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Stories touch us even before we enter the world and they continue until we go to the next world. They are in the dreams of an unborn baby, in the kindergarten in school, in news reports and movies, in novels, in conversations and nightmares. We tell each other stories all our waking hours, and when our mouths are silent, we are telling stories to ourselves in the secrecy of our minds. We can’t help but tell stories because they are a language in themselves.

Rachana quoted in In Arabian Nights (Shah, 2008, p. 52)

From published works and formal performances of gifted storytellers to mundane reporting of everyday events, narrative discourse is pervasive across cultural-linguistic groups, and the study of narrative has provided rich ground for exploring human cognitive, sociocultural, and communicative practices. Indeed, the sheer pervasiveness of narrative discourse supports, at least in part, Bruner’s (1986) contention that narrative is one of two fundamental ways that humans are wired to organize, and make sense of, experience. Focusing on marked cultural narratives, anthropologists (for example, Basso, 1996; Bauman, 1986) have typically documented the formal organization of narrative performances and analyzed the critical roles narratives can and do play in displaying and building cultural values, categories, and identities. Skillfully told narratives can break through into performance (Hymes, 1981) and command audience attention by evoking the events and atmospheres of a teller’s narrated world and imaginatively transporting both audiences and tellers to other times and places (Labov, 1997). Skilled storytellers
wield narrative tellings as cultural tools that convey and construct social, communicative, and personal histories as well as privileged genres and values (for example, Basso, 1996; Shah, 2008). However, in the flow of everyday interactions, many narratives are brief, routine, and unremarkable in their content and their telling. Sociolinguists and developmental psychologists have more often focused on mundane narratives, particularly personal narratives in which the teller is a protagonist in the narrative being told and the narrative depicts a sequence of events that form a portion of the teller's own biography. Much of this research focuses on narratives that are incidentally collected as part of broader projects, such as narratives offered by participants during interviews (as in Labov, 1997), captured during observations of everyday family interactions (as in Miller, Fung, and Koven, 2007; Miller, Hengst, Alexander, and Sperry, 2000; Ochs, Smith, and Taylor, 1989), or collected in the flow of young children's self-talk (as in Nelson, 1989).

The term conversational narratives evokes the routine ways that reporting or replaying of events is woven into everyday conversational interactions, allowing researchers (such as Bamberg and Georgakopoulou, 2008; Goodwin, 1990; Norrick, 2000; Ochs and Capps, 2001) to explore narrative discourse as an interactional accomplishment, to examine how particular tellings are negotiated by and distributed across participants within streams of interaction, and to trace how particular narratives may be shaped and stabilized through repeated tellings. Ochs and Capps (2001) have argued that the routine, repeated, and often contested conversational tellings of personal narratives offer participants opportunities 'to air, probe, and otherwise attempt to reconstruct and make sense of actual and possible life experiences' (p. 7). Of course, not all narrative discourse in conversational interactions focuses on events of tellers' lives nor are the events of conversational narratives always noteworthy or contested. Narrative discourse in conversations also organizes unproblematically reporting of past events; planning of future events; retellings of stories heard, read, or seen (the latest episode, for example, of a favorite television series); and sketching of imaginary or hypothetical scenarios. Indeed, in face-to-face interactions people's routine and fluid navigation of narrative discourse is particularly striking as tellers and audiences alike shift between and weave together the here-and-now of narrative tellings with the layered and shifting indexical grounds of other discursively represented times, places, and events. Focusing on conversational narratives not only allows researchers to examine the content and functions of a full range of narratives (small, fleeting, or incomplete narratives as well as extended and highly polished ones), but also shifts attention to narrative discourse as an interactional resource that participants deploy as they make sense of, and manage, their own and others' participation in social interactions.

As a researcher studying the social and communicative impact of acquired brain damage, I have particularly examined communication and aphasia. Clinical accounts often describe individuals with aphasia as being able to communicate better than they talk, that is, as individuals whose communicative competence is better than, though masked by disruptions in, their language abilities (Holland, 1998; Kagen, 1998). Much of aphasia research has focused on cataloging and differentiating language deficits in individuals with acquired brain damage. However, in all but the most mild of cases, aphasia disrupts not only the isolated performance of individuals but also the typical communicative practices of all participants in an interaction. Indeed, to communicate successfully, individuals with aphasia and their communication partners must work together to reorchestrate the semiotic resources of communicative interactions and redistribute the burden of meaning-making in interaction. This critical distinction between aphasia as an isolated impairment and its place in communicative practices is eloquently captured in Goodwin's (1995) description of Rob's experiences:

When Rob was in the hospital, his doctors, who had focused entirely on the trauma within his brain, said that any therapy would be merely cosmetic and a waste of time, because the underlying brain injury could not be remediated. Nothing could have been farther from the truth, and medical advice based on such a view of the problem can cause irreparable harm to patients such as Rob and their families. As an injury, aphasia does reside within the skull. However, as a form of life, a way of being and acting in the world in concert with others, its proper locus is an endogenous, distributed, multiparty system. (p. 255)

My research has focused on examining patterns of successful communication between routine communication partners, one of whom has aphasia. I have begun to document the successful deployment of a range of highly recognizable discourse practices, including collaborative referencing (Hengst, 2003), reported speech (Hengst, Frame, Neuman-Stritzel, and Gannaway, 2005), and verbal play (Hengst, 2006). Unsurprisingly, the disruptive effects of aphasia were quite evident across these analyses, as the partners with aphasia routinely produced
syntactic, semantic, phonemic, and articulatory errors and displayed false starts, long silences, and prosodic disruptions. However, despite managing aphasic disruptions, these pairs flexibly negotiated the complex, often subtle frame shifts associated with developing and sustaining shared perspectives on objects and references, establishing and shifting voices in reported speech, and juggling contesting frames in verbal play. Indeed, the partners both with and without aphasia used these recognizable discourse practices to contextually and make sense of each other's words and actions.

This chapter articulates an approach to narrative discourse as semiotic remediation practice and illustrates that approach by examining the ways narratives operate as communicative resources in the interactions of familiar communication partners, one of whom has a diagnosis of aphasia. Examining the discourse of participants managing aphasia highlights situated practices at play in everyday narratives-in-use. Attending to semiotic remediation - that is to 'the laminated multimodality of any moment of communicative practice as well as semiotic transformations over short and long time frames' (Prior, Hengst, Roozen, and Shipka, 2006, p. 740) - offers a way to understand how communicative competence can exceed linguistic competence in interactions of individuals with aphasia. The ability of individuals with aphasia to engage in complex, frame-shifting discourse practices so successfully and yet with sometimes quite limited linguistic signaling also helps us to see beyond the bright lights of language, to recognize how much communicative weight other semiotics and can and routinely do bear.

Conversational narratives as semiotic remediation practices

In earlier work we argued that 'reported speech' - which actually refers to the discursive representation of reporting words (oral or written), thoughts, or speech acts from other (real or imagined) times, places, and agents - should be conceptualized theoretically as one highly marked face of semiotic remediation practices available to, and used by, participants to organize communicative interactions (see Prior et al., 2006). In this chapter, I am exploring the implications of conceptualizing narrative discourse practices as another marked face of semiotic remediation. Much like reported speech, narrative discourse can be described broadly as the re-presentation of events (and related background, detail, affect, consequences, etc.) from other (real or imagined) times and places, and involving other characters (including past, future, imagined, and hypothetical 'selves'). Metadiscursively, both reported speech and narrative discourse involve an indexical decentering that laminates the discursively constructed indexical ground of the narrated or reported events onto the here-and-now indexical ground of the event of narrating or reporting (see Hanks, 1990; Haviland, 1996; Prior et al., 2006). Also consistent with reported speech, the actual veracity of events being (re)presented in the narrative telling is not critical to the deployment of narrative discourse. Events and details of narrative representations can be filled with embellishments, fantastical or hypothetical events, and presentations of what might have happened, but did not. As a marked and pervasive semiotic remediation practice, narrative discourse provides a familiar pattern within and around which individuals can organize their participation (for example, as ratified audiences or co-tellers), orient to one another's words and actions (as, for example, both centered in and decentered from the here-and-now), and integrate reported events and their interpretations into a holistic sense of what is being communicated and why. Theoretically, taking up conversational narratives as semiotic remediation practice pushes us to attend to the emergent, or improvised, aspects of specifically situated narratives-in-use as well as to more stable and recognizable aspects of narrative discourse. This next section then considers how to align methodology to this theoretical framework by describing the strategies and tools that I have drawn on and adapted for the analysis of conversational narratives and aphasia.

Identifying narratives and narrative tellings

Attending to the paradigmatic dimensions of narratives and narrative tellings provides the means to hone in on and operationally define stretches of narrative discourse within conversational interactions. To do that work, I have drawn on Labov's (1997) description of the core linguistic elements of narrative texts and Ochs and Capps' (2001) framework designed to capture the distributed and emergent character of narrative tellings. Focusing on temporal representations in texts, Labov (1997) described narrative 'as a technique of reporting past events through temporal junction' (p. 15) and defined narratives as containing at least one temporal junction (that is, two temporally related linguistic clauses). More elaborate narratives have multiple temporally related clauses presented as complicating actions (the what happens next) that move the narrative forward (through a beginning, a middle, and an end). The key point of the narrative can be highlighted as the most
reportable event (often the least common or most influential event), and the teller’s interpretations or evaluations of the narrated events can be marked by rhetorical devices or with directly stated evaluative clauses. Focusing on narrative tellings, Ochs and Capps (2001) offer five dimensions – tellership, tellability, embeddedness, linearity, moral stance – to characterize the diverse ways narrative tellings are organized, presented, and taken up in conversation. Within this framework, each dimension is a continuum with one end representing highly canonical narratives (well-ordered narrative with clear linearity and consistent moral stance) and well-performed tellings (a single narrator telling a highly engaging narrative, as a performance detached from the surrounding conversational activity, to an attentive audience). However, conversational narratives more commonly have noncanonical characteristics on one or more of these dimensions – more than one teller, poorly told or unremarkable narratives that fail to capture audience attention, tellings that are embedded in and interrupted by conversational activity, and/or narratives with contested or unstable linearity or moral stance.

In our research on conversational narratives and aphasia (Hengst and Duff, 2007; Pratzel, 2008), my colleagues and I adapted Labov’s definition to operationally define conversational narratives as minimally two elements: the verbal or nonverbal presentation of an event displaced from the moment of telling that is linked to a second temporally related event or a related evaluation. Using the identification of key narrative elements as the starting point, and guided by Ochs and Capps’ (2001) five dimensions, we then reexamined the surrounding discourse for additional verbal and nonverbal narrative elements distributed across participants and throughout the conversational activities. This operational definition and identification process allowed our research team to reliably identify stretches of discourse in videotaped data as narrative.2

Multisemiotics of narrative tellings

Taking up a focus on semiotics as embodied and situated practice complicates views of narrative as primarily encapsulated linguistic text or patterns of interactional talk. The richly embodied and performed character of narrative discourse can easily be seen in highly polished narrative performances in which tellers hold their audiences’ attention by weaving together gestures, postures, facial expressions, actions, voices, and physical props as they describe, display, and interpret narrative events. It can also be seen in the careful planning that goes into choreographing both verbal and nonverbal elements of artful performances, such as planning out a comedy skit (see Prior et al., 2006). The routine multimodality of narrative discourse is also seen as tellers blend verbally and nonverbally produced narrative elements. Such semiotic blending was evident in an analysis of reported speech and aphasia (Hengst et al., 2005; Prior et al., 2006), when participants with and without aphasia would point to indicate the original speaker of their direct reports instead of verbalizing the speaker (for example, he said). In an exploration of the heterogeneity of narrative discourse, Hengst and Miller (1999) described two-year-old Kurt’s fluid weaving of the at-hand objects and activities of his own family’s garden into a series of (re)tellings of Beatrix Potter’s The Tale of Peter Rabbit. Through linguistic and gestural deixis, Kurt animated his tellings by pointing to the plants that Peter Rabbit had eaten (for example, ‘ate that one’ [pointing to a marigold]) and the areas that Peter had spared (for example, ‘Peter not stepped in this stuff right here’).

The complex multisemiotics of embodied spaces also entail the strategic deployment of particular types of resources (visual, auditory, olfactory, thermal, haptic/tactile, and so on) and sets of behaviors to manage the multiple frames or attentional tracks of ongoing activities (see Goffman, 1981; Kendon, 1990; Scollon and Scollon, 2003). The orchestration of resources around different attentional tracks was a dominant feature in our analyses of a family make-believe game called Cindy Magic (Hengst and Miller, 1999). First played by my husband and three-year-old daughter on a long car ride, Cindy Magic was tuned to the affordances of car travel (players buckled into their seats, driver needing to watch the road, few props available) and consisted of improvisationally acting out scenarios by speaking in character voices. Across eight years of play, Cindy Magic continued to be a verbal game routinely played while participants were completing family chores (such as running errands or folding laundry). Talk was dedicated to, and taken up as, part of the game world, whereas family chores were managed and coordinated nonverbally (for example, stacking folded laundry in appropriate piles).3 Attending to the multiple semiotics of interaction pushes us to account for narrative tellings as embodied accomplishments achieved through, and within, the affordances of material environments and the embodied and discursive alignments among participants.

The production of laminated interaction orders in narrative tellings

As gatherings of co-present participants align physically and discursively to one another they construct and display highly recognizable patterns
of interaction, what Goffman has termed interaction orders (Goffman, 1981, 1983; Kendon, 1990; Scollon and Scollon, 2003). Recognizable interaction orders function as semiotic resources, allowing participants to read and display particular alignments by participants’ patterns of movement and direction of attention. Goffman describes routine ambulatory units that indicate people who are walking alone (as singles), traveling in groups (as walkers), or forming lines or processions. Interaction orders also distinguish people in ratified interactions who are engaged in a shared and exclusive group activity (such as a family reunion at public park or a service encounter in a department store) from people in loosely formed groups who are engaged in casual and fleeting contact (for example, casual conversations among people waiting for a bus). Among such recognizable interaction orders, Goffman also includes platform events set before audiences (public lectures, concerts, movies, and so on) and celebrative social occasions that are usually preplanned and highly anticipated and involve participants coming together under controlled (for example, invited) conditions in appreciation of a shared event or circumstance. Interaction orders in practice are dynamic, laminated, and emergent – as people navigate and manage their participation in platform events and celebrative occasions they do so, for example, in ambulatory units and ratified interactions; likewise, spontaneous and fleeting platform events and celebrative occasions can take shape within ambulatory units (as passersby, for example, stop to watch and applaud a street performer or citizens congregate in an unplanned vigil at the site of a tragedy).

In addition to aligning to each other’s physical co-presence, Goffman (1981) also describes ways that participants take up recognizable stances, or footings, within and around the activities they are engaged in. Focusing specifically on ‘talk’ in face-to-face interactions, Goffman offers a range of stances that participants take toward the production and reception of utterances. Production formats describe the complex ways that utterances can be animated by particular people, authored by the same or other participants, while potentially representing the perspectives of a different set of participants (a student, for example, reading a set of announcements compiled by the school secretary, submitted by teachers, and written in compliance with school board policies). Participant frameworks focus on the reception side of interaction, capturing ways that individuals are positioned as ratified participants in the talk, as bystanders or overhearsers not directly addressed, or as eavesdroppers working to conceal their participation.

In their prototypical, or canonical, form narrative tellings evoke a platform event in which participants align themselves either as audience or (co)tellers. All narrative discourse may carry with it this marked prototype effect, invoking, at least fleetingly, platform formats of formal storytelling. If the identification of narrative-as-text, of foregrounded patterns of interactional talk, and of highly recognizable forms of social gathering highlight the regular and recognizable character of narrative as discourse practice, then it is also important to attend to the subtle, emergent dynamics of narrative rooted in, for example, the situated and laminated weaving of interaction orders.

Mapping the indexical grounds of narratives

To understand the contextualizing practices of language-in-use, Hanks (1990, 1996a) focuses not only on the marked indexicality of particular language forms, such as deictic expressions of space (this, that, here, there) and participation (you, I), but also on the fluid way that language users organize their interpretations around the shifting perspectives of participants, relationships among objects in time/space, and projected representational worlds. Like Goffman’s (1981) footings, these indexical grounds are highly dynamic and richly laminated. Narrative discourse routinely involves a shift in indexical ground as tellers lay out (overtly or implicitly) – and audiences must be willing to posit and project – temporal frames, physical settings, and character perspectives decentered from the here-and-now.4 Haviland (2000) describes the way participants fluidly navigate through narratively transposed indexical grounds – as a teller, for example, points over his head to a mountain that only exists in that direction within the narrated (transposed) space.

Narrative discourse practices, then, prototypically involve a massive shift in indexical grounds in two senses. First, narrative tellings afford a shift in immediate footings as they nominate the potential rights and responsibilities of ratified tellers to discursively construct narrative grounds and the potential role of the audience to receive and imaginatively enter into the world of narrated events. Second, narratives project relatively fully embodied spaces, times, objects, and people of narrated worlds. The degree to which any particular narrative triggers such massive shifts in practice varies. For example, particular narrative genres and cultural practices inform who gets to be a storyteller, what types of stories get to be fantastical or factual, and indeed what types of stories even get to be told (see Miller et al., 2007). Narrative tellings may be ineffective or interrupted, failing to transport audiences to the
affectively lived experiences of narratives that Labov (1997) highlights, and, as Ochs and Capps (2001) point out, conversational narratives are often not full-blown performances, and narrative stances of tellers and audiences are not always fully taken up (in, for example, contested or flatly told narratives). On the other hand, for familiar partners, such shifts in indexical ground can be accomplished through quite minimal semiotic signaling, as a delicate linguistic or gestural reference evokes an elaborately known narrative world. Considering how the interactional affordances and sociocultural consequences of participation in narrative discourse are changed or sustained for individuals with aphasia is then a question with theoretical and human significance. The narratives I analyze in this chapter are ones that tended to realize striking shifts in the centered and decentered indexical grounds of the tellings, even if fleetingly. Yet in these cases, as with all narratives, the indexical dynamics of narrative as a marked practice makes it an important communicative resource that gives particular shape to discourse.

**Narrative tellings as sociohistoric trajectories**

Taking up narratives as semiotic remediation foregrounds the multiple dialogic processes involved in narrative practice. Bakhtin’s (1981) conceptualization of chronotopes—fully situated space/times—offers us a valuable tool for tracing the way sociohistorical trajectories flow through narrative discourse. Grounded in histories of real-life experiences and repeated engagements with narrative representations, tellers evoke chronotopes as they situate their narratives, motivate characters’ actions, and engage audiences in particular affective and interpretive evaluations of narrative events. Chronotopes then lay out not only an indexical field of space-time coordinates, but a dialogic field thick with history, affect, motive, personality, and sense. Bakhtin also usefully raises the issues of coordinating represented chronotopes (such as those of narrative events) with the embodied chronotopes of the present interaction. Locating narratives chronotopically brings multiple historical trajectories into the foreground, not only projecting a there-and-then to relate to a here-and-now, but also projecting layers of dialogic production and reception, the Shadow conversations (Irvine, 1996) that infuse sense-making and the production of people through chronologies of participation in practices (Lave and Wenger, 1991). Scollon (2008) uses the term discourse itineraries to describe particular complex, historical paths of semiotics spanning a variety of times, places, people, media, and objects.

In analyzing the chains of semiotic remediation relevant to particular narrative tellings, we should attend to the multiple temporal cycles/scales (Lemke, 2000; Scollon, 2008; Scollon and Scollon, 2004) implicated in dialogic itineraries. In the immediate turn-taking time frame of interaction, we can trace immediate repetitions and recycling of resources (Norrick, 2000). In the somewhat broader frames of an extended session or series of sessions at a site, we can read narratives against a chain of topics and strings of narrative (re)tellings. At the scale of personal relationships, we can locate a narrative in a specific discursive itinerary of shared past conversations. Relationships track a uniquely dialogic interaction order, a shadow network of times and places knotted together by the co-presence of certain people, a historical with-ness that allows for common ground (Clark, 1992; Hanks, 1990; Irvine, 1996). Interestingly, the temporally, spatially, and culturally dispersed itineraries of personal relationships form a complexly networked trajectory through space-time that challenges the assumption that chronotopes come neatly organized in coherent and bounded scenes. At the scale of ontogeny, narrative discourse itineraries may be marked along benchmarks not only of development (childhood, adolescence, adulthood, old age) but also of significant life events (marriage, parenthood, war, pre/post-stroke). Finally, narratives also cycle within longer, larger cultural time frames. Attention to the dialogic dimensions of narrative calls on us to seek out both recognizable histories (such as cultural discourses on driving) and also emergent phenomena (like fleeting references to particular, shared driving experiences). Attending to the dialogic effects of chains of action and chains of semiotics requires close attention to the historical depth of interaction orders and to the historically situated sense that infuses a narrative text with its powers to transport listeners imaginatively.

**Conversational narratives and aphasia**

The narrative tellings presented here were taken from semistructured interviews conducted during a broader study exploring the situated discourse practices of individuals with aphasia and their routine communication partners (see Hengst, 2003, 2006; Hengst et al., 2005). I completed 12 videotaped observations of each participant pair, which included four interviews, four observations of the pairs engaged in activities of their choosing at home and around the community (for example, cooking at home, eating at a restaurant, attending a high school football game), and four sessions in which the pairs completed multiple
trials of a barrier task held in a clinic setting. Preliminary analyses of conversational narratives on portions of the data set (Hengst and Duff, 2007; Pratzel, 2008) have documented that narrative discourse was pervasive (averaging about 30 narratives per session) and often successfully deployed in these interactions, and that individuals with aphasia were active participants in narrative tellings. Although participants with aphasia actively engaged in narrative tellings – serving as active audiences and as co-tellers for over half of the co-told narratives – they were only identified as sole tellers for 11 per cent of single-teller narratives. The three narrative tellings I turn to now illustrate some important implications of taking up narrative discourse as semiotic remediation practice. All three tellings display high tellability within these interactions, despite the fact that individuals with aphasia were the primary or sole tellers.

Narrative tellings as semiotic activity
This first example focuses on two brief narratives told in quick succession by Ethel at the beginning of the first scheduled interview and highlights the multiple semiotics of narrative tellings. Ethel and Barnie were a young wife–husband pair, each only 21 years old, who lived in an apartment with their one-year-old daughter. Ethel had a diagnosis of moderate–severe nonfluent aphasia as the result of a left-cerebral-hemisphere stroke 14 months prior to the study. In addition to aphasia, the stroke left her with a persistent right-sided weakness that made walking difficult and left her right arm hanging uselessly by her side. Formal language testing indicated that her reading and writing abilities were severely impaired and her auditory comprehension and spoken language were moderately to severely impaired. In unstructured conversational interactions Ethel’s speaking turns were marked by sparse and halting output, poorly articulated speech sounds, and a limited range of grammatical forms. Ethel’s mean length of turn (MLT) was only 2.0 words, in contrast to Barnie’s MLT which was 7.4 words. Despite their ongoing management of Ethel’s moderate to severe aphasia, analyses have documented that much of Ethel’s and Barnie’s discourse was very engaging and playful, with Ethel flexibly deploying gestures, facial expressions, shifting voices, exaggerated prosodies, and singing in combination with her relatively limited verbal productions. Analysis of their discourse during the four community observations documented frequent and effective use of reported speech (Hengst et al., 2005). Given her limited use of spoken language, she relied heavily on nonlinguistic resources (such as gestures, postures, voicings, intonations) to shape often telegraphic and single-word utterances into direct reports of others’ talk. In fact, individually Ethel had the highest frequency of reported speech use (17.4 reported speech episodes per 1000 words) of any of the 14 participants (7 participant pairs) in the analysis. The narratives I turn to now also display this combination of expressiveness and strong reliance on multiple semiotics.

Ethel’s ‘He just gets it’ narratives
Ethel produced two ‘He just gets it’ narrative tellings at the beginning of the interview, across just over a minute of interaction. We were sitting together in Ethel and Barnie’s living room, as shown on the still frames in Figure 5.1 – Ethel (E) and Barnie (B) are visible on the left and right sides of the images, respectively, their daughter walking around between them (staying close to mom). Ethel is facing the television (not visible in the image), and I (Julie = J) am sitting just off-camera to the bottom right of the image. I (Julie) begin the interview complimenting Ethel and Barnie on how well they had played the barrier game earlier that week, and then, as shown in the first line of Figure 5.1, ask them how do you work together to make it successful? Barnie responds I don’t know, and Ethel looking at Barnie attempts a halting one-word response Compom-tin-sen, which neither Barnie nor Julie understands. Julie offers a verbal reformulation Competition that Ethel immediately rejects – No [still looking at Barnie]. Barnie then offers his own reformulation Comprehension? that Ethel immediately accepts verbally and nonverbally – Mhm [nodding and smiling]. Barnie nods in agreement and rephrases Ethel’s point verbally – Yeah, we comprehended. Emphasizing that it is Barnie that understands her, Ethel points to Barnie and says all the time. All three participants took speaking turns, sharing overtly in this conversationally produced word search.

Ethel’s first narrative. With her basic answer to my question communicated, Ethel then launches a brief narrative illustrating how Barnie knows all the time what Ethel is trying to say and speaks the words that she is unable to say for herself. Ethel directs this narrative primarily to Julie, who participates as an active audience, while Barnie is a relatively motionless and quiet audience. Ethel presents a series of three direct represented speech/thought events, demonstrating a past (or hypothetical) conversation during which Barnie helped her find a particular word. Ethel sets up the narrative offering a target word she could not say, then represents first her own thoughts, then Barnie providing the words
E: I don't know.
B: Wha- what- how do you work together to make it successful?

E: *Compom-tin-sen No.*
B: *M hm. [smiling]
J: Competition?
E: *E, speaking tentatively, looking at B* *E still looking at B* *E nodding head*

E: All the time. ... Say ... Walmart* **What's your
B: *Yeah, we comprehended.
J: *B nodding head* *E points to B** *E points to self*

E: name? Oh go::d'...you 'du du du du du' **[deep voice]** "Ohh! That's right!"
B: *E looks at & points to B* *E points at self*
**E bobbing head, mimicking B's voice*

E: Um*
B: *Mhm.
J: So he understood you, you mean. ... Even when you
**E nodding

*E looks at J, makes back/forth hand gesture between B&E 3x*

E: *Yeah. I don't know!* [laugh]
B: *laugh*
J: couldn't get the words out. Ahh. And how did that happen?
**E hand-flip, nodding** *E looks at B*

E: *Mom. I*
B: *Kind of. I mean- well I just-...2.*
J: *Did you know you were doing that?*
**J looking at B** *E bends forward*

Figure 5.1 Ethel's 'He just gets it' narratives

for her, and finally her verbal agreement – Say ... Walmart [points to B] ... [points to self] 'What's your name? Oh go::d' ... [points to B] you 'du du du du du du'... [points to self] 'Ohh! That's right!' All three reported speech/thought events are attributed nonverbally, by Ethel pointing to the represented speakers, and the middle event is also verbally framed, by her saying you while pointing to Barnie. In addition, Ethel animates each telling by enacting (through voice quality, prosody, posture, facial expressions, and sometimes verbal exclamations) her own frustration at not being able to say the word (first event), her relief or excitement at Barnie's offer of the correct words (third event), and change in speakers (using, for example, a deeper male voice when animating Barnie in the second event). Ethel closes the narrative with a nonverbally presented coda, or evaluation, by gesturing back and forth (three times) between her and Barnie. As an active listener, Julie offers a verbal reformulation of Ethel's final gestures – So he understood you, you mean. Even when you couldn't get the words out. Ethel accepts Julie's reformulations verbally and nonverbally – Mhm [nodding] Yeah [hand-flip, nodding].

Ethel's second narrative. I (Julie) follow up on this narrative by reformulating the original interview question and asking Ethel – *And how did that happen?* – that is, how did Barnie know what the right word was? Laughing, Ethel answers emphatically, as if in amazement – *I don't
know! Julie redirects the question to Barnie — *Did you know you were doing that?* Barnie answers hesitantly — *Kind of, I mean— well I just*. Without setup, Ethel then launches a second narrative, again directed to Julie, that emphasizes the uniqueness of Barnie’s abilities by contrasting his routine correct understandings to that of other people, particularly Ethel’s mother. This second narrative is minimal, consisting of one event from some unspecified time during the past year (that is, since Ethel’s stroke) that is linked to a nonverbally presented evaluative statement. Presented in one turn, Ethel uses verbally framed direct reported speech to act out her mother’s lack of understanding — *Mom. [bends forward, looking at daughter] I don’t understand. I don’t understand.* She animates her mother’s words, using a somewhat blank facial expression and a slightly Southern-accented voice that conveys a kind of determined lack of understanding, and a posture that acts out her mother’s talking down to her as if she were a frustrating young daughter. Then sitting up straight she offers a nonverbal evaluation by pointing to Barnie and using the back-and-forth hand gesture (one time) from the first narrative. Julie again verbally reformulates this gesture as — *He just gets it.* This narrative telling has the same rich semiotic blendings of the first, through Ethel’s richly enacted event (bending forward and speaking in complaining voice) and Julie’s cross-modal re-presentation of the evaluation. Moreover, Ethel folded her daughter into the enactment; while speaking as her mother Ethel bent forward, as if talking down to a child, and directed her gaze toward her own daughter. Interestingly, her daughter responded to Ethel, looking back at her and holding her gaze during that narrated event. This local alignment between Ethel and her own daughter was fleetingly laminated with Ethel’s silent stance with her mother and her mother speaking down to her.

A chain of semiotic reformulations

Within the immediate time frame of this minute of interaction, these two narratives are part of a chain of semiotic reformulations as Ethel and Barnie respond to the original interview question. Both narratives stand out as detached from the back-and-forth turn-taking of the conversational interaction. Ethel as sole teller completes each narrative in one long speaking turn (about 16 and 8 words for each narrative), which is in stark contrast to her average 2-word turns. However, as reformulations and clarifications of Ethel and Barnie’s original response — *yeah we comprehended* — these narratives are deeply embedded in the conversational topic and interview activity, a local chain of reformulation that begins with Julie’s and Barnie’s attempts to clarify Ethel’s initial one-word response to the question, continues with the two contrasting narratives that Ethel deploys to elaborate first Barnie’s understanding and then her mother’s lack of understanding, and ends with my verbal reformulations of Ethel’s final evaluations of each story. This chain of semiotic reformulations seems to succeed by the end in Ethel’s conveying that Barnie just gets it and that he is very unique in that regard. Across the broader time frame of Ethel and Barnie’s participation in the research project (about one month), this theme recurred directly as Ethel repeatedly claimed that, in contrast to her relationships with everyone else, Barnie was the only one who understood her and that nothing had changed in her interactions with him. Indirectly, these contrasting narratives (Barnie just gets it; her mom doesn’t understand) also stood as a frame to interpret other stories of communicative successes (others like Barnie who just get it) and failures (others like her mom who don’t understand).

Weaving together conversational and narrative frames

This second example is a more extended narrative telling presented by Mary during the pair’s third interview. The rich multisemiotics of the first example are also evident here; however, this narrative telling is particularly striking because of the way it is embedded within the ongoing conversational interaction. *Mary and Rob*, a mother and son, were 47 and 16 years old, respectively, and lived together in their family home. Mary had a moderate-severe fluent aphasia due to a left-cerebral-hemisphere stroke only six months prior to the study. Although she had no residual difficulty walking or using either arm or hand, Mary's performance on formal language testing indicated that she had severe deficits in repeating words and phrases, moderate-severe deficits in both auditory and reading comprehension, and mild-moderate deficits with spoken and written production. In unstructured conversational interactions Mary struggled to find and form specific words, producing long speaking turns that were marked by frequent grammatikal and word choice errors, the use of nonwords (that is, paraphasias and neologisms), hesitations, and false starts. Mary’s MLT was 8.1 words, in contrast to her son Rob’s, which was 9.9 words. Mary was a very motivated communicator who routinely used gestures to act out her meanings and was persistent in working through communication breakdowns (for example, attempting words repeatedly, trying to spell words out loud or write them on paper). Mary and Rob were animated interactional partners — routinely speaking at the same time, competing for the floor, and contesting each other’s
accounts and response. Indeed, their interactions often took on a verbal sparring character. For example, Rob would use Spanish or German, languages his mother did not speak, whereas Mary would tease Rob about his wrong answers and playfully brag about being better at the game than he was. The narrative telling in Figure 5.2 is striking not only for its content, but for the rich interanimation of the narrative and conversational discourse and the ongoing lamination of multiple topics into and around this telling.

Mary's 'You're gonna DI:E of this!' narrative

Mary's 'You're gonna DI:E of this!' narrative occurred early in the interview, before I (Julie) began asking questions. The conversation began with Mary's news that her sister, Carole, was moving to Alaska. This news was clearly a current topic of family conversations; on this occasion Rob was looking at a map of Alaska and Mary was holding a stack of computer printouts of information on Alaska she had gathered from the Internet. Conversational topics leading up to Mary's narrative included discussion of the family's camping trips, how Carole was afraid of bears, opinions about the good parts of Alaska, and how Mary had been trying to change her sister's mind by saying that Alaska was going to be awful and the only thing there to eat would be whale blubber. Figure 5.2 is a transcript with just over a minute of interaction that includes the narrative telling and begins with Mary's comment - Carole's gonna go crazy with me - which seems to foreshadow the narrative she is about to tell. Rob, continuing to study the map, comments on his aunt's choice of towns - Why couldn't she have gone to Anchorage, or Fairbanks? Or Juneau? Juneau's the best of the three. During these comments, I carry a stool across the room in order to sit by them; as shown on the images in Figure 5.2, Mary and Rob are sitting together on the sofa (Mary on the left and Rob on the right), each holding and looking at texts, and I am sitting across from them.

As I (Julie) get ready to sit down, Mary looks up and begins recounting a recent conversation with Carole in which Carole was upset because Mary had essentially told her that she was going to die in Alaska - She thought I was ma- that I was- be- mad. Cause I really- told her she was gonna die. I said, 'You're gonna DI:E of this!' But it's it's because I'm worried about her really. It could happen to her. She's real heavy. And she's I don't think she'll be good. The narrative is presented as two events (what Carole thought, what Mary said) followed by evaluation and background statements. What Mary had said to Carole is the most reportable event, which Mary repeated, recasting it as enacted direct, or quoted speech.
(Continued)
map of Alaska and offering comments (overlapping with Mary’s narrative telling) that were critical of his aunt’s choice and focused on the geographic desirability of different cities in Alaska. Julie aligned with Mary’s telling as a narrative audience, looking at Mary, laughing appropriately at the high point, and not responding directly to Rob’s conversational comments. In addition to simultaneously managing the multiple footings of the immediate interactional framework of these three participants, across the narrative telling the participants wove together multiple indexical grounds: Mary’s past conversation with her sister, projected future hypothetical consequence of the move (such as Carole will die, or become food for the bears, or lose weight), the geography of Alaska, Mary’s current concerns both for Carole’s well-being and the status of her relationship with her. The participants fluidly coordinated their contributions and orchestrated resources to successfully navigate multiple footings and chronotropic laminations of this narrative telling.

Narrative trajectories and narrative shadows
The last example, which is the most canonical telling of the three examples presented here, is a personal narrative told by Louise during the pair’s third interview. The telling displays rich interanimations with a series of past and anticipated future narratives and conversational topics, foregrounding the long histories of interactions leading up to the current telling. Louise and Thelma were mother and daughter, who at the time of the study were 50 and 26 years old respectively. Although not living together, they spoke on the phone or in person daily. Louise had a mild residual aphasia due to a left-cerebral-hemisphere stroke four and a half years prior to the study. In addition to the aphasia she had a residual right-sided weakness that caused her to limp and keep her arm bent and held close to her side. Formal language testing indicated that her reading, writing, auditory comprehension, and spoken language were good, and her greatest difficulty was word finding. In unstructured conversational interactions Louise’s speaking turns were generally well-formed and grammatically complex, but marked by hesitancy in producing, or pronouncing, particular words. Louise’s MLT was 5.6 words, in contrast to Thelma’s, which was 7.5 words. Across these observations Louise and Thelma were engaging yet respectful communication partners who actively listened to each other, appeared to choose their words carefully, and frequently joked and laughed together.

Laminating participation frameworks and indexical fields
This narrative telling foregrounds the rich lamination typical of conversational narratives. As the interview was about to begin, the participants were engaged in, and coordinating their conversation around, multiple related activities (for example, Rob studying the map of Alaska, Julie pulling up a chair, Mary waiting for Julie and sharing news about her sister’s upcoming move). As Julie sat down, Mary directed the narrative telling to her, laminating a fleeting platform order onto the conversational interaction. Rob, however, maintained a different stance, more consistent with the preceding one, by continuing to look at the
Louise’s ‘And that’s how we drove’ narrative

Louise’s driving narrative occurred after the interview was over. We had turned to scheduling the remaining research sessions, including a final aphasia testing session that only Louise needed to attend. Louise and Thelma indicated that Thelma would come with Louise to all of the sessions, in order to drive, which prompted me to ask if Louise had gotten her driver’s license yet. Louise responded that she had not, which set off a five-minute discussion about driving. Directly and indirectly, the discussion focused on the need for Louise to get her driver’s license. Louise expressed reservations about driving one-handed (due to her paralyzed right arm), Thelma said that Louise was ‘just chicken,’ and I offered examples of people who successfully resumed driving after their strokes. Thelma argued that her mother was capable of driving, but that she just needed to try, adding that she had been ‘pushing for this for years.’ Louise argued that she did not know how she would get a car anyway, a point Thelma countered by saying that getting the license was the first step and after that ‘Aunt Shirley would be more than happy to get you a car’ or Thelma herself would buy her mom a car. At that point Louise returned to the question of driving one-handed, asking if she would need a special steering wheel. Thelma responded that Louise had already driven one-handed, and told the story of how several years ago (when they were arguing about driving) she had taken her mom out to the country and forced her to drive a regular car, which she did — ‘you drove with your other foot, you used your one arm, you turned around, you did everything.’ I suggested that adapting to physical limitations (like driving one-handed) was not as problematic for people as not being aware of what was going on around them, a problem that Louise did not have.

The transcript in Figure 5.3 shows the last minute of the driving discussion beginning with Louise’s response to me (Julie) that she has to do that (keep track of what’s going on around the car) for everyone she’s driving with, and Julie’s acknowledgement — ‘Right, exactly.’ Thelma responds nonverbally to this exchange by pointing at Julie and nodding (as if saying ‘you got that right’) and putting her head in her hand. Laughing, Louise points at Thelma and offers Julie a succinct evaluation — ‘She hates it.’ Thelma continues, verbally remediating her evaluation of Louise into an argument that her mother should be able to drive, a move which simultaneously recasts her mother’s positive comment (I have to do that for everyone) into a description of Louise as a backseat driver — And she can put on the brakes, and she can do all that in
L: "... to look this way, say "YOU'RE ON!" [laughing] And that's that's how we...
T: 
J: "..." [laughing]

*L looking at T
*L turns looking over right shoulder,
**L looking at J points whole arm forward

L: "we drove."
... but*
T: Yeah. See that'd concern me more than [laughing] than
J: "..."
*L nodding
**L looks away, shrugs shoulders

L: "[laugh]"
T: "then driving [laughing] than one-handed driving, let me tell ya. [laughing]
J: "...
*L nods

*L throws head back

L: "" Yes it is." "It is.
T: "I think it's just a confidence thing that you need to get over.
J: "..."
*T looking at L
**T looking at L
*L looking at T

*head point to L
*Looks back at T, nodding
**Look down, nodding

Figure 5.3 (Continued)

The passenger seat, there's no reason she can't do it in the driver's seat. Louise's attempt to begin her narrative is interrupted by Thelma, who continues her argument by giving an example that illustrates her mother's backseat driving - But then I do go slow and she yells at me for not going when I...there's okay never mind. Thelma breaks off her complaint, shaking her head and looking down, a stance that seems to indicate that she is giving up, having said all this before.

At this point, Louise redirects her gaze to Julie and relaunches the narrative that demonstrates her own competence - My cousin...we drove to Texas. She drove, and I was a passenger. But she can't turn her head this way. So I would always be sure to look that way, and...to look this way, say 'YOU'RE ON!' And that's that's how we...we drove. We realign around this narrative telling as a fleeting platform event, with Thelma and Julie taking up the stance of audience (for example, not interrupting, looking at Louise, laughing in response to the actions), and Louise presenting her narrative in one long conversational turn. Louise's narrative telling is highly engaging, as she sets up the narrative at the beginning, builds up to the most reportable event, nonverbally acts out the events as she tells them, and recaps the narrative in a closing that stays focused on the narrative itself. Julie follows the telling with an evaluation that reconnects Louise's narrative back to the conversational topics and essentially reformulates the stance she had taken just before Louise's narrative - See that concerns me more than driving with one- than one-handed driving, let me tell ya' [laugh]. Thelma then closes the entire driving discussion, also by restating her position on the broader issue, which she has apparently held for a long time - I think it's just a confidence thing that you need to get over - to which Louise agrees.

Narrative trajectories

At one level, Louise's 'And that's how we drove' narrative could stand as an amusing anecdote, conjuring up a chronotope of challenged driving on the open road. However, it also needs to be read as part of densely dialogic, sociohistoric trajectories, where it fits into ongoing arguments and fragile identity work. The competing evaluations and claims that Louise, Thelma, and Julie offer display dialogic histories that go beyond the five-minute conversation, reaching back to years of past experiences, acts and conversations, and looking forward to possible futures. Louise and Thelma's stances (both the footings they interactionally display and the beliefs/goals they argue for) appear to be well-honed in their interactional history. They openly reference this shared past when, for example, Thelma states that she 'has been pushing for this for years' and
Louise claims that Thelma ‘hates it.’ They also enact their dialogic relationship through their practiced familiarity, abbreviated arguments, and quick counterpoints to each other’s claims. Drawing on years of clinical experience, Julie intervenes in the pair’s long-standing argument, noting that after a stroke people often adapt to residual physical disabilities (such as hemiparesis), but more serious problems arise for drivers who cannot see or are not aware of the road/traffic around them.

This last point becomes the occasion for Louise’s narrative, prompting her to agree that she is very aware of the road and thus, in Julie’s terms, is competent. Commenting on Louise’s awareness, however, Thelma offers several representations of how (over)involved Louise is as a passenger in the car. Louise then delivers the narrative of her directing the driver, her cousin who could not turn her head, during their long cross-country drive. Louise delivers the narrative smoothly and displays her abilities by acting out her looking to the left and to the right. It is a moment where the disruptions in her competence from effects of the stroke are representationally and interactionally negated in converging accounts of her competence. It is interesting how enthusiastically Louise delivers this narrative that displays her competence, even though it sharply counters her larger argument that she is unable to drive (for a discussion of the complex dynamics of argument in everyday talk, see Ochs, Taylor, Rudolph, and Smith, 1992). Louise’s narrative leads Julie to reiterate her earlier point, one that affirms Louise’s potential, and Thelma to reiterate that the problem is confidence. Louise agrees with Thelma — somewhat ambiguously, as she does not go on to commit to getting her license. This conversational narrative telling enters into ongoing discussions of driving and disability and projects into the personal and interpersonal trajectories radiating forward from this five-minute interaction.

Conclusions

I opened this chapter with an epigraph from Rachana, taken from a book that centers on stories, particularly the tales of A Thousand and One Nights, a book of stories within stories, whose framing story is that of Scheherazade the queen whose life literally depends on her being able to keep the stories going and on building her ethos through her narrative tellings. Rachana’s words resonate with Bruner’s (1990) understanding of narrative as not only externalized discourse but also culturally scripted, internalized ways of organizing our experiences of the worlds we inhabit. Narrative is a kind of interface between how we (re)construct the world in our moment-to-moment experience and how the world (re)constructs us sociogenetically. Narrative chronotopes are thus about trajectories of human becoming as well as a means of representing events. Taking up narrative as semiotic highlights the way that narratives are not just linguistically presented but also materially performed in embodied and physical spaces. Taking up narrative as re-mediation highlights how persons and events, experiences and imaginings, are discursively (re)presented in a narrative now. Taking up narrative as practice foregrounds the ways narrative emerges as a central nexus among, and resource for, structuring or breaking interactive alignments, for organizing or disrupting interaction orders, for meaningfully navigating and folding together flows of time. All three of the narrative cases presented here display ways that narratives are richly multisemiotic, that they play central roles in managing complexly laminated interactions, and that social and personal identities often hang on the tellings and evaluations of narratives.

To align this theoretical perspective with methodological practices involves carefully repurposing methodological toolkits. As we note in the introduction to this volume, the methods for studying human activity and sense are not new. However, as we repurpose them to different theoretical ends, we need to interrogate and rework their use. For example, Labov’s (1997) account of narrative textuality, as an example of one methodological tool, was quite useful. However, for Labov, narrative moves were understood to be linguistic moves. The second narrative of Ethel’s (Mom, ‘I don’t understand, I don’t understand.’) would probably not have counted as a narrative by Labov’s criteria because so much was conveyed by gesture, posture, paralinguistics, and dialogic common ground. The three narratives here highlight how much of the work can be and is carried by semiotics other than language. The embodied performance of Louise’s smooth verbal narrative of assisting her cousin in driving makes this point as well as Ethel’s nonverbal elaboration of limited verbal productions. Aligning the theoretical perspective with methods also calls on us to focus on the mix of durable and emergent dimensions of narrative discourse. Labov’s scheme for narrative textuality and Ochs and Capps’ (2001) for narrative tellings highlight recognizable dimensions of narrative. Taking up such durable features provides ways of operationally defining and describing stretches of discourse as narrative texts. Yet each of these narrative cases also displays finely nuanced interactional work as well as the need to locate that work in the specific, extended dialogic trajectories of participants.

More broadly, attending to the narrative practices of individuals with aphasia is valuable in several ways. Given that aphasia is understood
as a marked disruption in the deployment of linguistic resources and in routine patterns of communication, attending to the communicative practices of individuals managing aphasia foregrounds the semiotic resources and work that support all narrative tellings (even highly verbal ones) and that scaffold diverse everyday interaction orders. For clinical practice, taking up these theoretical perspectives refocuses attention away from defining aphasic deficits as isolated phenomena owned by individuals to tracing the ways people collaboratively manage aphasia (successfully or not) as they wield communicative resources and act in concert with others. Finally, taking up narrative and other discourse practices as semiotic remediation holds promise for reconfiguring the study of brain–behavior relationships by respecifying what must be accounted for as we seek to understand the interanimation of minds, bodies, activities, and environments that form the dynamic functional systems of everyday worlds.

Appendix: Transcription conventions and key

Sample transcript segment

M: * She thinks- she thinks she
T: She could feed them for the winter. ... Anyway.
J: she'll lose weight up there.
* M looking at J, nodding, wringing hands

The transcription system used here was designed to track the ongoing participation of gatherings of individuals engaged in communicative interactions (see Hengst, 2001). Similar to a musical score, the transcript is presented as a series of temporally contiguous segments with each segment wrapping one to the next. Segments display a speaking line for each participant, with descriptions of gestures and actions (marked by *) included beneath speaking lines. Talk is presented in standard orthography, including contractions (e.g. won't, gonna) and common vernacular (e.g. okay, yikes). For the purposes of this analysis, mispronunciations typical of aphasic errors were also presented with standard spelling conventions. The sample transcript above shows an interaction among three co-present participants (M, T, J), all three participants speak, overlapping talk is evident when M interrupts T (She thinks- she thinks), and a gesture/action notes are described for M at the same time that J is speaking.

Transcription key

Bold text talk/gestures coded as narrative elements during narrative tellings
Italic text quiet, whispered, or soto-voice
Brackets audible gestures, such as laughing, presented in speaking lines
Timing of participant’s gesture/action relative to surrounding talk, with description of gesture/action displayed below speaking lines (as written descriptions and occasionally with thumbnail photographs)

.. pause, or silence, of less than one second
.. pause, or silence, in seconds indicated by numeral and surrounding periods
:: colons were used to mark prolonged sounds, one colon about \( \frac{1}{2} \) second
- dash marks an abrupt stop in speaking
description of how the underlined text was voiced

Notes

1. Traditionally, aphasia is defined as an isolated language disorder acquired by individuals as a result of focal damage to the dominant, usually left, hemisphere of the brain (see Benson, 1979; Davis, 2007). Although the particular presentation of symptoms varies across individuals and with the site and size of the brain lesion, the defining characteristic of aphasia is a marked deficit in the production and reception of language across all modalities – for example, spoken and written language production, and auditory and reading language comprehension. Aphasia deficits are primarily limited to language comprehension and production with sparing of other cognitive-communicative abilities (such as nonverbal memory and problem solving, judgment and insight, planning and pragmatics).
2. Even including disrupted and incomplete narrative fragments, Pratzel (2008) found that this definition allowed 70 percent agreement between two research...
teams in identifying the same stretches of discourse as narrative, with 35
commonly identified narratives out of a combined total of 50 narratives iden-
tified by both teams. In many cases, the disagreements on the remaining 15
stretches of discourse involved different ways narrative discourse was bounded
and parsed (a stretch of discourse, for example, coded as two narratives by one
team, and as one narrative by the other team) rather than failures to identify
stretches as narrative.
3. This finding resonates with the work of Rogoff and her colleagues (Rogoff,
Mistry, Goncu, and Mosier, 1993) who have documented the way that man-
agement of multiple semiotic channels of attention accomplishes culturally
specific patterns of child rearing.
4. The layering of multiple, decentered indexical grounds is, of course, not
unique to narrative discourse. Reported speech, for example, routinely lay-
ers not only multiple speakers, but also multiple times and places, into single
utterances (see Haviland, 1996; Hengst et al., 2005; Prior et al., 2006).
5. MLT (total words/total interactional turns) was calculated on the four com-
unity observations for each pair as part of a previously reported analysis
(Hengst et al., 2005).
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