



Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi, MEUDED, 2017; 14 (1), 35-60.

## THE TELLER/RECEIVER-ORIENTED FUNCTIONS OF *ONDAN SONRA* AS A DISCOURSE MARKER IN CONVERSATIONAL NARRATIVES

Emel Kökpınar Kaya<sup>1</sup>

*Hacettepe University*

**Abstract:** Discourse markers that are largely used in everyday talk carry out various functions in conversations. One of the conversational genres in which discourse markers are highly used is conversational narrative. Conversational narratives are the interactional productions of (the) teller(s) and listener(s), and also they are the textual reflections of the events that are experienced in past time and told in a sequence in the time of storytelling. In this storytelling which comprises of a sequence of events, both tellers and listeners use discourse markers for different purposes. This study aims to demonstrate the functions of *ondan sonra* as a discourse marker in Turkish conversational narratives. To this end, this study grounds on Conversation Analysis (Jefferson, 1978; Sacks et al., 1974) and Narrative Analysis (Labov and Waletzky, 1967; Labov 1972, 1997). The analysis which is carried out in the interface of these two study fields focuses on the narrative, conversational and interpersonal functions of *ondan sonra* in conversational storytelling. The data of the study includes 100 single and 12 complex conversational narratives gathered from 11 recordings of natural conversations in family gatherings whose participants are native speakers of standard Turkish. The findings show that *ondan sonra* has various

<sup>1</sup> Hacettepe University, Department of English Linguistics, Ankara, Türkiye, emelkokpinar@hacettepe.edu.tr

Makale gönderim tarihi: 02 Ağustos 2016; Kabul tarihi: 25 Ekim 2016

teller- and receiver-oriented functions in addition to the function of ‘continuity marker used in order to sequence the events’ as Özbek (1998a) suggested. The teller-oriented functions for narrative structure are sequencing the events in an temporal order, connecting the bound narratives to the first one, initiating the category of Complicating Action and initiating the category of Resolution. For conversational organisation, the teller-oriented functions are taking the turn and holding the floor, and for interpersonal interaction the only teller-oriented function is attracting the attention of the receivers to a specific point. In addition to them, the analysis shows that receivers use *ondan sonra* in order to initiate a turn and show their interest to the storytelling in conversational narratives.

**Keywords:** *Conversational narratives, discourse markers, ondan sonra*

## **BİR SÖYLEM BELİRLEYİCİSİ OLARAK *ONDAN SONRANIN* ETKİLEŞİMSEL ANLATILARDAKİ ANLATICI VE DİNLEYİCİ ODAKLI İŞLEVLERİ**

**Öz:** Günlük konuşmalar içinde sıkça karşılaşılan söylem belirleyicileri (discourse markers) konuşma içinde çeşitli işlevsel roller yüklenirler. Söylem belirleyicilerinin yoğun bir şekilde kullanıldığı günlük konuşma birimlerinden biri de etkileşimsel anlatılardır. Etkileşimsel anlatılar, anlatıcı(lar) ve dinleyici(ler) tarafından gerçekleştirilen etkileşimsel üretimlerdir ve ayrıca geçmiş yaşantıda deneyimlenen olayların günlük konuşmalar esnasında sıralı olarak anlatılmaları ile ortaya çıkan metinsel yansımalarıdır. Bu olaysal sıra içindeki öyküleştirme süresince, gerek anlatıcı(lar) gerek dinleyici(ler) farklı amaçlar ile söylem belirleyicilerine başvurmaktadırlar. Bu çalışma bir söylem belirleyicisi olarak *ondan sonra*nın konuşma içinde gerçekleşen etkileşimsel anlatılardaki işlevlerini göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çerçevede, çalışma yöntembilimsel olarak Konuşma Çözümlemesi (Jefferson, 1978; Sacks ve diğ., 1974) ve Anlatı Çözümlemesi (Labov ve Waletzky, 1967; Labov, 1972, 1997) alanlarından katkı almakta ve bu iki alan arayüzünde yürütülen çözümleme *ondan sonra*nın etkileşimsel öykülemelerdeki anlatı yapısı, konuşma düzeni ve kişilerarası etkileşim içindeki işlevleri üzerine odaklanmaktadır. Çalışmanın verisi, Türkçe anadili ve ölçünlü dil konuşucularının günlük aile içi konuşmalarından toplanmış 100 basit ve 12 karmaşık etkileşimsel anlatıyı kapsayan 11 farklı ses kaydından oluşmaktadır. Çalışmanın sonucunda, *ondan sonra*nın, Özbek (1998a) tarafından belirlenen ‘olayların sıralanması işlevini yürüten devamlılık belirleyicisi’ işlevine ek olarak, etkileşimsel anlatılarda anlatıcı ve dinleyici odaklı olmak üzere çeşitli işlevler yüklendiği gözlemlenmiştir. Anlatıcı odaklı işlevler, anlatı yapısı için

olayları sıralamak, bağımlı anlatıların önceki anlatı ile ilişkilendirilmesini sağlamak, ve anlatının Karmaşık Olaylar Dizisi ve Çözüm birimlerinin başladığına işaret etmek; konuşma düzeni için konuşma sırasını almak ve başlatmak, ve sırayı tutmak; kişilerarası etkileşim için ise dinleyicilerin ilgisini belirli bir noktaya çekmek şeklinde belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca, dinleyicilerin etkileşimsel öykülemeler sırasında, sıra alıp başlatma ve anlatıcıya anlatıya olan ilgilerini göstermek amacıyla *ondan sonra*yı kullandıkları bulgulanmıştır.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** *Etkileşimsel anlatılar, söylem belirleyicileri, ondan sonra*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Narrative, as an undeniable part of human language and a way of communicating ideas among interlocutors is interchangeably used with stories (Norrick, 2000; Georgakopoulou, 1997). Specifically, narrative can be defined as the presenting of previous experiences that took place at a specific point or over a specific interval in a past time story-world (Polanyi, 1989, p. 41). As a matter of fact, narrative can be explained as the expression of past events in a storytelling activity; therefore, it can be coined the term ‘storytelling’<sup>2</sup>. Narrative emerges as talking about the events and situations that human beings have experienced in their lives (Hymes & Cazden, 1980, p. 131), and it enables human beings to order and/or to reorder their experiences (Coates, 2003, p. 78). Depending upon the idea, Richardson (1990, p. 118) suggests that narrative is a method of organising past experiences and “primary way through which humans organize their experiences into temporally meaningful episodes”. Hereinafter, chronology is attributed to be the best candidate for distinguishing narrative from other genres due to the fact that “temporal sequencing of two or more events is considered by many to be a hallmark of narrative” (Ochs & Capps, 2001, p. 18).

Everyday talk is interwoven with narratives which emerge in terms of a temporal sequence of events about past experiences, reports of

<sup>2</sup> The terms ‘narrative’ and ‘story’ are used interchangeably in this study. Besides, the acts of ‘narrating’ and ‘telling’ and ‘storytelling’ are also taken to be equal. Other terms which can be interchangeably used in the study are ‘narrator’, ‘teller’ and ‘storyteller’. The people who are the recipients of the narrated texts may be expressed with the terms ‘listener’, ‘recipient’, and ‘audience’. Finally, the participants of a conversation may be represented with the term ‘conversationalists’ in the study.

newsworthy happenings, jokes and dream tellings. Narrative is a part of natural conversation and conversational stories are embedded in their contexts in conversations (Ochs & Capps, 2001, pp. 36-40). As a result, narratives which are linguistically and interactionally produced in conversations emerge as also ‘a polyphonic activity’ which can be addressed as conversational narratives. According to Schegloff (1997, pp. 100-101), conversational narratives have a dynamic nature which embraces the preceding and following talk, audience participation and potential deviations like hesitations and silences. The dynamic nature also credits the audience with an active participation in the course of storytelling by depending upon constant interactions and negotiations. Thus, conversational storytelling emerges as an interactional achievement of (the) teller(s) and listener(s) (Ochs & Capps, 2001; Schegloff, 1986).

In the production of conversational narratives, tellers introduce the story; monitor syntactic, semantic and prosodic development of the story; and use strategies to secure listener interest, to gain control of the floor, to ensure understanding, to gain planning time, to organise the story telling performance (Norrick 2000, pp. 1-6). Listeners may interrupt the narration of the teller to encourage and correct the teller, to contribute details, to evaluate the story, to provide comments, and just to interact; they may use conversational strategies to redirect the story line, to reformulate its point and to become full-fledged co-tellers. Both tellers and listeners strategically use discourse markers in addition to a great range of linguistic forms in order to achieve these acts.

Conversational storytelling is in the focus of many contemporary scholars who pay attention to different features of conversational narratives. The sequential and narrative organisation, and interpersonal aspects of conversational storytelling have been examined by various scholars (Blum-Kulka, 1993; Georgakopoulou, 1995; 1997; 2004; 2007; Ervin-Tripp & Küntay, 1997; Goodwin, 1984; 1986; 1990; Jefferson, 1978; Mandelbaum, 1987; Norrick, 1997; 1998; 2000; 2003; 2005; Ochs & Capps, 2001; Polanyi, 1979; 1985b; Sacks, 1972; Schegloff, 1997; 2000). In Turkish, there exists several studies (Küntay, 2002; 2004; Küntay & Nakamura, 2004; Küntay & Şenay, 2003) that mainly concentrate on preschool children’s conversational narratives with a developmental point of

view. Accordingly, the lack of more studies on narratives in natural contexts emerges as a gap for Turkish. Grounded on this, the present study concentrates on conversational storytelling in Turkish and the use of *ondan sonra* as a discourse marker in the sequence organisation, narrative structure and interactional aspects in Turkish conversational storytelling. More specifically, the study focuses on the teller- and receiver-oriented functions of *ondan sonra* as a discourse marker in Turkish conversational narratives.

### 1.1. DISCOURSE MARKERS IN CONVERSATIONAL NARRATIVES

In conversational storytelling, some specific linguistic forms are frequently used by tellers to trigger a storytelling, to produce a narrative body, to guarantee their teller positions, and to ensure the flowing of storytelling in a conversation and so on. These linguistic forms may be used for various purposes by listeners, as well. Discourse markers are in the list of these linguistic forms which are used by tellers and listeners for various narrative, conversational and interpersonal purposes in conversational storytelling. For example, they may have the function of initiating a narrative, taking and holding the turn in the course of storytelling, and requesting extra information about the narrated events. Or even they may perform the function of removing the events out of their past frame and locating them into the time of speaking. As a result, listeners feel as if they experience the narrated events by themselves. Georgakopoulou (1997, pp. 141-142) suggests that linguistic devices like discourse markers create a sense of proximity between the story world and immediate conversational situation. Thus, the listeners become involved with the teller as discourse markers create the feeling of witnessing the narrated experience (ibid., p.143). Besides, as Schiffrin (1987) proposes, with the help of discourse markers speakers can locate themselves in the ongoing conversation. According to Norrick (2001), discourse markers used in narratives have exclusive functions in narrative constructions, and their functions may differ from their usual meanings and from their genuine discourse marker functions in other contexts.

Many scholars have concentrated on the use of discourse markers in various genres (Bell, 1998; Fraser, 1990; 1996; 1999; Haliday & Hasan, 1976; Jucker & Ziv, 1998; Lenk, 1998; Redeker, 1990; Schegloff, 1982; Schiffrin, 1987; Schourup, 1999; van Dijk, 1979). The use of discourse markers in narratives, especially in conversational narratives has been

included in the works of Georgakopoulou (1997), González (2004), Labov and Fanshel (1971), Norrick (2001), Polanyi (1985a), Polanyi and Martin (1991).

Several discourse markers in Turkish have also taken the interest of scholars (Erdoğan, 2013; Ilgın & Büyükkantarçioğlu, 1994; Kuru-Gönen, 2011; Oktar and Cem-Değer, 2004; Özbek, 1995; 1998a; 1998b; Ruhi, 2009; Uçar, 2005; Yılmaz, 1994; 2004). More specifically, discourse markers, *şey*, *yani*, *işte*, have been studied in Turkish narratives (Furman & Özyürek, 2006). However, there is a lack of study on the use of *ondan sonra* in conversational narratives in Turkish. On this account, the present study aims to examine the specific uses of *ondan sonra* in Turkish conversational storytelling in terms of its teller/receiver-oriented functions in the narrative structures, conversational organisation and interpersonal procedures.

## 2. THE STUDY

### 2.1. THE DATA

The data of this study has been gathered from 11 audio recordings of unstructured, unmanipulated natural conversations of the native speakers of standard Turkish. The duration of the conversations is ten hours and eight minutes in total and ranges from sixteen minutes to two hours and forty minutes. 100 narratives have been randomly selected from a greater range of single narratives which take place in these 11 conversations. The recordings also include 12 complex conversational narratives<sup>3</sup> which are composed of 32 single conversational narratives. All complex conversational narratives which were found in the recordings have been analysed in the study.

### 2.2. THE PARTICIPANTS

The recordings have been taken up in the social gatherings of the conversationalists who are acquainted with each other and have a shared past. They are either family members or friends, thus they are expected to produce more narratives owing to their intimacy.

<sup>3</sup>Complex conversational narratives (CCN) are mainly identified as the combinational storytelling of related past experiences. They are organised through the combination of several single narratives which are about the same topic and from the words of a single narrator. For more information see Kökpınar-Kaya (2014).

The gender of the conversationalists seems to be equal in number; however, gender is not a variable in this study. The ages of the participants are limited between the ages of 20 and 65. All participants of the conversations are monolingual native speakers of Turkish who speak standard variety of Turkish.

Each set of group conversations used in the data contains participants ranging from four to eight in number.

### 2.3. DATA COLLECTION

All the spontaneous conversations in the data have been recorded in natural everyday conversations where people normally carried out their ordinary lives. The impromptness of the conversations has been preserved; there has not been a control of the researcher on their lengths and topics. However, the researcher has collected ethnographic observations concerning the participants, their moods and behaviours throughout the conversation, and the overall situation. Since an effective way of recording everyday speech is via participant observation (Labov, 1984; Milroy, 1987; Norrick, 2000), the existence of the researcher in the conversation is essential.

Since storytelling can come into life in conversations having participants with some certain degree of familiarity and there is a need for long periods of time to interact for familiar stories, the conversations in the indoor social gatherings of family members and friends have been recorded for the analysis. Obviously, conversations in family and friend gatherings are convenient for the participants to produce storytellings.

A digital audio recorder has been used for recording the ongoing conversations. The researcher has participated into the conversation during the data collection process with a recorder which is situated in a place where the conversationalists could easily see. The researcher has waited until everyone attends to the gathering and has informed the conversationalists about the recording for a scientific study at the very beginning of the conversation. The recordings of the conversations have been achieved by getting beforehand permission of

the conversationalists for both recording and the use of these recordings in an academic research after the recording process.

The beforehand permission may be claimed to have a minimal influence on the naturalness of conversations due to the close relationships between the participants who generally talked about subjects quite common of them. Further, the conversationalists intimately know the researcher; they are family members and friends. Due to this intimacy, they got used to being recorded easily. As Yılmaz (2004: 44) has noted, “the tape-recorder to be used for data collection had a minimal influence because the participants in natural conversations generally talked about subjects, which were quite intimate to them. This intimacy generally resulted in the participants’ getting used to the presence of the tape-recorder”. Besides, the conversationalists can orient themselves to the recording process after some time passes and their language use can be accepted as natural in general in spite of some effects of the recording (Labov, 1972; Norrick, 2000; Yılmaz, 2004; Tannen, 2005; Kökpınar-Kaya, 2013). Moreover, Labov proposes that the number of the participants is influential in the forgetting of the recording process and argues that “the effect of observation and recording was of course present, but the natural interaction of the group overrode all other effects” (1972, p. xviii-xix). Tannen (2005, p. 44) also supports this view by stating “If there is a relatively large number of participants who have ongoing social relationships, they soon forget the tape recorder. People play to the crowd.”

#### 2.4. PROCEDURES

The first step in the analysis is to transcribe the recordings. The recordings have been transcribed in terms of a simplified version<sup>4</sup> of the Jeffersonian Transcription System (2004a; 2004b). The next step in the analysis is to identify the narratives in the conversations. Then, the narrative body of the storytellings has been divided into narrative

<sup>4</sup> The following transcription conventions are used: - an abrupt cut-off when a speaker hears an interrupting talk, ... a repair of the speaker or rephrasing a sentence in progress, : prolongation of the sound that is followed, [ ] on successive lines are used for overlapping sequences. = When a next utterance is latched by prior one with no gap, (( )) non-verbal activity, ↑ falling pitch or intonation, ↓ increasing pitch or intonation, . a brief pause, and , continuing intonation. Capitalised text indicates increased volume in speech. The reported speech is identified with bold characters.



parts in terms of the categories of the narrative model that Labov and Waletzky (1967) proposed. The model of Labov and Waletzky consists of six components: Abstract, Orientation, Complicating Action, Resolution, Coda and Evaluation<sup>5</sup>. This classification helps us to frame the overall structure of Turkish conversational narratives. Thereafter, *ondan sonra* in the boundaries of conversational narratives and its functions in the narrative construction have been identified. After the identification of the functions in narrative construction, the functions of *ondan sonra* in the sequence organisation of conversational storytellings in Turkish have been delineated. In order for it, we have drawn upon both the methodological implications of Conversation Analysis proposed by Sacks et al. (1974), and the analyses of Jefferson (1978).

According to Sacks (1974), sequence organisation in conversations occurs through speaker change whose principles are:

- If the current speaker somehow has identified, or selected, the next speaker, then that speaker has the right to take and initiate the turn.
- If no such selection has been made, then any speaker may self-select and the first self-selecting speaker will take the turn.
- If no speaker self-selected for the next turn, then the main speaker may continue talking. However, it is not obligatory for him/her to keep the turn.

However, conversational storytelling may be problematic in this model of speaker change. One of the endeavours to bring an explanation for the sequence organisation of storytelling in natural talk belongs to Jefferson (1978) who put forward two principles: Stories emerge from turn-by-turn talk, therefore they are locally occasioned and they re-engage turn-by-turn talk, therefore they are sequentially implicative. These principles suggested by Sacks (1974) and Jefferson (1978) have provided the study with the impetus and analytical tools for analysing the sequence organisation in the narrative performances.

<sup>5</sup> Narrative categories of Labov and Waletzky are initially given by capital letters in the present study.

Grounded upon the narrative and conversational analysis whose frameworks and procedures have been given above, the study aims to classify the different functions of *ondan sonra* in conversational storytelling in Turkish. At this frame, the study presents a qualitative analysis which depends on several anecdotal implications in the following section.

### 3. THE FUNCTIONS OF *ONDAN SONRA*

*Ondan sonra* (means ‘after that’) is a discourse marker which may exist in different locations in the narrative body and may have various functions with different orientations in conversational storytelling. The various functions of *ondan sonra* which have been observed in the data are given in Table 1 below.

**Table 1.** *Ondan sonra* and its functions in conversational storytelling

Orientation of Ondan Sonra	Functions of Ondan Sonra	Domains of Functions
Teller-Oriented	Sequencing the events temporally	<i>Narrative</i>
	Connecting the bound narratives to the prior one	
	Initiating the category of Complicating Action	
	Initiating the category of Resolution	
Receiver-Oriented	Taking the turn	<i>Conversational</i>
	Holding the floor	
	Attracting the attention of the listeners to a specific point	<i>Interpersonal</i>
Receiver-Oriented	Taking the turn	<i>Conversational</i>
	Showing interest	<i>Interpersonal</i>

As it can be seen in Table 1, *ondan sonra* have been identified to have several teller- or receiver-oriented narrative, conversational and interpersonal functions. The narrative functions depend on the roles of *ondan sonra* in constructing a narrative body. Moreover, the ways narratives are initiated and produced in one after another, and how events are sequenced and distinguished in narratives have been highlighted as the narrative functions.

Conversational functions have been specified through the roles in the sequence organisation of a conversation. In other words, how tellers or listeners take and hold turns, signal that they will perform a storytelling and request a larger space for their storytelling in a conversation have been identified as the conversational functions.

Interpersonal functions of linguistic forms are relevant to the purposes of tellers to orient listeners for a storytelling, to manipulate them for giving permission for an extended turn and to make listeners feel as if they experience the events from the eyes of the teller. At that point, acts of attracting the attention of the listeners to the storytelling activity and visualising the situation emerge as the interpersonal functions.

The narrative functions of *ondan sonra* which are observed in the data can be listed as a) sequencing the events temporally, b) connecting the bound narratives to the prior one in a CCN, c) initiating the category of Complicating Action and d) initiating the category of Resolution. Its conversational functions are found as a) taking the turn and b) holding the floor. These are the teller-oriented conversational functions; however, *ondan sonra* has a receiver-oriented conversational function. It is the function of taking the turn in storytelling. The data of the study has shown that *ondan sonra* has also an interpersonal function with a teller-orientation. It is the function of attracting the attention of the listeners to a specific point in the storytelling.

These different functions of *ondan sonra* are exemplified in the narrative Woman with Parkinson's Disease given in Excerpt 1<sup>6</sup>.

(1)

WOMAN WITH PARKINSON'S DISEASE

1 D: şey parkinson hastalığı oluyor ya  
2 titremeler falan  
3 bir de onlardan bahsettiler.

<sup>6</sup> Participants in a conversation are represented by capital letters in the excerpts representing the conversational storytellings. These capital letters also signal the beginning of a turn.

4 onu da hafızayı normale şey yapıyormuş.  
5 onu da bir gün... kaset koymuşlardı.  
6 İstanbul'da çekim yapmışlar.  
7 video çekim yarışması yapmışlar bir de.  
8 herkesin hastalarla arasındaki ilişkileri.  
9 bir de bu patronları.  
10 patronlar da bu Çin'den şey,  
11 Kore'nin şeyi bu,  
12 firması.  
13 çok konuşunca boğazım acıyor.  
14 de ondan sonra işte adam.  
15 patronu da biz o gün tanıydık.  
16 çok matrak bir adam.  
17 ha şey yapıyor,  
18 orada da çekimleri vardı.  
19 burası şey olmuş.  
20 en güzel video çekimi,  
21 tanıtımı falan tezahüratı fazla yapıldığı için  
22 hastalarıyla böyle,  
23 şeylerin hani,  
24 yatak sahiplerinin firmanın böyle çok  
25 alakadar oluşu falan  
26 böyle tezahürat için,  
27 sokak dışına taşıdığı için,  
28 böyle çok yoğunluk olduğu için,  
29 çok coşku olduğu için,  
30 Türkiye birincisi olmuşlar.  
31 bu şube  
32 onun için.  
33 o:: sertifikaları falan var.  
34 Münevver Abla'nın resimleri var.  
35 sertifika almış.  
36 A: ha:::  
37 D: onlar he:::  
38 bir de eşini getirmiş adam.  
39 kadın,  
40 iki günde Türkçe'yi sökmüş.  
41 adam **tembel** diyor ama.  
42 kadın çok güzel Türkçe konu...  
43 ben girdim.  
44 bir de ben misafirim tanımıyorum ya ben şimdi.  
45 kadın gel... kadın böyle.  
46 **hoş geldiniz efendim** yapıyor.  
47 **siz de hoş geldiniz** dedim ben de.  
48 tahmin ettim yani.  
49 ufak tefek çekik gözlü.  
50 bir gün sonradan da gelecek dediler ya.  
51 toplantı var o gün diye  
52 **erken gel** dedi Münevver Abla.  
53 **çünkü erken toplanıyorlar** dedi.  
54 ben gittim dokuzda.  
55 a: yarısını konuşmuşlar zaten ama.  
56 dolu  
57 içerisi bütün dolmuş.  
58 biz yataklara geçtik yatakların üstünde oturduk artık  
59 geçilmiyor yani o kadar kalabalık yoğunluk olmuş.  
60 ondan sonra  
61 bir şey anlatacaktım.

- 62 ha: parkinson şeyini anlatıyordum.  
 63 İstanbul CD sinde,  
 64 kadın diyor.  
 65 benim diyor.  
 66 parkinson hastalığım var diyor.  
 67 ondan sonra unutuyordum diyor.  
 68 yaptığım şeyi unutuyordum diyor.  
 69 şunu şuraya koydum mu,  
 70 onu almaya aklım ermiyordu diyor.  
 71 bırakıyordum herşeyi diyor.  
 72 neyse beni hastaneye yatırdılar diyor.  
 73 ondan sonra,  
 74 hastanede diyor.  
 75 şeyler falan diyor.  
 76 böyle hep hastaların durumları kötü diyor.  
 77 böyle hepsi titriyor diyor.  
 78 şey yapıyor yaşlı yaşlı.  
 79 ben de kendimi onlardan daha kötü gördüm diye.  
 80 ben daha şeyim ya diyor.  
 81 biraz aklım eriyor ama diyor.  
 82 kafamda pek toplamıyor diyor.  
 83 kadın.
- 84 A: ha:  
 85 ondan sonra ben aklımı başıma toplayayım mı  
 86 demiş;
- 87 D: ondan sonra işte ben diyor.  
 88 biraz diyor tedavi gördüm diyor.  
 89 sonra bu yatakların şeyini duydum diyor.  
 90 teyzemin kızı ısrar etti buraya götürelim dedi diyor.  
 91 geldik diyor neyse diyor.  
 92 ben diyor.  
 93 altı ay mı dedi beş ay mı devam ettim diyor.  
 94 titremelerimde azalma oldu diyor.  
 95 unutkanlığımda azalma oldu diyor.  
 96 ondan sonra hatta diyor,  
 97 beni diyor bir gün diyor,  
 98 şeyden hastaneden gelirken diyor,  
 99 şey diyor...  
 100 çöp torbasını diyor,  
 101 eşya torbası diye diyor karıştırmışım diyor,  
 102 çöpü almışım diyor eve kadar getirmişim diyor.  
 103 içinde diyor kıyafetlerim var diye gece bir açtım diyor  
 104 olan çöp çıktı karşıma diyor.  
 105 kadın böyle elli beş altmış yaşlarında  
 106 şişkoda bir şey.  
 107 çok da matrak.  
 108 baktım baktım diyor.  
 109 güldüm diyor.
- 110 ondan sonra allahıma şükür dedim.  
 111 ben bu yatağa devam edeyim dedim diyor.  
 112 ona karar verdim çok şükür o zamandan beri diyor  
 113 öyle hatalar yapmıyorum,  
 114 aklım başıma geldi diyor.
- } Orientation  
 }  
 } Comp. A.  
 }  
 } Resolution  
 }  
 } Coda

### 3.1. NARRATIVE FUNCTIONS OF *ONDAN SONRA*

*Ondan sonra* can be accepted as a continuity marker which indicates that some more talk is coming next in conversation. With a narrative point of view, it may be identified as a marker which shows the continuity of events in a narration. In this context, it can be claimed that *ondan sonra* has a function of sequencing the events in a temporal continuum. The narrative function of sequencing the events in a temporal order can be exemplified in the narrative *Woman with Parkinson's Disease* given above in Excerpt 1 in the lines of 67 and 73. In these lines, the teller (Participant D) puts the events in a temporal order by relating them with the use of *ondan sonra*<sup>7</sup>.

In the same narrative, another narrative function of *ondan sonra* can also be observed. This narrative function connects the bound narratives to the priors in a complex narrative form. An example of the use of *ondan sonra* for this function can be seen in the lines of 60 and 96 in Excerpt 1. In these examples, *ondan sonra* seem like sequencing the events temporally; however, it also sequences the subsequent narratives in a higher narrative body by means of a temporal order. The teller jumps into new narrations and initiates new single narratives existing in a larger narrative body by using *ondan sonra*. By this act, the teller achieves to bridge a connection between the narratives of a complex narrative form. Obviously, complex narrative forms contain smaller narratives that are related to the former and latter ones and sequenced in terms of a temporal order or topical order (For more information about Complex Conversational Narratives, see Kökpınar-Kaya, 2014). In this narrative, the former and latter narratives follow one another in a temporal sequence with the help of *ondan sonra*. It gives signals that a new storytelling will be performed. As a deduction, *ondan sonra* can also be analysed as a 'narrative initiator' in addition to its role of continuity marker. However, the role of *ondan sonra* as a 'narrative initiator' can only account for the bound narratives which are connected to an initial narrative in a complex narrative structure. Therefore, *ondan sonra* can be identified as an initiator of bound narratives in conversational storytelling.

<sup>7</sup> The different functions which are examined in this study are represented with underlining.

*Ondan sonra* which functions as an initiator of bound narratives has been observed in turn-medial positions in the data of the study. In the lines of 60 and 96, in the middle of a turn the teller initiates the bound narratives with *ondan sonra* which is performed after another piece of storytelling. In this context, these bound narratives are initiated by the teller by holding the teller position.

*Ondan sonra* may also signal the launch of the Resolution in the narrative body. Tellers may differentiate the complicating events from the resolution of them by the help of *ondan sonra*. The teller in the narrative *Woman with Parkinson's Disease* separates the section of Resolution from a prior narrative section, Complicating Action by using *ondan sonra* which can be seen in Line 110. Here, *ondan sonra* distinguishes narrative events from the ones which indicate the results of them. In the same context, a tense shift from Continuous Historical Present (Schiffrin, 1981; Wolfson, 1982) also exists. In line 110, the teller separates the two narrative sections with the help of *ondan sonra* and a tense shift from Continuous Historical Present (CHP) which is distinguished from other uses of the present tense in terms of its potential to be replaced by the past tense without any change in time reference. The events narrated with CHP are always in the past, referring to the time at which the events took place.

Another narrative function of the discourse marker *ondan sonra* is initiating the section of Complicating Action. Tellers may pass to the narration of complicating events from the background information by signalling this transition via the use of *ondan sonra*. An example to the initiation of Complicating Action through *ondan sonra* can be seen in Excerpt 2 given below.

(2)

CUTTING GRASS

- |   |                           |                        |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------|
| <p>1 M: güzel ot yoldun ama değil mi↑<br/> 2 A: valla ot bile yoldurdular.<br/> 3 M: [güzel ot yoldun ha].<br/> (...)<br/> 17 A: ya onu bırak mahkumlar aşağıda.<br/> 18 Y: koca şey.<br/> 19 [askeriye].<br/> 20 A: [kuledeyim].<br/> 21 Y: bir makina alamadı mı↑<br/> 22 A: mahkumun birisinin dikkatini çekmiş.</p> | <p>—————→</p>             | <p><b>Abstract</b></p> |
| <p>}]</p>   | <p><b>Orientation</b></p> |                        |

- 23 şimdi kulenin etrafında,  
24 canım sıkılıyor iki saat nasıl vakit geçireceksin,  
25 sağa dön sola dön.  
26 kulede dört dönüyorum.  
27 M: asker  
28 A: hı: şimdi dönünce,  
29 aşağıda da,  
30 Z: [ot yoluyorlar].  
31 A: [şeyler]  
32 havalandırmalar var  
33 şöyle bir geniş,  
34 şey...  
35 duvar duvar ayrılmış işte.  
36 şeyler mahkumlar,  
37 orada,  
38 geziyorlar.  
39 şimdi bakıyorlar.  
40 laf atıyorlar zaten  
41 **asker ağa asker ağa** diye bağırlıyorlar.  
42 ondan sonra asker ağa dedi.  
43 Y: hıhı  
44 A: **ne oldu** dedim.  
45 işaret ettim.  
46 şimdi bizim burada jandarma yazıyor kıyafetlerimizde.  
47 burada da şey var ((shows))  
48 rütbe var.  
49 ondan sonra  
50 **o çavuşluk rütbesi mi** dedi.  
51 öteki de atladi  
52 yanındaki mahkum da  
53 **yok ya orada jandarma yazıyor** dedi.  
54 ben de dedim.  
55 **burada jandarma yazıyor** dedim, ((shows))  
56 **burada rütbe var** dedim. ((shows))  
57 ondan sonra öyle deyince  
58 **alla allah** dedi,  
60 ondan sonra ben bir şey demedim.  
61 fazla muattap almıyorum.  
62 onlar konuşuyor kendilerine göre.  
63 ben işaret ediyorum,  
64 şey yapıyorum.  
65 her yerde kamera var çünkü tepelerde.  
66 yani sürekli seni çekiyor kameralar.  
67 M: e:: asker.  
68 A: [ondan sonra],  
69 F: [ne konuşsan]  
70 A: tabi ne konuşsan.  
71 yani konuştuğun şey yapmaz ama  
72 tek tek şeylere  
73 kulelere zoom yapıyor  
74 F: [evet evet]  
75 A: [kameralar].  
76 F: en iyisi konuşmamak  
77 A: hm:: ben öyle şey bakmıyorum onlar konuşuyor,  
78 laf atıyor,  
79 şey yapıyorlar.  
80 bakıyorsun çok konuşacak oluyor,  
81 işaret ediyorum,

Orientation

Comp. A.



82	şöyle yapıyorum susuyorlar.	}	<b>Comp. A.</b>
83	anlıyorlar,		
84	bir daha		
85	şey yapıyorlar.		
86 M:	tozuyorlar.		
87 A:	kesiyorlar.	}	<b>Resolution</b>
88	<b>dedim yoksa</b> diyor,		
89	<b>sizin</b> diyor,		
90	<b>bütün herkes mi çavuş sizde</b> diyor.		
91	ben de <b>herkes çavuş</b> dedim,		
92	kapattım.		

*Cutting Grass* includes the narration of the absurd experiences of the teller's (Participant A) military service (lines of 17 and 92). The background information about the people and the setting, namely Orientation, is given between the lines of 17 and 41. Then, the events are narrated till Line 91 and by the Resolution (Lines 91-92), the narrative ends. In Line 42, the launch of the Complicating Action is achieved by the teller's using *ondan sonra* in the beginning of the narration of the complicating events. With the help of *ondan sonra* in the context exemplified in Line 42, the teller quits giving details of the information about the narrative events and separates narrative events from non-narrative ones, meanwhile Orientation from Complicating Action. In this context, the use of a tense shift from Continuous Historical Present is also influential in this process of the separation of the Labovian categories. Both the use of *ondan sonra* and a tense shift help to differentiate the events given as background information in Orientation and the events narrated in Complicating Action.

### 3.2. CONVERSATIONAL FUNCTIONS OF *ONDAN SONRA*

In addition to the narrative functions of *ondan sonra*, conversational functions of it as a discourse marker can also be observed in the data. As it can be seen in Table 1, the conversational functions have been identified as (1) taking the turn and (2) holding the floor. The first function, namely taking the turn can be specified in terms of its emergence with both teller and receiver orientations. However, the function of holding the floor is a teller-oriented function.

Tellers may take the turns in order to continue their storytelling with the use of *ondan sonra* in conversations. In Line 87 of Excerpt 1, it can be seen that there is a teller-oriented turn-taking act by the use of *ondan sonra*. After a participant's interruption (Participant A) for a

prediction, the teller (Participant D) takes the turn and continues storytelling by using *ondan sonra*. Here, *ondan sonra* emerges as a device for the teller in order to take the turn back and go on storytelling. A similar example can be seen in Excerpt 2, as well. In Line 68, the teller (Participant A) takes the turn via *ondan sonra* and goes back to the storytelling after a receiver interruption. Furthermore, by using it, both tellers incite the interest of the interrupters and the other audience to the story.

The data of the study shows that holding the floor with *ondan sonra* can be achieved by tellers in situations in which a longer turn is needed to continue storytelling. It is obvious that in conversations participants may interrupt the storytelling and begin talking about something different than the story. In order to prevent this, tellers may be in a tendency to take the control of the conversation by using some devices which give signals that they will continue storytelling. *Ondan sonra* is one of these devices which helps tellers to hold floors for their longer telling activities. The function of holding the floor can be exemplified on the lines of 14, 60 and 96 in Excerpt 1. On these lines, it is seen that the teller may aim at holding the floor in order to prevent listener interruptions and keep the storytelling continue by using *ondan sonra*.

In the data, it is possible to observe a receiver-oriented conversational function of *ondan sonra*. It is the function with the help of which listeners may take turns for their contributions, questions or predictions in the course of storytelling. Furthermore, they locate and link their contributions, questions, etc. to the story by using the continuity marker, *ondan sonra*. In Line 84 of the narrative given in Excerpt 1, Participant A takes the turn for a question form with the help of a filler *ha:::* and discourse marker *ondan sonra* (Line 85). The use of *ondan sonra* in this context helps the participant to relate her question with the narrative events which have been previously stated. After the question of Participant A, the teller goes back to the storytelling by taking the turn back with the help of *ondan sonra* (Line 87).

### 3.3. INTERPERSONAL FUNCTIONS OF *ONDAN SONRA*

Beside its narrative and conversational functions, *ondan sonra* has interpersonal functions. Tellers may use it in attracting the attention of

the listeners to the storytelling and listeners may use it to show their interest to the storytelling.

Any of the teller-oriented use of *ondan sonra* can be claimed to have the function of attracting the attention of listeners to the narration. Tellers may use *ondan sonra* to manipulate listeners to pay attention to what is narrated at that point and to make them leave the floor to tellers for the storytelling activity. This function can be illustrated in Excerpt 1 in Line 87 and in Excerpt 2 in Line 68. In both conversational situations, the tellers take the turn back by using *ondan sonra*. In addition, they attract the attention of the listeners to the storytelling after the interferences of the participants, Participant A in the former excerpt (lines 84-86) and Participant M in the latter (Line 65). Furthermore, any use of *ondan sonra* in any function may have the role that tellers are able to attract the attention of the participants to the storytelling. Last and more, listeners may use *ondan sonra* for showing their attention to the telling activity in addition to using it for conversational ends such as taking the turn as it can be seen in Excerpt 1 on Line 85.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

As the data of the study demonstrates, the discourse marker, *ondan sonra* can be accounted to have various functions exclusive to the storytelling. These functions are the results of the dynamic nature of *ondan sonra* which signals the continuity between the prior and following talk. As its denotational meaning (*after that*) suggests, *ondan sonra* comes after a piece of talk and indicates that there will exist some more talk after it. In other words, *ondan sonra* carries the influences of the former verbal production and implicates the existence of the next. In the data of the study, many functions with different orientations have been analysed as cited in the previous section. These functions can be classified in two meta-functions in conversational storytelling. They are the functions of indicating continuity and initiating a narrative. Thus, it can be possible to identify *ondan sonra* as a 'continuity marker' as Özbek (1998a) indicates and 'narrative initiator'.

The narrative functions of sequencing the events, connecting the bound narratives to the prior ones, and conversational functions of

taking and holding turn reinforce the idea that in conversational storytelling *ondan sonra* operates as a continuity marker which exists in the instant talk and bridges a link between the preceding and following talks in the production of the narrative. In the case of narrative construction in conversational storytelling, *ondan sonra* is used for sequencing the events in a temporal order. It is also used for ordering the internal parts of a narrative; it indicates tellers' launch of the next narrative section. In both situations, *ondan sonra* is the linguistic component which links the previous and following narrative productions.

In the frame of its roles in the internal construction of narratives, *ondan sonra* in Turkish conversational storytelling can be accounted as a 'separation marker'. It separates the telling of non-narrative events of Orientation from narrative events of Complicating Action, or events of Complication from events of Resolution. Here, *ondan sonra* is an indicator of a transition point with the former talk and the latter, thus it still functions as a continuity marker.

In the sequence organisation of conversational storytelling, *ondan sonra* is visible for taking and holding turns. *Ondan sonra* is a tool both for receivers and tellers to take turns. Via *ondan sonra*, conversationalists gain the stage for their talk by showing their consideration to the previous talk of another speaker, as well. At this context, *ondan sonra* instantly makes a connection between the turn units in the sequence organisation. In a similar vein, by using *ondan sonra* tellers may link their instant endeavours of controlling the floor to continue their talk with their previous talk. Therefore, they achieve to attract attention of the receivers on their talks, implicate that they continue their talking and thus prevent receiver-oriented interruptions and turn-takings.

In addition to its being either 'continuity marker' or 'separation marker', *ondan sonra* can also be coined with the term 'narrative initiator'. *Ondan sonra* with the function of initiating a narrative relates the topics of the previous talk with the following. However, this function can only account for the bound narratives which are connected to an initial narrative in a complex narrative body. At present, *ondan sonra* gives signals not only of a new storytelling but

also of a consideration for the prior narration(s). In the data, any examples for the initiation of single narratives via *ondan sonra* have not been found. Therefore, *ondan sonra* may be identified as an 'initiator of bound narratives' in conversational storytelling. Besides, *ondan sonra* with this function has mostly been observed in turn-medial positions in the telling of complex conversational narratives. Complex conversational narratives are the textual productions of the telling activities of one teller about several related past experiences. Since one teller has an extended turn for the narration of several stories in a complex conversational narrative, *ondan sonra* as the initiator of the bound stories is used in turn-medial positions.

The functions of linguistic forms in conversational storytelling cannot be thought in isolation, especially when the interpersonal functions of them are considered; any form can have either one of the narrative, conversational functions or interpersonal functions. This means that functions of *ondan sonra* are not autonomous from their functions of different domains in conversational storytelling. For example, it can be used both for initiating a narrative and attracting the attention of the listeners to the storytelling. The former function is a narrative one and the latter, an interpersonal function and they can be realised in the same linguistic body. Or *ondan sonra* can also be used for initiating a bound narrative in the turn-medial position of an extended turn, holding the control of the turn and taking the attention of the receivers to the teller activity. In this case, just one discourse marker may have narrative, conversational and interpersonal functions in the same context.

Another peculiarity about the compact nature of linguistic forms, more specifically the uses of *ondan sonra* in conversational storytelling is that they do not occur in isolation from other linguistic forms. As it is observed in the data of the study, *ondan sonra* may operate its functions together with the use of other linguistic forms such as tense shifts and fillers. Even it may be probable that *ondan sonra* may be used together with other discourse markers in Turkish storytelling. On the one hand, this study does not exhibit any use of *ondan sonra* together with another discourse marker, on the other, this kind of a use can be observed in a more extended data.

## 5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The present study has demonstrated that *ondan sonra* is a discourse marker which is highly exclusive to the Turkish conversational storytelling with its various functions. It grounds on different expectations of conversationalists about narrative structures and storytelling organisation as Norrick (2001) suggests for the discourse markers used in conversational narratives. According to him, any discourse marker is in a tendency to have specialised functions in conversational storytelling since conversational narrative as a genre is coined with a strict sequentiality.

The data of the present study illustrates that *ondan sonra* has various teller-oriented narrative, conversational and interpersonal functions exclusive to Turkish conversational storytelling. The receiver-oriented conversational and interpersonal functions of *ondan sonra* are also illustrated by the excerpts. However, any receiver-oriented narrative functions of *ondan sonra* has not been identified in the study. That may be because narrative functions are directly related to the telling activity, thus, to the teller position.

This study has been conducted with the use of a relatively large corpus of data which has been able to provide sufficient evidence in order to fulfil the aims of the study. However, for further implications more studies with larger corpus of narratives may justify and develop the findings of this study.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my PhD advisor Prof. Dr. Işıl Özyıldırım for her valuable suggestions and endless support throughout my research.

## REFERENCES

- Bell, D. (1998). Cancellative discourse markers: A core/periphery approach. *Pragmatics*, 8 (4), 515-541.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). 'You gotta know how to tell a story': Telling, tales, and tellers in American and Israeli narrative events at table. *Language in Society*, 22, 361-402.
- Coates, J. (2003). *Men talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Erdoğan, Y. (2013). Interactional functions of 'şey' in Turkish: Evidence from spoken

- Turkish corpus. *Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 10 (2), 33-52.
- Ervin-Tripp S. & Küntay, A. (1997). The occasioning and structure of conversational stories. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Conversation: Cognitive, communicative and social perspectives*. (pp. 133-166). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fraser, B. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 383-395.
- Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics*, 6 (2), 167-190.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers?. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 931-952.
- Furman, R. & Özyürek, A. (2006). The use of discourse markers in adult and child Turkish oral narratives: Şey, yani and işte. In S. Yağcıoğlu & A. Cem Değer (Eds.), *Advances in Turkish Linguistics*. (pp. 467-480). Izmir: Dokuz Eylül University Press.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (1995). Women, men, and conversational narrative performances: Aspects of gender in Greek storytelling. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 37 (4), 460-487.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (1997). *Narrative performances. A study of Modern Greek storytelling*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2004). Reflections on language-centred approaches on Modern Greek 'society' and 'culture'. *KAMHOS: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek*, 12, 45-68.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2007). *Small stories, interaction and identities*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- González, M. (2004). *Pragmatic markers in oral narrative: The case of English and Catalan*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goodwin, C. (1984). Notes on story structure and organization of participation. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. (pp. 225-246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1986). Audience diversity, participation and interpretation. *Text*, 6 (3), 283-316.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hymes, D. & Cazden, C. (1980). Narrative thinking and story-telling right: A folklorist's clue to a critique of education. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Language in education: Ethnolinguistic essays*. (pp. 126-138). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Ilgin, L. & Büyükkantarcıoğlu, N. (1994). Türkçe'de "yani" sözcüğünün kullanımı üzerine bir inceleme. *VIII. Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri*. (pp. 24-38). İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi.
- Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*. (pp. 219-248). New York: Academic Press.
- Jefferson, G. (2004a). Glossary of transcript symbols with an Introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*. (pp. 13-23). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Jefferson, G. (2004b). A sketch of some orderly aspects of overlap in natural conversation (1975). In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*. (pp. 43-59). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jucker, A. H. & Ziv, Y. (1998). *Discourse markers. Descriptions and theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kökpınar-Kaya, E. (2013). A case study on the ethical considerations of the methodology of Conversation Analysis. In. I. Özyıldırım, S. N. Büyükkantarcıoğlu, E. Yarar & E. Alpaslan (Eds.), *40. Yıl Yazıları*. (pp. 187-208). Ankara: Hacettepe University Press.
- Kökpınar-Kaya, E. (2014). An analysis on conversational narratives in Turkish. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Kuru Gönen, S. I. (2011). A neo-humean analysis of Turkish discourse markers 'ama' and 'fakat'. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 15 (1), 253-278.
- Küntay, A. (2002). Occasions for providing resolutions (or not) in Turkish preschool conversations. *Narrative Inquiry*, 11, 411-450.
- Küntay, A. (2004). Lists as alternative discourse structures to narratives in preschool children's conversation. *Discourse Processes*, 38, 95-118.
- Küntay, A & Şenay, İ. (2003). Narratives beget narratives: Rounds of stories in Turkish preschool conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 559-587.
- Küntay, A. & Nakamura, K. (2004). Linguistic strategies serving evaluative functions: A comparison between Japanese and Turkish narratives. In S.Strömqvist & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative, Volume 2: Typological and contextual perspectives*. (pp. 329-258). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. (1984). Field methods of the project on linguistic change and variation. In J. Baugh & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Language in Use*. (pp. 28-53). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Labov, W. (1997). Some further steps in narrative analysis. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7, 395-415.
- Labov, W. & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
- Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. (1967). Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts*. (pp. 12-44). Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Lenk, U. (1998). Discourse markers and global coherence in conversation. *Journal Pragmatics*, 30, 245-257.
- Mandelbaum, J. (1987). *Recipient-driven storytelling in conversation*. (Doctoral dissertation). Austin, TX, USA: University of Texas.
- Milroy, L. (1987). *Language and social networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Norricks, N. R. (1997). Twice-Told Tales: Collaborative narration of familiar stories. *Language in Society*, 26, 199-220.
- Norricks, N. R. (1998). Retelling stories in spontaneous conversation. *Discourse Processes*, 25, 75-97.
- Norricks, N. R. (2000). *Conversational narrative*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia:



Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Norrick, N. R. (2001). Discourse markers in oral narrative. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 849-878.
- Norrick, N. R. (2003). Remembering and forgetfulness in conversational narrative. *Discourse Processes*, 36, 47-76.
- Norrick, N. R. (2005). Interactional remembering in conversational narrative. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 1819-1844.
- Ochs, E., & Capps, L. (2001). *Living narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Oktar, L. & Cem-Değer, A. (2004). Turkish 'İŞTE' as trace and signal of discourse structure. In K. İmer & G. Doğan (eds.), *Current Issues in Turkish Linguistics* (pp. 121-134). Gazimağusa: Eastern Mediterranean University Press.
- Özbek, N. (1995). *Discourse markers in Turkish and English: A comparative study*. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Nottingham University, Nottingham, United Kingdom.
- Özbek, N. (1998a). Türkçe'de söylem belirleyicileri. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 9, 37-47.
- Özbek, N. (1998b). *Yani, işte, şey, ya*: Interactional markers of Turkish. In A. Göksel and C. Kerslake (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Ninth Interactional Conference on Turkish Linguistics* (pp. 393-401). Lincoln College, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- Polanyi, L. (1979) So what's the point? *Semiotica*, 25, 207-241.
- Polanyi, L. (1985a). Conversational storytelling. In Van Dijk, T. (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Vol. 3*. (pp. 183-201). Discourse and dialogue. London: Academic Press.
- Polanyi, L. (1985b). *Telling the American Story*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Polanyi, L. (1989). *Telling the American story: a structural and cultural analysis of conversational storytelling*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Polanyi, L & Martin, L. (1991). On the formal treatment of discourse particles: The case of mocho *la* in narrative discourse. In L. Polanyi & M. Steedman (Eds.), *Workshop on Grammatical Foundations of Prosody and Discourse*. University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Redeker, G. (1990). Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 367-381.
- Richardson, L. (1990). Narrative and sociology. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 19, 116-135.
- Ruhi, Ş. (2009). The pragmatics of *yani* as a parenthetical marker in Turkish: Evidence from the METU Turkish Corpus. *Working Papers in Corpus-based Linguistics and Language Education*, 3, 285-298.
- Sacks, H. (1972). An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. In D. N. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction*. (pp. 280-293). New York: Free Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. and Jefferson G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and

- Linguistics 1981. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1986) The routine as achievement. *Human Studies*, 9, 111-151.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Narrative analysis: Thirty years later. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7, 97-106.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*, 29 (1), 1-63.
- Schiffrin, D. (1981). Tense variation in narrative. *Language*, 57 (1), 45-62.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schourup, L. (1999). Discourse markers. *Lingua* 107, 227-265.
- Tannen, D. (2005). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends. Revised Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Uçar, A. (2005). Söylem belirleyicisi olarak işte'nin ezgi örüntüleri. *Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 2 (1), 35-50.
- van Dijk, T. (1979). Pragmatic connectives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 3, 447-456.
- Wolfson, N. (1982). *CHP: The conversational historical present in American English narrative. Topics in sociolinguistics, 1*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Yılmaz, E. (1994). *Descriptive and comparative study of the discourse markers 'well' in English and 'şey' in Turkish*. (Unpublished M.A. Dissertation). University of Essex, Essex, United Kingdom.
- Yılmaz, E. (2004). *A pragmatic analysis of Turkish discourse particles: Yani, işte and şey*. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.