

Narratives beget narratives: rounds of stories in Turkish preschool conversations

Aylin C. Küntay*, İbrahim Şenay

Department of Psychology, Koç University, Rumeli Feneri Yolu, Sarıyer 80910, Istanbul, Turkey

Received 2 June 2001; received in revised form 23 May 2002; accepted 19 August 2002

Abstract

An ethnographic study of Turkish children's conversationally occasioned narratives indicates that one of the instigators of conversational narratives in children's talk is peer coparticipants' narratives. This paper examines Turkish preschool children's rounds of narratives in multi-party talk-in-interaction. The data come from 60 hours of naturalistically collected talk of preschool children aged 3-to-6 in two different preschools. The results show that rounds of narratives occur in certain types of multi-party settings, where the child participants conceived of the teacher as the mutual audience. The analyses of the data indicate that children often achieve thematic relevance with prior stories either through emulating the same content or introducing elaborations to the topics presented in prior narratives. The discussion focuses on the emergence of narratives as linguistic structures from certain participation configurations and sequential interactional positioning strategies in preschool group talk.

© 2003 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Conversational narrative; Interactional positioning; Thematic relevance; Preschool children; Talk-in-interaction; Turkish

1. Introduction

Conversational narratives can be occasioned by a range of different types of prompts in the physical context or in the ongoing flow of the interactional context surrounding the participants (Jefferson, 1978; Sacks, 1972; Schegloff, 1997). One such prompt for

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: akuntay@ku.edu.tr (A.C. Küntay).

narrative talk is antecedent talk-in-interaction, which can provide either explicit or implicit cues that lead to conversational narratives. For example, explicit prompts such as prospective recipients' queries as in *what did you do over the weekend?* often lead to extended and narrativized replies. Similarly, previous conversational moves of interlocutors might lead to narrativized productions of personal experiences that display agreement or disalignment (Ochs and Taylor, 1992; Schegloff, 1997).

In accounting for narratives elicited by prior discourse, Jefferson (1978) depicts emergence of stories from turn-by-turn talk, demonstrating that story contents and structures are sequentially implicated for by earlier talk. Her analysis shows that speakers use special strategies to display a relationship between the current story and prior talk, implicitly justifying the appropriateness of the story's telling with respect to the local occasion. Other studies of multi-party conversational settings involving adults suggest that personal accounts of past events initiated by one participant implicitly invite related stories from coparticipants. Goffman (1974) states that "an illustrative story by one participant provides a ticket another participant can use to allow the matching of that experience with a story from his repertoire" (p. 510). Adult conversationalists often pick out some features from previous stories and incorporate them into their ongoing story without bothering to frame each story anew. Ryave (1978) calls the outcome of such interactional processes "series-of-stories". In a similar vein, Ervin-Tripp and Küntay (1997) observe "rounds of stories" in adults' talk, where conversationalists offer their own versions of dramatic personal experiences of a shared significant event such as a major earthquake.

Because developmental issues regarding narrative discourse are not addressed very often in the conversational analysis literature (but see Hausendorf and Quasthoff, 1992; Quasthoff, 1997), not much is known about whether young children also participate in and construct story rounds in multi-party settings. However, there is some evidence in the existing literature suggesting that such talk-in-interaction does occur around preschool years. Umiker-Sebeok (1979) found that one of the most common responses to others' narratives was a story that contained some similar element to the preceding narrative in spontaneous conversations of preschoolers. Similarly, Preece (1992) found that children's reactions to other children's narratives included collaborations and thematically related stand-alone narratives. These studies of conversational narratives in children are informative in providing some groundwork for the present study. The emphasis of the research conducted by both Umiker-Sebeok and Preece was on determining the types and the characteristics of the internal structures of preschool children's naturalistic narratives. Both studies noted the presence of interactions that appear like rounds of stories in their respective datasets among other types of narrative discourse. However, neither Umiker-Sebeok nor Preece focused on the occasions that lead to the emergence of narratives from prior conversational interaction. In studying the internal structural features of narratives in ordinary interaction, it is essential to probe into the conversational circumstances that surround the narrative discourse (Küntay and Ervin-Tripp, 1997; Polanyi, 1989). Thus, it is crucial to examine "the design and constructional features" of conversational narratives as they are shaped by the prior "trajectory of a conversation" (Schegloff, 1997: 97).

An additional benefit of examining the relation of narrative structure to the participation framework and the activity setting of the moment is that we can find out how children establish and maintain social organizational structures in peer groups in preschools. A good example of such a study is an ethnographic study conducted by M. Goodwin (1990) with working class African American children in Philadelphia of the 1970's. Among other observations, Goodwin found that child storytellers construct their stories with skillful attention to the immediate participation structure, demonstrating alignment and disaffiliation towards story characters and the participating audience of the moment.

In this paper, we will explore whether and how prior stories offer occasioning contexts for upcoming stories in multi-party conversational interactions of Turkish preschool children. The narratives will be analyzed as emergent from prior interaction, as they constitute a commonly observed event that we call "rounds of stories." The central research question is how preschool children and teachers interactionally manage their participation in rounds of stories, and how these rounds differ from those seen in adult conversations as described in the literature. As a sub-question, we will focus on the kinds of features of the previous story children seem to orient to in constituting their own succeeding story. C. Goodwin (2000) points out that "a primordial site for the analysis of human language, cognition, and action consists of a situation in which multiple participants are attempting to carry out courses of action in concert with each other through talk while attending to both the larger activities that their actions are embedded within, and relevant phenomena in their surround" (p. 1489). Preschool children's rounds of stories offer such a site. Our analysis will allow studying conversational narratives as linguistic structures that emerge from certain participation configurations and interaction management strategies.

2. Method

2.1. Research setting

The data that are analyzed for this article come from naturally occasioned narratives collected from 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. Although social class is not one of the factors studied systematically in the study, an attempt was made to include children representative of families of different socioeconomic backgrounds. Almost all (24 out of 25) of the children in the Eryavuz School had families of higher-middle to upper class socioeconomic backgrounds. The Ubaruz School included children of more heterogeneous socioeconomic backgrounds, mostly belonging to lower-middle class (13 out of 21) and middle class families (8 out of 21). The preschools selected for the study were both educationally, rather than custodially, oriented (Kağıtçıbaşı et al., 1988). Another similarity between the selected centers was that they employed comparable schedules, activities, and programs. A preschool educational program called High/Scope (Hohmann et al., 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.

2.2. 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 trip. 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 gender and age distributions of the participants in each of the preschools.

2.3. Data collection

The field studies in each of the preschools continued for two and a half months. The first author visited the preschools for two to three full 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. In the first week of the study, the researcher familiarized herself with the spatial and temporal arrangements in the school's curriculum. In the meantime, the children got accustomed to the researcher's presence in various contexts. At the end of a week in each of the preschools, she 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, where the teachers elicited and shaped participation on previously established topics from many of the children. For the analyses in this paper, 60 h of recordings were included.

All the recorded data were transcribed. The transcripts included descriptions of the settings, the participants, and the nonverbal interactions. Recently, the relevant excerpts were transcribed again in accordance with the transcription system developed by Gail Jefferson that is widely used in conversation analysis. A summary of the relevant transcription symbols is provided in the Appendix.

2.4. Identification of narrative rounds

Children's talk displays many different types of narrative talk (Berman, 1995; Preece, 1987) that might lead to multiple and conflicting definitions of narrative

Table 1
Distribution of participants by center, age, and gender

Age	Eryavuz Center		Ubaruz Center	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
3- to 4-year-olds	11	2	5	1
5- to 6-year-olds	7	5	8	7

(Ervin-Tripp and Küntay, 1997). In this study, 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 displaced in the past or in the future. The segments of talk that include both of these criteria according to both authors were operationally included in the analysis as narratives. Although narratives are often thought to concern real or pretend memories that refer to past events (Labov and 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 (Ervin-Tripp and Küntay, 1997; McCabe, 1997; Ochs et al., 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.

For this article, the two authors independently mined the transcribed data for segments that included conversational rounds of narratives. In order to locate rounds of narratives in the transcripts, both of the authors independently read over the datasets and marked off extended talk that fits the above criteria of narrative discourse. The next step for both of the coders was to look around the context of the narrative and determine whether more narratives can be located. Those narratives that are preceded and/or succeeded by narratives from other participants were included in the analysis as parts of rounds of narratives. The establishment of rounds was done independently by both authors. Only those segments where there was full agreement between the authors were included for further analyses. In total, 95 rounds were identified in 60 h of transcriptions. 52 of these rounds came from the Eryavuz corpus, and the remainder 43 came from the Ubaruz corpus. The segments selected for the remainder of this paper were chosen to exemplify particular types of rounds that emerged from an initial analysis. The data contains many similar rounds that could be used to illustrate the discussed points.

3. Results

3.1. Occasions for rounds

According to C. Goodwin (2000), “strips of talk gain their power as social action via their placement within larger sequential structures, encompassing activities, and participation frameworks” (p. 1489). From a developmental perspective, Nicolopoulou (1997) also stresses the importance of situating children’s narrative activity in the sociocultural context of their relations with adults, peers and the processes of

group life. Thus, it is essential, at the outset, to describe in detail the setting, the activities, and the participants that were found to surround narrative rounds in the Turkish preschool contexts.

Needless to mention, a multi-party interactive situation is called for rounds of personal experience narratives to take place. However, in the two Turkish preschools included in the study, not all multi-party situations were conducive to storytelling behavior. Rounds of personal narratives occurred most frequently in the presence of the teacher such as during Circle Time and Breakfast Time. At other times, the adult researcher was present. There is only one narrative in the entire dataset where a child narrator clearly and exclusively picked out a peer as his designated addressee. As Kyratzis (1999) also observes in her study of American preschoolers, personal narratives were rare in peer-to-peer talk in the Turkish setting. The children spent most of their unsupervised free time in object-oriented interaction (i.e., playing with toys with peers) and dramatic role-play. The presence of various manipulable objects seemed to detract children away from solely talk-centered activities such as storytelling. Only when an adult was present and willing to allow extended discourse, the children engaged in extended recountings of their personal experiences. As a result, as reported for family therapy conversations (Gale et al., 1995; Jones and Beach, 1995), turn-taking sequences tended to alternate around the teacher's turns in settings where the teacher was present, typically resulting in the sequence Child 1-Teacher-Child 2-Teacher, etc. (Some of such sequences, if they abide by the criteria mentioned above in the Method section, were coded as rounds of narratives.)

In carrying out their roles as managers of multi-party interactions, the teachers in the preschools had some implicit rules determining the appropriate time, occasion, and purpose of storytelling behavior. In classroom settings where the teacher leads the discussion about a preestablished topic, teachers discouraged children from taking up extended turns. One teacher in the Eryavuz school explicitly pointed out that long narratives by single speakers arrest the flow of multi-party talk, suspending turn-taking possibilities for others. However, some group activities were more loosely structured, and resulted in story-dominated conversations, where the teachers mediated between children reacting to each other's stories by their own versions. In such situations, it was common for an initial story to lead another coparticipant to launch her own version. One reason for the cluster of stories in teacher-present group settings seems to be an atmosphere of one-upmanship that characterizes such situations. Noticing that a peer's story gains the teacher's interest in the group setting, many children attempt to top other children's stories by offering their own accounts of thematically related personal experiences in narrativized form. Accordingly, it is very common for some of the thematic content in prior narratives to get replicated in succeeding stories. The next section will examine the nature of thematic relatedness between stories that constitute rounds. It is important to point out that thematic relevance across turns is interactionally motivated in preschool group talk. That is, child conversationalists position themselves with respect to each other and their teacher by emulating, digressing from, or varying on the theme introduced by coparticipants.

3.2. *Thematic continuity*

The commonality of topical content across multi-party talk is the signpost of coherence for both coparticipants and analysts of conversation (Linell and Korolija, 1997). Conversational analysts stress that analysis of topicality should be conducted in conjunction with an analysis of activity types, participation structure, and sequential structure (Goodwin, 1995; Schegloff, 1990).

As observed by Cortazzi (1993) in children's talk, also in the Turkish preschool setting "later narratives are highly pre-specified, showing marked parallels of topic, theme, character of events with preceding narratives" (pp. 32–33). In establishing thematic relatedness with previous discourse, some stories exhibited *thematic emulation*, where the succeeding story is almost an exact repetition of the prior story with little variation or elaboration. In rounds with *thematic elaboration*, on the other hand, successive stories exhibit some repetition, but also some variation and elaboration. We will examine both of these types of rounds in the following two sections. In line with the proposal of the conversational analysis approach, we will look at how topical coherence is achieved through organization of the participation framework and the sequential structures in talk-in-interaction.

3.3. *Thematic emulation*

At preschool ages, one-statement recounts of past activities that do not go beyond minimal event representations are very common. Thus, many mentions of past personal events do not get delivered in extended discourse form. It is important to take into account these abbreviated, not full-fledged narratives in studying nonprompted, conversational narratives, especially in child talk-in-interaction (Küntay and Ervin-Tripp, 1997; Kyratzis, 2000). These minimal representations of personal events often lead to "adjacency pairs" (Schegloff and Sacks, 1974) of events that emulate one another in content and form.

In the following excerpt from classroom interactions, two different children follow upon two different themes introduced in the initiatory narrative of another child (Ferit) with minimal linguistic material. After these responses, Ferit, who goes on with his narrative, later reacquires the floor. (In all of the excerpts included in this paper, the age and the sex of the children, and the source of the data are provided underneath the relevant example. All the names used for the children are pseudonyms.)

Excerpt 1:

((The whole sequence takes place in a routinized speech event (Beginning-of-the-Week Remembering Time), where the teacher (T4) invites rounds of weekend narratives from the child participants on a Monday.))

- 1 Ferit: anneannemleri anlatacam.
(I am going to talk about (my visit to) my grandmother's

- 2 u anneanneme gittim (1.8),
uhm (*I*) went to my grandmother
- 3 ondan sonra akşam oldu,
and then the evening came
- 4 elektrikler kesildi,
the power was cut off
- 5 Mine: = biz de anneanneme gittik
we also went to my grandmother
- 6 Kaya: = aynı şeyi biz de yaşadık,
we also had the same experience ((referring to the power cut))
- 7 = bizde de elektrikler kesildi.
the power was also cut off at our place
- 8 T4: öyle mi?
really?
- 9 Ferit: **AMA ESENTEPEYE KADAR**
but up until Esentepe
- 10 **ESENTEPEDE (0.8) DÜŞÜNÜN BÜTÜN HER YER KESİKTİ,**
just think of it, everywhere in Esentepe was blacked out
- 11 **Bİ ARA YANDI SÖNDÜ,**
for a moment (*it*) came back and went
- 12 **SONRA (0.6) IŞIKLAR DOKUZ BUÇUKTA GELDİ YANİ.**
then I mean, the power was back at nine thirty
- 13 **DOKUZ BUÇUKTA GELDİ YANİ,**
(*it*) came at nine thirty

Ferit (4;11, male)/Mine (5;2, female)/Kaya (5;10, male)
Eryavuz.Data7

In the initiatory narrative (1–4), Ferit mentions two events, him going to his grandmother's (2) and the power being cut (4). Following Ferit's introductory narrative, Mine asserts the experience of her going to her own grandmother (5), and Kaya claims the experience of his household being subject to a power cut (7). Kaya explicitly marks the thematic continuity between his own experience and a subtheme of Ferit's original narrative by a metanarrative comment, *we also had the same experience* (6). None of these contributions get extended into fully developed narratives. Yet, they both serve as narrativized responses to two separate themes introduced within the same story of a coparticipant. It is Ferit, the initial storyteller, who gets to elaborate further on the events of his story. He develops a highly evaluated story structure (9–13), implying the amount of the trouble he experienced by men-

tioning the extent (10) and the duration (12, 13) of the power cut. The reason for the predominance of Ferit's story in this multi-party interaction is probably because the turn was initially allocated to him by the teacher so that he can talk about his weekend experiences. In the turn that precedes this segment, T4 thanks another child who just completed talking about his weekend activities, and says 'evet Ferit neler yapmış', *yes, (let's hear) what Ferit did*. Ferit takes up the turn by characterizing his upcoming story to be about his grandmother's place (1).

A similar example is provided below. In this excerpt, three children provide stories based on personal experiences to illustrate a topic set up as the target subject by the teacher for the classroom interaction.

Excerpt 2:

((The sequence takes place in the classroom with nine students and two teachers. One of the teachers is T1. The activity is review of some previously introduced material on the subject of tourism.))

- 1 Ceren: benim babaannem de Almanya'ya [gitmişti].
my grandmother also went to Germany
- 2 T1: [evet?]
yes?
- 3 bak senin babaannen dış turizm yapmış
look, your grandmother did some international tourism
((Emir raises his hand, asking to speak.))
- 4 evet Emir?
yes, Emir?
- 5 Emir: biz bi kerecik İngiltereye gittik küçükken.
once we went to England, when (I was) little
- 6 T1: tamam
OK
- 7 ((Ferit raises his hand, asking to speak.))
- 8 Ferit?
Ferit? ((giving Ferit permission to speak))
- 9 Ferit: ee işte şimdi babamın bi Alman şey şeyi var,
mmh now my father has someone in Germany
- 10 o da İstanbul'a geldi.
he also came to Istanbul

Ceren (4;3, female)/Emir (5;0, male)/Ferit (5;0, male)
Eryavuz.Data15

In this excerpt, the teacher's involvement in the management of the group interaction, and consequently in moderating the topic development is very conspicuous. All through this excerpt and the remainder of the classroom session, the teacher makes sure that the children remain faithful to the preestablished subject of tourism in their personal narratives. In 3, she characterizes Ceren's recounting of her grandmother going to Germany (1) as an exemplar of international tourism. Emir, picking up on the theme of international tourism, mentions his family's trip to England when he was younger (5). Ferit also brings up his own instance of foreign visits by talking about his father's business associate's visit from Germany to Istanbul (9–10). The remainder of the conversation (not included in this excerpt) includes a discussion about whether Ferit's father's business associate's trip constitutes tourism or not.

The urge to continue with the theme of the previous story appears to be strong in these types of rounds. Often, second narrators claim to have exactly the same experience as first narrators, sometimes down to the same details. It seems that topic-related contribution, rather than being an end itself, is a way in which Turkish preschool children negotiate their participation in group talk. In the following example, we see that the child who initiates the story round, Mert, challenges the emulation of his experience in a subsequent story by Hasan. The experience is about his going to Famecity, a children's entertainment center, and trying a new game there.

Excerpt 3:

- | | | |
|---|--------|--|
| 1 | Mert: | Famecity'e gittim,
<i>(I) went to Famecity</i> |
| 2 | | orda yeni bi oyun çıkmış,
<i>there, there was a new game</i> |
| 3 | Adult: | Haa
<i>mmmh</i> |
| 4 | Hasan: | aa ben o oyunu oynadım
<i>oh, I played that game</i> |
| 5 | Mert: | oynadın
<i>you played</i> |
| 6 | | <u>nasıldı?</u> ((challenging tone))
<i>how was it? ((challenging tone))</i> |
| 7 | Hasan: | çok iyiydi
<i>(it) was very good</i> |
| 8 | Mert: | <u>nasıl bişeydi?</u> ((challenging tone))
<i>what kind of a thing was it? ((challenging tone))</i> |
| 9 | Hasan: | yani çok değişik bi oyun
<i>well, a very different game</i> |

- 10 Adult: tamam sen anlat Mert
OK, you tell (us), Mert
- 11 Mert: yumurtanın içinde baykuş mu çıkıyordu (.) kuş mu?
was (an) owl or (a) bird coming out of the egg?
- 12 Hasan: kuş çıkıyordu. ((hh))
(a) bird was coming out
- 13 Mert: hayır ikisi de değil
no, none of those
- 14 civciv çıkıyordu
(a) chick was coming out
- 15 Adult: Hhhhhhh

((The interaction continues by the dispute escalating and Mert telling Hasan to shut up. Later, Mert complains that it is always only Hasan who is always telling stories.))

Hasan (5;1, male)/Mert: (5;10, male)

Eryavuz.Data21

In this segment, Hasan tries to gain the floor by claiming to have played the same game (4) that Mert was going to talk about (2). Mert follows by challenging Hasan about the accuracy of his reported experience that is the basis of his demand for the floor (5–6). This move indicates that Mert is aware of a mutual conversational convention that determines the appropriateness of the report of similar experiences to those reported in prior discourse. Rather than directly shutting him up, which he later does in a furious tone of voice ('ayyy! e sus artık sen', *oyyy, oh, you shut up now!*), he starts questioning Hasan about the details of the latter's alleged experience with the new game in Famecity (6, 8, 11). In 11, he even bluffs Hasan by offering a forced-choice question to which neither alternative is the right answer (13). This excerpt is a good illustration of the interactional strategies used by the preschool-age narrators in managing their position in group talk. One way to seize the floor and assert one's own position is to interrupt the coparticipant and state to have had a similar experience to that was just reported, as demonstrated by Hasan in 4. Another tactic is to challenge the accuracy of the reported experience, eliminating the justification for the coparticipant's embarking on a large stretch of discourse, as demonstrated by Mert in 6, 8, and 11.

Another segment where the two coparticipants disagree about the similarity of their respective experiences is given below.

Excerpt 4:

((This segment is taken from a larger conversation where Mine tells the adult what she did over the holidays. She is talking about her visit to an atrium.))

- 1 Mine: jeton attık bi yere
we inserted a coin in some place

- 2 arkadaşım bi timsahlı bi oyun öğretti
my friend taught me a game with alligators in it
- 3 bi sopa var
there is a stick
- 4 o sopa- (0.5) bi düğmeye basıyoruz,
that stick- we press on a button
- 5 timsahlar çıkıyo
alligators come out
- 6 adamı vurmaya çalışıyoruz
we try to hit the man
- 7 sonra bilgisayar oynadık,
then we played with computers
- 8 bi sürü
for a long time
- 9 Mert: Ben de biliyorum
I know (it) too
ondan bende de var
I have that as well
- 10 Mine: Ama orda Fedon şarkı söylemez,
but there Fedon does not sing
- 11 arkadaşım söyledi
my friend told me that
- 12 Mert: Ama (.) böyle hani timsaha bi düğmeye basıyosun
but like this you know on the alligator you press a button
- 13 timsahlar ağzını açıp' kapıyo, di mi:?:
alligators open and close their mouths, no?
- 14 Mine: Hayır
no
- 15 Mert: Ama benimki öyle
but mine is like that
- 16 hani dönüyolar ama
but you know they rotate
- 17 ağzını da açıp kapıyolar
and open and close their mouths
- 18 Mert: hayır öyle de::il
no, not like that

19 Mert: aah ((very disappointed))

20 ((Mine switches to another story about going to MacDonald's))

Mine (5;03, female)/Mert: (5;09, male)

Eryavuz:Data14

Like in Excerpt 3, Mine, the first storyteller, does not agree with the premise of the second storyteller, who assumes similar experiences with her regarding a game. Ordinarily, that kind of a presumption would lead to a contribution of an appropriately launched extended discourse. However, as soon as Mert claims that he knows (9) what Mine has been talking about (1–8), Mine raises an objection, implying they are not talking about the same place (10). Mert reiterates his point by describing how the game is played (12–13), prompting Mine for a confirmation that they are talking about the same thing (13). Mine does not surrender (14). Mert resorts to the strategy of marking his next turn to be about his own experience, not Mine's (15), moving on with a description (16–17). But Mine keeps on challenging Mert by restating that his description does not fit with hers (18). Mert disappointingly relinquishes the floor to Mine (19).

Most of the observed thematic continuity in these rounds seems to be an outcome of the children having an overarching motivation to make some contribution to the unfolding conversation, thereby achieving the social goal of displaying one's own position. The interactional motivation to participate was so strong that in many occasions, children, in quite non-adultlike ways, reported the non-occurrence of the topical event in his/her life. Some reports of non-events are seen in the following two examples.

Excerpt 5:

((This takes place during breakfast, after 22 lines of two other children telling the teacher about their visits to the doctor. Both of the children started their stories by saying that their respective mothers took them to the doctor, explaining what the doctor did, what he/she prescribed, etc. The teacher shows great interest in the topic by elaborating on the themes introduced by both of the children.))

Osman: annem beni doktora götürmedi
my mother did not take me to the doctor

By reporting that his mother did not take him to the doctor, Osman justifies that he does not participate in the group activity of a story round. Since he does not have a relevant experience that he can employ to tie in to the previous themes included in the other's stories, he would not be able to relate a relevant story, but still chimes in.

In Excerpt 6, Ali has been telling the adult researcher about a toy—a robot that runs on battery—that he has at home. The excerpt starts with him mentioning that

his parents bought this toy and a Ciao Co toy for him as a gift for stopping biting his nails (1), extending his discourse by elaborating how this purchase took place (2–7).

Excerpt 6:

- 1 Ali: annem de o zaman Metrodan (.) tırnak yememe hediyesi almışdılar bana,
my mother bought it from Metro as a gift for not biting my nails
- 2 bi de annem Ciao Co almıştı bi tane.
also my mother bought me a Ciao Co
- 3 Adult: hı hı çok güzel
hmm very nice.
- 4 Ali: İKİSİNİ DE AYNI YERDEN ALDILAR
they bought both from the same place
- 5 Adult: öyle mi?
is that so?
- 6 Ali: ay- ve aynı- ve aynı yer- = aynı günde
7 aynı günde =
sa- and same- and same place- [on the same day on the same day]
- 8 Ahmet: =°Ali Ali°
Ali Ali ((calling the other child's name in a quiet voice))
- 9 Adult: bak Alican bişey söyluyo
look Ali is saying something
- 10 Ahmet bana da Ciao Co'nun arabasını aldılar
they also bought a Ciao Co car for me
- 11 Ali: bana almadılar
they did not buy (one) for me
- 12 Ahmet ama bi de Ciao
Ahmet, *but a Ciao*
- 13 Ali: = henüz bana bi tane yeşil şapkalı olan Ciao Coyu aldılar,
((interrupts))
up to now, they bought me the Ciao Co that has the green hat
- 14 o kadar
that is it
- 15 başka Ciao Co almıyolar
they are not buying any more Ciao Cos
- 16 [Ninjalarım da var]
I also have Ninjas

17 Ahmet: [bana da yeşil gözlüklü] olanlardan aldılar

for me they bought from the ones with green eyeglasses

Ali (4;3, male)/Ahmet (4;9, male)

Eryavuz.Data 23

In 8, Ahmet asks for the floor by calling Ali's name. The adult intervenes to turn the floor over to Ahmet (9), who tells what his own parents got for him (10), a Ciao Co car. Ali responds to this by mentioning the non-occurrence of the exact same event in his life, saying that his parents did not get him the same car (11). Disregarding Ahmet's attempts to regain the floor (12), Ali goes on to talk about what his parents bought him (13, 16), but also what they failed to get (14–15). It seems that Ahmet's display of his experience with recent purchase of toys leads Ali to incorporate into his unfolding narrative the kinds of things that his parents, as opposed to Ahmet's parents, did not get for him.

The data presented in this section indicate that narrative discourse in Turkish preschool interactions displays thematic relevance to prior discourse with respect to content and genre, often extending the activity of group narrating in rounds. The tendency to emulate the previous theme is so strong that children often report non-events, marking a contrast, rather than similarity, between their own experiences and those of the previous story. Through participating in these rounds, children learn to interactionally manage their respective positions in peer interactions. On cognitive grounds, such serial stories involve some sort of attention to and analysis of the content of the original story on the part of the subsequent storyteller. However, rather than displaying understanding, the children's goal appears to be to secure the floor and lay out their position with respect to the theme on the floor. Thus, through these rounds, children learn to establish and legitimate identities for themselves, apart from practicing the ability of converging on thematically related issues. As Wortham (2000) puts, "we are in part the kind of people we get positioned as when we narrate ourselves" (p. 162). Turkish preschool children, through participating in rounds of stories initiated by others, take the opportunity to cast their emerging persons in a particular light. Positions such as one who is approved by the teacher, or one who can challenge a peer, or one who is sympathetic to the agenda of a peer are among the many roles that can be assigned to oneself and others in narration. Within the contexts of rounds, such social roles are worked out and negotiated by the Turkish children.

In the next section we will turn to the cases of rounds where the subsequent storytellers does not merely replicate, but also introduce variations and elaborations on the thematic structure displayed in the antecedent narrative(s).

3.4. *Thematic elaboration*

Often, coparticipants elaborated on the previously introduced themes as they followed upon someone else's story with a thematically relevant story of their own. Although the initial story sounded more like reports of a personal experience, sub-

sequent stories tended to realize fuller story-like forms with resolutions and evaluations in the sense of Labov and Waletzky (1967).

The following segment is one such example, where the second storyteller presents a report of a similar event to that of the first, but goes on to provide a resolution for her own version.

Excerpt 7:

((It is lunchtime. The children, along with their teacher and the researcher, are eating desert. The desert is called ‘şekerpare’, but Emre calls it ‘şekerfare’. This variant pronunciation rhymes with and includes the word for mouse in Turkish, ‘fare’..))

- 1 Emre: bizim evde dün büyük fare görmüstük
 ((indicates the size with his hands))
 we saw a big mouse in our house
- 2 şekerfare değil
 not şekerfare
- 3 Bihter: öğretmenim (.) ben bizim evde ş::ey vardı
 teacher, I we had something in our house
- 4 (-) bizde evin üstüne kara fatma girmişti.
 (-) *at our place, a cockroach came into our house*
- 5 (1.8) babam dışarı attı
 my father threw (it) out

Emre (4;0, male)/Bihter (4;0, female)
Ubaruz.datab2

This example is a good illustration of how the surrounding physical environment serves as a contextual resource for initiatory stories (Linell and Korolija, 1997). The larger activity of eating a certain kind of desert and the fact that the child’s word for the desert (‘şekerpare’) is similar to the word for mouse (‘fare’) triggers Emre’s story (1–2). In this case, it is not the preceding conversation, but prompts in the local environments that occasion a story, leading to a round when Bihter chimes in with a story about cockroaches, that belong to the larger category of pests along with mice (3). Similarly to Emre’s story, she talks about her family noticing cockroaches in their household (4). But she culminates her own story with a resolution, saying that her father threw the cockroach out (5). Although Bihter’s story is thematically related to Emre’s in that they are both talking about pests in their respective homes, Bihter’s version is structurally more complete. This might be because the part that the second storyteller thematically borrows from the previous storyteller serves as support for thematic elaboration and structural expansion.

In the following story, too, the second storyteller lays out a more elaborated narrative by evaluating the recounted events from the perspective of his own emotions.

The reason for the spontaneous provision of his emotional reactions might be due to the fact that the first storyteller gets prompted by the adult (6) about what subjective experience was brought about by the events he had reported (2–5).

Excerpt 8:

- 1 Ethem: ()dım
 () I did
- 2 Hakkı: ben bi kere hasta olmuşum,
 once I got sick
- 3 bana iğne yaptılar.
 they gave a shot to me
- 4 Adult: aa! sonra
 oh! then
- 5 Hakkı: o iğneyi eeee—batırınca kendime geldim.
 that needle mmm—when they inserted it, I got fine
- 6 Adult: acıdımı?
 did it hurt?
- 7 Hakkı: acımadı.
 it did not hurt
- 8 *hiç* acımadı.
 it did not hurt at all
- 9 Ethem: bi kerecik de ben ameliyat olmuşum,
 once I also had a surgery
- 10 orda da iğne—iğne yapmışlardı,
 there also needle—they also gave me a shot
- 11 bırakmışlardı o iğneyi kolumda,
 they left that needle in my arm
- 12 öyle gitmi—gittiler,
 and left—left
- 13 öyle durup kalması gerekmiş,
 (the needle) needed to stay put like that
- 14 ben de onun için hiç ağlamadım.
 and therefore I did not cry at all

Ethem (4;11, male)/Hakkı (4;10, male)
Yavuzer.March5

In this excerpt, we see that the adult prompts Hakkı to provide a resolution (4) and to evaluate his feelings (6) about the events presented in his basic story (2–3). Accordingly, when Ethem launches a similar story (9–14), he spontaneously provides a resolution (12–13) and indicates his emotional response (14). The adult's intervention in the first story appears to have resulted in the subsequent story to be developed further to include the elaborations that the adult was after in the first child's version.

In a related vein, it is common for children to latch on the questions intended for other coparticipants with their own elaborated replies. Excerpt 9 presents a segment where Akat claims to have had similar experiences that are initially introduced by Osman.

Excerpt 9:

- | | | |
|----|--------|---|
| 1 | Osman: | ben kaç gün gelmedim okula.
<i>I did not come for how many days to school</i> |
| 2 | Adult: | kaç gün gelmedin?
<i>how many days didn't you come?</i> |
| 3 | Akat: | ben de dokuz gün gelmedim,
<i>I also did not come for nine days</i> |
| 4 | Osman: | = ()onbeş
<i>fifteen</i> |
| 5 | Adult: | ne yaptın ki gelmediğin günler?
<i>what did you do on the days you did not come?</i> |
| 6 | Osman: | hastaydım.
<i>I was sick</i> |
| 7 | Adult: | hı
<i>hmm</i>
ne yaptın evde? ((addressed to Osman))
<i>what did you do at home?</i> |
| 8 | Akat: | evde de oyuncaklarım var,
<i>at home I also have toys</i> |
| 9 | | hem de okuldakinden çok.
<i>even more than those at school</i> |
| 10 | Adult: | oynadın evde, ha?
<i>you played at home, ha?</i> |
| 11 | Akat: | ben de hastaydım.
<i>I also was sick</i> |
| 12 | | annem de hastaydı. |

- my mother was sick as well*
- 13 sonra ben de oyuncaklarımla oynadım,
then I played with my toys
- 14 minik annem bana bi uçak aldı.
my tiny mother bought me a plane
- Osman (5;5, male)/Akat (4;7)
Eryavuz data4.2

This segment starts by Osman mentioning to the adult that he has not come to school for the last few days (1). When the adult asks him to specify for how many days he has been away, Akat, not the intended recipient of the adult's question, reveals a similar experience of 'not coming to school' and replying to the adult's question with the precise number of days for which he has been sick home (3). Osman latches on Ahmet's reply by his own (4). When the adult asks Osman what he did during the days he did not go to school (5), it is Akat who answers (6). But Akat jumps back in (8–9) to respond to the next question by the adult (7), although the question is specifically addressed to Osman. From that point on, Ahmet retains the floor to give a detailed account of what happened while he was sick at home (11–14).

Obtaining the floor for extended talk seemed to be a major interactional goal for most of the children observed in the Turkish preschool contexts. In contexts where more than one child was present, some "dangling narratives" (Umiker-Sebeok, 1979) which are not topically coherent with the antecedent conversation were commonly observed. The purpose of such discourse segments seemed to be just getting hold of the floor despite the absence of contributions that could be relevant to the ongoing conversation. Not only these spontaneous, thematically discontinuous narratives were common to occur, but in some cases, they managed to determine the topical agenda for the upcoming talk. Here is an example:

Excerpt 10:

((The adult has been talking with Ahmet about his experiences during the nine days that he stayed sick at home. Ali loudly joins in and introduces a topic which shifts the focus of conversation to a completely different realm.))

- 1 Ali: bi tane daha—bi büyük trenim vardı büyük,
one more—I had a big train
- 3 pilliydi,
it had batteries
- 4 çok hızlı gidiyordu,
it would go very fast
- 5 ve elsiz,

- and without using hands*
- 6 ben yürütmüyordum,
I would not make it go
- 7 kendi yürüyordu tren.
the train would go by itself
- 8 ondan sonra o bozulan yerleri () aldım.
and then I bought those broken parts from ()
- 9 o da kayboldu
that got lost, too
- 10 ikisi de—ikisini de artık bulamıyorum.
either of—I can't find either of them
- 11 Adult: aa ee ne yapacaksın?
aaa what are you gonna do?
- 12 Ahmet: benim de trenim var.
I've also got a train
- 13 kendi gidiyor.
(it) goes by itself
- 14 babamın arkadaşı aldı,
my father's friend (got) it
- 15 adı da Yüksel amca
and his name is uncle Yüksel
- Ali (4;2-boy)—Ahmet (4;7-boy)
Eryavuz.data4

Although Ahmet has been talking to the adult about his totally different experiences, Ali's sudden drift to a thematically different realm for an extended turn (1–10) manages to set up the topic introduced by Ali as something to elaborate on by Ahmet. Ahmet recounts a similar story to Ali's (12–13) and goes on by adding seemingly personally important information about who bought the train for him (14–15).

In the following example, observed during Circle Time, the teacher (T1) had not yet set up an agenda for the session when Can plunges into his narrative about his unsupervised swimming activity in the sea. Sometimes this particular teacher allowed the children to govern the session with their own concerns instead of determining ahead of time a theme for the Circle Time. The experience reported by Can is, by all means, an extraordinary first experience for a 3-year-old boy, which the teacher acknowledges by an enthusiastic evaluation, *very nice* (3). This reaction by the teacher prompts Beril to seek the teacher's attention by addressing her twice by a summons (4), and contributes her own swimming-related story that evolves into a

more elaborated version. She ends up elaborating on the theme of autonomous, unsupervised swimming that was introduced by Can earlier (8–9).

It might be the case that Can did not have a chance to complete his account of his swimming experience in the first attempt. He actually attempts a few returns to the story in the part that is not included in the following excerpt (between 23 and 24). Finally, he is able expand on the theme he had initiated, starting from 24.

Excerpt 9:

- 1 Can: öğretmenim ben—ben arabada banyomu—mayomu giydim
teacher, I—I in the car my bath—I put on my swimming suit
- 2 = sonra da denizde kendim yüzdüm
and then I swam by myself in the sea
- 3 T1: çok güzel
very nice!
- 4 Beril: öğretmenim öğretmenim,
Teacher teacher
- 5 bi kere biz havuza gitmiştik.
once we went to the pool
- 6 mayomu giydim,
I wore my swimming suit
- 6 sonra bi atladım,
then I jumped immediately
- 7 kendim yüzdüm,
I swam by myself
- 8 annem de gelmedi.
and my mother did not come
- 9 za—oraya gittim sonra,
I went there then
- 10 sonra tekrar atladım,
then I jumped again
- 12 sola gittim.
I went to the left
- 13 bi daha atladım.
I jumped again
- 14 sonra da.. a şey ee simidin üstüne geldim
and then.. aa I came over the life buoy
- 15 sonra tekrar düştüm havuza,
then I again fell into the pool

15 yüzdüm
I swam

16 bi daha üste geldim
again I came over to the top

17 bi daha düştüm
again I fell

18 çıktım o zaman
that time I got out

19 sonra küçük denize—küçük havuza gittik
then we went to the little sea—little pool

20 yüzdük
we swam

21 sonra da (0.5) orda sisi gördüm arkadaşlarımla beraber.
and then I saw the fog together with my friends

22 T1: öyle mi?
is that so?

23 [korkmadın mı?]
weren't you afraid?

((39 lines of intervening talk about swimming where other participants chime in some talk about swimming. One child offers a future planning narrative, describing his projected activities regarding swimming))

24 Can: öğretmenim babam da denizde beni kendi yüzdürüyodu ama
teacher my father (da) was helping me swim in the sea but

25 = ben de kendim yüzemedim.
(as for me) I (de) could not swim by myself

26 ama babam beni bırakmıyordu
but my father was not letting go off me

27 T1: şimdi
Now

28 T1: başka bişey söylemek istiyomusunuz?
do (you) want to say anything else? ((addressed to the whole group))

29 Can: ha:yı:r
no:

30 T1: yokmu?
nothing?

31 Can: 1-1h
No

32 T1: beraber saatimiz bu kadarla sona ersin
let our circle time end with this much

Can (3;10-male)—Beril (4;1-female)
 Ubaruz.datab7.3

All of the children who participated in this round attempt to top the previous story by incorporating different facets of their similar experiences. The teacher's mere approval of the initial story is sufficient to set up the topic of swimming as a target. The topical coherence between the stories is obvious, with the prior stories providing a set of choices that the subsequent speakers can pick up on. Not all the content of the subsequent stories is tightly entailed by the previous ones, but a pattern of overlapping themes is developed throughout the storytelling round. The second story plays out and elaborates upon (8–9) the point of the initial story (2), which is ability to be able to swim without adult assistance. Can's attempt to pursue conversation in another topical domain fails (excluded transcripts between 23 and 24). In the excluded parts, three other children capture the floor by elaborating on some content from the previous stories. At the end, after several unsuccessful attempts (24), Can regains the floor by talking about his father's involvement in his swimming. The teacher then provides the closure of the session after making sure that none of the students want to pursue the topic further.

The data presented in this section show that children often build upon the thematic skeletons provided in other coparticipants' prior stories. They pull out memories similar to the previously reported events, but offer different elaborations on these, often laying out personally significant material. However, it is not clear how mutually cooperative the child storytellers are with one another, since it is obvious there are attempts to outperform the previous teller(s) in the eye of the teacher. Thus, child storytellers do not necessarily create a cooperative alignment with prior speakers in their rounds, but they clearly assert an affinity of understanding through invoking a participation framework where each child is expected to contribute on thematically similar matters in personally relevant ways.

4. Discussion

A basic ability needed to carry any conversation forward involves consideration of models provided by other speakers as valid thematic and formal scaffolds as bridges onto one's own contribution. Participation in many speech activities, such as joint problem-solving, planning, casual conversation, in addition to rounds of personal narratives, requires figuring out the topic on the floor for making a thematically relevant contribution. Conversational management of topics is an area of socio-

pragmatic and linguistic development in children which has received considerable attention in past child language research (e.g., Kertoy and Goetz, 1995; Lucariello, 1990; Pan and Snow, 1999; Wanska et al., 1989).

This study demonstrates that rounds of stories are one speech activity where preschool children exercise their developing strategies for achieving thematic continuity and thematic elaboration on the basis of prior discourse. As in the adult version of rounds (Ervin-Tripp and Küntay, 1997), sequences of stories often involve continuities of topic in children's multi-party conversations. In establishing thematic connectedness, Turkish children often instantiate the same speech event of 'rounds of stories', similarly to adults' versions. Yet, the nature of the strategies for achieving thematic coherence across successive stories seems to differ between children and adults. Ryave (1978), in his account of adult story series, characterizes adjacent stories as demonstrating the same point. In Turkish children's rounds, it is not the implicit point of the story, but its explicit content that gets replicated. The difference between the children and the adults seem to stem from different participation structures and different interactional positioning needs with respect to these participation structures.

In most occasions, the child participants of rounds are not addressing one another as their main target audience, but a mutual audience, the copresent adult. Especially in organized classroom interactions, the topical agenda is often set up by the teacher in advance of the conversational activity. Yet, to remain thematically relevant, children have to pay attention to what the previous speaker has said, not only to the adult participant's reaction to it. Since each contribution to a story filters through the mutual audience, most of the rounds are constituted on the basis of multiple "singly-developed" floors. In what Edelsky (1993) calls a "single floor", one speaker speaks at a time, and speakers take turns to own the conversational floor. However, the teachers in the Turkish preschool settings coordinate multiple "single floors" by sustaining the implicit allocation of interactional rights. We cannot characterize this type of interaction as a process where the trajectory of flow of ideas is determined by collaborative conversational undertakings by the participants, which Chafe (1997) calls polyphonic topic development. Rather than helping to expand a conversational theme, Turkish preschoolers seem to be seeking to erect and maintain identities of, for example, a "well-behaved boy" or an "athletic girl". Peers' stories and teachers' scaffolds provide prompts for them in accomplishing such interactional positioning.

Compared to what Ryave (1978) demonstrates for adults, the Turkish preschool children do not appear to pay much attention to the significance of previous stories in constructing their own. In adults' series of stories, it is the point of the storied events that lead to recountings of similar experiences. Similarity of stories has to do with the import the subsequent recounting offers to the significance of the prior story. Ryave calls this "same-significance procedure", from which two or more adjacent recountings can emerge. It is common for adult coparticipants to embed the successive story in the significance statement of a prior story. This is done by repeating the same or a similar significance statement, or doing a recounting that is reflexively embedded in the prior story's significance statement, lacking any overtly expressed indication of significance. Ervin-Tripp and Küntay (1997), for example,

find that adult constructions of story rounds show sensitivity to the point of the previous story, constituting elliptical story structures that presuppose information provided in the preceding discourse. In sum, adults usually mark some understanding of the relevance of prior stories in rounds, either through additional articulation of other coparticipants' point or ellipsis of previously mentioned content.

Children's rounds of stories, compared to what is described in the literature for adults, appear more like contiguous reports of matching or similar experiences. Polanyi (1989) draws a distinction between reports and stories, with the latter being distinguishable in making a point about the world. Reports, on the other hand, consist of a listing of events in which no specific point is made. If we accept this distinction, Turkish children's rounds of narratives look like contiguous reports of similar events, which collectively articulate the point of engaging in a socially accepted practice.

Although different in function than for adults, the speech activity of narrative rounds obviously facilitates the deployment of children's fledgling conversational and memory skills for interactive narrative goals. Researchers of autobiographical memory (Conway, 1997; Fivush, 1994; Fivush, et al., 1997; Nelson, 1993) demonstrate that young children are novice rememberers, needing to develop fluency in self-generating their own cues. It is certain that they benefit from externally presented cues such as themes included in other children's stories in organizing their long-term memory structures for the purpose of narrativization.

Weldon et al. (2000) point out that recollection often occurs as a social activity in adults' interactions. They refer to a process of cross-cueing, whereby the material recalled by each person serves as a retrieval cue for others' recall of additional material. There is ample evidence in the developmental literature demonstrating that the narrative ability has its precursors in social activities, specifically in parent-child conversations about past memories (Eisenberg, 1985; Fivush et al., 1997; McCabe and Peterson, 1991; Miller et al., 1990; Miller and Sperry, 1988; Snow, 1990). It appears that even in relatively later periods of narrative development during preschool ages, children employ conversational scaffolding provided by others in extracting relevant personal memories for narrativization. In rounds like the ones reported in this paper, second narrators frequently claimed to have exactly the same experience as first narrators, down to the same details, with elaborations building on the basis of the similar content across stories. Some children were observed to deliver experiences by stressing not only the commonalities, but also the differences. This might indicate that young children use prior discourse to model on while accessing their memories for personal events.

In discussing the motives and contingencies of conversational narratives, Schegloff (1997) points out that "subsequent stories are mobilized in recipients' memory by a story's telling just because they can serve as displays of understanding of, and alignment (or misalignment) with, prior stories. A 'subsequent story' is designed for the place in a course of tellings that it is to occupy" (p. 103). Although the displays of understanding and alignment are not as salient in children's talk as in adults' talk, Turkish preschool children also mobilize stories in demonstration of unique interactional stances between the teller and the child recipients. As Davies and Harré

have pointed out, narratives involve complex “interactional positioning” (Davies and Harré, 1990) of narrators with respect to the recounted events and other participants in the current setting. According to Wortham (2000), not all narratives, even adults’, contain explicit evaluations of the point of the story, but they do communicate interactional positioning. The manners in which Turkish children participate in rounds of narrative provide cues (for the coparticipants and for the researcher) about the identities they portray in their interactions. In the rounds we looked at, we observed displays of identities, such as a good student seeking approval from the teacher, or a confrontational peer challenging his friend’s account of a children’s game.

Sacks (1972), in a seminal article on children’s stories, pointed out that children have restricted rights to talk and need “tickets” to begin storytelling. That is, attaining the appropriate conditions for taking over floor for extended discourse is not straightforward for any conversationalist, especially young children surrounded by adults (Blum-Kulka, 1997). The present study indicates that the Turkish preschool settings also display a culture of “restricted rights” for children’s extended discourse. The ritual of story rounds, however, seems to provide a mutually agreed ground amenable to storytelling behavior. In sum, a prior story constitutes a “ticket” for a subsequent story, thereby setting up the suitable occasion for its launch. These rounds of stories offer preschool children, with fledgling conversational skills and restricted rights to talk, ample opportunities of practice of interactionally managed topic progression and manipulation of the turn taking system.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by a Turkish National Academy of Sciences award (TÜBA-GEBİP) to the first author. The paper benefited from various discussions and prior collaborative work with Susan Ervin-Tripp (University of California, Berkeley).

Appendix. Summary of transcription symbols

.	(period) Falling intonation
?	(question mark) Rising intonation
,	(comma) Continuing intonation
-	(hyphen) An abrupt cut-off
::	(colon(s)) Sound lengthening
<u>later</u>	(underlining) Stressed word or word part
YES	(all caps) Loud speech
°no°	(degree symbols) Quiet speech
> today <	(more than & less than) Quicker speech

hh	(series of h's) Laughter
[]	(square brackets) Simultaneous or overlapping speech
=	(equals sign) Contiguous utterances
(1.4)	(number in parentheses) Length of a pause
(.)	(period in parentheses) Micro-pause
()	(empty parentheses) Non-transcribable segment of talk
((pointing))	(double parentheses) Non-verbal activity

References

- Berman, Ruth 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, Shoshana, 1997. Dinner Talk: Cultural Patterns of Sociability and Socialization in Family Discourse. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Chafe, Wallace, 1997. Polyphonic topic development. In: Givon, T. (Ed.), *Conversation: Cultural, Cognitive and Communicative Perspectives*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 41–53.
- Conway, Martin A., 1997. Introduction: what are memories? In: Conway, M.A. (Ed.), *Recovered Memories and False Memories*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 1–22.
- Cortazzi, Martin, 1993. *Narrative Analysis*. The Falmer Press, London.
- Davies, Bronwyn, Harré, Rom, 1990. Position: The discursive construction of selves. *Journal of the Theory of Social Behavior* 20, 43–63.
- Edelsky, Carole, 1993. Who's got the floor? In: Tannen, D. (Ed.), *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 189–227.
- Eisenberg, Ann, 1985. Learning to describe past experiences in conversation. *Discourse Processes* 8, 177–204.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan, Küntay, Aylin, 1997. The occasioning and structure of conversational stories. In: Givon, T. (Ed.), *Conversation: Cultural, Cognitive and Communicative Perspectives*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 133–166.
- Fivush, Robyn, 1994. Young children's event recall: Are memories constructed through discourse? *Consciousness and Cognition* 3, 356–373.
- Fivush, Robyn, Pipe, Margaret-Ellen, Murachver, Tamar, Reese, Elaine, 1997. Events spoken and unspoken: Implications for language and memory development for the recovered memory debate. In: Conway, M.A. (Ed.), *Recovered memories and false memories*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 34–62.
- Gale, Jerry, Odell, Mark, Nagireddy, Chandra S., 1995. Marital therapy and self-reflexive research: research and/as intervention. In: Morris, G.H., Chenail, R.J. (Eds.), *The Talk of the Clinic: Explorations in the Analysis of Medical and Therapeutic Discourse*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 105–129.
- Goffman, Erving, 1974. *Frame Analysis*. Harper and Row, London.
- Goodwin, Charles, 1995. The negotiation of coherence within conversation. In: Gernsbacher, M.A., Givon, T. (Eds.), *Coherence in Spontaneous Text*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 117–137.
- Goodwin, Charles, 2000. Action and embodiment within situated interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 1489–1522.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness, 1990. *He-said-she-said: Talk as Social Organization Among Black Children*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Hausendorf, Heiko, Quasthoff, Uta M., 1992. Children's story-telling in adult-child interaction: Three dimensions in narrative development. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 2, 293–306.
- Hohmann, Mary, Banet, Bernard, Weikart, David, P., 1979. *Young Children In Action: A Manual For Preschool Educators*. High/Scope Press, Ypsilanti, MI.

- Jefferson, Gail, 1978. Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In: Schenkein, J. (Ed.), *Studies In The Organization Of Conversational Interaction*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 219–248.
- Jones, Charlotte M., Beach, Wayne A., 1995. Therapists' Techniques for Responding to Unsolicited Contributions by Family Members. In: Morris, G.H., Chenail, R.J. (Eds.), *The talk of the clinic: Explorations in the analysis of medical and therapeutic discourse*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 49–69.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem, Sunar, Diane, Bekman, Sevda, 1988. *Comprehensive Preschool Education Project: Final Report* (Manuscript Report No. 209e). Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Kertoy, Marilyn K., Goetz, Karen M., 1995. The effect of conversational setting on topic continuation in mother-child dyads. *Journal of Child Language* 22, 73–88.
- Küntay, Aylin, Ervin-Tripp, Susan, 1997. Narrative structure and conversational circumstances. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7, 113–120.
- Kyratzis, Amy, 1999. Narrative identity: Preschoolers' self-construction through narrative in same-sex friendship group dramatic play. *Narrative Inquiry* 9, 427–455.
- Kyratzis, Amy, 2000. Tactical uses of narratives in nursery school same-sex groups. *Discourse Processes* 29, 269–299.
- Labov, William, Waletzky, Joshua, 1967. Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In: Helm, J. (Ed.), *Essays On The Verbal And Visual Arts*. University of Washington Press, Seattle, pp. 12–44.
- Linell, Per, Korolija, Natasha, 1997. Coherence in multi-party conversation. In: Givon, T. (Ed.), *Conversation: Cultural, cognitive and communicative perspectives*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 167–205.
- Lucariello, Joan, 1990. Freeing talk from the here-and-now: the role of event knowledge and maternal scaffolds. *Topics in Language Disorders* 10 (3), 14–29.
- McCabe, Allyssa, 1997. Developmental and cross-cultural aspects of children's narration. In: Bamberg, M. (Ed.), *Narrative Ability and Human Development*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 137–174.
- McCabe, Alyssa, Peterson, Carole, 1991. Getting the story: a longitudinal study of parental styles in eliciting narratives and developing narrative skill. In: McCabe, A., Peterson, C. (Eds.), *Developing Narrative Structure*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 217–254.
- Miller, Peggy J., Sperry, Linda L., 1998. Early talk about the past: The origins of conversational stories of personal experience. *Journal of Child Language* 15, 293–315.
- Miller, Peggy J., Potts, Randolph, Fung, Heidi, Hoogstra, Lisa, Mitz, Judith, 1990. Narrative practices and the social construction of self in childhood. *American Ethnologist* 17, 292–311.
- Nelson, Katherine, 1993. The psychological and social origins of autobiographical memory. *Psychological Science* 4, 7–14.
- Nicolopoulou, Angeliki, 1997. Children and narratives: Toward an interpretive and sociocultural approach. In: Bamberg, M. (Ed.), *Narrative Ability and Human Development*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 179–215.
- Ochs, Elinor, Smith, Ruth, Taylor, Carolyn, 1989. Detective stories at dinnertime: problem-solving through co-narration. *Cultural Dynamics* 2, 238–257.
- Ochs, Elinor, Taylor, Carolyn, 1992. Family narrative as political activity. *Discourse and Society* 3, 341–364.
- Pan, Barbara A., Snow, Catherine E., 1999. The development of conversational and discourse skills. In: Barrett, M. (Ed.), *The Development of Language: Studies in Developmental Psychology*. Psychology Press Ltd, East Sussex, UK, pp. 229–249.
- Polanyi, Livia, 1989. *Telling the American story: a structural and cultural analysis of conversational storytelling*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Preece, Alison, 1997. The range of narrative forms conversationally produced by young children. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 14, 353–373.
- Preece, Alison, 1992. Collaborators and critics: The nature and effects of peer interaction on children's conversational narratives. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 2 (3), 277–292.
- Quasthoff, Uta M., 1997. Were you ever in a situation where you were in serious danger of being killed? Narrator-listener interaction in Labov and Waletzky's narratives. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7, 121–128.

- Ryave, Alan, 1978. On the achievement of a series of stories. In: Schenkein, J. (Ed.), *Studies In The Organization Of Conversational Interaction*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 113–132.
- Sacks, Harvey, 1972. On The analysability Of stories by children. In: Gumperz, J.J., Hymes, D. (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, pp. 325–345.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1990. On the organization of sequences as a source of 'coherence' in talk-in-interaction. In: Dorval, B. (Ed.), *Conversational Organization and its Development*. Ablex, Norwood, NJ, pp. 51–77.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1997. "Narrative analysis" thirty years later. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7, 97–106.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Sacks, Harvey, 1974. Opening up closings. In Turner, R. (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology*. Penguin Books: Harmondsworth.
- Snow, Catherine E., 1990. Building memories: the ontogeny of autobiography. In: Cicchetti, D., Beeghly, M. (Eds.), *The Self in Transition*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 213–242.
- Sperry, Linda L., Sperry, Douglas E., 1996. Early development of narrative skills. *Cognitive Development* 11, 443–465.
- Umiker-Sebeok, D. Jane, 1979. Preschool children's intraconversational narratives. *Journal of Child Language* 6, 91–109.
- Wanska, S.K., Pohlman, J.C., Bedrosian, J.L., 1989. Topic maintenance in preschoolers' conversation in three play situations. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 4, 393–402.
- Weldon, Mary S., Blair, Cassidy, Huebsch, Penny D., 2000. Group remembering: Does social loafing underlie collaborative inhibition? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition* 26, 1568–1577.
- Wortham, Stanton, 2000. Interactional positioning and narrative self-construction. *Narrative Inquiry* 10, 157–184.

Aylin C. Küntay is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Psychology, Koç University, Istanbul, Turkey. She received her PhD from the Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley, USA in 1997. Her dissertation was on extended discourse skills of Turkish preschool children. Upon completion of her PhD, she worked as a postdoctoral researcher in the Department of Linguistics of UC, Berkeley until 1999. Her research interests are early language development and use, conversational and narrative discourse, and autobiographical narratives and memory.

İbrahim Şenay is a senior student in the Department of Psychology, Koç University, Istanbul, Turkey. He transferred to Psychology from Physics in his third year of undergraduate studies. He recently accepted an offer for PhD studies in the Department of Psychology at the University of Chicago, USA. He will start pursuing graduate studies in the language studies program of this institution as of September 2001.