



Nextness and story organization: 'my day' sequences in parent-child interaction

Kim, Y., & Carlin, A. P. (2022). Nextness and story organization: 'my day' sequences in parent-child interaction. *Text & Talk*, 43(1), 21-43. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2020-0137>

[Link to publication record in Ulster University Research Portal](#)

Published in:
Text & Talk

Publication Status:
Published online: 07/03/2022

DOI:
[10.1515/text-2020-0137](https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2020-0137)

Document Version
Author Accepted version

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Ulster University's Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Ulster University's institutional repository that provides access to Ulster's research outputs. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact pure-support@ulster.ac.uk.

TEXT & TALK SUBMISSION

Author 1

Younhee Kim
University of Macau
Department of English
E21-4105
Avenida da Universidade
Taipa, Macau, SAR China
Email: yhkim@um.edu.mo
Phone: +853 8822-8287
Orcid: 0000-0001-7393-7767

Author 2 (corresponding author)

Andrew P. Carlin
Ulster University
School of Education
Cromore Road
Coleraine
United Kingdom
apcarlin@gmail.com
Orcid: 0000-0001-5138-9384

Title: Nextness and story organization: ‘My day’ sequences in parent-child interaction

Short title: Nextness and story organization

Bionotes

Younhee Kim received her PhD in Second Language Acquisition from University of Hawai'i at Mānoa and is currently an assistant professor at the University of Macau. Her research interests include Second Language Acquisition/Learning, Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, interaction with and among children, and Teacher Education. She has published various book chapters and articles in journals such as *Applied Linguistics*, *East Asian Pragmatics*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, and *Journal of Teacher Education*. Address for correspondence: Department of English, Faculty of Arts & Humanities, University of Macau, Avenida da Universidade, Taipa, Macau SAR, China. Email: yhkim@um.edu.mo

Andrew P. Carlin received his PhD in Sociology from the University of Stirling and lectures at Ulster University. His research interests include the Social Organization of Scholarly Communication, Disciplinarity and Interdisciplinarity, Disciplinary contexts for Teaching, Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, Sociology of Information, and conceptual analysis. He is co-editor of the book series *Directions in Ethnomethodology & Conversation Analysis* (Routledge) and co-editor of the *International Handbook of Ethnomethodology* (in press, Routledge). Address for correspondence: School of Education, Ulster University, Cromore Road, Coleraine BT52 1SA, UK. Email: apcarlin@gmail.com

Nextness and story organization: ‘My day’ sequences in parent-child interaction

Abstract

In this paper we offer a longitudinal Conversation Analysis of talk lasting 18 months between a father and son, which reveals changes in the child’s level of Interactional Competence (IC). We propose an index of developing IC based upon Sacks’ distinction between “invited” and “volunteered” stories. While stories have a “socialization function” we suggest stories may be tracked in terms of IC also. What has been called “today narrative” routines (“What did you do at school today”, etc.), initiated by the father, predominate in a series of conversations. The analysis reveals how the child is encouraged to take extended turns through the father’s questions and comments, which are developed into a storytelling sequence. We observe that the child’s responses to the initial inquiries become more elaborate over time. Furthermore, there is a gradual resistance to the invited story format because it inhibits how the child organizes his stories. Volunteered stories obtain a more personal ‘voice’. The paper showcases the nexus between socialization and interactional competence.

Keywords

Interactional competence | Invited Stories | Nextness | Progressivity | Socialization | Topic |
Volunteered Stories

1. Introduction

In this paper we look at “invited” stories as a story format – how these are scaffolded and collaboratively produced (Kim & Crepaldi 2021) – and the occurrence of identifiable conversational “objects” within stories. The presentation of story-able objects by a very young child suggests reflexive links between the content of a story and its production, and between interactional competence (henceforth, IC) and socialization. The interdisciplinary contours of our inquiry prompted us to ask, What is the nature of this nexus between socialization and IC? Beyond an age-related bracket to socialization (Mackay 1974), is there a discipline-specific preference for one term over another? In other words, is this nexus simply terminological, or is there conceptual discrimination?

The data which we shall be looking at in this paper are conversations between a father (*Daddy*) and child (*Harry*).¹ We observe in our data that these conversationalists regularly engage in the telling and receipt of stories, which allows us to catch a glimpse of particularized socialization functions in Daddy’s requirements for the telling of a story. In the data we hear Daddy attempting to instruct Harry that there are preferences within conversations. The glimpse of this “socialization function” is made available through the longitudinal aspect of the data under analysis in this paper.

Discussing a “socialization function” observable in Daddy’s treatment of Harry’s accounts bears upon the conversation-analytic concerns with “nextness” and “progressivity”, which will be discussed in Section 2.3. We argue that Daddy’s treatment of Harry’s accounts enables us to witness socialization into a culture, which “does not merely fill brains in roughly the same way, it fills them so that they are alike in fine detail” (Sacks 1992: 245).

¹ Harry is a pseudonym. Throughout this paper we use “Daddy” as this is Harry’s preferred address term for his father.

When one approaches socialization as happening in and through interaction, one sees a reflexive relationship between IC and socialization: it is through socialization that IC is acquired while at the same time, it is through IC, which is locally produced *in situ*, that socialization takes place. In this paper, we treat IC both as a product and medium of socialization (Lee 2006), thereby blurring the boundary between IC and socialization. While these have been treated separately in disciplinary domains, such separation may be artificial (Carlin & Kim 2021) and disguises the co-incidence of these concepts in the literature. In this paper we are making explicit a connection between linguistics and sociology. This connection extends “language socialization” because we are not looking at “language acquisition as a socializing process” (Blum-Kulka & Snow 2002: 3) but at the socialization/IC nexus.

The structure of this paper follows the chronological organization of our data. Longitudinal data identify stories solicited by a “How was your day”-type question, which are intriguing for consideration of socialization and IC, and afford examination of stories as sites of socialization. The sequential organization of talk allows appreciation of how a child’s IC changes over time. Furthermore, the reception of story content makes visible what we call “particularized socialization functions”. Accordingly, our literature review (Section 2) attends to data-relevant issues of socialization and IC (2.1); story structures (2.2); and the generic yet implicit concerns within CA regarding “nextness” and “progressivity” (2.3). After briefly outlining the data and methodology (Section 3), the data analyses (Section 4) follow the temporally unfolding of conversational phenomena. These include the socialization work of telling stories, i.e., instructing a child as to how a story should be told (4.1); the sequencing of activities (4.2); the production of lists of activities as indices of IC (4.3); and changes in the use of story formats – from invited stories to a mix of invited and volunteered stories (4.4). Section 5 offers a discussion of key findings and the conclusion.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Socialization and Interaction Competence

When children learn language in interaction with other social members, most prominently through engagement in interaction with their parents and other family members, they learn not only linguistic features such as grammatical resources of the language but also to be a “speaker of a culture” (Nguyen 2012). This idea has been most saliently represented by the framework of Language Socialization. The proposal that “the process of acquiring language is embedded in and constitutive of the process of becoming socialized to be a competent member of a social group” (Ochs & Schieffelin 2017: 5) has been prominent within child language learning research (Cook-Gumperz 1986; Garrett 2005; Schieffelin & Ochs 1986).

On the other hand, there have been a growing number of studies from an EM/CA (Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis) approach to children’s everyday interactions (Bateman 2015; Filipi 2019; Keel 2016; Kim 2018; Theobald and Danby 2017), e.g., the reading of a story at bedtime (Tolmie & Rouncefield 2013); at mealtimes (Keel 2016); during selection of preferred items from the produce aisle in a supermarket (Goodwin & Cekaite 2018); during participation in medical consultations (Stivers & Majid 2007); and in occasions of ‘co-presence’ with other children (Kim 2018). In these sites, we see socialization in action via instructional features of routinized activities: the development of ‘life skills’ such as cooperation with others, learning to share time and resources, savvy shopping, washing hands before meals, cleaning teeth at bedtimes, appropriate bedtime behaviour, appropriate and inappropriate manners of talking with others, etc. While language use *per se* is not the direct object of investigation in these studies, the studies inevitably examine language use as part of socialization occurring in different settings. Our study fits a growing literature that looks at

stories as socialization practices in granular detail (Evaldsson & Abreu Fernandes 2019; Ochs, Smith & Taylor 1989; Ochs & Taylor 1992; Ochs, Taylor & Smith 1992).

As Garfinkel & Sacks (2017) argue, central to becoming a competent member of a society lies “mastery of language”. Being a competent member of society entails being able to use the language in a way that is understandable/recognizable by other members of the society, which in turn necessitates acquisition of common-sense knowledge and interpretive practices needed to competently use natural language. As Heritage (1984: 239) observes, “the acquisition of interactional competence and the common-sense knowledge gained in and through such competence [...] constitute[s] the core of childhood socialization.” What we attempt to do in this paper is to look at the telling of stories in parent-child interaction as sites for socialization where children learn how to tell and receive stories. In doing this, we take an intrinsically data-based approach to socialization, evidenced by people’s naturally occurring talk. We see socialization as being based in and through interaction (Kidwell 2013). Rather than endorsing a processual model or seeking to identify socialization per se, which glosses rather than explicates persons’ changing orientations to settings, we may adapt the proposal above (Ochs & Schieffelin 2017: 5) to say that we are looking at linguistic actions “constitutive of the *practices* of becoming socialized”. In doing so, we can make a connection between the development of IC and socialization (Ochs 1991).

As a concept, IC has a rich history (Hymes 1972; Mehan 1980; Young 2011). The concept emerged partly as a response to the criticisms of communicative competence (Hymes 1972), which was itself a radical breakaway from the then-mainstream paradigm of linguistic competence (Chomsky 1965). Responding to criticisms levelled at monologic and individualistic nature embedded in the conceptualization of communicative competence, interactional competence incorporated a more “dialogic, distributed and locally contingent view ...with a focus on *in situ* social practices” (Pekarek-Doehler 2019: 28). This

conceptualization of IC is more in line with, and possibly influenced by, ethnomethodology's understanding of members' methods (Garfinkel 1967), i.e., known in common among members of a group, and thus enable members to organize their actions in mutually recognizable ways.

2.2. Story Structures

In this paper we consider particular story structures identified by Sacks (1974) as indices of IC.

Sacks (1992) made a distinction between “invited” and “volunteered” stories – though, with notable exceptions (Cuff & Francis 1978; Watson 1990), this distinction has not been subject to as much rigorous analytic attention as expected. The distinction relates to constraints these story formats impose on tellers and recipients. A problem with invited stories is how these may produce difficulties for the compliance with storytelling (Cuff & Francis 1978). IC enfolds the treatment of an invitation (either accept or decline) but, in the case of accepting an invitation to tell a story, it means telling a story that is recognized as a story that adheres to the terms of the invitation. As shown in Cuff & Francis' (1978) work on invited stories of marriage breakdown, it may be the case that the invitation to tell the story sets lineaments on the terms or relevance of the story, to which the teller may not have wished to conform when they accepted the invitation to tell their story. For example, the invitation would require a starting point, yet this is not necessarily the starting point for the teller.

In the corpus of data that we shall be looking at here, one routinized story format was an invited story. Daddy would ask his son, Harry, to tell him what he had been doing that day – a particular format identified as a “today narrative” (Blum-Kulka 1993, 1997). Our data

presents this particular structure of talk as recurring interactional routines in the conversation between the father and the son.

Today narratives are story formats referring to tellings of the events of the day, which “act as a critical socializing context for the acquisition of narrative skills” (Blum-Kulka 1993: 376). As a socializing device, today narratives “provide contexts of socialization in regard both to the choice of acceptable topics and to appropriate ways of telling” (Blum-Kulka 1993). Stories are, then, vehicles that may be used for socialization (Miller et al. 2011).

2.3. Nextness and Progressivity

The notion of “nextness” (Schegloff 2002) has been fundamental from the outset of CA and Harry’s stories as told to Daddy in our data elucidate this concern. Nextness is articulated in different ways and is predicated upon the explication of a turn-taking system for conversation. It finds expression in adjacency pair structures (Sacks 1992), for instance; the “why that now” problem (Schegloff & Sacks 1973); and provides for the ascription of “troubles”, such as impugning a member’s IC, based upon or informed by how appropriate an action is seen to be as a next action. The notion of “nextness” is also bound up with story structures; according to Sacks (1974: 337):

“This telling [of a joke] is composed, as for stories, of three serially ordered and adjacently paired types of sequences which we call the preface, the telling, and the response sequences.”

Schegloff (2002) argued that “nextness” was, through and through, a sequential matter, whereby sequencing exhibited courses of action and was not limited, say, to actual next actions in a sequence but more accurately found to be an ordering of events “in the proper sequence” (Schegloff 2002: 375). Schegloff goes on to suggest that events that are not

ordered in a recognizably proper sequence are characteristic of young children's stories, such as "First he ran away from home, then he took a horse, then he went to the city, then he picked his nose" (Schegloff 2002: 376). In our data, we see what Schegloff means by the inchoate nature of "nextness", which he is careful not to confine to conversational activities (Schegloff 2002: 375). A reported action is not necessarily the immediately following action, or "next", but the (observation or) reporting of such actions might be recognized by others as a "proper" sequence of actions. In our data, we find a double hermeneutic of "nextness": in the sequential organization of conversational actions, and in the narrative reporting of actions that may (or may not) discriminate a sequence of actions.²

Progressivity is another core concern within CA, related to "nextness", a preference for "'next parts' of structured units (e.g., turns, turn-constructive units like sentences, stories, etc.) to come next" (Schegloff 1979: 268). The relevance of the notion of progressivity to the current paper is related to Daddy's attempts at repairs of Harry's accounts. We often hear Daddy instructing Harry, both explicitly and implicitly, to attend to the conventions and procedural rules that taking a turn at talk requires. For instance, one of the turn-taking implications of storytelling in conversation is recognized to be the temporary suspension of turn-taking in order that the teller can take an extended turn, in which to tell the story (Sacks 1992).³ As we will see in our data Daddy is engaged in attempts to keep Harry's talk on a consistent topic.

² Although we locate our analysis within a single corpus of data, the notion of "nextness" provides linguistic and social organizational sense to cross-data approaches, i.e. those which use a plurality of data corpora. In addition, rather than being prescriptive regarding what constitutes a story for analysts, what a story "must have" (Siromaa 2012: 527), the notion of "nextness" encourages us to look instead at how utterances are treated by an interlocutor.

³ This is not to say that the telling of a story is a matter for a single storyteller: stories are collaborative productions (Kim and Carlin 2022a; Lerner 1992).

As such, we are observing socialization-in-action. ‘Socialization’ is an “over-used” term (Carlin & Kim 2021: 8); here we refer to the in situ instructional properties of talk that ‘folds back’ upon itself. Longitudinal CA data afford consideration of socialization in language practices, including answering questions, list-construction, taking blocs of talk, organizing details that constitute stories, which in this paper we connect with developing IC.

3. Data and Methodology

The data we are working with are audio-recordings of “‘parent’-‘child’ interaction” (see Jefferson [2004] on the deliberate problematization of this category pair). Audio-recordings capture and preserve “naturally organized ordinary activities” (Lynch 2002), and these are methodologically sufficient for the study of a child’s developing IC, as we see expressed through stories. The recordings were made at home every two weeks with the same participants over a period of eighteen months, and this longitudinal research design made available for observation changes in interactional practices.

The researchers were not present during the recording sessions: these were “self-administered” by the participants, who were given a recording device to preserve conversations at regular intervals (Carlin & Kim 2021: 5). Data practices, including collection, storage and retention, are in line with research ethics protocols. The father was responsible for consenting on his son’s behalf. The father was given the option of audio or video recording and for privacy reasons he opted for audio. Details have been changed to protect identities.

As a broad gloss, longitudinal conversation analysis allows us to see developments such as the iteration of Question-Answer sequences, which become more elaborate story-able objects or “invited stories”, moving to the initiation or “volunteered stories”. Longitudinal conversation analysis affords examination of recurrent practices of talk between the same

participants and to appreciate how these recurrent practices develop chronologically. For the practical purposes of this paper we are taking a ‘slice’ of the data: of the conversations that were recorded, not all of these included today narrative structures, “What did you do at school today?”, or attempts to answer such questions. We are taking these “What did you do [at school] today” fragments as an “occasioned corpus” (Zimmerman & Pollner 1971) from within the wider collection of recordings that constitute our data, because these seem to exhibit socialization-in-action. By this we mean that some of the data – putatively at least, and by virtue of the structure of the talk produced by Harry and his Daddy – were amenable to collocation within the wider collection of recordings between them: “a scan of the corpus yielded a series of recurrent, positioned elements which could be grouped into a rough segmental sort of order” (Jefferson & Lee 1992: 522). Moreover, these were available to a longitudinal abstraction: as retrievable data, they could be replayed and subjected to careful analysis, and such analysis could be tracked chronologically. Hence, what our data do bear is the search for what Schegloff calls an “empirically grounded account of action” (Schegloff 1996: 174).

4. Findings

Tracking recurrent episodes in longitudinal data allowed us to observe changes in the ways the structures of talk are organized. In summary, first, we observe how the child’s initially short reports of activities are elaborated collaboratively into telling sequences with the parent’s questioning and scaffolding, which we argue serves to help the child to learn to take extended turns for tellings. Second, these question-answer (QA) sequences become invited stories. While invited stories are taken to be an index for development from those QA sequences, they do not necessarily arrive in a delineated manner. We present a case where the child’s attempt at storytelling ends up failing to achieve intersubjectivity (though he did

manage to take an extended turn), i.e., a story which fails to be recognizable as a story about a particular topic, possibly due to the fact that it was not organized in a recognizably “proper” order. Lastly, we note increased incidence of volunteered stories.

4.1 Socializing properties of “what did you do at school today?”

In taking IC both as a product and medium of socialization, we see implicit socialization going on by how Daddy treats Harry’s response to his inquiry of “what did you do at school today?” Excerpt 1 presents a rather “typical”⁴ sequential organization of today narrative (see Appendix for transcript symbols).

Excerpt 1: (3 years, 6 months)

1 D: Huh huh, so why don' [t you] tell me=
2 H: [how]
3 H: =hmm=
4 D: =what you did [at] school today
5 H: [.h]
6 H: I .h recordant, .h then I play .h computers.
7 I (0.3) eat pandas, .h then I sepray,
8 .h then I drink .h water, then I play, I go home,
9 .h then I see with mommy, I s:leep
10 (1.0)
11 D: okay
12 so you just told me what you [were doing] all=.
13 H: [h:]
14 D: =da:y
15 H: we:
16 D: whe- when you were at school today
17 >what d-< what did you play?
18 (1.2)
19 H: no when we-
20 D: Harry come over here!
21 H: I- I- I- play wid (0.5) s:chool:l?
21 D: yeah what did you play at school.
22 What[did you do.]=
23 H: [re::co:r]der
24 D: =[w- w- what]=

⁴ We address the notion of “typicality” elsewhere (Kim & Carlin 2022b).

25 H: [re:cor:der,]
 26 D: =what recorder.
 27 H: recorder cam- (0.3) computer.
 28 D: oh the computer.
 29 H: the one like this one.
 30 Recorder.
 31 D: what did you do on it. Did you:
 32 (1.0)
 33 what did you do
 34 on the computer
 35 H: I type some- (0.7) svideo fo:r you.

Here, in response to Daddy's question, "what did you do at school today?" (line 4), Harry lists a series of activities he had done that day (lines 6-9) though not all of them are intelligible (e.g., "I .h recordant", "I sepray"). Daddy's formulation ("so you just told me what you were doing all day") (line 12) is interesting in that it comments on the way Harry answered the question rather than responding to the contents of what he did. Then, Daddy asks another question that narrows down the scope of the question to what he did at school (lines 16 and 17).⁵ Harry responds by deploying a rather general description "I- play wid (0.5) school?" (line 21), in response to which Daddy once again asks a narrowing down question (line 22). Through a few more rounds of questions, they reach an understanding that Harry did/watched something on computer regarding "teaching occupation" (this part not shown in Excerpt 1).

When the inquiry "what did you do at school today?" is asked at dinner table among competent members of the society, listing all they did during the day is not an expected answer (unless they are deliberately making a joke out of it). Competent members would respond to the query by highlighting what they take as significant or a major happening of the day. Responding to the query "what did you do at school today?" involves an effort to find

⁵ According to this version of the question, the last three activities in Harry's previous answer will be excluded.

what is reportable/tellable. What we see Daddy doing in Excerpt 1 as he deals with Harry's response is gently instructing Harry on an appropriate way of responding to a question, i.e., socializing the child into unspecified expectations and preferences embedded in conversation.

4.2 Nextness and “varying degrees of success”

The notion of “nextness” involves an ordering of events “in the proper sequence” (Schegloff 2002: 375). We noted earlier that listing a series of activities is a characteristic organization of Harry's stories about his day.

Excerpt 2: (3 years, 6 months)

- 1 D: =what did you do [at] school today.
- 2 H: I .h recordant, .h then I play .h computers.
- 3 I (0.3) eat pandas, .h then I sepray, .h then
- 4 I drink .h water, .h then I play, .h I go home,
- 5 .h then I see with mommy, I s:leep.

Harry lists a series of activities that he had done at school that day. Later, Harry threads an enumeration of activities with temporal markers (“then” in Excerpt 2, “then after that” in Excerpt 3 below) indicating that there had been a sequential organization to his activities. Of course, as analysts we cannot say definitively what these markers provide. It is a matter of conjecture whether these activities obtained a “nextness” – that there was a proper, e.g. chronological sequence to these; or, whether Harry was orientating to the telling of a story, the today narrative, i.e. are Harry's “then” markers (Excerpt 2, lines 2-5) and “after” (Excerpt 3) lists used as prepositioned sequential references or a realization that telling a story involves the reporting of activities as being sequentially organized.

The ‘conjectural’ status (Garfinkel 2002) of our observation regarding the ambiguous nature of Harry's temporal markers should not obscure a further observation, however.

Whether Harry was attempting to conform to a preference for organizing a narrative in temporal terms, or whether he was actually reporting a chronological sequence of activities, this indexes a shift from enumerating random activities to presenting them as sequentially organized.

Excerpt 3: (3 years, 9 months)

```
1 D:  how was your day today.
→ 2 H:  I (.) mt I run to play the playground
→ 3     and after that I .h I go(t) outdoor
→ 4     then(.) em I .h I play in the hot sun,
5     then after that, I bathe and I pass urine
6     and after (ti) I slee::p
7     and after this I learn more mo:re catfish
8     and after this like [that >cockroaches<
9 D:                                     [hey wh-
```

Elsewhere (Kim & Carlin 2022b) we have argued that Harry’s enumeration of activities shows a development into three-parted structure (Jefferson 1990). Compared to Excerpt 2 (when Harry was three and a half years old), in Excerpt 3, there is an emerging structure of three-parted-ness in Harry’s listing (arrowed). In Harry’s list, one recognizable activity (*playing outdoors*) is expressed through conceptualizing it into three sub-components: run to the playground, go outdoors and play in the hot sun (lines 2-4). Similarly, the subsequent three activities form one recognizable activity (bathe, pass urine, sleep) of break time.

While we find this emerging structure developing in Harry’s stories about his day (particularly at the level of list-construction), we also find excerpts that showcase that a lack of recognizably proper sequencing leads to a failure of obtaining intersubjectivity. While we do not want to reify the stretch of talk that the inquiry, “what did you do at school today?”, or “how was your day?” engenders, we find Blum-Kulka’s (1993: 376) reference that “the ritual can be performed with varying degrees of success” to be a fascinating formulation for what

we take to be a member's matter, i.e. something to be formulated by the parties to the talk that constitutes our data.

In the following sequence, Harry's story regarding 'a boy who threw tissue paper all over the floor' ends with Daddy's announcement of non-understanding of the story.

Excerpt 4: (3 years, 9 months)

01 D: He's got bloo:d. Where?
02 H: Mouth. Becu- he throw throw
03 all over the floor, then he sleep, I put
04 (1.9)
05 D: Okay okay strange. What did the teacher do?
06 H: He-, he pick up, (0.4) uh he- he pick up,
07 was like thi:s=
08 D: =Sit ↑do:wn
09 H: He- he- pick up one by one ((sniffing))
10 lei becu- he cannot walk becu- his,
11 his legs (0.5) is blood. His, (.) his leg
12 don't have blood, He's sleep. (.) His legs
13 don't have blood,
14 but (.) his mouth have (.) blood
15 D: He fell over?
16 H: ((sniffle)) Yah. I carry 'm thee-
17 ((tongue click)) his (0.4) hi- He's he:re,
18 becu (0.6) becu- (1.6) every children
19 can .h vake him beco, .hh hh becu he cannot
20 (.) walk he close his (.) Eyes,
21 becu- (.) blood all over
22 D: Alright.
23 I've got no idea what you're talkin' about, Harry.
24 Why don't you talk about thee uh, (0.7)
25 what else,
26 what did you do at school to(hh)day?

Throughout Harry's telling, Daddy's effort to make sense of Harry's narrative is visible through his understanding check questions (lines 1, 5, 15). However, the story ends up with the recipient's announcement of incomprehension (line 23), which is subsequently followed by a suggestion that they talk about something else (lines 24-26). Harry's description of what had happened (lines 9-14, 1-21) includes self-repair and contradiction, e.g., while first he says

“his legs (0.5) is blood” (line 11), he subsequently makes a statement that contradicts this, “his leg don’t have blood” (lines 12-13). Moreover, it is not clear whether he meant “he’s sleep” or “his sleep (possibly a mispronunciation of “sleeve”) by the utterance (line 12). Partly due to the age-related limitation of Harry’s linguistic ability and partly due to the ambiguous and unclear link between events described in each Turn Constructional Unit (e.g., he cannot walk, he closes his eyes, blood all over, lines 16-21), the story fails to obtain intelligibility for the recipient Daddy.

Excerpt 4 brings us back to Schegloff’s (2002) observation that events that are not ordered in a recognizably proper sequence are characteristic of young children’s stories. Harry’s narrative in Excerpt 4 (particularly lines 2-3, 9-14, 16-21) is disorganized. The child is taking extended turns, or a series of turns that, for him, amounts to an extended turn, but these fail to display an ordering of events “in the proper sequence”. As much as the notion of “nextness” is predicated on the turn-taking system, it also applies to sequencing actions in narrative. It is in this sense that one can argue that Excerpt 4 presents a case, for Daddy, with less degree of success.

4.3 Listing of actions developed into telling sequences

In our data, we found that Harry tended to respond to Daddy’s question “what did you do at school today?” or “how was your day?” by listing a series of actions. This pattern was most salient in the first half of the recording period. Subsequent sequential development revealed that one of those activities listed by Harry gets zoomed in on through Daddy’s questions and developed into telling sequences (Takagi 2019). Excerpt 5 illustrates this.

Excerpt 5: (3 years, 9 months)

18 D: Okay (0.5) anyway, (0.4) did you go to school today?

19 H: Yeah
 20 (0.5)
 21 D: En how was it?
 22 (0.4)
 23 H: I wander by the (.) playground,
 24 en after this, I- (.) I visit him again,
 25 en af[ter
 26 D: [Harry, sit down please
 27 H: en after (.) this, he just run,
 28 I visit him then, ((sniffing))
 29 he g[o toilet
 30 D: [who who who
 31 Who you talking about?
 32 (1.0)
 33 H: A bo:y, boy
 34 D: You visit a boy?
 35 H: A boy who- who who who trow the tissue paper,
 36 that one Jeremy
 37 D: Jeremy?
 38 H: Yeah
 39 D: Why did he throw the (.) tissue paper?
 40 H: He throw [the
 41 D: [Harry, sit down
 42 H: He throw the (.) all the f- all the the- all
 43 ((coughing))
 44 all over them (.) ((sniffing)) floor,
 45 becuz he he has a snot, (.)
 46 so he he decided to take tissue pa(.)per
 47 then he throw all over ((sniffing)) the floor there
 48 then, after this he suddenly, then he got blood en
 49 after this blood (put it like this)

Prior to the excerpt, Daddy was asking Harry why he had pen marks all over his leg. Now Daddy makes a topic-shift move by asking how Harry's day was (lines 18 and 21). Harry initially produces a list of a series of activities (lines 23-24 and 27-28), in the course of which Daddy initiates repairs on the person reference that is mentioned recurrently, "him" (lines 30-31). Harry provides a response, but this initial repair "a boy, boy" does not provide much more than previously known ("him") and Daddy seeks more information by piecing together Harry's previous list and the repaired noun, "you visit a boy?" (line 34). This elicits more

details about the boy as Harry elaborates on the initial trouble source, “a boy who throw the tissue paper, that one Jeremy” (lines 35-36).

The order in which Harry deploys the linguistic resources for person reference is interesting to note. The recognitional description “a boy who trow the tissue paper” is followed by a deictic expression, “that one”, which is, in turn, updated to a proper noun, “Jeremy”. Sacks and Schegloff (1979) observe that a proper name is preferred over recognitional descriptions as a resource for initial recognitional reference for person, which means that the default means for recognitional reference is a name and, when the name fails to achieve recognition, recognitional description will be deployed. While the order in which Harry structured his reference is a reverse of the reported default way for person reference, one might suspect that this inverting order of progressive recognitionals reflects the saliency of the event for Harry. Another repair initiation, “Jeremy?” (line 37) and why-question (line 39) serve to elicit further details about what happened concerning the boy, which amounts to forming a story. As can be seen in Excerpt 5, often, the initial listing of activities in short forms is developed into storytelling sequences facilitated and prompted by Daddy’s questions.

Takagi (2019) illustrates how reference to children’s past actions in the format of [(X) did (Y)] engenders opportunities for participants to develop telling sequences and how this serves to form a locus for socialization. Similarly, in our data, we hear Daddy attempting to instruct conversational preferences that he wants Harry to go into. For instance, when he is asked to talk about his day, about what he did during the day, this requires of Harry that he takes an ‘extended’ turn at talk, ‘extended’ not only in the form of listing activities, but in the sense of choosing what is reportable and elaborating on it. This is achieved not by telling the child explicitly “you have to take an extended turn”, i.e., propositional rule learning (Coulter 1983), but through the *in situ* instructional properties of talk that ‘folds back’ upon itself, i.e.,

collaboratively co-constructing the telling sequence with the child, and thus engaging the child in the co-constructed telling sequences.

4.4 From invited to volunteered story format

Earlier (Section 2.2), we discussed today narratives as invited stories.

With those considerations as background, we note a move to volunteered stories as one possible index for IC development in our data. In Excerpt 6, Daddy invites Harry to tell him more about his day by describing his daily routine when he goes to the second childcare centre, after the morning kindergarten is finished (lines 175 and 178).

Excerpt 6: (4 years, 4 months)

175 D: Harry, [so after kindergarden today, you went=
176 H: [yea
177 D: =to, (.) thee uh::
178 H: Toy uh=
179 D: =Kcare?
:
:
188 D: And after that's finished, [you] go to play (.)=
189 H: [yeah]
190 D: =[with] the other children.
191 H: [in::n]
192 H: I- i- i go play (xx)
193 then I go to another work place.
194 I go to to- to to- to kate- i go to Kcare
195 then i-
196 then then i walk there
197 then after that i'll-
198 then i drewn a bird nest
199 and after that, we- we- we-
200 we- i- i- i rush >to to< to go there.
201 I rush I- I- I-
202 I s- I tried to smash my feet on the ground.
203 D: right.
204 H: .hh .hh Yeah=
205 D: =is your friend Ryan in Kcare?
206 H: Ur:m yes
207 I- I smashed my f- feet

208 because I was really urgent
209 I wanted to (.) pee
210 but the teacher didn't let me.
211 D: Why didn't she let you pee?
212 H: Because it was GOing home time.
213 So- so I was so URgent.
214 D: So you ra:n to Kcare and you went to the toilet.

The progressivity of the sequence is briefly interrupted by Harry's repair initiation "kindergarten means what?" (line 180, not shown in the transcript), which is resumed in line 188. Daddy's invitation to talk about his time in the afternoon day care center echoes what has been reported in CA research as a 'fishing device' (Pomerantz 1980). By producing a statement that concerns Harry's activity, Daddy is indirectly seeking more information on this from Harry. This is taken up by Harry, who responds to it by enumerating his activities (lines 192-202). We note that in Harry's list, the last activity ("I rush to go there") is elaborated further ("I tried to smash my feet on the ground" line 202). This is acknowledged by Daddy (line 203) and once more by Harry (line 204). As we have examined before, then, Daddy asks a question which concerns one detail which might potentially develop into a story ("is your friend Ryan in Kcare?" line 205).

We can see that Daddy's question interrupts the progressivity of Harry's talk because he provides a minimal response to this ("ur:m, yes"), which serves a dual purpose of answering the question while orienting to "preferences for agreement and contiguity" (Sacks 1987). This is followed swiftly by recycling the detail he was elaborating in the previous turn ("I- I smashed my f- feet"), adding the reason for this behaviour ("because I was really urgent", line 208). Harry continues further telling "I wanted to pee but the teacher didn't let me", which elicits Daddy's question (line 211). In retrospect, "I tried to smash my feet on the ground" (line 202) projects that there is a story to be told and serves as a story preface.

Compared with earlier instances of today narrative, e.g. Extract 1 in the later periods of recording, e.g Extract 6, we find that Harry volunteers more stories on his own terms, i.e., there is less reliance on the parent's questions for producing a story. The longitudinal design of the data collection affords comparisons, e.g. in Excerpt 5 above Harry provides increasing amount of detail in response to Daddy's scaffolding inquiries; seven months later, Excerpt 6 shows Harry making moves to volunteered story formats as well as accepting invitations to tell stories about his day.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

As a broad gloss, longitudinal conversation analysis allows us to see developments such as the iteration of Question-Answer sequences, which become more elaborate story-able objects or "invited stories", moving to the initiation or "volunteered stories". Longitudinal conversation analysis affords examination of recurrent practices of talk between the same participants and to appreciate how these recurrent practices develop chronologically.

In examining the IC/socialization nexus, our findings can be summarized into two main themes: 1) tracing and identifying developmental features of IC in storytelling sequences in longitudinal talk between a father and a son; and 2) illustrating how implicit socialization is going on in and through storytelling sequences in parent-child interaction. The latter serves to reconstruct the link between socialization and IC. Elsewhere (Kim & Carlin 2022b) we elaborate the developmental trajectory of IC using excerpts from the same data set. Such features include parental scaffolding provided in the form of questions, increased incidence of volunteered stories and how volunteered stories obtain a more personal voice than invited stories. In the current paper, the nature of today narrative sequences as invited stories is highlighted. By attending to the distinction between invited

versus volunteered stories, we were able to identify some developmental aspects of storytelling sequence in parent-child interaction. This development is highlighted in the selected excerpts as a movement from Question-Answer sequences, to collaborative invited story tellings, to volunteered stories.

Furthermore, a close examination of sequential organization of storytelling sequences enabled us to see how Daddy, through his conversational moves, most typically through questions, was helping Harry elaborate and develop one or two short utterances into storytelling, thus nudging him into taking extended turns when he is invited to do so. Daddy's questions served to constantly unpack what Harry was referring to and made initial closed formulations more elaborate. It was shown that Daddy's response (e.g. "okay. You just told me what you were doing all day.") to Harry's response served to instruct him into certain preferences and expectations embedded in the structure of the particular practice of talk. Daddy is instructing Harry that talk is organized, and the moral tenor of Daddy's instructions clarifies the normative nature of this structural organization. This normative aspect of talk is ordinarily displayed in mundane conversational features which constitute structural organization.

The conversational features of nextness and progressivity provided us with grounds on which to attribute "varying degrees of success" of storytelling. Perceived difficulties in comprehending some of Harry's stories have to do with a sequencing problem, i.e., ordering events in a recognizably proper sequence. While we found a number of cases in our data where Daddy, the recipient, ends up announcing his failure to understand Harry's story, e.g., Excerpt 4, we also observed emerging structures in Harry's list construction (Excerpt 3) and a volunteered story (Excerpt 6). Looking at development through parental scaffolding enables one to characterize the development as becoming gradually less reliant on scaffolding. At the

same time, we observed that some structure was emerging in the child's list construction and the child produced more details in his tellings, which led to more volunteered stories.

In our listening to these data, we heard how Daddy's questions serve to expand and develop Harry's initial listing of activities into telling sequences (Takagi 2019). Daddy's questions provide scaffolds for Harry to take extended turns.⁶ Another dimension of socialization regarding progressivity that we observe going on is participants' orientation to the consistency of the topic. Sacks' (1974, 1992) concerns about stories were intrinsic to his concerns with topics of talk, e.g., that a story should be recognizable as a story, that a story should be recognizable as a story about a particular topic, that a story should be consistently recognizable as a story about a topic.

According to Ochs & Schieffelin (2017: 5), language socialization is a theoretical perspective that proposed "the process of acquiring language is embedded in and constitutive of the process of becoming socialized to be a competent member of a social group". The proposal has two aspects to it: socialization through the use of language and socialization to use language in an appropriate way. The current paper showcases both perspectives through the sequential analysis of talk between a father and a son. Daddy's efforts to encourage Harry to have some particular orientation to storytelling is embedded in a sequential organization of talk. This orientation involves the consistency of the topic and the relevance of narratives to his inquiries. These are achieved through the nextness of utterances, in terms of the organization of action "strings" (Sacks 1992: 496), as coherent tellings. If we can say that this constitutes socialization, it is the development of IC.

⁶ Of course, the taking of an "extended turn" is a matter for the participants themselves. What constitutes an extended turn for Harry may be a series of turns rather than an identifiable 'bloc' of talk. We allude to Harry's series of turns as extended turns as a matter of IC, and this may be considered a potential line of inquiry in future analyses.

We conclude this paper by revisiting Heritage's (1984: 239) assertion that IC "constitutes the core of childhood socialization". In this paper we endorse Heritage's articulation of this connection and we suggest that a reflexive relation obtains between IC and socialization. It is through socialization that a child acquires IC, while it is also through the development of IC that a child is socialized into becoming a competent member of a linguistic community.

Appendix

. terminal contour: falling

, continuative contour: slight rise

: within talk, colons indicate prolongation

[] overlapping talk

= latching

(.) micropause (less than 0.2 sec)

(2.0) length of pause in approximate seconds

> < words within angle brackets are delivered faster than surrounding talk

ye- truncated word

school emphasis on part of word

hhh audible breath

ye(hh)s within-speech aspiration, laughter

(yes) uncertain hearing, transcriber's best guess

((sniff)) describing paralinguistic features of talk

⋮ within line numbering, colons indicate turns have been omitted

References

- Bateman, Amanda. 2015. *Conversation analysis and early childhood education*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 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(3). 361-402.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1997. *Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and socialization in family discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana & Catherine E. Snow. 2002. *Talking to adults*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Carlin, Andrew P. & Younhee Kim 2021. Longitudinal conversation analysis of parent-child interaction: Small data and interdisciplinary work in linguistics and sociology. SAGE Research Methods Cases Part 1. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781529757248>
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cook-Gumperz, Jenny. 1986. Caught in a web of words: Some considerations on language socialization and language acquisition. In Jenny Cook-Gumperz, William A. Corsaro & Jürgen Streeck (eds.), *Children's worlds and children's language*, 37-64. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Coulter, Jeff. 1983. *Rethinking cognitive theory*. London: MacMillan.
- Cuff, Edward C. & David W. Francis. 1978. Some features of 'invited stories' about marriage breakdown. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 18. 111-133.
- Evaldsson, Ann-Carita & Olga Abreu Fernandes. 2019. Embodied performances and footings in a young child's spontaneous participation in bilingual (Russian-Swedish) storytelling. *Research on Children and social Interaction* 3(1-2). 36-64.
- Filipi, Anna. 2019. Snapshots of tellings in interactions between adults and children aged two, three and three and a half in an Australian context. *Research on Children and Social Interaction* 3(1-2). 119-143.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 2002. *Ethnomethodology's program: Working out Durkheim's aphorism*. Boulder CO: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Garfinkel, Harold & Harvey Sacks. 2017. On formal studies of practical actions. In Harold Garfinkel (ed.), *Ethnomethodological studies of work*, 157-189. London: Routledge.
- Garrett, Paul B. 2005. What a language is good for: Language socialization, language shift, and the persistence of code-specific genres in St Lucia. *Language in Society* 34(3). 327-361.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness & Asta Cekaite. 2018. *Embodied family choreography*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

- Hymes, Dell. 1972. On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & Janet Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, 269-293. London: Penguin.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1990. List-construction as a task and resource. In George Psathas (ed.), *Interaction competence*, 63-92. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Jefferson, Gail. 2004. A note on laughter in 'male'-'female' interaction. *Discourse Studies* 6(1). 117-133.
- Jefferson, Gail & John R.E. Lee. 1992. The rejection of advice: Managing the problematic convergence of a 'troubles-telling' and a 'service encounter'. In Paul Drew & John Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work*, 521-548. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keel, Sara. 2016. *Socialization: Parent – child interaction in everyday life*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kidwell, Mardi. 2013. Interaction among children. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 511-532. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Kim, Younhee. (2018). Private speech and mutual engagement in preschoolers' playtime interaction: Talk and embodiment. *Sociolinguistics Journal of Korea* 26(2). 119-165.
- Kim, Younhee & Andrew P. Carlin. (2022a). Story appreciation in conversations-for-learning: Stories and gestalt-contextures. In Anna Filipi, Binh Thanh Ta & Maryanne Theobald, (eds.) *Storytelling practices in home and educational contexts*. Springer. 10.1007/978-981-16-9955-9
- Kim, Younhee & Andrew P. Carlin. (2022b). "How was your day?": Development of Interactional Competence located in today narrative sequences. *Pragmatics* <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.19043.kim>
- Kim, Younhee & Yvonne Tse Crepaldi. 2021. Co-constructed storytelling as a site for socialization in parent-child interaction: A case from a Malay-English bilingual family in Singapore. *Journal of Pragmatics* 172. 167-180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.11.019>
- Lee, Yo-An. 2006. Towards respecification of communicative competence: Condition of L2 instruction or its objective? *Applied Linguistics* 27(3). 349-376.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1992. Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology* 15(3). 247-271.
- Lynch, Michael. 2002. From naturally occurring data to naturally organized ordinary activities: Comment on Speer. *Discourse Studies* 4(4). 531-537.
- Mackay, Robert W. 1974. Conceptions of children and models of socialization. In Roy Turner (ed.) *Ethnomethodology: Selected readings*, 180–193. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Mehan, Hugh. 1980. The competent student. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 11(3). 131-152.
- Miller, Peggy J., Michele Koven, & Shumin Lin. 2011. Language socialization and narrative. In Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs, & Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *The Handbook of language socialization*, 190-208. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Nguyen, Hanh. 2012. Social interaction and competence development: Learning the structural organization of a communicative practice. *Learning, Culture, and Social Interaction* 1. 127-142.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1991. Socialization through language and interaction: A theoretical introduction. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 2(2). 143-147.
- Ochs, Elinor & Bambi Schieffelin. 2017. Language socialization: An historical overview. In Patricia A. Duff & Stephen May (eds.), *Language socialization* (Encyclopedia of language and education). Springer International Publishing.
- Ochs, Elinor, Ruth Smith, & Carolyn Taylor. 1989. Detective stories at dinnertime: Problem-solving through co-narration. *Cultural Dynamics* 2, 238-257.
- Ochs, Elinor & Carolyn Taylor. 1992. Family narrative as political activity. *Discourse and Society* 3(3). 301-340.
- Ochs, Elinor, Carolyn Taylor, & Ruth Smith. 1992. Story-telling as a theory-building activity. *Discourse Processes*. 15(1). 37-72.
- Pekarek-Doehler, Simona. 2019. On the nature and the development of L2 interactional competence: State of the art and implications for praxis. In M. Rafael Salaberry & Silvia Kunitz (eds.), *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice*, 25-59. New York: Routledge.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1980. Telling my side: "limited access" as a fishing device. *Sociological inquiry* 50(3-4). 186-198.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1974. An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In Richard Bauman & Joel Scherzer (eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*, 337-353. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1987. On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In Graham Button & John R. E. Lee (eds.), *Talk and social organisation*. Clevedon, 54-69. Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey & Emanuel A. Schegloff. 1979. Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In George Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, 15-21. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1979. The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In Talmy Givón (ed.), *Syntax and semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*, 261-286. New York: Academic Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996. Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology* 102(1). 161-216.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2002. On 'opening sequencing': A frame statement. In James E. Katz & Mark Aakhus (eds.), *Perpetual contact: Mobile communication, private talk, public performance*, 321-385. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. & Harvey Sacks. 1973. Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8(4). 289-327.
- Schieffelin, Bambi & Elinor Ochs. (eds.). 1986. *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Siromaa, Maarit. 2012. Resonance in conversational second stories: A dialogic resource for stance taking. *Text & Talk* 32(4). 525-545.
- Stivers, Tanya & Asifa Majid. 2007. Questioning children: Interactional evidence of implicit bias in medical interviews. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70(4). 424-441.
- Takagi, Tomoyo. 2019. Referring to past actions in caregiver-child interaction in Japanese. *Research on Children and Social Interaction* 3(1-2). 92-118.
- Theobald, Maryanne & Susan Danby. 2017. Co-producing cultural knowledge: Children telling tales in the school playground. In Amanda Bateman & Amelia Church (eds.), *Children's knowledge-in-interaction: Studies in conversation analysis*, 111-125. Singapore: Springer.
- Tolmie, Peter & Mark Rouncefield. 2014. Reading for pleasure: Bedtime stories. In Peter Tolmie & Mark Rouncefield (eds.), *Ethnomethodology at play*, 53-71. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Watson, David R. 1990. Some features of the elicitation of confessions in murder interrogations. In George Psathas (ed.), *Interaction competence*, 263-295. New York: Irvington.
- Young, Richard F. 2011. Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In Eli Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 426-443. New York & London: Routledge.
- Zimmerman, Don H. & Melvin Pollner. 1971. The everyday world as phenomenon. In Jack D Douglas (ed.), *Understanding everyday life*, 80-103. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.