

**Documenting change across time:
some methodological challenges and
an empirical example
(a longitudinal study of storytelling practices)**

Simona Pekarek Doehler

This talk has been inspired by collaborations with
Evelyne Pochon-Berger and Johannes Wagner

Prelude I - Why do longitudinal CA?

- CA: documenting **systematicity** in conversational practices
 - **member's methods** (Garfinkel, 1967), i.e. i.e. systematic procedures (of turn-taking, repairing, opening or closing a conversation, etc.) by which members of a social group organize their conduct in a mutually understandable and accountable way
- So far: CA is not much concerned with **change, over time**, in conversational practices (but see Zimmermann's 1999)

Prelude I - Why do longitudinal CA?

- A socially and scientifically relevant fact: member's methods for accomplishing actions change over time
 - Change in *cultural practices* (e.g. Heritage and Clayman, 2013)
 - Change due to *socialization processes, eg. professional practices* (Nguyen, 2012; Martin & Sahlström, 2010)
 - Change related to *learning/development* (Brower & Wagner, 2004)
 - Change in personal histories/encounters (Beach, 2009)
 - Change in people's ability to engage in social interaction (Wootton, 1997; Hall et al., 2013)
 - Etc.

Prelude 2 – what are the challenges?

1. The limits of an emic perspective?

- How can we bring to bear an emic perspective on learning, when we analyze not the sequential deployment of learning processes, but rather products of learning, i.e. a member's being more competent at time $X+1$ than at time 1?

2. Tracking what (or: the object of study)?

- What are the relevant entities that allow tracking change across time in member's methods?

3. The issue of comparability between practices that are eminently context sensitive

- How can we differentiate, in the observable change bw. time X and time $X+1$, what is due to development over time, and what is due to a change in local context?

What are possible methodological solutions?

An example: tracking change in story-telling practices
(Pekarek Doehler & Pochon Berger)

- Narrowing the focus: *story-openings*
- Interpreting the change: developing *interactional competence* in an L2

Data

- Julie and her host family:
 - au-pair girl, German L1, advanced speaker of French L2, aged 18, sojourning in a French-speaking family in the *Suisse Romande*
 - mother, father, 2 children (a girl aged 4 and a boy aged 7)
- Longitudinal design:
 - 20 audio recordings, 15'-25' in length, ordinary conversations (total: 7h)
 - recorded in regular intervals across the 9 months-stay (Sept.-June)
 - **Overall: 40 storytellings**

This study

Focus on:

- stories in **first position**:
 - Cf. Schegloff 1997: difference between stories that are solicited (second position) and stories that are elicited (first position)
- stories that recount events that have **not been co-experienced**
- **story-openings**
 - *How does Julie design the story at this moment as a relevant for these recipients?*
 - *Story design as recipient design*

What is at stake in story-openings?

Sacks, 1992: “*The beginning clues you into what sorts of things you should watch for so as to recognize the end, and also what sort of thing you should announce, having recognized the end*” (p. 766).

The design of the story opening:

- Making the opening recognizable as an opening of a story
(.e.g so as to suspend the turn-taking machinery cf. Mandelbaum, 2013)
- Displaying ‘fittedness’ to what precedes
(cf. Jefferson 1978: stories are “methodologically introduced”)
- Securing reciprocity
(Sacks, 1974)
- Projecting a story of a given type
(e.g. a complaint story, a ‘stupid me’ story; cf. Sacks, 1992; Mandelbaum, 2013)
- Anticipating how the story is to be received by co-participants

Previous study on L2: Hellermann 2008 – beginner to intermediate level

Analysis: months 2 & 3 (n=14)

(1) 12/10 'boulangerie' (2nd story)

05 JOR: mais- (0.3) .hh si tu bouges pas tu restes quand même
but if you don't move you stay nevertheless

06 *l'eau c'est un petit peu froide* °(alors;l'eau)°.
the water it's a little bit cold (so; the water)

07 MUM: mh=mh.

08 (0.3)

09 MAN: [((shouting in the background))]

10 JOR: [(xx)] au nid-du-crô.
(xx) at the nid-du-crô

11 (0.6)

11 JUL: à: la b:oulangerie elle m'a- (0.3)
at the bakery she PRO.REFL.1Ps as-

12 euh: j'ai demandé deux (0.4) euh cacaos?
I AUX asked for two cocoas

13 (0.6)

14 JUL: et puis ehm (0.3) elle m'a [demandé&
and then she asked me

15 JOR: [DEUX cac[aos.
two cocoas

16 JUL: &[ah je l-
oh I d-

17 je les fais <ti↑èdes>.
I do them lukewarm

18 (0.3)

19 JUL: et moi j'ai- (0.3) <tièdes>? ((laughs))=
and me I AUX- lukewarm

20 MUM: =((laughs))=

21 JUL: =je ne=savais pas qu'est-ce que ça °veut dire°.=
I didn't know what it meant

→ 22 MUM: =ah ouais.=
oh yeah

23 JUL: =↑oui lauwarm.
yes +lukewarm ((in German))+

24 (0.3)

→ 25 JUL: c'est- ouais.=
it's yeah

→ 26 DAD: =↑mh=

27 JUL: =c'est pas ch↑aud pas f[roid.=
it's not warm not cold

→ 28 MUM: [*>ouais ouais<*.
yeah yeah

29 JUL: hhhh.

30 +(6.1) ((Manon jumping and laughing))+

31 JOR: mais ma↑non c'est pas <drô:le> hein.
but Manon it's not funny PRT

(2) Pour rien 'for nothing' (Julie_091028)

01 MAR: ↑non mais: c'est- c'est tellement (con) quand elle ↑pleure
no but it's it's so stupid when she cries

02 comme ça [pour ↑RIEN,]&
like this for nothing

03 JUL: [(r::)e::h]
((non-lexical))

04 MAR: &et [<↑FOrt>],
and loud

05 [(noise of a fork)]

06 et [ah::=
and oh

07 JUL: [ou↑i:] a:h.
yes oh

08 (0.2)

09 JUL: et puis- euh une fois on est allé à l'école,
and then one time we AUX went to DET school
'and once we went to school'

10 (0.8)

11 JUL: et:: ehm ils ont <couru:>?
and they AUX ran
'and they were running'

Sum: months 2 & 3

- observable orientation to issues of sequential placement
- minimal projection of the incipient telling
 - Adverbial phrases (time and space) + past tense
cf. Hellermann's 2008 intermediate level ESF learners
- absence of prefatory work
- relevance to prior talk is not displayed at story onset
 - not 'fitted' to first story; cf. Sacks 1992; not displayed as "locally occasioned", cf. Jefferson, 1978
- no indications further characterizing the story
 - E.g. allowing the recipients to anticipate how it is meant to be received.

months 7 & 8 (n=14)

(3) 16.02.2010: 'moi je connais une fille' (5min36-6min06)

01 MAR: ts. >bon< c'est clair que dans l'idéal c'est mieux de prendre-
well it's clear that ideally it's better to take

02 (0.4) d'avoir un petit job le: week-end et pis:=
to have a little job on the week-end and then

03 JUL: =ouais.
Yeah

04 (0.5)

05 MAR: .h mais moi je trouve- je pense tu trouves pas si facilement
but me I think- I think you don't find so easily

06 °°hein.°°

07 +(3.3)((drinking sound))+

08 JUL: °mais° MOI je connais une fille qui euhm <travaille à la ga::re>?
but me I know a girl who works at the trainstation

09 dans=le: (1.4) °dans le petit bar là dans le:::° (0.2)
in the in thevc little bar there in the

10 °tu peux aussi euh boire un thé° [ou boire° une bière hh.
you can also have a tea or have a beer

11 MAR: [m↑hm.]

12 (1.3)

13 JUL: et:=euh: (0.4) ouais (1.0) elle gagne <vingt francs l- l'↑heure>?
and yeah she earns twenty francs per hour

14 MAR: mh=c'est pas mal?
It's not bad

15 JUL: ouais. ((telling continued))
yeah

(4) 15.03.2010: le belge : 'le belge' (début enregistrement)

01 MAR: =alors tu prends le tien pis vous arrêtez: de vous énerver
so you take yours and you stop getting annoyed

02 pour rien
for nothing

03 JOR?: mais toi t'as celui-là- bon moi j'ai celui-là.
but you you have this one well me I have this one

04 (1.1)

05 MAN: moi je prends celui-[là?
me I take this one

06 JUL: [mai:s euh [ce weekend&
but this week-end

07 MAR: [mhm

08 JUL: &il y avait aussi un belge,
there was also a Belgian guy

09 +(1.0) ((dish noises))+

10 JUL: de: un flamand,
from a Flemish

11 +(1.1) ((dish noises))+

12 MAR: à ski?
skiing

13 +(0.5) ((dishes noises))+

14 JUL: non mais euh euh (0.7) avec nous,
no but with us

15 (1.1)

16 JUL: avec l'↑uni ouais.
with the university yeah

17 MAR: ouais. (0.2) ah::
yeah oh

18 JUL: mais il était en jeans, hhhh.
but he was in jeans

➔ 19 MAR: +ah ouais? ((smiley voice))+
oh yes

20 (1.0)

➔ 21 MAR: [ah=ouais.
oh yes

22 JUL: [.hhhhh +ou:i:: ((smiley voice))+[et puis:(hn)
yes and then

➔ 23 MAR: [+c'est bien les belges ça.
that's typical of Belgian people

24 ~~((smiley voice))+ hhhh-~~

25 JUL: =ouais (0.4) .hh et puis euh (0.4) OUais: j'ai dit=euh
yeah and then yeah I AUX said

26 si: euh ouais (.) si il peut >skier avec ça< h.
if yeah if he can ski with this

((storytelling continued))

Summary of findings

	<u>Months 2-3</u>	<u>Months 7-8</u>	
Sequential placement - after sequence closing	√	√	Cf. Hellermann 2008
Projecting a telling - framing by means of temporal/spacial adverbials + past tense	√	√	
Securing reciprocity and referent availability before launching the story proper	--	√	Extensive prefatory work -> recipient design -> index relevancy for the <i>hic et nunc</i>
Displaying relation to prior talk - displaying the story as locally occasioned, as 'fitted') (cf. Sacks, 1972, 1992; Jefferson, 1078)	--	√	
Projecting features of the nature of the incipient story - e.g. anticipating recipient reaction	--	√	

Discussion and conclusion

Interpreting the findings

- Over time, L2 speakers
 - deploy **more context-sensitive conduct** by means of which they manage more effectively the local contingencies of the talk-in-progress.
 - develop the **ability to project upcoming actions** in order to make them recognizable for co-participants;
 - show more close **monitoring of the linguistic and sequential details** of co-participant's turns.
- ⇒ *L2 interactional competence involves participant's increased ability to recipient design their actions and to deploy increasingly context-sensitive conduct. (cf. Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011)*
- ⇒ *learning can be traced as a more or less durable change in the middle or long run -> here: the outcomes of learning (≠ the process)*

Discussion and conclusion

The limits of an emic perspective

A possible dilemma for developmental CA studies?

Change over time may not be sufficiently accounted for from an *emic perspective*:

- e.g. learning: people do not demonstrably orient toward past learning; they do not consistently display 'oh, I've learned this'

Discussion and conclusion

The issue of comparability between practices that are eminently context sensitive

How can we differentiate bw. what, in the observable change in conduct, can be accounted for in terms of *local context-sensitivity*, and what provides evidence for *change across time*?

01: merci!
thanks