
Reviewed by: Martine Noordegraaf, Department of Social Studies, Christian University for Applied Sciences (CHE), The Netherlands

This book is the newest addition to the Routledge series ‘Directions in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis’, which is dedicated to publishing the latest work on the study of human conduct and aptitudes, the (re)production of social orderliness and the methods and aspirations of the social sciences. Keel’s contribution fits perfectly with this aim, analysing interactions between parents and (young) children in the light of socialization theory. Keel succeeds in showing how children aged two and three years old initiate their ways into society as full members of interaction. In doing so, Keel forces readers to re-think parent–child relationships and to start to look carefully at children’s own contributions to their upbringing.

Adopting a conversation analytic approach informed by ethnomethodology (EM/CA), the book examines the process of socialization as it takes place within everyday parent–child interactions. Based on a large audio-visual corpus featuring footage of families filmed extensively in their homes, Keel focuses on the initiation of interactive assessment sequences on the part of young children with their parents and the manner in which, by means of embodied resources such as talk, gaze and gesture, they acquire communicative skills and a sense of themselves as effective social actors.

After an introduction (Chapter 1), Keel proceeds with a thorough examination of the study of socialization (Chapter 2), from Parsons (1951) via Berger and Luckmann (1966), Vygotsky (1962) and Bourdieu (1967) to Garfinkel et al. (1982) and Sacks (1992, I: 363–369, 489–506). Keel positions herself with the latest two and then discusses all the EM/CA work on parent–child interaction from the eighties until now. This chapter is the reason that a book like this (rather than a series of articles) was needed.

Chapter 3 explains how Keel came from recordings to findings by analysing collections: rather than making a single case analysis, Keel studied different ‘sets of extracts in which particular phenomena occurring in specific sequential positions were identified’ (p. 67). Keel’s collections come from daily interactions in five families with two children, and in three families with three children. Two camera operators video-recorded each family’s everyday interactions at home on four separate occasions of their own choosing, for periods of 3–4 hours at a time (each of which would include a family meal). This third chapter is very helpful for novice EM/CA researchers who want to learn how to work with collections and who want to use software (like CLAN or ELAN) as an analytical tool in doing so.

The analyses of Keel’s collections are presented in Chapters 4–6. Chapter 4 presents young children’s repetitions of initial assessments, Chapter 5 presents parents’ agreements with children’s initial assessments and Chapter 6 discusses parents’ disagreements with children’s initial assessments. In Chapter 7, concluding comments are given. Keel succeeds in showing in very precise descriptive analyses how young children and parents manage to achieve mutual understanding of the world they both inhabit, how children manage to render their actions and normative positions intelligible to their parents and how parents treat their children’s accomplishment of evaluation actions. In doing so, Keel shows that young children already have an incipient grasp of the interactive delicacy of certain initiating actions and that children successfully play their part in the complex (socialization) process: taking positions, displaying their affective implications with the surrounding world, engaging others to do so as well, negotiating with them, finally giving in to others’ stances, or maintaining their own position until the significant other backs down or comes up with a compromise. (p. 230)

With this book, new directions for ethnomethodology and conversation analysis are indeed given. Keel’s book is living proof that there is work to be done in renewing and rethinking established concepts in social sciences, by taking both an interactional and a user’s (in this case, a child’s) perspective. The way in which Keel performs such work on the concept of socialization is impressively well done. By analysing collections, she was able to describe systematic, recurrent patterns of interactions in a meaningful way, meaningful to both the field of social interaction and the field of early childhood studies.

One minor criticism is that Keel’s conclusions are rather abstract. I would prefer to have seen the outcomes discussed with parents, educationalists and social workers. In
that way, Keel could have started to formulate implications of her outcomes for daily life. Pedagogy has a tradition of applying its knowledge to (biological and professional) parents that I think is valuable and that a more applied version of EM/CA could add to.

Having said that, I realize that each study has an end and I truly hope that this one will have a follow-up in which parents can participate as co-researchers. If that were to happen, I would also recommend including families with children with developmental problems to see whether ‘all’ children show an incipient grasp of the interactive delicacy of certain initiating actions, and if not, how children without such a grasp can be supported to have an active part in their socialization.
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