



From the

## **AERA Online Paper Repository**

<http://www.aera.net/repository>

**Paper Title** "Hey, It's a Gink": A Young Child's Use of the Internet in the Home

**Author(s)** Christina R. Davidson, Charles Sturt University

**Session Title** Reconceptualizing Methods in Early Childhood Research

**Session Type** Paper

**Presentation Date** 4/8/2011

**Presentation Location** New Orleans, Louisiana, USA

**Descriptors** Early Childhood, Qualitative Research

**Methodology** Qualitative

**Unit** SIG-Critical Perspectives on Early Childhood Education

Each presenter retains copyright on the full-text paper. Repository users should follow legal and ethical practices in their use of repository material; permission to reuse material must be sought from the presenter, who owns copyright. Users should be aware of the [Ethical Standards of the American Educational Research Association](#).

Citation of a paper in the repository should take the following form:  
[Authors.] ([Year, Date of Presentation]). [Paper Title.] Paper presented at the [Year] annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Retrieved [Retrieval Date], from the AERA Online Paper Repository.

**“Hey it’s a Gink”: A Young Child’s Use of the Internet in the Home**

**Paper for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 8 –  
April 12, 2011, New Orleans, Louisiana.**

**Dr Christina Davidson  
Faculty of Education  
Charles Sturt University  
Wagga Wagga  
Australia**

## **“Hey it’s a Gink”: A Young Child’s Use of the Internet in the Home**

Increasingly, young children are using the internet. Yet studies of young children’s computer activity give little attention to information and persuasive texts that child access and use via the internet. This paper examines the talk and interaction of a young child aged two years and eleven months during his use of internet sites about lizards. Sites were accessed from YouTube and Wikipedia. The study provides an ethnomethodological account of the ways that Denny accomplished his various activities related to an initial Google search for lizards that his father provided for him. Specifically, the analysis examines and discusses Denny’s use of the internet sites to provide and talk about information and to share on-screen images that he found amusing.

### **Purpose**

Survey research has established young children’s increasing use of computers in the home (NetRatings, 2005; Zevenbergen, 2007, Zevenbergen & Logan, 2008). Their computer activities include using computer games, drawing tools, word processing, desktop publishing, and printing pictures (Marsh et al., 2005). Young children also access the internet (Levy, 2009, Marsh et al., 2005). Despite the variety and richness of young children’s computer practices, research also confirms that the use of computers in early learning contexts remains controversial with many staff in preschool and primary settings slow to acknowledge the importance that digital technologies have now assumed in the lives of young children (Carrington, 2001, 2005a, 2005b; Plowman, Stephen & McPake, 2008).

Many existing studies of young children’s use of computers give primacy to children’s development of reading (Levy, 2009) and writing skills (Merchant, 2005), for example through engagement with stories using CD-ROMS (Lefever-Davis & Pearman, 2005; Shamir & Korat, 2006; Smith, 2002) or with programs designed to teach children decoding skills rather than more authentic literacy practices (Lankshear & Knobel, 2003). Other studies examine children’s use of computer games (Downes, 2002; Facer et al., 2001) or emphasise the development of computer skills, such as effective use of the mouse and keyboard (Zevenbergen, 2007). Few studies provide detailed examination of very young children’s use of the internet to access information (Spink, Danby, Mallan, & Butler, 2010).

This paper addresses the internet use of Denny, a child of almost three who regularly used the internet at home with his father and brother. The paper provides a detailed sequential analysis of Denny’s internet activity as he viewed the results of an internet search for lizards. In particular, the analysis examines Denny’s selection and use of information texts from Wikipedia and a YouTube advertisement that he found funny. Discussion considers how the young child used computer images and interaction to share and develop knowledge of various lizards and to engage family members in his activity.

## **Perspective**

The research is informed by the theoretical perspective of ethnomethodology (EM), a sociological approach to understanding people's ordinary actions. According to the perspective, members of society bring about an ordered existence as an everyday and local accomplishment (Cuff, Sharrock & Francis, 1990). Members orient to sense-making in ways that provide for order, seek to find it, and account for its absence in orderly ways (Heritage, 1985). What ethnomethodologists seek to do specifically is to find, describe and explicate the methods by which members do this as an ordinary and everyday way of *doing life* (Garfinkel, 1984). One way of determining these methods is to examine social interaction. The perspective is particularly powerful for examining the social activity of young children because it takes them to be competent contributors to their social worlds (Hutchby & Moran-Ellis, 1998; Theobald, 2009).

Conversation Analysis (CA) is an arm of EM that focuses on the sequential analysis of talk. Central to the approach is the repeated reviewing of recordings of naturally occurring activity, detailed transcription of recordings and reporting of analysis that provides transcripts as evidence. The approach to analysing activity *in situ* results in fine-grained descriptions of how people 'bring off' their social activity (Sacks, 1995) on a turn-by-turn basis during their talk and interaction. A particular focus for analysis is to show how turns at talk produce or document what people take to be going on during interaction (Schegloff, 2007).

The social organization of young children's activity is an established field within the EM and CA literature. Studies include examinations of young children's disputes (Church, 2009; Theobald, 2009), a young child's use of topical talk in family mealtime (Busch, 2009), the social organization of young children's activity during a writing lesson (Davidson, 2004) and the social accomplishment of games in the playground (Butler, 2008). The fine-grained description that results from CA has encompassed such interactional activity as young children's requests (Wootten, 1981) and arguments (Maynard, 1985) and the accomplishment of joint action (Kidwell & Zimmerman, 2007).

## **Methods**

The broader study that informs this paper sought to describe and explicate the social organization of young children's activity during use of the computer in their homes (Davidson, 2010; 2009). Data collection consisted of DVD recordings of young children (under the age of eight) from four families. Recording was up to thirty minutes in length on each occasion. This article draws on one recording where two boys in a family used the computer with their father. Initially, the father initiated a Google search, using the word "lizards". This search provided a number of sites that then became the focus in particular for the younger child's activity.

The recording of the children's internet activity was uploaded into Transana, a computer program used for repeated viewing of recordings and development of transcripts. The recording

was transcribed using Jefferson notation (Atkinson and Heritage, 1999); a transcription system employed within CA. Jefferson notation is a detailed system of symbols that can be used to encode aspects of talk and interaction such as pauses and changes in intonation. The transcription of laughter was important in this study and Jefferson's system also allows for the close transcription of laughter in order to attend to "laughter's details" (Jefferson, 1979, p. 80) so as to understand how humour was orientated to and relevant for the on-going social interaction between the adults and child while watching a YouTube clip. The transcript was used in tandem with the original recording to analyse the talk and interaction that occurred. Symbols used in transcription are provided after the conclusion section of the paper. Gary (G) and Leanne (L) are the parents of the children. Denny (D) is the younger child and Matt (M) is his brother. The researcher (R) was also present during the recording. At the time of recording, Denny was aged 2 years and 11 months and Matthew was 6 years and 7 months.

### **Analysis**

Analysis is of a number of sequences of interaction that involved Denny. Sequences are from a single recording and were selected because of the young child's orientations to particular activities that resulted from the Google search that his father initiated at his request. These activities included selecting and watching YouTube clips and scrolling through Wikipedia sites about lizards. Extended sequences of talk about a single YouTube clip and one Wikipedia site are examined in this paper.

### ***Example 1: Wikipedia***

This first sequence is analysed in order to establish some of the ways that Denny and his father accomplished the exchange and discussion of information about a Wikipedia page. The analysis will show how Denny and his father determined what they knew and didn't know, as well as confirmed their shared knowledge of lizards. Of specific interest are the methods used by Denny to gain the attention of his father and to convince him of the identity of one lizard.

During the initial interaction that resulted from the Wikipedia page, the father and young child engage in talk to identify lizards. In the excerpt that begins here, Denny summons attention to a lizard through his talk and action with the cursor (1). His use of the word "hey" is the initial summons. Together with the directive (look) and the use of the cursor to point, Denny's actions all seek to gain and draw attention to a single lizard in an image that contains several. The emphasis given to his words also appears to seek attention.

- 1 D: he:y
- 2 (0.4)
- 3 D: look! ((places cursor on lizard))
- 4 G: who's that
- 5 (0.4)
- 6 M: frill neck

- 7 (0.2)  
8 D: fri:ll neck

In response, Denny's father asks a question (4) that provides for the identification of the lizard that Denny's actions have indicated. In the absence of a comment from Denny (5), Matt answers the question (6) and Denny then repeats the name of the lizard. His pronunciation of words adds emphasis to his utterance and endorses the information provided by his brother (8). Therefore, the name of a lizard is produced as a mutual accomplishment between family members as a result of the father's question. Once produced there is no endorsement of the answer provided by the children. This suggests that the father has used the question for the children to display their knowledge rather than prompting exploratory talk about a lizard that is unknown to them.

After a gap in talk, the father then asks a question about another lizard in the image (10), although he does not indicate the recipient for his talk. His utterance encompasses a clue to how the lizard might be identified or named because it draws attention to a particular feature of the lizard –it's spikey. Denny's talk overlaps his father's with a summons (11) and the movement of the cursor to the same lizard that is the focus of his father's question. The overlap is "trouble" in the talk (Schegloff, 2007) and so the father attempts repair by repeating his question. His use of "spikey" again names the attribute of the lizard and he avoids providing the name of the lizard himself through the use of "one" (12).

- 9 (1.6)  
10 G: who's that spi[key  
11 D: [hey\_((places cursor on the lizard))  
12 G: who's that [spikey one  
13 D: [a dorny devil  
14 G: well done  
15 D: a dorny devil  
16 (0.2)  
17 G: good boy

The father's second question is also overlapped, this time by the provision of the name of the lizard. This answer is assessed in a way that acknowledges that it was a difficult identification (14). The words "well done" provide an assessment of the child's activity in identifying the lizard and confirm the correctness of the answer. The provision of a further assessment (17) suggests that the question was a tricky one for Denny to answer.

A little later in the interaction, it is Denny who begins to ask questions about lizards in the image. Again, he uses a summons (39) to attract attention and this is closely followed by use of the cursor to point at the specific lizard. These actions are then followed by his question (41 and 43) which makes relevant the provision of information.

- 39 D: he::::y

40 (2.0)↔((D points at screen using cursor))  
41 D: what's=  
42 L: =°sit on°  
43 D: dat one called  
44 (0.6)  
45 G: o:h I'm not sure=  
46 D: =skin lizard!

Gary's response does not provide information; instead, he indicates his uncertainty (45). This in turn prompts Denny to propose a name for the lizard. His talk is latched to his father's so appears to provide an answer in the absence of information from his father (45-46).

In the talk that follows, Gary's question does not provide agreement with Denny's candidate answer (skin lizard) but avoids the provision of a dispreferred (Schegloff, 2007) or negative response (such as "no"). Instead he inserts a question which proposes an alternative candidate answer (Jefferson, 1979) – that it is "some sort of dragon" (50). Denny agrees that the lizard is like a kind of dragon (52) but then he provides an alternate answer ("or plying lizard").

47 (0.8)  
48 G: is it like ↑a::h  
49 (0.6)  
50 G: some sort of dragon?,  
51 (0.4)  
52 D: yea::h (0.2) or plying lizard ((looking at G))  
53 (0.6)  
54 G: a::w I think that other one's a flying lizard (0.4) flying gecko  
55 (3.0)↔((D turning back to face screen))  
56 D: know what dat one  
57 (0.4)↔((D uses cursor to point at lizard))  
58 D: dat one  
59 (0.4)  
60 D: ↑ei↓der  
61 M: °Dad°  
62 G: I kno::w  
63 (1.0)  
64 M: °go go go°

The father does not provide agreement with Denny's proposed name for the lizard, and again shows that a negative answer is a dispreferred response through the use of the delaying tactic (a::w). Instead, he indicates another lizard that is a flying lizard thus countering or ruling out Denny's proposal. The father also repairs his talk to provide the correct terminology (flying gecko). There is then a gap in talk as Denny turns his gaze and attention back to the on-screen image (57). Denny then indicates another lizard that is unknown to him and this complaint

(Schegloff, 2007) prompts agreement from the father (62). In the background the older son can be heard very softly to summons his father and then direct an action. (61 and 64)

Denny then returns to the unknown lizard that he had asked about earlier (lines 41 and 43). The word “hey” followed by the non-verbal action of turning, precedes Denny’s announcement (it’s a ↑gink). There is a gap in the talk and then the father speaks. He formulates Denny’s previous talk as indicating his thinking about the lizard (do you think?), although again uses the words “some sort of”. This utterance indicates his understanding that there are kinds of skinks and “leaves room” for the possibility that the lizard might be a skink of some kind.

- 65 D: hey((turning to G))it’s a ↑gink  
66 (1.6)  
67 G: some sort of skink do you think?  
68 (0.2)  
69 D: yeah  
70 (0.4)  
71 D: [[maybe  
72 G: [[o::h it could be too

Denny provides agreement (69). The silence that follows is potentially a place for his father to speak as it indicates a completion of Denny’s turn. However, Denny resumes talk at the same time as his father speaks. Although Denny’s talk suggests that his answer is a possibility, his father than appears to provide agreement with Denny’s original proposal. The token (o::h) indicates a change of state or understanding (Heritage, 1985), and the use of ‘could’ and the emphasis given to it also indicate that the father now considers his son’s suggestion as even *more* possible.

Denny then reiterates his proposal that the lizard is a skink and his father agrees promptly, again overlapping his son’s talk. Because of this overlap, Gary repeats his agreement, naming the lizard in full (76).

- 73 D: it’s a skin [lizard  
74 G: [↑could ↓be  
75 (0.4)  
76 G: could be a skink lizard  
77 (0.4)  
78 D: °yeah°  
79 (1.0)

Denny indicates his understanding that his father has agreed with him. His use of “yeah” (78) also audibly concludes the interchange about that particular lizard and talk between the two lapses.

In summary, the image that prompted talk required some negotiation of the correct names of lizards and in the talk, between Denny and his father, we see them negotiate meaning through interaction that considers the names that can be assigned to individual lizards, in some instances according to their attributes (such as being “spikey”). Although there were gaps in the knowledge of each about lizards, they shared enough common knowledge for the initial guessing game and then, later, negotiation of the genuinely unknown.

### ***Example 2: YouTube clip***

During his use of the internet, Denny also selected YouTube clips. These were sites that he found humorous and were usually advertisements of some kind that contained animation. He returned to watch one of these on several occasions during the recording. This was a Superbowl advertisement for an energy drink which uses the music and dance movements from Michael Jackson’s Thriller. In the advertisement, the characters dancing are lizards (see <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=anLqu77uTH0> to see this same clip, watched over five million times to date). The recording showed that Denny located the YouTube clip by scrolling down the search results. The analysis that follows describes and explicates how Denny galvanized the attention of others to share his amusement and how his actions, including laughter, were used to maintain shared attention until the specific on-screen images were located that Denny took to be very funny.

Initially, talk is about the clip and establishes that family members have seen it before and that it is regarded as the children’s favourite YouTube clip. Denny finds the site first and then summons the attention of others (1) around him. Gary’s repetition of Denny’s words (2) both acknowledges that Denny has been successful in gaining attention and provides a response to Denny’s talk. There is a short gap which is followed then by laughter (4). Laughter is constituted by an aspiration (Jefferson, 1995) and then talk that is interspersed with laugh particles (Potter & Hepburn, 2010). Through the use of “their”, the father is hearably speaking *about* the children in their presence. The researcher’s utterances appear in response to the gradually emerging on-screen image but also takes account of the father’s invitation for laughter (Jefferson, 1979).

- 1 D: look! this one!
- 2 G: th(h)is one
- 3 (0.6)
- 4 G: hhmph th(h)is is the(h)ir fav(h)ourite
- 5 (1.0)↔((YouTube clip begins to appear))
- 6 R: °oh huh°
- 7 (3.0)↔((image continuing to appear))
- 8 M: oh this is our favourite
- 9 R: is it?
- 10 M: yeah this is fu(h)nny
- 11 (11.0)↔((clip begins to play))

The older child then speaks (8). His utterance appears in response to the image appearing on the screen. So “oh” is the realization or acknowledgement of the image appearing and then his words formulate the YouTube clip as the children’s favourite. His words echo those of his father. The researcher’s response (9) appears to confirm her hearing that his words are directed at her and her question occasions the answer that Matt then provides (10). His confirmation (“yeah”) is followed by further information that indicates his assessment of the clip as funny.

When the YouTube clip plays it provides a number of on-screen visual images that are *potentially* amusing. At the same time, interactions with those same images are required to produce them as funny when viewed on particular occasions. In this next section, the appearance of images of lizards dancing is followed by laughter from Denny (12-13). The close proximity of the laughter to the images suggests that Denny’s laughter is a response to the onscreen activity.

- 12 (1.0)↔((images of lizards dancing to music))
- 13 D: hee he:::e
- 14 (2.0)↔((music playing and lizards moving))
- 15 M: hehehehe
- 16 (0.8)

As the clip continues to play, the older brother also responds with laughter (15) which endorses his previous comment that the clip is funny. The gap between the laughter of the boys, however, suggests that each is laughing *at* (Glenn, 2003) the screen images rather than laughing together at the same thing.

Next, an image of an insect appears on the screen as the lizards dance. It is this aspect of the clip that Denny works to produce as notable and the focus for interest of those around him who are watching the clip. The appearance of the insect first occasions a directive from Denny (17 and 18). His words (↑watch ↓dis) draw attention to the screen and are a harbinger (Macbeth, 2000) of something to come on the screen. He also stops the clip momentarily (19). His next utterance coincides with the flight of the insect across the front of the lizards (20). Then, he again produces talk (with utterances 22 and 24) which requires that attention is focused on the screen, even though for the moment the insect can’t be seen.

- 17 (1.0)↔((image of insect lands above lizards’ heads))
- 18 D: ↑watch ↓dis
- 19 (2.0)↔((screen image freezes))
- 20 D: de:(h)re ((as insect flies past lizards))
- 21 (1.0)↔((music playing and lizards dancing))
- 22 D: ↑wa:tch
- 23 (0.6)
- 24 D: ↓watch
- 25 (2.0)↔ ((image freezes on the screen))

Denny’s use of the word “watch” is varied in its production each time. In this way, his talk works

to command attention over several seconds. Since the family members know the clip and have watched it on other occasions, Denny's actions at this point indicate specifically what he finds to be funny in the clip rather than just that the clip itself is funny (since members of the family know that).

In line twenty six, Denny again summons attention ( $\uparrow$ he:l:y) and makes a directive (26 and 28). The summons does not indicate a specific referent so could be taken to be a general summons for everybody. After a gap, and without verbal response from others, Denny provides a directive (30) that names his focus on the screen.

- 26 D:  $\uparrow$ he:l:y  
27 (0.4)  
28 D: look wha(h)t's the(h)re  
29 (8.0) $\leftrightarrow$ ((a lizard uses his tongue to grab and swallow the insect))  
30 D: look at him  
31 (0.4)  
32 D: hhhm  
33 (1.8)  
34 D: °huh°  
35 (14.0) $\leftrightarrow$ ((singing 'Thriller Thriller'))  
36 D: what is he going to do with that? that [gecko!  
37 G: [°awwww°  
38 (1.0 ) $\leftrightarrow$ ((music playing and image moving then image freezes))

During most of the above segment, Denny is the only person to speak. His talk continues to focus others on the actions on screen, and the laughter provides an audible response for others (32 and 34). His question (36) occasions a response from someone else although, again, no-one is named. This utterance appears to seeking a sign of shared attention. Certainly, it prompts a brief response from his father (37).

The parents speak to each other softly, although the talk cannot be discerned on the recording, and the images continue to move on screen (39-40). Then the father responds to the action on the screen with an outward breath (42) and potentially an opportunity for shared laughter to develop. Denny responds non-verbally and verbally. His question is about the action on the screen and more directly requires a response from his father through the use of the summons ("Dad"). He has also turned and is looking at his father (44).

- 39 G: °( )°  
40 L: °( )°  
41 (2.0) $\leftrightarrow$ ((image moving on screen))  
42 G: °hhhhmmph°  
43 (1.0)  
44 D: ((turning to father)) is this the bit Dad! =

45 G: =here it comes (0.2) >here it comes< watch it!

The father's announcement (here it comes) is repeated at a faster pace and followed by a directive (45). This hearably produces urgency and is, again, evidence that the YouTube clip is a familiar one and talk draws on that familiarity. Since Denny has been looking at his father the directive to "watch it!" works to return Denny's attention to the screen.

In the next segment of the clip, Gary's laughter is followed closely by laughter from Denny. It appears that Gary's laughter is heard by Denny, as an invitation (Jefferson, 1979) to laugh. Denny laughs (48) and provides an agreement token in response. Denny then produces more laughter (50) and Gary's response (an in-breath) also provides laughter but signals the final laugh from him through the inbreath (51). The researcher also laughs softly.

46 (2.0)↔ ((image on screen of all lizards dancing to Thriller))

47 G: chhuh

48 D: hhhhyea:h

49 (1.0)

50 D: hmuh

51 G: .hhhh

52 R: °hehe°

In this sequence we see the accomplishment of laughing together (Glenn, 2003). Laughter occurs in joint recognition of something that is funny at the same time as it produces "funniness" as an audible and shared interactional phenomenon indexed to a common understanding of "what it is that one is looking at" (Sacks, 1995, pp. 87-88).

## Discussion

This section discusses the young child's navigation of web pages and interactions with those, the mutual accomplishment of activity during the child's use of the internet, and the interaction resources that were used to produce socially recognisable actions and activities during interaction. Each of these points is considered here as they relate to either or both of the excerpts analysed.

The ways that the young child successfully navigated and interacted with the various web pages and images were of interest. Although his father keyed in the initial search term, the search result enabled Denny to find various sites independently and interact with those. In the case of the YouTube clip, Denny's talk indicated that he knew what image would appear, even before the clip began to download. Prior experience of previous searches was important therefore in producing meaningful talk and enabling particular actions and interactions to occur, such as the recruitment of attention. Shared *experience* of previous searches was also evident in the assessment of the clip as a favourite and as funny by other members of the family. Thus, familiarity informed much of Denny's activity as he negotiated his way between Wikipedia and YouTube sites.

The websites visited by Denny were clearly designed for particular purposes. However, they were used for other activities by Denny and members of his family. Although the lizard's clip was an advertisement, this was not made relevant by the parents or by the children. Instead they continued to orient to their shared interest in lizards and to images of them. So, while the advertisement was designed for one purpose, the analysis showed the use of it, *in situ*, for quite another. This was also evident in the use of the Wikipedia site where talk about images enabled the exchange or sharing of information, learning of new information and "testing" the information of others as a kind of guessing game. Printed information was not referred to by adults or children during talk; instead the screen provided a locus for family engagement during which the younger child was able to participate in knowledgeable and competent ways.

Clearly, the young child already knew a lot about lizards and it was the exchange of what was known and not known that became the focus for much of the talk and interaction with his father. Integral to talk was the clear identification of *not knowing* by the father and by Denny. Importantly, it wasn't always the father who knew and provided information, as his utterances and interactions clearly indicated to Denny at various stages throughout. As both viewed images in the Wikipedia site, they named lizards that they knew and asked each other whether they knew the names of others. At times, clarification was required and this prompted talk about features of lizards. Negotiation of understandings followed when they disagreed.

The shared accomplishment of "laughables" was an important aspect of Denny's online viewing of YouTube recordings. In the case of the Thriller-inspired clip, there were potentially many things to prompt laughter. What was evident in the recording was that points in the clip became shared recognition points (Jefferson, 1979) or places where laughter made apparent what was being laughed *at* on the occasion, and where laughter was taken to be "laughing together" or mutual acknowledgement of something thought to be funny and indicated to be funny to others present. Laughter was sometimes, then, a "display of mutual understanding" (Glenn, 2003, p. 29). At other times, laughter appeared to be a response to an action on the screen but was not used to invite or initiate "laughing together" (Glenn, 1989; 1992) and the sharing of something funny.

The transcription and description of laughter illustrate that humans "laugh in systematic, socially organized ways" (Glenn, 2003, p. 52), even when talk is prompted by, or directed at, images on the computer screen. For example, laughter was used to systematically take account of the researcher's presence in the home during the children's use of the computer. That is, talk and laughter were directed at the researcher with laughter being used on several occasions to invite (Jefferson, 1979) the researcher into sharing the image and the family's experience of it. The researcher's acceptance and provision of laughter was integral to doing "being with the family" (Sacks, 1995) as the recording was produced.

It is important, then, to understand laughter as an interactional resource. Previous studies have established the importance of the sequential placement of laughter (Jefferson, 1979), and the

sounds and dynamics of laughter in relation to exchanges during interaction. In this study, the analysis has produced understandings of how laughter, talk, and image intersected. Although laughter is a taken-for-granted aspect of interaction, we see the competence of the young child in his use of laughter and response to it to accomplish his interactions with the computer and with those present.

Finally, the analysis provides illustrations of the ways that the young child was able to gain the attention of others and maintain that attention so as to talk about lizards and share the amusing YouTube clips. Joint attention, understood as an interactional process (Kidwell & Zimmerman, 2007), was constituted by a number of interactional resources including the young child's use of the word "hey", as well as use of laughter. The word "hey" was important in the maintenance of activity during the naming of objects in the "guessing game" kind of activity that the father and child maintained using the Wikipedia lizard's site. The word "hey" was used to initiate interaction, and to resume talk when there had been a lapse. It was followed by an announcement that named a lizard or by a question that required the father to name a specific lizard. Sometimes pointing, either finger pointing or with the cursor, was used and "freezing" of the YouTube clip also became integral to framing on-screen activity that was of interest. All these actions enabled the young child to make certain images "perceptually available to another" (Kidwell & Zimmerman, 2007, p. 593).

## **Conclusions**

There is an urgent need to document and understand young children's use of computer technology. This study addresses that need through its analysis of one young child's activity during use of the internet. The focus on the social accomplishment of his online activity results in fine-grained analysis that enables description and explication of computer practices and talk about online texts that is central to them. Denny's use of the computer suggests implications for educators and researchers alike. In particular, we might learn from the ways that the young child oriented to information texts and images that interested and amused rather than literature designed specifically to teach young children to read. Further, through analysis of interaction between the family members and the technology itself we are able to find meaning-making in the audible and visible actions produced by family members for each other in response to on-screen images and activity.

## **Transcription Symbols**

- [[ Utterances that begin at the same time
- [ Overlap in speakers' talk
- ] Indicates point where simultaneous talk finishes
- = Talk between speakers that latches or follows without a break between
- (0.2) Used to indicate length of silences, pauses and gaps
- (.) Indicates micro intervals
- ::: Indicates that a prior sound is prolonged e.g. li::ke
- Word is cut off e.g. ta-

><	Talk enclosed within symbols is said at a faster pace than the surrounding talk
?	Rising inflection
?,	Rising intonation that is weaker than ?
↑	Marked rising intonation
↓	Marked falling intonation
!	An animated tone
<u>un</u>	Emphasis with capitals indicating greater emphasis e.g. <u>NO</u>
.....	Emphasis and prolongation indicate pitch change e.g. <u>stra::p</u> indicates stress on word but no change in pitch; <u>stra::p</u> pitch rise
CA	Upper case indicates loudness
°	Indicates softness e.g. It's a °secret °
.hhh	Indicates audible inhalation
hhh	Indicates audible aspiration
w(h)as	Parenthesized <i>h</i> , or row of <i>h</i> s indicates breathiness in words that may be laughter
(it)	Indicates that the word within parentheses is uncertain
( )	Empty parentheses indicate that word/s could not be worked out
(( ))	These are used to indicate verbal descriptions e.g. ((sits down))
→	Talk that is the focus for analysis
↔	Indicates action occurring during gap in talk e.g. (3.0)↔((watching screen))
.	Indicates that turns at talk have been omitted

Adapted from Jefferson's transcript notation (1989) as presented in Atkinson and Heritage (1999) and Psathas and Anderson (1995).

## References

- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1999). Jefferson's transcript notation. In A. Jaworski and N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 158-166). London; New York: Routledge.
- Busch, G. (2009). *Mealtime: Choices about topic – considering co-participants*. Symposium on the Interactional Practices of Children in Institutional Contexts for 11<sup>th</sup> International Pragmatics Conference, 12-17 July, Melbourne, Australia.
- Butler, C. W. (2008). *Talk and social interaction in the playground*. Aldershot, Eng: Ashgate Publishing.
- Carrington, V. (2001). Emergent home literacies: A challenge for educators. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 24(2), 88-100.
- Carrington, V. (2005a). The uncanny, digital texts and literacy. *Language and Education*, 19(6), 467-482.
- Carrington, V. (2005b). New textual landscapes, information and early literacy. In J. Marsh (Ed.), *Popular culture, new media and digital literacy in early childhood* (pp. 13-27). London; New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Church, A. (2008). *Preference organization and peer disputes*. Farnham, Eng: Ashgate Publishing.
- Cuff, E. C., Sharrock, W., & Francis, D. (1998). *Perspectives in sociology*. New York: Routledge.
- Davidson, C. (2004). *The social organization of independent writing in an early years*

- classroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.
- Davidson, C. (2009). Young children's engagement with digital texts and literacies in the home: Pressing matters for the teaching of English in the early years of schooling. *English: Practice and Critique* 8(3), 36-54.
- Davidson, C. (2010). "Click on the big red car": The social organization of playing a Wiggles computer game. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 16(4), 375-394.
- Downes, T. (2002). Blending play, practice and performance: Children's use of the computer at home. *Journal of Educational Inquiry*, 3(2), 21-34.
- Duranti, C. (2003). Pointing as situated practice. In S. Kita (Ed.), *Pointing: Where language, culture and cognition meet* (pp. 217-41). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Facer, K., Furlong, J., Furlong, R., & Sutherland, R. (2001). Constructing the child computer user: From public policy to private practices. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 22(1), 91-108.
- Garfinkel, H. (1984). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Glenn, P. J. (1989). Initiating shared laughter in multi-party conversations. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 53, 127-149.
- Glenn, P. J. (1992). Current speaker initiation of two-party shared laughter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 25, 139-162.
- Glenn, P. J. (1995). Laughing at and laughing with: Negotiating participant alignments through conversational laughter. In P. ten Have & G. Psathas (Eds.), *Situated order: Studies in social organization of talk and embodied activities* (pp. 43-56). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Glenn, P. (2003). *Laughter in interaction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an over-hearing audience. In T. v. Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis. Vol 3: Discourse and dialogue* (pp. 95-117). New York: Academic Press.
- Hutchby, I., & Moran-Ellis, J. (1998). *Children and social competence: Arenas of action*. London; Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.
- Kidwell, M., & Zimmerman, D. H. (2007). Joint attention as action. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(3), 592-611.
- Jefferson, G. (1979). A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance declination. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 79-96). New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Jefferson, G., Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. (1998). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In G. Button & J. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 152-205). Clevedon, Eng; Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2003). New technologies in early childhood literacy research: A review of research. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 3(1), 59-82.

- Lefever-Davis, S., & Pearman, C. (2005). Early readers and electronic texts: CD-ROM storybook features that influence reading behaviours. *The Reading Teacher*, 58(5), 446-454.
- Levy, R. (2009). 'You have to understand the words ... but not read them': Young children becoming readers in a digital age. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 32(1), 75-91.
- Macbeth, D. (2000). Classrooms as installations. In S. Hester & D. Francis (Eds.), *Local educational order: Ethnomethodological studies of knowledge in action* (pp. 21-71). Amsterdam;Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Marsh, J., Brooks, G., Hughes, J., Rickie, L., & Roberts, S. (2005). *Digital beginnings: Young children's use of popular culture, media and new technologies*. University of Sheffield. Retrieved March 18, 2011, from <http://www.digitalbeginnings.shef.ac.uk/DigitalBeginningsReport.pdf>
- Maynard, D. (1985). How children start arguments. *Language in Society*, 14(1), 001-030.
- Merchant, G. (2005). Barbie meets Bob the builder at the workstation. In J. Marsh (Ed.), *Popular culture, new media and digital literacy in early childhood* (pp. 183-200). London; New York: Routledge Falmer.
- NetRatings Australia. (2005). *kidsonline@home: Internet use in Australian homes*. Sydney; Hobart: Australian Broadcasting Authority.
- Plowman, L., Stephen, C., & McPake, J. (2008). Supporting young children's learning with technology at home and in preschool. *Research Papers in Education*, 25(1), 93-113.
- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2010). Putting aspiration into words: 'Laugh particles', managing description trouble and modulating action. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 1543-1555.
- Psathas, G., & Anderson, T. (1990). The 'practices' of transcription in conversation analysis. *Semiotica*, 78(1/2), 75-99.
- Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on conversation/Harvey Sacks; edited by Gail Jefferson; with an introduction by Emanuel A. Schegloff*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shamir, A., & Korat, O. (2006). How to select CD-ROM storybooks for young children: The teacher's role. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(6), 532-543.
- Schegloff, M. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis (vol. 1)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, C. (2002). Click on me! An example of how a toddler used technology in play. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 2(1), 5-20.
- Spink, A. H., Danby, S. J., Mallan, K. M., and Butler, C. (2010). Exploring young children's web searching and technoliteracy. *Journal of Documentation*, 66(2),191-206.
- Theobald, M. A. (2009). *Participation and social order in the playground*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia.
- Wootton, A. J. (1981). The management of grantings and rejections by parents in request sequences. *Semiotica*, 37, 59-89.
- Zevenbergen, R. (2007). Digital natives come to preschool: Implications for early childhood

practice. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 8(1), 19-289.

Zevenergen, R., & Logan, H. (2008). Computer use by preschool children: Rethinking practice as digital natives come to school. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 33(1), 37-44.