



An examination of narrative in Radio 4's *The Listening Project*

Emma Ellis

Introduction

BBC Radio 4's *The Listening Project* is an archive of conversations between members of the British public from 2012 onwards. It was influenced by Storycorps, a similar American project beginning in 2003 that has recorded over 35,000 conversations and is stored at the Library of Congress (BBC Radio 4 Listening Project: 2012). In *The Listening Project* excerpts of these recorded conversations are broadcast by Radio 4 and regional BBC radio channels, then compiled online and stored permanently in the British Library. Some of the conversations are recorded professionally at regional studios, and some recorded by participants themselves. The project expresses itself as a way of capturing 'a picture of the nation', encouraging participants to tell 'a fantastic story that you'd love them to share with the world' (BBC Radio 4 Listening Project: 2012).

How participants choose a 'fantastic story' that the world, or at least the audience of Radio 4, want to listen to lends itself to an analysis regarding the heightened importance of tellability (Baroni: 2011) in their stories. For example, some stories are familiar between the two speakers of the conversation, and some are known only to the teller. The way in which familiar and unfamiliar stories are narrated during conversations in *The Listening Project* will be the focus of this investigation. I will therefore qualitatively analyse two conversations archived as part of *The Listening Project*: one between two adult males and another between an older female and her adopted daughter. Both conversations involve the relaying of two stories and provide examples of singular narration and co-narration.

To measure the differences between singular and co-narration I will apply and analyse the influential framework of narrative structure included in Labov and Waletzky (1967). Labov and Waletzky also suggest that narrative can serve 'an additional function determined by social context' (ibid, 2); I will then analyse the social function served by these singular and co-narrated conversations, including their effect upon relational (Sluss and Ashforth: 2007) and narrative identity (Georgaopoulou: 2002).

Literature Review

There are many varying definitions of what makes a piece of discourse a narrative, since previous research has assigned importance to different elements of its construction. For Labov (1972), temporality and structure are the most significant components; narrative is outlined as 'one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of narrative clauses' (Labov: 1972, 359). Bruner (1991a) agrees that sequential order is a grammatical constituent to narrative (Bruner: 1991a, 77) and that Labov's credit is 'to have recognized that narrative structures have two components: "what happened and why is it worth telling?"' (Bruner: 1991b, 12). However, as a whole Bruner defines that what makes a narrative so is its focus upon people and intentional states, and how these led to activity (ibid, 28). This focus upon people and intent is extended through

Bruner's other crucial grammatical constituents of narrative which include agentivity, sensitivity to what is canonical in human interaction, and the requirement of a narrator's perspective (the narrative cannot be 'voiceless') (ibid, 77).

Benwell and Stokoe (2006) summarise an outline of narrative components, including Labov (1972) and Bruner (1991), to compile a list of shared features in identifying narrative. This entails the inclusion of a teller, a trajectory, and the recounting of events that are displaced both spatially and temporally (Benwell and Stokoe: 2006, 133). In addition to these, narratives must also include basic structural features such as a narrator, characters, settings, a plot, events that evolve over time, crises and resolutions (ibid). Overall, therefore, the wealth of definitions of what a narrative *is* consists of both structural and non-structural aspects.

Labov's revision of Labov and Waletzky (1967) further argues that the structure of narrative is necessarily 'well-articulated' (Labov: 2001, 63) if the narrative uses the principle of temporal organization. The structure he refers to consists of an abstract; orientation; complicating action; evaluation; result or resolution; and a coda (Labov: 1972, 363). In this specification, the abstract refers to one or two clauses summarizing the story (Labov: 1972, 363). The orientation is usually found at the beginning of a narrative, but can be placed later at strategic points (ibid, 365), situating the story's temporal and spatial location. Complicating Action is the only entirely essential aspect (ibid), providing the action of the narrative which is then resolved. The coda, said to occur less frequently than the other components (ibid, 370), signals the end of the narrative, providing general observations or the effects on the narrator and bridging the temporal gap between the time of the narrative and the time of the present (ibid). Indeed, this notion of steps towards narratorial consciousness following the turning point in a narrative is echoed by Bruner (Bruner: 1991a, 33).

Labov (2001) adds two further categories to this structure, noting the validation of an event by enhancing its credibility and using objective witnesses (Labov: 2001, 64) and the assignment of praise and blame by the integration or polarization of participants (ibid). Indeed, supporting the addition of objective witnesses and enhancement of credibility, in Sciffrin's 1996 study it was found that there was syntactic contrast between directly and indirectly reported speech in narrative, which had a role in the construction of story characters (Schiffrin: 1996, 193-94) and therefore the objectivity of witnesses. However although these categories have proven 'a robust general framework' (Coupland: 1999) in the field of narrative analysis, they have also been subject to a great deal of criticism. For example, Edwards argues that these narrative categories underspecify the components of narrative (Edwards: 1997, 276) and are idealised, meaning that they are less useful when used as 'pre-loaded analytic slots' (ibid).

Nevertheless, Labov and Waletzky (1967) also put forward the notion that narrative can serve an additional function determined by social context (ibid, 2). According to Baynham there are several types of narrative that serve different functions, including the personal narrative, the generic/iterative narrative (what happens typically or repeatedly), the hypothetical or future narrative, narrative-as-example (to illustrate a point) and the negated narrative ('the story of what didn't happen') (Baynham: 2011, 64-67). Life stories, like those featured in many of the conversations recorded for *The Listening Project* are exemplary of the personal narrative form, allowing the teller to reflect upon and interpret life experiences through constructing and understanding stories (Edwards: 1997, 269) (Schiffrin: 1996, 167). They may reveal an image from the speaker of 'what they are or what they wish to be' (Cortazzi: 2001, 388), reiterating the notion of autobiography that Bruner notes as a method of presenting ourselves as typical, or 'culture conforming' (Bruner: 1991, 29).

However in the case of the narrative from a non-typical speaker with visible disabilities, like Nick in Appendix 1, Smith and Sparkes argue that the body exerts an

attraction to specific narratives regarding its disability (Smith and Sparkes: 2008, 6), that particularly encourage the construction of restitution narratives in which there is a hope and 'affinity for the restored self' (ibid). This is shaped socially, reinforced by the audience who have a concrete hope for the desired outcome of the speaker's bodily restoration (ibid, 7). Indeed, Schiffrin argues that narrativity is a form of verbalization in which we verbally place our past experiences in, and make them relevant to, a particular 'here' and 'now' (Schiffrin: 1996, 168). The selection of significant events in the teller's life, like the story of disability, allows the teller to shape the narrative with exceptionality or tellability (Baroni: 2011): a necessary component to narrative delivery (Bruner: 1991, 29).

This presentation of life stories is also strongly related to the demonstration of identity, especially relational identity (Sluss and Ashforth: 2007). As Schiffrin notes, who we are is sustained by our ongoing interactions with others and the way we position ourselves in relation to those others (Schiffrin: 1996, 197). It follows that narrative language provides a process of subjunctivization, or the formation that one is not a self but a relation of the self to an other (Ranci re: 1992, 60). Narrative language therefore 'reveals our presuppositions, permits multiple perspectives and allows subjectification' (Schiffrin: 1996, 169). Thus certain identity aspects may be made more salient or relevant than others in different points in an interaction (Georgaopoulou: 2002, 428).

At the same time as these identity aspects, however, there may also be the manifestation of narrative identity in the joint-construction of narrative. Interaction-based narrative that is enacted by more than one speaker thus relies upon the enactment of 'a set of discourse identities that are intertwined with the story's emerging internal structure' (ibid: 427). Georgaopoulou outlines these participant identities as follows:

- 1) The elicitor (asking questions that pose complications and invite suggestions for the projected events)
- 2) The assessor; references to group stories (as implicit assessments) and explicit identity claims. This identity manifested itself sequentially in responses to questions by the plotline elicitor
- 3) The teller-aide, who agreed with and elaborated on the story's evaluation. (Georgaopoulou, 2002: 446)

These participant identities are, according to Georgaopoulou, constitutive of building blocks in the group's interactional history as they are 'rich in symbolic associations and prone to recontextualization' (ibid, 431). Indeed, Norrick (1997) explores the variety of non-informative functions that a re-told narrative can serve. He suggests that sharing a familiar narrative within a group allows participants to relive pleasant common experiences, confirms the long-term bond they share, and 'redounds to feelings of belonging' due to the experience of collaborative narration (Norrick: 1997, 211). Common features of this co-narration include the repetition of sounds, words, phrases and sentences (ibid, 200), and checking on the accuracy of their own recollections through open-ended statements or explicit questions (ibid, 206).

However, in this investigation the participant identities evoked within *The Listening Project* will also be read within the frame of radio discourse. Although there is no institutional radio DJ/radio host figure involved in the conversations it should be kept in mind that these broadcasts simulate an interface between the public and private spheres in a similar way to the radio phone-in (Scannall: 1991, 9) and the everyday 'mundane' talk radio format (Hutchby: 1991, 119). Their engagement therefore serves a double articulation; the communication between the participants of discussion is also designed to be heard by absent audiences (Scannall: 1991, 1) who will not provide direct feedback (ibid, 1). However, as the aim of *The Listening Project* is, ostensibly, to 'listen' to the participants converse with each

other, there is no direct address or even outspoken acknowledgement of the radio audience and the presence of the listener is not integral to this study.

Methodology

Cortazzi emphasises the importance of narrative analysis as a tool for access to ‘the textual interpretive world of the teller’ (Cortazzi: 2001, 385). Yet, according to Edwards, this kind of analysis largely ignores ‘interactional business’ (Edwards: 1997, 263); indeed, studies such as Labov and Waletzky (1967) used a research interview to collect narrative data, which differs from discourse in a conversation between peers (Cortazzi: 2001, 388). Nevertheless, I have ensured that this investigation does not neglect interaction by applying the relational theories of co-narrative by Georgaopoulou (2002) and Norrick (1997) alongside those of Labov and Waletzky (1967).

Indeed, the conversations from *The Listening Project* that I have transcribed demonstrate a more naturalistic stream of discourse between two participants rather than the sociolinguistic interview setting. In this case the discourse is not troubled by the research observer’s paradox, although there is a more obvious awareness of observation in the sense that the conversation is recorded with the potential of radio broadcast to regional areas. This may affect the language used, particularly in terms of censorship and what is suitable for broadcast, but it brings forth the point of narrative choice since the tellers must relate a story with tellability in order to be chosen to broadcast. It also allows the investigation to be carried out without ethical concerns.

The recording of my data as part of media construction also has consequences with relation to selective editing; *The Listening Project* suggest that listeners send in 30 minute clips of conversation (BBC Radio 4 Listening Project: 2012), but these are then reduced to 2-3 minutes of broadcasting time. To minimize the effects of this I chose small, continuous extracts of discourse. However, instances where selective editing may occur also denote the components of narrative that are considered necessary and tellable to the radio audience.

I have included the transcription conventions used in this study in Appendix III. During the next section I will use the format [x] to refer to the line numbers from specific conversations. Due to the small scale of this study I have chosen to focus upon the close, qualitative analysis of two conversations rather than loosely looking at a large number of extracts in a quantitative analysis, which arguably lessens the generalisability of my findings; however, it allows the investigation to assess several points of both structural and non-structural analysis collaboratively, and is representative of speakers of different age, race and genders, and with different relationships (both friendships and family relations).

Data Analysis

Defining Appendix I and Appendix II as ‘Narrative’

Taking into account Benwell and Stokoe’s requirements of a narrative to contain a teller, a trajectory, and the recounting of events that are displaced both spatially and temporally (Benwell and Stokoe: 2006, 133) Appendix I, taken from a conversation entitled ‘Life Goes On’, can be divided into two sections each classed as *narrative* stories. What will hereby be referred to as Narrative I is characterised by Nick talking about what happened after he was involved in an accident that caused him spinal damage. He recounts waking up in hospital and explains how he felt, as Neil joins in to co-narrate the remainder of the trajectory and displace these past worries with what really happened afterwards, concluding with the continuation of their relationship [30]. In terms of Baynham’s (Baynham: 2011, 64-67) classification of narrative type, this fits both the personal narrative and the negated narrative, since lines [10] – [17] describe Nick’s worries that [16] ‘didn’t happen’.

Neil then becomes the teller of a different story, re-locating to a different temporal

space of [32] 'a few years ago'. This will accordingly be referred to as Narrative II. The trajectory of Narrative II follows Neil watching Nick regain his passion for dance, which led him to a [39] 'visceral and emotional release'. Here Neil remains the single narrator since Nick was previously unaware of the story, [41] 'no I didn't know this', classifying it as a personal narrative (*ibid*).

Appendix II is taken from a conversation between retired doctor Myrtle and her adopted daughter, Denika, entitled 'The Gift of You'. They first discuss temporally displaced events as exemplary of Denika's hyperactive behaviour as a child, qualifying as a narrative-as-example (*ibid*). I will refer to this section as Narrative III. Here both speakers co-narrate this story of Denika taking a skipping rope to church, which has a short trajectory concluding in [14], 'so it was such a *huge* thing when you came into my life'. The following stretch of discourse, Narrative IV, may also be counted as a narrative-as-example (*ibid*) since it uses a story in response to Denika's question about adoption [20]. Indeed, with reference to another trait of the narrative it is a form of 'verbalization' that makes the past verbally relevant to a particular here and now (Schiffrin: 1996, 168).

Narrative Structure

Here I will use Labov and Waletzky's (1967) framework of narrative structure to further categorise Narratives I-IV. Taking into account Edwards' criticism that the categories are too idealized as 'pre-loaded analytic slots' (Edwards:1997, 276), I will note where problems and divergences from this structure occur; this will form part of my later analysis of the differences between co-narrative and narrative delivery.

Narrative I

Narrative I does not seem to include an abstract, although this may be due to radio editing or because the narrative is a shared story familiar with both participants. Instead we are presented with an orientation, or clauses with a referential function (Labov and Waletzky: 1967, 23), explaining the accident; [2] 'I was really drunk of course' and [2] 'I didn't have the initial shock', before a re-orientation to [3] 'a matter of hours later' in the location [7] 'my bed' which is re-affirmed as [7] 'my hospital bed'. There are also two events in the narrative that could be considered a 'complication' component: the accident itself and also Nick's concern of being treated 'as the disabled friend'. The second complication is followed by a lengthy evaluation, during which Neil joins in as co-narrator, to a collaborative resolution in [30] 'we kind of carried on our relationship didn't we' and [31] 'yeah', although this could also be considered a coda in the sense that it denotes the effect of the narrative's events on the narrators.

Narrative II

Labov and Waletzky's (1967) model fits slightly differently when applied to Narrative II. Again, there is no abstract, just the initial orientation [31] 'a few years ago'. The complication of the narrative appears to be Neil's emotional reaction to Nick enjoying the dance performance, which is followed by the evaluation characterising this reaction as a [39] 'visceral and emotional release'. Situated amongst this evaluation may be a coda in [43] 'I'm still a bit tear about it now', in the sense that it denotes the current effect on the narrator, standing at the present moment of time and 'pointing to the end of the narrative, identifying it as a remote point in the past' (Labov and Waletzky: 1967, 31).

Narrative III

Narrative III presents an abstract of sorts in line [1], as Myrtle indicates that she will tell Denika something representing how energetic she was as a child [1] 'I don't know if I have ever told you'. As co-narrator however, Denika brings in a line of evaluation confirming that she is familiar with the story [9] 'I know times have changed now though' and anticipates what she is going to say with the overlap in [11] 'I do yes'. The complication arises from

Denika bringing a skipping rope to church, with the resolution of having to skip to church and run back. Evaluation is present in the form of [14] ‘so it was such a *huge* thing when when you came into my life’, although again this is tied in with a coda, denoting the narrative’s effect upon the present-day narrator.

Narrative IV

In Narrative IV there is an abstract, outlined in reference to one day when [22] ‘there was (.) a major standoff in relation to [23] (.) the little brown shoes’. This also functions as an orientation, although it is far from in-depth, providing only the temporal setting of a day in the past. The complication arises early on as Denika refuses to wear a pair of shoes [25], which is resolved following line [40]’s reporting of direct speech, [40] ‘when you come into this car’ [41] ‘you must be happy’; that is to say, when there is an establishment of rules and positivity in their relationship. There is also symbolic action around lines [33] – [38] through the imagery of singing in the car, which Labov and Waletzky (1967) outline as a type of culturally defined evaluation. There does not appear to be a coda in this narrative, although this may again be due to the selective editing of the radio broadcast.

Clause Structure

According to Labov and Waletzky (1967) this narrative structure is underlined by a specific arrangement of clauses. They give a thorough definition of the prototypical clause structure involved in the delivery of narrative that suggests only independent clauses are relevant to the temporal structure of narrative (Labov and Waletzky: 1967, 11) and can be narrative clauses (Labov: 2001, 362). These are organized into displacement sets which are the basis of establishing temporality (ibid, 12). A displacement set is made up of a narrative clause and at least one free clause or co-ordinate clause, with the order of free and co-ordinate clauses being interchangeable but the narrative clause necessarily static (ibid, 13). This can be demonstrated in Narrative I:

[4] Nick: later I was sober uh	Free clause
I couldn’t move uh my uh my lower limbs	Free clause
and then suddenly [5] all my friends all you [6] Neil : yeah [7] Narrative clause Nick : were standing around my bed	

(Bold = Clause embedded within spoken discourse)

However, Nick waking up in hospital after his accident is the only action during the narrative that here requires temporal order. Although I earlier suggested that another complication of this narrative consists of Nick’s worries about perceptions of his disability, the following discourse simultaneously consists of evaluation that can be re-arranged differently whilst retaining semantically coherent.

<i>Original Narrative I Extract</i>	<i>Clause Type</i>	<i>Re-arranged Clauses in Narrative I</i>
Neil : [14] that’s the that’s the very thing we we we [15] didn’t want [to do] = [16] Nick: [<i>didn’t do</i>]	Free clause	[17] [an and we actively] worked against doing that =
[and it didn’t happen] =	Free clause	[and it didn’t happen] =
[17] [an and we actively] worked against doing that =	Free clause	Neil : [14] that’s the that’s the very thing we we we [15] didn’t want [to do] = [16] Nick: [<i>didn’t do</i>]

Cortazzi and Jin (1999) emphasise the importance of evaluation in narrative in revealing how speakers intend the narrative to be understood and what the point is (Cortazzi and Jin: 1999, 103). Therefore the reinforcement of evaluation through clause structure in Narrative I is relevant to both the overall narrative trajectory and identity values, as discussed later in this investigation. In terms of trajectory, evaluation combined with coda here firmly positions the situation and Nick's initial thoughts as distant and opposing those in the present. Labov's argument that the 'complicating action' is the only necessary component of narrative (Labov: 1972, 365), but this is not the case in Narrative I since the tellability of the story is also based on the evaluation of the relationship between Nick and Neil following Nick's accident.

Narrative II and Narrative III

Narrative II differs from Narrative I in the sense that there are substantially more narrative clauses than free clauses. Thus, the focus is upon complicating action rather than evaluation.

[32] Neil: we came to see dance again for the very first time	Free clause
[33] and you danced in your chair	Narrative clause
and erm I dunno if I've told you about this before	Free clause
[34] but I came out of that performance and and	Narrative clause
and left with the family	Free clause
and we went back [35] to the car park	Narrative clause
and I let the family go to the car	Narrative clause
and I just took myself to um a [36] little corner dark corner	Narrative clause
and just [37] Nick: oh right [38] Neil : bawled my eyes out	Narrative clause
[39] Nick : oh god [right] [39] Neil : [it was] a really kind of um (.) visceral and emotional release for me	Narrative clause

This is similarly the case in Narrative III. However, Denika provides some of the narrative clauses in this extract which exemplifies her role as a co-narrator.

[10] Do you [remember when you] [11] Denika: [I do yes] [12] Myrtle: took a skipping rope to church	Narrative clause
We had to skip to church =	Narrative clause
[13] Denika : and run back = [14] Myrtle : and run back	Narrative clause

The evaluation in this extract involves a suspension of action through repetition which

Labov and Waletzky argue is indicative of an evaluative statement (Labov and Waletzky: 1967, 29), although this is between the co-narrators rather from a single teller. The instances of evaluation from both speakers are characterised semantically by their form as direct statements (ibid) and although Labov suggests that semantic definition includes lexical intensifiers, here there are instead frequent phonological intensifiers, such as the emphasis on ‘*minimize*’ and raised volume for ‘*LIFE CHANGING EVENT*’.

Narrative IV

Unlike the above narratives, this conversation seems to be composed of a balance between free clauses and narrative clauses that typifies Labov and Waletzky’s (1967) model of clause structure. For example, lines [28] - [36]:

whatever reason you agreed to put on these [29] little shoes	Narrative clause
And you stomped down the corridor to the car	Narrative clause
We got in the [30] car	Narrative clause
And up until this point you hadn’t said a word to me	Free clause
It must have been [31] half an hour later	Free clause
You hadn’t said a word to me	Free clause
And I sat in the car	Narrative clause
And I [32] looked across at you	Narrative clause
And I said you know something	Narrative clause
I don’t have to do this [33]	Narrative clause
This is a happy car	Narrative clause
When you come into this car	Narrative clause
you have to be in a happy [34] mood	Narrative clause

Identity and Group Features

Norrick’s (1997) suggestion that sharing a familiar narrative within a group allows participants to confirm their long-term bond through the experience of collaborative narration (Norrick: 1997, 211) seems particularly applicable during these conversations from *The Listening Project*. There is a great deal of repetition of words and phrases in both Narrative I and Narrative III; for example, in Narrative I the repetition of ‘didn’t’ [15] and [16] by both Nick and Neil emphasises what did not happen, again recalling the notion of the negated narrative (Baynham: 2011, 64-67). Narrative I also strongly recalls Smith and Sparkes (2008) analysis of the restitution narratives with an affinity for the restored self (Smith and Sparkes: 2008, 6), particularly since both the audience of Neil and the audience of radio listeners share the desired outcome of Nick’s bodily restoration (ibid, 7). Indeed, it seems that this restitution narrative prompts Neil to initiate a responding narrative that confirms Nick’s restoration of watching dance again for the first time [31].

In Narrative III lines [4] [5] Myrtle repeats Denika’s evaluation that she was a hyperactive child, overlapping with Denika’s laughter. It is notable that these instances of repetition seem to occur during periods of evaluation rather than periods of complicating action. However, in Narrative IV despite Denika not entirely being able to recall the event narrated, she suggests what she imagines to be Myrtle’s feelings, [27] ‘terrified’, which

Myrtle then repeats, similarly emphasising the long-term bond manifested in collaborative narrative.

Narrative Identity

Georgaopoulou argues that certain identity aspects may be made more salient or relevant than others in different points of an interaction (Georgaopoulou: 2002, 428). I will apply Georgaopoulou's outline of discourse participant identities; elicitor, assessor, teller-aide (ibid, 446). Although these components are based on narratives discussed in groups with more than two speakers, their application to the two-participant *The Listening Project* conversations still provides an insight into their interactive narrative relationships.

Narrative I

Neil is originally the elicitor of the narrative, disputing Nick's relaying of thoughts that he will be treated negatively because of his disability in [14] and prompting a shifting into the negated narrative. After this Neil takes over as the assessor and Nick shifts into becoming elicitor, supporting Neil as in [30] 'we kind of carried on our relationship didn't we'. Both participants oscillate as teller-aide, agreeing with and elaborating on the story's evaluation as the story shifts from Nick's personal experience to the dynamics of their shared relationship.

Narrative II

There does not seem to be an elicitor or teller-aide during this section, reiterating that the event is only known and narrated by Neil. Neil speaks for a total of 12 lines, whereas Neil only interjects with 3 lines of backchannelling 'yeah'.

Narrative III

Myrtle appears to be an elicitor, asking Denika [10] 'do you remember when you' which recalls Norrick's suggestion that talking about remembering to preface a story justifies its telling (Norrick: 2005, 1820). Myrtle also takes on the role of the teller-aide, supporting events of the story like '[13] and run back'. Therefore Denika is the assessor, agreeing with this version of events and repeating it '[14] and run back'.

Narrative IV

Denika is clearly the elicitor of the narrative here, asking [20] 'what made you still go ahead and adopt me?'. She invites suggestions for projected events by anticipating Myrtle's evaluative narration, as in [27] 'terrified' and [37] 'so that's why we always sang in the car'. Denika also acts as teller-aide, agreeing with and elaborating on the story's evaluation as in the above cases and [41] where she partially echoes Myrtle with 'you must be happy', a phrase that Myrtle then repeats. Throughout the narrative it is Myrtle who becomes the assessor, referencing shared stories in responses to questions by Denika, the elicitor.

Discussion

The results from my analysis of the structure of narrative demonstrate that the continuous components in the stories are orientation and evaluation. When the story is familiar between the two speakers there is less of a need for an abstract or coda, particularly seen in Narrative I which does not have an abstract, and where the coda may be considered part of another category; even though Labov argues that the 'complicating action' is the only necessary component of narrative (Labov: 1972, 365). Even if these aspects have been omitted during editing for radio broadcast, this reveals that the abstract and coda are viewed as less necessary to provide for the radio audience.

Indeed, a closer analysis of clause structure shows that in stories co-narrated between the familiar speakers, there is a greater emphasis upon periods of evaluation rather than those furthering the narrative story. In Narrative II, a story told to Nick for the first time, there are longer stretches of narrative clauses rather than evaluative. Therefore the structure of

narrative is dictated by the familiarity of the story, and points to high levels of evaluation as justification for tellability since it strengthens the bond between co-narrators (Norrick: 1997).

Georgaopoulou's (2002) foundations of co-narration here are proven to be applicable to Narrative I, Narrative III and Narrative IV, which may be because they are familiar, shared stories. In Narrative II Nick is previously unaware of the story, which negates the need for an elicitor or teller-aide.

Conclusion

Therefore the influential frameworks from Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972) are demonstrably more effective when applied to the discourse narrated by a single speaker, as in Narrative II. In the case of co-narration, Georgaopoulou's framework is more useful, with the stages of elicitation, teller-aideing and assessment present in the co-narrated, familiar stories. Assessment is particularly important in dual-narrated stories, since it is similar to the evaluation aspect of Labov and Waletzky (1967) that structurally dominates Narratives I, III and IV and provides the important component of tellability by reinforcing the group relationship. Further research in this area could focus upon whether evaluation is just as important in conversations between more than two people, and repeat the study with field observation to negate the effect of the radio broadcast frame upon the speakers.

Bibliography

Baroni, R. (2011), 'Tellability' in *The Living Handbook of Narratology* [online] Available at: <http://hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/index.php/Tellability> [Last accessed 06/01/2013]

Baynham, M. (2011), 'Stance, positioning, and alignment in narratives of professional experience' in *Language in Society* 40 (1), 63-74.

BBC Radio 4 Listening Project (2012) [online] Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/features/the-listening-project>

Benwell, B. and Stokoe, E (2006), *Discourse and Identity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Bruner, J. (1990), *Acts of Meaning*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

----- (1991a), 'Self-making and world-making' in J. Brockmeier and D. Carbaugh (eds.), *Narrative and Identity: Studies in Autobiography, Self and Culture*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins

----- (1991b) 'The Narrative Construction of Reality' in *Critical Inquiry* 18, 1-21

Cortazzi, M. (2001), 'Narrative analysis in ethnography' in P. Atinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland and L. Lofland (eds), *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage

Cortazzi, M. and Jin, L. (1999) in Hunston, S. and Thompson, G. (eds), *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Coupland, N. and Jaworski, A. (1999) 'Editors Introduction to Part Three' in *The Discourse Reader*, New York: Routledge

Edwards, D. (1997), *Discourse and Cognition*, London: Sage

Georgaopoulou, A. (2002), 'Narrative and identity management: Discourse and social identities in a tale of tomorrow', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 35 (4), 427-51

Hutchby, I. (1991), 'The organization of talk on talk radio' in Scannell, P. (ed.), *Broadcast Talk* London: Sage

Labov, W. (1972), *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Philadelphia Press

----- (2001), 'Uncovering the event structure of narrative', in *Georgetown University Round Table 2001*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press

Labov, W. and Waletzky, J. (1967), 'Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience' in Bamberg, Michael G. W. (ed.), *Oral Versions of Personal Experience: Three Decades of Narrative Analysis*. Special Volume of *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, Volume 7, 1997, 3-38

Norricks, N. R. (1997), 'Twice-told tales: Collaborative narration of familiar stories' in

Language in Society 26, 199-220

----- (2005) 'Interactional remembering in conversational narrative' in *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (11) 1819-1844

Rancière, J. (1992) 'Politics, Identification, and Subjectivization' in *October* 61, 58-64

Scannell, P. (1991), 'Introduction: the relevance of talk' in Scannell, P. (ed.) *Broadcast Talk* London: Sage

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

Sluss, D. M. and Ashforth, B. E. (2007), 'Relation Identity and Identification: Defining ourselves through work and relationships' in *Academy of Management Review* 32 (1) 9-32

Smith, B., and Sparkes, A. C. (2008), 'Changing bodies, changing narratives and the consequences of tellability: a case study of becoming disabled through sport' in *Sociology of Health and Illness* 30 (2) 217-236

Stockwell, P. (2002), *Sociolinguistics: A Resource Book for Students* London: Routledge

Tolson, A. (2006), *Media Talk: Spoken Discourse on TV and Radio*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Appendix I*Life Goes On: Nick and Neil*

- 1 Nick : remember a time in the first - I think it was probably hours after my accident uh cos
 2 I was really drunk of course so the first - I didn't have the initial shock of laying - on
 3 the pavement - my - shady recollections start where it was I don- a matter of hours
 4 later I was sober uh I couldn't move uh my uh my lower limbs and then suddenly all
 5 my friends all you =
- 6 Neil : yeah =
- 7 Nick : were standing around my bed my hospital bed well you know which kind of felt
 8 like a painting you know like you [see uh old fashioned paintings] →
- 9 Neil : [yeah yeah I know what you mean]
- 10 Nick : ← umm - it kind of felt sick man in bed and then my worry was oh this has
 11 changed *everything* - this has changed our relationship you are now [gonna] →
- 12 Neil : [but ju-
 but I]
- 13 Nick : ← you you are now gonna treat me as the disabled friend=
 14 Neil : no but I think that that's the point though that's the that's the very thing we we we
 15 didn't want [to do] =
- 16 Nick : [didn't do] [and it didn't happen] =
- 17 Neil : [an and we actively] worked against doing that =
- 18 Nick : yeah yeah yeah =
- 19 Neil : we we tried to *minimize* the *LIFE CHANGING EVENT*
- 20 Nick : [Yeah ((laughs)) yeah]
- 21 Neil : [as as much as we could] into a well Nick (.) you know it doesn't change our
 22 relationship at all - but there are things you need to get through now and and we'll
 23 we'll support [you through it]
- 24 Nick : [yeah absolutely yeah] I mean yeah I'm lucky in the sense that before
 25 this our relationship was always talking =
- 26 Neil: yeah =
- 27 Nick: we're not afraid of talking about feelings and how we feel about stuff [like you
 28 know]
- 29 Neil : [yeah]
- =
- 30 Nick : we kind of carried on our relationship didn't we do you know what I mean=
 31 Neil : yeah (.)
- 32 a few years ago we came to see dance again for the very first time - and
 33 and you danced in your chair - and (.) erm I dunno if I've told you about this before
 34 but I came out of that performance and and and left with the family and we went back
 35 to the car park - and I let the family (.) go to the car and I just took myself off to um a
 36 little corner dark corner and just =
- 37 Nick : oh right =
- 38 Neil : bawled my eyes out =
- 39 Nick : oh god [right]
- 40 Neil : [it was] a really kind of um (.) visceral and emotional release for me
 41 because =
- 42 Nick : no I didn't know this =
- 43 Neil : no I yeah I'm still a bit tear about it now but for me it was to see you reclaim that
 44 part of you - that you had (.) put in a box and and it and it was never going to
 45 happen again - and to see you back and for you to kind of - to make that
 46 because I think you were quite scared about getting back on stage

Appendix II*The gift of you: Myrtle and Denika*

- 1 Myrtle : I don't know if I (.) have ever told you (.) what a bundle of (.) energy ((laughs)) and fun
- 2 Denika : [((laughs))]
- 3 Myrtle : [you were when you] came to me aged five and a half
- 4 Denika : Very hyperactive child [((laughs))]
- 5 Myrtle : [Extremely hyperactive] (.) you never stopped moving (.)
- 6 [you never walked] →
- 7 Denika : [oh I remember]
- 8 Myrtle : ← if you could run =
- 9 Denika : I know times have changed now though ((laughs))
- 10 Myrtle : ((laughs)) you never ran if you could skip do you [remember when you] →
- 11 Denika : [I do yes]
- 12 Myrtle : ← took a skipping rope to church we had to skip to church =
- 13 Denika : and run back =
- 14 Myrtle : and run back so it was such a *huge* thing when when you came into my life I
- 15 thought oh my goodness uh oh how - this is completely different from what I
- 16 saw in Sheffield in Sheffield you were a very (.) sort of (.) angry and subdued
- 17 [child]
- 18 Denika: [yeah] my behaviour was quite challenging [at times] →
- 19 Myrtle : [mmhmm mmhmm]
- 20 Denika : ← what made you still go ahead and adopt me?
- 21 Myrtle : I think you are aware of how close I (.) came to abandoning the whole process
- 22 (.) can you remember one day when there was (.) a major stand off in relation to
- 23 (.) the little brown shoes →
- 24 Denika : [vaguely]
- 25 Myrtle : ← [that you] (.) absolutely refused to wear (.) eventually however (.) I don't
- 26 know whether you looked at my face and realised that I was →
- 27 Denika : [terrified]
- 28 Myrtle : ← [(remember that)] terrified I but whatever reason you agreed to put on these
- 29 little shoes and you then stomped down the corridor to the car (.) we got in the
- 30 car (.) and up until this point you hadn't said a word to me this must have been
- 31 half an hour later you hadn't said a word to me (.) and I sat in the car and I
- 32 looked across at you and I said you know something (.) I don't have to do this
- 33 (.) this is a happy car when you come into this car you have to be in a
- happy
- 34 mood →
- 35 Denika : [I I definitely remember that]
- 36 Myrtle : ← [you have to sing] you have to sing whether you want to sing or not so=
- 37 Denika : so that's why we always sang in the car=
- 38 Myrtle : that's why we always sang in the car that was the day the decree went out
- 39 Denika : [((laughs))]
- 40 Myrtle : when you come into this car [you have to sing] →
- 41 Denika : [you must be happy]
- 42 Myrtle : ← you must be happy

Appendix III*Transcription Conventions (from Stockwell 2002: 128-130)*

® utterance continues without a break onto the next line of text

– line of text is a continued utterance from the last arrow

= next speaker's turn begins with no break after current speaker

? intonation marking a question

word indicates heavy contrastive emphasis on a single word

WORD indicates shouting

() indecipherable word

(word) indecipherable word, containing best guess as to what was said

((smiles)) contains note on non-verbal interaction

(2.3)

(.) indicates significant pause below measurable length

- indicates very brief pause

[point at which overlap between speakers begins

] point at which overlap between speakers ends