Title:

The video camera as a cultural object: The presence of (an)Other.

Michael Forrester
(School of Psychology, University of Kent)

Introduction

The emergence and rising significance of qualitative methods in psychology is coterminous with the introduction and advancement of recording technologies (both audio and visual, and analogue and digital). It is likely that part of the reason for this is the apparently less interpretative nature of technologically reproducible 'factual' documents, that is in comparison to earlier methods such as diary studies and ethnographic field notes. Across the discipline there are many examples which exhibit that close and particular integration of theoretical development, methodological innovation, data-collection practices and the associated conventions of interpretation – all coalescing around the record – the documentary evidence produced by audio and video techniques and technologies (Ochs, 1979; Zuengler, Ford & Fassnacht, 1998). Observational methods in developmental psychology and discursive approaches found in social psychology are two such example domains difficult to imagine developing in they way they have without the corresponding availability of recording devices and techniques. The aim in what follows is to consider, and place into context, video-recording as a research practice in what is often described as a naturalistic or an 'everyday' setting, particularly when one of the participants also has the dual role of researcher/participant. The focus is on understanding something of how participants orient towards, accommodate or otherwise respond to the video-camera as a cultural object particularly when it used regularly in an everyday context (family mealtime recordings).

In order to locate the focus of the material reported in this chapter something should be said regarding the background to these opening comments. Having carried out experimental/laboratory research in the late 1980's and 1990's into the development of young children's conversational skills (Forrester, 1988; 1992), the costs, constraints and challenges, presented by developing and extending this particular line of research within a laboratory context seemed out of proportion to the insights that might be gleaned from the results. In contrast, the opportunity afforded by being able to study in detail, over a long period of time, one particular child as she was learning how to talk appeared more fruitful given the insights that can emerge from the longitudinal single-case study. In developmental psychology there is a long history of such studies, informing work in such areas as language acquisition and the development of musicality (Brown, 1958; Papousek and Papousek, 1981).

The research that forms the background to the extracts discussed in this chapter employed a single-case longitudinal design, and set out to examine the developing conversational skills of one child during an important period of language development during pre-school years, from 12 to 41 months. This child was my youngest daughter Ella, aged one year at the time I began the study, and I was very fortunate in my immediate family giving their permission, and agreeing to participate in this extended piece of research. At the outset the aim of the work sought to understand what is involved in a child learning how to talk and thus becoming a member of a particular culture. A second objective of the work was to describe in detail the socialisation processes whereby the child learns, and begins to produce, discourses relevant to successful participation in the

context he/she inhabits (certain aspects of this work have been documented elsewhere; Forrester, 2002; 2008).

The question of what constitutes the 'natural' or the 'real' in psychology and other social sciences has a long and distinguished history. The discipline, especially in those sub-topics and areas with a close methodological allegiance to the hypothetic-deductive framework(s) of natural science, has a particular suspicion of theoretical over-interpretation and speculation, and going beyond the facts or record (James, 1890; Cooper, 2008). This is not the place to enter into a discussion regarding the epistemological or pre-theoretic presuppositions and assumptions underlying different theoretical frameworks in psychology. Many others have done so with considerably more insight than what might be accomplished here (see Edwards, 1997; Burr, 2003). Instead my aim is simply to raise some questions or concerns regarding the procedures and practices we bring into play when we set out to video-record the 'normal', the 'natural' or the spontaneously 'real' when studying human interaction.

Some time ago Hall (2000) drew attention to the fact that social scientists seem peculiarly reticent to consider in detail their own 'activities of collecting, watching, or interpreting video as a stable source of "data" for research and presentation purposes' (p. 647). Hall (2000) outlines four observations relevant to the collection of video records, suggesting that video-recordings,

(a) reorganize the tasks and experiences of research participants
(b) serve different research interests by selectively attending to different aspects of human activity
(c) reinforce or break open traditional boundaries between researchers and their study participants, and
(d) provide both limited and privileged access to aspects of human interaction

In what follows I would like to refer to these comments when considering extract examples taken from the corpus described earlier, and specifically, moments when the target child displays an orientation to the video-camera as an object.

There are a number of reasons why such examples provide us with opportunities for re-considering or at least articulating pre-conceived ideas we may have regarding video-recording, especially video-recordings of everyday normal or natural interaction. Notice, the focus is not necessarily on the child and how she (may/might have) gradually become aware of the camera subsequently learning how to 'perform' for it; the original work was solely directed at documenting the child's emerging conversations skills. Further, the question is not one of the veridicality of the 'record' as a record of the true or 'real'. Nor is it a secondary analysis of the processes one might initiate in order to best ensure that interactions being recorded are as natural as they could be, whatever that might mean, if the camera had not been present. Instead by simply substituting 'video-camera' for 'video-recording', Hall's (2000) comments can serve as a entry-point into the analysis and discussion of examples.

Methodological approach

Before turning to the extract examples, something needs to be said regarding the methodological approach adopted here, best described as ethnomethodologically informed conversation analysis (CA). The analytic approach adopted for the initial analysis is ethnomethdologically informed, in that (a) the selection consisted of events where there was evidence in the sequence of the interaction itself that participants displayed some orientation to the event as noticeable for some reason, and (b) detailed extracts employing the conversation analytic approach were produced so as to highlight certain aspects of the interactional sequences. This approach is particularly concerned with an examination of the fine-detail of talk-in-interaction, close attention being paid to the unfolding sequence of talk using a transcription orthography that serves to highlight fine-grained aspects what is going on.

CA originally emerged as a specific method aligned with an approach in sociology known as ethnomethodology. Ethnomethodologists focus on people's own ideas and understandings about whatever it is they are doing, and it is these understandings which guide the analytic enterprise. Ethnomethodology has been described as 'the study of the common, everyday, naturally occurring, mundane methods that are used by people to produce and manage the common, everyday activities of the everyday social world' (Livinston, 1987, p. 10). Ethnomethodology involves a rational analysis of the structures, procedures and strategies that people themselves use when they are making, and making sense of, their everyday world.

CA itself aims to show how meanings and representations in discourse are produced through the structures, procedures and practices of talk. Conversation analysts have been principally concerned with classifying and describing the structures and general procedures employed by people in understanding and taking part in conversations (Hutchby & Woofit, 2008; Psathas 1995). These include turn-taking, closing conversations, introducing topics, asking questions, making requests and other related features of talk. It is important to recognize that the question of whether or not people perform naturally or not whenever a camera is recording their behavior, is of no particular theoretical or methodological concern to the ethnomethodological perspective. Instead ethnomethodology/CA is simply concerned with understanding the methodic sense-making reflexive social practices people engage in and produce within *any* social context (Garfinkel, 1964; Livingston, 1987).

Data extract examples

The extract examples considered here come from a series of video-recordings (31) of the author's daughter, Ella. This child was filmed during meal-times as she was interacting with her father, mother, and/or older sibling, Eva (aged 8 at the beginning of the recordings) and for the most part was positioned in a high-chair in view of the camera (as in Quay, 2008). The recordings of the target child were collected from age 1 year to 3 years 5 months. The length of the recordings range from 10-45 minutes (average 35) with the total recording amounting to around 11 hours. Following completion of the recordings transcriptions using

conversation analytic conventions were produced (following Psathas, 1995)[i]. Additional transcription notations relevant for child language analysis were also produced (McWhinney, 2000) and the resulting data corpus can be viewed through the web-data feature of the CLAN software (CHILDES, 2008).

The available data corpus was examined in detail and all examples where participants showed some explicit or implicit participant-oriented interest in the camera were noted for further analysis. Across the full detail set the number of instances was 15 in total, all relatively brief (as in the extracts below). Given that there is around 12 hours of recorded material transcribed and documented one might surmise that for these participants, in this context, the video-camera was not necessarily of particular interest or note. We can turn first to the earliest example where the principal participant, that is the target child in the research project, explicitly referred to the video camera.

Extract 1[ii]:   *Child age 1 year 5 months*

Context: The child is sitting in a high-chair eating, and the father has only recently switched the camera on. This is the 9th recording in the sequence of 31. During this brief extract the mother enters the room. The video camera is a small portable digital camera on a tripod in a corner of the room (kitchen).

Summary exposition of extract: In this extract we find one of the first examples where the child explicitly refers to or notices the camera. From the outset there are also indications that the child's father displays an orientation to the fact of being filmed recording for research purposes. The mother makes an explicit comment about the video and a brief discussion around this takes place between the adult participants.

Extract 1   Child age – 1 year 5 months


```
 1    FAT:   I kn↑ow Mummy's singing a s↑on↓g
 2           (0.4)
 3    FAT:   is she↑                ((spoken as he walks past child))
 4           (1.6)
 5    FAT:   ↑singing a ↑so::ng to us?      ((child looking in opposite direction))
 6           (2.2)                          ((during pause sits down))
 7    FAT:   ((coughs))                             ((looks towards/beyond the camera
 8           (3.0)
 9    ELL:   ((turns towards father and looks towards camera during turn))
10    MOT:   [xxx xxx ]xxx [xxxx]        ((M singing))
11    FAT:                 [sniff]
12           (5.3)                          ((father adopts 'frozen' gesture))
13    MOT:   °it's nearly half xxxx°
14           (0.1)
15    FAT:   alright darlin=
16    MOT:   =coffee first actually          ((child looking at camera))
```

```
17          (0.9)
18    ELL:  d[a !]     ((E points to the camera))
19    MOT:    [exx clement↑]                    ((spoken while entering room))
20          (0.2)
21    MOT:  ↑ooh are you videoing?
22          (0.3)
23    FAT:  ye↓ah                              ((body posture still 'frozen'))
24          (2.5)                              ((father slight smile at mother))
25    MOT:  °m° bleur:: ↓            ((towards child puts finger far into her mouth))
26          (0.2)
27    FAT:  hhh
28          (0.4)
29    MOT:  °m° bleur::
30          (0.6)
31    MOT:  that's why you're so calm and relaxed darling isn't it?
32          (0.3)
33    FAT:  ((smiles glumly and looks at camera))
34    MOT:  hhh
35          (0.5)
36    FAT:  ((looks towards mother with quick smile))
37          (3.0)                              ((child looks towards father))
38    FAT:  I kn↓ow ↑I do feel calm and relaxed
39          (0.6)
40    FAT:  don't I googlin(g) it             ((family pet name for child))
41          (0.6)                             ((moves away from table))
42    MOT:  hhh ↓hou::se Daddy hou::se=
43    FAT:  = ↑kno:↓w
```

The extract begins not long after the video-camera has again been set up and switched on. As the father is moving around the room he comments to Ella that her mother (in the next room) is singing and then, at line 6, sits down near the child in view of the camera. Between lines 6 and 13, while the child is eating, and not always looking towards her father, he appears to adopt a somewhat curious posture (around line 12), saying nothing and doing little, that is apart from looking past the child and 'side-on' to the camera.

At this point, line 13, in the adjoining room, the mother quietly comments about the time, which for these particular participants, presupposes a series of actions regarding what is going to happen next (the mother leaving the child in the care of the father, and going off to prepare for the day). This is indicated in his reply, however as he stops speaking she comments that (before continuing) she will make some coffee.

Our attention is drawn to the next short sequence, from lines 17 to around 24 for a number of reasons. First, the child herself turns towards, looks at, and simultaneously points towards the camera and produces an utterance (line 18). Notice she does this precisely at the point her mother is entering the room and, as far as one can tell from the video, the mother is not aware of or looking at the video-camera. Second, the mother indicates surprise at the fact

that the camera is on (line 19). Heritage (1998) and others have documented the significance of the 'oh' comment or response in conversation, indicative of an addressee recognizing or understanding something that was not immediately apparent. Third, neither the mother nor the father reply to the child or appear to notice that the she has pointed at the camera. Fourth, we can note that between, and through, lines 23-25, the father, although maintaining the body posture mentioned earlier, does two things, (a) he replies with a minimal 'yeah', spoken with a noticeable downward intonation, and (b) looks towards the mother and then produces a slight ambiguous smile. We might ask, who is this smile for, and what might it indicate? The father, occupying a somewhat ambiguous role as both participant and as researcher is concerned with recording the natural and normal everyday behaviour of the child (and her family), and yet it would appear, keenly aware of a potential 'sometime-in-the-future' audience presupposed by the very fact of the production of the record and the collection of data.

Continuing with the analysis, the mother makes a comment (line 25) precisely at the point where Ella places her finger in her mouth while still eating her banana. At line 26 she repeats this phrase, while still looking at the child, and then, displays a specific orientation to the fact that the father appears to be having difficulty in 'doing being natural' while the camera is on (line 31) by producing an ironic comment.   His response is noteworthy and may be indicative of precisely the question or rather challenge surrounding the 'capturing' of natural, spontaneous, everyday family behavior. He produces a curiously 'glum' smile, looks very briefly towards the camera, and noticeably, as he does so, his hand on the back of his chair, falls or rather 'droops'. Sustaining a performance of 'doing being ordinary', as Sacks (1992) has pointed out always involves effort, and in this instance it is the somewhat stilted and unnatural nature of his attempts at ordinariness that are being explicitly referred to. Explicit reference to such a 'performance' has undermined the very attempt at naturalness.

The final section of this extract again provides us with some indications of the complex role of the camera, and rather, the recording of natural behaviour for academic/research purposes, particularly where the researcher is also a participant in the interaction. In response to the suggestion that he is not 'calm or relaxed' and thus accountably not 'doing being natural', his response is instead to treat the ironic comment in curiously 'literal' terms and through doing so, transforms the topic or trajectory of the conversation along lines of an agreement. However, it may be worth noting that immediately after saying this, he then (a) acts as if he is addressing the child – using a pet family name for her – and (b) moves to leave the table.   One interpretation of this might be the taking of a position such as; 'no, look, I'm just going to carry on and act as if everything is fine and normal'. The mother then changes the topic of the conversation.

Taking into account Hall's (2000) comments above, the events described here certainly accord with the suggestion that the presence of the video camera re-organizes the tasks and experiences of research participants. Here, the father's task re-organised into one of 'being the adult participant' in the task of collecting research data. But notice, this 're-organisation' is subtly embedded in the fabric of the sequence of the interaction. This also draws our attention to the notion of the camera as involved in the breaking of traditional boundaries –

raising the question of, in this case, of the position of the father as 'insider participant' in the research, including the analysis of the data.

Moving on, and turning to a second extract, recorded when the child was 15 months older, we have an instance where her recognition of, and orientation to, the video camera is both more marked and possibly more complex than in the first.

Extract 2   *Child age 2 years 8 months*

Context: The context is the same above, however this is the 23rd recording in the series. During this brief extract the father leaves the room briefly and then returns.

Summary exposition of extract:
In this short extract the child, on finding herself alone for a brief moment at the kitchen/breakfast table, looks towards, non-verbally addresses and performs 'for' the camera.

Extract 2   Child age – 2 year 8 months

```
 1    FAT:   look there's a big hu::ge bit
 2           (1.8)
 3    FAT:   you can't eat ↓that↑
 4           (0.4)
 5    ELL:   yea::eaoh            (hands on head – sticks tongue out when speaking)
 6           (3.1)
 7    ELL:   oh
 8           (3.4)
 9    FAT:   mmhhmm
10           (2.1)
11    ELL:   >I can eat<
12           (0.4)
13    ELL:    a::lll by myself
14           (0.1)
15    FAT:   a::wh >that's pretty good↓<          (turns and makes to leave table)
16           (0.5)
17    ELL:   ye::h all by myself              (as she finishes speaking father leaves room)
18           (1.6)
19    ELL:   when daddy wasn't coming here I'd be a::::ll al::: ↓one↑
20           (1.0)                (during line 19 looks at camera then at toy monkey)
21    ELL:   ((during pause holds hands and looks down))
22    FAT:   well daddy be back in minute (voice heard from adjoining room)
23           (12.2)          ((see text for detail on activity))
24    FAT:   I am back
25           (11.6)          ((both participants resume eating and eating/reading))
```

26   ELL: this tri::angle shape and look
27   (0.9)

The earlier extract highlighted how an adult-participant researcher attempts to deal with the challenges and ambiguities surrounding recording 'normal' interaction in an everyday context. In this second extract we are provided with some indication of how the youngest participant orients towards the camera as a significant object, doing so in a manner that presupposes her recognition of its 'presence' or rather something/someone who is 'present'.

The first part of the extract (lines 1-to 14) involves the father and child discussing the toast she is eating, how this toast is quite large, and her positioning herself as somebody who can nonetheless manage to eat it. We might notice the manner in which, after her father has suggested she couldn't possibly eat all the toast (line 2), she emphasises how she (alone) will manage to eat it by herself by stretching the sound she makes when saying 'all' in line 13.

What happens next draws our attention to how this child orients towards the presence of the camera in a situation where she suddenly finds herself in the room on her own – a situation she marks quite explicitly as something undesirable or negative. Around line 15, the father replies to her assertion that she can indeed eat all her toast by herself, by speaking quickly in a positive tone, and yet simultaneously getting up from the table and walking into an adjoining room.   At this point (line 17), Ella produces a receipt of his statement, commenting that, yes indeed, she will eat all the toast herself. However, as she finishes speaking he has already got up from the table, and as he leaves the room she produces the extended utterance at line 19. As she is doing so, at the point where she says 'here', she turns and looks directly at a soft-toy (her pet monkey) who is placed opposite her on the table.

Leaving aside the child's mistaken use of 'coming/gone', the utterance itself is interesting as there may be a curious 'slippage' or association between the positive – assertive- use of 'all' which she has just said in line 17 (with some emphasis) and the long-stretched-out plaintive use of 'all' in line19. The switching from positive to negative or at least from assertiveness to 'sad' or problematic is marked in the particular manner in which, as she speaks, she draws her hand together, and looks downwards (see figure 1.1).   Immediately after she is saying/doing this 'performance' we hear the father (line 21) responding to her comment from an adjoining room and displaying an orientation to what she saying (notice his use of 'well' and mirroring of 'daddy').

We then observe, during the pause in the extract at line 23, a very specific and marked orientation towards the camera by the child which warrants our attention. After the father stops speaking (line 22), she raises her head, and after approximately 3 seconds, then looks up and towards the camera (see figure 1.2) [and not at her favorite toy]. Following another short pause (2 seconds) Ella then begins to 'interact' with or perform for, the camera (see figure 1.3).   She begins to sway, move and dance in her chair, adopting a pursed smile while

continuously looking towards the camera. She does this (figures 1.3-5) for the remaining 5 or 6 seconds until the father returns into the room and to sit beside her once again.

At the very least her response presupposes her recognition of something/someone watching. We can ask, and again with reference to camera presence re-organizing the tasks or experience of participants, how are we to understand the nature of the child's smile – who is it for and why is it expressed in the manner it is? Certainly there are grounds for suggesting that she displays an awareness of 'being watched'. There is however, and again with regard to earlier comments on video-recordings and privileged access to hitherto unrecorded aspects of human interaction, the question of whether, and in what way, this momentary interplay between child and camera is potentially somehow private or confidential. A psychoanalytically informed interpretation of the child's response in this instance might draw our attention to children's use of the 'smile' or fixed grin when encountering danger or feeling anxiety. It remains unclear in this case to ascertain whether the child appears to draw on the presence of the camera as a resource to assuage her 'being alone' or, in contrast, whether it is the camera itself with initiates her use of a smile as a defensive gesture. The ethical and moral dimensions underpinning research conducted with researchers own children are not necessarily realized in legislative parameters outlined by bodies such as the British Psychological Society or the Economic and Social Research Council. In other words, the protocols and guidelines regarding what is deemed both acceptable and appropriate will reflect the prevailing cultural conventions regarding children's rights. What might be seen as entirely appropriate in a UK context would not necessarily be acceptable in a Norwegian (Solberg, 1996) or Danish (Qvortrup, 1993) research context. Certainly the recognition that a research cannot second-guess any potential future use of research data in an unanticipated manner is often glossed over in established ethical guidelines (King, 2010).

In the next short extract, recorded when the child was a few months older we find a more clear-cut case of the camera being oriented to as 'something that watches' or records. Here, and in addition to the indications that Ella may view the camera as someone/an entity that can be communicated with and/or appealed to when seeking solace, below we have an instance where the camera is viewed with suspicion and/or negatively.

Extract 3   *Child age – 2 year 11 months*

Context: The father has prepared breakfast for the child and is busy in the kitchen – awaiting her eventual completion in order that they can go to work/nursery. The child is playing with her toys at the breakfast table and does not appear to want to eat her breakfast.

Summary: The child looks towards the camera while engaging in a behavior which is generally prohibited in this context (using a pacifier /dummy instead of

eating food), and before her parent has recognized that she is engaging in such behaviour.

```
 1   ELL:   °xx xxx so°
 2          (1.2)
 3   FAT:   have you ↑tried your porridge ↓now
 4          (2.3)
 5   FAT:   has it cooled down for [you?]
 6   ELL:                         [↑I'm] only cutting this kiwi fruit up
 7          (.) and [I'll] eat it
 8   FAT:          [alright]
 9          (1.9)                  ((child cuts toy fruit and one part flies off))
10   ELL:   eh but ↑I like my fruit be:::↑es[t]
11   FAT:                                  [you] do don't you
12          (3.5)                  ((sound of father starting toaster))
13   ELL:   °I miss my xxx° (.) xxx xxxx xxxxx
14          (17.9)                 ((puts dummy in mouth and looks at the camera))
15   ELL:   mmmhhhmmmm
16          (7.1)
17   ELL:   °mmmmmhhmm°=
18   FAT:   =↑a::::W >come on darling< don't put your [pubs in]
19   ELL:                                            [I wann com xxx I'm gonna wait] °for it° =
20   FAT:   =well it is cooled down now darling your not eating i:::↑t
21          (0.2)
22   FAT:   >d'you want me< to take it away then?
23          (0.9)
24   FAT:   cause your not eating any and you've not even tried it and you put
25          your pubs back in
26          (3.7)
```

 Around line 3 we hear the father asking Ella whether she has tried her food, and on not receiving a reply then asks whether in fact it has cooled down now. Indications of upcoming disagreement between the participants may be apparent at line 6, when the child both interrupts/overlaps her father's second question, and in doing so using the qualification 'only' when offering an explanation why she has not yet started eating. This account is accepted as reasonable by the father (line 8). The child however, again after a pause, then makes the suggestion that (rather than eating porridge) she 'likes her fruit' best, doing so with a stress and emphasis on the latter parts of her utterance. The father (who is talking from another part of the room) then simply agrees to what she has said, and it remains ambiguous whether there is any engagement on his part with the ongoing topic (the disagreement over what is being eaten/or instead played with).

What then happens next again provides us with evidence regarding the status of the camera as a cultural object for this participant. About 3-4 seconds after the end of the quiet utterance in line 13, she looks quickly towards the

porridge, then towards her 'dummy' (this/these have the pet name 'pubs' in this family), and putting her head on her hand/arm on the table reaches for her 'pub' and puts it into her mouth (see figure 2.1). Then, after a 5 second pause, she first reaches for a second dummy on the table, and after lifting it to her face, then turns and looks at the camera. This 'look' is sustained (4-5 seconds long) without any change in her facial expression (figure 2.2). She then looks away before spending another 9-10 seconds moving one of her toys around in a circular motion (figure 2.3).   And then at line 18 we observe the father returning to the table and on doing so (line 18-24) displays annoyance at the fact that she is not eating her food, is now sucking her dummies instead and asserting that she has not 'even' tried her food.

Certainly when we consider and compare the manner of these looks towards and actions in front of the camera (extracts 2 and 3), the earlier example, although highlighting the child's recognition of the camera's presence, her experience and responses remain ambiguous and somewhat difficult to interpret. In extract 3 in contrast, the looks she directs at the camera happens at a particular point in the sequence where (a) she is being asked to do something she does not wish to, (b) her response towards the food indicate she has little intention of carrying out the adult's request, and (c) instead engages in a series of actions which, in this particular family are recognized as inappropriate and prohibited in this context (using her pacifiers). The length of the 'look', it's manner and the specific moment in time that it occurs lend credence to the suggestion that she displays a recognition of being watched and is possibly being held accountable in some way (i.e., in the sense that somebody is watching you 'being naughty', and you notice that the watching is happening).

In the final extract for consideration, and recorded when the child was 4 months older, Ella's understanding and perception of the video-camera in the context of her everyday life becomes both a topic for specific comment on by herself and others, and also an object that elicits particular kinds of behaviors and responses. The extent to which she seems to treat the camera both as a presence (an entity to interact with) and as something akin to a 'mirror' (showing what 'it' can see) seems to initiate an interesting series of gestures and actions by the child. Again, we also observe how the father/researcher is treating the camera as particular kind of object.

Extract 4   *Child age – 3 year 3 months*

Context: As before, the recording context is meal-time (breakfast) and on this occasion, following the meal, the father is reading a book on the table (not interacting with the child). Ella is playing with a collection of large alphabet cards in front of her on the table and one of her soft toys is placed nearby.

Summary: On this occasion the child treats the video-camera (when the view-finder/display is visible to her) in manner not dissimilar to responses children often exhibit when in front of a mirror.

```
 1    ELL:   sun sk:::y                              ((child singing across the next few lines))
 2           (1.2)
 3    ELL:   bethlehem
 4           (0.3)
 5    ELL:   ↑bethlehem xxx
 6           (2.4)
 7    ELL:   xxxx xxxx come for you xxx
 8           (7.8)
 9    ELL:   it's not coming ↑U::p              ((looking at camera))
10           (0.8)                   ((child continues pointing – moving index finger))
11    FAT:   what's not coming up darlin =
12    ELL:   =that thing
13           (0.1)
14    FAT:   the camera?
15           (0.3)
16    ELL:   °n:: ↑:o↓°
17           (0.7)
18    FAT:   ((coughs twice))
19           (0.4)
20    ELL:   can you turn it round?
21           (1.3)                              ((father moves from the chair))
22    ELL:   cant see it
23           (1.3)
24    FAT:   [((coughs))]
25    ELL:   [°an turn an xxx it°]    ((child holding hand up and doing 'turning' motion))
26                                    ((F turns the display viewer on the camera around)) .
27           (5.4)                    ((on seeing her own image, child smiles))
28    ELL:   a::::w =
29    FAT:   =a::w awawa
30           (1.1)
31    FAT:   now we can see grommit            ((name of soft toy on table))
32           (4.1)
33    FAT:   grommit's looking quiet isn't he
34           (0.6)
35    FAT:   he he (.) ·hhh
36           (2.2)
37    FAT:   ((coughs))
38           (14.4)
39    ELL:   he had his breakfast (.) and now he's coming to play like a bi::g (.) big (.)
40           big ↓doggy
41           (3.2)
42    ELL:   and he ate all his breakfast
43           (1.5)
44
```

The extract begins with the child playing with large cards on the table (the father reading) and quietly singing to herself. During the quite long pause at line 8, and

it would appear as she is trying to rub something out of one of her eyes, she looks across to her father, then turns and looks briefly towards the camera and then turns back towards her father again (who continues reading). She then turns again towards the camera, and as she utters line 9, raises her hand, points at the camera, and on finishing speaking, continues to look while moving/wiggling her finger as she holds her hand in the pointed position.

At line 11, and in reply, the father turns towards her, glances at the camera, then moves towards and close to the child, looking at her (not the camera) when he asks his question. When he replies with his question (after the briefest of pauses), he also turns towards the camera. Her quiet response to this question is noteworthy in that it is very quiet, is not in the affirmative and accompanied by a pitch/intonation contour indicative of communicating "no, it is not" (coming up).

Leaving aside the possibility that his 'cough' that then follows might indicate his recognition/reminder that they are being filmed, Ella then, at line 20, asks if the viewfinder/display attachment can be 'turned around'. As he moves from the table to alter the video-camera, she says very quietly something that sounds like 'and turn and see it', while at the same time holding out her hand in front of her and 'simulating' the turning motion of the display part of the video.

What happens next is striking and not dissimilar to the responses young pre-school children exhibit when placed in front of full-length mirrors (Vyt, 2001; Bard, 2006). Just before her utterance at line 29, she first smiles bringing her hand to her face in a posture Goffman (1979) describes as a 'cant' (a head or body posture of subordination). As she continues her gaze/smile the father immediately imitates/repeats her 'aw-isn't that nice' sound, and as he returns to sit at the table, comments that now she can see her soft toy. Notice he doesn't say, 'now you can see yourself' or 'oh look, I can see you'. His comment may indicate his efforts at maintaining a 'researcher/professional' perspective on this sequence of events. Instead he says, 'now we can see grommit' (the toy sitting on the table). Of course, an alternative reading is that the adult, given that he was busy reading and not interacting with the child, simply did not wish to be disturbed and produced this comment so as to increase the likelihood that the child would play with the soft-toy, leaving him to read.

What is of interest here, and again with reference to how the child participant understands the presence of the camera, is what happens next. The child, (line 33) maintains a close studied gaze towards the camera/mirror and after 4 seconds, the father suggests that the soft toy is not saying very much. Notwithstanding the possibility that this comment is related to the fact that the child is not saying very much at this point, at line 39, after a brief cough, the father returns to reading the book on the table. At this point, we observe an elaborate and detailed set of responses or performed interactions in front of/with the camera/mirror by the child. While continuously looking at the video-sequence of herself in the viewfinder she first waves the large card in her hand; then puts the card under her chin, strokes her own body with the card, places it down, and although continuing to look at her image, then moves towards the soft-toy, gives it a cuddle while still looking, and finally after this somewhat 'plaintive' performance, finally moves away and makes a comment about the soft-toy. The father then turns around and looks again at the child.

Consider for a moment how the child responds to the camcorder view-screen, keeping in mind that she requested to see it in the first place. It is difficult to know what is going on here, and how we are to understand the series of actions and gestures initiated following the moment when the view-screen it turned around. The sequence of her gestures, actions and comments move from offers 'to the camera/self-image', touching the card against her body, face and head, while continuously looking, and then performing 'with' and 'comforting her toy-dog. This complex sequence of responses and actions is likely to be an expression of the child's own self-positioning, self-image recognition and the playing-around with image manipulation that children often engage in at around this age. At the very least we can say that the view-finder/camera object is now oriented to, and used by, the child in a manner which highlights something of the multiple-associations it brings into play simply by its presence in this kind of context. The video-camera is a cultural object of a particular kind and for many children during the early years experienced within and through discursive contexts which predicate the significance not so much of the image (photograph) but of the film or video-sequence - the video-clip of the first day at school, the week-end holiday break, the school play and all the self-recordings of everyday play between children. We are only beginning to understand how children themselves understand and orient to such practices.

Concluding comments

At some risk of stating the obvious, there is of course a close interdependence between technological development and changing research practices. Conversation analysis is unthinkable without the development of cheap, reliable, portable recording and playback of talk. The video-camera and associate recording techniques and practices have similarly initiated emerging orientations, perspectives and specific practices, to the study of naturalistic everyday human interaction. Notice for example, in discussion and explication of extracts in CA publications (Schegloff, 1992) the referencing of the original recording of the event. One reading of such practices might be something along the lines of 'well, if you don't agree with the analysis, have a look at the video-sequence yourself, and you'll see what I mean'. It is the predicating of the significance or the 'very obviousness' or 'realness' of the associated recording that should draw our attention to the difficulties involved in the analysis of video-recordings. In a way reminiscent of Roland Barthes's (1982) comment that every photograph is a certificate of presence (*Camera Lucida,* p.81), the video-sequence unfolding-ly making available to us, this, then that, then the next thing, making it increasingly difficult to recognise, in the process of analysis, the interrelationships between event selection, interpretation and the subsequent production of the extract/video-clip as analytic object. When the selection, capturing, recording and production of the event is itself a result of an 'insider participant' researcher's own agenda, then matters can indeed become both more complicated and potentially ambiguous.

The extracts examined above may also highlight certain hitherto unrecognised issues regarding participant's own recognition and orientation to

the video-camera in situ. Through documenting one child's changing responses to, and interaction with, the camera we are able to see that, for her, the camera as a cultural object has a particular and occasioned status within family life. Initially these responses are minimal and of maybe of little remark, but increasingly it would seem the camera plays a somewhat ambiguous role – potentially a source of comfort and redress (extract 2) or something more akin to a 'presence' which presupposes accountability (extract 3). Certainly towards the end of the research study, the child's recognition and orientation towards the camera appears intertwined with the documenting of records, and indeed, her own self-positioning and self-image-play (extract 4).

We also noted that the researcher himself has a somewhat peculiar relationship or orientation to the camera, envisioned not only on those occasions where the recognition or at least projection of 'possible audiences' in the future becomes clear (extract 2), but needless to say in the contribution that constitutes this chapter. The traditional boundaries between participant and researcher, as Hall (2000) intimated do indeed become somewhat amorphous when engaged in 'insider participation' research concerned to document and analysis the everyday world of human interaction.

The analysis of the extracts in this chapters remind us of the challenges and complexities surrounding the recording and analysis of whatever constitutes everyday naturalistic interaction. Within social science, and in particular psychology, there remains a certain suspicion and scepticism over the interdependence between interpretation and the object of analysis. To some extent this reflects the particular emphasis on the experimental laboratory in the discipline such that observational methodologies themselves were traditionally viewed as belonging to the qualitative end of the methodological spectrum. In fact, developmental psychology, and particularly those braches concerned with documenting naturally occurring interactions (e.g., Smith & Connolly, 1980) adapted and extended techniques and procedures from ethology into sophisticated protocols for observational sampling (Altman, 1974). The initial coding of an event as an instance of a coding category remains the starting point of this from of observational analysis and an important element of such procedures was the development of reliability procedures for establishing, measuring and assessing inter-observer reliability (e.g., the kappa co-efficient index). With the gradual introduction and spread of audio and then video technologies alongside the focus on procedures and practices concerning the documentation of the record of what 'has truly happened', computer-based video technologies have, if anything, increased the focus on quantification (e.g., the Observer Video-Pro system, Noldus et al, 2000).

It is against this background that researchers in psychology using visual methods and adopting qualitative approaches in the study of human interaction have established and developed interpretative approaches from varying perspectives, e.g., ethnomethodological, discursive, ethnographic and social-semiotic. The examples above may help contribute to these recent developments through seeking to understand more of what the presence of recording equipment, and being recorded, might mean to people. How, we might ask, are the various technologies integrated into the people's everyday sense-making practices? What forms of analysis might we use which draw out the subtle nature of the interdependence between the document record itself and

the conditions within which such records are produced and made realizable? The participant-orientation focus of ethnomethodolgically informed conversation analysis certainly highlights the reflexive nature of everyday sense-making practices in situ. The status of being an 'insider participant', that is when a researcher straddles the boundaries between being 'object of analysis' and 'interpreter', does however draw our attention to the ongoing challenges central to the interdependence between the production of analytic objects (the video segment, the transcribed extract) and corresponding interpretation.

References:

Altmann, J. (1974). Observational study of behavior: Sampling Methods.
    Behaviour, 49(3/4), 227-267.
Bard, K. A., Todd, B. K., Bernier, C., Love, J., & Leavens, D. A. (2006). Self-
    awareness in human and chimpanzee infants: What is measured and what
    is meant by the mark and mirror test? *Infancy, 9*(2), 191-219.
Barthes, R. (1982). *Camera Lucida*. London: Jonathan Cape.
Brown, R. (1958). *Words and things*: Free Press.
Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism*. London: Routledge.
CHILDES. (2008). Childes Overview System - Basic., 2008, from
    http://childes.psy.cmu.edu/media/Eng-UK/Forrester/
Cooper, H., Maxwell, S., Stone, A., & Sher, K. J. (2008). Reporting Standards for
    Research in Psychology Why Do We Need Them? What Might They Be?
    American Psychologist, 63(9), 839-851.
Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse as cognition*. London: Sage.
Forrester, M. A. (1988). Young children's conversation monitoring abilities. *First
    Language, 8*, 201-226.
Forrester, M. A. (1992). *The development of young children's social-cognitive kills*.
    Hove: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
Forrester, M. A. (2002). Appropriating cultural conceptions of childhood:
    Participation in conversation. *Childhood, 9*, 255-276.
Forrester, M. A. (2008). The emergence of self-repair: A case study of one child
    during the early pre-school years. *Research on Language and Social
    Interaction, 41*(1), 99-128.
Garfinkel, H. (1964). 'Studies of the routine grounds of everyday activities'. *Social
    Problems, 11*, 220-250.
Goffman, E. (1979). *Gender advertisements*. London: Macmillan.
Hall, R. (2000). Video recording as theory. In D. Lesh & A. Kelley (Eds.), *Handbook
    of Research Design in Mathematics and Science Education* (pp. 647-664).
    Mahweh, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society, 27*(3),
    291-334.
Hutchby, I., & Woofit, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.
James, I. A., & Allen, K. (2004). A post-hoc analysis of emotions in supervision: A
    new methodology for examining process features. *Behavioural and
    Cognitive Psychotherapy, 32*(4), 507-513.
James, W. (1890). *The principles of psychology*. New York: Holt.
Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of Transcript Symbols wiht and introduction. In G.
    H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation.*
    (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
King, N. (2010). Research ethics in qualitative research. In M. A. Forrester (Ed.),
    Doing qualitative research in Psychology: A practical guide. London: Sage.
Livingston, E. (1987). *Making sense of ethnomethodology*. London: Routledge &
    Kagan Paul.
McWhinney, B. (2000). *The CHILDES Project: Tools for analyzing talk.* (3 ed. Vol.
    2). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Noldus, L. P. J. J., Trienes, R. J. H., Hendriksen, A. H. M., Jansen, H., & Jansen, R. G.
    (2000). The Overserver Video-Pro: New software fo rthe collection,

management, and presentation of time-structured data from videotapes and digital media files. *Behavior Research Methods, Instrument, & Computers, 32*(1), 197-206.

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. Schiefflein (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics*. London: Academic Press.

Papousek, M., & Papousek, H. (1981). Musical elements in infant's vocalisations: Their significance for communication, cognition and creativity. *Advances in Infancy Research, 1*, 163-224.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis*. London: Sage.

Quay, S. (2008). Dinner conversations with a trilingual two-year-old: Language socialization in a multilingual context. *First Language*, 5-33.

Qvortup, J. (1993). Societal position of childhood: The international project Childhood as a Social Phenomenon. *Childhood, 1*(2), 119-124.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structrually provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 97*, 1295-1345.

Smith, P. K., & Connolly, P. K. (1980). *The ecology of pre-school behaviour.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Solberg, A. (1996). The challenge in child research: From being to doing. In M.O'Brien (Ed.), *Children in families: Research and policy.* London: Routledge.

Vyt, A. (2001). Processes of visual self-recognition in infants: Experimental induction of 'mirror' experience via video self-image presentation. *Infant and Child Development, 10*(4), 173-187.

Zuengler, J., Ford, C., & Fassnacht, C. (1998). Analyst eyes and camera eyes: Theoretical and technological consideration in 'seeing' the details of classroom interaction. Retrieved 20.10.09, from http://cela.albany.edu/analysteyes/index.html

Appendix 1

Conversation analysis orthography

Conversation Analysis: Transcription Conventions			
Transcription Element	Meaning	Transcription Element	Meaning
↑ or ↓	Marked rise (or fall) in intonation	:::	Sounds that are stretched or drawn out (number of :: indicates the length of stretching)
underlining	Used for emphasis (parts of the utterance that are stressed)	[ ]	Overlaps, cases of simultaneous speech or interruptions.
UPPER-CASE LETTERS	Indicate increased volume (note this can be combined with underlining)	° word °	Shown when a passage of talk is noticeably quieter than the surrounding talk
.hhh	A row of h's with a dot in front of it indicates an inbreath. Without the dot an outbreath	=	When there is nearly no gap at all between one utterance and another
(comment)	Analyst's comment about something going on in the talk	(.)	Small pauses
> word<	Noticeably faster speech	(1.4)	Silences (time in secs)
<word>	Noticeably slower speech	(xx)	Untranscribed talk

Figures

Figure 1.1

Figure 1.2

Figure 1.3

Figure 1.4.

Figure 1.5

Figure 2.1

Figure 2.2

Figure 2.3