

# Lists as Alternative Discourse Structures to Narratives in Preschool Children's Conversation

Aylin C. Küntay  
*Department of Psychology*  
*Koç University, Istanbul, Turkey*

This study examines a corpus of conversations of Turkish preschool-age children with adults, with the goal of analyzing 2 types of extended discourse structures (i.e., lists and narratives). Lists and narratives are compared with respect to (a) their internal structures, and (b) their social functions in the participants' daily interactions. The analyses suggest that although lists and narratives differ on structural grounds, they overlap in the functions they serve for the tellers. Lists constitute more of a descriptive structure, although temporality is foregrounded in narratives. Yet, both genres are used to express strips of past experience, and are employed by the same child in similar contexts, framed by similar metadiscourse comments, often blending into another. These findings suggest that, although lists and narratives are revealed as 2 clearly differentiable genres on formal analyses, lists carry some features of narrativity in children's conversational interactions.

Anyone who attempts to identify narratives in a corpus of naturalistic discourse would encounter other kinds of extended discourse that cannot be included as valid exemplars of narrative. Although narratives have attracted much attention from a variety of approaches in linguistics, literary theory, and psychology, nonnarrative discourse has been largely neglected. In recent studies of Turkish preschool children's conversational narratives (Küntay, 2002; Küntay & Şenay, 2003), segments of nonnarrative extended discourse were noticed to be also quite rampant. Turkish children often displayed list-like extended discourse structures that differed from narratives in terms of their internal structure (Schiffrin, 1994a, 1994b). As some researchers of children's narrative discourse have pointed out (Berman, 1995;

Hudson & Shapiro, 1991), children's productions of extended discourse draw on both structural knowledge about text internal organization and social knowledge about the interactional functions of narratives. In comparing lists to narratives in terms of both their structural features and interactive functions, this article will show that in Turkish preschool children's talk, the social interactional functions of lists overlap with those of narratives, however the discourse organizational features of the two extended discourse types differ descriptively. It will be demonstrated that lists are as sophisticated as narratives in serving to embody autobiographical events, and not necessarily more developmentally primitive, as some past research on narrative has implied.

### GENERIC CATEGORIES: FORMALIST VERSUS RHETORICAL APPROACH

Aims to examine particular discourse types in oral or written modes of communication call for systematic tools for distinguishing discourse forms from one another. The notion of genre provides such a tool for recognizing and classifying discourse forms of different types. Folklorists and literary scholars determine the definitive features of speech events and written forms with the aim of "attempting to make taxonomies or typologies that seek to classify universal types of form" (Tonkin, 1992, p. 51). It was originally within this effort of formalist generic classification that a basic story structure was identified as a distinct patterned form that can be differentiated from other forms (Genette, 1980; Greimas, 1966; Prince, 1971; Propp, 1928/1968; Todorov, 1978).

The formalist approach applies a preestablished set of criteria in determining boundaries between different types of extended discourse. This approach has the obvious advantage of rigorousness in describing the nature of structural variation, leading to identification of systematic types of discourse that can be studied further. Yet, the formalist approach, partially because of its focus on fixed texts such as folktales rather than on spontaneously occurring everyday discourse, often overlooks the interactive functions different discourse structures serve. When one considers everyday conversational discourse, one sees that discourse structures are organized as a response to interactive functions they seek to serve (Kyratzis, 2000). Thus, defining genres mainly on the basis of the internal structural features of discourse might be a misguided effort for studying naturally occasioned discourse.

Mainly because of their neglect of the communicative functions of discourse genres, formalist traditions have been challenged by the rhetorical approach (e.g., Abrahams, 1976; Bauman, 1992; Ben-Amos, 1976; Hymes, 1971). The rhetorical approach regards discourse types such as narratives as part of an interactional sense-making situation, emphasizing their function as communicative events. As Bauman suggested, because storytelling is a particular performance in a particular

setting, its structural organization is determined by its function in that setting. Webber (1991), in an ethnographic analysis of Tunisian personal narratives, also pointed out that genre features of stories have rhetorical functions in that they point to and give insight about sociocultural referents for narrators and audience.

The rhetorical approach, as opposed to the formalist approach, avoids using previously established criteria for identifying generic boundaries. Instead, it directs attention to identifying the sociopragmatic factors in the context of the speech event that affect the structure of a certain discourse type. Goodwin's (1990) ethnography of African American children's speech patterns is a good example of this approach, where the social and interactional functions of narratives are foregrounded. Her research indicated that boys and girls use different participation frameworks in their conversational narratives to achieve differently constructed social identities. Goodwin (1997) found that such interactional positioning strategies (Wortham, 2000) find their way into structural characteristics of stories: "By examining naturally occurring stories we can see how narrative structure is related to the participation structure of the moment and current social projects" (Goodwin, 1997, p. 107). In line with the rhetorical approach, Blum-Kulka and Snow (2002) defined generic categories as "relatively stable types of interactive discourse, as socially and culturally established discursive ways of achieving different ends by using language" (p. 8). Thus, in the rhetorical approach, two different genres, identified as such on the basis of formal criteria, could achieve similar discursive functions in a certain sociocultural setting.

## THIS STUDY

The analysis used in this article will benefit from two approaches to discourse: variation analysis (Labov & Waletzky, 1967; Schiffrin, 1994a) and register and genre theory (Eggs & Martin, 1997). Both of these approaches represent attempts to combine the formalist approach with the rhetorical approach. Variation analysis attempts "to discover patterns in the distribution of alternative ways of saying the same thing, i.e., the social and linguistic factors that are responsible for variations in ways of speaking" (Schiffrin, 1994a, p. 282). Analysis of variation can be conducted within a text type, attempting to identify different substructures within texts. Also, more relevantly, it can be used to carry out comparisons between different textual structures.

Register and genre theory seeks to establish how discourse, or texts, are like and unlike each other, looking for situational reasons determining similarities and differences. As described by Eggs and Martin (1997), the first step in a register and genre analysis is to describe the linguistic patterns in two texts that create different effects on the recipient. The second step is to attempt to explain the differences in these linguistic patterns. Explanations usually refer to the effects of different social contexts

leading to different discourse patterns. By examining the linguistic features and realization contexts of different genres, register and genre theory attempts to provide accounts of how genres can relate to and evolve into other genres.

Using these approaches to discourse as a backdrop, in this article I will compare lists and narratives in Turkish preschool children's narratives with respect to (a) their internal structures and (b) their social functions in the participants' daily interactions. I will show that analysis of variation across different discourse types (Eggins & Martin, 1997; Labov, 1972; Labov & Waletzky, 1967; Schiffrin, 1994a) is adequate to discriminate lists from narratives on a structural basis. Yet, an analysis of what roles different discourse structures serve in situated social interaction is needed to reveal the similar functions that lists and narratives fulfill in these young children's talk.

## METHOD

### Research Setting

The data that are analyzed for this article come from naturally occasioned discourse collected from Turkish preschool children as part of a field study conducted in two middle-class preschools in Istanbul. These two preschools are pseudonymed as the Ubaruz School and the Eryavuz School.

Because this research was carried out with Turkish-speaking children, language-specific characteristics of Turkish might be thought to influence children's productions of different types of discourse structures. However, the Turkish language does not have any cross-linguistically unique characteristics that might affect performance differently than if the participants were speakers of a different language. Thus the findings obtained in this study can be generalized to other languages.

### Participants

The research design was maximally inclusive of all the children who were attending either of the two preschools during the course of the fieldwork. Overall, there were forty-six 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 gender and age distributions of the participants in each of the preschools.

### Data Collection

The field studies in each of the preschools continued for 2½ months. I visited the preschools for 2 to 3 full days a week throughout the course of the study. The pur-

TABLE 1  
Distribution of Participants by School, Age, and Gender

<i>Age</i>	<i>Eryavuz School</i>		<i>Ubaruz School</i>	
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
3- to 4-year-olds	11	2	5	1
5- to 6-year-olds	7	5	8	7

pose of the larger project was to collect naturally occasioned and elicited extended discourse in different settings. In the first week of the study in each of the locations, I familiarized myself with the spatial and temporal arrangements in the school's curriculum. In the meantime, the children got accustomed to my presence in various contexts. At the end of a week in each of the preschools, I started audiorecording (and occasionally videorecording) various organized and free-time activities. 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 in which the teachers elicited and shaped participation on previously established topics from many of the children. For the analyses in this article, a total of 60 hr of recordings were included. These recordings included 347 recordings in the Eryavuz School and 224 recordings in the Ubaruz School. I was present in all of the recordings. The extent of the corpora acquired from both preschools is summarized in Table 2 in terms of the number of words, number of utterances, number of child-produced utterances, and number of adult-produced utterances they contain.

All the recorded data were transcribed. The transcripts included descriptions of the settings, the participants, and the relevant nonverbal interactions.

TABLE 2  
Description of the Corpora in Terms of the Number of Words,  
and Child-Produced and Adult-Produced Utterances in Each Age Group

	<i>Words</i>	<i>Utterances</i>	<i>Child-Produced Utterances</i>	<i>Adult-Produced Utterances</i>
Total Eryavuz Corpus	59,710	17,256	11,330	5,926
3-to 4-year-olds	29,333	9,267	5,986	3,281
5- to 6-year-olds	30,377	7,989	5,344	2,645
Total Ubaruz Corpus	21,752	6,797	4,822	1,975
3-to 4-year-olds	8,274	2,665	1,872	793
5- to 6-year-olds	13,478	4,132	2,950	1,182

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Identification of Lists and Narratives:  
What Makes Them Different?

What are lists and how do we identify them as differential discourse structures than narratives? Narratives and lists are alike in that they are both embodied in discourse extended beyond one clause. For this article, the definition of extended discourse is taken to be at least three successive topic-maintaining utterances offered by one participant. In discriminating narratives and lists, Schiffrin's (1994a, 1994b) approach is adopted. Schiffrin suggested that spoken lists and narratives differ from one another in terms of the information structures they display: Narratives build primarily temporal structures, whereas lists build primarily descriptive structures. As Schiffrin (1994b) pointed out, "whereas the basic syntactic unit of a narrative is a clause with temporal juncture, i.e., an event that moves reference time forward, the basic unit of a list is an entity, i.e., anything of which something may be predicated" (p. 297). That is, the criterion that distinguishes lists from narratives is that the latter include some clauses that express temporally ordered events, whereas lists can be characterized by lack of temporal junctures. What we mean by temporal junctures is not limited to temporal connectives such as *and* or *then*, but include consecutive clauses that express temporally ordered events without a formal marker (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). Although Schiffrin (XXXXX) specified evaluative structure as the other characteristic that is found in narratives, but not in lists; Turkish children's narratives did not always include explicit evaluatives (Küntay & Ervin-Tripp, 1997). Therefore, presence or absence of evaluation was not used as a discriminatory feature in this study. In summary, in this study, narratives are defined as extended discourse structures of three or more clauses that express temporally ordered events. Lists are defined as discourse stretches of three or more clauses that display a descriptive structure without any temporal junctures between the expressed events or situations.

With these definitions in mind, I went through the data and marked off both narrative and list segments. Three hundred and twelve narrative segments and 157 list segments were identified in this initial round. Later, two assistants, independently from me and from each other, coded the data for lists and narratives using the same definitions. All three coders agreed about the identification of 301 (96.5 %) of the narratives and 154 (98%) of the lists. The remaining segments were not included in further analyses.

Table 3 provides number of lists, narratives, and blended forms (lists within narratives and narratives within lists) obtained from each school, broken down into two age groups. The data about the number of child-produced utterances from Table 2 is repeated in Table 3 to provide a comparison benchmark for different corpora and age groups. The summarized data in Table 3 indicate that the distributions

TABLE 3  
 Number of Lists, Narratives, and Blends, in Each Corpora and in Each  
 Age Group, Broken Down into Child-Initiated and Adult-Initiated Segments

	<i>Lists</i>		<i>Narratives</i>		<i>Blends</i>		<i>Child Utterances</i>
	<i>CI</i>	<i>AI</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>AI</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>AI</i>	
Total Eryavuz	41	51	79	93	9	13	11,330
3- to 4-year-olds	20	29	37	54	6	7	5,986
5- to 6-year-olds	21	22	42	39	3	6	5,344
Total Ubaruz	19	27	43	61	8	11	4,822
3- to 4-year-olds	11	14	23	39	3	7	1,872
5- to 6-year-olds	8	13	20	22	5	4	2,950

*Note.* CI = child initiated; AI = adult initiated.

of lists, narratives, and blended forms (lists within narratives and narratives within lists) do not show differences between age groupings, suggesting that lists and narratives are used by both 3- to 4-year-olds and 5- to 6-year-olds. Also, the data indicate that both lists and narratives can be either child-initiated or adult-initiated, indicating that lists and narratives were likely to be both initiated by direct adult questioning and to be launched spontaneously by the children. Peer initiations of other children's narratives or lists were low in frequency in these data, partially because of the methodology not being sensitive to detecting peer-peer exchanges without adult presence.

The next section will show that lists embody different discourse structures than narratives. It will also show that the same child can use narratives and lists at different times. Then, the following section will show how lists serve similar functions to narratives in children's talk.

### Lists and Narratives Constitute Different Discourse Structures in Children's Conversations

In the corpus acquired from Turkish preschool children, presenting a collection of items as part of a descriptive discourse structure is a very common speech activity. Such lists were mostly spontaneously volunteered and sustained by children, often leading to sidestepping of adult questions that call for a shift to recounting of action-laden experiences. The discourse segment in Table 4, from a 5-year-old girl, is a case in point.

The extended discourse in Table 4 starts with Mine volunteering to tell what her mother brought from Europe. She starts by mentioning the most prominent entity in her mind, the sea mermaid (line 2), but then goes on to list many other presents that were brought to her (lines 3–6). In lines 5 and 6, she ellipses the verb *almak* 'to

TABLE 4  
Presents From Europe

Mine had mentioned earlier in the day that her parents returned from a trip to Europe the day before. For this example, she approaches the adult and starts the following exchange.

1 Mine	<i>Biliyor musunuz annem bana ne aldı?</i>	'Do you know what my mother bought for me?'
2	<i>deniz kızı</i>	'Sea mermaid'
Adult	<i>aaah! çok güzel</i>	'Wow! Very nice'
3 Mine	<i>annem çanta al-miş</i>	'My mother got (me) (a) bag'
4	<i>kazak almış</i>	'(She) got (a) sweater'
5	<i>yeni çoraplar</i>	'New socks'
6	<i>kiyafetler</i>	'Clothings'
Adult	<i>iyi gez-mişler-mi?</i>	'Did (they) [=your parents] travel well?'
7 Mine	<i>bi tane pantolon almış</i>	'(She) got (me) one pants'
Adult	<i>kime, sana mı?</i>	'To who? To you?'
8 Mine	<i>evet</i>	'yes'
9	<i>gömlek al-mişlar</i>	'(They) got (me) (a) shirt'

% {One of the teachers comes in and interrupts the talk by asking if the children in the room have started tidying up. Adult asks Mine about what her parents did in Europe, but she does not show interest in responding to such prompting}

Note. Mine (girl, 5 years, 2months). Ubaruz.data.11.4.

get', relying on the global configuration provided by the structure of the list. Schiffrin (1994b) pointed out that

ellipsis is a striking illustration of how lists reduce the need to predicate something about each individual item: rather, any properties of the item that need to be known to merit its inclusion in the list are assumed from shared knowledge about what category is being described. (p. 297)

Because lists tend to enumerate items from a certain category, such as "what my parents brought for me from abroad," once that category is established for the audience, it can be presupposed. Thus, it is very common to observe that lists are heavily concentrated with nominals, with extensive ellipsis of predicates. This is a feature that makes lists look terser and structurally less complex than narratives. The information conveyed, though, might be richer than what is explicitly mentioned.

Although some character introductions observed in the corpus led to elaborations into narrative, extended discourse consisting primarily of lists of entities were also common. Another example of a list comes from Emre. In the discourse segment in Table 5, Emre and the adult have been chatting when the adult opens the topic of having dreams.

Here, instead of describing what happens in his favorite dream, Emre highlights the entities that "existed" in his dream as units of a list. Appropriate first introduc-

TABLE 5  
A Nice Dream

Adult	<i>peki Emrecim, sen hiç rüya görürmüsün?</i>	'OK, Emre, dear, do you ever have dreams?'
1 Emre	<i>rüya görüyorum ama</i>	'I have dreams but'
2	<i>güzel rüyalarımın bitanesini—bi tanesini her zaman aklımda tutuyorum</i>	'I always keep one of—one of my nice dreams in my mind'
Adult	<i>hangisi—anlat bakim</i>	'Which one—tell (me)'
3	<i>annem babam va—{discarded start}</i>	'my mom my dad'
4	<i>annem vardı rüyamda</i>	'There was my mother in my dream'
5	<i>babam vardı</i>	'There was my father'
6	<i>ben vardım</i>	'There was me'
7	<i>bi çiftlik vardı</i>	'There was a farm'
8	<i>kuzular vardı</i>	'There were lambs'
9	<i>öyle bi rüya gördüm ben bi kere</i>	'Once I saw a dream like that'

Note. Emre (boy, 4 years, 11 months). Eryavuz.data.2.1

tion devices accompany all the referents in his list, indicating that the function of the discourse is to mention, and not to predicate anything of, the entities in his dream. He provides a summary in line 9 to end the list and link it back to the conversational topic of dreams (line 1). Thus, from his perspective, he marks the completion of the "telling" of his dream, although he did not recount any action.

The reason that Mine and Emre provide lists rather than narratives in Tables 4 and 5 is not because they cannot yet build a narrative structure. In fact, they were two of the most skilled and robust storytellers among the children participating in the study. The discourse segment in Table 6 is an example of narrative from the same girl, Mine, recounted 4 days before the list in Table 4.

In this story, there is an evident story plot that incorporates disappearance of the initial embarrassment that Mine felt after her mother's departure from the house in which the birthday party took place (lines 11–12). The chronological sequencing of all the details about what she did before, during, and after the birthday party suggests that Mine's discourse is a narrative. She probably is emulating typical beginning-of-the-week narratives, in which most children, rather unenthusiastically, go through the sequence of mundane details that constitute the summaries of their weekend. At the end of her turn, Mine steps out of the birthday story into subsequent events (lines 50–54), including what she did the next day (lines 53–54). Some sort of final segment like this is very typical in preschool children's beginning-of-the-week narratives, in which they list what they sequentially did throughout the 2 days, capping the story with the event of going to school on Monday morning. Although Mine expressed a disinterest in talking about her immediately past weekend (lines 2–5) and negotiated with the teacher so that she can recount "some other day," the teacher's permission (line 5) did not lead to her developing a narrative structure that is different from the typical beginning-of-the-week narra-

TABLE 6  
Embarrassment in Birthday Party

It is the Monday beginning-of-the-week time. The teacher (T4) is going around the group asking everyone what he or she did during the weekend. Mine volunteers to talk about some other day instead of her weekend. AO is another child in the group.

1 Mine	<i>öğretmenim öğretmenim anlatıyorum</i>	'teacher, teacher, I am telling'
2	<i>öğretmenim başka günü hatırlıyorum</i>	'teacher, I remember some other day'
3 T4	<i>hayir Cumartesi Pazar neler yaptin onlari</i>	'no, tell (us) what did you do did on Saturday, Sunday'
4 Mine	<i>ama başka gunde çok güzel seyler yaptim</i>	'but I did very nice things on some other day'
5 T4	<i>tamam onu da anlatabilirsin istiyosan</i>	'ok, you can also tell that'
6 Mine	<i>başka gün şey yapmışım</i>	'on some other day I did something'
7	<i>arkadaşimin do ğum gününe gitmişim</i>	'I went to my friend's birthday'
8	<i>yeme ğimi yiyip ondan sonra gelmişim</i>	'I went after having eaten my lunch'
9	<i>arkadaşı gelmişti arkadaşimin</i>	'my friend's friend came'
10	<i>annesi—annem gelmişti</i>	'her mother—my mother came'
11	<i>çünkü azıcık kalmıştı</i>	'because she [=my mother] stayed for a very short time'
12	<i>ben çok utandım</i>	'I got very embarrassed'
13 T4	<i>niye?</i>	'why?'
14 Mine	<i>ondan sonra annem</i>	'=and then my mother='
15 T4	<i>yalniz oldu ğun içinmi?</i>	'=because you were alone?='
16 Mine	<i>gitti</i>	'left'
17	<i>ondan sonra şey</i>	'and then something—'
18	<i>annem gittikten sonra ben de arkadaşimin annesinin yanında/kaldım</i>	'after my mother left I stayed by my friend's mother'
19	<i>ondan sonra uyuyumustum</i>	'and then I fell asleep'
20	<i>çok uykum gelmişti</i>	'I felt very sleepy'
21	<i>ondan sonra</i>	'and then'
22 T4	<i>do ğum gününde mi uyudun?</i>	'did you sleep in the birthday?'
		{interrupts}% {Mine nods; T4 laughs}
23 Mine	<i>ondan sonra annesi ayakkabilarimiçikardi</i>	'and then her mother took off my shoes'
24	<i>ondan sonra üstüme örtü örttü</i>	'and then she covered me with a cover'
25	<i>ben uyudum</i>	'I slept'
26	<i>annesi de başka yere gelmişti gelmişti ond—uyandı ğimda</i>	'and her mother came to some other place th—when I got up'
27	<i>ayakkabimi giydim</i>	'I put on my shoes'
28	<i>ondan sonra da..</i>	'and then ..'
29 AO	<i>ve de masal bitti</i>	'and then the (fairy) tale is over'
30 T4	<i>masal de ğil</i>	'this is not a (fairy) tale'
31 Mine	<i>ondan sonra ayakkabilarimi giydikten sonra</i>	'then after having worn my shoes'
32	<i>arkadasimin anneannesi elimden tuttu</i>	'My friend's grandmother held my hand'
33	<i>beni odasına götürdü</i>	'took me to her room'

(continued)

TABLE 6 (Continued)

34	<i>orda televizyon seyrettim</i>	'there I watched TV'
35	<i>pastayla portakal suyu içtim</i>	'I drank orange juice with cake'
36	<i>ondan sonra arkadaşımın arkadaşları geldi yanına</i>	'and then my friend's friends came by me'
37	<i>oyun oynuyorlardı</i>	'they were playing some games'
38	<i>yerlerde kavgaya ediyorlardı</i>	'they were wrestling on the floor'
39	<i>ondan sonra ben açıldım</i>	'and then I loosened up'
40	<i>ondan sonra da</i>	'and then'
41 T4	<i>nasıl açıldın?</i>	'how did you loosen up?' {interrupts}
42 Mine	<i>arkadaşlarıyla tanıştım ondan sonra da oynadım</i>	'I met (my friend's) friends and then I played ga' {interrupted}
43 T4	<i>yani utanmanımı geçti açıldın</i>	'you mean your embarrassment went away, you loosened up'
44 Mine	<i>oynadım onlarla ondan sonra..</i>	'I played with them and then ...'
45	<i>oynadım</i>	'I played'
46	<i>ondan sonra anneler almaya geldiler beni</i>	'and then my parents came to pick me up'
47	<i>yukarı çıktık</i>	'we went up'
48	<i>ondan sonra ayakkabılarımı giydim</i>	'and then I put on my shoes'
49	<i>annemim arkadaşına gittim</i>	'I went to my mother's friend'
50	<i>onlardan sonra gittik</i>	'after then went'
51	<i>ayakkabımı giyip gittim</i>	'after putting on my shoes, I left'
52	<i>ondan sonra sabah oldu günde kahvaltımı ettim</i>	'and then when the morning came, I had breakfast'
53	<i>okula gittim</i>	'I went to school'

Note. Mine (girl, 5 years, 2months). Ubaruz.data7.13.

tives. As Hudson, Gebelt, Havilan, and Bentivegna (1992) pointed out for chronologies, beginning-of-the-week narratives "fulfilled the request to report 'what happened,' but there was no indication of what was special or significant about the event" in these tellings" (p. 141). However, despite a chronological structure constituting the outer shell of Mine's narrative, the mention of her emotion of embarrassment serves a dramatic function. Although she does not explicitly relate her emotional reaction to her mother's leaving her at a friend's place as a problem-inducing situation that she dealt with, such a theme is identifiable between the lines in Mine's story. There is an initiating action—her embarrassment upon her mother's leaving—which might have led to her falling asleep (lines 19–25), and spending some time with her friend's mother and by herself (lines 33–36). The obliteration of Mine's embarrassment is presented as a resolution of the substory, which came about after her watching for a while how other children were playing together (lines 37–40). The problem–resolution structure is not immediately evident because it is embedded within a narrative belonging to another type, beginning-of-the-week narrative. Because beginning-of-the-week narratives constitute

a preestablished genre that commonly and normatively occurred in the Eryavuz School, Mine's embarrassment substory gets overborne by the chronological structure that such narratives frequently employed.

In many aspects of form, Mine's narrative in Table 6 is different than her list in Table 4. Presence of temporal sequencing is enough for Table 6 to be identified as narrative discourse. Labov and Waletzky (1967) proposed that a minimal narrative contains two temporal junctures, plus a possible evaluation and a possible complication. Evaluation and complication-resolution are considered to be crucial elements of narrative discourse by many other researchers. Thus, the segment in Table 6 includes features other than temporality that make it more narrative-like than a mere sequence of events. In this narrative, Mine is recounting an event of personal significance that has embarrassment as its underlying emotional theme, and therefore includes an evaluative element. The narrative also displays a problem-resolution structure, where an initial embarrassing situation gets neutralized for the teller.

The next segment shows a narrative from Emre, the teller of the list in Table 5, indicating that he, like Mine, can also form both list-type and narrative-type discourse. The discourse segment in Table 7 was told one day after the list was recorded.

This example is introduced clearly as a counterexample (line 2) to the generalization that the adult makes in (line 1). It is constructed as a contrast between a stimulus and nonresponse (lines 3–4) in agreement with the adult's assumption, and a contrasting (*but then*—) stimulus and fear response (lines 5–6) in disagreement with her generalization. The next utterance prefaced by *and then* (line 7) escalates to a more vivid example of fear. In the next four utterances (lines 7–10), the child builds up his narrative into a climax (lines 7–8) and a resolution (lines 9–10). The closing statement (line 10) can also be seen as a reply to adult's statement in (line 1), tying the example back to its prompt. Thus, the narrative follows a direct

TABLE 7  
Scary Films

1 Adult	<i>sen hiç bişeyden korkmuyosun demek</i>	'so you don't get scared of anything?'
2 Emre	<i>korkarım mesela şeyden korkarım</i>	'(I) get scared—for example I get scared of something'
3	<i>çizgi filmde çok iyi—ilk önceden çok çirkin bi adam vardı</i>	'in the cartoon very good—at first there was a very ugly man'
4	<i>ondan korkmadım</i>	'I didn't get scared of him'
5	<i>ama sonra daha çirkinleşti o o filmde</i>	'but then he got uglier in the film'
6	<i>onu seyretmedim</i>	'I did not watch it'
7	<i>sonra bugün ben bıraktım televizyonu kapatmadan</i>	'and then I left the TV without turning it off'
8	<i>çok korktum diye</i>	'since I got so much frightened'
9	<i>annem mutfaktaydı</i>	'my mother was in the kitchen'
10	<i>mutfaka kostum hemen</i>	'I immediately ran to the kitchen'

Note. Emre (boy, 4 years, 11 months). Eryavuz.data 3.6

reply, is marked by an example, and is punctuated with recurrent challenges to the stimulating question. In short, it is a tactical story (Küntay & Ervin-Tripp, 1997; Kyratzis, 2002) told to provide an example for a point made earlier by the narrator.

As opposed to Emre's list in Table 5, the example in Table 7 incorporates an event structure, and indeed features temporal ordering of the recounted events on a chronological sequence. In addition, like Mine's narrative in Table 6, it is an elaborate narrative with extensive presentation of an emotional reaction, fear of violent movies, and also culminates in a problem-resolution structure. In short, this extended discourse also fulfills the Labovian criteria of temporal junctures plus complication plus evaluation, constituting a full-fledged narrative.

It was not only adult interactants that children used as audience for their lists—they often employed listing of (sometimes imagined) possessions as part of an one-upmanship routine in their play contexts with their peers. The discourse segment in Table 8 shows two boys (Ekrem and Ali) enlisting such a routine as they are playing in the "ball pool," which involves a slide that goes into a pool filled with colored plastic balls.

Such collaboration in building up of a competitive list where valuable imaginary possessions are pitted against each other was commonly observed in boys' peer interactions. In lines 6, 9, 12, and 21, when the turn is acquired from the other child, both Ali and Ekrem provide the entire possessive construction frame (*bende (de) X var*, 'I (also) have X'). However, as they move down their respective lists, both of the children condense the predicate structure to *X var*, 'There is X'. By repetition of the same frame, accompanied by a reduction of the presupposed part of the possessive construction, embedding successive nominals, children take turns in introducing their respective (and quite similar) list-items. The point of this listing activity is to name as many items as possible, as illustrated by the children's own comments in lines 6, 16, and 22. By pluralizing the nominals standing for their list-items, they prevent an interpretation of the specifics of the entities mentioned, emphasizing the quantity of their toys.

In summary, on many occasions, the children in the Turkish preschool contexts were observed providing lists, even sometimes as a response to promptings that probed for personal experience narratives. Referents of list-items have some commonalities and are interrelated as part of a collection. It appears that in young Turkish children's list structures, a set of referential terms are successfully employed in relating listed entities, each segmented from one another by means of a new construction mentioning a new list-item. It is possible that the predictable and categorical structure of lists, which leads to ellipsis of much of non-nominal information, has a facilitative effect on referential movement of children across their extended discourse, allowing them to incorporate many entities. In narratives, on the other hand, it is not reference to certain items and successive item introductions that constitute the crux of the discourse, but how these referents participate in temporally ordered events, sometimes of emotional sig-

TABLE 8  
I have ...

% {Ekrem and Ali have been talking about an imaginary treasure}		
01 Ekrem	<i>ben de—burda benim hazinem</i>	'I too—my treasure is here'
02	<i>gizli</i>	'Secret'
03	<i>bu hazine-m-in üstünden hiç bi kimse geçemez</i>	'Noone can pass over this treasure of mine'
04 Ali	<i>Evet ama senin çok oyuncuğın yok</i>	'Yes, but you don't have many toys'
05	<i>benim var</i>	'I have'
06 Ekrem	<i>ama benimkinde—ama benimkinde çok fazla şey var</i>	'But in mine—but in mine there is a lot of things'
07	<i>altınlar var</i>	'There is [=I have] gold'
08	<i>kumbaralar var</i>	'There are [=I have] moneyboxes'
09 Ali	<i>ben-de de çok altınlar var</i>	'I also have a lot of money'
10	<i>kumbaralar var</i>	'There are [=I have] moneyboxes'
11	<i>oyuncaklar var</i>	'There are [=I have] toys'
12 Ekrem	<i>bende de bi sürü oyuncaklar var</i>	'I also have lots of toys'
13	<i>paralar var</i>	'There are [=I have] monies'
14	<i>=silahlar var=</i>	'There are [=I have] weapons'
15 Ali	<i>=başka kitaplar var=</i>	'There are [=I have] other books' {overlapping with EE}
16	<i>Herşey var</i>	'There is [=I have] everything'
17	<i>resimler var</i>	'There are [= I have] pictures'
18 Ekrem	<i>GI Joe kitapları var</i>	'There are [= I have] GI Joe books'
19	<i>GI Joe şapkaları var</i>	'There are [= I have] GI Joe books'
20	<i>GI Joe—</i>	'GI Joe—' {interrupted}
21 Ali	<i>bende de GI Joe oyuncakları var</i>	'I also have GI Joe toys'
22	<i>herşey var</i>	'There is [=I have] everything'

% {They end by switching to a squabble about Ali's being in the way of Ekrem's way down the slide}

Note. Ekrem (boy, 5 years, 0 months) and Ali (boy, 4 years, 2 months).Ubaruz.data.7.6

nificance. Narratives thus build an action structure, but lists build a referential structure.

Fox (1987), in her rhetorical structure analysis of different units, presented lists and narratives as the only discourse structures ("rhetorical structures") that have the same internal structures: She suggested that "like the List structure, Narrate has an unlimited number of nuclei and no adjuncts. Within this structure, however, each piece describes a temporally situated action which follows the last action in the last sequence" (p. 82). As discussed in the previous section, expression of temporality is what minimally distinguishes narratives from lists. On the basis of the data examined, one can also claim that most narratives emphasize the perspective of the teller through evaluative content, such as reference to narrators' emotions about the recounted events. In addition, narratives often embody a problem-reso-

lution structure; lists do not. Thus, narratives and lists, as argued in the last section, do display some discourse organizational differences in Turkish preschoolers' talk, supporting Schiffrin's (1994a, 1994b) documentation of lists as structures that differ from narratives in adults' conversations.

### Are Lists and Narratives Also Similar?

Although they differ in their structural features, lists share some features with narratives—for example, being produced during conversational exchanges in preschool settings, in the form of extended discourse, often stretching over several turns. How do the interactional functions of lists and narratives compare? As Schiffrin (1994b) concluded her variation analysis of lists and narratives, she pointed out that people need to devote some attention to the similarities between genres when they are focusing on their differences. The lists and the narratives observed in Turkish preschool conversations feature some striking similarities. Both lists and narratives were used to provide accounts of past events (nonpresent situations), and therefore qualify as linguistic structures used for talking about one's autobiographical repertoire. Thus, both lists and narratives are discourse structures that convey fragments from the teller's past. In serving that function, lists constitute a descriptive structure, and narratives foreground a temporal structure.

Goffman defined narratives as "strips of personal experience from the tellers' past which are replayed" (as quoted in Cortazzi, 1993, p. 39). Such a definition does not entail any structural criteria such as temporal order. The concept of "strip" implies that each telling is an extraction from an integral experience as a response to conversational occasions. Within such a framework, we can propose that lists and narratives fulfill similar functions of communicating strips of autobiographical experiences in children's conversations.

One piece of evidence indicating that lists occupy a similar position to narratives in preschool children's repertoire was the metamemory and metanarrative comments that children associated with these discourse genres (Hirst & Manier, 1995). Metamemory comments are statements that evaluate one's ability to remember such as "I don't remember what I did over the weekend." Metanarrative comments are statements that evaluate one's own narrative with implicit or explicit standards of narrative structure (i.e., "I am still not done with my narrative"). The kinds of metacommentary that children made in their lists indicated the perceived similarity of lists to narratives in their conversations.

Although lists are distinctive discourse structures in adult textual classification systems, easily distinguishable from narratives, young children sometimes displayed metalinguistic markers indicating that one could be substituted for the other. Especially in situations where adults posed general questions—such as "what did you do over the weekend?"—which called for narrative accounts, the children's productions showed that they might be thinking that any reasonably long

stretch of discourse will be sufficient to satisfy the expectations for their replies. The discourse segment in Table 9 illustrates such an example from a 5-year-old.

The way Erhan concludes his description of members of the family (lines 6–16) in line 17 indicates that he considered his list as part of a reply to what he did over the weekend. That is not to say that he was not aware that he shifted from a narrated event to presentation and description of a series of characters, but his sudden link to the original question by a summary statement in line 17 shows that he viewed his entire contribution as a valid response to the adult's prompt calling for a narrative.

How the segment in Table 5 ends also includes a good example of a metanarrative comment. The ending of the list is extracted in Table 10 for further discussion.

This statement serves the function of returning to the current interaction by wrapping up of a telling. In the example in Table 5, Emre did not include any of the temporally ordered events in his dream, but by the ending presented in Table

TABLE 9  
I did nothing else

This segment is extracted from the end of a long conversation with Erhan, which begins by the adult asking him what he did over the weekend. He first recounts a story about a dog biting him on the leg, and mentions that the dog belongs to Yağiz (*Yağiz-lar-in köpe-ği* '(the) dog belonging to Yagiz'), without offering a further identification information for Yagiz.

Adult	<i>ha Yağiz kim peki?</i>	'OK, who is Yağiz?'
1 Erhan	<i>Yağiz</i>	'Yağiz'
Adult	<i>arkadaşın mi Yağiz?</i>	'Is Yağiz your friend?'
2 Erhan	<i>hayir</i>	'No'
3	<i>ama Yağiz çocuk değil</i>	'But Yağiz is not a child' [= can't be my friend!]
Adult	<i>çocuk değil</i>	'Not a child'
4 Erhan	<i>biz-im evde çalışmiyo</i>	'(He) doesn't work at our house'
Adult	<i>sizin evde çalışmiyo Yağiz</i>	'Yağiz doesn't work at your house'
5 Erhan	<i>evet</i>	'Yes'
6	<i>bi de Recep var</i>	'And there is Recep'
7	<i>en aşağıda Recep var</i>	'Farthest downstairs, there is Recep'
Adult	<i>kim o kapici mi?</i>	'Who's that, the door-keeper?'
8 Erhan	<i>hayir</i>	'No'
9	<i>ama küçük</i>	'But small/young'
10	<i>küçük</i>	'Small/young'
11	<i>bi de Mustafa</i>	'And (there is) Mustafa'
12	<i>büyük o da</i>	'And he is big/old'
13	<i>bi de Güllü</i>	'And (there is) Güllü'
14	<i>o da büyük</i>	'She is also big'
15	<i>onun anne-si</i>	'His mother'
16	<i>Mustafa da onun babasi</i>	'And Mustafa is his father'
17	<i>başka hiçbi şey yapmadım</i>	'I didn't do anything else'

Note. Erhan (boy, 5 years, 2 months). Eryavuz.data.19.12.

TABLE 10  
Ending of Example 1

Emre	<i>öyle bi rüya gördüm ben bi kere</i>	'Once I saw a dream like that'
------	--	--------------------------------

10, he completed his telling as if he recounted his dream like a narrative. This is similar to the way Erhan concluded his description of members of the family in line 17 in Table 9.

In fact, many of the children's responses to teachers' queries about weekend activities during what was called "Beginning-of-the-week chat" time, took the form a list of rather mundane activities involving themselves, rather than being told in narrative discourse form. During "beginning-of-the-week chat" time, the teacher recruited each child one by one into telling what "interesting" things they did over the weekend. This discourse type usually incorporated no other character than the self, which was marked by the first-person-agreement marker on the verb. One teacher's ridicule of this very common, but undesired, response type is given in the excerpt in Table 11. She interrupts Yit as he is expected to break into such a list of routine activities. The reason why such lists are frowned on might have to do with their lacking of evaluative structures (for instance, a point for the story). Schiffrin (1994a) pointed out that "the relative necessity and pervasiveness of evaluation [in narratives] is ... critical to the distinction between narratives and lists of events" (p. 314). Thus, a list of routine events is considered to be lacking in an evaluative structure that is crucially involved in narratives.

Despite many subtle, and sometimes more direct, discouragements by teachers of reports of routine events, many children opted for providing such lists of routine events that are not specific to a given past time period. Prior research has shown that young children have difficulty in recounting distinctive activities that stand out from the usual routine. However, it could also be that young children cannot relate to the common adult activity of "telling about one's weekend." At least, they do not

TABLE 11  
Eat, Drink, and Sleep

It is Yit's turn in the "beginning-of-the-week chat" time in Eryavuz School.			
1	Yit	<i>yattım</i>	'(I) slept/went to bed'
2	T1	<i>yattım</i> {interrupts YT}	'(I) slept/went to bed'
3		<i>kalktım</i>	'(I) woke up'
4		<i>yedim</i>	'(I) ate'
5		<i>içtim</i>	'(I) drank'
6		<i>evet?</i>	'Yes'

Note. Yit (boy, 5 years, 2 months). Eryavuz.data.10.20.

always produce speech that indicates understanding that they are expected to pick out some experience that deviates from the expected routine of every weekend and render that in an autobiographical narrative form. Thus, lists are encountered where adults seek narratives.

Another bit of evidence that lists and narratives are somewhat similar genres is the way they blend into one another in children's talk. It is common to observe that a list is embodied in the larger context of a narrative, or vice versa, where a narrative is enlisted in the midst of a narrative. The next two examples (in Tables 12 and 13) illustrate blends of narratives and lists from two children.

Up until line 10, what Gürkan appears to be doing is listing some of the activities he did during the holidays as a response to the adult's prompt (line 1). This initial segment also includes a list of people who took part in the picnic event (line 6). However eventually, a temporally ordered series of events (lines 10–16) is incorporated into his reply. This shows that narratives and lists are both genres that serve the function expressing strips of past experience, with one form easily blending into the other in one stretch of conversation.

The excerpt in Table 13 also demonstrates how children float in and out of narrative talk, intermingling temporally ordered events with descriptive lists of activities.

TABLE 12  
Holiday Happenings I

Adult	<i>biseyler yaptınmi Gürkan bayramda?</i>	'did you anything during the holidays Gürkan?
2 Gürkan	<i>yaptım</i>	'I did'
Adult	<i>naptın?</i>	'what did you do?'
4 Gürkan	<i>dayım beni şeye götürdü—pikniğe götürdü</i>	'my uncle took me to the thing—took me for a picnic
Adult	<i>ha?</i>	'really'
6 Gürkan	<i>kardeşimi de anneannemi de dedemi de bi de annemi</i>	'and my brother and my grandmother and my grandfather and my mother
Adult	<i>götürdü</i>	'took you all'
8	<i>naptınız orda?</i>	'what did you do there?'
9 Gürkan	<i>yemek yedik</i>	'we ate'
10	<i>Gökhanla ben ko—kardeşimle ben koştuk</i>	'Gökhan and I—my brother and I ran around'
Adult	<i>hi?</i>	'really?'
12 Gürkan	<i>koştuk koştuk</i>	'we ran, we ran'
13	<i>sonra aşağıya indik</i>	'then we went down'
Adult	<i>hi?</i>	'really?'
15 Gürkan	<i>orda bi kola şeyi—kola şeyi bulduk</i>	'there a coke thing—we found a coke thing [= can]
16	<i>sonra onla top oynadık</i>	'then we played ball with it'
17	<i>o kadar</i>	'that's it'

Note. Gürkan (boy, 5 years, 3 months). Ubaruz data.4.23.

TABLE 13  
Holiday Happenings II

1 Adult	<i>şey bayramda güzel şeyler yaptın mı bayram tatilinde?</i>	'did you do anything nice during the holidays?'
2 Gamze	<i>evet</i>	'yes'
3 Adult	<i>naptın Gamze?</i>	'what did you do Gamze?'
4 Gamze	<i>şeker aldım</i>	'I got candies'
5 Adult	<i>hi?</i>	'really?'
6 Gamze	<i>otuz tane para biriktirdim</i>	'I collected 30 items of money'
7	<i>şeker aldım</i>	'I got candies'
8	<i>araba al—yani Barbi bebek aldım</i>	'I got a car—I mean a Barbi doll'
9 Adult	<i>ooh çok güzel harika</i>	'ooh very nice, how wonderful!'
10 Gamze	<i>uzun saçlı bebeklerden aldım</i>	'I got one of those dolls with long hair'
11	<i>sonra da ablama gittim</i>	'and then I went to my older sister'
12 Adult	<i>ooh?</i>	'ooh!'
13	<i>nereye?</i>	'where?'
14 Gamze	<i>eee İçerenköye</i>	'mmm—to İçerenköy'
15	<i>sonra ordan teyzeme gittik</i>	'then we went to my (maternal) aunt'
16	<i>ordan babaanneme gittik</i>	'from there we went to my grandmother'
17	<i>sonra anneanneme gittik</i>	'then we went to my (other) grandmother'
18	<i>sonra halama gittik</i>	'then we went to my (paternal) aunt'
19 Adult	<i>ha naptiniz orda? eğlenceli güzel şeyler yaptınız mı?</i>	'what did you do there?' 'did you do anything fun?'
20 Gamze	<i>evet pasta yedik</i>	'yes we ate some cake'
21 Adult	<i>hi hi</i>	'yes'
22 Gamze	<i>sonra..</i>	'then ... '
	<i>başka bi tane de bi de şey muzlu pasta yedik</i>	'we ate another cake with bananas in it'
23 Adult	<i>hi hi harika!</i>	'how wonderful'
24 Gamze	<i>evet</i>	'yes'
25	<i>teyzemin bi tane çocuğu var</i>	'my aunt has a child'
26 Adult	<i>hi hi</i>	'yes'
27 Gamze	<i>onla oynadık</i>	'we played with her/him'
28 Adult	<i>harika! çok güzel</i>	wonderful, very nice
29 Gamze	<i>evcilik oynadık</i>	'we played house'
30	<i>arabacılık oynadık</i>	'we played with cars'
31	<i>sonra televizyon—</i>	'then TV—'
32	<i>anneme dedim sonra dışarıya çıkıyorum dedim küçük kardeşim arkadaşımla</i>	'I asked my mother if I can go with my little sister—friend'
33	<i>evet dedi</i>	'she said ok'
34	<i>sonra çıktık</i>	'then we went out'
35	<i>oynadık</i>	'we played'
36	<i>o kadar</i>	'that's it'
37 Adult	<i>çok güzel, güzel geçti ha tatilin?</i>	'very nice, it seems you had a nice holiday'
38 Gamze		{ nods }

Note. Gamze (girl, 5 years, 11 months). Ubaruz.datab4.23.

In sum, in the examined corpus, we observed that (a) lists were provided when narratives were expected or prompted by adults, (b) similar metadiscourse comments were used for lists and narratives, and (c) lists and narratives frequently blended in one segment of extended discourse. As Smith (1980) suggested, narrative discourse is hardly distinguishable from description when one sees discourse units not only as structures but also as acts, making it “questionable if we can draw any logically rigorous distinction between them ...” (p. 228). In children’s extended discourse, narratives and lists obviously constitute two forms of discourse readily distinguishable on structural grounds. On the other hand, they merge, co-occur, and fulfill similar conversational functions to such a great deal in that an absolute distinction between the two genres is not quite warranted.

## CONCLUSIONS

This work shows that lists constitute different discourse structures than narratives in Turkish preschool children’s conversations, supporting Schiffrin’s (1994a, 1994b) original analysis of lists in adults’ interview-based conversations. The differences of the two types of extended discourse lie in the internal structures of the two units. However, some similarities of the two genres in terms of their interactive functions can also be pointed out. Both narratives and lists belong to the “repertoire of genres through which people enact their lives” (Martin & Plum, 1997, p. 299). That is, both genres involve communicating contents of personal memory, and therefore qualify as autobiographical discourse structures—one more descriptive, the other more temporal.

An important question that comes to mind is whether lists and narratives were surrounded by different elicitation conditions in these children’s interactions. In other words, it could be expected that different types of adult prompting or comments might lead to the preference of one discourse form over the other by the child. Previous work on the same corpora have examined in detail the effect of audience-prompted and self-launched discourse (Ervin-Tripp & Küntay, 1997; Küntay, 2002; Küntay & Ervin-Tripp, 1997; Küntay & Şenay, 2003), finding, for example, that adult questioning often led to provision of structural elements such as story resolutions in children’s narrative talk. However, lists and narratives did not differ in terms of the ways adults were involved as conversational partners with the preschool children. That is, as Table 3 indicates, lists and narratives could both be either child-initiated or adult-initiated. In addition, there were not any clear indications in the data that a particular kind of adult prompting led children to shift from lists to narratives, or vice versa. Also, because peer-to-peer talk was infrequent in these corpora, it is not possible to examine how different participant structures would have affected the discourse forms produced by children. It is important

to modify the methodology used in this study to allow such comparisons in further work.

An important question from the perspective of development of discourse competence is whether lists represent a developmentally primitive form of narratives. There is some research that would answer this question positively. For example, Nicolopoulou (2002) found that most children who participated in a longitudinal peer-oriented storytelling study and story-acting practice provided lists of characters, without integrating them into narrative plots in the first 3 weeks of storytelling. Nicolopoulou called this type of discourse a *protonarrative*, emphasizing its relative immaturity and primordialness in comparison to narrative. Eventually, with time and storytelling practice, children seemed to present more integrated plots with action and dramatic elements.

The idea that children's discourse productions gradually evolve from non-narrative extended discourse to narrative extended discourse dates back to the work of Applebee (1978). Applebee rated lists observed in this study as more a primitive type of discourse than full-blown narratives. In fact, he proposed a category of "sequence," which he defined as a series of events linked by a shared attribute (e.g., I saw a, I saw b, I saw c). Such characterization of children's extended discourse, where the age of the child is one of the most important determinants of the structural properties of children's narrative, is observed in other studies of narrative as well (Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Westby, 1984). This study shows that there are cases where the same child at the same age is capable of producing extended discourse that can be characterized as narratives in conjunction with non-narrative discourse. In addition, in terms of occasioning contexts, there are some similarities in the conditions that elicit lists and narratives in the context of Turkish preschool conversations. Also, there is some evidence indicating that children view lists as tellable as narratives, using similar metadiscourse comments about the two forms, and also blending them into one another. These findings demonstrate that lists and narratives can be within the repertoire of a child of a certain age, pulled out differentially depending on the goals of the narrators and the contextual factors that impact what aspects of autobiographical experiences are to be told in what structure. Conversational practice with lists may actually be facilitative in comprehension and production of informational discourse that uses categorical information to a larger extent than narratives, contributing to development of expository discourse.

In the final analysis, lists are not narratives. The two forms display major structural differences from one another, constituting two clearly identifiable genres. However, a claim can be made that lists are functionally similar discourse acts to narratives. As Smith (1981) argued, what is represented in our autobiographical memory is not a sequence of events, but rather a collection of images and ideas from the past. It is the linguistically expressed form of narrative that shapes these recollections into a temporally linked series of events. That is, it is possible to convey the same mental contents through non-narrative discourse forms such as lists.

In children's discourse, there is some evidence indicating that lists carry some narrative-like features, although they cannot be called narratives on structural bases.

The implications of this study for researchers analyzing preschool children's discourse are important. First of all, the study shows the inadequacy of purely structural accounts of narrative, which propose a deep structure representing the core of a story, and which draw demarcations between narrative and other genres by describing the necessary and sufficient properties of a text, in charting development of discourse skills in children's naturally occurring conversations. If one conceives of transcripts as disembodied structures that can be analyzed solely in terms of their structural organization, then interactionally and culturally motivated functions of narratives will always remain elusive.

Secondly, it is fruitful to explore non-narrative discourse forms—such as lists—and mixed genre forms—such as narratives embedded within lists—to be able characterize the entire repertoire of children's discourse. As Preece (1986) pointed out, “no comprehensive model of the range of orally produced narrative forms [for children] currently exists” (p. 355)—that is, a model that includes identificational criteria for encompassing, for example, personal anecdotes, hypothetical–what-if narratives, tattle-tales, and list-like discourse. One promising way that could progress towards a model is to present the characteristics of the range of discourse produced by children in terms of their interactive goals–functions.

It certainly helps the analyst to have a preestablished inventory of inherent features to recognize genres in children's discourse. However, this study shows that a functional analysis does not confirm clear-cut boundaries between the interactive roles these types of discourse play in children's conversations with peers and adults. Thus, analysis of conversational narratives in children's discourse calls for alternative criteria, in addition to purely structural ones, for flexibly defining boundaries and relations between discourse forms. If, for definitional or analytical purposes, one has to determine what narratives are and what they are not, one is probably better off in conceptualizing such a genre as a continuous cline (consisting of many subgenres, which may need differential analytical treatment) rather than a type that is clearly demarcated from other forms of discourse.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Turkish Academy of Sciences, in the framework of the Young Scientist Award Program (ACK–TüBA-GEB P/2001–2–13). Two anonymous reviewers and Susan R. Goldman (Associate Editor) contributed fruitfully to my rethinking of the initial version of the article. I also thank brahim Şenay and Ö. Ece Demir for their help with coding the data, and Sevda Bahtiyar for help in editing the transcription segments in the article.

## REFERENCES

- Abrahams, R. (1976). Personal power and social restraint in the definition of folklore. In D. Ben-Amos (Ed.), *Folklore genres* (pp. 16–30). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Applebee, A. N. (1978). *The child's concept of a story: Ages two to seventeen*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bauman, R. (1992). Contextualization, tradition, and the dialogue of genre: Icelandic legends of the *kraftakáld*. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 182–196). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ben-Amos, D. (1976). *Folklore genres*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Berman, R. A. (1995). Narrative competence and storytelling performance: How children tell stories in different contexts. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 5, 285–314.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Snow, C. (2002). Editors' introduction. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults: The contribution of multiparty discourse to language acquisition*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Cortazzi, M. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. London: Falmer Press.
- Eggs, S., & Martin, J. R. (1997). Genres and registers of discourse. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process* (pp. 230–256). London: Sage.
- Ervin-Tripp, S., & Küntay, A. (1997). The occasioning and structure of conversational stories. In T. Givón (Ed.), *Conversation: Cognitive, communicative and social perspectives* (pp. 133–166). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fivush, R., & Reese, E. (1992). The social construction of autobiographical memory. In M. A. Conway, D. C. Rubin, H. Spinnler, & W. Wagenaar (Eds.), *Theoretical perspectives on autobiographical memory* (pp. 1–28). Amsterdam: Kluwer.
- Fox, B. A. (1987). *Discourse structure and anaphora: Written and conversational English*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Genette, G. (1980). *Narrative discourse*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1997). Toward families of stories in context. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7, 107–112.
- Greimas, A. J. (1966). *Structural semantics: Search for a method*. Paris: Larousse.
- Hirst, W., & Manier, D. (1995). Remembering as communication: A family recounts its past. In D. Rubin (Ed.), *Remembering our past: Studies in autobiographical memory* (pp. 271–290). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, J. A., Gebelt, J., Haviland, J., & Bentivegna, C. (1992). Emotion and narrative structure in young children's personal accounts. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 2, 129–150.
- Hudson, J. A., & Shapiro, L. R. (1991). From knowing to telling: The development of children's scripts, stories, and personal narratives. In A. McCabe & C. Peterson (Eds.), *Developing narrative structure* (pp. 89–136). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Hymes, D. (1971). The contribution of folklore to sociolinguistic research. *Journal of American Folklore*, 84, 42–50.
- Küntay, A. C. (2002). Occasions for providing resolutions (or not) in Turkish preschool conversations. *Narrative Inquiry*, 11, 411–450.
- Küntay, A., & Ervin-Tripp, S. (1997). Narrative structure and conversational circumstances. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7, 113–120.
- Küntay, A. C., & Şenay, İ. (2003). Narratives beget narratives: Rounds of stories in Turkish preschool conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 559–587.
- Kyrtatzis, A. (2000). Tactical uses of narratives in nursery school same-sex groups. *Discourse Processes*, 29, 269–299.

- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts* (pp. 12–44). Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Martin, J. R., & Plum, G. (1997). Construing experience: Some story genres. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7, 299–308.
- Nelson, K., & Gruendel, J. (1981). Generalized event representations: Basic building blocks of cognitive development. In M. Lamb & A. L. Brown (Eds.), *Advances in developmental psychology, Vol. 1*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Özcan, H. (1993). *Coherence in narratives of Turkish-speaking children: The role of noun phrases*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Reading, XX.
- Peterson, C., & McCabe, A. (1983). *Developmental psycholinguistics: Three ways of looking at a child's narrative*. New York and London: Plenum Press.
- Prince, G. (1971). Notes towards a preliminary categorization of fictional “narrates.” *Genre*, 4, 100–106.
- Propp, V. J. (1928/1968). *Morphology of the folktale*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994a). *Approaches to discourse*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994b) Making a list. *Discourse Processes*, 17, 377–406.
- Smith, B. H. (1980). Afterthoughts on narrative: Narrative versions, narrative theories. In W. J. T. Mitchell (Ed.), *On narrative* (pp. 209–232). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Todorov, T. (1977). *The poetics of prose*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Tonkin, E. (1992). *Narrating our pasts: The social construction of oral history*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Webber, S. J. (1991). *Romancing the real: Folklore and ethnographic representation in North Africa*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Westby, C. E. (1984). Development of narrative language abilities. In G. P. Wallach & K. G. Butler (Eds.), *Language learning disabilities in school-age children* (pp. 103–127). Baltimore/London: Williams & Wilkins.
- Wortham, S. (2000). Interactional positioning and narrative self-construction. *Narrative Inquiry*, 10, 157–184.