

Research Article

Locating Exclusion in Male Peer Talk

Suranjana Barua

Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Information Technology Guwahati, Assam
Email: suranjana.barua@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper seeks to locate the phenomenon of exclusion within the domain of language: specifically male peer conversation. Essential gender differences in male and female styles of communication have been studied from various socio-psychological and linguistic perspectives in the twentieth century. However, male intra-gender communication is a much more nuanced process than the listing of a few essential characteristics might indicate. Within the complex dynamics of the male peer group, how is identity established, contested and re-contextualized is what this paper will examine. In the process, it is expected to highlight the contextual negotiations by which language performs both group solidarity and individual exclusion in the establishment of identity. This performative aspect of exclusion during talk in interaction will be underscored through an analysis of male peer group talk in this paper.

Keywords: Exclusion, Language, Locating, Male, Peer, Talk

INTRODUCTION

Social Identity

Our social identities are created when we assume defined roles within the existing social system. More often than not, the human self is created by an extensive and intensive network of relations with others who define and redefine us in more ways than we know. One of the most influential identity groups in the life of a young adult is the peer group. Often defined as "... the halfway house between the family and the adult world", the peer group is "one of the most powerful and potent forces effecting change in the adolescent" (Gay, 1992) and often ends up

dictating and defining behaviours. Thus, as a socializing institute, the peer group exerts profound influence in the formation and expression of selfhood. Studies in the last decade of the twentieth century have demonstrated how young students can reorient to their self-images while negotiating with others in peer group discussions (Alvermann, 1996) or how modeling of a behaviour within the peer group was, ‘ the strongest socialisation technique in developing healthy lifestyles’ (Lau *et al.*, 1990). Patterns of linguistic behavior within peers have also been studied by, amongst others, Rogers (1993) and Gilligan, Lyons and Hammer (1990) who have analyzed the importance of silences in conversation and their implications from a gendered perspective: for the former, silences in peer group conversations often become a strategy of psychological resistance while for the latter, silences of young girls in peer groups have been associated with loss of voice, resiliency, and self-esteem as they approach adolescence. A lot of studies from across disciplines in the last two decades have focused on the study of college students and importance of peer identity. Pascarella and Terenzini (1991, 2005) for example, identified two broad clusters of conceptual frameworks that are important for understanding change in college students: i) developmental theories and ii) college impact models. Of these, developmental models of student change address “the nature, structure, and processes of individual human growth. They focus primarily on the nature and content of *intra* individual change, although interpersonal experiences are often salient components of these models” [(Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005), emphasis in original]. In contrast, college impact models of student change focus more on the environmental and *inter* individual origins of student change “. . . [and] emphasize change associated with the characteristics of the institutions students attend (between-college effects) or with the experiences students have while enrolled” [(within-college effects) Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005: 18, emphasis in original].

Kaufman and Feldman (2004) also describe the dynamics of social interaction among college students that influence the constitution of their newly formed or modified *felt identities* in the triple domains of i) intelligence and knowledge ability, ii) occupation, and iii) cosmopolitanism. Based on data from 82 semi structured, open-ended interviews with a randomly selected sample of college students, they describe the feelings reported by students about their experiences with peers and others in the college environment that are perceived to have influenced the students’ perceptions of themselves in the intellectual and occupational domains. The interpretation of results in that study focused on exploring the extent to which the social environment impacts the formation of individual felt identity rather than “how students do or do not ‘develop’ in college” (p. 490). More recently, Weidman (2011) has argued that socialization can be thought of as having both individual (cognitive developmental) and organizational (affective interpersonal) dimensions linked through patterns of acquisition and maintenance of memberships and

participation in salient groups (Weidman, 1989) and he concludes that developmental and college impact frameworks are not mutually exclusive.

With this as the theoretical background, the current paper shall examine peer group conversation (encoding both developmental and college impact factors) in order to highlight the contextual negotiations by which language *performs* both group solidarity and individual exclusion in the establishment of the social identity of a “student”. A group identity is always a relational phenomenon – hence any attestation of belonging is bound to be offset with what or who does *not* belong in the group. Social dynamics in this sense not only impinges on a person’s felt identity (what Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005 as cited above call intra-individual) but also on inter-individual correlations. What this paper seeks to examine therefore, is a *form of social exclusion that is inter-individual but intra-group*: the shifting contours of intra-group negotiations may sometimes highlight exclusion too to be a contextual, discursive and hence ephemeral phenomenon rather than an over-oppressive social relation. More specifically, this paper seeks to explore how is identity established, contested and recontextualized within the complex dynamics of the male peer group. The rationale for examining male peer group conversation is that exclusion can be *interactionally and performatively achieved within the same context and without other important social variables such as age or gender* dictating such exclusion. The importance of group affiliations, social dynamics of peers and shifting positions of advantage within the same gender peer-group talk will be highlighted in such an attempt to locate social exclusion in language. As we shall see, non-hierarchical intra-gender groups can have their own dynamics of identity formation and shifting alliances can provide for considerable conflict. Pitched in a highly competitive academic environment, the otherwise egalitarian male peer group conversation may become a major source of *both* social affiliation and social exclusion.

Peer Group and Social Exclusion

There have been quite a few studies on social exclusion within the peer group: Wójcik and Kozak’s (2015) recent article provides an overview of the literature on the issue of social exclusion in peers as covering a great diversity of topics, which might be classified in three main streams: reasons and predictors of social exclusion in a peers group (Bierman, Smoot, and Aumiller, 1993; Rieffe, Villanueva and Terwogt, 2005), understanding the process and mechanisms of social exclusion (Bierman, 2004; Coie, 1990; Sandstrom & Zakirsi, 2004) and extensive consequences of rejection by peers (e.g. Boivin, Hymel, Bukowski, 1995, Buhs, Ladd and Herald, 2006; Warrington & Younger, 2011). In this context of intra-gender social groups, Goodwin (2002), citing other studies notes:

Ethological... as well as ethnographic cross cultural...studies have found that males establish dominance hierarchies through competitive and often quite physical interactions. Studies of Caucasian middle class boys in the Midwest U.S. ...have found that boys value 'toughness, trouble, domination, coolness, and interpersonal bragging and sparring skills' Such activities permit the boys to develop a ranked ordering, making comparisons in their skill levels in various sports in large, somewhat fluid, social groups (Goodwin, 2002).

Social exclusion as evident in young fluid peer groups at school level will expectedly be different from exclusion as evident in the language of mature University level male peer group which this paper will examine. At this mature age, social negotiations may tend to be less out and out competitive than at younger school-going age: consequently, social exclusion too will be expectedly less physical (as in contact sports) and more verbal. It is in the contextual handling of this kind of excluded self – unique to a discursive situation as opposed to a physical one – that an individual's *social competence* will be tested and peer marginalization may be established even amongst the thickest of peer group friendships. In the sections below, we shall now analyse how this situation of interlocution posits, contests and recontextualizes such marginalized peer identity.

Locating Exclusion in Male Peer Talk: The Current Study

As noted in the above section, we shall be examining talk-interaction to highlight the contextual negotiations by which language performs individual exclusion in the establishment of social identity. We will now examine two speech extracts in which the intra gender peer group conversation reveals the social negotiations by which identity of a “good student” gets established and recontextualized.

The speech extracts to be analyzed in the next section are part of data collected by the current author for a research project¹ and the analysis broadly follows a Conversation Analysis framework². *A total of 17 respondents* (13 female and 4 male)-postgraduate students of an interdisciplinary course taught by the current author-volunteered to take part in the project which required them to take/give interviews. The students all had Assamese as their mother tongue; were from different departments and were all in their early twenties. In the initial questionnaire that the respondents were asked to fill up prior to the actual interviews, they had to indicate whether they would prefer the role of an ‘interviewer’ or ‘interviewee’. They were told beforehand that those respondents who preferred the role of interviewer would be interviewed by the current author and they would then be

¹At the Centre for Assamese Studies, Tezpur University where the author was previously working.

²Conversation Analysis is the study of talk-in-interaction which uses minute details of everyday talk for analyzing multiple phenomenon. The conventional transcription symbols and the particular abbreviations used in the data are explained in the Table 1 at the end of the paper.

required to interview any two of their peers who preferred to be interviewees. The interviews so conducted were semi-structured with a list of common questions provided to the interviewer who was free to ask them in any order as s/he desired. Two of the questions provided in the questionnaire were:

1. Who in your opinion is a good human being? Do you consider yourself a 'good' human being?
2. Do you consider yourself a 'good student'?

For this current paper we shall be analyzing the responses of three male students viz. R13, R 14 and R17³ to the questions above. Of these, the first respondent – R13 – had chosen to be an interviewer and thus was interviewed by the current author who was his teacher. He then went on to interview two of his peers – R 14 and R17 – who were his close friends from the same Department and hostel.

The first question about what one considered to be a good human being and whether one was in one's opinion a good human served as a context for the next question which posed the identity of a "good student". The latter encodes a group affiliation with a common identity that of a student – and was also simultaneously an ideal. However, although it is an ideal and identity that every student aspires to, to reiterate it in peer context is fraught with problems as the speaker may be perceived to be an ingratiating teacher's pet or seen to consider himself above the peer or having too high an opinion of himself. Such implications anticipated in the question of whether one was a "good student" would require different kinds of handling in the discursive contexts: in the case of R13 who had a teacher as an interviewer, he would have to perhaps posit a positive self-image as a good student. In the case of R14 or R17 who had R13 – hence a peer – as an interviewer it would be a slightly more tricky situation. To accept and hence affirm oneself to be a "good" student might invite jealousy in or teasing from peers. *When a common peer group identity (as a student) becomes individualized to the detriment of the individual's self-identity (as too studious), we can be said to have a situation of exclusion – the person is marked out as not belonging to the common peer.* When the situation of interlocution is non-hostile but potentially requires a positive self-image (for example as we shall see in R13's interview by current researcher who was his teacher below), the negotiation of social identity may not be out and out excluded. However, when the situation of interlocution is potentially hostile (such as peer group conversation which would require admittance of being good and hence in some sense superior), dexterous handling of the discursive situation would be required to avoid social exclusion as an elitist peer. Let us now examine the relevant speech extracts to try and locate social exclusion in language of same peer members.

³Such naming codes are as per Conversation Analysis conventions and used to protect identity.

Performing Exclusion: The Role of Language and Peer Group Context

In the extract below, to the prior question of whether he considers himself a good human being, R13 says that he does not do so because he is too outspoken and does not have the diplomacy or astute observation skills to see whether his listener is upto the task for his forthright opinions. To the author's next question of whether he considers himself a good student, R13 has an interesting take (lines 5-10):

Extract I

[SBD Z000013 17:10]

((The following talk-in-interaction occurs fifteen minutes into the interview of R13. SB the current author asks if R13 considers himself a good student and categorically says in her line preceding R13's first turn that it does not matter what she or other teachers think – Does R13 consider himself a good student?))

1. R13: (.) >pra:: ↑i moi nijoke bha:↑↓l student buliye bhabu↑<
often I-nom self good student quot think1
'I mostly think of myself as a good student only.'
2. → >kintu kisuman khetrot ami nize (.) kisuman pha:: ↑↓ki-
but some area-loc we self some lie
3. *kisuma:n phakir a:sro:i lou*↑<
some lie-gen shelter take1
'But in some areas, we ourselves take recourse to certain lies...'
4. *tetiya hole nijoke bohut ::(.) ma:ne (.) >duxi duxi la::ge*< {SB: hmm}
Then happen self much means guilty guilty take
'Then...means... we feel very guilty'
5. → >kisuman khetrot(.) a::mi etiya:: (.) kisuma: n ka::m(.) koribole xomoy
mote dile↑< some area-loc we now some work give3 time according give3
6. → <ami ketiyaba:: ↑↓ NOKORU >(.)
we-nom sometimes neg-do1
'In some areas, now, we are given things to do within a certain time, and we sometimes do not do it...'
7. → >kisuma::n onyo karon karoneu nokoru<
some other reason reason –emph neg-neg1
'...we do not do it for some other reasons also...'
8. >ba: ketiyaba: mon nogoleu nokoru<
or sometime mind neg- go-emph neg-do
'..or sometimes, we do not feel like doing it'

9. <tenekuwa KA::RONOT ketiyaba> >duxi duxi la::ge<
those reason-loc sometimes guilty guilty want
10. → >tetia nijoke ma::ne(.) bohut beya: beya: (gutei) la::ge<
then self means much bad bad full want

‘In those cases sometimes we feel guilty. Then we feel ourselves (to be) very bad.’

R13 starts out in Line 1 of Extract I above by saying that he *mostly* thinks of himself as a good enough student but is quick to add the contrastive element right away – he, is good enough but he like any other normal student, indulges in lies and deception in certain areas sometimes (Lines 2-3). He begins his answer with an interesting word pra::i (often) but the moment he introduces the contrastive element in this answer (with kintu – ‘but’ in line 2), he also switches from singular to plural pronoun: he uses *a:mi* – the plural marker line 2. His rapid exposition thereafter in fast speech (marked by > <) has achieved a startling result - he *generalizes* his personal identity of a ‘good student’ to a *common student identity* without any other overt choice of words except that of the P lural *a:mi*. He uses the same plural first person nominative in lines 5 and 6 to reiterate where students fall short of expectations. He feels ‘guilty’ on such occasion (*duxi duxi l:age:* line 4) and then cites concrete examples of when such guilt surfaces: when they are asked to do some task on time but they do not do it (lines 5-6) or are *unable* to do it for some other reason (line 7) or sometimes simply do not feel like doing it (like 8). It is for reasons like these that he feels guilty or bad – emotions that he expresses by *reduplication*: *duxi duxi* (guilty) in lines 4 and 9 and *beya: beya:* (bad) in line 10.

A few things about R13’s use of language are remarkable here from a macro perspective: one is his *shift from a singular position* (of whether or not he considers *himself* to be a good student) *to that of a general position of students* and the other is the *extenuating* tone of the conversation – he feels “guilty guilty” when, as students, he and his peers (*a:mi*) do not do assigned tasks on time. At times, this is circumstantial and at times intentional (as his turns in lines 5-8 emphasize) but the cause for his guilt is typically *students’ inaction* and hence not *his* individual fault. His position on the peers helps to *exclude* him in way and helps position him within the discourse context as a sincere student – one who feels guilty for students’ apathy or indolence. His position pays off when SB categorically asks him a few turns later (lines not cited here due to space constraints) if he has ever been scolded for being a bad student – to this he replies that he has been scolded in general as a member of his class but never been scolded specifically. He successfully excludes himself from the general peer or his class of indolent students on behalf of whom he feels guilty. Thus R13 *generalizes through extenuation* – he

insulates his positive self-image (of *mostly* a good student) by subtle contrasting with the general tendency of students to be tardy at work who consequently receive scoldings from teachers

In contrast to R13's *apologetic stance* by which he accepts guilt for the student community as a whole, his peer A on the other hand accepts his *exalted* status straight away – he too reiterates his student identity but in an out and out affiliating positive sense in Extract II below. This is why he faces teasing right away from his friend R13 who is the interviewer in his case: R13 says A even *looks good* (better translation is “goody goody”) in line 2 and 4.

Extract II

((R14 and R17 are being interviewed by R13. All three male peers are good friends from the same department and living in the same hostel. The interview has been on for just over thirty minutes. Prior to R14's turns below, R13 had asked whether they considered themselves to be good humans and good students. To the first of these, it is R17 who takes the turn to answer that in his ‘internal world of his mind’, he is a good human; as for being a good student, *he categorically denies it saying that he is too lazy to be a good student*. It elicits laughter from his peers R14 and R13 following which the latter repeats his question and asks R14 to respond. R14's first line below is in response to whether he considers himself a good human being.))

DHA Z000016 30:26

1. R14: *OF KCO:RS moi nijoke bha::L buli [bha::bu↑(.)*
of course I-nom self good quot think I
‘Of course I think of myself as good’
2. R13: *[hoi. dekhatu la::ge [bha::L buli=*
Yes. See-inf-cl want good quot
‘Yeah –look-wise also (you seem) “good”.’
3. R14: *[moi ZI kori asu (.)=*
i-nom rel-pro do do-pres
‘Whatever I do...’
4. →R13: *=dekhatu bha::L bha::l la::ge olop=*
See-inf-cl good good want little
‘You look also *good* a bit’.
5. →R14: *=moi zi kori asu (.) bha:l buliye bha:bu ↑{D: hoi}*
i-nom rel pro do do-pres good quot-emph think yes
‘Whatever I am doing, I consider it good’.

6. → *etiya MANUHE (.) BELEGE(.) ki BHA:BE xei↑↓tu (dangor kotha nohoi)*
now people-nom other what think3 that big thing neg-cop
'Now, what people...others think is not a big thing'
7. → *MOI ki bha:bu xei↑↓tu he da::ngor kot(hh)ha= ((R17 laughs))*
i-nom what think1 that emph big thing
'What I think – that is the big thing'
8. R13: =*xeitu dangor kotha*
that emph big thing
'That is the big thing'
9. R14: *hehehe*
10. R13: *tumi nije:::ejon bha:l student >hoi nohoi ba:ru<?*
You self one good student cop neg-cop q-prt
'Are you yourself a good student or not?'
11. R14: <*bha::l student buli:: ↑>(.) etiya zihetu moi student (.)*
(qv) good student quot now since i-nom student
12. *gotike Bha:l student buli- ee:: ↑*
So good student quot
'To say good student.. now that I am a student, so to say 'good student'...'
13. > ⊥ *nijoke moi bha↑↓::l student buliye bha::bu<*
Self i-nom good student quot-emoh think1
'I think of myself as a good student only'
14. →R13: *hoi. Hehehe ketiyaba ka:mor dara sa::ge proka::x pai↑↓(.hh)*
yes sometimes work-gen through perhaps express get
'Yes. Hehehe...Sometimes it gets express through work also perhaps...'
15. R14: @*ka::m ma::ne ka::mor dara: proka::X pai:@*
work means work-gen through express get
'Work? Means it gets expressed through work.'
16. <*ma::ne GOMEI pai aru*>
Means know-emph get and
'Means... it becomes known'
17. R13: *hoi bha:: ↑↓le ne beya↑↓ye (.)hehehe=*
yes good-emph or bad-emph
'Whether good or bad... hehehe'
18. → R14:=>*mur jazment tu moi nije koribo nuwaru<*
i-gen judgment cl i-nom self do-fut cannot
'I myself cannot do my own judgement'

19. >*belegehe belegor sokuwedi sa:le*<
 other-emph other-gen eye-through see-3
 ‘When others perceive through their eyes’
20. *tetiya he moi dhora porim*<
 sthen emph i-nom catch fall1
 ‘Only then can I get assessed (lit.caught)’
21. R13: <*xeitu hoi*>
 That cop
 ‘That it is.’

Typical to R13’s ideolect, he uses reduplication to ensure that the ‘goody goody’ image of R14 is rubbed in at the beginning of the latter’s answer itself: ‘Look-wise also you seem “good”’ (line 2). When R13 repeats his taunt on looking good, (line 4) lest his taunt goes unnoticed in the *overlapping* speech (marked with [in relevant line), R14 goes for a potential face-off saying what others think of him does *not* matter; what matters is what he himself thinks (Lines 5-7). His turn here is a direct rebuttal of R13’s “goody goody” comment in lines 2 and 4 and achieves its end because their peer R17 laughs at this. As R13 pitches in with a conciliatory and agreeing turn (line 8), R14 too joins in the laughter which does break the subtle tension. R13 seizes on this TRP⁴ to ask his next question as to whether R14 thinks of himself as a good student (line 10).

This latter question is more problematic since in the intensely competitive classroom setting in which he excels academically and is known as a diligent student, R14 is supposed to answer whether he considers himself a good student. R14 therefore negotiates this question from his classmate and peer R13 in the presence of another peer R17 carefully in measured terms in line 11. It is interesting that he too, like R13 in the previous extract, latches on his “student identity” to work his way out of a tricky situation – *since* he is a student, he might as well think of himself as good (line 11). There is *marked pitch variation* in line 13 suddenly (signaled by ⊥) as he seems to *make up his mind* and confidently posits himself as a good student.

Expectedly he faces a direct taunt from R13 who challenges him: this time his peer interviewer is relentless as well as specific as he pointedly says in line 14 that R14’s goodness perhaps shines through some work: in other words, it is a fact that R14 himself cannot deny. R13’s confrontation is playful and yet direct and there is an inherent challenge in R13’s direct playful taunt for R14 to try to rebut it. From this point, R14 has no option but to defend his *exclusive* position as a good student – someone that is above his peers and hence liable to be excluded

⁴TRP is a Transition Relevant Phase: in Conversation Analysis it means that the ongoing topic of conversation is drawing to a close and the next speaker can self-select and go on to the next topic.

from the common peer. R14 concedes to this exclusion by admitting in line 15 that good work speaks for itself but then sees a way out to lay the onus on others – his superiority is something that *others* would be able to judge better and he himself wishes to be assessed by them (18-20). To this R13 agrees as a gracious interviewer and the exclusion or setting apart of R14 from the immediate context of the common peer is mitigated for the sake of the discursive context they are in: the ongoing interview. For someone who had a high opinion of himself as a good human being (lines 5-6) laying the onus of his academic merit to others through language (line 18-20) is a sign that R14 is under peer pressure to appear as a normal student and not an exceptionally talented one.

In Extract I and II above we see different forms of exclusion being performed in language. R13 *marks himself off* from an individualized position to a general one – he shifts the discourse *from exclusive talk about himself as a student to students in general*. This gives him a leeway to posit an ideal self in front of his teacher – he feels guilty whenever such hypothetical or general situations arise when he – *as one of many students* – could have worked hard but did not. By contrast, R14's situation of interlocution was different – he was not being interviewed by a teacher but a peer in the company of another peer who would both be judgmental about his self-image. As a fellow student, it was somehow *expected* of him that he too would be 'less-than-ideal' student. His peer and fellow interviewee – R17 – had already posited himself as a less than ideal student and R14 inherits a discursive situation which requires a dexterous negotiation of the self – one where the accusing peers cannot be dismissed off hand and neither can the competition and hence hierarchy go unaddressed. *R14 strives to save a non-ideal face* (ironically the "good student" tag is the non-ideal identity here since it encodes a pressure to conform to a normal student) and in the attempt to offset the exclusion that is already marked out in R13's challenge of him, he lays the onus on others as the judge of whether he is a good student. It stands to mitigate the challenge to him and the resulting exclusion in the conversation. R 13 in turn, constrained by his role of the gracious interviewer, has to accept it the new position with a concessional line (line 21). Thus, right at the outset R14's out and out acceptance of his being a good student establishes his superior status amongst peers; R13's contestation follows in the form of taunts and R14 ultimately has to subvert this exclusion as a "good student" by laying the onus of his judgement on others rather than himself thereby working his way back into a peer group conversation.

The discursive situation of the peer-group interview in Extract II reveals the complex dynamics of the group which renders exclusion a rather fluid process: one does not know when and why one might be excluded. There are other instances in which R14 has been marginalized for being a class apart in terms of what he wears (only branded clothes) or whether he is in a relationship (lines not cited

here due to space constraints). A peer group context thus has ample space for establishment, negotiation and recontextualization of exclusion and this is true across all peer groups. In another recent paper (Barua 2016b) I analyzed the narratives of a female student whose language encoded a serious marginalization she had to face when her peers spread vicious rumours about her purported affair with a classmate. The strategic silences reported within her narrative become a measure of the social ostracization that she faced and effectively recontextualizes her own marginalization – not only widening its ambit but also aggrandizing its power to injure. Language, in such situations and as we have also seen in this current paper, is subject to situational reinterpretation so much so that macro issues of power-play/ exclusion etc. become ultimately recontextualized. In the case of R13 in this study, when interviewed by a teacher, *he uses plural pronominals to distance and reduplicated words to protect his own image of a good student from the general student who are tardy at work and on whose behalf he feels “guilty guilty”*. For R14 on the other hand, a similar acceptance of his image as a good student results in taunts and teasing from his peer interviewer (R13) and *he ultimately has to back off from his own claim of being a good student*. The language that excludes him as a peer finds a middle ground when the onus is lifted onto the other – they can take the responsibility for branding him above average. In any social situation then, one’s own identity construction and one’s situational position as having the upper/ lower hand in terms of power asymmetries shared with the who often provide the frame for identity construction and negotiation (Barua 2016a). *Intra*-individual handling of *inter*-individual social contexts often

Table 1: List of symbols and abbreviations used

(.) = untimed pause;	→ = important segment discussed	↑↓ = pitch variation;
⊥ = marked pitch variation	> < = fast speech;	< > = slow speech
: = sound length;	[=overlapping speech	CAPS = loud speech
		{ } = backchannel communication
		1/2/3 = first/second/ third person
		@ = animated voice
abl = ablative	acc = accusative	cl = classifier
cop = copula	cpm = conjunctive participle marker	deic = deictic
emph = emphatic	ew = echo word	fem= feminine
fut = future	gen = genitive	hh= outbreath
h/ nh = honorific/ non-honorific	inf=infinitive	loc = locative
neg = negative	nom = nominative	pl =plural
prt = particle	pres = present	pst = past
q = question	quot = quotative	qv = quotation voice
refl = reflexive	rel pro = relative pronoun	sub = subjunctive

therefore reveal exclusion to be as much an experienced development issue as an encountered “college impact” issue (Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005; cited above).

REFERENCES

- Barua S, 2016a. *Othering in self-ascription: A case for the linguistic selfie*. In V. Dhanaraju (Ed.) *Voice of the Other: Understanding Marginal Identities*. GenNext Publication, New Delhi. pp. 298-310 (ISBN 978-9380-2230-01).
- Barua S, 2016b. *Marginalising the marginalized: The Feminine Narrative Voice and/as Exclusionist Language*. In: Debarshi Prasad Nath (ed.) *Women's Narratives from North East India: Lives in the Margins*. Purbanchal Prakash, Guwahati. pp. 48-64 (ISBN: 978-81-7213-282-8).
- Bierman KL, 2004. *Peer rejection: Developmental processes and intervention strategies*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Bierman KL, Smoot DL and Aumiller K, 1993. Characteristics of aggression-rejected, aggressive (non rejected) and rejected (nonaggressive) boys. *Child development*, Vol. 64, No. 1, pp. 139-151.
- Boivin M, Hymel S and Bukowski WM, 1995. The roles of social withdrawal, peer rejection and victimization by peers in predicting loneliness and depressed mood in childhood. *Development and Psychopathology*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 765-785.
- Buhs ES, Ladd GW and Herald SL, 2006. Peer exclusion and victimization: Processes that mediate the relation between peer group rejection and children's classroom engagement and achievements?. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 98, No. 1, pp. 1-13.
- Coie JD, 1990. *Towards a theory of peer rejection*. In: S.R Asher, J. D. Coie, (Eds.), *Peer Rejection in Childhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 365-402.
- Gay M, 1992. Talking with Adolescents. *British Journal Hospital Medicine*, Vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 207-218.
- Gilligan C, Lyons NP and Hanmer TJ, (eds.). 1990. *Making Connections: The Relational Worlds of Adolescent Girls at Emma Willard School*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goodwin MH, 2002. Exclusion in Girls' Peer Groups: Ethnographic Analysis of Language. Practices on the Playground. *Human Development*, Vol. 45, pp. 392-415.
- Kaufman P and Feldman KA, 2004. Forming Identities in College: A Sociological Approach. *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 45, No. 5, pp. 463-496.
- Lau RR, Quadrel MJ and Hartman KA, 1990. Development and Change of Young Adults' Preventive Health Beliefs and Behavior: Influence from Parents and Peers. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 240-259.
- Pascarella ET and Terenzini PT, 1991. *How College Affects Students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella ET and Terenzini PT, 2005. *How College Affects Students, Vol. 2: A Third Decade Of Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rieffe C, Villanueva L and Terwogt M 2005. Use of trait information in the attribution of intentions by popular, average and rejected children. *Infant and Child Development*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 1-10.
- Rogers AG, 1993. Voice, play, and a practice of ordinary courage in girls and women's lives. *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 63, pp. 265-295.
- Sandstrom MJ and Zakirski AL, 2004. *Understanding the experience of peer rejection*. In: J. Kupersmidt & K. A. Dodge (Eds.), *Children's peer relations: from development to intervention* (pp.101-118). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Locating Exclusion in Male Peer Talk

- Warrington M and Younger M 2011. Life is a tightrope: reflections on peer group inclusion and exclusion amongst adolescent girls and boys. *Gender and Education*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 153-168.
- Weidman JC, 1989. Undergraduate socialization: A conceptual approach. In: Smart, J.C. (Ed.). *Higher education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Vol. 5, pp. 289–322. New York: Agathon.
- Weidman JC, 2006. Socialization of students in Higher Education: Organizational Perspectives' In: Conrad C.F. and Serlin, R.C. (Eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Research*. Thousand Oaks, USA.
- Wójcik M and Kozak B, 2015. Bullying and exclusion from dominant peer group in Polish middle schools. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 2-14.