LEADING THE WAY AND SHOWING AFFILIATION: PARTICIPATORY ROLES IN A SEMI-STRUCTURED NARRATIVE INTERVIEW

Katie Paredes
Marisa Cordella
Monash University

Abstract: *This paper outlines the participatory roles of narrators and interviewers in the process of unfolding personal stories. Fifteen secondary school students of Hispanic-Australian background enrolled in intermediate Spanish classes in Melbourne (Australia) were asked to talk about a series of topics allowing them to explore and develop personal stories.*

For the purpose of providing a comprehensive corpus this manuscript focuses on the 11 personal stories that emerged in Spanish and English around the topic of 'the worst holiday'.

The results show that narratives are not initially volunteered by students, being prefaced by an initial denial of negative experience. Nevertheless, the interviewer's participation dissipates the narrator's initial attitude allowing students to construct narratives guided by the interviewer's expectations. Interviewer strategies include requests for clarification, prompts for story development and co-authorship. Also crucial to the interaction is the use of laughter as a form of personal affiliation.

Key words: *Participatory roles, interactional roles, personal narratives, affiliation, Spanish, discourse analysis.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Narrative is one of the most extensively studied discourse forms within the social sciences, across disciplines such as sociolinguistics, social anthropology and social psychology (Thornborrow & Coates, 2005: 1). The prominence of personal narrative, where the narrator plays an active role in the event or resolves an issue (Schiffrin, 1994: 299), relates to its centrality in everyday life and its importance in social interaction.

Linde goes into detail as to how storytelling can be used both to create self and present self to others in three major ways (Linde, 1993: 100). Firstly, by communicating the continuity of self over time (through the sequencing of narrative events), secondly by expounding the relation of self to others (through linguistic markers, the act of narration itself, and the establishment of group values), and thirdly by promoting the reflexivity or reflection of self (through evaluation in relation to norms from a distance in time and point of view). The splitting of self into the roles of narrator and protagonist, or animator and figure in the words of Goffman (1974) facilitate the evaluation of self. These features make narrative an ideal means through which we communicate identity.

Ochs & Capps note that narrative can cover a range of genres or discourse formats and that the activity of narrating is carried out with reference to the dimensions along which it varies (Ochs & Capps, 2001: 54). They mention five interrelated concepts, namely tellership, tellability, embeddedness, linearity and moral stance through evaluation. Tellership refers to who has the right to narrate the story; tellability refers to the culturally bound value placed on an event for selection as narrative material; embeddedness describes how integrally a narrative is tied to its

contextual environment; linearity refers to the degree of temporal progression of a narrative; and moral stance through evaluation is the expression of a perspective through the use of devices such as explicit comments or internal syntactic variations (Labov 1967, 1972b), which deviate linear narrative structure.

2. NARRATIVE STRUCTURE AND STORYTELLING ROLES

Labov's (1972) research into tellability, narrative structure and evaluative devices has been influential to the study of narrative. He defines a story as "one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred" (Labov, 1972: 359) and divides it into the following sections: abstract (an optional summary communicating the central point); complication (the major events of the plot which may be terminated by a resolution); coda (an optional statement indicating the story has finished and returning the audience attention to the present). However this paper will not be concerned with the structural features of narrative but rather the participatory and interactional roles that emerge in the narrative event between participants.

Embeddedness or contextual environment is relevant to this paper as it focuses on narratives told within an interview context which are characterised by being relatively independent or detached. This determines narrative structure and discourse functions to a certain extent (Ervin-Tripp & Küntay, 1997: 134), with detached narratives usually elicited by a potential recipient, following a prototypical or canonical structure. This consists of one teller who constructs a monologue, an arbitrary theme which is highly tellable, a temporally and sequentially ordered chain of events in the past, a plot line of three parts (a beginning, middle and end), and a defined moral stance (Ochs & Capps, 2001: 41).

Monologues are not the only way of constructing a narrative, there are instances when the recipient may intervene in the event by contributing to a lesser or greater degree in the development of the narrator's story (Goodwin, 1984). Although the contribution may be limited this may still influence the selection of material for the telling. As the context changes from elicited to embedded narratives, the level of participation increases and the role of co-author becomes a possibility. Therefore an elicited narrative will probably have a less involved audience (Ochs & Capps, 2001: 36) which may only give minimal responses, while an embedded narrative may allow recipients who shared the experience to tell part of the story or contradict the principal teller.

Studies focusing on narrative recipient roles have covered the establishment of the right to tell and listen (Shuman, 1986; Blum-Kulka, 1993), co-authorship (Duranti, 1986; Goodwin, 1986; Mandelbaum, 1987; Eder, 1988; Mandelbaum, 1989; Lerner, 1992; Johnson, 2006) and negotiation (Goodwin, 1986; Monzoni, 2005; Kjaerbeck, 2005). These investigations have demonstrated that storytelling is a joint production between teller and audience.

Traditionally research has focused on prototypical detached narratives although there has been less investigation into the roles interviewers play in the telling and how they may use strategies that are more participatory and allow them greater authorship rights. There is also a paucity of research on Hispanic speakers within the Australian context.

The main goal of this manuscript is to understand the narrative episodes produced by Hispanic-Australian adolescents in Spanish and English and study the participation roles of interviewers in the event.

3. PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY

The target group consisted of 15 bilingual participants (9 females, 6 males) aged 14-18 years attending Spanish classes through the Victorian School of Languages[1] in Melbourne, Australia. Students were free to participate in this study and university ethical guidelines were closely followed, involving the collection of signed consent forms from those students and parents interested in participating.

In order to participate, students had to fulfil the following requisites:

To have at least one parent who was born in a Spanish-speaking country and who had immigrated to Australia;

1. To have been born in Australia or have immigrated before the age of 5.

2. To speak Spanish at home with at least one parent.

3. Parental countries of origin included El Salvador, Chile, Uruguay, Columbia and Argentina. Participants were accustomed to interacting with different Hispanic nationalities both in classes and during community activities, where commonalities were emphasised.

An adequate level of communicative competence was ensured by selecting intermediate (grades 9 and 10 in the Victoria educational system) and advanced (VCE Level – grades 11 and 12) classes as participants.[2]

The interviews were conducted by four bilingual researchers (2 females, 2 males) aged 30-35. Each researcher had the chance to conduct some of the English interviews as well as the Spanish ones.

4. METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Participants were divided into single gender groups of two and interviewed twice by researchers of the same gender in order to prompt the production of narrative episodes. The presence of a peer was designed to put students at ease and also provide for the possibility of peer dyad interaction during the interview, although this did not often eventuate.

Two interviews were conducted in which the two participants remained constant but the interviewer changed each time. This provided motivation for recounting the same narrative episodes twice, once during the English interview and once during the Spanish interview. The order of the interviews was not fixed; some students completed their English interview first while for others it was Spanish. The first interview was followed directly by the second interview with a minimal time lapse.

While the general interview questions varied according to language the narrative episode questions were exactly the same in Spanish and English. They related to best and worst holiday experiences and sporting achievements. The formulation of narrative questions was based on

---

[1] The Victorian School of Languages runs classes for several hours on weekends during school terms as an alternative to studying a language as part of the mainstream school curriculum.

[2] In Victoria (Australia) grades 9 and 10 cover teaching material designed for a lower intermediate level of the language, pertaining to communication standards, intercultural knowledge and language awareness. VCE stands for the Victorian Certificate of Education which comprises four units of study and is awarded upon completion of the last two. Language requirements pertain to the establishment and participation in spoken and written exchanges, the expression of personal responses, the exchange of information and opinions as well as critical responses.

Labov's (1972) prototype about near death experiences but modified to take into account the background of the participants and the ethical research restrictions.

A total of 26 worst holiday narratives were selected and transcribed as the basis of the study. They were divided into 11 stories from the first interview (7 in Spanish and 4 in English) and 15 stories from the second interview (4 in Spanish and 11 in English). There were 10 stories that were retold and analysis consisted of comparisons made across tellings and languages. In this paper, the analysis concerning interactional factors such as participation roles will be presented, mainly relative to the 11 stories told from the first interview. The main research instrument used was a semi structured interview[3].

Some of the advantages of this qualitative research method are those of flexibility, sensitivity towards interviewees and delicacy in the capture of information (Mills, 2001). Two of the most significant drawbacks, however, relate to asymmetry or power imbalance and performance (Block, 1995). The power imbalance usually favours the researcher and participants tend to give the researcher the data they believe is desired which may not necessarily reflect natural speech. These constraints are difficult to overcome and must be taken into account when analysing the data.

In this case, the minimal level of formality and the semi-structured questions favouring interactional and not transactional speech (Chew, 1997) were used as resources to mitigate the power imbalance. Interviewers were instructed to develop a more conversational format instead of questions and answers, including the sharing of personal experience, in an attempt to make it less asymmetrical (Grindsted, 2005). Another criticism of the interview as a source of data relates to its lack of contextual environment as opposed to naturally occurring conversation. It may be argued that the language produced is simulated and divorced from its social context. While there is great merit in analysing conversational narrative, Schiffrin notes that the interview itself is a relevant contextual factor:

The identities that we display and that others act upon during sociolinguistic interviews, and during the narratives told during such interviews, are no less situated than those whose relevance emerges during other activities (Schiffrin, 1996: 200). Although the type of discourse and identities produced may be different to those of natural conversation, they are nonetheless valid and do not occur in a contextual vacuum.

Furthermore, the type of interaction produced between the interviewer and participant is of interest in itself (Grindsted, 2005) and particularly important in the case of narrative (Mishler, 1986; Lambrou, 2003). By not divorcing the narrative episode from the interview context, and examining how meaning was negotiated and what purpose it served, the limitations of this study could be minimised. In this case, given the ethical and time constraints on recording underage adolescents, the most productive research format for this investigation was that of an interview. The focus then turned to the role of the interviewer and the impact s/he had on the development of the narrative. The following research questions were formulated:

1.   Does the interviewer have a role in the narrative?

2.   Which strategies does the interviewer use?

3.   How does the narrator respond to the interviewer's strategy use?

---

[3] Semi-structured implies a pre-determined framework with scope for participants to talk at length and pursue particular themes (Mills 2001).

5. THE ROLE OF THE NARRATOR IN RESPONSE TO THE INTERVIEWER

When narrators are asked to talk about a negative experience they have many possible responses available to them. In the first instance, there is the decision whether to tell a story conforming to the interviewer request or to withhold one. In 8/11 narratives, tellers consider the type of response they are making through pauses or direct references to this category of narratives as opposed to others, with utterances such as: "I would say the worst was…"; "not bad but…". Participants demonstrate awareness of the tellability requirements and try to select material appropriate to this task.

One of the most important features of interviewee responses is an initial refusal to narrate a worst holiday experience. In 5/11 instances, narratives are not volunteered at all by participants and 7/11 are prefaced by an initial denial of negative experience. The fact that these stories are produced in spite of the refusals may be evidence of the orientation to the interview frame and the expectations regarding interviewee role obligations, as well as age and status differences, and the interviewer's insistence on obtaining a story.

The second predominant feature within narratives is the compliance with the interviewer's request to reconstruct the story with additional details or structural components which occurs in 8/11 cases. In 4/11 cases, the addition of complication action or a resolution through prompting could be seen as a natural conversational feature where recipients initiate repair for reasons of comprehension or reportability. However, in another 4/11 cases this constitutes the repetition of large segments of the story, evidencing the interview goal of obtaining a detailed response. In all cases but one interviewees respond affirmatively, evidencing the compliance with interview obligations.

An example of a conformation to story type, a refusal and a requested reconstruction will now be discussed. To facilitate analysis, the narrative has been divided into two sections outlined in examples 1 and 2.

Example 1[4]
This narrative concerns the narrator's sister and grandmother breaking bones through falls.

```
Language: Spanish            Gender: Male
Narrator: N                  Interviewer: I            Peer: Absent
3I      =en durante tu- vaca- en alguna- vacacione-/ alguna vez que fuiste de [vacaciones
4N                                                                             [ nno: yo
5I      tu- tuviste una mala experiencia/]
6N      no tengo mala ] cuando voy en vacaciones nunca tengo un ma-
7N      exp-experienta- no trato portarme bien y todo [y ] <£ no hago problemas no
8I                  [ sí]
9N      nunca tuve uno £ > [. ] o trato trato a portarme [bien]
10I               [yeah]   [ £ £ ]
11I     <£ sí £> pero um: pero nunca te pasó algo de por ejemplo algún acciden- mala
12I     experiencia en cuanto a algún accidente: alguien se cayó [de un árbol]
13N                                                              [ no: ]
14I     alguien se rompió una pierna o un brazo [o: ] algo así/ [ o: ]
15N                                             [oh:]          [cuan]do yo estaba en
16N     Rosebud en um. ah: en Rosebud en Australia/ mi hermana se se rompió el
17N     °cómo se dice eso ah° <L1 the elbow L1> [. y ] mi abuela se rompió
18I                                             [uhm:]
```

19N   <L1 her hip L1>

3I   =on during your vaca- on one vacation/ once when you went on [vacation
4N   [nno: I
5I   did you h- have a bad experience/]
6N   no I don-t have bad] when I go on vacation I never have a ba-
7N   exp-experience- no I try to behave and everything [and] <£ I don-t cause problems no
8I   [yes]
9N   I never had one £ > [.] or I try I try to behave [well]
10I   [yeah]   [£ £]
11I   <£ yes £> but um: but nothing ever happened to you on for example an acciden- bad
12I   experience relating to an accident: someone fell out [of a tree]
13N   [no:]
14I   someone broke a leg or an arm [or:] something like that/ [or:]
15N   [oh:]   [whe]n I was in
16N   Rosebud in um. ah: in Rosebud in Australia/ my sister she she broke her
17N   °how do you say that ah° <L1 her elbow L1> [. and] my grandmother she broke
18I   [uhm:]
19N   <L1 her hip L1>

The teller is emphatic in his denial of ever having experienced a bad holiday (lines 6 to 9) employing negatives repeatedly and paraphrasing the same idea for emphasis, including a statement about his good character. The interviewer makes a second request in lines 11 to 12, showing evidence of dispreferred turn shape (Pomerantz 1984) with "<£ yes £> but" and contextualises the worst experience category through an example.

The teller again initiates a denial (line 14) but then selects narrative material to comply with the request (line 15: oh). Although he is not the protagonist, he does express a brief narrative consisting only of a complication, about his sister's broken arm and his grandmother's broken hip (lines 15 to 19).

The interaction continues in example 2 below:

Example 2
24I   aha [y me puede- expli-] eh. um eh y me. puede- explicar un poco cómo pasó eso
29N   [mi her]mana e-taba jugando en el <L1 playground/ L1> y saltó a agarrar algo/
30N   [y no] lo agarró y se cayó y se re- se rompió [.] allí y mi a-uela/ en el a- el
31I   [uhm]   [uhm]
32N   nuevo año esta-mos todo- en la playa y se cayó y se rompió <Q y y se cayó al
33N   piso se rompió pobrecita Q>
34I   ah [.] pero te te acordái que má- cosa- pasaron alrededor de [de eso/ o:]
35N   [ahm]   [no no] era-
36N   todo- accidente- no no había nada que pasó [. más o] menos
37I   [uhm oh:]
38I   oh no no hay más detalles acerca de que pasó en el día [o]
39N   [oh:] nosotro- esta-mo- con
40N   la familia: cuando Natalia se rompió. su sus um. coso ah nosotro- no esta-mo-
41N   haciendo nada sólo esta-mo- eh en el la casa de ir a la playa y esta-mo- todo- y
42N   Natalia me X <Q ay me pe:gue: Q> nada pasó pero con la abuela: nosotro-
43N   esta-mos esta-mos caminando en la playa porque cada año en nuevo año todo-
44N   vamo- caminando en la playa y todo/ y ella se cayó pobrecita y se rompió

24I   aha [and can you expla- to me] eh. um eh and. can you explain to me a little about how that happened

29N   [my sis]ter was playing in the <L1 playground/ L1> and jumped to grab something/

30N   [and she didn-t] grab it and she <u>fell</u> and she br- she broke [.] there and my <u>grandmother/</u> in the y- the

31I   [uhm]   [uhm]

32N   <u>New Year</u> we were all- at the <u>beach</u> and she <u>fell</u> and she <u>broke</u> <Q and and she fell to the

33N   ground she broke poor thing Q>

34I   ah [.] but do you you remember what oth- thing- happened in addition to [to that/ or:]

35N   [ahm]   [<u>no no</u>] it was- 36N   all   an accident- there wasn-t wasn-t anything that happened [. more or] less

37I   [uhm oh:]

38I   oh there aren-t aren-t any more details about what happened on the day [or]

39N   [oh:] we were with

40N   the family: when Natalia she broke. her her um. thing ah we were- we were not

41N   doing anything we were just eh in the the house about to go to the beach and we were- all- and

42N   Natalia X to me <Q ay I hi:t: myself Q> nothing happened but with grandmother: we-

43N   were we were walking on the beach because every year at New Years we all-

44N   go- walking on the beach and everything/and she fell down poor thing and she broke

In line 24 the interviewer requests that the narrator retell his story, this time in more detail. The narrator complies, adding both orientation information (line 29: "playground"; line 32: "beach") and complicating action (lines 29 to 30: "jumped to grab something", "she fell"; lines 32 to 33: "she fell"). The statements about the broken bones which were previously the complication are now the resolution to this elaborated version. There is also some evaluation with the statement: "poor thing" (line 33). The result is a more elaborate construction not through co-authorship as we will see below but through a direct request for reconstruction.

However the interviewer goes further to issue the request once again (lines 34), which appears to focus on the elaboration of the complication ("what oth- thing- happened in addition"). The teller seems to contextualise this question as a request for an explanation about why it happened and perhaps who was responsible (line 36: "all an accident") which reflects his initial self defence and misalignment with the interviewer in lines 7 to 9 (example 1). When the interviewer rephrases his request more specifically with the word "details" (line 38), the interviewee re-contextualises it as a request for another reconstruction and complies, with the most elaborate version yet. This features extended orientation information (lines 40, 41: "with the family", "in the house"; lines 43: "every year at New Years") without additions to the complication or resolution.

In this manner the narrator's response to the interviewer's initial request for a story and then the subsequent prompts will determine how far a narrative will develop, even when the basic complicating action is only minimal.

6. THE ROLE OF THE INTERVIEWER AS A QUESTIONER

After asking the narrator to tell his/her story, the main role of the interviewer during the narrative telling is that of questioner. However interviewers' involvement may differ, having lesser or greater participation in the event. At the lesser end of the scale no questions are asked, while at the greater end there are questions leading the direction of the narrative and negotiation of its significance (Mandelbaum, 1989). In the data 1/11 stories contain no questions, 3/11 stories contain clarification questions, 10/11 stories contain prompts to develop the story or requests to retell aspects of it through the use of open and closed questions, and 1/11 contain questions and

comments appearing to influence the unfolding of the narrative, which is a form of co-authorship. Closed questions can be seen as a means of control because they constraint the number of and length of possible responses (Grindsted, 2005).

In the following examples we will show the contrast between the same interviewer not employing any questioning strategies during one telling (i.e. example 3) and later employing several strategies (i.e. example 4) which lead to co-authorship.

Example 3
This narrative concerns a scary experience involving seeing an armed man in Chile.

Language: Spanish   Gender: Female
Narrator: N   Interviewer: I   Peer: P

```
1I    y: um: tuviste alguna mala:/ experiencia durante tu- vacaciones a Chile/
2N    um.. no mala pero eh ver tanta um. personas sin casa y la um que son pobre-
3N    [tam]bién e- como que te da un poco d- susto y tristeza [. <£ p]ero en una
4I    [hm ]                                      [ hm ]
5N    también/ £> esta-mo- afuera en el barrio y <£ pasó alguien um con una una pistola
6N    en la mano [entonce- todo X entramo- a] la casa £ pero ahora como que es
7I         [ oh:  ]
8N    chistoso pero £> [. <£ ahí: £ andamo-] corriendo para la casa £> [°pero°] eso no
9I         [ @ @ @ @ @ ]   [ oh: ]
10P                         ((it is unclear whether G is laughing))
11N   era tan malo pero la lo-: lo- cura-o- que s- sentaban en la esquina también e- como
12N   que. no y los perro- y yeah son. °un poquito malo que te da° un poco d- susto d-
13N   ir a la calle sola=
14I   =hm °ah°
```

```
1I    and: um: have you had a bad:/ experience during you- holidays to Chile/
2N    um.. not bad but eh to see so many um. homeless people and the um who are poor-
3N    [ al]so it-s like it makes you a little bit scared and sad [. <£ b]ut one time
4I    [hm]                                      [ hm ]
5N    as well/ £> we were outside in the street and <£ someone passed by um with a a pistol
6N    in their hand [so- we all X entered- ] the house £ but now it-s like it-s
7I         [ oh:  ]
8N    funny but £> [. <£ there we: £ were-] running for the house £> [°but°] that wasn-t
9I         [ @ @ @ @ @ ]   [ oh: ]
10P   ((it is unclear whether G is laughing))
11N   so bad but the the -: the- drunks- who s- sat on the corner as well i- like
12N   . no and the dogs- and yeah they are. °a little bit bad that it makes you° a little scared to-
13N   go into the street alone=
14I   =hm °ah°
```

In this example the narrator moves from a general comment regarding the request to talk about a bad experience to a specific narrative opening (line 3: "[<£ b]ut one time"). She then proceeds to tell a brief but complete narrative with a complication and evaluation and reiteration (lines 5 to 8). The interviewer responds to the dramatic high point with a minimal response (line 7) and then with laughter at the humorous evaluation given by the narrator (line 9). At the conclusion of the narrative the narrator adds other general comments, continuing her original statements (line 11).

In this instance there is sufficient narrative elaboration so that the interviewer is not required to make clarification questions, although she could have prompted the narrator to express a resolution. However in the data resolutions are not common (in 10/11 stories a clear resolution is absent) which may be related to the use of humorous anecdotes. Furthermore, the interviewer's shared cultural knowledge and experience of such incidents may mean she does not need to prompt further details. Most importantly the narrator's fluid development of the narrative and its embedding within a wider response about her experiences demonstrates her capabilities as a teller and minimises the need for and possibility of interviewer's participation.

In the next example we will analyse a) search for clarification; b) prompting strategies; and c) collaborative co-authorship.

Example 4
This narrative concerns a near case of drowning in a pool.

Language: Spanish   Gender: Female
Narrator: N   Interviewer: I   Peer: P

1I	y: a ti/ te alguna vez te pasó tuviste alguna <u>mala</u> experiencia
2N	cuando fui a Queensland um me caí
3I	<£ te caíste/ £>
4N	sí [<£ en agua/ £>]
5I	[@ @] @@@@ =
6N	= <£ X [.] y tenía toda mi <u>ropa</u> y todo eso y £> um.. no podía
7I	[@]
8N	nadar/
9I	oh no=
10N	=°sí °
11I	y de de dónde te caíste/
12N	um.. no me <u>acuerdo</u> creo que estaba jugando con mi prima y. <£ algo pasó y
13N	caí £>
14P	@
15N	[@]
16I	[en] una piscina/
17N	sí
18I	una piscina y y qué pasó alguien te: ayu[dó/]
19N	[sí] mi prima. me ayudó
20I	saltó al agua:
21N	°sí °
22I	y ella estaba vestida también/ =
23N	= sí

1I	and: you/ did something ever happen to you did you have a <u>bad</u> experience
2N	when I went to Queensland um I fell
3I	<£ you fell/ £>
4N	yes [<£ in the water/ £>]
5I	[@ @] @@@@ =
6N	= <£ X [.] and I had all my <u>clothes on</u> and all that and £> um.. I could not
7I	[@]
8N	swim/
9I	oh no=
10N	=°yes °

11I   and from from where did you fall/
12N   um.. I don-t <u>remember</u> I think I was playing with my cousin. <£ something happened and I
13N   fell £>
14P   @
15N   [@]
16I   [in] a pool/
17N   yes
18I   a pool and and what happened did someone help [you/]
19N   [yes] my cousin. helped me
20I   she jumped into the water:
21N   °yes °
22I   and was she dressed as well/ =
23N   = yes

The narrator states that she has fallen into the water (line 4) but gives little orientation information for recipient comprehension, which is a necessary requirement for narrative response (Sacks, 1974). The nature of the fall, as well as the location, is important for comprehension and this prompts the interviewer to ask for clarification in lines 11 and 16 and thus comprehend the narrative complication. From the narrator's comments about being clothed and not being able to swim, she surmises a pool must be the location, firstly asking "from where did you fall/" and then explicitly suggesting a pool. In this way she clarifies the basis of the story.

In the data, prompts are either placed after an abstract as a sequentially adjacent response to an invitation to tell a story (Sacks, 1974), or when the narrator finishes the complication section and relinquishes the floor. In the above example, the interviewer prompts the resolution of the narrative by affirmatively mirroring the narrator's answer ("a pool" line 18), and then through her open ended question ("what happened" line 18). She then goes on to ask a closed question ("did someone help [you/]" line 18), which is suggestive of a direction the narrative could take, encouraging the narrator to elaborate further. The interviewer now begins to take on an active participatory role as co-author of the narrative.

In line 19 the narrator relinquishes the floor after her brief response: "my cousin. helped me", which incorporates the interviewer's words. However the resolution is only advanced minimally, so the interviewer continues with her co-authorship strategy, now making a statement ("she jumped in the water:" line 20) and then following with another closed question ("and was she dressed as well/" line 22). The narrator responds affirmatively on both occasions but does not take the floor, thereby ratifying the interviewer as co-author. The interviewer has taken the option of leading and co-constructing the narrative episode as a response to the lack of elaboration on the part of the narrator.

7. SHOWING AFFILIATION AND INVOLVEMENT IN THE EVENT

The most common strategies used by the interviewer to indicate involvement in the narrative telling include affiliative moves such as response laughter, minimal responses and affiliative questions. These features will be briefly outlined before examples are presented.

The presence of laughter may be linked to the reportability requirement for narrative (Norrick 2004 a, b) which ensures that a story is worth telling and holding the conversational floor. When produced by recipients such as the interviewer, it may indicate ratification of the narrative as well as serving interpersonal affiliative functions. In 6/9 of the humorous anecdotes, laughter is invited by the narrator usually in the form of laugh particles in utterances prior to the narrative

high point and is mirrored by recipients. In the few cases (2/11) where the invitation is declined through silence, narrators pursue it through the repetition and paraphrasing of utterances, clarifying their point, until the recipient complies. By responding positively, the recipient sends a signal of affiliation important for the interaction. Both the interviewer and the peer choose laughter as an affiliative strategy.

Aside from laughter as a means to show affiliation, minimal responses can demonstrate interpersonal consideration towards the narrator by the interviewer or the peer. Some minimal responses (for example: "oh:") show a positive alignment to the narrator, enhancing solidarity. They can be differentiated from more predominant minimal response showing understanding of the narrative in progress (for example: "uhm"; "yeah") because they communicate an emotional reaction. They are present in 6/11 narratives, generally occurring in overlap during the climax and evaluation components.

Interviewer questions can also have an affiliative component when they show an interest in the personal outcome for the narrator or a display of consideration towards his positive face (the desire to be respected by others). This is observed in survey interviews by Houtkoop-Steenstra (1997) when interviewers change the open/closed question format to respect interviewee negative face (the desire people do not intrude in one's affair). Affective questions occur in 6/11 narratives, indicating it is an important strategy for this group of interviewers.

In the next example the use of minimal responses, affiliative questions and laughter are demonstrated. Of note is the participation of the peer as well as that of the interviewer, who adopts a similar role. Her use of affiliative comments was the only case present in the data.

Example 5
This narrative concerns being lost at Disneyland.

Language: English   Gender: Female
Narrator: N   Interviewer: I   Peer: P
1N   yeah um I would say we went to Disneyland we were in America/ a[nd] ah there
2P   [@]
3N   was like a night show of like Fantasmic or something/ and I got lost [um I got lost
4P   [oh:]
5I   [@
6N   from my parents um] for some reason I thought they-d left without me -cos I w- I
7I   @ @ @]
8N   got separated from them an- I was just so upset and everything
9I   oh:
10N   ye[ah so] [X]
11P   [ºgoodnessº]
12I   [how did they] find you
13N   um I just like kinda stood I stayed in one spot after a while an- eventually on-
14N   a lady saw me by myself/ an- she asked me how I was an- then she I don't know
15N   we just [£] <£ we found each other [eventually £>] yeah [so it wasn-t] very
16I   [uh: @@@@@] [ah:]
17P   [@ @ @ @]
18N   ni:[ce..]
19P   [<£ traumatic £>]
20N   [<£ yeah a little bit £>]
29I   [@ @ uh:] [@ @ uh:]
30P   [@ @] [@ uh:]

Sympathetic minimal responses occur three times in lines 4, 9, 11 from both the interviewer and the peer. It is the peer who affiliates in the first instance to the climax (line 4), followed by the interviewer in response to the narrator's emotive evaluation (line 9). This is followed by another overlapped affiliative comment from the peer (line 11) at which point the interviewer directs the narrative by requesting a resolution through an open-ended question (line 12). This reflects her expectations about the probable outcome but also communicates a degree of concern for the narrator's welfare. Had she not prompted a resolution with such a question it could be seen as an indication of a lack of interest, given the narrator's serious evaluation ("so upset and everything" line 8). Minimal responses such as 'oh', 'goodness' communicate a degree of emotion to the story being developed rather than serving the purpose of unfolding the resolution. When compared to other possible, more general linguistic formulations (such as "what happened"), the question "how did they find you" has more affiliative connotations.

Regarding laughter, the interviewer orients to the possibility of a humorous anecdotal climax by volunteering laugh particles (line 7). However shared laughter does not eventuate here as it is not ratified by the narrator or the peer. It is during the resolution that the narrator makes a humorous comment "we just [£] <£ we found each other eventually £>" (line 15) with laugh particles, which is accepted by both recipients, and joint laughter ensues. This affiliative focus is continued when the peer makes an evaluative comment in line 19 ("<£ traumatic £>") which paraphrases the narrator's point. Her laugh particles indicate the possibility for more joint laughter which is again only realised when the narrator agrees in the same tone (line 20), which the interviewer and peer take up (lines 29, 30).

If we consider other possible strategies for demonstrating affiliation such as explicit comments or questions regarding narrator welfare and emotions, then the examples shown here in the form of minimal responses, affective questions and response laughter only show a low degree of affiliation. However this may be interpreted as an interactional achievement given the interview context and lack of prior interpersonal relationships. By using even low affiliative strategies such as these interlocutors construct non-serious narratives and change the participation framework of the interview to maximise interpersonal interaction.

8. CONCLUSION

This manuscript shows that personal stories are at the heart of social life, allowing the unfolding of a story to take shape through joint efforts by both the interviewer and interviewee. The sharing of these stories opens a window of opportunity to gain knowledge and understanding about how individuals construct and express meaning within a socio-cultural group.

This study also reveals that the interview frame favoured a context where a set of expectations and participatory obligations were realized. Although Hispanic-Australian adolescents when asked to narrate their worst holiday appeared not to desire to do so initially, they did comply shortly after, following the interviewer's prompting strategies, which points to the interactional role that each participant played in the event.

We have shown that interviewers' participatory roles are of great importance in the development and unfolding of personal narratives. They search for clarification, co-author stories and encourage narrators in their journey of recollections of the past favouring a friendlier and less asymmetrical encounter that fosters affiliation.

Similarly, narrators also exercised their stance in the event by inviting laughter frequently. When interviewers did not reciprocate the narrators presented their views more clearly so joint laughter could ensue.

The response of recipients is crucial not only to the success of the narrative (in terms of content and status or face of the teller), but has further consequences for subsequent discourse, future recipients and future tellings (Ochs & Capps 1996:34). What is interesting about narrative is the negotiation of self in interaction with the audience.

Future studies could look at the impact of conducting narrative discourse in Spanish and English on the communicative and social competencies of Hispanic-Australian adolescents and how their narrative styles develop.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Chew, P. (1997). "Distance and familiarity in unequal dialogue:The role of alignment and style-switching", *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 10-3: 208-221.

Block, D. (1995). "Social constraints on interviews", *Prospect* 10-3: 35-48.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). "You gotta know how to tell a story: Telling, tales, and tellers in American and Israeli narrative events at dinner", *Language in Society* 22: 361-402.

Duranti, A. (1986). "The audience as co-author: An introduction", *Text* 6-3: 239-247.

Eder, D. (1988). "Building cohesion through collaborative narration", *Social Psychology Quarterly* 51-3: 225-235.

Ervin-Tripp, S., & Küntay, A. (1997). "The occasioning and structure of conversational stories", in T. Givón (ed.) *Conversation: Cognitive, communicative and social perspectives.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 133-166.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York, Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.

Goodwin, C. (1984). "Notes on story structure and the organization of participation", in J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 225-246.

Goodwin, C. (1986). "Audience diversity, participation and interpretation", *Text* 6-3: 283-316.

Grindsted, A. (2005). "Interactive resources used in semi-structured research interviewing", *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 1015-1035.

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1997). "Being friendly in survey interviews" *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 591-623.

Kjaerbeck, S. and Asmuss B. (2005). "Negotiating meaning in narratives: An investigation of the interactional construction of the punchline and the post punchline sequences" *Narrative Inquiry* 15-1: 1-24.

Johnson, G.C. (2006). "The discursive construction of teacher identities in a research interview", in A. DeFina, D. Schiffrin & M. Bamberg (eds.) *Discourse and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 188-232.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English Vernacular.* Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lambrou, M. (2003). "Collaborative oral narratives of general experience: When an interview becomes a conversation", *Language and Literature* 12-2: 153-174.

Lerner, G. (1992). "Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter", *Qualitative Sociology* 15-3: 247-271.

Linde, C. (1993). *Life stories: The creation of coherence*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Mandelbaum, J. (1987). "Couple sharing stories", *Communication Quarterly* 35-2: 144-170.

Mandelbaum, J. (1989). "Interpersonal activities in conversational storytelling" *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 53. Spring, 114-126.

Mills, J. (2001). "Self-construction through conversation and narrative in interviews" *Educational Review* 53-3: 285-301.

Mishler, E. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Monzoni, C.(2005). "The use of interjections in Italian conversation", in U. Quasthoff & T. Becker (eds.) *Narrative interaction*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Norrick, N. (2004a). "Humor, tellability, and conarration in conversational storytelling", *Text* 24-1: 79-111.

Norrick, N. (2004b). "Interaction in the telling and retelling of interlaced stories: The co-construction of humorous narratives", in U. Quasthoff & T. Becker (eds.) *Narrative Interaction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 263-283.

Ochs, E. and Capps L. (1996). "Narrating the self". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25: 19-43.

Ochs, E. and Capps L. (2001). *Living narrative: Creating lives in everyday storytelling.* Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1994). "Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes" in J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis, 7*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 57-101.

Sacks, H. (1974). "An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation", in R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds.) *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 337-353

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Cambridge, MA, Blackwell Publishers.

Schiffrin, D. (1996). "Narrative as self-portrait: Sociolinguistic constructions of identity", *Language in Society* 25: 167-203.

Shuman, A. (1986). *Storytelling rights*. Cambridge, The University of Cambridge.

Thornborrow, J., Coates J. (2005). "The sociolinguistics of narrative: identity, performance and culture", in J. Thornborrow & J. Coates (eds.) *The sociolinguistics of narrative.* Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1-16.