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Many developmental studies of narrative isolate resolutions as a structural element, aiming to demonstrate age-related influences on the presence or absence of this component in children's narrative productions. This study is an ethnographic study of Turkish children's conversationally occasioned narratives investigating the conversational occasions that lead to provision or omission of a problem-resolution structure in children's narratives. The data come from 60 hours of naturalistically collected talk of preschool children aged 3-to-6 in two different preschools. The results indicate that Turkish preschool children often provide narratives without a problem-resolution structure but also that they can provide high-point structures, depending on the speech situation. The analyses reveal that whether children organize their narratives in terms of a problem-resolution structure is dependent on the characteristics of the recounted events and conversational factors rather than merely age-related competence.

Resolution, that is, how story events are brought to closure, is one of the analytic units that are commonly examined in narratives of different types. Whether a certain discourse segment includes a resolution or not has often been used as a benchmark in identification of exemplars of the narrative genre in the field of narratology, in studies of adult discourse processing, and in studies of the development of narrative competence in children. In narratology, there are several metaphors explaining the relation between a
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peak, usually a problematic event, and how it is dealt with, such as villainy vs. villainy nullified, disequilibrium vs. equilibrium restored. Most of such story analyses are based on a Proppian (1928/1968) view addressing the structure of fairy tales, which easily lend themselves to an internal patterning of narrative components in terms of problem resolutions. Even though such a schema might be too rigid for application to other types of narrative, resolution is considered to be an essential component of narrative structure in many other conceptualizations of narrative. As an example, in Cortazzi's (1993) definition of a minimal narrative, there are three conjoined clauses:

"the beginning state, a state of equilibrium which prefigures a change where a character (or the audience listening) envisages what is likely to happen next and plans to intervene to offset the outcome; a middle action which sets up tension by a dynamic change or disequilibrium through character action as the events unfurl; and a final state, the resolution or outcome which is the inversion of the first" (p. 85).

In exploring the cognitive reality of structural elements used as principles in mental organization of narratives, Van Dijk (1977) and Kintsch (1977) both proposed story resolutions as basic elements of narrative superstructures that determine comprehension, organization, and recall of narrative content. From a different vantage point, Labov and Waletzky (1967) established resolutions as one of the essential structural segments of narrative in a seminal article that has proved to have a high impact on the field of narrative analysis (See Special Issue of Journal of Narrative and Life History, Volume 7, Numbers 1–4, 1997). In more recent writing, Labov (1997) emphasized the difference between narratives as the prototypical examples of a well-formed speech event and “pseudonarratives” such as recipes and apartment-house layouts, proposing that resolutions play a major role in the former but not the latter. Labov (1997) suggests in this later work that the judgment as to whether a narrative has been brought to closure or not lies with the listener. If and when the listener is satisfied with the information provided by the narrator and is not urged to ask “what happened then” at the end of a narrative, that means the narrator has appropriately completed narrating. Some researchers of narrative such as Fleischman (1997) has criticized the Labovian approach to narratives. The criticism is partially based on the assertion that the Labovian model fails to contain formal mechanisms for handling narratives that lack a well-defined resolution.

How crucial is an explicitly articulated final state or resolution to a narrative? Martin and Plum (1997) consider discourse that does not contain a resolution as belonging outside the narrative genre. According to these researchers, narratives are about restoring a disturbed equilibrium and in that they differ from recounts. Thus, some researchers view resolution as a criterial element in determining what kinds of extended discourse constitute a narrative. Some other researchers, on the other hand, downplay the criticalness of a resolution in narratives. Brewer (1985) talks about "suspend discourse structures" (p. 169), in which the story does not contain the outcome of the initiating events. He goes on to cite Finnegan (1970) who studied a genre called “dilemma” stories told by Limba people of West Africa, wherein conflicts remain deliberately unresolved. Relatedly, according to Ochs and Capps (1996), the function of narrative activity could be to lay out the problematic of a situation without attempting to resolve it. They point out "whether or not a narrative offers a resolution for a particular predicament, all narratives, through dialogue, action, and reflection, expose narrators and listener/readers to life’s potentialities for unanticipated pain and joy" (p. 29).

Brown and Yule (1983) put forward a more general criticism of approaches which attempt to dissect narrative discourse into a set of hierarchically organized components: “The discourse analyst may actually find that an investigation which tells him a ‘story’ consists of a setting plus a plot plus a resolution has not told him a lot” (p. 120). Hudson, Gebelt, Haviland, and Bentivegna (1992) also view typical approaches to assessing narrative coherence in terms of a “high-point analysis” with a critical eye. In summary, although there are a variety of approaches that posit resolution as essential in narrative discourse, some proposals attempt to challenge or deconstruct the essentiality of this structural component (see also Cazden, 1988; Michaels, 1991).

RESOLUTIONS IN CHILDREN’S NARRATIVES

Developmental research emulates the broader field of narrative analysis in persistent examinations of children’s story resolutions. Many frameworks that evaluate children’s structural narrative competence include an evaluation of whether the analyzed narrative includes a segment devoted to “resolving” or “reacting to” a problem which is set up earlier in the narrative (e.g., Applebee, 1978; Berman & Slobin, 1994; Hudson et al., 1992; Hudson & Shapiro,
Especially so-called "schema approaches," which "assume narratives are goal-directed, based on resolving problems besetting the protagonist" (Fivush, Haden, & Adam, 1995, p. 35) consider extended discourse segments that constitute other sorts of structure to be incoherent or non-canonical. As a representative of "schema approaches," Stein and PolICASTRO (1984) rank only those stories with an obstacle to immediate completion of a goal-based action as having higher levels of structural complexity.

A prevalent finding that cuts across different methodologies and theoretical viewpoints is that preschoolers' stories hardly ever feature a resolution. For example, Kemper (1984) reports that young children's stories "frequently lack dyadic organization in that an attack will occur without a response or a state of deprivation will not be resolved" (p. 105). The assumption underlying such searches for "dyads" in children's stories is that "stories, at one level of analysis, are dyadic: an act of villainy occurs and the villain is vanquished; a threat is made and nullified; something is lost and then regained" (Kemper, 1984). Stories that lack structural elements such as resolution have often deemed to be incomplete, referred to as underdeveloped (Pratt & Robins, 1991) or impoverished (Peterson & McCabe, 1983).

Behind all of the approaches which view resolution as essential to story structure lies an assumption that narratives have to introduce some imbalance, conflict, or problem that can only be cleared up by story endings. In the following definition of story from Polanyi (1985), such an assumption is quite subtle: "In essence, a story consists of events that took place in specific circumstances involving specific characters and gave rise to states of affairs that contrast in some important way with the situation obtaining in the storyworld at the beginning of the story [emphasis mine]" (p. 188). However, in other approaches, the presence of a problem-oriented structure is explicitly stipulated for a story to be tellable. For example, Bruner (1991) states: "For to be worth telling, a tale must be about how an implicit canonical script has been breached, violated, or deviated ... " (p. 11). Although some of children's narratives display breaches of the canonical or lay out other kinds of problems, it will be seen in this paper that children find stories with different structures to be "worth telling" as well.

Another problem in the line of research on children's developing narrative competence is that age is considered as the only major factor to determine how children's narrative clauses are structurally sequenced. For example, Peterson and McCabe (1983), in a classic "high-point analysis" of children's personal narratives, summarize their findings in regard to the observed structural patterns in a way that implies a perfect match with "the most sophisticated narratives" and those told by the oldest children that participated in the study. They state that three patterns—leap-frogging, ending at-the-high-point, and classic—summarize the changes in narrative structure occurring in 3% to 9% of children aged 3 to 5 years. The most sophisticated narratives with the classic pattern are organized around a high point, building up to this high point and finally offering a closure. Only by 6 years of age, do children develop the narrative structure in which they proceed beyond a high-point, bringing the central issue of their story to a closure (McCabe, 1997; Peterson & McCabe, 1983). Younger children, despite organizing their narratives around a central point, fail or forget to resolve actions. Another developmentally interesting finding with respect to story resolutions comes from Umiker-Sebeok's (1979) work on preschool children's narratives produced spontaneously within natural conversation. She observes an age-related increase in the number of narratives which included at least one resolution (11% at three vs. 17% at four vs. 41% at five).

Age is not the only determinant of structural elaboration—specifically, inclusion of a story resolution—in children's stories. How children unravel a complicating action is highly dependent upon characteristics of the speech situation. For example, depending on the speech situation, it is common for children to precede their narratives with a version of the resolution of their upcoming stories, and then proceed to retrace the complicating action(s) which led up to the already mentioned result. Such examples come from Umiker-Sebeok (1979), who notes the close resemblance of abstracts and resolutions in children's narratives. Below is a relevant example illustrating the point from a 5-year-old boy:

(1) Why didn't I pick you? Well, I wanted to pick someone who was being quiet, 'n Dave was being quiet so I picked him.

As seen in this example, the child narrator might provide the resolution of her upcoming story from the beginning as an orientation in order to engage the listener. Therefore, seeking resolutions where we would expect to find them according to our theory, for example, right after complicating actions, might turn out to be a misguided attempt. The specifics of the occasioning context that embeds the story should be taken into account in evaluating children's inclusion or exclusion of structural components such as resolutions.
Throughout this paper we will see that how child storytellers expand or do not expand recounted events towards a resolution is often an outcome of the conversational process.

Methodologies that employ elicited fictional stories or picture-book stories predominate the research on structural components of young children's narratives. This study will diverge from these studies methodologically and look at Turkish preschool children's conversational stories. The analyses will reveal that not all narratives involve resolutions, but some do even at younger ages than those proposed by other researchers. For those stories without resolutions, we will see that often the telling of the story is shaped by audience response or the resolution is withheld intentionally for interactional purposes. Therefore, it appears that children's conversational stories call for different levels of interpretation in addition to those inspired by analysis of plot structures in literary traditions or in the field of narratology.

METHOD

Research Setting

The data that are analyzed for this article come from naturally occasioned narratives collected from middle-class Turkish preschool children as part of a field study conducted in two preschools in Istanbul. These two preschools are pseudonymed as the Ubaruz School and the Eryavuz School. The preschools selected for the study were both educationally, rather than custodially, oriented (Kagiçbaş, Sunar, & Bekman, 1988). Another similarity between the selected centers was that they employed comparable schedules, activities, and programs. A preschool educational program called High/Scope (Hochmann, Banet, & Weikart, 1979) was implemented at both of the sites. The High/Scope system divides the curriculum into Circle Time, Planning-of-Working Time, Working Time, Remembering-of-Working Time, and Small Group Time. However, the Ubaruz School was observed to implement this system more systematically than the Eryavuz School. Not all days were structured in accordance with the High/Scope system in the Eryavuz School, but they had different activities such as the Beginning-of-the-Week Chat, which turned out to be conducive to narrative speech events.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Eryavuz Center</th>
<th>Ubaruz Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3- to 4-year-olds</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- to 6-year-olds</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants

The research design was maximally inclusive of all the children who were attending either of the two preschools during the course of the field study. Overall, there were 46 3- to 6-year-old children participating in the study, 25 from the Eryavuz School and 21 from the Ubaruz School. Table 1 summarizes the sex and age distributions of the participants in each of the preschools. All of these children contributed narratives to the data recorded.

The unequal distribution of male and female children in the participants reflects the demographic situation in the preschools at the time of the study. This bias in the data for male narrators might have some implications for this study given that other researchers convincingly lay out different preferred storytelling styles by boys and girls (e.g., Kyriazis, 2000; Nicolopoulos, Scales, and Weintraub, 1994; Nicolopoulos, 1996).

Data Collection

The field studies in each of the preschools continued for two and a half months. The author visited the preschools for two to three days a week throughout the course of the study. The purpose of the larger project was to collect naturally occasioned and elicited extended discourse in different settings. Some of the recorded settings were free-time activities during which children sat around and got involved in some loosely structured activity. Others were more formal classroom settings, where the teachers elicited and shaped participation on previously established topics from many of the children. For the analysis in this article, 60 hours of recordings were included. The tape-recorder was left to run in settings where the researcher expected narratives to occur on the basis of prior observations in the preschools. All
the recorded data were transcribed. The transcripts included descriptions of
the settings, the participants, and the nonverbal interactions.

Identification of Narrative Segments
For this article, the author and a student, who are both native speakers of
Turkish, independently searched in the transcribed data for segments that
included conversational narratives. A broad working definition of narrative
was adopted in order to take into account minimal narrative-like discourse
that is frequently found in child discourse. Sperry and Sperry (1996) define
"a minimal narrativelike displaced sequence as any topic-centered discourse
containing at least one asserted verb about a displaced action and one other
asserted utterance relevant to the topic" (pp. 445-446). In accordance with
this definition, this study takes into account two criteria in determining
narrative segments: (1) whether the discourse is extended, that is, whether there
is more than one utterance referring to the recounted event, and (2) whether
the discourse refers to personally experienced events that are temporally dis-
placed in the past or in the future. The segments of talk that include both of
these criteria were operationally included in the analysis as narratives. Al-
though narratives are often thought to concern real or pretend memories that
refer to past events (Labov & Waletzky, 1967; Polanyi, 1989), children’s talk
also include hypothetical narratives set in the future-tense (McCabe, 1997).
The criterion of encoding past events has not been unequivocally accepted by
all past researchers as a necessary indicator of narrativity (Küntay & Ervin-
Tripp, 1997; McCabe, 1997; Ochs, Smith, and Taylor, 1989). Accordingly,
the present study includes narratives of events that refer both to past and
future events, although most narratives in the data concerned past events.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The range of conversational narrative types that will be presented and dis-
cussed in this section are distinguished on the basis of whether or not they
feature resolutions, and also with respect to whether they include a time-line.
As the analyses will indicate, there is a relationship between whether sto-
ries include resolutions and whether they are told on the basis of temporal
sequence.

Problem-less, Resolution-less Stories
In the analyzed data, there were many stories that did not display a problem-
resolution structure, despite including complicated action sequences. Some
of these stories presented events with respect to a presumed time-line, either
linearly or non-linearly. Others did not attempt to establish such a time-line
in addition to not featuring a problem-resolution structure. The following
two subsections will focus on each of these subtypes of problem-less stories,
successively looking at stories with time-lines, and stories with no time-lines.

Stories with time-lines. The personal experience narratives that children
seemed least enthusiastic to tell were told as a response to explicit adult
elicitation about what happened during a specific period of past time (e.g.,
weekends, holidays, Working Time at school earlier in the day). These stories
tended to replay a series of events, organized with respect to the temporal
order in which they occurred. The following excerpt is an example that
includes a 5-year-old boy’s description of his weekend that is told in the
context of the Beginning-of-the-Week Chat activity. This activity involves
the teacher going around the room asking each child participant to talk about
what they did over the past weekend. In this example, the teacher’s (T1)
contribution (2-6) after the first utterance of the child (1) and her tone of
voice indicate that she is mocking such ordinary weekend “stories” based
on mundane, routine events. The discouragement—or mockery—function of
that segment might well have gone unnoticed by the child. What the teacher
says might even be taken as a model by him.

In all of the examples provided in the body of the paper, only English
translations of the Turkish originals will be provided. The original Turkish
transcripts will be included in Appendix A. The age and sex of the speakers
and the source of the data will be indicated at the beginning of each excerpt.
The symbols used in the translations are provided in Appendix B.

(2) Yit’s weekend (Yit: 5:2-boy; T1: Teacher 1) [Eryavuz.data10.20]
Beginning-of-the-week chat activity, where the teachers go around asking
each child to talk about what they did over the past weekend.
01 Yit I slept
02 T1 I slept
03 I woke up
04 I ate
05 I drank
06 yes?
07 YiT I played
08 then I went to Kentucky Fried Chicken
09 and then I ate chicken there
10 we went home
11 T1 who went to eat chicken?
12 who was there?
13 YiT noone
14 T1 you were all alone
15 YiT noone
16 T1 you left home all by yourself
17 went to eat chicken, is that right? {sounding sarcastic}
18 YiT no my father—everyone
19 YiT my father, my mother, I
20 T1 are your father and mother “noone”? yes
21 YiT and then my mother went to a movie
22 I stayed at my grandmother’s for a while
23 I lay down
24 I slept {knock on the door heard}
25 T1 T1 come on in!
26 YiT my mother came
27 T1 come in, dear! {to the child who just knocked on the door}
28 YiT picked me up [=my mother]
29 T1 Hasan Hasan took your undershirt in
30 =Hasan dear=, straighten what you’re wearing [=your shirt]
31 YiT =and then= {Hasan approaches the teachers for them to fix his shirt}
32 T4 you can fix that yourself
33 T1 you fix that
34 YiT that’s it
35 T1 thanks

Despite the teacher’s attempt to discourage dull, sequential stories (2–4), YiT proceeds to tell about his weekend by listing a temporally ordered series of events (7–10, 22–25, 26, 28, 31). If the interruption brought about by the knock on the door (after 25), and the teachers’ focus on Hasan’s undershirt had not occurred, YiT probably would have continued to tell more events that temporally followed from where he had left off, as evidenced by his overlapping and ignored and then marker (31). The institutional demand for such an activity where each student in the group is asked to describe their weekend activities leads to an speech activity with an almost mechanical temporal sequencing of non-problematic events independent of their significance for the child.

As Beginning-of-the-Week storytelling time was mostly unique to the Eryavuz School, Planning Time and Remembering Time, where children took turns to “plan for” and “remember” their Working Time activities, occurred almost exclusively in the Ubaruz School. These routinized activities were prime candidates for leading to problem-less, resolution-less stories told in a linear fashion with respect to a clear time-line. The following two examples are extended discourse segments told during Planning Time (Example 3) and Remembering Time (Example 4) in the Ubaruz School.

(3) Planning for block corner … (Ege: 4;1-boy; T1: Teacher 1)
{Ubaruz.data5.7}

Planning Time, where children take turns to talk about plans for the upcoming Working Time.

01 Ege 1—1—in the block corner
02 T1 there is not other place in the block corner
03 T1 there is enough of our friends in the block corner
04 in a different corner
05 ok, go on, that’s fine [= the block corner is fine]
06 Ege I’ll play with Furkan’s car in the block corner
07 our gas—I’ll go to the gas station
08 first I’ll put—put money
09 then I’ll fill gas
10 then I—here I’ll make a road
11 I’ll make an airplane
12 I’ll make the plane with buttons
13 the plane will move
14 it’ll fly over the clouds fuksh [=onomatopoeia]
% {gestures with his hand}
15 then—I'll come to the art corner
16 there I'll stick these with glue {shows stuff}
17 T1 are you thinking of doing xxx with the machine?
18 Ege yes
19 time—I won't sa—do anything else

(4) Remembering house corner ... (Can: 3;10-male) [Ubaruz.data.b3.19]

Remembering Time, where children take turns to talk about their activities in the preceding Working Time.

01 Can I played in the house corner
02 there I took the child out
03 then I put on my coat
04 then we went to the park
05 there we slid [=used the slide]
06 then we swam
07 the water was warm
08 then we went out like that
09 then we put on our clothings
10 and I put on my jeans
11 then I went home
12 I put the child in his car [=stroller?]
13 then I xxxed [=a past tense, first-singular verb]
14 then I had the child jump over the mud

It is not surprising that such Planning and Remembering Time narratives most commonly recount a series of events, planned for or recalled from the Working Time, organized in temporal order of projected or past occurrence. Unless the Working Time happens to involve an unexpected twist with respect to what was projected, the Remembering Time narratives could easily be constructed as mapping of Planning Time narratives onto past tense with deviations from the original plan simply omitted.

Not all stories that presented a chronologically organized series of events without a problem-resolution structure were pulled out by adult elicitation or during institutionally organized group activities. Children volunteered many such stories as a response to preceding conversational cues. Below is an excerpt that illustrates how Beril relates a personal experience of her swimming adventures as a response to another story told by Can during the Circle Time.

(5) Swimming (Can: 3;10-male; Beril: 4;1-female; T1: Teacher 1) [Ubaruz.data7.3]

Circle Time, where the children sit around the teacher and freely chat.

01 Can teacher I—I in the car my bath—I put on my swimming suit
02 and then I swam by myself in the sea
03 T1 very xxx
04 Beril teacher teacher
05 once we went to the pool
06 I wore my swimming suit
07 then I jumped immediately
08 I swam by myself
09 and my mother did not come
10 I went there then
11 then I jumped again
12 I went to the left
13 and then...aa I came over the thing
14 then I again fell into the pool
15 I swam
16 again I came over to the top
17 again I fell
18 that time I got out
19 then we went to the little sea—little pool
20 (we) swam
21 and then (I) saw you together with my friends
22 T1 is that so?
23 % wasn't you afraid?=

{Beril is cut off by the teacher; other children chime in}

Except for line 9, where Beril provides information that she was unaccompanied by her mother while swimming in the pool, the entire series of events which comprise her swimming adventure are presented in a temporal sequence with no problem-resolution structure, as Can's initial story is (1–2). The information encoded by the negative statement in 9 is part of the apparent point of Beril's story—i.e., that she was able to jump into the pool and swim by herself, possibly for the first time in her life.
Example (6) is another story by a 6-year-old girl that is initially elicited by the adult. However, the story later takes another form, led by conversational contingencies, and does not come to a clear closure, although the nature of the initiating event seems to be calling for one.

(6) **Grandfather's eye** (Gaye: 6;0-girl; Naz: 5;6-girl; Adult: Researcher)

[Ubaruq datab7.18]

The two girls approach the researcher and sit next to her.

01 Adult did any of you do anything interesting in the weekend?
02 Naz I didn't do anything strange [=interesting?]
03 we just stayed at home
04 then we went out
05 Gaye see we had an emergency patient situation
06 on Monday
07 my grandfather's eye became all bloody
08 all of a sudden, it seems his eye became all bloody
09 {evidential past}
10 and also tomorrow [=yesterday] it became (all bloody)
11 we didn't see it, of course
12 I—I—we didn't see
13 maybe my mother and father might have seen but
14 I didn't see
15 I never saw
16 Naz maybe also my mother and father did not see (it)
17 why are you seeing—then why are you telling here?
18 Gaye but
19 Naz if you didn't see (it) {interrupts}
20 Gaye sa—but I saw that it became all bloody
21 I—before it became (all bloody) [=before this last relapse]
22 {evidential past}
23 ya—then it went away, it went away {evidential past}
24 # [20 and 21 in evidential past]
25 Gaye =it happened again=
26 Naz =it happened again=
27 Adult =aaah=
28 ohh god!
29 Naz but you say "I didn't see"
30 if you didn't see, why do you =xxx=?
31 Gaye =no=
32 Naz first—first I hadn't seen it
33 then I saw it
34 Naz hmmm, when it bled again, you saw, right?
35 Gaye ha [=yes]
36 Adult hmmm

The beginning segment of this story (5–8) appears to be foreshadowing development of the story into a resolution in regard to the grandfather's eye. However, from 10 on, Gaye's narrativization interest seems to sway towards giving background information about evidentiality—whether or not, and when the family members noticed the grandfather's eye situation. Once Naz challenges Gaye's authorization to tell this narrative (16), given that Gaye never saw the grandfather's eye (11, 13–14), the conversation turns into a discussion of what Gaye actually saw. Naz's probing (26–27) disallows Gaye from developing her story into a possible closure, leading her to focus on what she saw (19–21), and did not see (28–30). In sum, her own and her interactant's conversational emphasis on evidentiality throws Gaye off the story track, which called for a remark (if not a resolution) about how her grandfather's eye got on. Gaye's going off on a tangent about who saw what is similar to the narrative style observed in Latino children living in the USA. Rodino, Gimbert, Perez, Craddock-Willis, and McCabe (1991) report that Latino children often do not get around to providing the sequence of events surrounding the central event in their story, foregrounding descriptive, orienting information, which tend to be about family members. By the time Example (6) is through, Gaye, similarly to Latino children, merely focuses on descriptive information about her parents, but it is not clear whether what sidetracked her from providing event-related information about her grandfather's eye is a culturally specific narrative structuring pattern or her being willing to be led by her audience's questioning and challenging about her eyewitness status. Given that Turkish children appear to provide a sequence of events that end with a resolution in other contexts, the latter interpretation (i.e., conversational occasioning) seems to be more plausible than the former one (i.e., culturally favored narrative structuring).
Stories with no time-line. Some events that children choose to talk about in a series of successive clauses bear no temporal relationship to one another albeit being told in extended discourse form. Adopting from Schiffrin (1994) the notion of lists, we can call such extended discourse segments which are termed list-narratives. The below example illustrates this type of discourse structure:

(7)  Nice dream (Emre: 4;11-boy; Adult: Researcher) [Eryavuz data.3.1]

Early in the morning, with few kids arrived to school. Emre is sitting with the researcher.

01 Adult OK, Emre, dear, do you ever have dreams?
02 Emre I have dreams but
03 Adult which one—tell (me)
04 Emre my mom my dad—
05 Adult there was my mother in my dream
06 Adult there was my father
07 Adult there was me
08 Adult there was a farm
09 Adult there were lambs
10 Adult once I saw a dream like that

Although telling a dream usually calls for recounting of events, Emre names participants without attempting to establish any time-line. His purely descriptive discourse sounds like it is a prelude to recounting of an action series, but he never gets to that, closing his list-narrative by a statement which looks like a story abstract (11). Consequently, his extended discourse does not incorporate a problem that can be resolved.

Although Example (7) does not include even a single action, such lists of participants sometimes get incorporated into descriptions of activities, which still do not constitute a temporal sequence of events. In such extended discourse segments, what is encoded is not temporal relationships among activities. The function of these discourse units is usually provision of a rundown of what was done during a prespecified period of time by mentioning all the salient events that are not necessarily sequentially interrelated. In the following example, the time period about which such a summary is given is specified by the eliciting question of the adult (1):

(8)  Holiday activities (Nil: 5;9-girl; Adult: Researcher) [Ubaruz data.b4.26]

The researcher has joined a group of girls during the afternoon resting time.

01 Adult during the holidays?
02 Adult did you do anything nice or interesting?
03 Adult yes my grandmother came
04 Adult hmmh
05 Adult I played with her
06 Adult then eee father—I guess it was the last day of the holidays
07 Adult then we ate fish
08 Adult mmmh!
09 Adult my cousin came
10 Adult very nice
11 Adult my aunt's husband came
12 Adult my aunt came
13 Adult and they stayed until the the holidays were over
14 Adult where did they come from?
15 Adult from Izmir
16 Adult nam—his name was Mert
17 Adult my cousin's
18 Adult and also there was my cousin's sibling [= brother]
19 Adult it [= his name] was Umit
20 Adult I played with them on holiday days
21 Adult then I played with my friends in the apartment building
22 Adult we did barbeque in our garden
23 Adult mmmh!
24 Adult we ate meat all the time
25 Adult we ate fish

It is clear that Nil finds it "interesting" to report who visited over the holidays, and what was eaten. The first two events that she mentions are her grandmother's visit, including how she interacted with her (3, 5), and what they ate on the last day of the holidays (6–7). Nil's direct plunge into these two temporally unordered segments indicates that she is not attempting to set up a time-line on which she sequentially mentions all events that transpired during the holidays. Later in her discourse, she goes on to introduce more
family members who visited their house in addition to providing summary statements, such as 20, about how she interacted with them. The discourse marker then in 21 does not indicate temporal sequentiality between events, but rather marks “successive ideas in discourse time” (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 250). It confirms that Nil is progressing through discourse time by picking out salient events from her vacation in order to summarize how she spent it. It appears that this kind of discourse structure without a temporal time-line is not conducive to a problem-resolution structure.

Problem-presenting Stories with Diffuse Resolutions

In some stories, it is clear that children engage in that certain discourse activity in order to problematize events that intrinsically do not contain any resolutions at the time of recounting. In some others, they invite adult interpretation/intervention into their personal experiences, without offering a resolution on their own (see Blum-Kulka, 1997). Occasionally, adults or other interlocutors spontaneously participate in children’s narrativizing activity, sometimes leading to “re-perspectivizing [of] the fundamental narrative problem” (Ochs, Smith, & Taylor 1989, p. 254). The next two sections will examine such stories with diffuse resolutions, those with a time-line and those without.

Stories with time-line. There are stories where the recounted events are simultaneously unfolding as the story is being told. Such stories chronologize already experienced events, but instead of expressing an explicit resolution, they either make a projection for the future, or just wind up by mentioning the ongoing condition, as seen in the next example from a 3-year-old girl:

(9) Mother’s broken arm (Berrin: 3:6-girl; Adult: Researcher)

Berrin is sitting around with the adult next to her, and playing with legos.

01 Adult have you ever fallen down?
02 Adult have you ever hurt yourself?
03 Berrin no
04 my mother fell down
05 she broke her arm
06 Adult hihi!

In this story, the expansion of the story to how her mother’s arm got treated (9–10) follows the adult’s probing for the rest of the initiating event (4–5), but Berrin herself indicates that there is not much more to tell apart from the visit to the doctor (9–10)—specifically, no resolution—by mentioning that her mother is still wearing the “device” on her arm, on and off. Berrin’s mother’s health condition is still ongoing, not having reached an actual completion that can serve as a reply to the adult’s explicit call for a resolution (7–8).

In many cases, resolutions of stories were left open to the confirmation of co-narrators. In the next story, as Yit is talking very cryptically about his recent birthday party, Emre chimed in to answer the adult question, providing a short story that ends with a question to Yit (9).

(10) Unpleasant birthday gifts
(Emre: 5:0-boy; Yit: 5:2-male; Adult: Researcher) [Eryavuz.data6.8]

Emre and Yit are playing with legos. As the researcher approaches them, they start talking about Yit’s recent birthday celebration.

01 Adult any gifts?
02 Yit (gifts) did not come
03 Emre gold—gold came
04 and we brought him a watch-book
05 (it) teaches what time it is
06 and we brought him a book like that
07 he did not like the gold
08 and first he didn’t like us—what we brought
09 but then you liked it, didn’t you, Yit?
10 Yit and I didn’t like my grandmother—what she brought
11 Emre why?
12 Yit she brought me an evil eye
Other linearly constructed stories that did not incorporate explicit story closures were tattle-tales that, by their nature, are stories without clear resolutions—they usually call for an adult’s intervention in settling a past or an ongoing dispute. Preece (1987) describes tattle-tales as “...let-me-tell-you-the-bad/mean/miserable-thing-that-so-and-so-did’ narratives” (p. 359).

(11) Emre’s tattle-tale (Emre: 5;0-boy; Yit: 5;2-boy; Adult: Researcher) [Eryavuz.data6.8]

Emre catches the adult to tell on Yit, right after a lego construction session with him.

01 Emre Yit—when I put my finger here, Yit threw (it) [=points at something]
02 it hit on it [=my finger]
03 and then he didn’t apologize
04 Adult aaa!
05 so what did you do?
06 Emre and I here—came back here

The tattle-tale comes as a response to a Yit’s perceived wrong-doing (6), and possibly appeals for adult intervention in making Yit apologize (3). The dispute between Yit and Emre is probably still going on, and has not reached a resolution as Example (11) is told to the adult.

A similar story is provided in Example 12, which was told out-of-the-blue to the teacher (T1). It seems the teacher thinks that the problem set up by Beril’s story is not resolved, so the teacher probes for a closure. In many ways, this story is similar to “detective stories” in American families examined by Ochs et al. (Ochs et al., 1989)—“the mark of the detective story is that somebody persists in examining the narrative problem beyond this point [of completion as marked by the storyteller], eliciting or introducing relevant information not provided in the initial version of the story” (p. 242–243).

(12) Sharing gum (Beril: 4;0-girl; T1: Teacher 1) [Ubaruz.data.b1.5]

Beril approaches the teacher to tell her about the conflict she had with Özlem.

01 Beril I ate [=chewed] gum
02 remember, I brought in some gum at night
03 I distributed some and there was very little left
04 remember, Özlem asked for one
05 she cried
06 T1 yes?
07 did you give one to Özlem?
08 Beril there was not any left

This story seems to be about a conflict that Beril and Özlem had over chewing gum, but it is not clear how the conflict was resolved or whether it was left unresolved. Although the story conjures up a sense of incompleteness without the mention of whether Beril ended up giving gum to her friend or not, she might well be intentionally omitting that kind of information in a classroom environment which fosters harmonious peer relationships and sharing of personal belongings with others. Beril’s justification of her not giving a gum to Özlem by pointing out the depletion of the resources (8) downplays her own agency. Ochs et al. (1989) calls such a narrative strategy “looking good” constraint on storytelling, indicated by “a preference of initial tellers to present narrated events in a way that portrays themselves in the most complimentary light” (p. 244). Instead of simply telling the teacher that she did not give any gum to Özlem, she steps back in the time-line of her story, and repeats an aggravated version of the situation expressed in 3 by saying “there was not any left,” possibly offering a justification of her not sharing.

Stories with no time-line. It is not only in list-narratives that children produced extended discourse with no temporal sequentiality between successive clauses. At many times, temporality and sequentiality turn out to be tangential to the point of the story. Especially in stories where depicted events are problematized, children preferred to relate problems of a generalized situation rather than a specific series of events. The following story from a 5-year-old girl is illustrative:

(13) Love and hate friendship (Mine: 5;1-girl; Adult: Researcher) [Eryavuz.data.2.5]

Mine approaches the researcher to talk about her friends from her clique.

01 Mine teacher, there is Gizem and Cerem
(they) always play with me
There is also Minno?
I try to make them jealous
I like them—them much
but they sometimes treat me badly
Gizem and Cerem sometimes go “yuck” to me [= expressing
disgust]

08 Adult aah, do you get angry at them?
09 Mine no
10 Adult what did they do to you recently?
11 Mine (I) don’t remember some of them
12 xxx was doing some game to me
13 but don’t tell anyone
14 Adult sure, would I tell anyone?
15 Mine even to my teacher
16 Adult no (I) won’t tell

As Mine expresses in her reply (11) to the adult’s question attempting to
probe into specific experiences on which she could be basing her story (10),
the point of the story is not to mention specific misdemeanors of her friends,
but to reveal generally about her ambivalent relationship with them.

In addition to recounting unresolved situations that children experience
in the preschool, many stories referred to problems that children bring from
home. Below is one such example from a 4-year-old girl, who spontaneously
talked about the ongoing sickness of her sister. Perhaps because Alev’s sister’s
condition is still going on, it is presented as a description of the current
situation, not, for example, as a story of recovery.

(14) Sick sister (Alev: 4;0-girl) [Eryavuz.data5.14]

Alev offers to the researcher, who is surrounded by a few children, the story
about her sick sister.

01 Alev my sister is sick
02 she was sleeping on the couch
03 now when I was going to school [=leaving for school]
04 now she was sleeping
05 then she was sleeping after I left
06 then my sister—she did not go to school

Problem-centered Stories with Resolutions
Some of the stories told by young children in the Turkish preschool settings
did feature a high-point structure, through which previously set up story-
problems were brought to a resolution within the course of the telling. In
this section, we will look at stories with resolutions that unfold linearly and
non-linearly with respect to a presumed time-line. In the entire dataset, there
were not any extended discourse segments that featured a problem-resolution
structure without a time-line.

Stories with time-line. Many of the personal or vicarious experience narr-\atives in the data built towards a high-point or a problem situation, and then
proceeded to resolve it. One such narrative, from a 4-year-old boy recharging a particularly dramatic experience of near-death of a sibling, is provided
below.

(15) Brainwashing (Hasan: boy, 4;11; Adult: Researcher)

This was the researcher’s first day in the Eryavuz Center. She was sitting in
a corner, watching the children going through their routine morning gymnastics
session. A 4-year-old boy launched into a dramatic story about his younger
brother. Later, the researcher asked Hasan to retell his story about his younger
brother. He did not hesitate—he certainly seemed to consider his narrative
worth repeating. The content of the retold story was the same as the original
telling, with only some slight changes in the wording. Both versions were
told using an animated tone of voice.

01 Adult tell it again.
02 Hasan my sibling opened medicine/medicine box—took it?
03 was able to open it?
04 broke that lid?
05 ate them up?
06 ate all all of them up?
07 Adult a-ah! [=expressing surprise]
08 eee? [=so then?]
09 Hasan ate them?
10 the ones which were mine?
11 he/she deserved it, so he got sick
12 Adult then?
that she has something to say, and at some point explicitly says "now let me tell something." After the other girl keeps talking for a while, the researcher asks Gonca "what do you want to tell?"

01 Gonca on the weekend we did ...
02 wen—we went out
03 we got in our car and went out
04 we went to some places
05 then we went to get a dog
06 Adult how nice!
07 Gonca we found a dog
08 but that was very dirty
09 Adult why?=
10 Gonca it= we couldn't have washed it at home
11 and its [=another dog] price was too high
12 it, we couldn't get
13 Adult hmm
14 Gonca I got very upset then
15 I got very angry at my mother
16 I said 'I am not going to talk to you again'
17 but when my mother told me that its price is too high
18 I went home
19 imagining that my toy dog is a real dog, I petted it
20 then I laid it on my bed
21 Adult so nice
22 a good idea, really, no?
23 maybe soon you'll find a dog which costs less
24 Gonca yes
25 Adult no?
26 Gonca my mother wants to never get a dog

This is not a "danger-of-death" story like Example (15), but it displays the features of high-point stories in which a rise to a climax is followed by a resolution. In content and structure, the story is very similar to what Hudson et al. (1992) calls "mad narratives" which very often incorporate a "rising action, a climax, and then falling action" (p. 139). In the Hudson et al. study, 4-year-old children were asked to tell narratives regarding personal experiences of three emotions (happy, mad, and scared). The relationship be-
tween the emotional tone and the structure of the narrative that Hudson et al. (1992) found is corroborated in this spontaneously told narrative. Most of the “mad stories” collected by Hudson et al. (1992) feature a goal-based structure, where a “problem or frustration leads to a solution and action [that] is directed towards the problem resolution” (p. 143). The action that constitutes a resolution (18–20) is obviously not perceived by Gonca as entirely eradicating the underlying problem regarding her mother’s unwillingness to get a dog (26), but indicates how she temporarily coped with her emotions of upsetness and anger (14–15). The fact that she was still bearing traces of her emotions towards the event before and during the time of storytelling explains why she told the story in the first place without any need for elicitation such as used by Hudson et al. (1992). Thus, the observation that Gonca told a “coherent” narrative which resolves a problem that had been set up during the course of her storytelling indicates the influence of other factors than just her age or cognitive/linguistic maturity. The type of emotion that is being evoked through the story and the ongoing relevance of the recounted events seem to among those other factors.

In many instances, children start out by mentioning a segment of their narrative that would be coded as part of the resolution of their stories if the story had been more linearly organized. Especially during group activities that are controlled by adults, children pick out a certain event as the crux of their story, with an agenda of elaborating it into a full narrative if the situation allows. In such stories, resolution segments often serve the function of abstracts that summarize the story or the result of the story, while implicitly demanding the right for extended talk during group-organized activities. The following example illustrates such an example, where a 5-year-old girl prefaces her story by a one-liner “abstract-resolution” right at the beginning of Circle Time, before the teacher gets a chance to announce the topic of the day.

(17) **Bad Dream**  
(Naz: girl 5–6; Ed: 5–10; girl; XX: unidentified child; T2: Teacher 2)  
[Ubaruz data b6.1]

Circle Time, where the children are allowed to freely chat.

01 Naz I went to the doctor today
02 because ha {interrupted}
03 T2 our Circle Time started, kids
04 Naz because I had seen [=had] an imagination
05 T2 I've— I have imaginations everyday
06 T2 you mean you had dreams?
07 Ed I don't see anything
08 XX xxx
% {some talk from other children}
09 T2 just a minute, kids
10 T2 it seems Naz has a problem
11 T2 she went to the doctor [=she says she went to the doctor]
12 T2 let’s tell—let her tell—let’s see=
13 Naz =my= mother—aa I have an uncle [=aunt’s husband]
14 my uncle had thrown me a xxx
15 then he didn’t have any eyes
16 then fish then
17 T2 these Naz saw in her dream {to other children}
18 Naz then he had a fish-like mouth
19 Naz then he didn’t have any eyes like this
20 T2 hmmh
21 Naz then my uncle xxx [=name] said “open your mouth”
22 Naz he had taken fish into his mouth
23 T2 you mean, you saw this in your dream
24 Naz you were very scared
25 did you go to the doctor then?
26 what did the doctor tell you—what did he/she recommend?
27 Ed is it xxx?
28 Naz eee—he/she said that
29 T2 no dear, not xxx [=same xxx as in line 27]
30 Ed is that real?
31 T2 she really saw it in her dream and got very scared
32 in the morning they came to the doctor’s
33 now she’s going to tell us what the doctor said
34 yes?
35 Naz he/she said that
36 “you don’t get scared at all”
37 “wake—wake—also when you see (it) in the morning, don’t get scared”
38 T2 that is, everyone sees dreams
CONCLUSIONS

Many developmental studies examining children’s extended discourse skills indicate age as the most important factor in determining children’s increasing sophistication in incorporating various narrative elements into their stories. The conclusions of Applebee’s (1978) seminal study on children’s developing capacity for “event-arrangement” prefigure much of the subsequent research. Applebee describes six stages, a developmental pattern ranging from “heaps” (mere lists of unrelated events) to “sequences” (heaps with a central character and a topic) to “true narratives” (complete events that reveal an evaluation). (See Nicolopoulou (1997) for a criticism to formalist approaches to narrative development.) In a later study, Peterson and McCabe (1983) arrive at similar developmental patterns, where before age 6 the most sophisticated narratives are those which develop to a high-point, but terminate abruptly without a resolution. To represent many of the developmental studies that give age the primary place among the determinant factors that influence development of narrative abilities, Westby’s (1984) summary is very fitting:

“With age, children’s stories grow longer and more complex on virtually any dimension of complexity. Narrative structures become more tightly controlled, evolving from a collection of events related to each other only by their proximity in time or space, to stories that have a physical or psychological center, that is, a central character or theme; to stories that have a chaining of events in temporal or cause-effect sequences; to highly structured narratives in which the events are linked structurally both to a common center or theme and to other events which immediately precede and follow it in cause-effect and true temporal relationships” (p. 115).

The present study indicates that most of these developmental approaches entertain an idealized view of progression, bracketing all other aspects that affect narrative performance. Misled by a preoccupation with preset developmental outcomes, they neglect to examine concurrent production contexts that determine the sequential and structural organization of children’s narratives. In this study, by looking at different types of children’s stories told in Turkish preschools, we observed that the nature of the events related and the conversational contexts surrounding narratives have an important effect on whether or not young children’s stories evolve to include resolutions. In fact, the data includes cases where the same child at the same age is capable of producing narratives with and without conventional high-point/resolution structures, depending on the contextual factors that impact and shape the narratives told. Thus, the influences of adult prompting and the conversational goals entertained by the children themselves should be seen as crucial factors in determining what shape a story takes.

In addition, we observed the virtues of examining children’s story resolutions in relation to the temporal structure featured in their narratives. The lack of stories with clear closures but no time-lines in the present corpus suggests that resolution is a notion that is interrelated with the ability to set up temporal relations between events in children’s conversationally occasioned extended discourse.

The isolation of the concept of resolution from other narrative components and features is very common in the Labovian and story grammar approaches to narrative analysis. Schiffrin (1994), as she describes the variation analysis to extended discourse, epitomized by the Labovian framework, talks about a “linear” and “fairly regular” structure attributed to narratives that makes them amenable to comparative analysis. She suggests that “variationists view the structure of narrative as largely independent of surrounding talk: narratives are autonomous textual units whose internal parts stand in systematic relationships with one another” (p. 285). Moreover, in variationist and structural approaches, individual internal units of narrative (such as orientation, evaluation, resolution, etc.) are considered to be analyzable independently from the remaining subcomponents. What is considered to be of prime importance in these views is the sequential relationship of a discourse segment with respect to the other story parts. This study suggests that what is clearly left out of such approaches is the effects of the conversational contexts of production which lead to sequencing, and in turn, to the existence or lack of story sub-
components (see also Norrick, 2000). As Bruner suggests for tellings of some types of events and under certain circumstances, "texts evoke expectancies, though they may not fulfill them" (Bruner, 1991, p. 63).

Fleischman (1997) proposes that modern fiction and film constitute a challenge to the application of the Labovian model to narrativity, but sets aside natural narration by suggesting to "simply write off texts that lack closure as failed narratives" (p. 164). This paper argues that narratives without identifiable resolutions exist in conversational narration, not only in literary fiction, serving certain social functions just because they do not explicitly spell out their own resolutions. Thus, they should not be labeled as failed narratives or developmentally immature discourse types.
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**APPENDIX A**

**Turkish originals of the data excerpts**

(2) *Yit's Weekend*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yit</td>
<td>Yit's Weekend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tackım</td>
<td>take out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yedin</td>
<td>ate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>içtim</td>
<td>took coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evet?</td>
<td>yes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| % (making fun) |%
| Yit | Yit |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sonra Kentucky Fried Chicken'a gittim</td>
<td>after I went to Kentucky Fried Chicken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ondan sonra... tavuk yedi</td>
<td>after I ate chicken...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordum evimden gitti</td>
<td>I came home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Yit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tavuk yemeğe kim kim gitti?</td>
<td>who ate the chicken?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kimler vardı?</td>
<td>were there any people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yit</td>
<td>kimac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yit</td>
<td>kimac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>sen tek başına evden çıktı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tavuk yemeğine gitti, öyle mi?</td>
<td>did you go to eat chicken, yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yit</td>
<td>hayır babam—herkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babam annem ben</td>
<td>father—everyone—me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>baban annen sen hiçbir zaman mi olsun?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evet</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yit</td>
<td>ondan sonra annem sinemaya gitti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ben babannemde kaldım biraz yattım</td>
<td>my mother went to the cinema, I stayed there a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uyдум</td>
<td>slept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| % (knock) |%
| T1 | girin |
| Yit | geldi annem |
| T1 | gel camun |
| Yit | ben eldeki |
| T4 | Haydar Haydar Hanımlan içine koy |
| =Haydarcım'ın üstünü düzelt | put Haydar Han into it |
| Yit | ondan sonra= |
| % | [HT approaches to teachers] |
| T4 | sen onu yapabilirsin |
| T1 | sen düzelt |
| Yit | a Kadar |
| T1 | teşekkürler |

(3) Planning for Block Corner

Ege | ben—ben bi—blok köşesinde |
| T1 | blok köşesinde arık yer kalmad |
| | blok köşesinde yeterince arkaşlarımız var |
| | başka bir köşede |
| tanım devam et oldu |

Ege | block | koçesinde | Parkán arabanla oynuyorum |
| benzinemiz—benzin[e]ye gidicem | once para ko koycam |
| sonra benzin doldurcam | sonra ben—buraya bi de yol yapcam |
| uçak yapcam | uçagı düşmeli yapcam |
| uçayı uçucuk uçak | uçuyucuk uçak |
| fış uçacak butunların üstünde (gestures with his hand) | sonra—sonra sanat koçesine gelœm |
| orda tutkalla ben bunlarla yapıştrem (shows) |
(6) Grandfather’s Eye
Adult ilginç bıçeyler yaptınım kağıtızda biri haftasonunda?
Naz ben acayip bıce yapmadım
Nad sadece evde oturdum
Nad sonra da güçsel bir etkili oldu
Gaye e bizim acil bir hastamız olduğu
Gaye Pazartesi günü
Gaye şey dedemin gözli kapkan oldu
Gaye bir gündüz kapkan olmuş
Gaye yarın da olmuyor ama
Gaye biz görmemiş tabii ki
Gaye be—be—biz görmemiş
Gaye belki anemle baham görmüşüm ama
Gaye ben görmemiş
Gaye hiç görmemiş
Gaye belki anemle baham da görmemiş
Nad o zaman nite görüyorsun—o zaman ne söyleyorsun burda?
Gaye ama
Nad görmemişsen (interrupts)
Gaye gő—ama kapkan olduğumu görmüş
Gaye ben—once biz kereem olmuş
Gaye ya baş—geçmiş geçmiş
Gaye genel olmuş
Gaye =gene olmuş=
Adult =ana=
Adult hay allah
Nad a—ah ama sen görmemiş diyosun
Nad görmemişsen ne =xxsün=
Gaye =hay=
Gaye en—en başta görmemişim
Gaye sonra gördüm
Nad haa bu daha kann akmca gördün, di mi?
Gaye haa
Adult haa

(7) Nice Dream
Adult Peki Emreim, sen hiç riyaya görmüşün?
Emsr Rıya görürüm ama
Güzellı riyalarından bitanesini bitanesini her zaman aklımda tutuyorum
Adult Hangisi—anlat bakım.
Emsr Ananem baham va—
Ananem vardır rıyâmanda
Baham vardı
Ben vardır
Bi çiftliği vardı
Kuzular vardır
(8) Holiday Activities

Adult şey hani bayram tatilinde?
güzelliğiğiniz işyeri yaptın mı?
Nil evet babanannen geldi
Adult bu
Nil onla oynadım
sonra eee ve bayramın son günütüldü galiba
o zaman balkı yedik
Adnit ooh!
Nil kuzenim geldi benim
Adult çok güzel
Nil eniştemi geldi
teyzemi geldi
onlar da bayram bitene kadar kaldular
onlarla oynadım
Adult onlar rıden geldiler?
Nil izmirden
iş-Meriti adi
kuzenimin
bi de kardeşi vardı kuzenimin
Ünütü
onlarla oynadım bayram günleri
sonra apartmandaki arkadaşlarımla oynadım
barbuki yaptık bizim bahçedede
Adult ooh
Nil hep et yedik
balk balkı yedik
(9) Mother's broken arm

Adult sen hiç düştmü?
bi yeri hicv mi senin
Berrin hayır
anne de düştu
kolu kırdı
Adult hii
sonra?
ne yaptıklar koluna?
Berrin sonra doktora gittik
doktor alet taktı bi
Adult alet taktı, ha?
bi takıyo bi çıkartyyo
bi takıyo bi çıkartyyo
yunu da çıkarttımımsız?
(10) Unpleasant birthday gifts

Adult başka hediye rler?
(14) Sick sister
Alev ablam hasta
koltukta uyuyodu
şimdi ben okula gittiğim zaman
şimdi uyuyodu
sonra ben gittiğim zaman da uyuyodu
sonra ablam oku—şey okula gitmedi

(15) Brainwashing
Adult bi daha anlat.
Hasan kardeşim izinsiz ilaç aştı—aldi
aşabıldı
kuru o kapağı
yedi onlan
hep hep hep hep yedi hepsini
Adult a-ab. Ee?
Hasan yedi onlan—benimmekleri
oh oton da hasta oldu.
Adult sonra?
Hasan sonra doktorda gördük
Adult ne yaptınlar doktorda?
Hasan bu ne? {re: taperecorder}
Adult bu- dinleyecez onu
Hasan dinleyecemisin? 
Adult huh. Ne yaptınlar sonra doktorda?
Hasan doktorlar.. boru-boru koydular karuna doğru bi boru koydular
Adult bi
Hasan ondan sonra da e midesini- e beyinini yakaldilar.
Adult uuh.
Hasan evet.
Adult şimdi iyimi?
Hasan beyini yükarsalardı öldürdü o
Adult aliak korunun. şimdi iyi yanı.
Hasan <beynim> yakaldılar
sonra ryleştı
ve izinsiz ilaç almadi artıkt

(16) Real dogs, toy dogs
Gonca şey biz haflasomu şey yaptık
g-e—sonra gezdik
şey arabilme hamip gezdik
bi yerlere gittik
sonra köpek almay kommer gittik
Adult ne güzel
Gonca bi köpek bulduk anna
o da çok kirhydi
Adult =niye?=

Gonca =-ona evde ykyarana adık
onun da parası çöktu
onu alamadık
Adult bu
Gonca ben çok üzülümd o zaman
annem kızdım
“bi daha konumsuyuca” dedim
ama annem de onun çok parasını olduğu söyliyince {yes, error}
ben de eve gittim
oyunca köpeğini köpek—gerçek köpek sans evde sevdim
sonra onu yatağa yatırdım
Adult çok güzel
Adult iyi bi fikir aslında, di mi?
Adult belki daha parası az olan bi köpek bulursunuz alırsınız yakında
Gonca evet
Adult di mi?
Adult =sever—
Gonca =benim= annem <çığ>bi zaman köpek almak istemiyo

(17) Bad Dream
NN ben bugün doktora gittim
NN çünkü ha (interrupted)
T2 çember saatimiz başladı çocuklar
NN çünkü ben hayal görmüştim
NN ben he—hergün hayal gördülerüm
T2 yani rüya mi gördülerüm?
XX ben öğüteri gördülerüm
XX
T2 bi daikka çocuklar
T2 galiba Nazlımın bi problemi varmış
T2 doktora gittmiş
T2 bi anlatalım—anlatsın =bakalım=
NN =benim= annem—bi benim eniştem var
NN eniştem bana (siklet) atmıştır
NN sonra hiç güleri yoktu
NN sonra balık sonra
T2 rüyasında görmüş bunları Nazlı
NN sonra balık ağzıldı
NN sonra böyle güleri hiç yoktu
T2 he he
NN sonra xxx ancam “ağzını aç” dedi
NN ağzına balık atmıştı
T2 yani rêyanı bunu gördün
t2 çok korktun
T2 doktora mı gittin sonra?
T2 doktor ne söyledi sana ne tavsiyelerde bulundu?
ED xxx mı?
NN şey—dedi ki
T2 hayur çanım xxx [=same xxx] değil
APPENDIX B

Symbols used in transcription translations

== Overlapping speech
?
Rising intonation
XXX Non-transcribable segment of talk
...
Pause
[=]
Gloss
{}
Nonverbal actions and researcher's comments
— Rephrased or self-correction

A CAUTIONARY TALE: A DIALOGIC RE-READING OF A STUDENT TEACHER'S VISUAL NARRATIVE

Greer Cavallaro Johnson

Faculty of Education, Centre for Language and Literacy Education Research, Griffith University, Australia

In the past, narrative inquiry into teaching has relied mostly on written materials in the form of autobiographies, biographies and personal diaries and journals. This paper changes the focus from the written mode to the visual-verbal by examining one student-teacher's hand drawn picture book as a representation of her becoming a teacher. The analytic aim is to produce a re-reading of one student teacher's text that extends and critiques her "common-sense" interpretation. Rather than accepting the teacher-as-author's intended reading as definitive, this paper seeks a different reading from a social interaction and a political perspective. The re-reading is produced by asking how and what membership categories are being constructed visually-verbal in the telling of the narrative and ultimately, whose interests are being served by the acceptance of a common-sense reading. The analytic aim is achieved by establishing a dialogue between various theories of narrative and membership categorization analysis and critical discourse analysis so as to arrive at an increasingly critical understanding of student teacher narrative reflection. (Narrative theory and analysis, Membership categorisation analysis, Critical discourse analysis, Teacher reflection, Visual narrative)

Personal narrative continues to be an important focus of academic study within and across a wide range of disciplines. Once the sole province of creative writers and literary theorists, this form of narrative is now used frequently to conduct inquiries in more pragmatic sites including workplaces such as educational institutions (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Grumet, 1981;...