant FARE, and the girls Layla (10), Nok (7), and the boys Hiwa (8), Sawan, (9), Ali (7).

- 1 VERA: [Han luktar på snön (.) det är alldeles riktigt. Och då
[He is smelling at the snow (.) that's absolutely right. And
- 2 säger man att=
then you say that=
- 3 Sawan: = HAN LUKTA:R=
= HE IS SMELLI:NG=
- 4 VERA: =<Han nosar på sn[ön>
=<He is sniffing at the sn[ow>
- 5 Nok: [På snö

[At snow]

6 VERA: Han nosar på snön
He is s[niffing at the snow]

7 Nok: [Nosar på snö
[Sniffing at snow]

-> 8 Sawan: [NUSA (.) HON HETER Nusa ((smiley voice))
[NUSA (.) SHE'S CALLED Nusa]

9 Nok: he he he he he ((looks at Layla))

-> 10 Layla: JAG HETER NUSA ((smiley voice))
I'M CALLED NUSA

11 Sawan: HE HE HE HE HE [HE HE

-> 12 Ali: ((to VERA))[>A:hon heter Nusa hon heter Layla hon heter Kadi<
[>Ye:s she's called Nusa she's called Layla she's called Kadi<

13 (2)

-> 14 Ali: °Hon heter tre namn° ((looks at Layla))
°She's called three names°

-> 15 Nok: he he he he he he [titta det du: (.) vad gör du du på?
 ((points at the journal, addresses Layla))
 he he he he he he *[look it you: (.) what you doing you on?*

-> 16 Sawan: [he he he Nusa Nusa det är hunds (.)det är hunds
[he he he Nusa Nusa that's dog's (.) that's dog's]

17 näsa he he
nose he he

18 Layla: ((smiles, hides her face in her hands))

19 Hiwa: Nusa

20 Nok: E Nusa °he he he he° ((looks at Ali, Ali smiles at Nok))

Vera is browsing through the journal 'Animal friend', talking to the class about a dog. Sawan explicitly identifies a pair of homophones (line 8), which reveals metalinguistic awareness on his part, in that he has discovered the phonological sameness between 'nosa' ('*sniffing*') and the personal name Nusa. One of his peers', Layla's, nickname in the family is Nusa, which is known among the children. Sawan's comment is delivered in a markedly increased volume, and he is

evidently explaining the source of entertainment to the entire class. His explanation can be seen as a sort of word play or simple pun, and Nok, indeed, responds to it as a laughable matter (line 9). Ali then explains to the teacher that Nusa is Layla's nickname, providing her with information on the ambiguity of 'nosa' ('*sniffing*') and the personal name 'Nusa' (lines 12; 14). The children collaboratively thus offer their teacher Vera an explanation as to why 'nosa' is funny, explicitly unpacking the source of entertainment (the phonologic resemblance between the Swedish and Arabic words; lines 8-20). In line 15, Nok makes a new contribution to the joking event now equating Nusa with a 'dog'. In the following turn (lines 16-17), Sawan presents yet another meaning of the newly introduced lexical item, as he laughingly refers to Nusa as 'hunds näsa' ('*dog's nose*').

The rudimentary pun is thus accomplished as a group activity. The children draw upon their shared linguistic knowledge in a joint exploitation of the ambiguity of the 'Nusa - nosa' word play. The performance of this joking event unfolds through a long chain of multiparty contributions, in the form of laughter, loud talking, gaze trajectories, as well as verbal explications.

Thus, both puns (Examples 5 and 6) illustrate how the children transformed a language teaching situation (vocabulary training) into a joking exploration of the aesthetic potential of language, exploiting onomatopoeia and sound parallelisms, while simultaneously engaging in a collaborative exploration of the relation between language meaning and form.

REPAIR WORK AND COLLABORATIVE LANGUAGE PLAY

– CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

In several ways, the present analyses reveal collaborative aspects of language play. In order to be heard and seen in a lively classroom with parallel activities, the pupils often had to use all their ingenuity to secure the attention and maintain the interest of their co-participants. Joking

alignments (e.g. between Hiwa and Fusi, Ex.1 or Hiwa and Sawan, Ex. 5) and realignments in language play episodes thus seemed to be key elements of the local politics of classroom life. At times, a pupil tried to be funny, but failed to entertain the co-participants, as when Hiwa produced his series of mislabelings (Example 3). Hence, the group as such, including audience design phenomena, played a crucial role in collaborative language play, as could be seen in loud announcements and poetic embellishments (alliterations, sound repetitions, and rhythmic patterns). Spontaneous language play thus included “spoken artistry” as revealed in linguistic creativity and collaborative pattern variation. Such collaborative performance also involved cross utterance poetics, that is, spontaneous parallelisms across extended series of turns, including rhyming and rhythmically tuned responses, varied intonational patterns, sing song, onomatopoeics, and voice modulations.

As Jakobson has formulated it, the metalingual function has an “important role in our everyday language” (1960: 356) in that we practise metalanguage without realizing the reflexive nature of our operations. In the present data, collaborative language play entailed the peer group’s attention to language form. Thereby, it created possibilities for language practice. Collaborative repetitions and variations can, in turn, be seen to promote the learner’s awareness of the phonology and morphology of correct and incorrect language choices. Language play is therefore one of the crucial building blocks of peer run “language lessons”.

In the present data, language play included instances of serious and non serious peer teaching within such informal “language lessons”, in that they featured repair work (Examples 1-5), word definitions (Examples 4-6), and explanations of language use (Example 5). During extended language play and repair work, the peer group thus generated opportunities for ‘pushed output’ (Swain 2000). Thereby, the children not only displayed their L2 skills, but also their concern for L2 form and accuracy. Even though language play often occurred off-task, it still offered important opportunities for language learning in that the children could exercise their skills in word-

segmentation, word-definitions and syntactic analysis (puns). Language play events thus provided the peer group with important resources for exploring several levels of grammar.

Obviously, many of these events thus constitute instances of explicit language instruction that bear a resemblance to language drills and other “outlawed” form-focused language teaching activities (cf. Cook 2000:187-193, 2001 for a critique of the contemporary rejection of form-focused language teaching). Yet, no one can question the authenticity or “naturalness” of the present form focused sequences, in that it was the children themselves, who initiated these very play episodes. The present findings can thus be seen as an empirical underpinning of ludic models of language learning.

A remaining question is: when and why does language play become funny? In our data, the children’s language play bears a striking resemblance to the grammatical and lexical exercises in the routine language learning activities of the classroom. Within the joking events, the children indirectly commented on their own language use as it were (and created ‘time out’ within the framework of classroom activities). In fact, language play was bound to a range of classroom routines, which directly or indirectly involved vocabulary training, that is, activities that focus on formal aspects of L2 learning. The ritual character of language learning was thus recycled into something funny (cf. Rampton 1999a; 1999b).

Being able to play with language can ultimately be seen as an aspect of communicative competence, perhaps “a necessary part of advanced proficiency” in a first or second language (Cook 2000: 150). When the present children jokingly played with their second language, they were thus involved in a twofold process, of practicing language and of qualifying as participants in the classroom community, thereby securing occasions for practicing L2.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the editors G. Cook and G. Kasper, and two anonymous reviewers for insightful comments. Thanks are also due to Jakob Cromdal, Michael Tholander and the members of the Discourse Seminar at the Department of Child Studies for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this article. Financial support from the Swedish Research Council is gratefully acknowledged.

NOTES

1

We have explored elsewhere joking events involving metapragmatic play: e.g. play involving role reversal, as in imitations of teachers' gestures or ways of talking (Cekaite and Aronsson 2004).

² Thereby, he is violating Swedish gender rules (in choosing 'en' instead of 'ett' as the indefinite article. A similar violation of gender rules can be seen in Ex. 2 (line 2 'en par skor' instead of 'ett par skor'; our underlining). In Swedish, there is no natural gender, and standard gender choices are relatively late acquisitions in children's L2 repertoires. It should also be noted that the children at times produced other-repairs that involved such minor violations of Swedish grammar.

Transcription key

- : : prolonged syllable
- [] : demarcates overlapping utterances
- (.) : micropause, i.e. shorter than (0.5)
- (2) : numbers in single parentheses represent pauses in seconds
- YES : relatively high amplitude
- x : inaudible word
- (xx) : unsure transcription
- what* : word in English
- jala* : word in Arabic
- ° ° : denotes speech in low volume
- (()) : further comments of the transcriber

> <	: quicker pace than surrounding talk
< >	: slower pace than surrounding talk
?	: denotes rising terminal intonation
.	: indicates falling terminal intonation
=	: denotes latching between utterances
<u>Fare</u>	: sounds marked by emphatic stress are underlined
he	: indicates laughter (number of tokens represent duration)

REFERENCES

- Bauman, R. and C. Briggs.** 1990. 'Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life.' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 59-88.
- Belz, J.** 2002. 'Second language play as a representation of the multicompetent self in foreign language study.' *Language, Identity and Education* 1/1:13-39.
- Bjorklund, D. F.** 1989. *Children's Thinking. Developmental Function and Individual Differences.* Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Broner, M. and E. Tarone.** 2001. 'Is it fun? Language play in a fifth-grade Spanish immersion classroom.' *The Modern Language Journal* 85/3: 363-379.
- Cathcart-Strong, R.** 1986. 'Input generation by young second language learners.' *TESOL Quarterly* 20/3: 515-530.
- Cazden, C.** 1976. 'Play and meta-linguistic awareness' in Bruner, J., A. Jolly, and K. Sylva (eds.): *Play: Its Role in Development and Evolution.* New York: Basic Books.
- Cekaite, A. and K. Aronsson.** 2004. 'Repetition and joking in children's second language conversations: playful recyclings in an immersion classroom.' *Discourse Studies* 6/3: 373-392.

- Chukovsky, K.** [1928] 1963. *From Two to Five*. (Translated and edited by M. Morton). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cook, G.** 1997. 'Language play, language learning'. *English Language Teaching Journal* 51/3: 224-231.
- Cook, G.** 2000. *Language Play, Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, G.** 2001. '"The philosopher pulled the lower jaw of the hen": ludicrous invented sentences in language teaching.' *Applied Linguistics* 22/3: 366-387.
- Cromdal, J. and K. Aronsson.** 2001. 'Footing in bilingual play.' *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4/3: 435-457.
- Crystal, D.** 1998. *Language Play*. Penguin Books.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. and C. Mitchell-Kernan.** (eds.) 1977. *Child Discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ervin-Tripp, S.** 1981. 'Social process in first- and second-language learning.' *Annals of the New York Academy of Science* 379: 33-47.
- Garrett, P. and P. Baquedano-Lopez.** 2002. 'Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change.' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 339-61.
- Garvey, C.** 1977. 'Play with language and speech' in Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan (eds.).
- Glenn, P. J.** 1989. 'Initiating shared laughter in multi-party conversations.' *Western Journal of Speech communication* 53/2: 127-149.
- Goodwin, M. H.** 1990. *He-said-she-said: Talk as Social Organization among black Children*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Heath, S. B.** 1983. *Ways with Words*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, R.** 1992. *Telephone Conversation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Iwamura, S.** 1980. *The Verbal Games of Pre-school Children*. London: Croom Helm.

- Jakobson, R.** 1960. 'Closing statement: linguistics and poetics' in Sebeok T. A. (ed.): *Style in Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Jakobson, R.** 1988. 'Children's verbal art' in Jakobson, R. *Selected Writings*. vol VIII. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Jefferson, G.** 1987. 'On exposed and embedded correction' in Button, G. and J. Lee (eds.): *Talk and Social Organisation*. Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Jefferson, G.** 1996. 'On the poetics of ordinary talk.' *Text and Performance Quarterly* 16/1: 1-61.
- Kasper, G.** 1985. 'Repair in foreign language teaching.' *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 7/2: 200-215.
- Kirchenblatt-Gimblett, B.** (ed.) 1976. *Speech Play*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kramsch, C.** 2002a. 'Introduction' in Kramsch (ed.).
- Kramsch, C.** (ed.) 2002b. *Language Acquisition and Language Socialization*. London: Continuum.
- Kramsch, C. and P. Sullivan.** 1996. 'Appropriate pedagogy'. *English Language Teaching Journal* 50/3:199-213.
- Krupa-Kwiatkowski, M.** 1998. 'You shouldn't have brought me here!' Interaction strategies in the silent period of an inner-directed second language learner.' *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31/2: 133-175.
- Lantolf, J. P.** 1997. 'The function of language play in the acquisition of Spanish' in Glass, W.R. and A.T. Pèrez- Leroux (eds.): *Contemporary Perspectives on the Acquisition of Spanish*. volume 2. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Lantolf, J. P.** (ed.) 2000. *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Mannheim, B.** 1986. 'Popular song and popular grammar, poetry and metalanguage.' *Word* 37/1: 45-75.
- McGhee, P.E. and A. J. Chapman** (eds.). 1980. *Children's Humour*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Mitchell-Kernan, C. and K. T. Kernan.** 1977. 'Pragmatics of directive choice among children' in Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan (eds.).
- Nelson, C.** 1989. *Narratives from the Crib*. Harvard University Press.
- Norrick, N.** 1994. 'Repetition as a conversational joking strategy' in Johnstone, B. (ed.): *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Vol. II. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Ohta, A.** 2001. *Second Language Acquisition Processes in the Classroom*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Peck, S.** 1980. 'Language play in child second language acquisition' in Larsen-Freeman, D. (ed.): *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Rampton, B.** 1999a. 'Dichotomies, difference and ritual in second language learning and teaching.' *Applied Linguistics* 20/3: 316-340.
- Rampton, B.** 1999b. 'Inner London Deutsch and the animation of an instructed foreign Language'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 34/4: 480-504.
- Sacks, H.** 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*. vol. 1. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. pp: 318-331.
- Saville-Troike, M.** 1989. *The Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sawyer, R. K.** 1997. *Pretend Play as Improvisation. Conversation in the Preschool Classroom*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schieffelin, B. and E. Ochs.** 1996. 'The microgenesis of competence: methodology in language socialization' in Slobin, D., J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis and J. Guo (eds.): *Social Interaction, Social Context, and Language*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sherzer, J.** 1978. 'Oh! That's a pun and I didn't mean it.' *Semiotic* 22/3-4: 335-350.

- Sullivan, P. N.** 2000a. 'Spoken artistry: performance in second language classroom' in Hall, J. K. and L. S. Verplaetse (eds.): *Second and Foreign Language Learning through Classroom Interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sullivan, P. N.** 2000b. 'Playfulness as mediation in communicative language teaching in a Vietnamese classroom' in Lantolf (ed.).
- Sutton-Smith, B.** 1976. '*A developmental structural account of riddles*' in Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (ed.).
- Swain, M.** 2000. 'The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue' in Lantolf (ed.).
- Thorne, B.** 1993. *Gender Play. Girls and Boys in School*. New Brunswick: Rutgers.
- van Dam, J.** 2002. 'Ritual, face, and play in a first English lesson' in Kramsch (ed.).
- Weir, R.** 1962. *Language in the Crib*. The Hague: Mouton and Co.
- Willet, J.** 1995. 'Becoming first graders in an L2. An ethnographic study of L2 socialization.' *TESOL Quarterly* 29/3: 473-503.
- Wong Fillmore, L.** 1979. 'Individual differences in second language acquisition' in Fillmore, C., D. Kempler and W. Wang (eds.): *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior*. New York: Academic Press.