



Communication as Performance and the Performativity of Communication

Bernhard Kils. "Aerial View of Münster." Wikimedia Commons. August 27, 2009. https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Muenster_Innenstadt.jpg

Proceedings of the 2014 International Colloquium on Communication

Edited by

Kevin M. Carragee
Suffolk University

Annette Moennich
University of Bochum

Communication as Performance and the Performativity of Communication:
Proceedings of the 2014 International Colloquium on Communication

Kevin M. Carragee, Editor
Department of Communication and Journalism
Suffolk University
73 Tremont Street
Boston, MA 02108
USA

Annette Mönnich, Editor
Germanistisches Institut
Ruhr-Universität Bochum
GB 3/129
44780 Bochum
GERMANY

CC-BY-NC-ND: This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 United States License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/us/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

Published by Virginia Tech Libraries, 2016

Contents

Kevin M. Carragee and Annette Moennich	1
Preface: Communication as Performance and the Performativity of Communication	
<i>Performance in the Arts</i>	
Hans Martin Ritter	5
Performativity and Performance – Thinking About Performativity in Performance	
Franziska Krumwiede	15
Aesthetic Resistance Against Antiziganism Using the Example of Roma Theatres	
Michelle LaVigne	28
Moving from Performance to Performativity: Reconsidering the Rhetoricity of Mimesis and Alvin Ailey's <i>Revelations</i>	
<i>Performance in the Media and Legal Arenas</i>	
Martha Kuhnhen	39
Performance in Mass Mediated Interaction	
Per Fjelstad	50
Collaborative Substantiation and Qualification of Expertise in Concurrent Court Testimony	
<i>Performance in Social Contexts</i>	
Claudia Muller and Linda Stark	58
Pretend Reading in Parent-Child Interaction: Interactive Mechanisms of Role Taking and Scaffolding	
Margarete Imhof	76
Listening is Easy!? Looking at Critical Factors for Listening Performance	
Werner Pfab	89
Verbal Art and Social Conflict	

Pretend Reading in Parent-Child-Interaction: Interactive Mechanisms of Role Taking and Scaffolding

Claudia Müller

Department of German Philology
University of Bochum, Germany
c.mueller@rub.de

Linda Stark

Department of German Philology
University of Würzburg, Germany
linda.stark@rub.de

Shared reading is a specific communication context in which early literacy learning emerges (Becker & Müller in press). The same applies for role play (Andresen 2011) and narrating (Müller 2012, Becker & Wieler 2013). However, very few studies exist that highlight the meaning of pretend reading for literacy learning. Pretend reading often is seen as an expression of early literacy (Bredel, Fuhrhop & Noack 2011). By the age of 3, children start to imitate reading, for example, by reproducing the text of a picturebook which is familiar to them (Bredel et al. 2011, 75). By doing this, children operate with language productively and immerse themselves into literate language use (Maas 2008). In this paper, we focus on interactive processes during pretend reading from an exploratory perspective. To assess the potential of pretend reading for literacy learning, we use an integrative approach. Our research design consists of a parent-child shared reading session organized in a phase of parent-child book reading and a phase in which the child takes over the role of the reader by “reading” (pretending to read) the story to the parent. In this study, 17 parents (12 mothers, 5 fathers) and 20 children (10 boys, 10 girls) (3 to 6 years) participated. This paper presents the first results of our analysis. We discuss in particular how the role taking is established in interaction and how the “reading process” (pretend reading) of the child is supported by the parents interactively. Section 1 outlines the theoretical background of our study and refers particularly to the relevance of role play, shared reading and pretend reading in literacy acquisition. Sections 2 and 3 highlight methods and empirical results by presenting two cases in our corpus. Section 4 summarizes our research results and draws conclusions for language promotion in kindergarten.

1. Theoretical Background

In our study, we focus on an interactive learning format which brings three crucial language learning contexts together: role play, dialogic reading and pretend reading. In the following, we will show the relevance and similarities these interaction contexts have in language learning.

1.1 Role Play

Role play is a fictional peer interaction frequently observable in children between 3 and 5 (Andresen 1997). In essence, role play exhibits three distinct components: (i) immersion into a fictional world, (ii) cooperation between the interactive partners, (iii) meta-communication (Andresen 2011). In the fictional play, children deal with subjects such as a doctor's visit, school or themes stemming from book series (Andresen 1997). In order to initiate role play, children have to agree on roles and objects which are integrated in the play. In doing so, they negotiate on a semantic level. For example, if a child wants to include a telephone in the play, all children have to agree on which object is representing the telephone. This defining process acquires a high degree of interactive negotiation and cooperation. All interactive partners must follow the same interpretation, otherwise the play dissolves and fiction cannot be created. But in role play, interaction partners do not only have to find an agreement on the meaning of objects which are integrated in the play, they also have to determine roles and the course of the play. The consensus finding is often expressed on a verbal meta-level. Besides this, gestures and non-verbal elements guide the process of negotiation and conformity (Andresen 2011).

For literacy learning, role play is highly relevant. Boundaries between reality and fiction vanish. Children not only realize actions that exceed their current abilities and potentials, they also experiment with objects and roles which are not yet part of their real lives and fulfil actions which are for them not yet achievable. Vygotskij (2002, 348) calls this acting in the "zone of proximal development." Role play is mainly based on affections and children's voluntariness and spontaneity (Andresen 1997). Furthermore, the interactive process of reinterpretation induces a shift from the overall context of action to a fictional context and the reinterpretation of linguistic and non-linguistic signs. Within this process of decontextualization, the interaction partners abstract from the here-and-now and generate shared fictive interpretations. Situational thinking, which is typical for the cognitive development of small children, approaches abstract thinking; contextualized language use advances to decontextualized language use. Therefore, role play builds a bridge between two states of cognition (Andresen 1997) and provides a crucial incentive for literacy learning, the development of a theory of the mind (Lillard et al. 2013) and abstract thinking (Andresen 1997).

In Germany, research on role play is dominated by the works of Andresen. In one of her studies, Andresen (2005) assessed the language behaviour of small children while engaged in fictional play. She investigated role play interactions of 48 children from the ages of 3 to 6 in kindergarten. Children were free to play without external instruction. Peer interaction was classified as role play when role taking was actually

happening. “As criteria for identifying role play there served explicit role taking, for example *Pretend I am the father*, or addressing each other with the role of name, such as *Here, mother - What’s the matter, child?* (Andresen 2005, 398). In contrast, pretend play was regarded as a reinterpretation process of objects without role taking. Results show that role playing younger children stick to the real meaning of objects without carrying out a fictional transfer. In the further course of development, children start to modify the meaning of objects and generate fictional reinterpretations (Andresen 2005). Role taking involving persons occurs when children had reached the final state of preschool age. At this time, children’s behaviour turns out to be more characterized by meta-communication and reflections on interpretations. Andresen’s results confirm findings of international research reconstructing a similar progression of development (Andresen 2005).

More applied studies indicate that role play can be combined with shared reading situations and narratives in order to promote speech production. Müller (2012) asked preschool children to narrate on the basis of a picturebook. After narrating, children were requested to dictate their story to an adult. In a study by Merklinger (2011), preschool, non-literal children dictated their story to literal school children. Both studies focused on the extent children adapt their language use to the literal conditions of dictating and how they fulfil the role of a dictating person linguistically. Both studies showed that children, when taking the role of a dictating, literal person, are more likely to use literate language forms, such as narrative markers, tense shifts and modifiers.

1.2 Dialogic reading

Story reading contributes to early literacy in several aspects: vocabulary, morpho-syntactic knowledge, print awareness and narrative skills (Becker & Müller in press, Müller 2012). Particularly in terms of reading competences, story reading is essential. If children participate regularly in story reading from an early age, there is a high probability that they will become competent readers and writers (Stiftung Lesen 2014). Story reading facilitates language growth and reading competencies. By participating in story reading, children also adapt practices and routines which are part of the culture and social milieu in which they live. “[A]s children are socialized to particular literacy practices, they are simultaneously socialized into discourses that position them ideologically within the larger social milieu” (Razfar & Gutiérrez 2003, 35). This process of language socialization is steered by sociocultural factors. “[I]n contrast to conceptions of literacy as the acquisition of discrete skills, a sociocultural view of literacy argues that literacy learning cannot be abstracted from the cultural practices in which it is nested” (Razfar & Gutiérrez 2003, 34). For example, sociocultural factors affect the interactive quality of book reading (Müller 2013) by determining if parents practice a rather monologic or dialogic structuring of the reading process (Wieler 1997). In turn, interactive differences have implications for children’s language development as the child’s activity during book reading is crucial for language acquisition and speech production (for a meta-analysis see Fletcher & Reese 2005).

In view of these social differences, several didactic concepts suggest various interactive strategies to increase the child’s self-activity and his/her number of utterances, either in a family or in an elementary and primary school. Among these concepts “dialogic reading” (Whitehurst & Lonigan 1998) is the most popular one.¹

Dialogic reading is mainly based on empirical findings from Whitehurst et al. (1988) which provided evidence for the language promoting effects of dialogic shared reading in families. The focus of this concept highlights several interactive strategies applied by the adult reader for activating the child:

- produce extratextual talk (e.g. supplementary explanations, decontextualizations,...),
- ask questions to the child (about illustrations, figures' feelings, expected actions,...),
- answer the child's questions (about vocabulary, illustrations,...),
- follow the child's interests and attention (expand the child's utterances),
- note: communication is dialogic (not monologic).

With this interactive assistance of the adult which comprises challenging but not burdensome questions and activities (also called "scaffolding", Bruner 1977), the child manages to act in the "zone of proximal development" (Vygotskij 2002, 348) exceeding his/her current state of development.

Whereas dialogic reading can be considered as an overall language promoting strategy initiated by adults, related concepts highlight the scope of early literacy. Ezell and Justice (2005), for example, concentrate on early literacy skills. Spinner (2004) and Preußner and Merklinger (2014) suggest how to use dialogic strategies in story reading to provide opportunities for literary learning. Mempel (2013) shows how to implement dialogic reading strategies in contexts of bi- and multilingual learning settings which are conducted in preschool and kindergarten. Despite positive effects on language learning, a number of authors assume that dialogic strategies lead to interruptions of the reading process. Lowe (2011), Ezell and Justice (2005) and Spinner (2004) argue that these interruptions can compromise the understanding of the story as a whole (Lowe 2011), reduce children's enjoyment of the story (Ezell & Justice 2005) and prevent immersion into the story being read (Spinner 2004). Thus, Müller and Stark (2015) proposed a story reading concept which accentuates "language didactic stimuli" in picturebooks. By exposing textual and illustrative features contained in the book itself, Müller and Stark (2015) demonstrate how adult readers can increase the communicative activity of the child without neglecting the aesthetic value of children's literature and, thus, without compromising literary learning. Furthermore, they link textual and illustrative stimuli with particular domains of language acquisition. For example, according to Müller and Stark (2015), the picturebook *Greta Gans* (Horáček 2007) is suitable to practice subordinate clauses, in particular conditional sentences. The protagonist, the goose Greta, doubts her existences as a goose. She wishes she could be someone else and reflects what she could do in the form of a different animal. The textual stimulus consists of a conditional clause and a subjunctive II ("if I were a ... I could ..."), which is underlined with a suitable image. When reading the book, parents can use this stimulus systematically in order to encourage children to produce subjunctive forms and conditional sentences by adding different animals (Müller & Stark 2015).

1.3 Pretending to read

When exploring written language, children start to imitate literal practices of adults or older children, e.g. pretending to read (Bredel et al. 2011) or scribbling (Barkow 2013). At that time, children do not know how to read or write exactly. They are neither able to capture textual contents nor to establish phoneme-grapheme-correspondences. Nevertheless, they discover the symbolic function of written language by gradually realizing that written language is reproducible and symbolic (Bredel et al. 2011). Günther (1986) refers to this early literacy learning as a “preliterate-symbolic phase”. According to his reading model, which goes back to the works of Frith (1985), the “preliterate-symbolic phase” is followed by a phase in which the child recognizes words and graphemes on the basis of memorization and the development of “logographic skills” (Frith 1985). In the further course of literacy acquisition, the child detects phoneme-grapheme correspondences and links spoken language with written language. At that time, children spell words according to the way they hear them, primarily without textual understanding (“alphabetic skills”, Frith 1985). Finally, children acquire orthography by considering orthographic principles and patterns (“orthographic skills”, Frith 1985). Günther (1986) assumes that this final process of acquisition results in automated procedures of reading and writing.

Although the reading models of Frith (1985) and Günther (1986) have influenced German research and school practice extensively, several authors criticize these models. Scheerer-Neumann (2003) argues that the single phases of both models cannot be clearly differentiated because each phase is characterized by continual changes. Bredel et al. (2011) point out that not every developmental stage is passed by every child in the same progression. Röber (2011) argues that many spelling tests, which are based on this model, do not take into account the quality of teaching which steers the various stages of reading acquisition (see also Schründer-Lenzen 2013). Nevertheless, the model of Frith (1985) and Günther (1986) is frequently referred to in German research and highlights pretend reading as a crucial element of literacy acquisition.

Although in the German research literature the relevance of pretend reading is frequently highlighted (see, for example, in Rau 1979), no specific studies to our knowledge have been carried out to assess the scope of pretend reading. In international research, Curenton, Craig and Flanigan (2008) investigated pretend reading in story reading sessions. In this exploratory study, a researcher read a storybook to pre-school children (n=33). After reading, three interaction settings were designed: first, the child was requested to pretend to read the book to the mother; second, the mother read a story to the child; third, the mother told a self-experienced childhood episode to the child. Despite the fact that the children were not able to read yet, they took over the role of the reader in the first parent-child-interaction condition. Besides this, as Curenton et al. (2008) showed, children produced more decontextualized discourse during the first setting than when listening to the story told or read by their mothers. For example, they used more conjunctions, adverbs and simple elaborated noun phrases. In view of these data, we conclude that as well as the dictating situation or role play (see sections 1.1 and 1.2) pretending to read is “an opportunity for children to practice using complex talk” (Curenton et al. 2008, 182). “When children are permitted to use their creative energy, they are actually able to express themselves in a sophisticated manner” (182). Furthermore, it can be assumed that children, when taking the role of the reader, act in the “zone of proximal

development” (Vygotskij 2002) as they realize actions which are not achievable yet in their real lives.

2. Research Question and Methodology

In our study, we investigated the potential of pretend reading in picturebook reading sessions from an exploratory perspective. Seventeen parents (12 mothers, 5 fathers) and 20 children (10 boys, 10 girls) from 3 to 6 years participated in the study. First, parents were requested to read the story “Der Prinz mit der Trompete” (“The prince with the trumpet”, Janisch & Antoni 2011) to their children. This book was chosen because

- none of the adult test persons knew the book
- the language used in the book is literate in many aspects (e.g. tense use, narrative markers)
- the plot resembles traditional fairy tales
- the protagonists (prince, dragon, princess, king, queen) are classic narrative figures of fairy tales which are familiar to young children.

After reading, parents were prompted to request that the child takes over the role of the reader. Therefore, parents obtained an instruction to initiate the process of role taking. Story reading and role taking were conducted in the family. Parents were free to choose the timeline of the recording; cameras and audiotapes were provided. Particular emphasis was placed on creating a private atmosphere. Audio files (in total 105 min) were transcribed according to the transcription convention GAT2 (Selting et al. 2009). Furthermore, background information of the parents was collected by the use of a short interview conducted several days after the reading situations.

For analyzing the data, we referred to a model of Hausendorf and Quasthoff (2005) which we adapted in previous works (Müller 2012). Originally, the model was developed for analyzing narrative discourse units. The model consists of 5 globally embedded interactive tasks (“jobs”) which have to be carried out by two or more communication partners to accomplish interaction (Hausendorf & Quasthoff 2005, 127 ff.; Quasthoff 1997):

- “display of referential/formal relevance”: priming of the narrative discourse unit within the turn-by-turn talk
- “topicalization”: initial point of the narrative discourse unit based on “conditional relevance” (Quasthoff 1997); moves in interaction which make a certain behaviour very likely to occur ; for example, *tell me, what has happened in the story*
- “elaboration”: phase of performance. Within this phase, the representation of narrated events has to be accomplished.

- “closing”: finalization of the narrative discourse unit
- “transition”: transition point back to turn-by-turn talk.

In order to gain insights into the interactive strategies the parents pursue to initiate role taking and support the “reading” of the child, we analyzed our data according to this model and the qualitative methodology of conversational analysis. We assume that the elaboration phase of pretend reading shows similarities to narrating as it is grounded on narrative text material which has been read to the child. As it has been shown for the dictating method (see section 1.1), we assume that by role taking within a pretend reading session, the child is activated for literate speech production and the elaboration of a narrative discourse unit.

In the following, we will present two examples of our data which differ widely in terms of the interactive strategies used by the parents. We will focus on how the interactive behaviour of the adult influences the child’s literate language production within the pretend reading setting. We will show that in these case examples the language production of the child highly depends on the interactive behaviour of the adult.

3. Data

As we have discussed above, Hausendorf and Quasthoff (1996) suggest 5 jobs which have to be accomplished in a narrative discourse by the interactive partners. In our setting, the first two jobs (“display of referential/formal relevance and topicalization”) are realized by the adult, whereas the main job of elaboration (pretend reading) has to be carried out by the child. The following examples display the different interactive jobs of the reading child and the listening adult.

3.1 Example 1

In this example, a father and daughter are sitting on a couch, and the father is holding the book². After having read the book, the father requests the child (75 months) to take over the role of the reader. In the first sequence, the father establishes “conditional relevance” (Quasthoff 1997) by requesting the child to read out the text (line 002-003). First, the child (C) is ashamed (line 004), shy and refuses to read. But the father (F) enhances conditional relevance by encouraging the child to read. In addition, the father gives the child assistance to start the elaboration process: “Yes, but look, perhaps you can do it out of the pictures” (line 005-006).

001 C: ((Quietschgeräusche)) und JETZT, was muss ich JETZT machen?
 ((spielt Lufttrompete))
 ((squeaking)) and now, what am I supposed to do now?
 ((pretends playing the trumpet))

002	F:	ne (-) JETZT möchte ich gerne dass DU mir das buch mal
003		vorliest

now, I want you to read the book to me

004 C: <<beschämt> (-) ich kann gar nicht LE [sen]>

((ashamed)) (-) I cannot read
((schaut zum Vater auf))
((looks at his father))

005	F:	[JA]: aber GUCK mal, vielleicht kannst
006		du es ja aus den BILdern machen.

yes, but look, perhaps you can do it out of the pictures.

007 C: (2.2) <<pp> okay.> (1.0) (11.2 (Geräusche))
((schlägt das Buch auf und blättert darin; legt die Hand an den Mund))
((low)) okay. ((noise))
((opens the book and flicks through it; puts its hand on its mouth))

After a preparatory phase (line 008-012), the child concentrates and starts elaborating (from line 013 on).

008 C: (6.2) <<pp> (was sind) diese prinzessin> (.)
((low)) (what are) this princess
009 ich hoff=ich wollte grad sagen es war einmal ein Ritter (mit=
010 ner schwarzen Mütze auf sein -)
I hope, I just wanted to say once upon a time there was a knight (with a black cap on his-)
011 aber da ist ja kein -
but there is no
((zeigt auf das Bild))
((points at the picture))

012 F: (0.7) nee.
no.

013 C: (1.7) es WAR einMAL(1.1) ein (0.7) verTIEF(-)ter (1.6) wo
014 Königssohn,
((hat beim Reden den kleinen Finger im Mund (bis 019); schaut fragend zum Vater auf))
once upon a time (1.1) an (0.7) immersed (1.6) prince
((while speaking, the child puts his fingers in his mouth; looks questioningly up to his father))

015 F: hehe
hehe

016 C: hehehe
hehehe

017 F: stimmt.
that's right.

018 das ist ein PRINZ. (0.7)
this is a prince.

019 erzähl WELter.
keep telling.

022 C: <<stockend> DER hatte auf sein Hof ganz gan ganz ganz oft
023 (0.9) kinder oder ritter oder>
((stumbling)) on his royal court he had very very very very often children or knights or
024 °h (1.4) wa w:er auch alles °h sonst noch °h der °h musik
025 zuhören °h wollte.
who else wanted to listen to the music.

026 auf jeden fall konnte der Königssohn der PRINzen also °h ähm
027 ah (1.8) ha konnte der WUNdergu, WUNderschön un °h (0.8) GANZ
028 gut (0.5) tromPEte spielen.
however, the king's son the prince he played the trumpet

wondergoo, wonderfully, quite good.

029 F: ich find du liest (s) !WUN!derbar vor;

030 *I think, you read great*
 da kann man !HERR!lich bei gucken.
at the same time, one can look perfectly
 ((lächelt))
 ((smiles))

As shown in the example, the child takes over the role of the reader by pretending to read. In turn, the father takes over the role of an active listener. He refrains from steering the interaction and interrupting the elaboration phase of the child by questioning or producing extratextual talk. Instead, he respects the speaking right of the child and enhances the child's role of the reader by praising the "reading" (bold, line 073). Furthermore, the father makes it explicit that he is paying attention (line 072) when the child reaffirms his attention (line 070-071). Role taking and role adoption is interactively implemented.

066 (5.2) und da: hat einer trompetet auf einmal.
and there, suddenly somebody played the trumpet
 067 (0.9) <<tiefe/raue Stimme> ich werd=den drachen nicht °h> (1.2)
 ((harsh, deep voice)) *I will not*
 068 ich werd' den drachen NICHT besiegen (.) ich hab kein !SCHWERT!
I will not defeat the dragon, I have no sword
 069 ich mach mich aus dem !S:TAUB!
I make off
 ((schaut freudig zum Vater auf;))
 ((looks up to this father happily))
 070 (2.6) papa?
 dad?
 071 F: hm_hm.
 hm_hm
 072 ich HÖR dir zu.
I am listening to you
 073 (0.6 (mit Geräusch)) **ich find du liest WUNderbar vor.**
 ((noise)) *I think you read lovely.*

In order to underline his modified role as an active listener, the father imitates falling asleep. By doing this, he first displays the conventional distribution of roles in shared reading situations: an adult reads out a text, the child listens and finally falls asleep; second, he highlights the reversed roles and preserves his role of the picturebook listener.

127 C: (1.6) sie hatten freien weg denn denn an drachen wollte NIEMand
they had free access because because dragons nobody wanted to be
 128 nah dran kommen.
near of.
 ((schaut zum Vater auf, der vorgibt zu schlafen))
 ((looks up to his dad, who is pretending to sleep))
 129 °h (1.1) das war KLAR.
that was clear.

The child, on the other hand, fulfils her role as the reader. She meets the obligation to elaborate the discourse unit by pretending to read. According to the text material, the child's pretend reading is shaped by narrative structures and literate language forms. As the following transcript shows, this is apparent from the use of German *Präteritum*, the provision of an orientation at the beginning of the narrative ("It was beautiful, the sun was shining", line 046-047) and the dramatic integration of an unexpected moment as a specific feature of narratives (line 097, see also Müller 2012). Furthermore, it is evident that the child imitates reading: first, the child applies interactive strategies such as pointing (lines 050, 055); second, the child refers to the surface of the book (lines 045, 046) and underlines her performance by using gestures (lines 091-093). Thus, the child applies interactive strategies which are normally used by adults in shared reading situations (Rau 2013).

- 045 C: ((nimmt das Buch nun ganz allein in die Hand))
 ((takes the book independently))
- 046 es war wunder (-) sch (-) schön.
 ((streicht mit dem Finger über das Bild))
it was beautiful.
 ((touches the pictures))
- 047 die Sonne SCHEINte (.) er war an manchen ländern am STRAND,
the sun was shining, in some countries he was at the beach
- 048 °h in manchen ländern in der STADT,
in some countries in the city
- 049 °h in manchen LÄNdern an ganz vielen KIRCHtürmen,
in some countries at many many church towers
- 050 (0.6) er musste über eine (3.0) °h brücke gehen,
 ((zeigt auf das entsprechende Bild))
he had to cross a bridge
 ((points at the respective picture))
- 051 °h z vom einen schloss zum andern (0.6) SCHLOSS,
from one castle to the other
- 052 (2.3) er ist durch den WALD geGANgen,
he passed a forest
- 053 (3.8 (Seite wird umgeblättert)) da: traf er (1.9) eine
 ((turning the page)) *there he met a*
- 054 !WUN!derv:'schone prinzessin(-)
a beautiful princess
- 055 und UNten (.) standen viele ritter.
 ((zeigt auf den unteren Bildrand))
and below there were many knights
 ((points at the image border below))
- 090 C: °h (-) dann (0.9) hatte °h ER m' mit °h ein STOCK auf die
 091 SCHUPpen (0.5) gehauen. (2.2)
and then he banged with a stick on the dragon`s skeleton
 ((haut mit der Hand auf den abgebildeten Drachen))
 ((bangs with the hand on the illustrated dragon))
- 092 dann erst 'nen kleinen stein auf ihn geworfen,
then first a small stone thrown on him
 ((haut mit der Fausrückseite auf die Seite))
 ((bangs with the fist on the page))
- 093 dann einen GROßen stein auf ihn geworfen.
then a big stone thrown on him
 ((holt weiter aus und haut mit der Hand auf die Seite))

- 094 ((swings back and bangs with the hand on the page))
 (0.5) dann immer noch nich.
then still not
- 095 er überlegte und überlegte und überlegte und überlegte und
he thought about it and thought about it and thought about it and thought about it and
 ((wiegt sich dabei vor und zurück))
 ((moves forwards and backwards))
- 096 überlegte und überlegte °h und über' °h legte
thought about it and thought about it and thought about it
- 097 schließlich fällt's ihm ein=°h seine (1.0) tromPEte.
suddenly it came into his mind (.) his trumpet.

The closing of the discourse unit (the fourth job) is realized by the child marked with the lexical unit “I am done, Dad” and its reference to the backside of the book followed by the father’s praise (line 155), which leads back to the turn-by-turn talk (the fifth job).

- 152 C: fertig papa.
I am done, dad.
 ((schaut freudig zum Vater hoch))
 ((looks up happily to his dad))
- 153 F: e:cht?
really?
- 154 C: ja. (.) (guck doch mal) da war ich.
yes, look. there I was.
 ((zeigt dem Vater die Rückseite des Buches))
 ((shows his dad the backside of the book))
- 155 F: **SEHR gut hasse das gemacht.**
very well done.

This first example shows how far the role taking of the child, and, thus, the realization of the elaboration phase is affected by the interactive behaviour of the adult. The father scaffolds the pretend reading process of the child by maintaining his role as an active listener. Due to this interactive reticence, the child is free to elaborate the story and to make use of decontextualized language.

3.2 Example 2

In this example, a mother and her son (62 months) are sitting together on a couch. The mother (M) holds her arm around the son (C) and the book in front of them. As the transcript shows, the phase of initiating does not run smoothly as the child refuses to “read” the text. “Topicalization” is characterized by a negotiation without role taking. In contrast to the first example, conditional relevance is established more instructively by the use of the German modal verb *sollen*: “jetzt sollst du mir das buch bitte vorlesen” (“Now you are supposed to read the book to me, please”). No further assistance to take over the role of the reader is given.

- 001 M: ja: schätzchen,
yes, dear

002		jetzt sollst DU mir das buch bitte vorlesen. <i>now you are supposed to read the book to me, please.</i>
003	C:	o:h [oh].
004	M:	[o:h]
005		hehe <<lachend> wie HEIßT denn das buch?> <i>((laughing)) what's the book's name?</i>
006	C:	(2.4) will schlafen. <i>want to sleep.</i>
007	M:	<<lachend> du willst SLAfen?>(0.2) <i>((laughing)) you want to sleep?</i>
008		hehe_°h
009		is dir das jetzt ein bisschen PEINlich? (0.4) <i>hehe. do you feel a little bit ashamed now because of this?</i>
010		hm (.) soll ich die KAMera ausmachen? (.) <i>shall I turn off the camera?</i>
011		liest du es mir DANN vor? <i>do you read it then to me?</i>
012	C:	[JA], <i>yes.</i>
013	M:	[oder] JA:? <i>or yes?</i>
014	C:	nein. <i>no.</i>

In line 017, the child starts to elaborate. The elaboration gets immediately interrupted by a corrective question of the mother (line 019: “are you talking like a baby now?”). The elaboration phase dissolves and role taking has to be re-established.

017	C:	der PRINZ mit der trompete. <i>the prince with the trumpet.</i>
018	M:	!OKAY! (0.7 ((Buchseite wird umgeblättert)) <i>okay. ((turning the page))</i>
019		sprichst du jetzt wie ein BAby? <i>are you talking like a baby now?</i>
020	C:	(2.0 ((es wird weiter im Buch geblättert)) <i>((again turning the pages))</i>
021		gägä bubu gägäi ((lacht)) <i>((pretends babbling like a baby, laughs))</i>

In order to re-establish role taking, the mother steers the child back to elaboration in line 025-027 by giving structural assistance such as reminding the child of typical patterns for opening a fairy tale story (line 027).

025	M:	SAG mal, wie FÄNGTS denn an? <i>tell me, how does it begin?</i>
026	C:	ich WEIß nich [mehr] (1.8) <i>I don't know any more</i>
027	M:	[WIE] fangen denn normalerweise märchen an? <i>how do fairy tales usually begin?</i>
028	C:	es war EINmal. <i>once upon a time.</i>
029	M:	es WAR einmal. (0.7) <i>once upon a time.</i>

In the further course of interaction, the mother continues structuring the process of elaboration for the child. A question-answer-play emerges.

- 030 M: und WAS war einmal?
and there was what once a time
- 031 C: (0.7) EIN prinz.
a prince
- 032 (-)
- 033 M: EINFach irgendein prinz?
only any prince?
- 034 C: (1.0) nein.
no.
- 035 M: (.) sondern?
but?
- 036 C: mit Elner trompEte.
with a trumpet.
- 037 M: aha.
aha.

The interaction between child and mother is dominated by questioning and displaying of knowledge. When the child cannot remember the further course of the story, the question-answer-play comes to an end.

- 063 C: (1.9) und jetzt? (4.0 (es wird im Buch geblättert))
and now? ((pages are getting turned))
- 064 wie geht's weiter? (0.8)
how does it go on?
- 065 <<etwas beschämt> weiß auch nichts nix mehr> (0.5) ((schnief))
((ashamed)) I don't know nothing more ((sniff))
- 066 M: (3.5) magst du nicht mehr WEIter erzählen?
do you not want to tell anymore?
- 067 C: (0.7) ja jetzt DAS. ((zeigt auf ein anderes Buch))
yes, now this ((pointing to another book))
- 068 M: jetzt DAS.
now this.

As the transcript shows, pretend reading does not occur in the second example. Both interaction partners do not stay in their roles. The child does not do his interactive job of elaborating. The mother does not fulfil her role as an active listener. Instead the mother scaffolds the elaboration phase of the child by questioning and structuring the narrative process in a very dominant manner. Because of this, the child's speech production is restricted and limited to orate instead of literate language use. The child has no sufficient interactive space to unfold a narrative by the use of decontextualized language.

4. Discussion

Despite its reputation as "ideal" form of shared reading, in this paper we assumed that in dialogic reading children's speech production is limited as it is reduced to extratextual discourse sections evoking orate language use (Becker & Müller in press, Stark in preparation). In literacy learning, however, it is essential that children not only

receive literate texts orally, but also practice literate language productively, for example, by narrating (Müller 2012).

In German research, pretend reading is classified as an equally meaningful literal practice as narrating in early childhood, although there is no extensive evidence that validates the impact of pretend reading for children's literacy development. Thus, in this paper, we have highlighted pretend reading as a literal learning context focusing on three main questions:

- (i) How can pretend reading be integrated in parent-child-reading sessions?
- (ii) How do the interaction partners (parent and child) behave interactively in a pretend-reading-setting in order to establish the unfamiliar interactive roles?
- (iii) How do parents interactively affect the "reading" and the language use of the child?

In order to investigate these questions, we designed a research setting in which a parent first read a story to the child and then requested the child to take over the reader's role. Of course, as we use a qualitative approach with a small number of cases, assumptions drawn from our analysis are preliminary and have to be tested with larger samples. Nevertheless, a closer look at our data provides several insights:

(1) The data yield in this study provides exploratory indicators that when pretend reading is embedded in adult-child-interaction the interactive behaviour of the adult determines whether the child is able to unfold his/her literal potential by using decontextualized language forms while pretend reading. A key point seems to rest in the role awareness of the parent. By establishing role taking sufficiently in interaction and playing the role of an active listener, the adult scaffolds the child's performance as reader.

(2) As shown in international research, in children's first narrative attempts (Hausendorf & Quasthoff 2005) and shared reading situations (dialogic reading, see section 1.2), adults apply scaffolding-mechanisms in order to support the language production of the child. It seems interesting that these scaffolding-processes in children's pretend reading appear to be counterproductive as they interrupt the elaboration phase and the speech production of the child. Pretend reading seems to bear resemblance to role play which is characterized by a high degree of self-determination and self-fulfilment (Lillard et al. 2013).

(3) As it accounts for role play or dictating, the data suggest that by taking the role of the reader there is also a shift from the current potential of the child to a higher point of development (Vygotskij 2002) as the child explores a linguistic register which exceeds his/her language experiences in family and everyday interactions. This requires that the adult gives the child sufficient interactive space for elaboration.

(4) Furthermore, the results of this study are not only relevant with respect to parental interactive strategies in order to increase children's literate speech production. They also can be applied for interactive strategies of preschool-teachers in order to implement pretend reading in language promotion systematically. By implementing pretend reading in kindergarten as part of language promotion, we assume that particular attention has to be drawn towards the role-awareness of the preschool-teachers mediated by teacher training programs.

Particularly in Germany, there is an urgent need for alternative forms of language promotion as only since the execution of international large-scale studies such as PISA (the Programme for International Student Assessment) have preschools and kindergartens been considered to provide the first and most important step in children's educational careers. This adds even more weight to the argument, "[f]uture research

should examine what questioning and comment techniques parents and teachers can use to scaffold children's use of decontextualized language" in order to contribute to children's language development successfully (Currenton et al. 2008, 183).

We would like to thank the Centre of Educational Research of the Ruhr-University Bochum for funding our research.

Notes:

1. Also in Germany, this concept is widely known and approved – especially in kindergartens
(c.f. http://www.foermig-berlin.de/materialien/Dialogisches_Vorlesen.pdf
http://www.fb12.uni-bremen.de/fileadmin/Arbeitsgebiete/deutsch/Werke/alt_dialogisches_lesen.pdf,
http://www.bezreg-arnsberg.nrw.de/themen/b/buero_sprache/weiterfueh_infos/literatur_medien/aufsaeetze/0_10_dialogisches_lesen.pdf,
http://www.weiterbildungsinitiative.de/fileadmin/download/WW_Fruehe_Bildung_Arbeitsblaetter/Arbeitsblatt_3_Die_Techniken_des_Dialogischen_Lesens.pdf; all websites checked on 27.05.2015).
2. Total record time: 10 minutes, 30 seconds.

References

- ANDRESEN, H. 2011: *Erzählen und Rollenspiel von Kindern zwischen drei und sechs Jahren: Eine Expertise der Weiterbildungsinitiative Frühpädagogische Fachkräfte (WiFF)*: Deutsches Jugendinstitut e. V.
- ANDRESEN, H. 2005: Role play and language development in the preschool years. *Culture & Psychology*, 11, 387–414.
- ANDRESEN, H. 1997: Bedeutungskonstitution im Fiktionsspiel von Vorschulkindern. In J. Lompscher (Ed.), *Lernen und Entwicklung aus kulturhistorischer Sicht: Was sagt uns Wygotski heute* (pp. 516–532). Marburg: BdWi.
- BARKOW, I. 2013: Kritzeln als Vorform des Schreibens und des Zeichnens. In I. Barkow (Ed.), *Schreiben vor der Schrift: Frühe Literalität und Kritzeln* (pp. 7–18). Stuttgart: Fillibach.
- BECKER, T., & MÜLLER, C. in press: Vorlesen und Erzählen im Vergleich. In E. Gressnich, C. Müller & L. Stark (Eds.), *Lernen durch Vorlesen. Sprach- und Literaturerwerb in Familie, Kindergarten und Schule*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.
- BECKER, T., & WIELER, P. (Eds.) 2013: *Erzählforschung und Erzähldidaktik heute: Entwicklungslinien, Konzepte, Perspektiven ; [Beiträge der Sektion "Die Vielfalt des Erzählens in didaktischer Sicht" beim 19. Symposium Deutschdidaktik im Herbst 2012 in Augsburg]*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- BREDEL, U., FUHRHOP, N., & NOACK, C. 2011: *Wie Kinder lesen und schreiben lernen*. Tübingen: Francke.

- BRUNER, J. S. 1977: Early social interaction and language development. In: H. R. Schaffer (Ed.), *Studies in mother-infant interaction. Proceedings of the Loch Lomond Symposium, Ross Priory, University of Strathclyde, September 1975* (pp. 271–289). London: Academic Press.
- CURENTON, S. M., CRAIG, M. J., & FLANIGAN, N. 2008: Use of decontextualized talk 254 across story contexts: How oral storytelling and emergent reading can scaffold children's development. *Early Education & Development*, 19 (1), 161–187.
- EZELL, H. K., & JUSTICE, L. M. 2005: *Shared storybook reading*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- FLETCHER, K. L., & REESE, E. 2005: Picture book reading with young children: A conceptual framework. *Developmental Review*, 25, 64–103.
- FRITH, U. 1985: Beneath the surface of developmental dyslexia. In K. Patterson, J. Marshall, & M. Coltheart (Eds.), *Surface dyslexia; Neuropsychological and cognitive studies of phonological reading* (pp. 301–330). London: Erlbaum.
- GÜNTHER, K. B. 1986: Ein Stufenmodell der Entwicklung kindlicher Lese- und Schreibstrategien. In H. Brügelmann (Ed.), *ABC und Schriftsprache: Rätsel für Kinder, Lehrer und Forscher* (pp. 32–35). Konstanz: Faude.
- HAUSENDORF, H., & QUASTHOFF, U. M. 1996: *Sprachentwicklung und Interaktion: Eine linguistische Studie zum Erwerb von Diskursfähigkeiten*. Opladen: Westdt. Verl.
- HAUSENDORF, H., & QUASTHOFF, U. M. 2005: *Sprachentwicklung und Interaktion: Eine linguistische Studie zum Erwerb von Diskursfähigkeiten*. Radolfzell: Verl. für Gesprächsforschung.
- HORÁČEK, P. 2007: *Greta Gans*. Düsseldorf: Sauerländer.
- JANISCH, H., & ANTONI, B. 2011: *Der Prinz mit der Trompete*. Wien: Betz.
- LILLARD, A. S., LERNER, M. D., HOPKINS, E. J., DORE, R. A., SMITH, E. D., & PALMQUIST, C. M. 2013: The impact of pretend play on children's development: A review of the evidence. *Psychol Bulletin.*, 139 (1), 1–34.
- LOWE, V. 2011: 'Don't tell me all about it – just read it to me!'. In B. Kümmerling-Meibauer (Ed.), *Emergent literacy: Children's books from 0 to 3* (pp. 209–226). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.
- MAAS, U. 2008: *Sprache und Sprachen in der Migrationsgesellschaft: Die schriftkulturelle Dimension*. Göttingen: V & R unipress.
- MEMPEL, C. 2013: Der „ideale“ Leser kommt zu Wort. Vorleseinteraktionen im fremdsprachlichen Klassenzimmer. *Fremdsprache Deutsch*, 48, 35–39.
- MERKLINGER, D. 2011: *Frühe Zugänge zur Schriftlichkeit: Eine explorative Studie zum Diktieren*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Fillibach.
- MÜLLER, C., & STARK, L. 2015: Sprachdidaktische Anreize in der Kinderliteratur. In U. Eder (Ed.), *Sprache erleben und lernen mit Kinder- und Jugendliteratur I: Theorien, Modelle und Perspektiven für den Deutsch als Zweitsprachenunterricht*. Wien: Praesens.
- MÜLLER, C. 2013: Familiäre Sprachsozialisation und schriftsprachliches Lernen im Vorschulalter: Bedingungen und Voraussetzungen. *leseforum.ch*, 3/2013.
- MÜLLER, C. 2012: *Kindliche Erzählfähigkeiten und (schrift-)sprachsozialisatorische Einflüsse in der Familie: Eine longitudinale Einzelfallstudie mit ein- und mehrsprachigen (Vor-)Schulkindern*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider.
- PREUßER, U., & MERKLINGER, D. 2014: Im Vorlesegespräch Möglichkeiten für literarisches Lernen eröffnen: Steinsuppe von Anaïs Vaugelade. In G. Scherer (Ed.), *Bilderbuch*

und literar-ästhetische Bildung: Aktuelle Forschungsperspektiven (155–174). Trier: WVT.

- QUASTHOFF, U. 1997: An interactive approach to narrative development. In M. Bamberg (Ed.), *Narrative development: Six approaches* (pp. 51–83). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- RÖBER, C. 2011: Ermittlung rechtschreiblicher Kompetenz. In U. Bredel, & T. Reissig (Eds.), *Weiterführender Orthographieerwerb* (pp. 509–545). Baltmannsweiler: Schneider.
- RAU, M. L. 1979: Die Entwicklung von Vergangenheitsstrukturen in der Sprache eines Dreijährigen. *Folia Linguistica*, 13, 356–412.
- RAU, M.L. 2013: *Kinder von 1 bis 6. Bilderbuchrezeption und kognitive Entwicklung*. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Razfar, A., & Gutiérrez, K. 2003: Reconceptualizing early childhood literacy: The sociocultural influence. In N. Hall, J. Larson, & J. Marsh (Eds.), *Handbook of early childhood literacy* (pp. 34–47). London.: Sage Publications.
- SCHEERER-NEUMANN, G. 2003: Rechtschreibschwäche im Kontext der Entwicklung. In I. M. Naegele (Ed.), *Grundlagen und Grundsätze der Lese-Rechtschreib-Förderung: Mit Hinweisen auf die Neuregelung der Rechtschreibung* (pp. 45–65). Weinheim: Beltz.
- SCHRÜNDER-LENZEN, A. 2013: *Schriftspracherwerb*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien.
- SELTING, M., AUER, P., BARTH-WEINGARTEN, D., BERGMANN, J. R., BERGMANN, P., BIRKNER, K., COUPER-KUHLEN, E., DEPPERMAN, A., GILLES, P., GÜNTNER, S., HARTUNG, M., KERN, F., MERTZLUFFT, C., MEYER, C., MOREK, M., OBERZAUCHER, F., PETERS, J., QUASTHOFF, U., SCHÜTTE, W., STUKENBROCK, A., & UHMANN, S. 2009: Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2). *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*, 10, 353–402.
- SPINNER, K. H. 2004: Gesprächseinlagen beim Vorlesen. In G. Härle & M. Steinbrenner (Eds.), *Kein endgültiges Wort: Die Wiederentdeckung des Gesprächs im Literaturunterricht* (pp. 291–308). Baltmannsweiler: Schneider.
- STARK, L. in preparation: *Vorlesesituationen und literale Lernmöglichkeiten am Beispiel des deutschen Präteritums. Eine linguistische Analyse des Inputs, den erwachsene Interaktionspartner ihrem Kind bei der Bilderbuchrezeption bereitstellen*. Dissertation at Ruhr-University Bochum.
- STIFTUNG LESEN 2014: *Vorlesestudie 2014. Vorlesen macht stark. Repräsentative Befragung von Eltern mit Kindern im Alter von 2 bis 8 Jahren*. <https://www.stiftunglesen.de/download.php?type=documentpdf&id=1357>. Accessed 7/23/2015.
- WHITEHURST, G. J., FALCO, F. L., LONIGAN, C. J., FISCHER, J. E., DEBARYSHE, B. D., VALDEZ-MENCHACA, M. C., & CAULFIELD, M. 1988: Accelerating language development through picture book reading. *Developmental Psychology*, 24, 552–558.
- WHITEHURST, G. J., & LONIGAN, C. J. 1998: Child development and emergent literacy. *Child Development*, 69 (3), 848–872.
- WIELER, P. 1997: *Vorlesen in der Familie*. Weinheim: Juventa.
- VYGOTSKIJ, L. S. 2002: *Denken und Sprechen. Psychologische Untersuchungen*. Weinheim: Beltz.